

**Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services  
Office of Protection and Safety**

**Child  
Abuse or  
Neglect**

**Annual  
Report**

**for  
Calendar Years  
2005 - 2006**

# Table of Contents

Forward.....	
Information on Child Abuse or Neglect.....	
Overview of Steps Followed by Child Abuse or Neglect Cases.....	
Service Area Map.....	
Glossary of Terms.....	
Section I: Child Abuse and Neglect (CAN) Reports.....	
Section II: Allegations.....	
Section III: Victims.....	
Section IV: Perpetrators.....	
Tab A: Service Areas.....	
Central Service Area.....	
Eastern Service Area.....	
Northern Service Area.....	
Southeast Service Area.....	
Western Service Area.....	
Tab B: Additional Charts for Section I –CAN Reports.....	
Tab C: Additional Charts for Section II – Allegations.....	

## **FORWARD**

This report is a compilation of information pertaining to child abuse and neglect (CAN) reports received during calendar years 2005 and 2006. All information presented in this report is by calendar year unless noted and should not be compared to other reports that may use a different time period. The Department of Health and Human Services, Protection and Safety Section published a Protection and Safety Annual Report in 2005 and 2006. The information presented in those reports included much of the same information that was included in previous Child Abuse and Neglect Annual Reports.

The Department continues to receive inquiries about information pertaining to tables that were presented in previous years' Child Abuse and Neglect Annual Reports. These tables and information were not readily available in the Protection and Safety Annual Report. To accommodate those inquiries it was decided to reestablish the Child Abuse and Neglect Annual Report.

This report includes CAN data for Calendar Years 2005 and 2006. The information for 2005 is as of November 2006. The information for 2006 is as of May 2007. This is highlighted only to inform researchers that when comparing the two years there is not a direct comparison since the information was obtained at different times of the year. All years prior to 2005 were extracted in May of the following year.

This report only includes information for 2003 through 2006 where trends are being presented. Previous years reports presented ten years of information. The justification for this change is that the Department has established many policy and procedure changes since 2003, which had a major impact on practices and the information that is being presented in this report. The department does not feel that it is viable to compare calendar years prior to 2003 to current years because of the impact these changes had on the numbers.

## **Information on Child Abuse or Neglect for Calendar Years 2005 and 2006**

This report provides information from the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) about child abuse or neglect in Nebraska for calendar years 2005 and 2006. It also provides statutory child protective service references; responsibilities of law enforcement, the courts, and DHHS; an overview of steps followed as cases go through the DHHS Protection and Safety System; and a glossary of terms.

### **Statutory Child Protective Service References**

- ❖ All citizens are required by state law to report suspected child abuse or neglect by calling 1-800-652-1999 or contacting law enforcement.
- ❖ Nebraska Revised Statutes sections 28-710 through 28-727 define the terms “abuse” and “neglect” and outline reporting responsibilities. Responsibilities for law enforcement and DHHS are described.
- ❖ Nebraska Revised Statutes section 43-407 sets out the powers and duties of DHHS relating to the protection of children.

### **The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is the state agency responsible for child welfare, child protection and Juvenile Offenders.**

Services are provided to: children and families with issues involving abuse, neglect, and dependency; and youth that violate the law or have mental health issues.

### **The Department of Health and Human Services’ (DHHS), Law Enforcement, and the Courts’ Responsibilities in Child Abuse or Neglect Cases**

DHHS develops policy and guidelines to conduct work relating to abuse or neglect. In reports of child abuse and neglect where DHHS becomes involved, DHHS employees assess for child safety and risk to the child and other children in the family, provide services to the child and family. If children are removed from their homes by law enforcement or the courts, DHHS is usually given custody and responds by finding an appropriate temporary placement for the children.

Different entities become involved at various times in child abuse cases. Only law enforcement or courts have the authority to remove children from their homes. County attorneys are responsible for filing charges against those who victimize children. Law enforcement may be involved in investigations in which DHHS does not become involved and vice versa depending on local protocols established between DHHS and law enforcement.


### **Context for the Data in This Report:**

- ❖ *Data Source:* For trending purposes, this report includes information from 2003 – 2006. The data for this report was extracted at the time each year’s report was published. Information and data prior to 2003 can be found in previous years reports. Prior to 1998, state data was maintained on the Child Welfare Legacy Computer System, which is still maintained today when additional information is collected on those specific reports. All information since 1998 is from DHHS’ Nebraska Family On-Line Client User System (N-FOCUS), developed in part with Federal Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) funding. All states are required to submit data on child abuse or neglect cases, foster care, and adoption.
- ❖ *Time period for this report:* The data relates to reports received during calendar years 2005 and 2006. However, not all assessments may have been completed in the same year they were received.

## **Changes for the Data in This Report:**

- ❖ *Change in data extraction formulas:* During data extraction for the 2003 Child Abuse and Neglect Annual Report, a problem was identified with previously used extraction formulas, which had resulted in some records being counted multiple times. The formulas were improved in 2004 to correct this, resulting in changes in the data previously reported for calendar years 1999 – 2003.
- ❖ *Changes for this year:* The following changes and additions have been added to this report based upon suggestions and inquiries received throughout the year:
  - Population numbers have been added to some of the tables. Comments from some readers of previous versions of this report indicated that they would like to see and make a determination of the data impact based upon the population.
  - Additional tables and analysis narrative added to the ‘Statewide’ section providing data on gender, race, and relationship of the victim (child) to the perpetrator. The ‘Service Area’ sections have remained the same as previous years.
  - The layout of the report has been adjusted in the ‘Statewide’ section. The tables have been grouped into four separate categories: Reports; Allegations and Abuse Types; Victims; and Perpetrators. This was done to help the reader better understand what is being presented.

# Overview of Steps Followed by DHHS Child and Family Services for Child Abuse and Neglect Cases




# Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services Service Areas

**Western**  
Nathan Busch  
1600 10th St.  
Gering, NE 69341  
(308) 436-6500

**Northern**  
Mike Puls  
P.O. Box 339  
209 N. 5th St.  
Norfolk, NE 68702  
(402) 370-3359

**Eastern**  
Barry DeJong  
1313 Farnam  
Omaha, NE 68102  
(402) 595-2880



**Central**  
Yolanda Nuncio  
P.O. Box 2440  
208 N. Pine St.  
Grand Island, NE 68802  
(308) 385-6125

**Southeast**  
Jeff Schmidt  
P.O. Box 98933  
1050 "N" St.  
Lincoln, NE 68509-8933  
(402) 471-5328

Map 88 10/07

## Glossary of Terms

**Allegation:** A categorizing of reported actions into one of the six (6) child maltreatment types listed below. A report can contain more than one allegation and a child/victim or perpetrator could be involved in more than one allegation in the same or separate reports.

**Central Register:** A list of individuals identified as having been responsible for child abuse or neglect following an investigation and assessment either by law enforcement, the Department, or both.

**Central Registry:** Data pertaining to child abuse or neglect.

**Child Maltreatment:** Maltreatment occurs when a child age birth through 17 years is physically, emotionally, or sexually harmed. The six maltreatment types fall within one of the two categories:

### Abuse:

- ❖ **Physical:** Indicated by the existence of an injury that is unexplained, not consistent with the explanation given, or is non-accidental. The information may also only indicate a substantial risk of bodily injury.
- ❖ **Emotional:** Indicated by a psychopathological or disturbed behavior in a child, which is documented by a psychiatrist, psychologist, or licensed mental health practitioner to be the result of continual scapegoat, rejection, or exposure to violence by the child's parent/caretaker.
- ❖ **Sexual:** Any sexually oriented act, practice, contact, or interaction in which the child is or has been used for the sexual stimulation of a parent, the child, or other person.

### Neglect:

- ❖ **Emotional Neglect:** When a child is suffering or has suffered severe negative effects due to a parent's failure to provide opportunities for normal experience which produce feelings of being loved, wanted, secure, and worthy. Lack of such opportunities may impair the child's ability to form healthy relationships with others.
- ❖ **Physical Neglect:** The failure of the parent to provide for the basic needs, or provide a safe and sanitary living environment for the child.
- ❖ **Medical Neglect of Handicapped Infant:** The withholding of medically indicated treatment (appropriate nutrition, hydration, and medication) from disabled infants with life-threatening conditions. Exceptions include those situations in which the infant is chronically and irreversibly comatose; the provision of this treatment would merely prolong dying or not be effective in ameliorating or correcting all of the infant's life-threatening conditions, and the provisions of the treatment itself under these conditions would be inhumane.

**Child Welfare:** Provides a broad spectrum of services that starts with taking child abuse and neglect reports, assessing safety and risk to the child, and providing needed intervention when indicated in the assessment. It includes services that help to preserve families and enhance family strengths and functioning by actively engaging families in decision making, assessing their needs, and linking with resources. It also includes services that children require when placed outside of the home in foster care and other levels of group home or therapeutic living arrangements. Finally, when children aren't able to return home safely, children are assisted to permanent living arrangements through services and supports such as adoption, guardianship, or other long-term arrangements.

**Family Assessment:** An in-depth assessment of critical issues that relate to the safety and risk of the child. This assessment lays the foundation for a family-centered, child-focused approach to case planning and service delivery.



**Findings:** There are five categories of findings: Court substantiated; Court Pending; Inconclusive; Unable to Locate; and Unfounded.

- ❖ **Court Substantiated:** A District Court, County Court, or separate Juvenile Court has entered a judgment of guilty on a criminal complaint, indictment, or information, or an adjudication of jurisdiction on a juvenile petition under Section 43-247 (3)(a), and the judgment or adjudication relates or pertains to the same matter as the report of abuse or neglect.
- ❖ **Court Pending:** A criminal complaint, indictment, or information, or a juvenile petition under Section 247(3)(a), has been filed in District Court, County Court, or separate Juvenile Court, and the allegations of the complaint, indictment, information, or juvenile petition relate or pertain to the same subject matter as the report of abuse or neglect. This was previously referred to as a “Petition to be Filed”
- ❖ **Inconclusive:** The evidence indicates it is more likely than not (preponderance of evidence standard) that child abuse or neglect occurred, and court adjudication did not occur.
- ❖ **Unable to Locate:** Subjects of the maltreatment report have not been located after a good-faith effort on the part of the Department.
- ❖ **Unfounded:** All reports not classified as “Court Substantiated,” “Court Pending,” “Inconclusive,” or “Unable to Locate” will be classified as “Unfounded.”

**Intake:** The process of documenting all reports of child abuse and neglect. Intake includes the activities associated with receiving and screening the referral, determining the appropriateness of accepting the referral for assessment, and if accepted, determining the correct priority for department response. Intake also may refer the reporter to other community agencies if the situation is not appropriate for DHHS intervention.

**Initial Assessment:** The gathering and analyzing of information in response to reports of suspected child abuse or neglect, to determine which families need further intervention. During this phase the Protection and Safety Worker is primarily concerned with child safety. The worker determines if child maltreatment did occur, determines the level of risk, and arranges services as necessary to protect the child.

**Perpetrator:** The person who was found to have committed an offense, as in abuse or neglect of a child.

**Report:** The record of an official account received from an individual that provides facts about a possible act of child abuse. Each report is assigned its own identification number. There may be multiple reports for an incident. A report may contain multiple allegations and multiple victims and/or perpetrators.

**State Ward:** When a court of competent jurisdiction gives custody of a child under the age of 18 to the Department that child becomes a state ward. The State acts as the child’s parent.

**Victim:** For the purpose of child welfare and child abuse and neglect, a victim is always a child. A child involved in an allegation as being abused is identified as a victim. For the purpose of this report, victim refers to a child who was abused and the action has been substantiated with a finding of “Court Substantiated,” “Court Pending,” or “Inconclusive.”

## SECTION I – CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT (CAN) REPORTS

A CAN report is impetus that starts the child abuse and neglect process. The Department of Health and Human Services first becomes aware of a possible incident of child abuse or neglect when they receive information that an alleged action of abuse or neglect has occurred. All of the information gathered is entered into a report.

A report can and usually does include:

- More than one incident defined as an allegation;
- More than one child (victim) which would cause multiple allegations;
- More than one abuser (perpetrator) which would cause multiple allegations; and,
- One child with different abuse types which would cause multiple allegations.

In this section a case or report is considered substantiated if at least one allegation was substantiated and counts of children are usually unique (each child is only counted once) unless otherwise specified.

### REPORTS:

- ❖ **Assessments:** There were 12,629 cases assessed in 2006 compared to 13,897 in 2005. This is a decrease of 1,268 (9.1%). Compared to the 9,296 cases assessed in 2003, this is an increase of 3,333 (35.9%) reports of child abuse or neglect assessed by DHHS.
- ❖ **Substantiated Reports:** 3,065 reports were substantiated in 2006 compared to 3,324 reports that were substantiated in 2005. This is a decrease of 259 (7.8%). Compared to 2,423 reports substantiated in 2003, this is an increase of 642 (26.5%).
- ❖ **Number of Children Involved:** There were 4,335 children that were involved or identified as a victim in at least one of the substantiated reports in 2006. This is a decrease of 506 (10.5%) compared to the 4,841 children identified in 2005. This is a 725 (20.1%) increase when compared to the 3,610 children identified in 2003.

**TABLE 1-1: STATEWIDE REPORTS OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT**

STATEWIDE STATISTICS, CALENDAR YEARS 2003 – 2006				
CALENDAR YEAR	TOTAL REPORTS ASSESSED	NUMBER OF SUBSTANTIATED REPORTS	INVOLVED CHILDREN	18 AND UNDER POPULATION ESTIMATES
2003	9,296	2,423 (26.1%)	3,610	471,235
2004	13,291	3,336 (25.1%)	4,896	470,415
2005	13,897	3,324 (23.9%)	4,841	470,046
2006	12,629	3,065 (24.3%)	4,335	469,771

The information in Table 1-1 shows that the total number of reports assessed has been stabilizing over the last three years. The State hypothesized that the increase in numbers of assess reports in 2004 was based on the implementation of a new intake tool. The stabilization of the numbers over the last three years lend support the hypothesis that the State's Intake Workers are getting more familiar with the Intake Screening Tool introduced in 2003 and are more proficient in screening calls. Proficient screening of reports could also support the increase of the substantiation rate from 23.9% in 2005 to 24.3% in 2006.


There seems to be an indication that there may be a decrease of children involved in substantiated reports. There was a decrease of 506 unique children involved in substantiated reports from 2005 to 2006 compared to a decrease of only 259 substantiated reports. This is not a direct correlation but is a positive indicator. When the victim rate is calculated the decrease of unique children is not so positive. The number of substantiated victims in each report determines the victim rate. This means the child will be counted more than once (once for each report they are a victim). The victim rate for 2006 was 1.72. There was a count of 5,284 victims in the 3,065 substantiated reports. This is an increase of 0.07 when compared to the 1.65 victim rate for 2005, in which there were 5,500 victims in the 3,324 substantiated reports.

One factor that needs to be taken into consideration is the time period that 2005 data was extracted when compared to 2006 data. The data for 2006 was extracted in May 2007 and the 2005 data was extracted in November 2006. The extraction of the November data allowed for an additional six months time frame during which cases could have become substantiated. There were still 595 reports for calendar year 2006 that were in the process and awaiting final determination at the time the data was extracted.

Tables 1-2 and 1-3 show an increase of 349 total calls received between 2005 (28,009) and 2006 (28,358). Table 1-3 puts the State's profile and trends into perspective. When the percentages are added and compared across the years it is evident that a change in policy that occurred in 2003 had a major impact on the amount and percentages of Calls received and assessed and the substantiation rate.

The policy and procedure change implemented in 2004 resulted in a 48% increase in the number of reports that were assessed. This leveled off in the subsequent years. This is a reflection of the Intake Workers' proficiency in screening reports that do not require an assessment or provision of a different service.

**TABLE 1-2: CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS TRENDS BY CALENDAR YEAR**



**TABLE 1-3: CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS PERCENTAGE AND COUNTS**

Calendar Year	Total Reports Received	Reports Alleging Abuse or Neglect (CAN)		CAN Reports Assessed		CAN Reports Substantiated		CAN Reports Unfounded		CAN Reports Unable to Locate		CAN Reports In Process	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
2003	23,479	16,246	69.2%	8,592	52.9%	2,423	28.2%	5,969	69.5%	200	2.3%	704	4.3%
2004	24,111	20,568	85.3%	12,750	62.0%	3,336	26.2%	9,084	71.2%	330	2.6%	541	2.6%
2005	28,009	24,397	87.1%	13,318	54.6%	3,324	25.0%	9,691	72.8%	303	2.3%	579	2.4%
2006	28,358	24,173	85.2%	12,034	49.8%	3,065	25.5%	8,738	72.6%	231	1.9%	595	2.5%

Table 1-4 displays Child Abuse and Neglect Reports by service area. (Refer to the map on page 4.)

This information is also presented at the county level in Tab B ‘Reports Charts and Tables.’

**TABLE 1-4: CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS PERCENTAGE AND COUNTS BY SERVICE AREA**

Calendar Year	Report Status	Central		Eastern		Northern		Southeast		Western		Grand Total	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
2005	Reports Received	3,697		10,599		3,126		7,081		3,506		28,009	
	Reports Alleging Abuse	2,914	78.8%	9,239	87.2%	2,731	87.4%	6,220	87.8%	3,293	93.9%	24,397	87.1%
	Reports Assessed	1,693	58.1%	4,622	50.0%	1,751	64.1%	2,968	47.7%	2,284	69.4%	13,318	54.6%
	Reports Substantiated	304	18.0%	1,158	25.1%	351	20.0%	1,144	38.5%	367	16.1%	3,324	25.0%
	Reports Unfounded	1,355	80.0%	3,320	71.8%	1,373	78.4%	1,771	59.7%	1,872	82.0%	9,691	72.8%
	Unable to Locate Family	34	2.0%	144	3.1%	27	1.5%	53	1.8%	45	2.0%	303	2.3%
2006	Investigation In Process	102	6.0%	81	1.8%	174	9.9%	109	3.7%	113	4.9%	579	4.3%
	Reports Received	3,590		10,623		2,839		7,790		3,516		28,358	
	Reports Alleging Abuse	2,823	78.6%	8,866	83.5%	2,399	84.5%	6,749	86.6%	3,336	94.9%	24,173	85.2%
	Reports Assessed	1,551	54.9%	3,810	43.0%	1,492	62.2%	3,022	44.8%	2,159	64.7%	12,034	49.8%
	Reports Substantiated	229	14.8%	1,069	28.1%	238	16.0%	1,216	40.2%	313	14.5%	3,065	25.5%
	Reports Unfounded	1,291	83.2%	2,628	69.0%	1,228	82.3%	1,771	58.6%	1,820	84.3%	8,738	72.6%
Unable to Locate Family	31	2.0%	113	3.0%	26	1.7%	35	1.2%	26	1.2%	231	1.9%	
Investigation In Process	101	6.5%	129	3.4%	132	8.8%	68	2.3%	165	7.6%	595	4.9%	

**SOURCE of REPORTS:**

Table 1-5 presents the source of the reports that are captured when a Child Abuse and Neglect Report is received. This table lists the sources in alphabetical order and compares calendar years 2005 and 2006. The total number of reports and number of those reports that actually led to assessments are used to determine the percentage of reports assessed.

A review of the data shows that Law Enforcement continues to be the states primary source of reports that lead to an assessment. There are not many noticeable differences between years when comparing the percentages or rankings of reporting sources. The biggest change is the increase of friends and neighbors calling the hotline. The cause of this could be a result of several factors. The ‘Unknown’ category shows a decrease, which may mean that callers once reluctant in providing their name are now sharing and that neighbors and friends are becoming more vigilant and actively involved in keeping children safe.

The “Unknown” category represents callers that either did not provide their name or requested to remain anonymous. The “Other” category is callers that did provide their name but did not provide any information that would identify them as any of the sources listed as one of the predetermined selections.

**TABLE 1-5: REPORT SOURCE COMPARING CALENDAR YEAR 2005 – 2006**

Report Source	2005					2006				
	Total Reports Alleging Abuse		Total Abuse and Neglect Reports Assessed		Percent of Reports Assessed	Total Reports Alleging Abuse		Total Abuse and Neglect Reports Assessed		Percent of Reports Assessed
	Count	%	Count	%		Count	%	Count	%	
Law Enforcement Personnel	4,830	19.80%	2,693	20.22%	55.76%	4,386	18.14%	2305	19.15%	52.55%
Educational Personnel	2,815	11.54%	1,655	12.43%	58.79%	3,054	12.63%	1636	13.59%	53.57%
Friend/Neighbor	2,319	9.51%	1,312	9.85%	56.58%	2,488	10.29%	1242	10.32%	49.92%
Parent/Legal Guardian	2,487	10.19%	1,131	8.49%	45.48%	2,389	9.88%	925	7.69%	38.72%
Relative	2,163	8.87%	1,214	9.12%	56.13%	2,219	9.18%	1075	8.93%	48.45%
Unknown	2,361	9.68%	1,297	9.74%	54.93%	2,006	8.30%	992	8.24%	49.45%
Public Social Services Personnel	1,588	6.51%	899	6.75%	56.61%	1,728	7.15%	902	7.50%	52.20%
Hosp/Clinic/Public Health Personnel	1,642	6.73%	969	7.28%	59.01%	1,613	6.67%	871	7.24%	54.00%
Other	994	4.07%	511	3.84%	51.41%	1,112	4.60%	535	4.45%	48.11%
Private Mental Health Personnel	1,074	4.40%	520	3.90%	48.42%	1,092	4.52%	521	4.33%	47.71%
Private Social Services Personnel	611	2.50%	268	2.01%	43.86%	578	2.39%	251	2.09%	43.43%
Private Doctor/Nurse	391	1.60%	243	1.82%	62.15%	362	1.50%	195	1.62%	53.87%
Child Care Personnel	209	0.86%	121	0.91%	57.89%	254	1.05%	146	1.21%	57.48%
Public Mental Health Personnel	218	0.89%	106	0.80%	48.62%	169	0.70%	79	0.66%	46.75%
Alleged Victim	133	0.55%	71	0.53%	53.38%	141	0.58%	55	0.46%	39.01%
Day Care Center Personnel	149	0.61%	96	0.72%	64.43%	138	0.57%	73	0.61%	52.90%
Private Residential Facility Personnel	79	0.32%	25	0.19%	31.65%	99	0.41%	35	0.29%	35.35%
Foster Parent	101	0.41%	43	0.32%	42.57%	91	0.38%	39	0.32%	42.86%
Prosecutor	60	0.25%	47	0.35%	78.33%	88	0.36%	71	0.59%	80.68%
Public Residential Facility Personnel	49	0.20%	23	0.17%	46.94%	70	0.29%	29	0.24%	41.43%
Court/Judge	59	0.24%	49	0.37%	83.05%	45	0.19%	34	0.28%	75.56%
Private Attorney	40	0.16%	14	0.11%	35.00%	35	0.14%	16	0.13%	45.71%
Alleged Perpetrator	17	0.07%	7	0.05%	41.18%	13	0.05%	6	0.05%	46.15%
Public Defender	7	0.03%	4	0.03%	57.14%	3	0.01%	1	0.01%	33.33%
Coroner	1	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	NA
Grand Total	24,397		13,318		54.59%	24,173		12034		49.78%

## ALLEGATIONS IN REPORTS:

A report could contain one to many allegations. An allegation is counted no matter how many times it is reported in one single report. The purpose of presenting the information this way is to provide a better indication of the impact of the allegation or how often a specific allegation is reported to DHHS.

EXAMPLE: A report involves a perpetrator and two (2) children. The perpetrator is alleged to have physically abused both children. Although there are two (2) physical abuse allegations the physical abuse allegation count will be one (1). If only one of those allegations are substantiated then the allegation type is considered substantiated.

An allegation is categorized in one of the six maltreatment types listed in the Glossary of Terms on page 5. Table 1-6 provides the counts by report where the allegation was entered and if any one of the allegations of that type in the report was substantiated. An allegation type is considered substantiated as long as one allegation of the same type in the report was substantiated. Allegations are presented independently and in more detail in Section II of this report.

Table 1-6 can be used in different ways to analyze the impact of certain types of allegations. To better clarify how this table is developed the following analysis was conducted for the statewide counts:

- ❖ In 2005, 24,397 (87.1%) reports of the 28,009 reports received contained one or more allegations. There was a slight decrease to 85.2% (24,173) of the 28,358 reports containing one or more allegations in 2006.
- ❖ Physical neglect continues to be the most reported maltreatment type with 45.6% of the reports in 2005 and 41.8% of the reports in 2006. Most of the percentages by maltreatment type remain the same or have changed little when the two years are compared.
- ❖ The substantiation rate decreased for every maltreatment type from 2005 to 2006 except for physical neglect and medical neglect of a handicapped infant. It is interesting to see that emotional abuse allegations tend to be substantiated more often than the other five maltreatment types.

**TABLE 1-6: ALLEGATION TYPES IN REPORTS BY SERVICE AREA COMPARING CALENDAR YEAR 2005 – 2006**

Calendar Year	Categories		Central		Eastern		Northern		Southeast		Western		Statewide		State Ranking
			Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	
2005	<b>Report</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>3,697</b>		<b>10,599</b>		<b>3,126.00</b>		<b>7,081</b>		<b>3,506</b>		<b>28,009</b>		
		<b>With Allegations</b>	<b>2,914</b>	<b>78.8%</b>	<b>9,239</b>	<b>87.2%</b>	<b>2,731.00</b>	<b>87.4%</b>	<b>6,220</b>	<b>87.8%</b>	<b>3,293</b>	<b>93.9%</b>	<b>24,397</b>	<b>87.1%</b>	
	Physical Abuse	Allegations	285	9.8%	801	8.7%	338.00	12.4%	629	10.1%	453	13.8%	2,506	10.3%	2
		Substantiated	56	19.6%	249	31.1%	70.00	20.7%	208	33.1%	72	15.9%	655	26.1%	
	Emotional Abuse	Allegations	59	2.0%	61	0.7%	54.00	2.0%	317	5.1%	26	0.8%	517	2.1%	1
		Substantiated	9	15.3%	11	18.0%	16.00	29.6%	156	49.2%	3	11.5%	195	37.7%	
	Sexual Abuse	Allegations	296	10.2%	681	7.4%	273.00	10.0%	232	3.7%	356	10.8%	1,838	7.5%	3
		Substantiated	55	18.6%	161	23.6%	45.00	16.5%	86	37.1%	81	22.8%	428	23.3%	
	Emotional Neglect	Allegations	54	1.9%	294	3.2%	71.00	2.6%	167	2.7%	151	4.6%	737	3.0%	6
		Substantiated	9	16.7%	52	17.7%	5.00	7.0%	65	38.9%	12	7.9%	143	19.4%	
	Physical Neglect	Allegations	1,369	47.0%	3,767	40.8%	1,484.00	54.3%	2,708	43.5%	1,804	54.8%	11,132	45.6%	4
		Substantiated	207	15.1%	865	23.0%	256.00	17.3%	982	36.3%	239	13.2%	2,549	22.9%	
	Medical Neglect Handicapped Infant	Allegations	3	0.1%	9	0.1%	4.00	0.1%		0.0%	3	0.1%	19	0.1%	5
		Substantiated	1	33.3%	1	11.1%	1.00	25.0%		NA	1	33.3%	4	21.1%	
Calendar Year	Categories		Central		Eastern		Northern		Southeast		Western		Statewide		State Ranking
			Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	
2006	<b>Report</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>3,590</b>		<b>10,623</b>		<b>2,839.00</b>		<b>7,790</b>		<b>3,516</b>		<b>28,358</b>		
		<b>With Allegations</b>	<b>2,823</b>	<b>78.6%</b>	<b>8,866</b>	<b>83.5%</b>	<b>2,399.00</b>	<b>84.5%</b>	<b>6,749</b>	<b>86.6%</b>	<b>3,336</b>	<b>94.9%</b>	<b>24,173</b>	<b>85.2%</b>	
	Physical Abuse	Allegations	303	10.7%	742	8.4%	283.00	11.8%	596	8.8%	488	14.6%	2,412	10.0%	2
		Substantiated	57	18.8%	232	31.3%	40.00	14.1%	206	34.6%	67	13.7%	602	25.0%	
	Emotional Abuse	Allegations	43	1.5%	39	0.4%	48.00	2.0%	446	6.6%	17	0.5%	593	2.5%	1
		Substantiated	4	9.3%	6	15.4%	8.00	16.7%	146	32.7%	2	11.8%	166	28.0%	
	Sexual Abuse	Allegations	255	9.0%	525	5.9%	270.00	11.3%	256	3.8%	314	9.4%	1,620	6.7%	4
		Substantiated	45	17.6%	124	23.6%	33.00	12.2%	86	33.6%	58	18.5%	346	21.4%	
	Emotional Neglect	Allegations	32	1.1%	152	1.7%	47.00	2.0%	200	3.0%	96	2.9%	527	2.2%	5
		Substantiated	2	6.3%	21	13.8%	2.00	4.3%	58	29.0%	6	6.3%	89	16.9%	
	Physical Neglect	Allegations	1,222	43.3%	3,155	35.6%	1,203.00	50.1%	2,751	40.8%	1,764	52.9%	10,095	41.8%	3
		Substantiated	145	11.9%	829	26.3%	175.00	14.5%	1,084	39.4%	215	12.2%	2,448	24.2%	
	Medical Neglect Handicapped Infant	Allegations		0.0%	8	0.1%	3.00	0.1%		0.0%	2	0.1%	13	0.1%	6
		Substantiated		NA	2	25.0%		0.0%		NA		0.0%	2	15.4%	

**TABLE 1-7: REPORTS CONTAINING MORE THAN ONE ALLEGATION TYPE**

State Service Area	2005			2006		
	Reports With Allegations	Reports With More Than One Allegation Type	%	Reports With Allegations	Reports With More Than One Allegation Type	%
Central	2,914	252	8.65%	2,823	188	6.66%
Eastern	9,239	841	9.10%	8,866	651	7.34%
Northern	2,731	275	10.07%	2,399	211	8.80%
Southeast	6,220	895	14.39%	6,749	1,041	15.42%
Western	3,293	364	11.05%	3,336	340	10.19%
Grand Total	24,397	2,627	10.77%	24,173	2,431	10.06%

- ❖ Table 1-7 demonstrates how reports may have more than one allegation. Ten (10%) percent of the reports that have allegations contain more than one type of maltreatment; meaning that around 90% of the reports contain only one allegation type.
- ❖ One interesting point is that the Southeast Service Area has a higher percentage of reports with multiple allegations than other service areas by 3 to 5 % respectively and it is the only service area that increases in percentage when 2006 is compared to 2005. This point may indicate a different practice.



## SECTION II – ALLEGATIONS

This section provides information and tables based upon allegations. Section I – Reports included some measurements about allegation types at the report level. This section will present data and information about all allegations that were substantiated. An allegation type may be counted more than once if a child is an alleged victim in the same or another report for that allegation type.

A report can contain more than one allegation and a child/victim or perpetrator could be a involved in more than one allegation type in the same or separate report. The six types of allegations are as follows:

- ❖ **Physical Abuse:** Indicated by the existence of an injury that is unexplained, not consistent with the explanation given, or is non-accidental. The information may also only indicate a substantial risk of bodily injury.
- ❖ **Emotional Abuse:** Indicated by a psychopathological or disturbed behavior in a child, which is documented by a psychiatrist, psychologist, or licensed mental health practitioner to be the result of continual scapegoat, rejection, or exposure to violence by the child’s parent/caretaker.
- ❖ **Sexual Abuse:** Any sexually oriented act, practice, contact, or interaction in which the child is or has been used for the sexual stimulation of a parent, the child, or other person.
- ❖ **Emotional Neglect:** When a child is suffering or has suffered severe negative effects due to a parent’s failure to provide opportunities for normal experience which produce feelings of being loved, wanted, secure, and worthy. Lack of such opportunities may impair the child’s ability to form healthy relationships with others.
- ❖ **Physical Neglect:** The failure of the parent to provide for the basic needs, or provide a safe and sanitary living environment for the child.
- ❖ **Medical Neglect of Handicapped Infant:** The withholding of medically indicated treatment (appropriate nutrition, hydration, and medication) from disabled infants with life-threatening conditions. Exceptions include those situations in which the infant is chronically and irreversibly comatose; the provision of this treatment would merely prolong dying or not are effective in ameliorating or correcting all of the infant’s life-threatening conditions, and the provisions of the treatment itself under these conditions would be inhumane.

**TABLE 2-1: SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATION TYPES AND VICTIM COUNT**

Calendar Year	Physical Abuse	Emotional Abuse	Physical Neglect	Emotional Neglect	Medical Neglect of a Handicapped Infant	Sexual Abuse	Total Allegation Counts	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports of Abuse
2003	829	363	3,712	221	6	363	5,494	3,610
2004	969	374	5,787	332	2	441	7,905	4,896
2005	809	481	5,892	231	4	540	7,957	4,840
2006	734	440	5,984	176	2	439	7,775	4,335

The count of allegation types reflects the number of allegations that were substantiated. Because a child may be a victim in more than one type of allegation and/or may be a victim of the same type of allegation in one or more reports the total number of allegations types will greater than the number of children involved in substantiated reports of abuse. The count of children reflects the unique count of victims for that year.

Table 2-1 indicates that the number of substantiated allegations from 2005 to 2006 has declined except for physical neglect. Sexual abuse substantiations peaked in 2005 at 540 but declined back to 439 in 2006 (two less than the count in 2004). The total number of substantiated allegations had a slight increase of 52 (0.66%) more in 2005 than 2004 with a total of 7,957. In 2006 this count decreased back to 7,775, a 2.3% decrease from 2005 and a 1.6% decrease from 2004 (in which there was a total count of 7,905).

**TABLE 2-2: SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATIONS TYPES AND VICTIM COUNT**

Calendar Year	Allegation	Total Allegations	Gender		Children Involved
			Female	Male	
2005	Physical Abuse	809	295	356	651
	Emotional Abuse	481	154	160	314
	Sexual Abuse	540	352	114	466
	Emotional Neglect	231	82	83	165
	Physical Neglect	5,892	1,877	2,023	3,900
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	4	2	2	4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7,957</b>	<b>2,762</b>	<b>2,738</b>	<b>5,500</b>
2006	Physical Abuse	734	288	304	592
	Emotional Abuse	440	141	146	287
	Sexual Abuse	439	292	76	368
	Emotional Neglect	176	58	53	111
	Physical Neglect	5,984	1,919	2,005	3,924
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	2		2	2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7,775</b>	<b>2,698</b>	<b>2,586</b>	<b>5,284</b>

In this report the once single table used to display the counts of children in each allegation type is being presented in two separate tables (Table 2-2 and Table 2-3) to more accurately reflect the data.

Table 2-2 shows the total count of allegations and each victim by gender by abuse types.

- ❖ If a child is a victim of more than one perpetrator for the same allegation type in the same report then they are only counted once for that allegation type. This accounts for the total number of children involved being less than the total number of allegations.
- ❖ If a child is a victim for the same allegation type in a different report then the child is counted for each report where the child was a victim of that type of allegation. This accounts for the total number of children involved being higher than the number of children involved presented in Table 2-1.

- ❖ Table 2-3 was created for users that would prefer to study or track allegation types by gender and determine which gender specific types of allegations may impact the most.

**TABLE 2-3: SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATIONS TYPES BY GENDER**

Calendar Year	Allegation	Gender		Total Allegations
		Female	Male	
2005	Physical Abuse	379	430	809
	Emotional Abuse	230	251	481
	Sexual Abuse	410	130	540
	Emotional Neglect	119	112	231
	Physical Neglect	2,786	3,106	5,892
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	2	2	4
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3,926</b>	<b>4,031</b>	<b>7,957</b>
2006	Physical Abuse	343	391	734
	Emotional Abuse	216	224	440
	Sexual Abuse	346	93	439
	Emotional Neglect	95	81	176
	Physical Neglect	2,908	3,076	5,984
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant		2	2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3,908</b>	<b>3,867</b>	<b>7,775</b>

- ❖ Both Tables 2-2 and 2-3 reflect that sexual abuse tends to involve females victims more than male victims whereas physical neglect seems to have a greater number of male victims than female victims.
- ❖ Table 2-3 indicates that more females were involved in allegations in 2006 where in 2005 the reverse was true. This is misleading; refer to Table 3-1 in Section III of this report. There were actually more female victims in both years with females surpassing males by 24 in 2005.

**TABLE 2-4: TYPES OF ABUSE OR NEGLECT IN SUBSTANTIATED CASES  
BY SERVICE AREA – CY 2005 AND 2006**

<b>Calendar Year</b>	<b>Service Area</b>	<b>Abuse</b>	<b>Neglect</b>	<b>Sexual Abuse</b>	<b>Children Involved in Substantiated Reports</b>	<b>Percentage of Children Involved</b>
2005	Central	94	490	78	453	9.4%
	Eastern	316	1,831	189	1,607	33.2%
	Northern	126	632	63	569	11.8%
	Southeast	659	2,626	102	1,707	35.3%
	Western	95	548	108	504	10.4%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,290</b>	<b>6,127</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>4,840</b>	
2006	Central	84	430	75	329	7.6%
	Eastern	303	1,891	146	1,551	35.8%
	Northern	73	426	37	353	8.1%
	Southeast	631	2,861	115	1,665	38.4%
	Western	83	554	66	437	10.1%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,174</b>	<b>6,162</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>4,335</b>	

- ❖ Table 2-4 presents this information by service areas. Physical abuse and emotional abuse are rolled up into the category 'Abuse.' Physical and emotional neglect and medical neglect of a handicapped infant are consolidated into the 'Neglect' category. Sexual abuse remains to be reported out on its own.
- ❖ Eastern and Southeast Service Areas have a majority of the victims and allegations, as would be expected since the two largest cities in Nebraska reside in those areas.
- ❖ Tab C contains additional charts and tables for research references to include tables by county.

## SECTION III – VICTIMS

Victims are defined as children 18 years of age and younger that were maltreated and that maltreatment was either substantiated by a court having jurisdiction over the case or by the Department of Health and Human Services through a fact-finding assessment process.

This section will provide information, demographics, and data pertaining to victims involved in reports received during calendar years 2005 and 2006. Some of the information presented in this section may have been included in previous sections but are repeated here to introduce and compare other charts and tables.

Information is presented only as facts or as points of interest and not to determine that one race or gender is more likely to be victimized than another.

**TABLE 3-1: VICTIMS BY GENDER AND SERVICE AREA – CY 2005 AND 2006**

Calendar Year	State Service Area	Gender		Total
		Female	Male	
2005	Central	229	224	453
	Eastern	836	771	1,607
	Northern	283	286	569
	Southeast	829	878	1,707
	Western	255	249	504
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,432</b>	<b>2,408</b>	<b>4,840</b>
2006	Central	177	152	329
	Eastern	816	735	1,551
	Northern	181	172	353
	Southeast	823	842	1,665
	Western	240	197	437
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,237</b>	<b>2,098</b>	<b>4,335</b>

Table 3-2 indicates that younger children are victimized more frequently than older children. In both 2005 and 2006 the highest percentage of victims are less than two years old; the percentage of victims in this age group increased by nearly 2% between the two years. Other age groups had very minor changes when the two years are compared.

According to Table 3-3 nearly 40% of the child victims are under the age of 4 and the percentage has a downward trend with the increase of the age group. Table 3-3 also includes the children's race. Additional information comparing population and victimization rates by race is presented later in this section.

**TABLE 3-2: VICTIMS BY GENDER AND AGE – CY 2005 AND 2006**

AGE IN YEARS	2005					2006				
	GENDER		Total	%	Cumulative	GENDER		Total	%	Cumulative
	Female	Male				Female	Male			
<2	345	422	767	15.8%	15.8%	390	371	761	17.6%	17.6%
2	180	205	385	8.0%	23.8%	164	160	324	7.5%	25.0%
3	157	196	353	7.3%	31.1%	145	151	296	6.8%	31.9%
4	163	177	340	7.0%	38.1%	150	168	318	7.3%	39.2%
5	165	157	322	6.7%	44.8%	154	149	303	7.0%	46.2%
6	162	153	315	6.5%	51.3%	133	144	277	6.4%	52.6%
7	136	152	288	6.0%	57.2%	123	132	255	5.9%	58.5%
8	126	135	261	5.4%	62.6%	102	117	219	5.1%	63.5%
9	109	111	220	4.5%	67.2%	126	122	248	5.7%	69.2%
10	121	100	221	4.6%	71.7%	91	84	175	4.0%	73.3%
11	103	105	208	4.3%	76.0%	74	94	168	3.9%	77.1%
12	92	96	188	3.9%	79.9%	86	72	158	3.6%	80.8%
13	99	102	201	4.2%	84.1%	95	87	182	4.2%	85.0%
14	133	86	219	4.5%	88.6%	115	68	183	4.2%	89.2%
15	125	79	204	4.2%	92.8%	95	60	155	3.6%	92.8%
16	113	56	169	3.5%	96.3%	97	55	152	3.5%	96.3%
17	72	56	128	2.6%	98.9%	63	47	110	2.5%	98.8%
>17	31	20	51	1.1%	100%	34	17	51	1.2%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,432</b>	<b>2,408</b>	<b>4,840</b>			<b>2,237</b>	<b>2,098</b>	<b>4,335</b>		

**TABLE 3-3: VICTIMS BY RACE AND AGE GROUP – CY 2005 AND 2006**

Calendar Year	Race	AGE										Total	%
		0 to 4		5 to 9		10 to 14		15 to 18		Over 18			
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%		
2005	White	1,145	62.1%	909	64.7%	639	61.6%	344	62.7%	3	100.0%	3,040	62.8%
	Black or African American	206	11.2%	180	12.8%	139	13.4%	77	14.0%	0	0.0%	602	12.4%
	American Indian or Alaska Nation	133	7.2%	89	6.3%	60	5.8%	23	4.2%	0	0.0%	305	6.3%
	Asian	11	0.6%	3	0.2%	9	0.9%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%	24	0.5%
	Multiple Races	38	2.1%	14	1.0%	13	1.3%	5	0.9%	0	0.0%	70	1.4%
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	0.2%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.1%
	Other	189	10.2%	147	10.5%	123	11.9%	59	10.7%	0	0.0%	518	10.7%
	Unidentified	120	6.5%	64	4.6%	54	5.2%	40	7.3%	0	0.0%	278	5.7%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,845</b>	<b>38.1%</b>	<b>1,406</b>	<b>29.0%</b>	<b>1,037</b>	<b>21.4%</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>4,840</b>	
2006	White	1,070	63.0%	739	56.8%	531	61.3%	287	62.0%	2	40.0%	2,629	60.6%
	Black or African American	227	13.4%	214	16.4%	138	15.9%	64	13.8%	0	0.0%	643	14.8%
	American Indian or Alaska Nation	85	5.0%	66	5.1%	44	5.1%	25	5.4%	0	0.0%	220	5.1%
	Asian	7	0.4%	16	1.2%	9	1.0%	2	0.4%	0	0.0%	34	0.8%
	Multiple Races	37	2.2%	7	0.5%	6	0.7%	4	0.9%	0	0.0%	54	1.2%
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.1%	3	0.2%	1	0.1%		0.0%	0	0.0%	5	0.1%
	Other	177	10.4%	187	14.4%	82	9.5%	50	10.8%	1	20.0%	497	11.5%
	Unidentified	95	5.6%	70	5.4%	55	6.4%	31	6.7%	2	40.0%	253	5.8%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,699</b>	<b>39.2%</b>	<b>1,302</b>	<b>30.0%</b>	<b>866</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>4,335</b>	

Table 3-4 indicates the victim rate per 1,000. The U.S. Census report population estimates published in August 2007 was the source for the populations presented in this table. The rate per 1,000 was calculated by dividing the count of victims by race, divided by the race population for that year, and multiplied by 1,000.

The victim rate presented provides a different perspective than just looking at the raw count. The ranking nearly flip-flops, White children are the highest *counts* of victims but are fourth out of the six races when comparing the victim *rate*. The highest victim rate is the American Indian and Native Alaskan category.

The Native American Indian victim rate did show a major decline of 13% in 2006 from 2005. The population only increased slightly but the number of victims dropped by nearly 100. This may be a result of efforts implemented by the department in 2006.

**TABLE 3-4: VICTIM RATE BY RACE – CY 2005 AND 2006**

Race	Calendar Year 2005		Victim Rate Per 1,000	Calendar Year 2006		Victim Rate Per 1,000
	*Population (Pct)	Victims		*Population (Pct)	Victims	
American Indian and Alaskan Native	6,594 (1.4%)	305	46.25	6,621 (1.4%)	220	33.23
Asian	7,494 (1.6%)	24	3.20	7,577 (1.6%)	34	4.49
Black or African American	27,492 (5.8%)	602	21.90	27,769 (5.9%)	643	23.16
Multiple Races	11,137 (2.4%)	70	6.29	11,333 (2.4%)	54	4.76
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	293 (0.1%)	3	10.24	290 (0.1%)	5	17.24
White	417,036 (88.7%)	3,040	7.29	416,181 (88.6%)	2,629	6.32
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>470,046</b>	<b>4,840</b>	<b>10.30</b>	<b>469,771</b>	<b>4,335</b>	<b>9.23</b>

\* Population Source: Estimates U.S. Census August 2007

Table 3-5 uses the same method to determine the victim rate by age and the results are quite different. Table 3-5 shows that younger children are victimized more often than older children. The ranking follows the same trend for victim rate as it does for the raw count

**TABLE 3-5: VICTIM RATE BY AGE GROUP – CY 2005 AND 2006**

Age	Calendar Year 2005		Victim Rate Per 1,000	Calendar Year 2006		Victim Rate Per 1,000
	*Population/(Pct)	Victims		*Population/(Pct)	Victims	
0 to 4	126,523 (26.9%)	1,845	14.58	127,665 (27.2%)	1,699	13.31
5 to 9	117,118 (24.9%)	1,406	12.00	117,832 (25.1%)	1,302	11.05
10 to 14	123,602 (26.3%)	1,037	8.39	121,644 (25.9%)	866	7.12
15 to 18	102,803 (21.9%)	549	5.34	102,630 (21.8%)	463	4.51
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>470,046</b>	<b>4,840</b>	<b>10.30</b>	<b>469,771</b>	<b>4,335</b>	<b>9.23</b>

\* Population Source: Estimates U.S. Census August 2007



**RELATIONSHIP OF PERPETRATOR TO VICTIM:**

Table 3-6 shows that non-relatives and others rank second and third and occur more often than stepparents or an unmarried partner of the parent. Biological parents were identified as the perpetrator for over 75% of victimized children in both 2005 and 2006. This percentage had a slight increase between the two years, although the count decreased by nearly 400.

**TABLE 3-6: PERPETRATOR’S RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM – CY 2005 AND 2006**

Perpetrator’s Relationship to Victim	Calendar Year				Grand Total	
	2005		2006		Count	%
	Count	%	Count	%		
Biological Parent	3,686	76.16%	3,305	76.24%	6,991	76.20%
Non-Relative	250	5.17%	205	4.73%	455	4.96%
Other	228	4.71%	172	3.97%	400	4.36%
Stepparent	185	3.82%	155	3.58%	340	3.71%
Other Relative	139	2.87%	122	2.81%	261	2.84%
Unmarried Partner of Parent	109	2.25%	96	2.21%	205	2.23%
Relative	59	1.22%	98	2.26%	157	1.71%
Child Day Care Provider	44	0.91%	66	1.52%	110	1.20%
Sibling (Bio)	48	0.99%	26	0.60%	74	0.81%
Adoptive Parent	31	0.64%	29	0.67%	60	0.65%
Foster Parent	28	0.58%	26	0.60%	54	0.59%
Unknown	17	0.35%	20	0.46%	37	0.40%
Residential Facility Staff	11	0.23%	10	0.23%	21	0.23%
Legal Guardian	2	0.04%	2	0.05%	4	0.04%
Sibling (Adoptive)	2	0.04%	1	0.02%	3	0.03%
Sibling (Step)	1	0.02%	2	0.05%	3	0.03%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4,840</b>		<b>4,335</b>		<b>9,175</b>	

## SECTION IV – PERPETRATORS

Table 4-1 displays the gender demographics for perpetrators by Calendar Year. Both years indicate that women tend to be perpetrators more than men. There was a decline of 393 perpetrators between 2005 and 2006. This is a 10.65% decrease, which is in line with the 10.43% decrease in the count of victims, 9.1% decrease of reports assessed and the 7.8% decrease in the reports substantiated. The Victim to Perpetrator ratio in both 2005 and 2006 remained at 1.31: 1.

A perpetrator is any person that is involved with a substantiated allegation. Their name and pertinent information related to the offense is entered on the State’s Central Register.

**TABLE 4-1: PERPETRATOR BY GENDER AND SERVICE AREA – CY 2005 AND 2006**

Calendar Year	State Service Area	Gender		Grand Total
		Female	Male	
2005	Central	181	148	329
	Eastern	703	547	1,250
	Northern	245	174	419
	Southeast	697	581	1,278
	Western	206	208	414
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,032</b>	<b>1,658</b>	<b>3,690</b>
2006	Central	129	121	250
	Eastern	664	511	1,175
	Northern	160	124	284
	Southeast	647	614	1,261
	Western	165	162	327
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,765</b>	<b>1,532</b>	<b>3,297</b>

Table 4-2 is a race and age table that presents a cross tabulation of the race and Age Groups for perpetrators. The data shows that the highest percentage of all perpetrators is white and that the trend by age group peaks for the age group 20-29 and then trends downward when moving up the age group scale. The Under 20 Age Group consists of ages 18-20. This is the age grouping that is used in the Census when presenting populations by age group. A perpetrator can be under 18 but were not included in the perpetrator counts for the tables in this section.

**TABLE 4-2: PERPETRATORS BY RACE AND AGE GROUP – CY 2005 AND 2006**

Calendar Year	Perpetrator Race	Age Group												Grand Total	
		Under 20		20 to 29		30 to 39		40 to 49		Over 50		Unknown			
		Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT	Count	PCT
2005	White	126	61.2%	895	64.6%	779	64.1%	394	63.1%	95	53.7%	3	3.7%	2,292	62.1%
	Black or African American	21	10.2%	174	12.6%	135	11.1%	74	11.9%	21	11.9%		0.0%	425	11.5%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	16	7.8%	77	5.6%	59	4.9%	23	3.7%	9	5.1%		0.0%	184	5.0%
	Asian		0.0%	4	0.3%	11	0.9%	5	0.8%		0.0%		0.0%	20	0.5%
	MULTIPLE	3	1.5%	17	1.2%	5	0.4%	3	0.5%	1	0.6%		0.0%	29	0.8%
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific		0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	2	0.1%
	Other	28	13.6%	142	10.3%	140	11.5%	63	10.1%	9	5.1%	1	1.2%	383	10.4%
	Unidentified	12	5.8%	75	5.4%	85	7.0%	62	9.9%	42	23.7%	78	95.1%	354	9.6%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>5.6%</b>	<b>1,385</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>1,215</b>	<b>32.9%</b>	<b>624</b>	<b>16.9%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>3,689</b>	
2006	White	94	59.5%	793	62.0%	668	60.7%	321	62.6%	107	58.8%		0.0%	1,983	60.1%
	Black or African American	27	17.1%	177	13.8%	156	14.2%	70	13.6%	22	12.1%	2	3.1%	454	13.8%
	American Indian or Alaska Native	6	3.8%	59	4.6%	47	4.3%	14	2.7%	9	4.9%		0.0%	135	4.1%
	Asian	1	0.6%	3	0.2%	17	1.5%	2	0.4%		0.0%		0.0%	23	0.7%
	MULTIPLE	2	1.3%	20	1.6%	7	0.6%	4	0.8%	1	0.5%		0.0%	34	1.0%
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific		0.0%		0.0%	2	0.2%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%	2	0.1%
	Other	17	10.8%	173	13.5%	134	12.2%	44	8.6%	16	8.8%	1	1.6%	385	11.7%
	Unidentified	11	7.0%	54	4.2%	70	6.4%	58	11.3%	27	14.8%	61	95.3%	281	8.5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>4.8%</b>	<b>1,279</b>	<b>38.8%</b>	<b>1,101</b>	<b>33.4%</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>15.6%</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>3,297</b>	



❖ Table 4-3 below uses the population for each race independently to calculate the perpetrator rate by race and shows that the white race is fourth out of the five races and falls below the total rate per 1,000 by 0.95.

**TABLE 4-3: PEREPTRATOR RATE BY RACE – CY 2005 AND 2006**

Perpetrator Race	Calendar Year 2005		Perpetrator Rate Per 1000	Calendar Year 2006		Perpetrator Rate Per 1000
	Population (PCT)	Perpetrators		Population (PCT)	Perpetrators	
White	1,198,611 (93.1%)	2,292	1.91	1,206,501 (92.9%)	1,983	1.64
Black or African American	48,653 (3.8%)	425	8.74	49,867 (3.8%)	454	9.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,205 (0.8%)	184	18.03	10,482 (0.8%)	135	12.88
Asian	21,021 (1.6%)	20	0.95	21,676 (1.7%)	23	1.06
MULTIPLE	8,745 (0.7%)	29	3.32	9,099 (0.7%)	34	3.74
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	882 (0.1%)	2	2.27	935 (0.1%)	2	2.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,288,117</b>	<b>3,689</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>1,298,560</b>	<b>3,297</b>	<b>2.54</b>

- ❖ Table 4-4 looks at the perpetrator rate by age. This table also provides a different perspective and conclusion than just looking at the raw numbers.
- ❖ Age Group 'Under 20' has the highest rate and from there the rate trends downward as the chart progresses up the age groupings. This is impacted by the fact that this is the smallest percentage group of the total population.

**TABLE 4-4: PEREPTRATOR RATE BY AGE GROUP – CY 2005 AND 2006**

Age Group	Calendar Year 2005		Perpetrator Rate Per 1000	Calendar Year 2006		Perpetrator Rate Per 1000
	Population (PCT)	Perpetrators		Population (PCT)	Perpetrators	
*Under 20	28,024 (2.2%)	206	7.35	27,708 (2.1%)	158	5.70
20 to 29	250,071 (19.4%)	1,385	5.54	253,656 (19.5%)	1,279	5.04
30 to 39	222,262 (17.3%)	1,215	5.47	222,083 (17.1%)	1,101	4.96
40 to 49	260,182 (20.2%)	624	2.40	256,230 (19.7%)	513	2.00
Over 50	527,578 (41.0%)	177	0.34	538,883 (41.5%)	182	0.34
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,288,117</b>	<b>3,689</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>1,298,560</b>	<b>3,297</b>	<b>2.54</b>

\* The under 20 Group includes ages 18 and 19

**TABLE 4-5: PEREPTRATOR/VICTIM RACE CROSSTABULATION  
CY 2005 AND 2006**

Calendar Year	Victims Race	Perpetrators Race					Grand Total
		White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific	
2005	White	3,687	95	29	7	1	3,819
	Black or African American	61	611	1	0	0	673
	American Indian or Alaska Native	39	14	315		0	368
	Asian	2	1	0	26	0	29
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0	2	0	1	5
	<b>2005 Total</b>	<b>3,791</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4,894</b>
2006	White	3,440	111	21	8	1	3,581
	Black or African American	43	762	7	4	0	816
	American Indian or Alaska Native	56	16	233	0	0	305
	Asian	3	0		40	0	43
	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	3	3
	<b>2006 Total</b>	<b>3,542</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4,748</b>

- ❖ Table 4-5 compares the race of the victim with the race of the perpetrator. This table supports other studies and reports that indicate that victimization is usually within the same race.
- ❖ The totals on these tables will not match totals on other tables. Identifying a unique perpetrator and victim relationships were used to develop the counts on this table. A child may have more than one perpetrator for the same report.

## SERVICE AREAS


There are five (5) Service Areas designated for the state of Nebraska. They are designated as:

Central  
Eastern  
Northern

Southeast  
Western

This section provides information particular about each of those service areas that are not presented in the main section of this report. The map below shows the boundaries for these service areas and what counties are included in these service areas.

### Department of Health and Human Services



## CENTRAL SERVICE AREA (CSA)

Central Service Area is made up of the following twenty-one (21) counties:

Adams	Howard
Blaine	Kearney
Buffalo	Loup
Clay	Merrick
Custer	Nuckolls
Franklin	Phelps
Garfield	Sherman
Greeley	Valley
Hall	Webster
Hamilton	Wheeler
Harlan	

The following are some highlights about this service area that are supported by the charts and tables on the next several page:

- ❖ There was a decrease of 143 (7.9%) CAN reports assessed between 2005 and 2006. The 1,652 CAN reports assessed in 2006 reflect 41 more reports than the 1,611 assessed in 2005.
- ❖ The 229 CAN reports substantiated in 2006 show a decrease of 75 (24.7%) from the 304 CAN reports substantiated in 2005.
- ❖ The decrease trend continues for children involved in substantiated reports. The count of 329 in 2006 was at its lowest of the last four years. This is a 27.4% decrease compared to the 453 victims in 2005.
- ❖ The top two sources of CAN reports for the CSA are educational persons or institutions and unknown persons.
- ❖ Central Service Area is in line with the rest of the state in that younger children are abused more than older children and physical neglect is the primary type of maltreatment.


## CENTRAL SERVICE AREA (CSA)

### NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT ASSESSMENT STATISTICS

CALENDAR YEARS 2003 - 2006

Calendar Year	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Substantiated	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports
2003	1,611	274	446
2004	1,651	248	369
2005	1,795	304	453
2006	1,652	229	329

### CENTRAL SERVICE AREA CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS CY 2003 - 2006





## CENTRAL SERVICE AREA (CSA)

### Source of Abuse or Neglect Reports – CY 2005 and 2006

Under Nebraska law, citizens are required to report suspected child abuse or neglect to their local law enforcement agencies or the Department. The following table shows the source of reports assessed in the Central Service Area.

Source of Report	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed			
	Calendar Year 2005		Calendar Year 2006	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Educational Personnel	246	14.5%	242	15.6%
Unknown	237	14.0%	244	15.7%
Friend/Neighbor	202	11.9%	192	12.4%
Parent/Legal Guardian	198	11.7%	157	10.1%
Public Social Services Personnel	147	8.7%	165	10.6%
Relative	159	9.4%	153	9.9%
Hosp/Clinic/Public Health Personnel	110	6.5%	76	4.9%
Law Enforcement Personnel	117	6.9%	65	4.2%
Other	60	3.5%	70	4.5%
Private Mental Health Personnel	61	3.6%	63	4.1%
Private Social Services Personnel	36	2.1%	32	2.1%
Private Doctor/Nurse	41	2.4%	24	1.5%
Child Care Personnel	24	1.4%	17	1.1%
Public Mental Health Personnel	14	0.8%	9	0.6%
Day Care Center Personnel	12	0.7%	10	0.6%
Alleged Victim	10	0.6%	10	0.6%
Public Residential Facility Personnel	3	0.2%	10	0.6%
Foster Parent	6	0.4%	2	0.1%
Private Residential Facility Personnel	4	0.2%	2	0.1%
Court/Judge	3	0.2%	2	0.1%
Prosecutor	2	0.1%	3	0.2%
Alleged Perpetrator		0.0%	2	0.1%
Private Attorney	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,693</b>		<b>1,551</b>	

**Central Service Area (CSA)  
Types of Abuse or Neglect in Substantiated Cases – CY 2005 and 2006**

In a single case a child (or children) could have been involved with one or more substantiated types of abuse or neglect so the number of substantiated allegations is larger than the total number of children involved in these instances.

<b>Calendar Year</b>	<b>Physical Abuse</b>	<b>Emotional Abuse</b>	<b>Physical Neglect</b>	<b>Emotional Neglect</b>	<b>Med Neg Hndcp Infant</b>	<b>Sexual Abuse</b>	<b>Children Involved in Substantiated Reports</b>
2003	127	20	469	19	0	49	446
2004	68	30	438	8	1	39	369
2005	78	16	475	14	1	78	453
2006	77	7	427	3	0	75	329

**Children Involved in Substantiated Reports of Abuse or Neglect  
By Gender and Type of Allegation Abuse or Neglect Type – CY 2005 and 2006**

<b>Calendar Year</b>	<b>Allegation Type</b>	<b>Child Gender</b>		<b>Grand Total</b>
		<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	
2005	Physical Abuse	39	39	78
	Emotional Abuse	6	10	16
	Physical Neglect	214	261	475
	Emotional Neglect	8	6	14
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	0	1	1
	Sexual Abuse	53	25	78
	<b>Total</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>662</b>
2006	Physical Abuse	41	36	77
	Emotional Abuse	5	2	7
	Physical Neglect	199	228	427
	Emotional Neglect	0	3	3
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	0	0	0
	Sexual Abuse	60	15	75
	<b>Total</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>589</b>

**CENTRAL SERVICE AREA (CSA)**

**Characteristics of Children Involved in Abuse or Neglect  
Gender and Age of Involved Children**

Victims Age	2005				2006			
	Gender		Total	PCT	Gender		Total	PCT
	Female	Male			Female	Male		
<02	33	41	74	16.3%	33	33	33	14.4%
02	18	19	37	8.2%	18	18	18	7.9%
03	13	17	30	6.6%	13	13	13	5.7%
04	22	17	39	8.6%	22	22	22	9.6%
05	14	17	31	6.8%	14	14	14	6.1%
06	14	9	23	5.1%	14	14	14	6.1%
07	13	17	30	6.6%	13	13	13	5.7%
08	16	10	26	5.7%	16	16	16	7.0%
09	9	9	18	4.0%	9	9	9	3.9%
10	11	11	22	4.9%	11	11	11	4.8%
11	7	16	23	5.1%	7	7	7	3.1%
12	9	5	14	3.1%	9	9	9	3.9%
13	9	9	18	4.0%	9	9	9	3.9%
14	8	7	15	3.3%	8	8	8	3.5%
15	12	8	20	4.4%	12	12	12	5.2%
16	13	7	20	4.4%	13	13	13	5.7%
17	4	4	8	1.8%	4	4	4	1.7%
>17	4	1	5	1.1%	4	4	4	1.7%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>453</b>		<b>229</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>229</b>	

## **EASTERN SERVICE AREA (ESA)**

Eastern Service Area is made up of the following two counties:

Douglas  
Sarpy

The following are some highlights about this service area that are reflected in the charts and tables on the next several page:

- ❖ There was a decrease of 764 (16.2%) CAN reports assessed between 2005 and 2006. The 3,939 CAN reports assessed in 2006 are 1,029 (35.4%) more than the 2,910 CAN reports assessed in 2003.
- ❖ The 1,069 CAN reports substantiated in 2006 is 89(7.7%) less than the 1,158 CAN reports substantiated in 2005.
- ❖ The 1,551 victims in 2006 are 56 (3.5%) less than the 1,607 victims in 2005. This is an increase of 430 (38.3%) victims compared to the 1,121 in 2003.
- ❖ The top source of CAN reports for the ESA is Law Enforcement. The Child Abuse and Neglect Hotline is located in the same building as one the Metropolitan's police departments.
- ❖ Eastern Service Area is in line with the rest of the state in that younger children are abused more than older children and physical neglect is the primary type of maltreatment.


## EASTERN SERVICE AREA (ESA)

### NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT ASSESSMENT STATISTICS

CALENDAR YEARS 2003 - 2006

Calendar Year	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Substantiated	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports
2003	2,910	732	1,121
2004	5,165	1,382	1,982
2005	4,703	1,158	1,607
2006	3,939	1,069	1,551

#### EASTERN SERVICE AREA CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS CY 2003 - 2006



■ Intake Reports   
 ■ CAN Reports   
 ■ Assessed   
 ■ Substantiated

## EASTERN SERVICE AREA (ESA)

Source of Abuse or Neglect Reports – CY 2005 and 2006

Under Nebraska law, citizens are required to report suspected child abuse or neglect to their local law enforcement agencies or the Department. The following table shows the source of reports assessed in the Eastern Service Area.

Source of Report	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed			
	Calendar Year 2005		Calendar Year 2006	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Law Enforcement Personnel	1,074	23.2%	798	20.9%
Friend/Neighbor	530	11.5%	430	11.3%
Hosp/Clinic/Public Health Personnel	501	10.8%	419	11.0%
Educational Personnel	446	9.6%	448	11.8%
Relative	418	9.0%	373	9.8%
Parent/Legal Guardian	375	8.1%	270	7.1%
Public Social Services Personnel	262	5.7%	232	6.1%
Unknown	312	6.8%	169	4.4%
Private Mental Health Personnel	147	3.2%	158	4.1%
Other	146	3.2%	139	3.6%
Private Social Services Personnel	128	2.8%	114	3.0%
Private Doctor/Nurse	82	1.8%	67	1.8%
Child Care Personnel	33	0.7%	41	1.1%
Public Mental Health Personnel	33	0.7%	25	0.7%
Day Care Center Personnel	26	0.6%	27	0.7%
Court/Judge	28	0.6%	22	0.6%
Alleged Victim	23	0.5%	11	0.3%
Foster Parent	15	0.3%	18	0.5%
Prosecutor	12	0.3%	20	0.5%
Private Residential Facility Personnel	11	0.2%	12	0.3%
Private Attorney	8	0.2%	9	0.2%
Public Residential Facility Personnel	6	0.1%	7	0.2%
Alleged Perpetrator	4	0.1%	1	0.0%
Public Defender	2	0.0%		0.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>4622</b>		<b>3810</b>	

## Eastern Service Area (ESA)

### Types of Abuse or Neglect in Substantiated Cases – CY 2005 and 2006

In a single case a child (or children) could have been involved with one or more substantiated types of abuse or neglect so the number of substantiated allegations is larger than the total number of involved children in these instances.

Calendar Year	Physical Abuse	Emotional Abuse	Physical Neglect	Emotional Neglect	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	Sexual Abuse	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports
2003	224	16	1,142	38	0	81	1,116
2004	400	19	2,297	77	1	15	1,982
2005	301	15	1,757	73	1	189	1,607
2006	290	13	1,847	42	2	146	1,551

### Children Involved in Substantiated Reports of Abuse or Neglect By Gender and Type of Allegation Abuse or Neglect Type – CY 2005 and 2006

Calendar Year	Allegation Type	Child Gender		Grand Total
		Female	Male	
2005	Physical Abuse	149	152	301
	Emotional Abuse	11	4	15
	Physical Neglect	863	894	1,757
	Emotional Neglect	43	30	73
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	1		1
	Sexual Abuse	157	32	189
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,224</b>	<b>1,112</b>	<b>2,336</b>
2006	Physical Abuse	139	151	290
	Emotional Abuse	6	7	13
	Physical Neglect	915	932	1,847
	Emotional Neglect	23	19	42
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant		2	2
	Sexual Abuse	116	30	146
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,199</b>	<b>1,141</b>	<b>2,340</b>

## EASTERN SERVICE AREA (ESA)

### Characteristics of Children Involved in Abuse or Neglect Gender and Age of Involved Children

Victims Age	2005				2006			
	Gender		Total	PCT	Gender		Total	PCT
	Female	Male			Female	Male		
<02	119	156	275	17.1%	134	121	255	16.4%
02	57	55	112	7.0%	56	52	108	7.0%
03	53	61	114	7.1%	45	52	97	6.3%
04	51	48	99	6.2%	50	66	116	7.5%
05	60	49	109	6.8%	66	52	118	7.6%
06	51	48	99	6.2%	52	45	97	6.3%
07	35	44	79	4.9%	39	44	83	5.4%
08	41	45	86	5.4%	39	40	79	5.1%
09	37	36	73	4.5%	45	45	90	5.8%
10	43	32	75	4.7%	35	32	67	4.3%
11	39	26	65	4.0%	29	31	60	3.9%
12	28	25	53	3.3%	28	27	55	3.5%
13	33	40	73	4.5%	35	32	67	4.3%
14	57	26	83	5.2%	45	25	70	4.5%
15	48	30	78	4.9%	36	26	62	4.0%
16	44	21	65	4.0%	39	22	61	3.9%
17	31	20	51	3.2%	26	16	42	2.7%
>17	9	9	18	1.1%	17	7	24	1.5%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>836</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>1607</b>		<b>816</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>1,551</b>	



## NORTHERN SERVICE AREA (NSA)

Northern Service Area is made up of the following twenty-four (24) counties:

Antelope	Holt
Boone	Keya Paha
Boyd	Knox
Brown	Madison
Burt	Nance
Cedar	Pierce
Cherry	Platte
Colfax	Rock
Cuming	Stanton
Dakota	Thurston
Dixon	Washington
Dodge	Wayne

The following are some highlights about this service area that are reflected in the charts and tables on the next several page:

- ❖ There was a decrease of 301 (15.6 %) of CAN reports assessed between 2005 and 2006. The 1,624 CAN reports assessed in 2006 are 421 (34.9%) more than the 1,203 CAN reports assessed in 2003.
- ❖ The 238 substantiated CAN reports in 2006 are 113 (32.2%) less than the 351 CAN reports substantiated in 2005.
- ❖ The 353 victims in 2006 are 216 (37.9%) less than the 569 victims in 2005. This is a decrease of 141 (28.5%) victims compared to 494 in 2003.
- ❖ The top source of reports for NSA is educational personnel. It is interesting to see the big jump in the rankings for Friends and Neighbors. In 2005 the CAN reporting source of Friends and Neighbors ranked fourth and in 2006 it was second with a percentage increase of nearly 3%.
- ❖ Northern Service Area is in line with the rest of the state in that younger children are abused more than older children and physical neglect is the primary type of maltreatment .


## NORTHERN SERVICE AREA (NSA)

### NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT ASSESSMENT STATISTICS

CALENDAR YEARS 2003 - 2006

Calendar Year	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Substantiated	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports
2003	1,203	318	494
2004	1,618	336	544
2005	1,925	351	569
2006	1,624	238	353

#### NORTHERN SERVICE AREA CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS CY 2003 - 2006



## NORTHERN SERVICE AREA (NSA)

Source of Abuse or Neglect Reports – CY 2005 and 2006

Under Nebraska law, citizens are required to report suspected child abuse or neglect to their local law enforcement agencies or the Department. The following table shows the source of reports assessed in the Northern Service Area.

Source of Report	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed			
	Calendar Year 2005		Calendar Year 2006	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Educational Personnel	291	16.6%	262	17.6%
Friend/Neighbor	173	9.9%	191	12.8%
Relative	194	11.1%	145	9.7%
Parent/Legal Guardian	175	10.0%	149	10.0%
Law Enforcement Personnel	162	9.3%	146	9.8%
Public Social Services Personnel	167	9.5%	109	7.3%
Unknown	168	9.6%	107	7.2%
Other	97	5.5%	103	6.9%
Hosp/Clinic/Public Health Personnel	101	5.8%	77	5.2%
Private Mental Health Personnel	89	5.1%	88	5.9%
Private Doctor/Nurse	36	2.1%	26	1.7%
Private Social Services Personnel	25	1.4%	18	1.2%
Child Care Personnel	15	0.9%	17	1.1%
Day Care Center Personnel	13	0.7%	12	0.8%
Alleged Victim	11	0.6%	11	0.7%
Prosecutor	6	0.3%	11	0.7%
Public Mental Health Personnel	8	0.5%	5	0.3%
Court/Judge	5	0.3%	3	0.2%
Foster Parent	5	0.3%	3	0.2%
Private Residential Facility Personnel	4	0.2%	2	0.1%
Alleged Perpetrator	3	0.2%	1	0.1%
Private Attorney	1	0.1%	3	0.2%
Public Residential Facility Personnel	2	0.1%	2	0.1%
Public Defender	0	0.0%	1	0.1%
Coroner	0	0.0%		0.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,751</b>		<b>1,492</b>	

## NORTHERN SERVICE AREA (NSA)

### Types of Abuse or Neglect in Substantiated Cases – CY 2005 and 2006

In a single case a child (or children) could have been involved with one or more substantiated types of abuse or neglect so the number of substantiated allegations is larger than the total number of involved children in these instances.

Calendar Year	Physical Abuse	Emotional Abuse	Physical Neglect	Emotional Neglect	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	Sexual Abuse	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports
2003	116	32	445	9	0	67	494
2004	135	52	481	20	0	71	544
2005	92	34	625	6	1	63	569
2006	57	16	421	5		37	353

### Children Involved in Substantiated Reports of Abuse or Neglect By Gender and Type of Allegation Abuse or Neglect Type – CY 2005 and 2006

Calendar Year	Allegation Type	Child Gender		Grand Total
		Female	Male	
2005	Physical Abuse	44	48	92
	Emotional Abuse	13	21	34
	Physical Neglect	309	316	625
	Emotional Neglect	5	1	6
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant		1	1
	Sexual Abuse	40	23	63
	<b>Total</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>821</b>
2006	Physical Abuse	23	34	57
	Emotional Abuse	6	10	16
	Physical Neglect	195	226	421
	Emotional Neglect	4	1	5
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant			
	Sexual Abuse	28	9	37
	<b>Total</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>536</b>

## NORTHERN SERVICE AREA (NSA)

### Characteristics of Children Involved in Abuse or Neglect Gender and Age of Involved Children

Victims Age	2005				2006			
	Gender		Total	PCT	Gender		Total	PCT
	Female	Male			Female	Male		
<02	37	48	85	14.9%	32	25	57	16.1%
02	24	24	48	8.4%	14	17	31	8.8%
03	22	22	44	7.7%	8	11	19	5.4%
04	23	23	46	8.1%	14	15	29	8.2%
05	18	20	38	6.7%	12	8	20	5.7%
06	15	24	39	6.9%	9	16	25	7.1%
07	24	18	42	7.4%	11	11	22	6.2%
08	8	15	23	4.0%	4	10	14	4.0%
09	19	8	27	4.7%	11	10	21	5.9%
10	11	15	26	4.6%	9	3	12	3.4%
11	7	12	19	3.3%	6	9	15	4.2%
12	19	13	32	5.6%	6	11	17	4.8%
13	10	7	17	3.0%	5	6	11	3.1%
14	13	11	24	4.2%	12	2	14	4.0%
15	14	12	26	4.6%	6	6	12	3.4%
16	9		9	1.6%	12	6	18	5.1%
17	7	11	18	3.2%	10	5	15	4.2%
>17	3	3	6	1.1%		1	1	0.3%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>569</b>		<b>181</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>353</b>	

## SOUTHEAST SERVICE AREA (SESA)

Southeast Service Area is made up of the following seventeen (17) counties:

Butler	Pawnee
Cass	Polk
Fillmore	Richardson
Gage	Saline
Jefferson	Saunders
Johnson	Seward
Lancaster	Thayer
Nemaha	York
Otoe	

The following are some highlights about this service area that are reflected in the charts and tables on the next several page:


- ❖ There was a small increase of 13 (0.4%) CAN reports assessed between 2005 and 2006. This is the only service area that showed an increase in the number of CAN reports assessed. The 3,090 CAN reports assessed in 2006 are 973 (45.9%) more than the 2,117 CAN reports assessed in 2003.
- ❖ The 1,216 substantiated CAN reports in 2006 are 72 (6.3%) more than the 1,144 CAN reports substantiated in 2005. This is the only service area that had an increase in the number of CAN reports that were substantiated
- ❖ The 1,665 victims in 2006 are 42 (2.5%) less than the 1,707 victims in 2005. This is an increase of 420 (33.7%) victims compared to the 1,245 in 2003.
- ❖ The top source of reports for the SESA is Law Enforcement personnel. Nearly 40% of the reports received in this service area come from Law Enforcement personnel.
- ❖ Southeast Service Area is in line with the rest of the state in that younger children are abused more than older children and physical neglect is the primary type of maltreatment.

## SOUTHEAST SERVICE AREA

NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT ASSESSMENT STATISTICS  
CALENDAR YEARS 2003 - 2006

Calendar Year	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Substantiated	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports
2003	2,117	851	1,245
2004	2,689	1,053	1,599
2005	3,077	1,144	1,707
2006	3,090	1,216	1,665

**SOUTHEAST SERVICE AREA CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT  
REPORTS CY 2003 - 2006**



## SOUTHEAST SERVICE AREA (SESA)

Source of Abuse or Neglect Reports – CY 2005 and 2006

Under Nebraska law, citizens are required to report suspected child abuse or neglect to their local law enforcement agencies or the Department. The following table shows the source of reports assessed in the Southeast Service Area.

<b>Source of Report</b>	<b>Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed</b>			
	<b>Calendar Year 2005</b>		<b>Calendar Year 2006</b>	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Law Enforcement Personnel	1,130	38.1%	1,091	36.1%
Educational Personnel	340	11.5%	328	10.9%
Friend/Neighbor	221	7.4%	250	8.3%
Relative	212	7.1%	200	6.6%
Public Social Services Personnel	161	5.4%	225	7.4%
Parent/Legal Guardian	170	5.7%	157	5.2%
Unknown	182	6.1%	127	4.2%
Hosp/Clinic/Public Health Personnel	134	4.5%	170	5.6%
Private Mental Health Personnel	107	3.6%	127	4.2%
Other	75	2.5%	86	2.8%
Private Social Services Personnel	52	1.8%	61	2.0%
Private Doctor/Nurse	51	1.7%	44	1.5%
Child Care Personnel	27	0.9%	39	1.3%
Prosecutor	23	0.8%	34	1.1%
Public Mental Health Personnel	28	0.9%	25	0.8%
Day Care Center Personnel	17	0.6%	14	0.5%
Alleged Victim	10	0.3%	12	0.4%
Foster Parent	7	0.2%	14	0.5%
Court/Judge	11	0.4%	3	0.1%
Private Residential Facility Personnel	3	0.1%	11	0.4%
Public Residential Facility Personnel	3	0.1%	3	0.1%
Private Attorney	2	0.1%	1	0.0%
Public Defender	2	0.1%		0.0%
Alleged Perpetrator		0.0%		0.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,968</b>		<b>3,022</b>	



## SOUTHEAST SERVICE AREA (SESA)

### Types of Abuse or Neglect in Substantiated Cases – CY 2005 and 2006

In a single case a child (or children) could have been involved with one or more substantiated types of abuse or neglect so the number of substantiated allegations is larger than the total number of involved children in these instances.

Calendar Year	Physical Abuse	Emotional Abuse	Physical Neglect	Emotional Neglect	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	Sexual Abuse	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports
2003	254	287	1,400	134	0	103	1,245
2004	244	267	2,156	204	0	110	1,599
2005	247	412	2,505	121		102	1,707
2006	230	401	2,746	115		115	1,665

### Children Involved in Substantiated Reports of Abuse or Neglect By Gender and Type of Allegation Abuse or Neglect Type – CY 2005 and 2006

Calendar Year	Allegation Type	Child Gender		Grand Total
		Female	Male	
2005	Physical Abuse	104	143	247
	Emotional Abuse	197	215	412
	Physical Neglect	1,150	1,355	2,505
	Emotional Neglect	51	70	121
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant			
	Sexual Abuse	85	17	102
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,587</b>	<b>1,800</b>	<b>3,387</b>
2006	Physical Abuse	99	131	230
	Emotional Abuse	196	205	401
	Physical Neglect	1,318	1,428	2,746
	Emotional Neglect	62	53	115
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant			
	Sexual Abuse	91	24	115
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,766</b>	<b>1,841</b>	<b>3,607</b>

## SOUTHEAST SERVICE AREA (SESA)

### Characteristics of Children Involved in Abuse or Neglect Gender and Age of Involved Children

Victims Age	2005				2006			
	Gender		Total	PCT	Gender		Total	PCT
	Female	Male			Female	Male		
<02	120	135	255	14.9%	161	150	311	18.7%
02	67	83	150	8.8%	66	71	137	8.2%
03	54	81	135	7.9%	61	67	128	7.7%
04	57	66	123	7.2%	58	64	122	7.3%
05	62	59	121	7.1%	50	59	109	6.5%
06	62	60	122	7.1%	43	56	99	5.9%
07	48	52	100	5.9%	46	55	101	6.1%
08	44	47	91	5.3%	33	50	83	5.0%
09	33	46	79	4.6%	47	48	95	5.7%
10	38	30	68	4.0%	29	32	61	3.7%
11	42	38	80	4.7%	28	36	64	3.8%
12	29	43	72	4.2%	30	24	54	3.2%
13	32	37	69	4.0%	40	41	81	4.9%
14	38	32	70	4.1%	36	28	64	3.8%
15	36	25	61	3.6%	32	22	54	3.2%
16	31	24	55	3.2%	34	18	52	3.1%
17	24	15	39	2.3%	18	16	34	2.0%
>17	12	5	17	1.0%	11	5	16	1.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>829</b>	<b>878</b>	<b>1,707</b>		<b>823</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>1,665</b>	

## WESTERN SERVICE AREA (WSA)

Western Service Area is made up of the following twenty-nine (29) counties:

Arthur	Hitchcock
Banner	Hooker
Box Butte	Keith
Chase	Kimball
Cheyenne	Lincoln
Dawes	Logan
Dawson	McPherson
Deuel	Morrill
Dundy	Perkins
Frontier	Red Willow
Furnas	Scotts Bluff
Garden	Sheridan
Gosper	Sioux
Grant	Thomas
Hayes	

In previous years the Western Service Area was reported out as two separate Service Areas; Western and Southwest Service Areas. These service areas were combined to form one Service Area known as the Western Service Area in 2006.

The following are some highlights about this service area that are reflected in the charts and tables on the next several page:


- ❖ There was a small decrease of 73 (3.0%) CAN reports assessed between 2005 and 2006. The 2,324 CAN reports assessed in 2006 are 869 (59.7%) more than the 1,455 CAN reports assessed in 2003.
- ❖ The 313 substantiated CAN reports in 2006 are 54 (14.7%) less than the 367 CAN reports substantiated in 2005.
- ❖ The 437 victims in 2006 are 67 (18.3%) less than the 504 victims in 2005. This is an increase of 104 (31.2%) victims compared to the 333 in 2003.
- ❖ The top source of reports for the WSA is “Unknown”. The second highest source is Educational Personnel.
- ❖ Western Service Area is in line with the rest of the state in that younger children are abused more than older children and physical neglect is the primary type of maltreatment.

## WESTERN SERVICE AREA (WSA)

### NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT ASSESSED STATISTICS CALENDAR YEARS 2003 - 2006

Calendar Year	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Substantiated	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports
2003	1,455	248	333
2004	2,168	317	436
2005	2,397	367	504
2006	2,324	313	437

#### WESTERN SERVICE AREA CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS CY 2003 - 2006



■ Intake Reports   
 ■ CAN Reports   
 ■ Assessed   
 ■ Substantiated

## WESTERN SERVICE AREA (WSA)

### Source of Abuse or Neglect Reports – CY 2005 and 2006

Under Nebraska law, citizens are required to report suspected child abuse or neglect to their local law enforcement agencies or the Department. The following table shows the source of reports assessed in the Western Service Area.

Source of Report	Total Abuse or Neglect Reports Assessed			
	Calendar Year 2005		Calendar Year 2006	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Unknown	398	17.4%	345	16.0%
Educational Personnel	332	14.5%	356	16.5%
Relative	231	10.1%	204	9.4%
Law Enforcement Personnel	210	9.2%	205	9.5%
Parent/Legal Guardian	213	9.3%	192	8.9%
Friend/Neighbor	186	8.1%	179	8.3%
Public Social Services Personnel	162	7.1%	171	7.9%
Other	133	5.8%	137	6.3%
Hosp/Clinic/Public Health Personnel	123	5.4%	129	6.0%
Private Mental Health Personnel	116	5.1%	85	3.9%
Private Doctor/Nurse	33	1.4%	34	1.6%
Child Care Personnel	22	1.0%	32	1.5%
Private Social Services Personnel	27	1.2%	26	1.2%
Day Care Center Personnel	28	1.2%	10	0.5%
Public Mental Health Personnel	23	1.0%	15	0.7%
Alleged Victim	17	0.7%	11	0.5%
Public Residential Facility Personnel	9	0.4%	7	0.3%
Foster Parent	10	0.4%	2	0.1%
Private Residential Facility Personnel	3	0.1%	8	0.4%
Prosecutor	4	0.2%	3	0.1%
Court/Judge	2	0.1%	4	0.2%
Private Attorney	2	0.1%	2	0.1%
Alleged Perpetrator		0.0%	2	0.1%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,284</b>		<b>2,159</b>	

## WESTERN SERVICE AREA (WSA)

### Types of Abuse or Neglect in Substantiated Cases – CY 2005 and 2006

In a single case a child (or children) could have been involved with one or more substantiated types of abuse or neglect so the number of substantiated allegations is larger than the total number of involved children in these instances.

Calendar Year	Physical Abuse	Emotional Abuse	Physical Neglect	Emotional Neglect	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	Sexual Abuse	Children Involved in Substantiated Reports
2003	109	8	247	21	2	63	333
2004	122	6	415	23	0	31	436
2005	91	4	530	17	1	108	504
2006	80	3	543	11		66	437

### Children Involved in Substantiated Reports of Abuse or Neglect By Gender and Type of Allegation Abuse or Neglect Type – CY 2005 and 2006



Calendar Year	Allegation Type	Child Gender		Grand Total
		Female	Male	
2005	Physical Abuse	43	48	91
	Emotional Abuse	3	1	4
	Physical Neglect	250	280	530
	Emotional Neglect	12	5	17
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant	1		1
	Sexual Abuse	75	33	108
	<b>Total</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>751</b>
2006	Physical Abuse	41	39	80
	Emotional Abuse	3		3
	Physical Neglect	281	262	543
	Emotional Neglect	6	5	11
	Med Neg Hndcp Infant			
	Sexual Abuse	51	15	66
	<b>Total</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>703</b>

**WESTERN SERVICE AREA (WSA)**

**Characteristics of Children Involved in Abuse or Neglect  
Gender and Age of Involved Children**

Victims Age	2005				2006			
	Gender		Total	PCT	Gender		Total	PCT
	Female	Male			Female	Male		
<02	36	42	78	15.5%	34	46	80	18.3%
02	14	24	38	7.5%	15	11	26	5.9%
03	15	15	30	6.0%	19	10	29	6.6%
04	10	23	33	6.5%	17	12	29	6.6%
05	11	12	23	4.6%	15	19	34	7.8%
06	20	12	32	6.3%	20	12	32	7.3%
07	16	21	37	7.3%	14	16	30	6.9%
08	17	18	35	6.9%	12	9	21	4.8%
09	11	12	23	4.6%	16	8	24	5.5%
10	18	12	30	6.0%	11	9	20	4.6%
11	8	13	21	4.2%	8	12	20	4.6%
12	7	10	17	3.4%	18	3	21	4.8%
13	15	9	24	4.8%	8	3	11	2.5%
14	17	10	27	5.4%	10	7	17	3.9%
15	15	4	19	3.8%	12	2	14	3.2%
16	16	4	20	4.0%	6	6	12	2.7%
17	6	6	12	2.4%	3	8	11	2.5%
>17	3	2	5	1.0%	2	4	6	1.4%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>504</b>		<b>240</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>437</b>	

TAB B: Child Abuse and Neglect Reports: This tab contains additional charts and tables not included in Section I





**CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS BY COUNTY CALENDAR YEAR 2005**

County	Total Calls	Abuse/Neglect Calls <sup>1</sup>		Assessed Reports <sup>2</sup>		Substantiated Reports <sup>3</sup>		Unfounded Reports <sup>3</sup>		Unable to Locate <sup>3</sup>		In Process of Assessment <sup>2</sup>	
Adams	388	318	82.0%	252	79.2%	42	16.7%	198	78.6%	12	4.8%	11	4.4%
Antelope	31	31	100.0%	19	61.3%	2	10.5%	17	89.5%		0.0%	3	15.8%
Arthur	1	1	100.0%	1	100.0%		0.0%	1	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Banner	3	3	100.0%	2	66.7%	2	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Blaine	3	3	100.0%	1	33.3%	1	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Boone	15	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	1	6.7%	14	93.3%		0.0%		0.0%
Box Butte	175	161	92.0%	112	69.6%	21	18.8%	91	81.3%		0.0%	8	7.1%
Boyd	9	9	100.0%	8	88.9%	4	50.0%	4	50.0%		0.0%	1	12.5%
Brown	33	31	93.9%	23	74.2%	5	21.7%	18	78.3%		0.0%	2	8.7%
Buffalo	2,044	1,391	68.1%	493	35.4%	59	12.0%	431	87.4%	3	0.6%	16	3.2%
Burt	52	51	98.1%	38	74.5%	2	5.3%	36	94.7%		0.0%	3	7.9%
Butler	45	43	95.6%	37	86.0%	17	45.9%	20	54.1%		0.0%	3	8.1%
Cass	166	160	96.4%	139	86.9%	40	28.8%	95	68.3%	4	2.9%	4	2.9%
Cedar	28	28	100.0%	20	71.4%	2	10.0%	17	85.0%	1	5.0%		0.0%
Chase	17	17	100.0%	16	94.1%	1	6.3%	14	87.5%	1	6.3%		0.0%
Cherry	56	55	98.2%	46	83.6%	10	21.7%	36	78.3%		0.0%		0.0%
Cheyenne	143	136	95.1%	109	80.1%	12	11.0%	97	89.0%		0.0%	1	0.9%
Clay	34	34	100.0%	32	94.1%	6	18.8%	26	81.3%		0.0%		0.0%
Colfax	45	45	100.0%	39	86.7%	11	28.2%	26	66.7%	2	5.1%	1	2.6%
Cuming	44	44	100.0%	40	90.9%	5	12.5%	34	85.0%	1	2.5%	1	2.5%
Custer	160	145	90.6%	111	76.6%	27	24.3%	82	73.9%	2	1.8%	9	8.1%
Dakota	256	248	96.9%	197	79.4%	41	20.8%	151	76.6%	5	2.5%	11	5.6%
Dawes	80	78	97.5%	62	79.5%	5	8.1%	52	83.9%	5	8.1%	5	8.1%
Dawson	318	314	98.7%	273	86.9%	37	13.6%	229	83.9%	7	2.6%	1	0.4%
Deuel	6	6	100.0%	5	83.3%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Dixon	21	21	100.0%	17	81.0%	5	29.4%	12	70.6%		0.0%	1	5.9%
Dodge	379	373	98.4%	303	81.2%	66	21.8%	236	77.9%	1	0.3%	6	2.0%
Douglas	9,828	8,511	86.6%	4,011	47.1%	999	24.9%	2,877	71.7%	135	3.4%	62	1.5%
Dundy	12	12	100.0%	10	83.3%	2	20.0%	8	80.0%		0.0%	1	10.0%
Fillmore	31	30	96.8%	24	80.0%	4	16.7%	20	83.3%		0.0%	3	12.5%
Franklin	21	21	100.0%	19	90.5%	1	5.3%	18	94.7%		0.0%		0.0%
Frontier	16	16	100.0%	15	93.8%	4	26.7%	11	73.3%		0.0%		0.0%
Furnas	47	47	100.0%	39	83.0%	7	17.9%	32	82.1%		0.0%	3	7.7%
Gage	168	163	97.0%	133	81.6%	47	35.3%	82	61.7%	4	3.0%	22	16.5%
Garden	9	9	100.0%	7	77.8%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%		0.0%	1	14.3%
Garfield	10	10	100.0%	10	100.0%	2	20.0%	8	80.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Gosper	12	12	100.0%	11	91.7%	1	9.1%	10	90.9%		0.0%		0.0%
Grant	4	4	100.0%	4	100.0%		0.0%	4	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Greeley	16	16	100.0%	14	87.5%	3	21.4%	11	78.6%		0.0%		0.0%
Hall	685	640	93.4%	477	74.5%	108	22.6%	359	75.3%	10	2.1%	43	9.0%
Hamilton	24	24	100.0%	16	66.7%	5	31.3%	11	68.8%		0.0%	6	37.5%
Harlan	13	13	100.0%	11	84.6%	4	36.4%	7	63.6%		0.0%		0.0%
Hayes	3	3	100.0%	3	100.0%	1	33.3%	2	66.7%		0.0%		0.0%
Hitchcock	24	24	100.0%	21	87.5%	2	9.5%	19	90.5%		0.0%		0.0%
Holt	120	117	97.5%	90	76.9%	11	12.2%	77	85.6%	2	2.2%	11	12.2%
Hooker	6	6	100.0%	5	83.3%		0.0%	5	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Howard	32	32	100.0%	25	78.1%	5	20.0%	20	80.0%		0.0%	6	24.0%

Notes: 1 Denotes percent when compared to "Total Calls." 2 Denotes percent when compared to "Abuse/Neglect Calls." 3 Denotes percent when compared to "Assessed Reports." "Substantiated Reports" indicates reports in which a finding of Court Substantiated, Court Pending, or Inconclusive was made.

**CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS BY COUNTY CALENDAR YEAR 2005 (CONT)**

County	Total Calls	Abuse/Neglect Calls <sup>1</sup>		Assessed Reports <sup>2</sup>		Substantiated Reports <sup>3</sup>		Unfounded Reports <sup>3</sup>		Unable to Locate <sup>3</sup>		In Process of Assessment <sup>2</sup>	
Jefferson	49	49	100.0%	40	81.6%	7	17.5%	33	82.5%		0.0%	5	12.5%
Johnson	38	36	94.7%	23	63.9%	6	26.1%	16	69.6%	1	4.3%	4	17.4%
Kearney	36	36	100.0%	29	80.6%	3	10.3%	26	89.7%		0.0%	2	6.9%
Keith	117	111	94.9%	82	73.9%	8	9.8%	70	85.4%	4	4.9%		0.0%
Keya Paha	1	1	100.0%		0.0%								
Kimball	38	38	100.0%	36	94.7%	5	13.9%	30	83.3%	1	2.8%		0.0%
Knox	80	79	98.8%	69	87.3%	14	20.3%	51	73.9%	4	5.8%		0.0%
Lancaster	5,971	5,139	86.1%	2,063	40.1%	856	41.5%	1,177	57.1%	30	1.5%	32	1.6%
Lincoln	1,335	1,284	96.2%	655	51.0%	99	15.1%	548	83.7%	8	1.2%	65	9.9%
Logan	8	8	100.0%	7	87.5%		0.0%	7	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Loup	1	1	100.0%		0.0%							1	
Madison	1,197	891	74.4%	323	36.3%	50	15.5%	271	83.9%	2	0.6%	70	21.7%
McPherson	1	1	100.0%	1	100.0%		0.0%	1	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Merrick	41	41	100.0%	33	80.5%	3	9.1%	26	78.8%	4	12.1%	1	3.0%
Morrill	68	68	100.0%	63	92.6%	11	17.5%	51	81.0%	1	1.6%	3	4.8%
Nance	22	22	100.0%	19	86.4%	6	31.6%	13	68.4%		0.0%	1	5.3%
Nemaha	47	45	95.7%	40	88.9%	9	22.5%	30	75.0%	1	2.5%	1	2.5%
Nuckolls	18	18	100.0%	17	94.4%	4	23.5%	11	64.7%	2	11.8%		0.0%
Otoe	116	114	98.3%	102	89.5%	22	21.6%	75	73.5%	5	4.9%	1	1.0%
Pawnee	8	8	100.0%	8	100.0%	2	25.0%	6	75.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Perkins	12	12	100.0%	10	83.3%	2	20.0%	8	80.0%		0.0%	1	10.0%
Phelps	65	65	100.0%	62	95.4%	7	11.3%	55	88.7%		0.0%		0.0%
Pierce	96	94	97.9%	67	71.3%	12	17.9%	55	82.1%		0.0%	15	22.4%
Platte	321	298	92.8%	237	79.5%	51	21.5%	182	76.8%	4	1.7%	8	3.4%
Polk	15	15	100.0%	15	100.0%	5	33.3%	10	66.7%		0.0%		0.0%
Red Willow	203	196	96.6%	145	74.0%	12	8.3%	131	90.3%	2	1.4%	9	6.2%
Richardson	67	66	98.5%	60	90.9%	14	23.3%	44	73.3%	2	3.3%	4	6.7%
Rock	7	7	100.0%	7	100.0%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%		0.0%		0.0%
Saline	73	70	95.9%	62	88.6%	24	38.7%	37	59.7%	1	1.6%	3	4.8%
Sarpy	771	728	94.4%	611	83.9%	159	26.0%	443	72.5%	9	1.5%	19	3.1%
Saunders	95	95	100.0%	76	80.0%	24	31.6%	50	65.8%	2	2.6%	10	13.2%
Scotts Bluff	829	709	85.5%	574	81.0%	135	23.5%	424	73.9%	15	2.6%	17	3.0%
Seward	93	93	100.0%	70	75.3%	35	50.0%	35	50.0%		0.0%	9	12.9%
Sheridan	61	59	96.7%	51	86.4%	5	9.8%	45	88.2%	1	2.0%	1	2.0%
Sherman	13	13	100.0%	11	84.6%	5	45.5%	6	54.5%		0.0%	2	18.2%
Stanton	42	42	100.0%	33	78.6%	3	9.1%	30	90.9%		0.0%	7	21.2%
Thayer	12	12	100.0%	9	75.0%	2	22.2%	6	66.7%	1	11.1%	3	33.3%
Thomas	5	5	100.0%	4	80.0%		0.0%	4	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%
Thurston	153	113	73.9%	51	45.1%	33	64.7%	14	27.5%	4	7.8%	28	54.9%
Valley	30	30	100.0%	27	90.0%	10	37.0%	16	59.3%	1	3.7%	1	3.7%
Washington	98	96	98.0%	77	80.2%	13	16.9%	63	81.8%	1	1.3%	2	2.6%
Wayne	20	20	100.0%	13	65.0%	3	23.1%	10	76.9%		0.0%	3	23.1%
Webster	14	14	100.0%	12	85.7%	2	16.7%	10	83.3%		0.0%	1	8.3%
Wheeler	2	2	100.0%	2	100.0%		0.0%	2	100.0%		0.0%		0.0%
York	87	82	94.3%	67	81.7%	30	44.8%	35	52.2%	2	3.0%	5	7.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28,009</b>	<b>24,397</b>	<b>87.1%</b>	<b>13,318</b>	<b>54.6%</b>	<b>3,324</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>9,691</b>	<b>72.8%</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>4.3%</b>

Notes. 1 Denotes percent when compared to "Total Calls." 2 Denotes percent when compared to "Abuse/Neglect Calls." 3 Denotes percent when compared to "Assessed Reports." "Substantiated Reports" indicates reports in which a finding of Court Substantiated, Court Pending, or Inconclusive was made.

**CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS BY COUNTY CALENDAR YEAR 2006**

County	Total Calls	Abuse/Neglect Calls <sup>1</sup>	Assessed Reports <sup>2</sup>	Substantiated Reports <sup>3</sup>	Unfounded Reports <sup>3</sup>	Unable to Locate <sup>3</sup>	In Process of Assessment <sup>2</sup>						
Adams	396	330	83.3%	253	76.7%	30	11.9%	216	85.4%	7	2.8%	12	3.6%
Antelope	28	28	100.0%	23	82.1%	6	26.1%	17	73.9%	0	0.0%	2	7.1%
Blaine	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Boone	8	8	100.0%	7	87.5%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Box Butte	138	132	95.7%	113	85.6%	30	26.5%	81	71.7%	2	1.8%	8	6.1%
Boyd	7	7	100.0%	7	100.0%	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Brown	40	40	100.0%	35	87.5%	2	5.7%	33	94.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Buffalo	1999	1383	69.2%	439	31.7%	52	11.8%	386	87.9%	1	0.2%	16	1.2%
Burt	37	34	91.9%	28	82.4%	2	7.1%	26	92.9%	0	0.0%	5	14.7%
Butler	84	82	97.6%	72	87.8%	29	40.3%	43	59.7%	0	0.0%	2	2.4%
Cass	152	146	96.1%	134	91.8%	30	22.4%	104	77.6%	0	0.0%	3	2.1%
Cedar	12	12	100.0%	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Chase	16	16	100.0%	13	81.3%	4	30.8%	9	69.2%	0	0.0%	1	6.3%
Cherry	74	72	97.3%	59	81.9%	6	10.2%	51	86.4%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%
Cheyenne	134	132	98.5%	90	68.2%	13	14.4%	75	83.3%	2	2.2%	26	19.7%
Clay	29	29	100.0%	26	89.7%	3	11.5%	22	84.6%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%
Colfax	24	24	100.0%	21	87.5%	4	19.0%	16	76.2%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%
Cuming	32	32	100.0%	23	71.9%	3	13.0%	20	87.0%	0	0.0%	2	6.3%
Custer	150	131	87.3%	96	73.3%	16	16.7%	79	82.3%	1	1.0%	8	6.1%
Dakota	218	206	94.5%	171	83.0%	37	21.6%	133	77.8%	1	0.6%	13	6.3%
Dawes	119	111	93.3%	97	87.4%	9	9.3%	87	89.7%	1	1.0%	3	2.7%
Dawson	241	237	98.3%	209	88.2%	20	9.6%	182	87.1%	7	3.3%	4	1.7%
Deuel	9	9	100.0%	5	55.6%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	44.4%
Dixon	19	19	100.0%	16	84.2%	4	25.0%	12	75.0%	0	0.0%	3	15.8%
Dodge	320	307	95.9%	250	81.4%	32	12.8%	215	86.0%	3	1.2%	6	2.0%
Douglas	9917	8229	83.0%	3,274	39.8%	907	27.7%	2265	69.2%	102	3.1%	118	1.4%
Dundy	10	10	100.0%	10	100.0%	1	10.0%	9	90.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Fillmore	34	34	100.0%	30	88.2%	12	40.0%	18	60.0%	0	0.0%	2	5.9%
Franklin	14	14	100.0%	11	78.6%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%
Frontier	7	7	100.0%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%
Furnas	41	41	100.0%	39	95.1%	4	10.3%	35	89.7%	0	0.0%	1	2.4%
Gage	147	143	97.3%	133	93.0%	31	23.3%	101	75.9%	1	0.8%	2	1.4%
Garden	5	5	100.0%	5	100.0%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Garfield	8	8	100.0%	7	87.5%	2	28.6%	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%
Gosper	11	11	100.0%	9	81.8%	2	22.2%	7	77.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Grant	4	4	100.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Greeley	10	10	100.0%	8	80.0%	1	12.5%	7	87.5%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%
Hall	706	640	90.7%	471	73.6%	91	19.3%	367	77.9%	13	2.8%	40	6.2%
Hamilton	35	35	100.0%	27	77.1%	3	11.1%	24	88.9%	0	0.0%	6	17.1%
Harlan	17	17	100.0%	16	94.1%	5	31.3%	10	62.5%	1	6.3%	0	0.0%
Hayes	2	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%
Hitchcock	18	18	100.0%	14	77.8%	0	0.0%	14	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	11.1%
Holt	100	100	100.0%	83	83.0%	12	14.5%	71	85.5%	0	0.0%	2	2.0%
Howard	30	30	100.0%	24	80.0%	4	16.7%	18	75.0%	2	8.3%	5	16.7%
Jefferson	60	60	100.0%	51	85.0%	11	21.6%	40	78.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Notes: 1 Denotes percent when compared to "Total Calls." 2 Denotes percent when compared to "Abuse/Neglect Calls." 3 Denotes percent when compared to "Assessed Reports." "Substantiated Reports" indicates reports in which a finding of Court Substantiated, Court Pending, or Inconclusive was made.

### CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT REPORTS BY COUNTY CALENDAR YEAR 2006 (CONT.)

County	Total Calls	Abuse/Neglect Calls <sup>1</sup>		Assessed Reports <sup>2</sup>		Substantiated Reports <sup>3</sup>		Unfounded Reports <sup>3</sup>		Unable to Locate <sup>3</sup>		In Process of Assessment <sup>2</sup>	
Johnson	20	20	100.0%	20	100.0%	5	25.0%	15	75.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Kearney	37	37	100.0%	28	75.7%	1	3.6%	26	92.9%	1	3.6%	6	16.2%
Keith	100	99	99.0%	92	92.9%	7	7.6%	83	90.2%	2	2.2%	2	2.0%
Keya Paha	2	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Kimball	46	45	97.8%	35	77.8%	2	5.7%	33	94.3%	0	0.0%	5	11.1%
Knox	45	41	91.1%	31	75.6%	2	6.5%	28	90.3%	1	3.2%	4	9.8%
Lancaster	6730	5712	84.9%	2,071	36.3%	972	46.9%	1071	51.7%	28	1.4%	52	0.9%
Lincoln	1604	1504	93.8%	628	41.8%	98	15.6%	526	83.8%	4	0.6%	41	2.7%
Logan	11	11	100.0%	8	72.7%	0	0.0%	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%
Loup	2	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Madison	1250	895	71.6%	296	33.1%	46	15.5%	246	83.1%	4	1.4%	31	3.5%
McPherson	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Merrick	25	25	100.0%	21	84.0%	3	14.3%	16	76.2%	2	9.5%	0	0.0%
Morrill	66	65	98.5%	60	92.3%	16	26.7%	44	73.3%	0	0.0%	2	3.1%
Nance	15	15	100.0%	12	80.0%	3	25.0%	6	50.0%	3	25.0%	1	6.7%
Nemaha	40	40	100.0%	37	92.5%	2	5.4%	35	94.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nuckolls	17	17	100.0%	17	100.0%	1	5.9%	15	88.2%	1	5.9%	0	0.0%
Otoe	126	124	98.4%	119	96.0%	11	9.2%	108	90.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.8%
Pawnee	2	2	100.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Perkins	14	14	100.0%	13	92.9%	0	0.0%	12	92.3%	1	7.7%	1	7.1%
Phelps	52	52	100.0%	50	96.2%	7	14.0%	42	84.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%
Pierce	66	59	89.4%	53	89.8%	6	11.3%	47	88.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.7%
Platte	307	286	93.2%	239	83.6%	45	18.8%	183	76.6%	11	4.6%	5	1.7%
Polk	6	6	100.0%	6	100.0%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Red Willow	139	135	97.1%	115	85.2%	10	8.7%	105	91.3%	0	0.0%	7	5.2%
Richardson	56	54	96.4%	51	94.4%	9	17.6%	38	74.5%	4	7.8%	0	0.0%
Rock	4	4	100.0%	3	75.0%	0	0.0%	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	25.0%
Saline	67	65	97.0%	62	95.4%	16	25.8%	46	74.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sarpy	705	637	90.4%	536	84.1%	162	30.2%	363	67.7%	11	2.1%	11	1.7%
Saunders	77	77	100.0%	68	88.3%	32	47.1%	36	52.9%	0	0.0%	3	3.9%
Scotts Bluff	727	674	92.7%	546	81.0%	93	17.0%	447	81.9%	6	1.1%	53	7.9%
Seward	74	72	97.3%	68	94.4%	27	39.7%	41	60.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
Sheridan	47	47	100.0%	41	87.2%	3	7.3%	37	90.2%	1	2.4%	1	2.1%
Sherman	18	18	100.0%	16	88.9%	3	18.8%	13	81.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sioux	1	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Stanton	22	22	100.0%	18	81.8%	2	11.1%	16	88.9%	0	0.0%	2	9.1%
Thayer	20	20	100.0%	19	95.0%	4	21.1%	14	73.7%	1	5.3%	0	0.0%
Thomas	5	5	100.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Thurston	118	95	80.5%	22	23.2%	12	54.5%	10	45.5%	0	0.0%	49	51.6%
Valley	23	23	100.0%	20	87.0%	4	20.0%	16	80.0%	0	0.0%	3	13.0%
Washington	65	65	100.0%	59	90.8%	7	11.9%	52	88.1%	0	0.0%	3	4.6%
Wayne	26	26	100.0%	22	84.6%	2	9.1%	20	90.9%	0	0.0%	2	7.7%
Webster	20	20	100.0%	18	90.0%	2	11.1%	16	88.9%	0	0.0%	1	5.0%
Wheeler	1	1	100.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
York	96	92	95.8%	79	85.9%	24	30.4%	54	68.4%	1	1.3%	2	2.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>28,358</b>	<b>24,173</b>	<b>85.2%</b>	<b>12,034</b>	<b>49.8%</b>	<b>3,065</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>8,738</b>	<b>72.6%</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>2.5%</b>

Notes: 1 Denotes percent when compared to "Total Calls." 2 Denotes percent when compared to "Abuse/Neglect Calls." 3 Denotes percent when compared to "Assessed Reports." "Substantiated Reports" indicates reports in which a finding of Court Substantiated, Court Pending, or Inconclusive was made.

**REPORTS BY ALLEGATION TYPE IN THE MONTH THE REPORT WAS  
RECEIVED CALENDAR YEAR 2005**


<b>Report Month</b>	<b>Physical Abuse</b>	<b>Emotional Abuse</b>	<b>Sexual Abuse</b>	<b>Emotional Neglect</b>	<b>Physical Neglect</b>	<b>Medical Neglect</b>
January	246	44	155	61	908	2
February	219	42	119	64	903	1
March	239	46	177	71	1,024	2
April	250	47	172	56	1,030	1
May	200	44	160	74	1,076	
June	155	33	153	51	908	
July	151	33	159	65	863	1
August	181	43	153	65	961	2
September	227	49	162	64	947	5
October	212	40	141	54	875	
November	212	49	156	52	847	2
December	214	47	131	60	790	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,506</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>1,838</b>	<b>737</b>	<b>11,132</b>	<b>19</b>

**REPORTS BY ALLEGATION TYPE IN THE MONTH THE REPORT WAS  
RECEIVED CALENDAR YEAR 2006**


<b>Report Month</b>	<b>Physical Abuse</b>	<b>Emotional Abuse</b>	<b>Sexual Abuse</b>	<b>Emotional Neglect</b>	<b>Physical Neglect</b>	<b>Medical Neglect</b>
January	194	47	152	56	879	1
February	212	39	136	57	778	1
March	228	53	147	65	913	
April	196	50	106	47	844	3
May	235	67	143	41	1,002	1
June	154	59	131	46	809	3
July	145	51	145	44	827	2
August	161	43	148	25	860	
September	235	41	127	42	813	
October	211	46	142	44	828	2
November	241	46	137	40	868	
December	200	51	106	20	674	
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,412</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>1,620</b>	<b>527</b>	<b>10,095</b>	<b>13</b>

Tab C Allegations: This tab contains additional charts and tables not included in Section II

**Types of Abuse or Neglect in Substantiated Cases By Service Area - CY 2005**



**Types of Abuse or Neglect in Substantiated Cases by Service Area - CY 2006**



**CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT TYPES IN SUBSTANTIATED CASES BY COUNTY CALENDAR YEAR 2005**

County	Abuse	Neglect	Sexual Abuse	Children Involved In Substantiated Reports	Percentage of Children
Adams	13	67	7	60	1.2%
Antelope	1	7	5	8	0.2%
Banner	0	4	1	3	0.1%
Blaine	0	0	1	1	0.0%
Boone	0	4		2	0.0%
Box Butte	1	33	10	27	0.6%
Boyd	4	4	2	6	0.1%
Brown	1	12		6	0.1%
Buffalo	12	74	19	73	1.5%
Burt	0	1	1	2	0.0%
Butler	2	52		30	0.6%
Cass	17	125	4	77	1.6%
Cedar	4	0		4	0.1%
Chase	0	1		1	0.0%
Cherry	3	14	1	12	0.2%
Cheyenne	2	14	9	13	0.3%
Clay	1	19	4	8	0.2%
Colfax	3	19	1	15	0.3%
Cuming	1	9	2	9	0.2%
Custer	9	35	11	36	0.7%
Dakota	19	77	12	71	1.5%
Dawes	4	7		9	0.2%
Dawson	14	61	4	54	1.1%
Deuel	0	1		1	0.0%
Dixon	4	8	1	7	0.1%
Dodge	23	120	7	99	2.0%
Douglas	262	1,612	156	1,406	29.0%
Dundy	1	0	1	2	0.0%
Fillmore	2	8		6	0.1%
Franklin	0	1		1	0.0%
Frontier	0	1	4	5	0.1%
Furnas	1	11	2	10	0.2%
Gage	19	101	6	69	1.4%
Garden	0	0	1	1	0.0%
Garfield	2	0	2	4	0.1%
Gosper	0	2		1	0.0%
Greeley	0	15		10	0.2%
Hall	46	190	19	178	3.7%
Hamilton	2	10		8	0.2%
Harlan	0	1	4	3	0.1%
Hayes	1	1		1	0.0%
Hitchcock	2	0	2	2	0.0%
Holt	9	20		25	0.5%
Howard	0	12		7	0.1%
Jefferson	3	22	2	15	0.3%

\* Some counties are served by offices in other counties. Counts are based upon the location of the office

**CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT TYPES IN SUBSTANTIATED CASES BY COUNTY CALENDAR YEAR 2005  
(CONT.)**

County	Abuse	Neglect	Sexual Abuse	Children Involved In Substantiated Reports	Percentage of Children
Johnson	2	21	2	10	0.2%
Kearney	1	5		4	0.1%
Keith	4	4	2	8	0.2%
Kimball	2	12		7	0.1%
Knox	3	35	1	30	0.6%
Lancaster	548	1,921	63	1,241	25.6%
Lincoln	29	147	30	137	2.8%
Madison	12	114	6	81	1.7%
Merrick	0	3	3	3	0.1%
Morrill	2	9	6	14	0.3%
Nance	0	3	6	9	0.2%
Nemaha	4	16		8	0.2%
Nuckolls	2	2	1	4	0.1%
Otoe	4	45	6	33	0.7%
Pawnee	0	2		2	0.0%
Perkins	0	2	4	4	0.1%
Phelps	0	17	3	15	0.3%
Pierce	5	16	5	16	0.3%
Platte	12	85	9	77	1.6%
Polk	0	13	3	12	0.2%
Red Willow	3	20	4	15	0.3%
Richardson	4	29	2	20	0.4%
Rock	0	2		1	0.0%
Saline	9	50	3	42	0.9%
Sarpy	54	219	33	201	4.2%
Saunders	7	45	3	36	0.7%
Scotts Bluff	30	219	26	191	3.9%
Seward	19	102	6	60	1.2%
Sheridan	0	10	4	8	0.2%
Sherman	1	12		12	0.2%
Stanton	1	2		2	0.0%
Thayer	0	4		4	0.1%
Thurston	15	60	2	65	1.3%
Valley	2	12	2	11	0.2%
Washington	5	18		18	0.4%
Wayne	1	2	2	4	0.1%
Webster	2	4		5	0.1%
York	19	70	2	42	0.9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,290</b>	<b>6,127</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>4,840</b>	

\* Some counties are served by offices in other counties. Counts are based upon the location of the office



**CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT TYPES IN SUBSTANTIATED CASES BY COUNTY CALENDAR YEAR 2006**

County	Abuse	Neglect	Sexual Abuse	Children Involved In Substantiated Reports	Percentage of Children
Adams	10	49	3	43	1.0%
Antelope	9	6	4	9	0.2%
Boone	0	2		2	0.0%
Box Butte	3	52	10	43	1.0%
Boyd	0	5	1	4	0.1%
Brown	0	1	1	2	0.0%
Buffalo	15	88	16	65	1.5%
Burt	1	1		2	0.0%
Butler	7	94	8	46	1.1%
Cass	15	57	3	38	0.9%
Chase	1	4		4	0.1%
Cherry	0	8		3	0.1%
Cheyenne	9	12		13	0.3%
Clay	2	18		3	0.1%
Colfax	0	10	3	9	0.2%
Cuming	0	10	1	6	0.1%
Custer	7	19	7	21	0.5%
Dakota	16	76	5	57	1.3%
Dawes	1	21	3	17	0.4%
Dawson	5	33	6	24	0.6%
Dixon	3	9		8	0.2%
Dodge	9	38	4	37	0.9%
Douglas	253	1,647	118	1,331	30.7%
Dundy	0	1		1	0.0%
Fillmore	16	35		21	0.5%
Furnas	1	12	1	7	0.2%
Gage	21	67		36	0.8%
Garden	0	3	2	3	0.1%
Garfield	0	2		2	0.0%
Gosper	0	3	1	4	0.1%
Greeley	2	2		1	0.0%
Hall	33	168	13	144	3.3%
Hamilton	0	14		10	0.2%
Harlan	2	1	2	5	0.1%
Holt	3	34		17	0.4%
Howard	1	8	1	4	0.1%
Jefferson	0	20	5	13	0.3%

\* Some counties are served by offices in other counties. Counts are based upon the location of the office

**CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT TYPES IN SUBSTANTIATED CASES BY COUNTY CALENDAR YEAR 2006  
(CONT.)**

County	Abuse	Neglect	Sexual Abuse	Children Involved In Substantiated Reports	Percentage of Children
Johnson	5	10	3	10	0.2%
Kearney	0	0	1	1	0.0%
Keith	3	4	3	10	0.2%
Keya Paha	1	1		1	0.0%
Kimball	0	4		4	0.1%
Knox	4	0	1	3	0.1%
Lancaster	541	2,328	59	1,335	30.8%
Lincoln	27	138	24	122	2.8%
Loup	0	0	2	1	0.0%
Madison	6	77	7	67	1.5%
Merrick	0	3		2	0.0%
Morrill	7	18	3	16	0.4%
Nance	2	5	2	4	0.1%
Nemaha	0	5		2	0.0%
Nuckolls	0	2	2	2	0.0%
Otoe	5	9	2	11	0.3%
Phelps	4	26	13	15	0.3%
Pierce	0	16		11	0.3%
Platte	9	84	5	69	1.6%
Red Willow	5	17	4	14	0.3%
Richardson	2	13	5	11	0.3%
Saline	3	28	4	28	0.6%
Sarpy	50	244	28	220	5.1%
Saunders	5	79	4	44	1.0%
Scotts Bluff	20	210	9	145	3.3%
Seward	7	51	13	35	0.8%
Sheridan	1	22		10	0.2%
Sherman	2	11		5	0.1%
Stanton	0	4	1	3	0.1%
Thayer	1	16		4	0.1%
Thurston	9	23	1	26	0.6%
Valley	3	18	11	1	0.0%
Washington	1	9	1	9	0.2%
Wayne	0	7		4	0.1%
Webster	3	1	4	4	0.1%
York	3	49	9	31	0.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,174</b>	<b>6,162</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>4,335</b>	

\* Some counties are served by offices in other counties. Counts are based upon the location of the office