



## What is child abuse in Pennsylvania?

Pennsylvania law defines any of the following as child abuse when it is committed upon a child less than 18 years of age:

- Any recent act or failure to act which causes non-accidental serious physical injury (defined as an injury that either causes the “child severe pain” or “significantly impairs the child’s physical functioning, either temporarily or permanently”);
- An act or failure to act which causes non-accidental serious mental injury or sexual abuse or sexual exploitation;
- Any recent act, failure to act or series of such acts or failures to act which creates an imminent risk of serious physical injury, sexual abuse or sexual exploitation;
- Serious physical neglect which endangers a child’s life or development or impairs a child’s functioning.

## Who can be defined as a perpetrator of child abuse in Pennsylvania?

Under Pennsylvania law a parent, a paramour of a parent, an individual (over the age of 14) living in the same home as the child, or a person responsible for the welfare of a child can be considered a perpetrator.

### KEY FACTS

**In 2010, PA’s substantiated child abuse rate remained the lowest in the nation at 1.3 per 1,000 children. Nationally it was 9.2 per 1,000 children.**

**24,615 reports of suspected child abuse and student abuse were registered at ChildLine in 2010.**

**After investigation, 3,656 of the reports (approximately 15 percent) were substantiated.**

**3,508 (unduplicated count) Pennsylvania children were child abuse victims in 2010.**

**At least 377 PA children died from child abuse between 2002 and 2010.**

## Who must report suspected child abuse in PA?

### KEY FACTS

**PA law mandates certain persons (e.g., police officers, teachers, nurses, child care providers, etc.) to report suspected child abuse to ChildLine.**

**In 2010, mandated reporters of suspected child abuse reported over 18,972 (approximately 77%) of all reports of suspected abuse.**

Since 1975, Pennsylvania law has mandated that persons who, in the course of their professional work, come into contact with children are obligated to report suspected child abuse to ChildLine or law enforcement.

Mandated Reporters (MRs) of suspected child abuse (e.g., teachers, doctors, police officers, child care providers, dentists, clergy, etc.) are an essential component of how Pennsylvania prevents, investigates and treats child abuse and abuse by school employees. In 2010, MRs in Pennsylvania reported 18,972 cases of suspected child abuse – approximately 77 percent of all reports made.

Act 179 of 2006 required that MRs report suspected child abuse regardless of the perpetrator. Act 179 also removed the provision that had required the child to “come before” the mandated reporter in order to require that a report be filed. The penalty for failing to report child abuse (other than by a school

employee) was upgraded to a misdemeanor of the 2<sup>nd</sup> degree. The failure to report suspected child abuse by a school employee remains a summary offense.

There is no training requirement for MRs in Pennsylvania. Where training does occur, it is not standardized with content areas and points developed by the state.

### **KEY FACTS**

**In 2010, ChildLine answered approximately 121,800 calls.**

**ChildLine had a missed call rate of nearly 9 percent in 2010.**

## **What is ChildLine?**

ChildLine is a unit of the Department of Public Welfare (DPW) responsible for operating the state's toll-free child abuse hotline (1-800-932-0313). ChildLine receives reports of suspected child abuse and determines if a child abuse investigation occurs. ChildLine transmits a report of suspected abuse for investigation and referrals for General Protective Services (GPS) to the county children and youth (C&Y) agency. It also maintains the Statewide Central Registry serving as the clearing house for information on all substantiated reports of child abuse, including the names of perpetrators of indicated and founded cases of child abuse. ChildLine data is made available to the public

through an annual publication *"The Annual Child Abuse Report."*

In 2010, ChildLine answered approximately 121,860 calls, but also had a missed call rate of nearly 9 percent (11,792 calls). ChildLine is funded with state general funds. In 2010, ChildLine expenditures amounted to \$4.58 million with an additional \$1.32 million for costs related to Act 33, Act 179 and the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety units.

## **Who investigates child abuse in Pennsylvania?**

Reports of suspected child abuse registered at ChildLine are investigated by a county C&Y agency. Not every report alleging abuse or every call to ChildLine will lead to a child abuse investigation. When a child abuse investigation is required, a county C&Y agency is to begin its investigation and see the child within 24 hours after receipt of the report. If the child has been taken into emergency protective custody or, based on the initial report, the child's safety has not been assured, the child is to be seen immediately.

There are also times that a report of suspected child abuse will be referred to law enforcement for investigation or a concurrent investigation will occur between law enforcement and the county agency. In 2010, 3,288 cases (known as law enforcement only cases) were turned over to law enforcement for investigation. These referred cases, which declined from 2009, involve a criminal act against a child but the alleged perpetrator falls outside the state definition of perpetrator within the Child Protective Services Law (e.g., a parent, a paramour of a parent, an individual over age 14 living in the same house as the child, or a person responsible for the welfare of the child). In addition, approximately 35 percent (8,654) of the child abuse reports registered at ChildLine were referred to law enforcement for possible criminal investigation and prosecution, including 804 reports involving a child care setting and 23 reports of suspected abuse by a school employee.

Occasionally, when there is a conflict in which a contractor for the County is alleged to have perpetrated abuse, the investigation will be conducted by a Regional Office of DPW's Office of Children Youth and Families.

In 2010, state and county agencies spent more than \$51.26 million to investigate reports of suspected child abuse and student abuse.

## **Are child abuse investigations multidisciplinary?**

ACT 127 (of 1998) amended the CPSL's "Findings and Purpose" to "encourage more complete reporting of suspected child abuse ... to involve law enforcement agencies in responding to child abuse." The change required county C&Y agencies and district attorneys to develop standards and protocols for joint investigations, the convening of an "investigative team." The protocols are to address how reports are received and referred, and a system for sharing information learned as a result of interviews. The resulting protocols were intended to "avoid duplication of fact-finding" and "to minimize the trauma to the child."

### **KEY FACTS**

**PA's rate of child abuse investigations remains the lowest in the nation at 8.0 per 1,000 children in 2010 – the national rate was 40.0 per 1,000 children.**

**In 2010, 8,654 of the state's child abuse reports (approximately 35 percent) were referred to law enforcement for possible criminal investigation and prosecution.**

**Allegheny County's substantiated child abuse rate was 0.4 per 1,000 children in 2010. The rate was 2.5 per 1,000 children in Philadelphia and 3.3 per 1,000 children in McKean County and 3.5 per 1,000 children in Potter County.**

[Act 165 of 2006](#) included a definition of Children's Advocacy Centers (CACs), which can be either a public or private agency that exists "for the primary purpose of providing a child-focused, facility-based program dedicated to coordinating a formalized multidisciplinary response to suspected child abuse," and which assists "county agencies, investigative teams and law enforcement by providing services, including forensic interviews, medical evaluations, therapeutic interventions, victim support and advocacy, team case reviews and a system for case tracking." There is no designated state funding stream for CACs.

Pennsylvania recently applied for and received its first federal Children's Justice Act (CJA) funding. Approximately \$470,000 of the CJA funding was awarded to two grantees:

- the PA Chapter of Children's Advocacy Centers & Multidisciplinary Teams; and
- the Pennsylvania Children and Youth Solicitor's Association (working in partnership with the PA District Attorneys Association)

Among the funded objectives:

- Promote, assist, and support the development, growth and continuation of the multidisciplinary process with a particular focus on improving the effectiveness of the joint investigative approach for the protection of Pennsylvania's children.
- Improving investigative handling of child abuse and neglect cases while reducing secondary trauma to children by providing county C&Y agency staff and their teams with forensic interviewing training.

#### **KEY FACTS**

***Suspected student abuse is not reported to ChildLine. Instead it is reported to local law enforcement and the district attorney.***

***23 reports of student abuse were investigated in PA during 2010.***

## **How is suspected child abuse by a school employee handled?**

School abuse reporting provisions were established through Act 151 of 1994. Under current law (Title 23, Section 6351), student abuse is reported and investigated only when the allegation involves sexual abuse, sexual exploitation or "serious bodily injury."

School-based mandated reporters meet their obligation to report suspected child abuse when they notify the school administrator (the identified party within the building/school setting designated to make the report). The law states, "a school employee who has reasonable cause to

suspect, on the basis of professional or other training and experience, that a student coming before the school employee in the employee's professional or official capacity is a victim of serious bodily injury or sexual abuse or sexual exploitation by a school employee shall immediately contact the administrator."

Unlike other child abuse reports, abuse that is alleged to have occurred in a school setting (not necessarily only within an official building but at school-related events, for example), at the hands of a school employee is to be immediately reported by the designated school administrator to local police **and** the district attorney. If the alleged perpetrator is the school administrator then the mandated reporter must notify police **and** the DA. If these law enforcement officials then have "reasonable cause to suspect" after initial investigation that there is evidence of sexual abuse or exploitation or serious bodily injury, then they are to notify the local children and youth agency so that it also can conduct an investigation.

## **What happens at the end of a child abuse investigation?**

The investigation required of a C&Y agency, which is expected to be completed within 30 days, will lead to one of the following determinations:

- **Unfounded** (the county agency lacked evidence to determine the child was abused, according to the statutory definition of child abuse);
- **Indicated** (the county agency or DPW regional staff determined abuse occurred based on medical evidence, the child protective services investigation or an admission by the perpetrator);
- **Founded** (there is judicial adjudication that the child was abused);
- **Founded report for a school employee;**
- **Indicated report for a school employee;** or
- **Unfounded and accepted for services.**

Substantiated child abuse cases are those where the report has been founded or indicated. Identifying information in unfounded cases must be destroyed within 1 year and 120 days from the date of determination.

When child abuse was not substantiated but the family was accepted for services, the county agency may retain records related to the case so long as the file clearly reflects that the report was unfounded. In substantiated cases of child abuse or in non-abuse cases where the family has been accepted for services, a family service plan is implemented.

Child abuse substantiation rates vary from county-to-county with Allegheny County substantiating 0.4 per 1,000 children, Philadelphia 2.5 per 1,000 children, and 3.5 per 1,000 children in Potter County.

## What are General Protective Services (GPS)?

Through the state's dual response approach, a child/family can be accepted for General Protective Services (GPS). GPS cases represent the majority of those coming to the attention of a county children and youth agency.

These cases are generally considered to involve "non-serious injury or neglect" (e.g., inadequate shelter, truancy, inappropriate discipline, abandonment or other problems that threaten a child's opportunity for healthy growth and development). The [2010 Report on Progress from the City of Philadelphia Community Oversight Board for the Department of Human Services](#), however, noted that across the Commonwealth, GPS cases can "frequently involve significant risk to the safety and well-being of the children involved."

In addition to services to prevent potential harm to the child, DPW, within its CY 28 data collection form, defines GPS in this way: "Activities and services to protect rights, health and safety of children who are without proper parental supervision or who have been neglected, exploited, or injured by the parents to an extent not sufficient to be covered by the Child Protective Services Law."

According to [PA's 2010 Annual Child Abuse Report](#), 39,791 GPS referrals were made to ChildLine in 2010 – a one-year increase of 3,418. GPS referrals can be made either to ChildLine or to a county C&Y agency. Information related to GPS referrals are not maintained in the statewide central registry.

In these cases, the county agency does not conduct a child abuse investigation. Instead, the agency undertakes an assessment where the county C&Y agency seeks "to determine if the child or children are safe and whether or not the family is in need of services." If the safety of the child has not been assured at the time of referral, the county agency is expected to see the child immediately; otherwise "the agency prioritizes the response time based on the risk of the children."

After the assessment, the family will either be accepted for services through the county C&Y agency, referred to another community-based agency for services or the case will be closed. PA's Child Protective Services Law (Title 23, Section 6370) requires that when the C&Y agency determines that the child and/or family are in need of services to safely keep the child at home, the agency "shall explain that it has no legal authority to compel the family to receive the services." If "an appropriate offer of service is refused," the agency can then seek court intervention.

During the state's 2008 Federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR), inconsistent county-level practices with regard to responding to maltreatment reports and the establishment of face-to-face contact with children was identified. DPW committed to realizing greater consistency across the Commonwealth within its federally required Program Improvement Plan (PIP). DPW conducted a survey of counties about their GPS response times in the fall of 2010 and is now working to implement statewide GPS response guidelines.

## Are there times significant injury of a child is not substantiated as child abuse?

The simple answer is yes. Beyond that simple answer is a complicated set of circumstances, professional opinions and discussion points. These issues warrant fuller analysis and understanding as to how often and why Pennsylvania children and youth may be experiencing significant injury, but it does not result in a substantiated case of child abuse.

**KEY FACTS**  
**39,791 referrals for General Protective Services were received at ChildLine in 2010 – an increase from 2009 of more than 3,400.**

**Response times to GPS referrals vary from county to county with some counties responding immediately and others within 14 days. The variation in response times was identified as a challenge in the state's Federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR).**

The [2010 Report on Progress from the City of Philadelphia Community Oversight Board for the Department of Human Services](#) spoke to PA's definition of child abuse, noting that it is "relatively narrow when compared to the definition of child maltreatment used by most other states." It also noted that PA generally is considered "to under count certain types of physical abuse and a significant portion of neglect reports."

In 2008, physicians, including Dr. Rachel Berger from Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh of UPMC, were concerned that they were seeing more cases of abusive head trauma (e.g., Shaken Baby Syndrome). In fact, in 2008, for the first time, there were more deaths from abusive head trauma (AHT) at Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh than from non-inflicted (accidental) brain injuries for all ages of children. Research published in the journal *Pediatrics*, demonstrated significant increases in the number of cases and in the rate of unequivocal AHT in a twenty-three county region of Western PA during the recent economic recession compared to the five years before the recession. The number of cases of AHT that were substantiated as child abuse in this same region, however, remained stable.

**KEY FACTS**  
**PA is a statistical outlier in its investigation and substantiation of child abuse.**  
**In 2010, state and county funding for child welfare services exceeded \$1.5 billion. Child welfare funding is among PA's top ten state expenditures.**  
**Decisions made within the child welfare system profoundly impact the safety, liberty and custody of the state's children and families.**

Dr. Mark Dias and a team of researchers from Penn State Hershey Medical Center are assessing a method of preventing AHT through education of parents in the newborn nursery. To determine its effectiveness, the team is tracking the number of medically indicated AHT cases across the Commonwealth. The research team recognized early on that assessing the full reach of the prevention methods would be very difficult because the number of substantiated cases of child abuse maintained at ChildLine is not an accurate reflection of the actual number of cases of AHT.

Last summer, Dr. David Rubin and the research team at the PolicyLab at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia unveiled preliminary research related to hospitalizations due to unequivocal physical abuse without a concomitant increase in the number of substantiated child abuse cases.

This research and other on-the-ground experiences of the child welfare workforce, mandated reporters, law enforcement and child advocates present a compelling invitation to critically examine core elements of our child welfare system, including: how abuse is defined, reported and investigated, and whether pathways to services for vulnerable children are assured.

# TABLE 1: Rate of Child Abuse Reports Triggering Investigation<sup>1</sup>

Table developed from [data prepared](#) by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF) Children's Bureau research on child abuse and neglect including the annual Child Maltreatment reports. The included states represent those identified by the National Quality Improvement Center on Differential Response in Child Protective Services (QIC-DR) as operating a differential response system either statewide or in part of the state.

STATES	<u>2010 Investigation Rate</u>	<u>2009 Investigation Rate</u>	<u>2008 Investigation Rate</u>	<u>2007 Investigation Rate</u>	<u>2006 Investigation Rate</u>	<u>2005 Investigation Rate</u>
<b>NATIONAL</b>	40.0	40.3	27.1	26.0	26.0	26.3
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>	38.3	39.1	26.1	24.8	24.0	24.2
<b>FLORIDA</b>	66.5	67.6	43.3	38.5	37.8	37.3
<b>IOWA</b>	44.1	43.3	30.4	32.5	35.2	34.6
<b>KENTUCKY</b>	60.8	59.3	49.6	48.4	48.6	48.2
<b>LOUISIANA</b>	28.3	29.4	19.3	17.5	24.0	23.1
<b>MINNESOTA</b>	18.1	17.9	14.8	15.1	15.8	14.9
<b>MISSOURI</b>	41.9	40.9	34.6	34.7	33.4	38.9
<b>NEVADA</b>	30.7	31.4	21.5	24.8	23.4	23.6
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>	37.0	34.6	26.3	21.6	13.5	16.6
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>	43.7	38.7	28.8	29.7	33.2	40.7
<b>NEW YORK</b>	50.7	50.8	36.2	34.9	33.5	30.9
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>	51.4	51.8	30.9	30.3	31.4	31.6
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>	44.1	---	28.0	25.0	26.4	27.2
<b>OHIO</b>	33.8	36.8	30.7	28.1	26.4	25.7
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>	45.8	48.4	38.6	39.9	41.2	41.9
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>	8.0	8.3	9.1	8.4	8.2	8.2
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>	31.6	32.0	18.1	18.4	19.9	22.7
<b>TENNESSEE</b>	53.7	50.6	41.5	42.3	42.4	41.7
<b>VERMONT</b>	32.6	27.8	18.3	19.5	17.3	18.4
<b>VIRGINIA</b>	35.1	31.7	15.9	14.5	16.0	15.4
<b>WASHINGTON</b>	26.6	24.0	23.2	23.0	23.4	22.6
<b>WISCONSIN</b>	25.1	23.9	20.1	20.4	21.9	22.3
<b>WYOMING</b>	43.3	36.0	18.7	19.4	19.8	16.5

<sup>1</sup> Since not all reports of suspected child abuse trigger a response or investigation, this chart depicts the rate at which child abuse investigations were generated. In 2010 nationally, 2,987,515 unduplicated numbers of children were the subject of a report of suspected child abuse generating a response/investigation by the Child Protective Services system at a rate of 40.0 per 1,000 children. Pennsylvania recorded 22,263 children who were the subject of a report triggering an investigation – a rate of 8.0 per 1,000 children. The specific source for this data was Table 3-2 within Child Maltreatment 2010. According to the Child Maltreatment 2010 document, the rate was computed by dividing the number of children who received a CPS response by the child population and multiplying by 1,000.

## TABLE 2: Substantiated Child Abuse Rate per 1,000 Children

Table developed from [data prepared](#) by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF) Children's Bureau research on child abuse and neglect including the annual Child Maltreatment reports. This is the substantiation/child victim rate per 1,000 children. The included states represent those identified by the National Quality Improvement Center on Differential Response in Child Protective Services (QIC-DR) as operating a differential response system either statewide or in part of the state.

STATE	<u>Total Rate 2010</u>	<u>Total Rate 2009</u>	<u>Total Rate 2008</u>	<u>Total Rate 2007</u>	<u>Total Rate 2006</u>	<u>Total Rate 2005</u>	<u>Total Rate 2000</u>
<b>NATIONAL</b>	9.2	9.3	10.3	10.6	12.1	12.1	12.2
CALIFORNIA	8.1	7.8	9.1	9.4	9.5	10.1	14.0
FLORIDA	12.4	11.3	12.8	13.3	33.5	33.0	26.3
IOWA	16.8	16.3	15.7	19.7	20.5	19.8	14.8
KENTUCKY	16.8	16.0	18.1	18.7	19.8	19.6	18.7
LOUISIANA	7.4	8.1	9.2	8.6	11.7	10.6	8.7
MINNESOTA	3.5	3.7	4.6	5.4	6.1	6.7	9.2
MISSOURI	3.7	3.7	3.9	5.0	5.0	6.3	8.2
NEVADA	6.8	6.5	7.3	8.2	8.4	8.5	11.3
NEW JERSEY	4.4	4.3	4.4	3.7	5.6	4.7	4.2
NEW MEXICO	10.7	9.6	11.3	12.1	11.9	14.7	12.4
NEW YORK	17.4	17.5	19.1	18.8	17.8	15.6	15.8
NORTH CAROLINA	9.6	9.8	11.0	11.8	13.2	15.7	18.4
NORTH DAKOTA	7.8	---	9.0	9.0	10.2	10.6	0
OHIO	11.5	11.5	13.2	14.0	15.0	15.2	18.7
OKLAHOMA	7.8	7.8	12.3	14.6	15.1	15.8	15.5
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.7</b>
SOUTH DAKOTA	6.8	7.2	7.0	7.5	7.8	8.3	15.2
TENNESSEE	5.9	5.9	7.8	10.9	7.8	8.3	11.8
VERMONT	5.2	5.5	5.3	6.6	6.4	7.9	9.1
VIRGINIA	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.8	3.6	4.3
WASHINGTON	4.2	3.9	4.4	4.6	4.8	5.2	4.7
WISCONSIN	3.5	3.6	4.4	5.9	6.5	7.3	8.8
WYOMING	5.5	5.4	5.7	6.1	6.4	7.0	10.3

## TABLE 3: Substantiated Child Abuse by Type

Table developed from [data prepared](#) using the annual Child Maltreatment reports. When abuse was substantiated, this table represents the type of abuse (e.g., neglect, physical or sexual). A child may have been the victim of more than one type of maltreatment, and therefore, the total percent may equal more than 100. The included states represent those identified by the National Quality Improvement Center on Differential Response in Child Protective Services (QIC-DR) as operating a differential response system either statewide or in part of the state.

STATE	<u>NEGLECT 2010</u>	<u>NEGLECT 2009</u>	<u>NEGLECT 2008</u>	<u>NEGLECT 2007</u>	<u>NEGLECT 2006</u>	<u>NEGLECT 2005</u>	<u>NEGLECT 2000</u>
NATIONAL	78.3	78.3	71.1	59.0	64.1	62.8	59.8
FLORIDA	54.9	52.7	49.4	36.0	32.4	30.2	35.9
KENTUCKY	96.4	95.3	87.9	85.0	87.2	85.0	67.5
LOUISIANA	81.8	82.8	77.5	68.0	78.9	76.2	76.5
MINNESOTA	72.2	75.2	71.7	68.9	75.8	76.4	73.6
MISSOURI	57.0	53.5	52.6	39.6	51.7	51.7	45.2
NEVADA	76.2	75.8	80.0	66.1	84.8	82.8	42.8
NEW YORK	106.6	107.0	91.8	57.3	91.5	91.5	89.5
NORTH CAROLINA	87.0	87.4	79.0	78.5	52.1	64.3	89.9
OHIO	47.4	47.7	46.1	50.5	54.3	55.0	52.7
OKLAHOMA	88.4	89.0	83.4	58.2	83.1	82.4	80.0
PENNSYLVANIA	2.8	3.9	3.9	2.2	3.5	3.5	3.6
TENNESSEE	57.2	59.0	49.2	41.1	53.1	53.3	42.9
VERMONT	2.3	4.0	4.1	1.6	4.9	5.6	38.2
VIRGINIA	64.5	63.1	59.5	56.8	61.6	59.8	58.6
WASHINGTON	83.2	82.7	77.7	76.3	81.9	83.1	71.0
WISCONSIN	57.0	55.4	49.0	31.0	29.9	28.4	27.8
WYOMING	70.6	70.7	74.1	71.0	70.9	71.0	63.1
	<u>PHYSICAL 2010</u>	<u>PHYSICAL 2009</u>	<u>PHYSICAL 2008</u>	<u>PHYSICAL 2007</u>	<u>PHYSICAL 2006</u>	<u>PHYSICAL 2005</u>	<u>PHYSICAL 2000</u>
NATIONAL	17.6	17.8	16.1	10.8	16.0	16.6	19.3
FLORIDA	10.6	10.5	9.7	6.5	11.3	12.0	16.0
KENTUCKY	8.5	10.0	10.3	8.1	11.0	12.4	27.2
LOUISIANA	27.4	28.0	26.4	16.3	25.5	27.7	23.0
MINNESOTA	20.4	20.5	17.7	12.6	15.7	16.9	21.9
MISSOURI	30.8	33.1	29.1	20.2	31.2	27.5	27.4
NEVADA	32.8	29.6	19.2	9.3	17.8	17.8	18.0
NEW YORK	11.4	11.4	10.1	1.5	10.6	11.2	13.9
NORTH CAROLINA	9.9	10.7	9.4	9.8	6.4	3.5	3.9
OHIO	39.2	37.5	31.6	24.0	22.2	20.9	27.7
OKLAHOMA	15.4	19.0	16.9	5.6	17.9	18.3	19.9
PENNSYLVANIA	33.1	34.0	31.5	33.1	34.0	32.4	37.6
TENNESSEE	17.3	15.3	23.8	24.7	34.1	33.3	20.0
VERMONT	37.1	52.3	46.1	44.7	51.3	48.4	22.1
VIRGINIA	28.9	27.9	27.6	21.6	27.9	27.4	28.5
WASHINGTON	23.3	24.7	20.7	14.0	17.3	16.5	21.7
WISCONSIN	20.9	22.2	19.3	11.6	14.2	12.7	15.3
WYOMING	6.6	8.1	6.3	7.0	6.4	7.0	27.3
	<u>SEXUAL 2010</u>	<u>SEXUAL 2009</u>	<u>SEXUAL 2008</u>	<u>SEXUAL 2007</u>	<u>SEXUAL 2006</u>	<u>SEXUAL 2005</u>	<u>SEXUAL 2000</u>
NATIONAL	9.2	9.5	9.1	7.6	8.8	9.3	10.1
FLORIDA	4.6	4.7	4.6	3.4	3.4	4.0	5.7
KENTUCKY	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.0	4.0	5.1	7.8
LOUISIANA	7.7	7.8	7.3	4.0	7.2	7.2	6.7
MINNESOTA	18.5	16.9	16.1	11.3	12.1	10.7	7.4
MISSOURI	28.1	28.5	27.6	22.7	28.7	26.2	28.3
NEVADA	7.5	8.3	4.9	3.7	3.7	4.3	4.5



<b>NEW YORK</b>	3.5	3.6	3.3	0.7	3.4	3.9	4.1
<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>	8.5	8.2	8.0	7.5	4.8	3.8	3.5
<b>OHIO</b>	18.5	19.4	17.5	16.5	17.6	18.6	14.0
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>	7.7	7.8	6.3	2.5	6.6	6.4	7.8
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>	<b>65.5</b>	<b>64.2</b>	<b>61.7</b>	<b>59.9</b>	<b>60.5</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>49.9</b>
<b>TENNESSEE</b>	30.1	31.2	31.2	22.9	20.4	20.4	21.0
<b>VERMONT</b>	67.0	52.9	48.4	46.8	43.2	46.5	40.8
<b>VIRGINIA</b>	14.7	15.8	16.4	13.5	13.9	15.0	11.0
<b>WASHINGTON</b>	7.2	7.4	7.3	4.5	6.0	6.0	7.0
<b>WISCONSIN</b>	30.2	29.9	28.4	24.2	35.0	37.8	40.1
<b>WYOMING</b>	9.2	12.6	10.6	9.2	7.9	7.4	10.3

## TABLE 4: States which require every person to report suspected child abuse

Table developed from [data prepared](#) by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF) Children's Bureau research on child abuse and neglect including the annual Child Maltreatment reports. Pennsylvania is not a state that requires every person to report child abuse but is included below as a point of reference, comparison to other states.

STATE ( <i>"Specify certain professionals who must report but also require all persons to report suspected abuse or neglect, regardless of profession"</i> )	2010 TOTAL Referrals (includes calls screened in and screened out)	2010 Rate of Referral per 1,000 children	# of Unduplicated children receiving a Child Protective Services response (a formal child abuse investigation)	2010 Rate of CPS response/Investigation	2010 # of Unduplicated child victims [hyperlink 2010]	2010 Child Victim Rate
National	2,607,798	43.8	2,987,515	40.0	688,251	9.2
Delaware	11,084	53.5	13,434	64.9	2,125	10.3
Florida	193,339	47.6	269,689	66.5	50,239	12.4
Idaho	14,887	35.5	8,848	21.1	1,609	3.8
Indiana	95,148	59.9	92,008	57.9	21,362	13.4
Kentucky	73,026	72.0	61,643	60.8	17,029	16.8
Maryland	45,129	33.4	33,302	24.6	13,059	9.7
Mississippi	28,666	37.3	26,875	35.0	7,403	9.6
Nebraska	26,909	59.6	24,236	53.7	4,572	10.1
New Hampshire	13,070	45.2	9,949	34.4	851	2.9
New Mexico	30,313	59.4	22,314	43.7	5,440	10.7
North Carolina			117,116	51.4	21,895	9.6
Oklahoma	64,793	70.5	42,113	45.8	7,207	7.8
Rhode Island	11,790	52.0	8,564	37.8	3,295	14.5
Tennessee	89,025	59.6	80,125	53.7	8,760	5.9
Texas	207,965	30.2	267,823	38.8	64,937	9.4
Utah	31,693	36.5	27,827	32.0	12,854	14.8
Pennsylvania	Not submitted	Not submitted <sup>2</sup>	22,263	8.0	3,555 <sup>3</sup>	1.3

<sup>2</sup> The [2010 Annual Child Abuse Report](#) issued by the Department of Public Welfare indicates that "approximately nine out of every 1,000 children living in Pennsylvania were reported as victims of suspected child abuse in 2010."

<sup>3</sup> The [2010 Annual Child Abuse Report issued by the Department of Public Welfare](#) lists the total number of unduplicated Pennsylvania child victims as 3,508.