



CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT PREVENTION: HOW TO DO IT BETTER

The best way to reduce the number of children in foster care is to prevent child abuse and neglect from occurring in the first place. But this is easier said than done, especially in Texas where funding prevention has not been a priority. Even in this difficult economic environment, however, the Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) can maximize the effect of the limited resources it has. We are not suggesting that DFPS should choose among its various prevention programs or reduce funding for one to give more support to another. All of its prevention programs provide important services to vulnerable constituencies. Instead, DFPS needs to be more strategic in targeting where services are provided and ensure that it builds community capacity. This policy page suggests several ways in which it can do so and, thereby, ensure the most vulnerable communities have the services they need to support families and keep children safe.

Funding Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Should Be a Priority in Texas, But It Is Not

Child abuse and neglect is expensive. Every year Texas spends more than \$6 billion to investigate and provide services to over 100,000 children who have been abused or neglected.¹ And this doesn't even begin to account for the incalculable human cost these children pay, bearing the scars of their trauma for years to come. Funding child abuse and neglect prevention should be a priority in Texas, but it is not.

In addition to helping families after abuse or neglect has already occurred, the Child Protective Services (CPS) division within DFPS also provides prevention services. When CPS investigates a family and finds the children are at risk of abuse or neglect, the family may voluntarily participate in CPS family based safety services even if there is no substantiated allegation. CPS administers all other types of prevention programs through the Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) division.

The legislature created PEI in 1999 to coordinate prevention and early intervention programs. PEI has a very small annual budget of \$46 million, representing only about 3 percent of DFPS' overall budget.²

With this small budget, PEI is required to address a broad range of negative outcomes for children including child abuse, delinquency, running away, truancy, and dropping out of school.³ As a result, PEI has to split its limited resources among three different areas, all of which provide important services to vulnerable constituencies:

- (1) delinquency prevention
- (2) helping youth in crisis, and
- (3) child abuse and neglect prevention.⁴

Other than the Youth and Runaway Hotlines, which are primarily manned by volunteers, PEI provides no direct services. Instead, it supports services through contracts with community organizations.

There are three primary programs to prevent child abuse and neglect in at-risk families before a crisis occurs or a family becomes involved with (CPS).⁵ They are: (1) Texas Families Together and Safe (TFTS); (2) Family Strengthening Services (FSS); and (3) Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP).

Since these programs are only a part of PEI's overall mission, the current budget for them is tiny, totaling only \$8.3 million per year. This represents less than 18 percent

of PEI's total budget and less than 1 percent of DFPS' overall budget.⁶

With its limited resources for child abuse and neglect prevention, PEI can only reach a fraction of the families that need services. In 2009, a total of 4,939 families participated in one of the three child abuse and neglect prevention programs.⁷ That same year, there were 40,126 confirmed cases of abuse or neglect.⁸ That means that even if PEI could have identified those families that were actually going to abuse or neglect their children, it could only have provided services to prevent the abuse or neglect to about 1 in 8.

Moreover, compared to other states, Texas has the lowest rate of child abuse and neglect prevention coverage.⁹ In Texas, about 5 of every 1,000 children receive prevention services.¹⁰ The national average is almost nine times higher at about 44 of every 1,000 children.¹¹

The PEI Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Programs Have Had Positive Effects on Families

In 2009, the University of Houston evaluated the TFTS, FSS, and CBCAP programs, finding that families in all three programs experienced a statistically significant increase in protective factors and resiliency after completing the services.¹² It also found that only about 5 percent of the participating families had a confirmed child abuse or neglect allegation while receiving services or in the 12 months thereafter.¹³ Finally, families were very satisfied with the services they received. The average score on the post-service survey was 6.4 out of 7.

To Maximize Its Impact, PEI Needs a Strategic Plan on How to Prioritize Where Prevention Services Are Provided

Like the University of Houston evaluation, almost all the research on improving prevention focuses on whether the services provided are effective.¹⁴ But that is only one piece of the puzzle. To maximize the impact of the limited resources it has, PEI also needs a strategic plan about how to prioritize where services are provided. Otherwise, state

supported services end up randomly distributed instead of where they may be needed the most.

For example, in 2009, families in Brown County received a large share of the state-supported prevention services. Brown County, however, has a tiny child population compared to the state overall and only a miniscule share of the children in state custody for abuse and neglect. Moreover, Brown County's child poverty rate, one of the most consistent predictors of child abuse and neglect, is only slightly higher than the state average. Yet, 1 in 10 of the families who received services through one of the three programs lived in Brown County.

In contrast, Harris County has the largest overall child population in the state and the largest share of children in state custody for abuse and neglect. Yet, fewer families living there received state-supported prevention. Only one in 15 of the families who received child abuse and neglect prevention services under the three programs lived in Harris County. And families in El Paso, where the child poverty rate is 60 percent higher than the state average, received no services at all under any of the three programs.

Both the Texas Legislature and DFPS recognize the need for a more strategic approach in providing prevention services. In passing Senate Bill 2080 last session, the legislature formed a child welfare task force charged with developing a strategic plan for child abuse and neglect prevention. With respect to DFPS, one of the goals in its recent strategic plan for child abuse and neglect services is to prioritize prevention services by targeting "vulnerable communities."¹⁵ To implement this goal, PEI recently formed an internal workgroup to help identify geographic areas in which it should focus its future procurements.

The sections below provide some guidance to help inform these efforts so PEI can more strategically allocate its child abuse and neglect prevention resources.

Targeting Counties with High Reported Rates of Child Abuse and Neglect May Not Be Effective

In choosing among those who respond to its requests for proposals (RFP), PEI gives preference in all three programs to contractors serving counties with a higher than average reported child abuse and neglect victimization rate.

The reported victimization rate, however, is not an accurate measure of how many children are actually abused or neglected in any given community. Studies have shown only a minority of children who are abused and neglected are actually reported to and investigated by a state child welfare agency.¹⁶ And the magnitude of underreporting may vary significantly among different communities.

For example, children in communities that lack access to medical care have a higher risk of abuse and neglect.¹⁷ But without adequate medical care, children are less likely to see the doctor and so the abuse and neglect may go unnoticed. This is especially important in Texas as medical personnel are one of the most common sources of child abuse and neglect reports.¹⁸ Ironically, this means that more children in counties with little or no medical coverage may be abused or neglected, but the reported victimization rate may actually be lower.

Conversely, children in communities with a strong support system for families may have a higher reported victimization rate. This may not be because there is more abuse and neglect actually occurring. Instead, as more families access services (e.g., go to the doctor, attend parenting classes), there is simply more opportunity for the abuse or neglect to be identified.

A strategy that relies on data such as victimization rates that reflect only what is reported to DFPS may not be the best way to identify which communities are most vulnerable and most in need of prevention services.

PEI Should Target Counties with Multiple Risk Factors for Child Abuse or Neglect

There is a significant body of research identifying factors that place a child at a higher risk of abuse or neglect

including poverty, teen parenting, lack of access to social services, lack of community resources, community violence, and unemployment.¹⁹ PEI can calculate the rates on these various measures (e.g., the child poverty rate and the availability of privately funded prevention programs) and create a vulnerability score for each county. It can then use these scores to prioritize among the different communities and geographic areas around the state. In doing so, PEI should expand beyond its internal workgroup and engage and solicit input from community stakeholders and organizations at every stage in the process.

The Size of the County's Child Population Should Be Considered in Setting Priorities

In addition to identifying which counties are most vulnerable, any prioritization must take into account the size of the child population.

For example, Loving County has the highest child poverty rate²⁰ in the state but only 3 children live there.²¹ Although the families with these 3 children may be in desperate need of services, it may not be the best use of PEI's limited resources. Even if a prevention program eliminated all child abuse and neglect in the county, the impact on the state overall would be minimal.

Conversely, Harris County's child poverty rate is similar to the state average but over a million children live there and it has over 7,000 children in state custody for abuse or neglect. Even a small reduction in the rate of child abuse and neglect in this area would have a significant impact both in terms of number of children and savings to the state. If prevention programs reduced the number of children in state custody in Harris County by only one percent, it could benefit 70 children and save the state over \$400,000 per year in general revenue for foster care costs alone.²²

PEI Should Mandate that Services Are Actually Provided in the Contracted Areas

Once PEI determines which counties to target and obtains a contract to cover those areas, it needs to ensure that services are actually provided there.

In 2009, PEI contracted with 23 different organizations to provide services under one of the three programs in 50 different counties.²³ Some counties had contracts for only one type of program while others had contracts for multiple types of programs.

Although the community organizations contracted to provide services in specific counties, the output measures only require that a certain number of families are served and does not measure where they are served.²⁴

In 2009, there was a disparity between the counties that were contracted for services and the counties where families actually received services.

Overall, more than 1 in 4 of the counties covered by a contract did not receive the contracted services. For TFTS programs, families received services in 29 of the 31 contracted counties. For FSS programs, families received services in only 7 of the 12 contracted counties. For CBCAP, families received services in 12 of the 18 contracted counties.

The table in Appendix A shows which counties in 2009 had a contract and whether the contracted services were provided to families in that area.

For a myriad of reasons, a small number of families also received services in 23 counties that were not covered by any contract.

The table in Appendix B shows how many families in each county actually received services.

In future solicitations and contracts, PEI needs to ensure that organizations actually provide services to families in the areas they are contracted to cover.

PEI Should Ensure Its Programs Help Build Community Service Infrastructure and Capacity

The community in which a family lives can influence parent-child interactions in a myriad of ways. Community norms may affect a parent's view about appropriate parenting behavior and set standards as to when and how parents should seek help from others.²⁵ The availability of

services in a community can also affect a parent's level of stress and feeling of social isolation, both of which are risk factors for child abuse and neglect.²⁶ Parents who live in a safe neighborhood with resources such as day care and other social services are less likely to be stressed and more likely to feel integrated into the community.²⁷

As a result, improving communities and building the infrastructure of available services is an essential component of child abuse and neglect prevention.

All three programs were intended to support both direct services and community capacity. But given its limited resources, PEI has focused primarily on supporting direct services. Currently, only the TFTS and FSS programs contain an express requirement to help build community capacity.²⁸ The CBCAP program used to address building community capacity through its Community Partnerships for Strengthening Families program. This program was designed to assess current prevention services and develop new services to meet identified community needs. But the last contract for such services ended in 2009 and there are currently no plans to renew them.²⁹

Building community capacity does ultimately support direct services and may allow them to be more self-sustaining. The sections below provide guidance as to how PEI can better support this process, even within the limited resources it has.

PEI Needs to Clarify What It Expects from TFTS and FSS Contractors in Building Community Capacity

The community capacity element of the TFTS program is meant to improve and enhance access to family support services, increase the efficiency and effectiveness of community-based family supporting services, and increase collaboration among local programs, government agencies and families.

FSS requires contractors to foster strong community collaboration to provide a continuum of family services.

The broad policy statements for the TFTS and FSS programs are an important first step. At some point,

however, they have to be translated into concrete objectives and goals so contractors know what is expected and PEI can measure whether progress is actually being made.

PEI needs to establish exactly what it wants to achieve through the building community capacity provisions of the TFTS and FSS programs. Then it needs to identify the role it expects contractors to play in achieving the outcome. Finally, it needs to create performance measures to assess whether community service capacity is actually improving. Throughout this process, PEI needs to engage communities and the organizations it will be contracting with to ensure that its expectations and performance measures are useful, realistic and achievable.

PEI Should Make Every Effort to Use Contractors Based in the Counties in Which They Are Providing Services

One way to build and support community capacity is contract with an organization that is based in the community in which it will provide services. Since PEI currently has no such requirement, or even preference, in its RFPs, it should build one in for its future procurements.

In doing so, however, PEI should understand that the most vulnerable communities may have a limited infrastructure for providing services. As discussed above, one reason a community may be more vulnerable to child abuse and neglect is that there are few community organizations to provide support services. As a result, PEI may need more flexibility in its contracting process. In some counties there may be smaller, less developed organizations that are interested and capable of providing services but who may not be able to meet every particular detail of the current contract. PEI should identify which contracting provisions are essential to providing a quality, effective prevention program and which provisions can be waived on a case-by-case basis.

If PEI does not get a sufficient response to its RFP, it may need to proactively identify and solicit proposals from specific community organizations, something that is already allowed under the current procurement process.³⁰

In some instances, PEI may have to turn to an organization that is based outside of the county. In these cases, PEI should ensure that the organization still involves others who are based in the community. For example, the out-of-county organization may fulfill the administrative aspects of the contract (e.g., reporting) but may subcontract with a county based organization, such as a church, to provide some or all of the services (e.g., the actual parenting class).

The Proposed Budget Cuts Will Essentially Eliminate PEI's Ability to Support any Meaningful Level of Direct Services

To satisfy the legislature's request for a 10 percent budget reduction for this upcoming biennium, DFPS has proposed an 84 percent reduction in the current PEI budget.³¹ That would leave PEI with an annual overall budget of about \$9 million and 10 full time staff to administer its 10 different programs.³²

As the proposed cuts are generally across the board³³, the budget for child abuse and neglect prevention will be even smaller. With the cuts, the annual combined budget for TFTS, FSS, and CBCAP would be about \$2.8 million.

PEI is already lean and streamlined. There is simply nothing left to cut. It already passes through about 92 percent of its budget directly to community organizations.³⁴ Only about 8 percent of the PEI budget is spent on full time PEI employees and administration to monitor and enforce contracts and run the Hotlines.³⁵

The proposed cuts should not be made, even if it means that DFPS does not comply with the 10 percent budget reduction mandate.

Were the legislature to make the proposed cuts, PEI's budget would be so small that it would effectively lose its ability to support any meaningful level of direct services. Based on the projected number of confirmed child abuse and neglect cases for 2012, even if PEI could identify who these families would be, TFTS, FSS and CBCAP collectively could only provide services to about 3 percent of them.³⁶ At this point, PEI would cease to exist as a

statewide services program and may be required to completely restructure the way it does business.

Without sufficient resources to contract for direct services, PEI may be forced to shift to providing only technical and training assistance to community organizations. PEI might provide a centralized collection of available prevention resources such as tool kits and research on effective programs that community organizations could access. It might also support collaboration among community organizations by facilitating meetings where the organizations identify service gaps and barriers and ways to fix them. With respect to direct financial support, PEI could be reduced to providing a small amount of seed money to a few community organizations that fill an identified gap in services to support families. To actually provide the services, however, the community organizations would have to find other funding sources, a difficult task in this economic environment.

The proposed cuts would essentially eliminate PEI in its present form. If that happened, there might be ways to

salvage a few bits and pieces without eliminating the program altogether. But it would still mean that community organizations that are already struggling would have even fewer resources to help families in need and it could require PEI to completely reorient the way it does business.

Conclusion

Funding child abuse and neglect prevention has not been a priority in Texas and that is unlikely to change in the upcoming biennium. As a result, it is more important than ever that PEI maximize the impact of the limited resources it does have. To do so, PEI should develop a strategic plan to prioritize and target where services will be provided. PEI also needs to ensure that its procurement and contracting processes help build available community resources so that families have the support they need to keep their children safe.



This *Policy Page* was underwritten in part through funding by Casey Family Programs, whose mission is to provide and improve—and ultimately to prevent the need for—foster care. Established by UPS Founder Jim Casey in 1966, the foundation provides direct services and promotes advances in child welfare practice and policy. To learn more, visit www.casey.org. The opinions expressed in this policy brief, however, are those of the Center for Public Policy Priorities and do not necessarily reflect the views of Casey Family Programs.

Endnotes

- ¹ *Findings from the 2008-2009 Evaluation of Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Programs and Services*. December 2009.
- ² DFPS 2010 operating budget.
- ³ Texas Family Code (TFC) §265.001(3).
- ⁴ DFPS 2009 databook.
- ⁵ PEI also administers the Community Based Family Services program which serves families whom CPS investigated but whose allegations were unsubstantiated and who do not participate in CPS family based safety services. This program was started in 2009 and served only 110 families. PEI also administers the Tertiary Child Abuse Prevention program which works with children who have left the CPS system. It also was started in 2009 and is very small, serving only 32 families. The Services to At-Risk Youth (STAR) program provides services designed to increase knowledge and awareness of child abuse and neglect and promote good parenting in the general population.
- ⁶ DFPS 2010 operating budget.
- ⁷ DFPS 2009 databook, updated.
- ⁸ DFPS 2009 databook.
- ⁹ *Child Maltreatment 2008*. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau.
- ¹⁰ *Child Maltreatment 2008*. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau.
- ¹¹ *Child Maltreatment 2008*. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau.
- ¹² Unless otherwise noted, all information in the sections is from: The Interagency Coordinating Council for Building Healthy Families. *Findings from the 2008-2009 Evaluation of Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Programs and Services*. December 2009.
- ¹³ While this percentage is low, there is no comparison, or control, group. As a result, it is unclear what the level of confirmed abuse among the participating families would have been if they hadn't received the services. Difficulty in measuring the impact on child abuse and neglect is something that is inherent in almost every prevention program.
- ¹⁴ See e.g., *Preventing Child Maltreatment*. The Future of Children 19:2. Fall 2009.
- ¹⁵ Department of Family and Protective Services Strategic Plan for Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Services. December 2008.
- ¹⁶ Sedlak, A.J., Mettenburg, J., Basena, M., Petta, I., McPherson, K., Greene, A., and Li, S. (2010). *Fourth National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect (NIS-4): Report to Congress*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.
- ¹⁷ DFPS Strategic Plan for Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Services, December 2008. Available at: www.dfps.state.tx.us/documents/Prevention.../2008-12-01_ICC-SP.pdf (Accessed on July 21, 2010).
- ¹⁸ DFPS 2009 databook.
- ¹⁹ DFPS Strategic Plan for Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Services, December 2008. Available at: www.dfps.state.tx.us/documents/Prevention.../2008-12-01_ICC-SP.pdf (Accessed on July 21, 2010). Sedlak, A.J., Mettenburg, J., Basena, M., Petta, I., McPherson, K., Greene, A., and Li, S. (2010). *Fourth National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect (NIS-4): Report to Congress*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families.
- ²⁰ Texas KIDSCount child poverty data for 2008.
- ²¹ DFPS 2009 databook.
- ²² 1 percent of children in care in Harris County is 70 children. At the end of 2009, about 70 percent of the children in state custody lived in some type of foster care. (DFPS 2009 databook). $0.7 \times 70 = 49$. The average foster care payment is \$21,522 a year. (DFPS 2008 LAR). $49 \times \$21,522 = \$1,054,578$. In general, the federal government subsidizes about 60 percent of foster care costs. (DFPS 2010 Operating Budget).
- ²³ Based on contract data DFPS provided.
- ²⁴ TFTS 2010 RFP. FSS 2010 RFP.

-
- ²⁵ Daro D. and Dodge KA. *Creating Community Responsibility for Child Protection: Possibilities and Challenges*. The Future of Children 19(2): 67-94. Fall 2009.
- ²⁶ DFPS Strategic Plan for Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Services, December 2008. Available at: www.dfps.state.tx.us/documents/Prevention.../2008-12-01_ICC-SP.pdf (Accessed on July 21, 2010).
- ²⁷ Daro D. and Dodge KA. *Creating Community Responsibility for Child Protection: Possibilities and Challenges*. The Future of Children 19(2): 67-94. Fall 2009.
- ²⁸ Unless otherwise noted, all information regarding the goals and purposes of the child abuse and neglect programs comes from the DFPS Strategic Plan for Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Services, December 2008. Available at: www.dfps.state.tx.us/documents/Prevention.../2008-12-01_ICC-SP.pdf (Accessed on July 21, 2010).
- ²⁹ Based on information DFPS provided.
- ³⁰ DFPS is allowed to make a non-competitive procurement if a competitive solicitation fails to elicit more than one qualified response. TAC §§ 391.109 and 732.206.
- ³¹ Key Elements of 2012-13 Legislative Appropriation Request (LAR) Submission. Health and Human Services System Presentation. August 6, 2010.
- ³² Letter from Commissioner Suehs to Representative Mike Villarreal dated August 11, 2010.
- ³³ The CBCAP budget will not be cut as it is funded entirely through federal money which cannot be spent on any other program.
- ³⁴ DFPS 2010 operating budget.
- ³⁵ DFPS 2010 operating budget.
- ³⁶ Based on 16 percent of families served by FSP and TFTS in 2009 and 100 percent of families served by CBCAP in 2009 for a total of 1,377 families. DFPS' most recent LAR projects 47,518 confirmed cases of child abuse and neglect in 2012.

The Center for Public Policy Priorities (CPPP) is a non-profit, non-partisan policy institute dedicated to improving the economic and social conditions of low- and moderate-income Texans. You can learn more about CPPP at: <http://www.cppp.org>.

APPENDIX A

COUNTIES WITH A PEI CONTRACT IN 2009

County	TFTS	FSS	CBCAP
Bexar	✓	✓	
Brazos	✓		
Brown	✓		
Burleson	✓		
Cameron	✓	✓	
Coke			✓
Coleman	✓		
Collin			✓
Comal		X	
Comanche	✓		
Concho			X
Crockett			X
Crosby	✓		
Dallas		✓	✓
Dimmit			✓
Eastland	✓		
Garza	X		
Grimes	✓		
Guadalupe		X	
Harris	✓	✓	
Hidalgo	✓	✓	

County	TFTS	FSS	CBCAP
Hockley	✓		
Irion	X		✓
Jefferson			✓
Kerr		X	
Leon	✓		
Lubbock	✓		
Lynn	✓		
Madison	✓		
Maverick			✓
McCulloch	✓		
Mills	✓		
Nueces		X	
Reagan			X
Robertson	✓		
Runnels	✓		✓
San Saba	✓		
Schleicher			X
Starr	✓		
Sterling			X
Sutton			X
Tarrant	✓	✓	
Taylor		✓	
Tom Green	✓		✓

County	TFTS	FSS	CBCAP
Travis			✓
Uvalde	✓		✓
Washington	✓		
Webb		X	
Willacy	✓		
Zavala	✓		✓

- ✓ County was covered by a contract and at least one family from that county received the contracted services
- X County was covered by a contract and no families from that county received the contracted services

APPENDIX B

COUNTIES WHERE FAMILIES RECEIVED SERVICES IN 2009

County	TFTS	FSS	CBCAP	Total Served
Atascosa	0	3	0	3
Bastrop	0	0	1	1
Bell	1	1	0	2
Bexar	787	288	0	1075
Brazos	123	0	0	123
Brooks	3	0	0	3
Brown	507	0	0	507
Burleson	27	0	0	27
Cameron	77	88	0	165
Coke	0	0	3	3
Coleman	17	0	1	18
Collin	1	0	23	24
Comal	1	0	0	1
Comanche	38	0	0	38
Coryell	1	0	1	2
Crane	0	0	1	1
Crosby	38	0	0	38
Dallas	1	407	143	551
Dawson	0	0	1	1
Deaf Smith	0	0	1	1
Dimmit	0	0	21	21
Eastland	17	0	0	17
Erath	1	0	0	1
Frio	0	0	6	6
Grimes	12	0	0	12
Guadalupe	1	0	0	1
Hamilton	1	0	0	1
Hardeman	0	0	1	1
Harris	256	60	0	316
Haskell	0	0	1	1
Hidalgo	138	105	0	243
Hockley	1	0	0	1
Howard	0	0	1	1
Irion	0	0	1	1
Jefferson	0	0	13	13
Jones	0	0	1	1
Kimble	0	0	1	1
Knox	0	0	1	1
Leon	11	0	0	11
Lubbock	236	0	0	236
Lynn	1	0	0	1
Madison	59	0	0	59

County	TFTS	FSS	CBCAP	Total Served
Mason	1	0	0	1
Maverick	0	0	20	20
McCulloch	30	0	0	30
Medina	0	1	0	1
Midland	0	0	4	4
Mills	21	0	0	21
Randall	0	0	4	4
Robertson	39	0	0	39
Runnels	2	0	1	3
San Saba	29	0	0	29
Scurry	0	0	1	1
Shackelford	1	0	1	2
Starr	41	0	0	41
Stephens	0	0	1	1
Tarrant	272	82	0	354
Taylor	0	165	2	167
Terry	1	0	0	1
Tom Green	198	0	169	367
Travis	0	0	211	211
Uvalde	4	0	18	22
Washington	30	0	0	30
Willacy	14	0	0	14
Williamson	0	0	4	4
Zavala	1	0	41	42
State	3,040	1,200	699	4,939