

Shannon County Sheriff's Office

MISSOURI / REVIEW WINDOW: JAN. 1, 2025 - OCT. 4, 2026

TWO RATINGS. TWO DIFFERENT MEASURES.

TCF Grade: not yet assigned. Broad public sentiment: NR. Limited YouTube sample: 6/100. TCF will assign the editorial letter grade from the cited evidence and reporting. A separate 1-100 public-comment index will summarize the accessible comments actually reviewed. A provisional YouTube sample was collected on October 4, 2026: 73 comments/replies reviewed, 37 account entries retained. Its 6/100 index concerns one incident and is not a department-wide public-trust estimate. See the appended audit. The five evidence categories remain NR; unknown evidence is not a failure or clearance.

CATEGORY	DRAFT RESULT / EVIDENCE LIMIT
Constitutional policing	NR. Civil allegations and docket activity located; no merits outcome verified. Stop, search, arrest and custody review records were not obtained. [3,4]
Conduct & accountability	NR. Criminal charges were announced; internal investigative findings, disciplinary outcomes and current criminal dispositions were not verified. [1]
Transparency & records	NR. This review did not obtain request logs, response times, retention audits or a complete policy publication record. A web search alone cannot establish noncompliance.
Use-of-force oversight	NR. Outside investigation of a May 2026 shooting was reported. Complete force reports, supervisory findings and final review records were not obtained. [8]
Training & supervision	NR. One academy graduation was reported; a complete roster, license verification, continuing education records and supervisory audits were not obtained. [7]

What this draft contains

One standalone Facebook grade-card image carries the badge, compact ratings and evidence rows, staffing, reported budget figures and FBI crime counts. This separate reference file supplies the evidence register, TCF Method v1.2 and linked records. The graphic and notes use identical source numbers.

Review limits

This is a public-source desk review, not a complete court-docket search, POST records check or operational audit. No records request or request for comment was sent. Existing public statements are identified by their original dates; they are not responses to this draft.

Staffing, budget & FBI crime data

DATES AND DATA COVERAGE ARE PART OF EACH FIGURE

MEASURE	VALUE / BASIS
Full-time sworn	8 in the 2025 FBI employee return: 7 male and 1 female officer. This total includes sworn command staff; it is not eight deputies plus the sheriff. The annual series measures full-time employment as of October 31. [11,15]
Full-time civilian	5 in the 2025 FBI return: 2 male and 3 female civilian employees. These are not sworn officers. [11]
Reserve officers	Not verified. This full-time FBI series does not establish a reserve headcount. A current 2026 roster was not obtained.
2026 operating budget	\$338,137.51 , as stated by Sheriff Hogan in June reporting. This is an attributed figure; the adopted full budget was not obtained or reconciled. [14]
2026 law-enforcement appropriation	\$301,046.23 , attributed to the county lawsuit in June reporting. The scope has not been reconciled with the sheriff's operating-budget figure; do not add or interchange them. The reported funding of two deputy positions is not an actual staffing count. [10]

FBI UCR / AGENCY-REPORTED OFFENSES

PERIOD	VIOLENT	PROPERTY	CLEARANCES
2025 / 12 months [12]	15	19	6 violent; 2 property
Jan.-Apr. 2026 [13]	5	0	1 violent; 0 property

Coverage: the 2025 response has a value for every month. For 2026, January-April values are present; May-September are null (missing), not zero. No full-year 2026 total or year-over-year comparison is justified. The displayed 2026 crime period therefore differs from the card's wider record-review window. [12,13]

Interpretation: these are reported offenses within the FBI violent/property groupings, not all crime, misconduct findings, convictions or a department quality score. Clearances are not convictions and can relate to offenses from earlier periods. Do not treat a clearance/offense ratio as the percentage of the year's cases solved.

Reproducibility: agency ORI MO1020000. Counts are sums of agency monthly actuals, not rates or statewide estimates. API metadata shows last refresh September 15, 2026; retrieved October 4, 2026. The returned served population is 5,180, not the entire county population. [11-13]

Badge: the graphic uses the Steven Hogan/Shannon County badge artwork reproduced with local agency reporting [7]. It is an identification element, not an endorsement of this independent report.

Evidence register

Classification applies to each claim, not to the agency as a whole.

01 / Criminal allegations - charging action verified [1]

The Attorney General announced charges against three personnel on November 26, 2025, concerning alleged sexual offenses and forgery. This verifies a charging announcement, not guilt. No later criminal disposition was verified in the sources obtained. [1] supplies the names and individual allegations.

02 / Agency statement - not independent validation [2]

In a November 26, 2025 public statement reproduced by Ozark Radio News, Sheriff Steven Hogan said the office had cooperated with the Highway Patrol investigation and continued serving the community. This is the sheriff's stated position. No independent cooperation assessment or completed internal review was obtained.

03 / Civil allegations and procedural docket [3,4]

Local reporting described Winona Police Chief Chester Allan Brewer's allegation of a retaliatory arrest. The federal docket mirror for Brewer v. Hogan, No. 1:26-cv-00143, lists a June 16, 2026 defense motion to dismiss and a July 21 reassignment. Its displayed retrieval cutoff is July 21, 2026. Those entries are procedural; no merits judgment was verified. The current docket and motion contents were not obtained.

04 / County audit - audit underway, no new final finding [5,6]

The State Auditor announced a Shannon County performance audit on October 10, 2025. Its in-progress list included Shannon County when checked for this draft. An audit opening is not an adverse finding. The county's older audit rating is not treated as a current sheriff's-office grade.

05 / Training and service developments - reported [7,9]

An agency announcement reproduced May 11, 2026 identified Deputy Sam Cummins as a Drury academy graduate. A March 28 report described the office's adoption of EDGE mapping. These are positive reported developments; neither establishes office-wide training compliance, better response times or overall performance.

06 / Force review and budget context - limited records [8,10]

A May 28 report stated that MSHP was investigating a May 25 shooting at the sheriff's request. That is evidence of a reported referral, not a final force finding. Separate June reporting described a county spending lawsuit and Hogan's position that budget cuts affected operations. No budget dispute merits ruling was reviewed. Neither side's assertions were scored as established fact.

TCF Grade: editorial assessment

TCF METHOD v1.2 / APPLIED CONSISTENTLY ACROSS AGENCIES

Attribution: Assigned by TCF. **Measure:** an evidence-informed editorial judgment of agency conduct and leadership. The letter is not assigned by a sentiment algorithm. It is not an accredited rating, a legal finding, or an estimate of guilt. TCF has not selected a grade for this draft.

Use the same five lenses for every agency: constitutional policing; conduct and accountability; transparency and records; force oversight; training and supervision. Consider reliable operational statistics, authenticated findings, court records, reporting, improvements and the agency response. State the review period and distinguish the source of each assertion.

GRADE	CONSISTENT EDITORIAL ANCHOR
A	Strong, affirmative evidence of effective safeguards and corrective leadership across the available record; no material unresolved verified failure that defeats this assessment.
B	Generally positive verified performance, with limited documented shortcomings and a credible response.
C	A materially mixed record: meaningful strengths alongside verified deficiencies requiring improvement.
D	Serious verified deficiencies, with an inadequate or incomplete documented corrective response.
F	Pervasive or especially grave verified institutional failures, with no adequate demonstrated correction.
UNASSIGNED / NR	TCF has not assigned the grade, or the evidence is too incomplete for a defensible editorial assessment. Unknown is not zero.

Required explanation alongside a published grade

Record the selected letter, at least three decisive source-linked reasons, countervailing evidence, major evidence gaps, the agency's response, and the date. State how a deficiency is attributable to institutional policy, supervision or response; do not automatically blame every employee for one person's conduct. Where coverage is materially incomplete, label the opinion provisional and explain what could change it.

Evidence labels remain mandatory

Complaints, charges and civil pleadings are allegations. Administrative sustained findings require authenticated conclusions and appeal status. Court decisions must be described by their actual holding: guilt, liability, procedure or dismissal ground. A settlement without admission is not proof of misconduct. Media can identify questions and corroborated facts; repetition of an accusation does not establish it.

No automatic conversion: allegation counts, lawsuit counts, news volume, spending, arrest totals and the public-comment index do not mechanically determine the letter. Missing or legally protected records remain unknown. No numerical composite is implied by the TCF letter. The evidence table can remain NR even while a clearly provisional editorial opinion is explained.

Public Sentiment: comment index

REPRODUCIBLE METHOD / LIMITED SAMPLE AUDIT APPENDED

The graphic uses a percent sign at the user's request. This is a **normalized 1-100 index**, not the percentage of residents who trust the office and not a representative poll. One means entirely negative coded account entries; 100 means entirely positive entries. The index measures expressed opinion, not the truth of accusations or agency quality.

STEP	RULE
1 / Define coverage	Set dates before collection. List platforms, pages, search terms and every reviewed thread. Include supportive, critical and mixed sources. Seek complete accessible threads rather than only top-ranked comments. Never claim all internet comments were captured.
2 / Eligible material	Use public comments or user-authored posts that explicitly evaluate the named agency. Retain text, date and source URL in the research record. Exclude unrelated material, news headlines alone, duplicate reposts, confirmed spam and official agency promotion. Do not infer opinions from likes, views or shares.
3 / Limit repetition	For each account on each platform, use its most recent eligible substantive evaluation within the window. Publish total comments reviewed and account-platform entries scored separately. Cross-platform identity may be unknown; entries are not necessarily unique people.
4 / Code the stance	Code eligible entries positive, mixed or negative. Mixed requires both positive and negative evaluation. Factual or unclear text without an evaluative stance is excluded. Check sarcasm and context manually. Keep an exclusion log and review ambiguous classifications before release.
5 / Minimum coverage	Publish a score only with at least 30 scored account-platform entries across at least three distinct threads from at least two independently managed pages. Otherwise show NR. These are editorial coverage gates, not statistical confidence guarantees.

Calculation: $N = \text{positive} + \text{mixed} + \text{negative entries}$. Raw index = $1 + 99 \times (\text{positive} + 0.5 \times \text{mixed}) / N$. Round to the nearest integer, with halves rounded up. All-negative = 1; all-positive = 100. Equal positive and negative = 51 after rounding. Never calculate when N is zero.

Display bands: 1-20 strongly negative; 21-40 negative; 41-60 mixed; 61-80 positive; 81-100 strongly positive. Always show the review dates, comments reviewed, entries scored and coverage limits. Do not combine this value with the TCF grade.

Bias and integrity: self-selection, moderation, deleted posts, platform access and coordinated campaigns can distort results. Flag suspected organized activity and show a sensitivity check; if it dominates or cannot be assessed, withhold the score. Comments inform the sentiment index, not factual misconduct findings. Do not publish ordinary commenter identities in the card.

Linked sources & next records

All links were reviewed Oct. 4, 2026. Publication dates and record cutoffs differ.

[1] Missouri Attorney General - open source

Charging announcement, Nov. 26, 2025. Primary source; charges are allegations.

[2] Ozark Radio News - open source

Sheriff Hogan statement, Nov. 26, 2025. Reproduced agency statement.

[3] Justia docket mirror - open source

Brewer v. Hogan, 1:26-cv-00143. Displayed docket cutoff: July 21, 2026.

[4] Ozark Radio News - open source

Brewer lawsuit allegations, May 19, 2026. Secondary reporting.

[5] Missouri State Auditor - open source

Shannon County audit announcement, Oct. 10, 2025. Primary source.

[6] Missouri State Auditor - open source

Audits in Progress. Shannon County listed at review; live page.

[7] Ozark Radio News - open source

Deputy Sam Cummins academy graduation, May 11, 2026. Reproduced agency announcement; the story headline is less specific than its body.

[8] E Communications - open source

MSHP shooting-investigation report, May 28, 2026. Secondary report of a preliminary investigation; no final force conclusion obtained.

[9] Ozark Radio News - open source

EDGE mapping adoption, March 28, 2026. Reported agency development.

[10] Ozarks First / AOL - open source

Budget litigation and sheriff response, June 11, 2026. Secondary reporting; competing positions, not adjudicated findings.

Added data sources & query record

[11] FBI Crime Data Explorer / employee counts - open source

Primary API return for MO1020000, 2025: 8 full-time sworn officers and 5 full-time civilian employees. Retrieved Oct. 4, 2026; refresh Sept. 15, 2026.

[12] FBI Crime Data Explorer / 2025 offenses - open source

Primary monthly actuals for MO1020000: 15 violent and 19 property offenses; 12 months populated. Exact query links follow.

[13] FBI Crime Data Explorer / 2026 offenses - open source

Primary monthly actuals: 5 violent and 0 property offenses for Jan.-Apr.; May-Sept. missing. Exact query links follow.

[14] E Communications - open source

June 12, 2026 report reproducing the sheriff's account of the budget: \$338,137.51 for 2026 operations. Attributed statement, not the adopted original budget.

[15] FBI Crime Data Explorer / definitions - open source

Law Enforcement Employee Counts: annual full-time sworn and civilian employment as of October 31 of the reporting year.

Exact FBI crime queries for [12] and [13]

[12] 2025 violent offenses - exact monthly API record

[12] 2025 property offenses - exact monthly API record

[13] 2026 violent offenses - exact monthly API record

[13] 2026 property offenses - exact monthly API record

These public JSON endpoints supplied the counts used here. Preserve a dated copy when publishing; live data can be revised. Null months were excluded as missing, never converted to zero.

Records needed to convert NR into a supported grade

For the evidence review: current criminal dispositions and civil docket; final administrative findings and appeals; policies and redacted complaint logs; request/response and retention logs; force and independent-review records; roster, licensing/training verification and supervisory audits. For sentiment: collect and code a disclosed set of eligible public comments under the Public Sentiment method. A limited YouTube sample is documented in the appended audit; wider Facebook and department-wide coverage remains incomplete.

Response opportunity: give the office the exact evidence-based draft and a reasonable deadline for corrections and supporting records before publishing a final scored review. No outreach was made for this draft. Preserve the reply, unresolved disputes and revision date alongside the scoring worksheet.

Provisional comment sample: 6/100

YOUTUBE ONLY / ONE INCIDENT / COLLECTED OCT. 4, 2026

Result: 2 supportive, 0 mixed and 35 negative account entries. The index describes the observed sample. It is not a claim that 6% of residents trust the office, and it does not establish misconduct or institutional quality. **Broad department-wide public sentiment remains NR.**

MEASURE	OBSERVED RESULT
Retrieved comments / replies	73 across five videos; the four incident videos supplied all scored entries.
Deduplicated scored accounts	37 YouTube account entries across four separately managed channels. Account identity is not verified personhood or residency.
Comment dates retained	January 15 through October 3, 2026 (UTC timestamps). Search window: Jan. 1, 2025 through Oct. 4, 2026.
Sample calculation	$1 + 99 \times (2 + 0.5 \times 0) / 37 = 6.35135$; rounded to 6/100 . The raw supportive share is 5.4%; the normalized index has a floor of 1.
Eligibility and repetition	36 retrieved items were excluded, including earlier entries by retained accounts, unrelated praise, questions, unclear targets and factual material without an evaluative stance. One latest eligible substantive entry per account.

The decisive coverage limitation

All 37 scored entries concern the same March 2025 confrontation between county deputies and National Park Service rangers. Four channels are four discussion locations, not four independent incidents. The numeric sample gate is met, but the sample is highly dependent on topic selection and uploader framing. It cannot describe all social-media discussion or the views of local residents. No representative poll was conducted.

Coding decisions and sensitivity

Two entries were coded supportive because, in context, they defend the deputies' jurisdiction position against criticism. This is an interpretation of stance, not validation of the legal assertions. If those two implicit defenses are instead excluded as jurisdiction-only statements, the remaining sample scores 1/100. The appropriate reading is strongly negative incident commentary, not a precise estimate of community trust. One creator's latest substantive opinion is included once; creator questions and repeated replies are excluded.

Additional sources located, not pooled into this calculation

A Reddit camping discussion contained criticism of local police service. Search-indexed Facebook school posts expressed appreciation for a send-off and a donated SRO vehicle. Full Facebook threads could not be retrieved, and complete dates/account-level coverage were not verified. Those supportive leads remain visible in the source list; they were not silently treated as zero support. Reddit was reviewed qualitatively, not coded into this YouTube-only denominator.

Use on a graphic: "6/100 — Provisional YouTube comment index; n=37; one incident." Do not place "6% public trust" on the card. Keep the broader public-sentiment field NR until broader coverage can support it.

Sample sources & collection log

V1 / Docketline - open discussion

9 comments/replies retrieved; 5 account entries scored.

V2 / Texas Safety Watch - open discussion

18 comments/replies retrieved; 5 account entries scored.

V3 / Wild West Bodycam - open discussion

29 comments/replies retrieved; 18 account entries scored.

V4 / Response Cam - open discussion

16 comments/replies retrieved; 9 account entries scored.

V5 / Ozark Radio News - open discussion

1 comments/replies retrieved; 0 account entries scored.

How the sample was collected

Public web searches covered the agency name, sheriff name, reviews, recommendations, support, criticism, Reddit and Facebook. A YouTube search used the agency name and the report date window; a follow-up sought sheriff support. Five relevant videos with returned comments were read through the connected comment tool in newest-first order, without a like filter, up to 100 threads per video. Each returned next-page cursor was null. This exhausts those returned comment listings, not all YouTube posts or hidden/deleted replies. Search selection was not random.

No mechanical weighting

Likes, views and replies were not used as votes. Repeated comments by one account did not add weight. No residence, identity, bot or coordination verification was performed. There is no claim that the commenters are Shannon County voters or a cross-section of residents.

Unpooled qualitative leads

Reddit / camping discussion

Eminence school / appreciation for send-off

Summersville school / appreciation for SRO vehicle

Facebook page fetches were throttled. The Reddit extract was readable, but it was not pooled with the fully timestamped YouTube sample. Supportive Facebook material is acknowledged without inventing counts for inaccessible discussions.

Scored account-entry ledger

PARAPHRASED OPINIONS / CLAIMS ARE NOT VERIFIED FACTS

ID / SOURCE	UTC DATE / CODE	STANCE BASIS
Y002 / V1	2026-10-03 / NEGATIVE	Criticizes suspected misuse of public money.
Y005 / V1	2026-10-02 / POSITIVE	Defends deputies' jurisdiction position in context.
Y006 / V1	2026-10-02 / NEGATIVE	Criticizes rivalry over fine revenue.
Y009 / V1	2026-09-30 / NEGATIVE	Distrusts treatment of ordinary citizens.
Y010 / V1	2026-09-30 / NEGATIVE	Expresses concern about surveillance access.
Y014 / V2	2026-08-31 / NEGATIVE	Interprets confrontation as an authority contest.
Y018 / V2	2026-08-28 / NEGATIVE	Condemns perceived revenue dispute.
Y021 / V2	2026-08-28 / NEGATIVE	Criticizes sheriff's unnecessary jurisdiction contest.
Y024 / V2	2026-09-23 / NEGATIVE	Agrees with criticism of jurisdiction conflict.
Y027 / V2	2026-07-29 / NEGATIVE	Condemns petty politics.
Y029 / V3	2026-04-18 / POSITIVE	Defends deputies' position against critics.
Y032 / V3	2026-04-11 / NEGATIVE	Expresses hostile distrust of involved officers.
Y033 / V3	2026-04-10 / NEGATIVE	Dismisses deputies' conduct.
Y034 / V3	2026-03-16 / NEGATIVE	Attributes conduct to revenue seeking.
Y036 / V3	2026-01-30 / NEGATIVE	Criticizes wasted resources and authority seeking.
Y037 / V3	2026-01-27 / NEGATIVE	Criticizes desire for control and revenue.
Y039 / V3	2026-01-19 / NEGATIVE	Dismisses sheriff's office priorities.
Y041 / V3	2026-01-16 / NEGATIVE	Attributes dispute to county revenue seeking.
Y042 / V3	2026-01-16 / NEGATIVE	Uses hostile authoritarian comparison.

Each row is one account's latest eligible substantive entry in the collected corpus. Comment text and account URLs were retained in the working audit for deduplication. Usernames are omitted here; the linked discussion, date and paraphrase identify the reviewed entry.

Scored account-entry ledger

PARAPHRASED OPINIONS / CLAIMS ARE NOT VERIFIED FACTS

ID / SOURCE	UTC DATE / CODE	STANCE BASIS
Y043 / V3	2026-01-16 / NEGATIVE	Expresses distrust of officers' public interactions.
Y044 / V3	2026-01-16 / NEGATIVE	Calls for investigation of depicted deputy.
Y046 / V3	2026-01-16 / NEGATIVE	Mocks sheriff's department using unverified grant claim.
Y048 / V3	2026-01-16 / NEGATIVE	Criticizes officer anonymity and alleged wrongdoing.
Y049 / V3	2026-01-16 / NEGATIVE	Expresses hostility toward involved officers.
Y050 / V3	2026-01-15 / NEGATIVE	Condemns perceived interference with federal officer.
Y053 / V3	2026-01-15 / NEGATIVE	Dismisses deputies' position.
Y054 / V3	2026-01-15 / NEGATIVE	Explicitly says sheriff is wrong.
Y055 / V3	2026-01-15 / NEGATIVE	Insults participants' conduct.
Y058 / V4	2026-09-28 / NEGATIVE	Questions deputies' competence and qualifications.
Y059 / V4	2026-07-08 / NEGATIVE	Insults deputies' competence.
Y063 / V4	2026-06-16 / NEGATIVE	Mocks depicted deputy.
Y064 / V4	2026-06-14 / NEGATIVE	Criticizes renewed stop and defends rangers.
Y065 / V4	2026-06-14 / NEGATIVE	Rejects depicted assertions of sheriff authority.
Y067 / V4	2026-05-19 / NEGATIVE	Mocks depicted deputy's competence.
Y069 / V4	2026-02-28 / NEGATIVE	Insults sheriff's judgment.
Y071 / V4	2026-06-20 / NEGATIVE	Predicts punishment for alleged interference.
Y073 / V4	2026-05-19 / NEGATIVE	Sides with rangers in explicit dispute.

Each row is one account's latest eligible substantive entry in the collected corpus. Comment text and account URLs were retained in the working audit for deduplication. Usernames are omitted here; the linked discussion, date and paraphrase identify the reviewed entry.

Exclusion ledger

EXCLUDED ITEMS ARE NOT NEGATIVE VOTES

ID / SOURCE	EXCLUSION REASON
Y001 / V5	Target agency not established.
Y003 / V1	Earlier entry by account retained as Y005.
Y004 / V1	Question; no evaluative stance.
Y007 / V1	Ambiguous sarcasm or target.
Y008 / V1	Historical information; no agency evaluation.
Y011 / V2	Creator question; no stance.
Y012 / V2	Praise of video creator.
Y013 / V2	Targets prosecutor and video creator.
Y015 / V2	Question; stance unclear.
Y016 / V2	Earlier opinion by account retained as Y014.
Y017 / V2	Emoji-only response.
Y019 / V2	Earlier repeated opinion; Y018 retained.
Y020 / V2	Earlier opinion by account retained as Y014.
Y022 / V2	Repeated entry; Y021 retained.
Y023 / V2	Earlier opinion by account retained as Y014.
Y025 / V2	Praise of video creator.
Y026 / V2	Generic creator discussion.
Y028 / V2	Earlier opinion by account retained as Y014.
Y030 / V3	Legal explanation; no agency evaluation.
Y031 / V3	Amusement; agency evaluation unclear.

Exclusion ledger

EXCLUDED ITEMS ARE NOT NEGATIVE VOTES

ID / SOURCE	EXCLUSION REASON
Y035 / V3	Joke; agency evaluation unclear.
Y038 / V3	Question about rangers; no clear agency stance.
Y040 / V3	Town insult; target unclear.
Y045 / V3	Earlier opinion; Y044 retained.
Y047 / V3	Earlier opinion; Y046 retained.
Y051 / V3	Ambiguous comparison.
Y052 / V3	Non-substantive reply; latest substantive opinion Y055.
Y056 / V3	Exclamation only.
Y057 / V3	Statewide generalization; specific target unclear.
Y060 / V4	Other-state factual discussion.
Y061 / V4	Identifies officers; no evaluation.
Y062 / V4	Earlier entry; Y071 retained.
Y066 / V4	Question; no expressed conclusion.
Y068 / V4	Earlier opinion; Y067 retained.
Y070 / V4	Earlier opinion; Y067 retained.
Y072 / V4	Creator question; no stance.