



Brown County

Table of Contents

Youth Level	3
Distribution of the Population Age 10-17 by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a	3
School Membership by Race/ Ethnicity and School Year (2014-2019) ^b	4
Nebraska Public High School 4-Year Graduation Rates by County (5-year estimates, 2015-2019) °	5
Youth Who Report Mental Health Symptoms and Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d	6
Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) ^d	7
Arrest Rates for Adults and Juveniles for 2018 and 2019 with Percent Change ^f	7
Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) ^g	7
Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019)	8
Family Level	10
Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportatio year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a	on (5- 10
Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) ^d	11
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means h	11
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ	11
Community Level	12
Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) ^j	12
Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d	12
Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) ^m	13
Policy, Legal and System Level	14
Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) ⁿ	14
Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) ^m	14
Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) $^{\rm m}$	15
County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) $^{\circ}$	15
Community Team Level	17
Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^p	17
Collective Impact Survey Scores ^p	17
Community Planning Team Diversity ^p	18
References and Resources	20
Appendix: Sealed Records by Year	22





Youth Level

- While we could not get race/ethnicity data for chronic absenteeism in this community because
 the frequency was too low to report, Hispanic, Native American, and Black youth are overrepresented statewide in chronic absenteeism.
- Brown County has higher than state averages of youth who qualify for free/reduced lunch, a little less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the students in the last five years.
- Graduation rates are very high for Brown County the last 5 years.
- This community has not participated in the NRPFSS since 2010 and should consider participating in the next survey year (2020) to get youth-level data on mental health, gangs, supportive adults and community perceptions of substance use.
- Arrest rates for all age groups has gone down the last two years; there is no arrest data information under 18 years old.
- JJI did not have risk assessment scores for diversion from the 2015-2017 assessment evaluation to include. If the county is not using a validated assessment tool, then it should begin doing so (there will be a statewide tool coming in July 2021). If the county does have assessment data in digital format for JJI to analyze, we would be happy to update this table.
- Law enforcement data by race and ethnicity would be very beneficial to have a clearer picture
 of RED. Compared to the overall population of Brown County, Native American youth are
 overrepresented at probation underride, intake, and successful probation; Black youth are
 overrepresented at probation override and probation intake, and Hispanic youth are
 overrepresented at all diversion points.
 - Race/ethnicity data is missing at the court system points for about 15% of cases.

Table 1.

Distribution of the Population Age 10-17 by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a

Males

Geographic Area	Total Count	Non-Hispanic White	Hispanic or Latino	Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	2+ Races
Nebraska	108,494	70.4%	16.2%	5.7%	1.4%	2.0%	4.4%
Brown	81	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Females





Geographic Area	Total Count	Non-Hispanic White	Hispanic or Latino	Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	2+ Races
Nebraska	102,658	70.4%	16.2%	5.7%	1.4%	2.0%	4.4%
Brown	169	96.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%

Click here to go back to RED analysis

Table 2. School Membership by Race/ Ethnicity and School Year (2014-2019) ^b

Year	Geographic Area	Total Count	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific islander	White	Two or More Races
2014-	Brown	477	1.05%	0.00%	2.10%	0.21%	0.00%	95.39%	1.26%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-	Brown	483	2.48%	0.00%	2.28%	0.21%	0.00%	93.58%	1.45%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-	Brown	462	3.46%	0.00%	2.16%	0.22%	0.00%	92.64%	1.52%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-	Brown	443	3.84%	0.00%	2.26%	0.23%	0.00%	92.78%	0.90%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-	Brown	429	5.59%	0.00%	3.26%	0.23%	0.00%	90.21%	0.70%
2019	Nebraska	325,984	19.13%	2.83%	1.33%	6.63%	0.15%	66.02%	3.91%

Table 3. Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity and School Year ^b

Year	Geographic Area	Total Youth with Chronic Absenteeism	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific islander	White	Two or More Races
2014-	Brown	11	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2015	Nebraska	35,638	24.54%	1.64%	4.42%	12.93%	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-	Brown	11	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2016	Nebraska	38,812	25.73%	1.55%	4.27%	13.68%	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
	Brown	15	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*

2016-	Nebraska	42,290							
2017			26.90%	1.66%	4.40%	14.22%	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-	Brown	15	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2018	Nebraska	46,365	26.81%	1.77%	4.18%	14.49%	0.22%	47.37%	2389
2018-	Brown	12	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2019	Nebraska	46,356	27.64%	1.76%	4.16%	14.71%	0.23%	46.27%	5.23%

Per the Nebraska Department of Education, the * represents masked data, which they define as 10 or fewer students, for the confidentiality of the students

Table 4. Disabilities, English Proficiency, Eligibility for Free/Reduced Lunch and School Year (2014 – 2019)

Year	Geographic Area	Total Count	IDEA	504 Plan	Limited English Proficiency	Free/Reduced Lunch
2014-	Brown	477	13.21%	*	*	<mark>44.86%</mark>
2015	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	<mark>44.53%</mark>
2015-	Brown	483	<mark>14.49%</mark>	*	*	41.82%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-	Brown	462	<mark>14.72%</mark>	*	*	<mark>45.02%</mark>
2017	Nebraska	318,853	13.80%	0.93%	6.99%	<mark>44.76%</mark>
2017-	Brown	443	<mark>17.38%</mark>	*	*	45.82%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	15.87%	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-	Brown	429	<mark>16.78%</mark>	*	3.03%	<mark>46.39%</mark>
2019	Nebraska	325,984	<mark>16.13%</mark>	0.85%	6.78%	<mark>45.42%</mark>

Per the Nebraska Department of Education, the * represents masked data, which they define as 10 or fewer students, for the confidentiality of the students

Table 5. Nebraska Public High School 4-Year Graduation Rates by County (5-year estimates, 2015-2019) °

County	Total in Las	t 5 Years	Yearly Av	verages	Graduation	
	Graduates	Students	Graduates	Students	Rate	Rank
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	-
Brown	167	177	33.4	35.4	<mark>94.4%</mark>	43

Data are only for public school districts and their associated high schools. The figures are aggregated based on the location of the school, not the residential location of the student. The figures for Dawes County are impacted by a vocational school where graduation rates are less than 25%; in the rest of the county graduation rates equal 93%.

Table 6. Youth Who Report Mental Health Symptoms and Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Brown	Loss of sleep from worry			
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
Brown	Depressed			
Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
Brown	Considered/Attempted suicide			
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
Brown	Current alcohol			
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
Brown	Current binge drinking			
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%
Brown	Current marijuana			
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
Brown	Current tobacco			
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%
Brown	Current vaping			
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
Brown	Hopeful for future (past week)			
Nebraska		72.1%	74.7%	78.4%

^{*}Brown County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

**JJI is currently waiting for the legal team at DHHS to approve providing this data

Table 7.

Juveniles Referred to Services e

Table 8.

Juveniles Referred to Services by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Mental Health Diagnosis e

Table 9.

Juveniles Who Utilized Services e

Table 10.

Types of Services Utilized e



Table 11. Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) ^d

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Brown	Youth Reported Gang Involvement			
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

^{*}Brown County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

Table 12.
Arrest Rates for Adults and Juveniles for 2018 and 2019 with Percent Change ^f

Arrestee Age		All Arres	stee Ages		Un	der 18
Summary Arrest Date	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %
Jurisdiction by Geography			BROWN	COUNT	Υ	
Arrest Offense						
Total	<mark>85</mark>	<mark>50</mark>	-41.18	0	0	-
Aggravated Assault Total	3	1	-66.67	0	0	-
Larceny-Theft Total	2	-	-100.00	0	-	-
Other Assaults	5	1	-80.00	0	0	-
Fraud	1	2	100.00	0	0	-
Embezzlement	-	1	-	-	0	-
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	1	-	-100.00	0	-	-
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	3	5	66.67	0	0	-
Drug Violations - Possession	34	15	-55.88	0	0	-
Driving Under the Influence	29	17	-41.38	0	0	-
Liquor Laws	2	4	100.00	0	0	-
Disorderly Conduct	1	3	200.00	0	0	-
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	4	1	-75.00	0	0	-

Table 13. Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) ^g

	Brown All NYS Counties					nties
Score	0	1	2	0	1	2
Family Circumstance/Parenting				60.1%	26.7%	13.1%





Education/Employment				43.0%	44.0%	13.1%
Peer Relationships				44.7%	46.6%	8.6%
Substance Use				61.4%	30.3%	8.3%
Leisure/Recreation				50.6%	33.0%	16.5%
Personality/Behavior				50.1%	39.4%	10.4%
Attitudes/Orientation				61.3%	33.7%	5.0%
Mean Score	M =, SD =,			M = 5.6	4, SD = 3.	65, 0-17

Could not compute because county did not have any risk assessments completed

Table 14. Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019)

Click here to see Census and School Population Data

*Data were not separated by year because there were too few cases

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement								
contact								
Youth taken to temporary custody					1			
Youth issued citation/referral	9*							
Youth referred to diversion	1	0%	0%	0%	<mark>100%</mark>	0%	0%	0%
Youth enrolled in diversion	1	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Successful completion diversion	1	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Youth with multiple charges	7	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14.30%	85.70%
Filed on in adult court	6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16.70%	83.30%
RAI Override: More Severe	4	0%	0%	<mark>75%</mark>	0%	0%	0%	25%
RAI Override: Less Severe	3	33.30%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	66.70%
Probation intake	10	<mark>10%</mark>	0%	<mark>50%</mark>	0%	0%	0%	40%
Successful probation	26	7.70%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	92.30%
Revocation of probation	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%





Youth in OJS	 	 	 	
custody				
OJS custody: placed	 	 	 	
in detention				
Youth booked into	 	 	 	
detention				
Youth booked into	 	 	 	
detention more than				
once				

^{*}Brown County sheriff did not report to NCC in 2017





Family Level

- Boyd County has a higher rate of poverty compared to the state
- Number of people with bachelor's degrees is lower compared to the state; this could be a result of residents going to college in a different community and not returning to Brown County.
- The number of youth with access to computers is higher than the state average as is access to internet (ranked 6th overall).
- Almost ¾ of abuse/neglect cases are unfounded.

Table 15.
Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportation (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a

Measurement		Brown	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	<mark>21.5%</mark>	14.8%
-	Number of children 12-	120	43,814
	17 below 185% poverty		
	Percent of children 12-	<mark>56.9%</mark>	28.9%
	17 below 185% poverty		
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	<mark>19.8%</mark>	31.3%
	County rank	61	-
	Age 25+ with some	22.2%	23.0%
	college, no degree		
	County rank	72	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	92.0%	91.1%
	County Rank	54	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a	99.3%	96.9%
	computer at home		
	County rank	35	-
	% under 18 with an	97.5%	91.0%
	internet subscription at		
	home		
	County rank	6	-
	% under 18 with	97.5%	90.8%
	broadband internet		
	access at home		
	County Rank	6	-





Housing	Owner-occupied households	1,064	498,567
	Total households	1,434	754,063
	Owner %	74.2%	66.1%
	Renters	370	255,496
	Renter %	25.8%	33.9%
Transportation	Households with no vehicle available	55	40,465
	Total households	1,434	754,063
	No vehicle %	3.8%	5.4%

Table 16. Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) ^d

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Brown	Adult at home who listens	-		-
Nebraska		87.3%	85.0%	85.6%
Brown	Adult at school who listens			
Nebraska		85.2%	85.0%	87.4%

^{*}Brown County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

Table 17.

Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means ^h

	Aggravated	Aggravated	Simple Domestic	Simple Domestics
	Domestic Assaults	Domestic Assaults	Assaults Reported	Assaults Cleared
	Reported	Cleared by Arrest		by Arrest or
		or Exceptional		Exceptional Means
		Means		·
Brown	0	0	0	0
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

Table 18. Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Brown	75	36%	15%	<mark>70%</mark>
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%

Community Level

- Juvenile record sealing is not "automatic" even if statute requires it to seal. Sealing a record requires administrative staff to initiate the process. Dismissed or dropped cases should be sealed at a rate of 100%. All others should be sealed at the rate to which youth successfully complete their court requirements (completion of diversion, probation, restorative practice, or other treatment). Yearly data is available in the Appendix to see if the rate has improved because of legislation, but newer cases should naturally have lower rates of sealing than older cases.
- Data for race and ethnicity at each juvenile justice system point is imperative for an accurate Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) analysis. The court trial database (JUSTICE) has a high rate of missing data by race/ethnicity in this county.

Table 19.
Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) ^j

Type of Violence	Brown	Nebraska
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	0	34
Rape	0	264
Robbery	0	367
Aggravated Assault	1	1,639
Other Assaults	1	8,782

Table 20. Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Brown	Wrong/very wrong – Marijuana		-	
Nebraska		94.4%	89.8%	85.2%
Brown	Wrong/very wrong – alcohol		•	
Nebraska		89.1%	80.4%	68.7%
Brown	Wrong/very wrong – cigarettes		•	
Nebraska		92.9%	89.0%	78.7%

^{*}Brown County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey





Table 21.

Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) ^m

see Appendix for yearly data

	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	35	49	<mark>71.4%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	95	129	73.6%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	14	17	82.4%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	144	199	72.4%

^{*}Cases offered diversion, mediation or RJ are not available data points in in JUSTICE. All cases filed in adult court and transferred to juvenile court overlapped with cases that were filed in adult court as a misdemeanor or infraction; as such, they were omitted from analysis

Policy, Legal and System Level

- This county is not a county required to provide counsel under statute; notably, access to counsel is very low in this community. With respect to diversion practices, the community may want to consider a few things:
 - Allowing warning letters for the lowest risk youth
 - It is not clear why all first-time offenders are not referred to diversion but perhaps this is due to the ineligible offenses.

Table 22.

Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) ⁿ

	Brown	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	20.0-39.9%	73.5%

Neb. Rev. 43-272. Right to counsel; appointment; payment; guardian ad litem; appointment; when; duties; standards for guardians ad litem; standards for attorneys who practice in juvenile court.

(1)(a) In counties having a population of less than one hundred fifty thousand inhabitants, when any juvenile shall be brought without counsel before a juvenile court, the court shall advise such juvenile and his or her parent or guardian of their right to retain counsel and shall inquire of such juvenile and his or her parent or guardian as to whether they desire to retain counsel.

(b) In counties having a population of one hundred fifty thousand or more inhabitants, when any juvenile court petition is filed alleging jurisdiction of a juvenile pursuant to subdivision (1), (2), (3)(b), or (4) of section $\underline{43-247}$, counsel shall be appointed for such juvenile.

Table 23. Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) $^{\rm m}$

	Brown	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	0	352

Table 24.





Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 - 2019) m

		Brown					
Filed Subtype	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	0	1	0	0	0	1	
3B - Uncontrollable	0	0	2	0	0	2	
3C – Mentally III and Dangerous	0	0	0	0	0	0	

		Nebraska					
Filed Subtype	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	2	0	2	3	7	
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	96	510	493	423	475	1997	
3B - Uncontrollable	47	118	125	119	82	491	
3C – Mentally III and Dangerous	22	48	37	22	23	306	

Table 25. County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) $^\circ$

	Brown	Nebraska *
Refer ALL juveniles who are first	No	Yes: 27.3%
time offenders to diversion		No: 63.6%
		Not sure: 9.1%
File a juvenile's charges at the	No	Yes: 18.2%
time of the referral to diversion		No: 70.5%
		Not sure: 11.4%
File a juvenile's charges if they are	Not sure	Always: 47.7%
unsuccessful on diversion		Sometimes: 47.7%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Allow a juvenile to complete	Yes	Yes: 61.4%
diversion more than once		No: 34.1%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Charges/offenses that make a	No	Yes: 86.4%
juvenile ineligible for diversion		No: 9.1%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Warning letters instead of	No	Yes: 27.3%
intervention		No: 61.4%
		Not sure: 11.4%
Currently drug test	No	Yes: 31.8%
		No: 65.9%
		Not sure: 2.3%





Fees beyond restitution	Yes; \$100 (but can be waived or reduced, if needed)	Yes: 86.4% No: 13.6% Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior to discharge	Yes; may include additional activities, depending on what they are not compliant with	Yes: 47.7% No: 25.0% Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	Yes; sealed at successful completion and records are sealed when closed in JCMS	Yes: 59.1% No: 22.7% Not sure: 18.2%

^{*}responses included 44 juvenile diversion programs; representing 68 counties/tribe (91.9% response rate)

EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA

Community Team Level

- A community lead should be able to get roughly a 75% response, to ensure active participation on planning issues, your response rate was 75.0%.
- Mean score on Collective Impact is higher than in 2019 and higher than the state average in all areas
- The community team should be representative of the population of that community but should also include diversity. It might be beneficial to add diverse member to your team (especially because of the patterns of over and under representation.)
 - o This pertains to gender as well as race/ethnicity.
- On the survey –no probation, law enforcement, attorneys, treatment providers, child welfare, or elected officials in your team–but perhaps they did not respond to the survey.
 - The number of people on the team the survey was sent to is small, so you may want to consider growing the team to include other system points.
- 1/3 of people who responded indicated they do not feel heard on the team.

Table 26. Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^p

	Holt/Boyd/Brown		Nebr	aska
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020
Number of surveys sent	11	8	1407	780
Number of completed surveys	6	6	221	345
Response rate	54.6%	<mark>75.0%</mark>	28.3%	24.5%

Table 27.
Collective Impact Survey Scores p

	Holt/Boyd/E	Brown	Nebra	aska				
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020				
	Mean Score		Mean Score		Mean Score		Mean	Score
Common agenda	5.17	<mark>6.17</mark>	5.29	5.69				
Mutually reinforcing	4.75	<mark>5.83</mark>	5.37	5.50				
Shared measurement	4.71	<mark>5.83</mark>	5.21	5.45				
Continuous communication	4.94	<mark>5.83</mark>	5.49	5.55				
Backbone agency	4.95	<mark>6.00</mark>	5.52	5.78				





The five elements of Collective Impact are:

- **Common agenda:** Participants have a shared vision and common understanding of both the problem and potential solutions to that problem.
- **Mutually reinforcing activities:** Participant activities must be differentiated while still being coordinated through a mutually reinforcing plan of action.
- **Shared measurement:** Collecting data and measuring results consistently across all participants ensures efforts remain aligned and participants hold each other accountable.
- **Continuous communication:** Consistent and open communication is needed across stakeholders to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and create common motivation.
- **Backbone support**: Creating and managing Collective Impact often requires a separate organization(s) with staff and a specific set of skills to serve as the backbone for the entire initiative and to coordinate participating organizations ^q

Table 28.
Community Planning Team Diversity P

	Holt/Boy	Holt/Boyd/Brown		raska
	N = 6	(%)	N = 345	(%)
Gender				
Male			101	29.3%
Female	6	100%	229	66.4%
Missing			15	4.3%
Age				
Under 30			19	5.6%
30-39	1	16.7%	68	19.6%
40-49	1	16.7%	88	25.4%
50-59	2	33.3%	90	25.8%
60 and over	2	33.3%	44	13%
Missing			36	10.4%
Race/Ethnicity				
White	5	83.3%	230	66.7%
Black			10	2.9%
Hispanic			13	3.8%
Native American			6	1.7%
Asian			1	0.3%
Other			2	0.6%





Provided town name	1	16.7%	63	18.3%
Missing			19	5.5%
Previous System Involvement				
Yes	2	33.3%	98	28.4%
No	4	66.7%	242	70.1%
Missing			5	1.4%
System Point *				
Law enforcement	1	11.1%	34	7.8%
County attorney/ juvenile court			32	7.3%
K-12 or secondary education	2	22.2%	65	14.9%
Ministry/faith based			10	2.3%
Diversion	2	22.2%	55	12.6%
Probation	2	22.2%	31	7.1%
Public defender/ defense counsel/			8	1.8%
guardian ad litem				
DHHS or Child Welfare			13	3.0%
Treatment provider			40	9.2%
Post adjudication or detention			8	1.8%
Community based program	2	22.2%	109	25.0%
Elected official or government			6	1.4%
Restorative practices			6	1.4%
Backbone or system improvement			3	0.7%
Other			16	3.7%
Voice on Team				
Feel heard	4	66.7%	270	78.3%
Do not feel heard	2	33.3%	75	21.7%

Boyd n = 2, Brown n = 1, Holt n = 6 (two people named more than one county they represent).

^{*}note. Team members could have selected more than one system point; as such, they do not add up to 100%

References and Resources

- ^a **Population data:** Table B01001 race series, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Compiled and Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on July 10, 2020
- ^a **Youth employment:** Table B23001, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Compiled and Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on July 10, 2020
- ^a **Poverty/SES:** Table B10724, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 3-18-2020
- ^a **Technology in household:** Table B28005, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Compiled by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 8-11-20
- ^a **Home owner/transportation:** Table B25045, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Compiled and Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 8-11-20
- ^a **Education attainment:** Table B15002, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 3-18-2020
- ^b School membership, chronic absenteeism, student disability, and free/reduced lunch: Prepared by Sara Simonsen, Nebraska Department of Education
- ^c **Graduation rates:** Special Tabulation by Sara Simonsen, Nebraska Department of Education Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 7-24-2020
- ^d Mental health, Substance use, gang, and community perceptions of substance use: Bureau of Sociological Research, Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey: https://bosr.unl.edu/current-nrpfss-county-level-data
- e Referral to and utilization of services: Department of Health and Human Services
- f Adult and juvenile arrests: Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics: https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx
 g Diversion programs
- h Domestic violence: Nebraska Crime Commission, Domestic Assault: https://ncc.nebraska.gov/sites/ncc.nebraska.gov/files/doc/2019%20Domestic%20Assault%20and%20Arrest%20by%20County_0.pdf

¹Child abuse and neglect

^j **Community violence:** Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics: https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx

^k Distance to detention facility: Google Maps

¹Racial and ethnic disparities: Prepared by Mitch Herian, University of Nebraska-Lincoln with data provided by:





Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics: https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx
Nebraska Crime Commission, Juvenile Case Management System
Nebraska Judicial Branch Trial Court Case Management System, JUSTICE
Nebraska Judicial Branch, Juvenile Services Division

- ^m Court Filings and Juvenile Record Sealing: Data provided by the Nebraska Judicial Branch Trial Court Case Management System, JUSTICE. Prepared by: Lindsey Wylie, UNO Juvenile Justice Institute on 9-1-20
- ⁿ **Access to Counsel:** Kids County in Nebraska Report, Voices for Children, retrieved from: www.voicesforchildren.com/kidscount. Data originally from Nebraska Judicial Branch Trial Court Case Management System, JUSTICE
- ° **Diversion procedures and protocols:** Diversion survey distributed to Juvenile Diversion programs, 2020. Prepared by: Lindsey Wylie, UNO Juvenile Justice Institute
- ^p **Collective impact:** Collective impact surveys distributed to Community Planning Teams, 2019 and 2020. Prepared by: Anne Hobbs and Erin Wasserburger, UNO Juvenile Justice Institute
- ^q Collective Impact Elements: Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective Impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.

Appendix: Sealed Records by Year

*Cases offered diversion, mediation or RJ are not available data points in in JUSTICE. All cases filed in adult court and transferred to juvenile court overlapped with cases that were filed in adult court as a misdemeanor or infraction; as such, they were omitted from analysis

2015	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped			
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	32	39	82.1%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	3	3	100.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	35	42	83.3%

2016	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	0	1	0.0%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ		1	
Filed in Juv. Court	23	31	74.2%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	1	4	25.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	24	40	60.0%

2017	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	12	12	100.0%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	27	29	93.1%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	3	3	100.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	42	44	95.5%





2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	22	24	91.7%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	13	26	50.0%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	4	4	100.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	39	54	72.2%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	1	12	8.3%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	0	4	0.0%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	3	3	100.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court			
Total	4	19	21.1%