



# **Deuel County**

# **Table of Contents**

| Youth Level  | 3  |
|--|----|
| Distribution of the Population Age 10-17 by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (5-year estimates, 2014-2018)                                    | a3 |
| School Membership by Race/ Ethnicity and School Year (2014-2019)   | 4  |
| Chronic Absenteeism 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 (2016) d  | 5  |
| Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2016) d  | 6  |
| Arrest Rates for Adults and Juveniles for 2018 and 2019 with Percent Change <sup>f</sup>   | 7  |
| Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) g  | 7  |
| Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019)   | 8  |
| Family Level   | 9  |
| Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transporta year estimates, 2014-2018) <sup>a</sup> | •  |
| Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2016) d   | 10 |
| Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means (2019) h  | 10 |
| Child Abuse and Neglect Reports (2018) i   | 10 |
| Community Level  | 11 |
| Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) j  | 11 |
| Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2016) d  | 11 |
| Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>  | 12 |
| Policy, Legal and System Level   | 13 |
| Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) n  | 13 |
| Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>  | 13 |
| Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>   | 14 |
| County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) °   | 14 |
| Community Team Level   | 16 |
| Collective Impact Survey Response Rates <sup>p</sup>   | 16 |
| Collective Impact Survey Scores <sup>p</sup>   | 16 |
| Community Planning Team Diversity <sup>p</sup>   | 17 |
| References and Resources   | 19 |
| Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year   | 21 |



#### **Youth Level**

- Table 1: Deuel County has a Hispanic population similar to the overall state, but a higher number of Native American male youth ages 10-17. Your county also reports a high number of Hispanic adolescent females (Based on Census data).
- Table 2-3: Chronic absenteeism Deuel County's number were too small to report. 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 over-represented statewide in chronic absenteeism.
- Table 4: Free and reduced lunch slightly higher than the rest of the state. IDEA plans have risen slightly, still lower than the rest of the state.
- Table 5: HS graduation rates higher than the rest of the state -94% of your students graduate!
- Table 6: Youth in your county appear less likely to suffer from depression
- County 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> graders reporter higher rate of loss of sleep from worry, and depression. Slightly fewer 12<sup>th</sup> graders reported attempting or considering suicide as compared to the state average. More of your youth report feeling hopeful.
- 12<sup>th</sup> graders report using alcohol at a higher rate than the rest of the state. (40.6% report drinking compared to 34%, but fare fewer reported binge drinking.)
- Very few youth reported using marijuana. Twice as many 8<sup>th</sup> graders are using tobacco compared to the state.
- Table 11: No youth reported gang involvement.
- Table 12: Overall adult crime has increased, but there were almost no juvenile crimes reported.
- Table 13. Only 4 youth in Deuel County scored. A statewide tool is on the horizon. A validated tool can help design interventions (using the 8 domains).
- Table 14: Only 3 youth had a law violation reported to NCC. Asian youth were referred to diversion at a higher rate? But do not show up as completing diversion?
- Hispanic youth are more likely to be filed as adults (but very small number of cases)
- Only 2 youth placed on probation, but both were minority youth.

# Table 1. Distribution of the Population Age 10-17 by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) <sup>a</sup>

#### **Males**

| Geographic | Total<br>Count | Non-<br>Hispanic | Hispanic or |       | American | Asian or<br>Pacific | 2+    |
|------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|-------|----------|---------------------|-------|
| Area Name  |                | White            | Latino      | Black | Indian   | Islander            | Races |
| Nebraska   | 108,494        | 70.4%            | 16.2%       | 5.7%  | 1.4%     | 2.0%                | 4.4%  |
| Deuel      | 95             | 80.0%            | 15.8%       | 0.0%  | 4.2%     | 0.0%                | 0.0%  |

#### **Females**

| Geographic<br>Area Name | Total<br>Count | Non-<br>Hispanic<br>White | Hispanic or<br>Latino | Black | American<br>Indian | Asian or<br>Pacific<br>Islander | 2+<br>Races |
|-------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Nebraska                | 102,658        | 69.9%                     | 15.8%                 | 5.2%  | 1.2%               | 2.5%                            | 5.4%        |
| Deuel                   | 64             | 64.1%                     | 29.7%                 | 0.0%  | 0.0%               | 0.0%                            | 6.3%        |

#### Click here to go back to RED analysis

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

| Year  | Geographic<br>Area | Total<br>Count | Hispanic | Asian | American<br>Indian or<br>Alaska<br>Native | Black or<br>African<br>American | Native<br>Hawaiian<br>or Other<br>Pacific<br>islander | White  | Two<br>or<br>More<br>Races |
|-------|--------------------|----------------|----------|-------|---|---------------------------------|---|--------|----------------------------|
| 2014- | Deuel              | 400            | 4.75%    | 0.00% | 1.25%                                     | 2.25%                           | 0.25%   | 91.50% | 0.00%                      |
| 2015  | Nebraska           | 312,281        | 17.74%   | 2.43% | 1.42%                                     | 6.70%                           | 0.13%   | 68.20% | 3.38%                      |
| 2015- | Deuel              | 429            | 6.06%    | 0.47% | 1.63%                                     | 1.17%                           | 0.23%   | 90.21% | 0.23%                      |
| 2016  | Nebraska           | 315,542        | 18.08%   | 2.53% | 1.38%                                     | 6.67%                           | 0.14%   | 67.72% | 3.47%                      |
| 2016- | Deuel              | 420            | 7.62%    | 0.00% | 1.43%                                     | 1.90%                           | 0.95%   | 87.14% | 0.95%                      |
| 2017  | Nebraska           | 318,853        | 18.61%   | 2.66% | 1.38%                                     | 6.69%                           | 0.15%   | 66.92% | 3.59%                      |
| 2017- | Deuel              | 386            | 7.51%    | 0.00% | 1.04%                                     | 0.78%                           | 0.00%   | 90.16% | 0.52%                      |
| 2018  | Nebraska           | 323,391        | 18.80%   | 2.76% | 1.35%                                     | 6.67%                           | 0.14%   | 66.50% | 3.78%                      |
| 2018- | Deuel              | 373            | 7.51%    | 0.54% | 0.80%                                     | 0.54%                           | 0.00%   | 89.28% | 1.34%                      |
| 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 (2014 - 2019)<sup>b</sup>

| Year  | Geographic<br>Area | Total Youth with Chronic Absenteeism | Hispanic | Asian | American<br>Indian or<br>Alaska<br>Native | Black or<br>African<br>American | Native<br>Hawaiian<br>or Other<br>Pacific<br>islander | White   | Two<br>or<br>More<br>Races |
|-------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|-------|---|---------------------------------|---|---------|----------------------------|
| 2014- | Deuel              | 38                                   | *        | *     | *   | *                               | *   | 100.00% | *                          |
| 2015  | Nebraska           | 35,638                               | 24.54%   | 1.64% | 4.42%                                     | 12.93%                          | 0.19%   | 51.61%  | 4.68%                      |
| 2015- | Deuel              | 36                                   | *        | *     | *   | *                               | *   | 100.00% | *                          |
| 2016  | Nebraska           | 38,812                               | 25.73%   | 1.55% | 4.27%                                     | 13.68%                          | 0.27%   | 49.68%  | 4.83%                      |
| 2016- | Deuel              | 49                                   | *        | *     | *   | *                               | *   | 100.00% | *                          |
| 2017  | Nebraska           | 42,290                               | 26.90%   | 1.66% | 4.40%                                     | 14.22%                          | 0.24%   | 47.66%  | 4.92%                      |
| 2017- | Deuel              | 37                                   | *        | *     | *   | *                               | *   | 100.00% | *                          |
| 2018  | Nebraska           | 46,365                               | 26.81%   | 1.77% | 4.18%                                     | 14.49%                          | 0.22%   | 47.37%  | 2389                       |





| 2018- | Deuel    | 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) <sup>b</sup>

| Year  | Geographic | Total   | IDEA                | 504   | Limited English | Free/Reduced        |
|-------|------------|---------|---------------------|-------|-----------------|---------------------|
|       | Area       | Count   |                     | Plan  | Proficiency     | Lunch               |
| 2014- | Deuel      | 400     | <mark>14.50%</mark> | *     | *               | <mark>47.00%</mark> |
| 2015  | Nebraska   | 312,281 | 13.66%              | 0.76% | 5.97%           | <mark>44.53%</mark> |
| 2015- | Deuel      | 429     | 13.29%              | *     | *               | <mark>48.48%</mark> |
| 2016  | Nebraska   | 315,542 | 13.64%              | 0.90% | 5.90%           | <mark>44.23%</mark> |
| 2016- | Deuel      | 420     | 13.81%              | *     | *               | <mark>55.00%</mark> |
| 2017  | Nebraska   | 318,853 | 13.80%              | 0.93% | 6.99%           | <mark>44.76%</mark> |
| 2017- | Deuel      | 386     | <mark>15.28%</mark> | *     | *               | <mark>52.33%</mark> |
| 2018  | Nebraska   | 323,391 | 15.87%              | 0.88% | 6.59%           | <mark>46.24%</mark> |
| 2018- | Deuel      | 373     | <mark>15.82%</mark> | *     | *               | <mark>50.40%</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)  $^{\circ}$ 

| 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%              | n/a  |
| Deuel    | 141          | 150       | 14.1               | 15.0     | <mark>94.0%</mark> | 50   |

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 (2016) <sup>d</sup>

|          |                          | 8 <sup>th</sup>     | 10 <sup>th</sup>    | 12 <sup>th</sup>    |
|----------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Deuel    | Loss of sleep from worry | <mark>11.50%</mark> | 21.10%              | 21.20%              |
| Nebraska |                          | 18.0%               | 20.6%               | 21.6%               |
| Deuel    | Depressed                | <mark>23.10%</mark> | <mark>10.50%</mark> | <mark>21.20%</mark> |
| Nebraska |                          | 31.1%               | 34.8%               | 35.3%               |





| Deuel    | Considered/Attempted suicide   | <mark>11.50%</mark> | <mark>10.50%</mark> | <mark>15.20%</mark> |
|----------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Nebraska |                                | 22.9%               | 18.2%               | 16.2%               |
| Deuel    | Current alcohol                | 7.70%               | 5.30%               | <mark>40.60%</mark> |
| Nebraska |                                | 9.8%                | 20.1%               | 34.2%               |
| Deuel    | Current binge drinking         | <mark>0.00%</mark>  | <mark>5.30%</mark>  | <mark>3.00%</mark>  |
| Nebraska |                                | 1.3%                | 6.2%                | 15.0%               |
| Deuel    | Current marijuana              | <mark>0.0%</mark>   | <mark>0.0%</mark>   | <mark>3.1%</mark>   |
| Nebraska |                                | 3.0%                | 7.3%                | 13.9%               |
| Deuel    | Current tobacco                | <mark>7.70%</mark>  | 0.00%               | <mark>28.10%</mark> |
| Nebraska |                                | 3.7%                | 8.0%                | 15.3%               |
| Deuel    | Current vaping                 | 0.00%               | 5.60%               | <mark>18.80%</mark> |
| Nebraska |                                | 10.4%               | 24.7%               | 37.3%               |
| Deuel    | Hopeful for future (past week) | <mark>84.60%</mark> | <mark>78.90%</mark> | <mark>84.80%</mark> |
| Nebraska |                                | 78.0%               | 76.1%               | 77.6%               |

#### \*\*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 <sup>e</sup>

Table 11. Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2016) <sup>d</sup>

|          |                                 | 8 <sup>th</sup> | 10 <sup>th</sup> | 12 <sup>th</sup> |
|----------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Deuel    | Youth Reported Gang Involvement | 0.0%            | 0.0%             | 0.0%             |
| Nebraska |                                 | 3.8%            | 4.4%             | 3.8%             |





Table 12. Arrest Rates for Adults and Juveniles for 2018 and 2019 with Percent Change <sup>f</sup>

| Arrestee Age                   |                 | All Arrestee Ages Under 18 |                     |      | der 18 |             |  |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------|------|--------|-------------|--|
| Summary Arrest Date            | 2018            | 2019                       | 2018 - 2019         | 2018 | 2019   | 2018 - 2019 |  |
|                                |                 |                            | Growth %            |      |        | Growth %    |  |
| Jurisdiction by Geography      | DEUEL COUNTY    |                            |                     |      |        |             |  |
| Arrest Offense                 |                 |                            |                     |      |        |             |  |
| Total                          | <mark>46</mark> | <mark>86</mark>            | <mark>86.96</mark>  | 0    | 1      | -           |  |
| Larceny-Theft Total            | -               | 1                          | -                   | -    | 0      | -           |  |
| Vandalism                      | -               | 1                          | -                   | -    | -      | -           |  |
| Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, | 2               | 2                          | 0.00                | 0    | 0      | -           |  |
| etc.                           |                 |                            | 0.00                | •    | 0      |             |  |
| Drug Violations -              | 10              | <mark>6</mark>             | <mark>-40.00</mark> | 0    | 0      | -           |  |
| Sale/Manufacturing             |                 |                            | 10.00               |      |        |             |  |
| Drug Violations - Possession   | <mark>31</mark> | <mark>71</mark>            | <mark>129.03</mark> | 0    | 1      | -           |  |
| Offenses Against Family and    |                 | 2                          | _                   |      | 0      | -           |  |
| Children                       | _               | ۷                          | -                   | _    | 0      |             |  |
| Driving Under the Influence    | <mark>46</mark> | <mark>86</mark>            | <mark>86.96</mark>  | 0    | 1      | -           |  |
| Liquor Laws                    | 3               | 3                          | 0.00                | 0    | 0      | -           |  |

Table 13. Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) <sup>g</sup>

|                               | Deuel  |                   |          | All NYS Counties |            |          |
|-------------------------------|--------|-------------------|----------|------------------|------------|----------|
| Score                         | 0      | 1                 | 2        | 0                | 1          | 2        |
| Family Circumstance/Parenting | 75.0%  | 25.0%             | 0.0%     | 60.1%            | 26.7%      | 13.1%    |
| Education/Employment          | 50.0%  | 25.0%             | 25.0%    | 43.0%            | 44.0%      | 13.1%    |
| Peer Relationships            | 0.0%   | 100.0%            | 0.0%     | 44.7%            | 46.6%      | 8.6%     |
| Substance Use                 | 50.0%  | 50.0%             | 0.0%     | 61.4%            | 30.3%      | 8.3%     |
| Leisure/Recreation            | 50.0%  | 25.0%             | 25.0%    | 50.6%            | 33.0%      | 16.5%    |
| Personality/Behavior          | 75.0%  | 0.0%              | 25.0%    | 50.1%            | 39.4%      | 10.4%    |
| Attitudes/Orientation         | 50.0%  | 50.0%             | 0.0%     | 61.3%            | 33.7%      | 5.0%     |
| Mean Score                    | M = 4. | 00, <i>SD</i> = 1 | .41, 3-6 | M = 5.6          | 4, SD = 3. | 65, 0-17 |

Deuel County n = 4; Statewide n = 1512





Table 14. Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019) <sup>1</sup>

#### 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.<br>Indian/<br>Alaskan<br>Native | Asian/<br>Pacific<br>Islander | Black            | Hispanic/<br>Latino | Multiple/<br>Other | Unspec/<br>Missing | White  |
|--|----|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|
| Law enforcement contact                    |    |                                       |                               |                  |                     |                    |                    |        |
| Youth taken to temporary custody           |    |                                       |                               |                  |                     |                    |                    |        |
| Youth issued citation/referral             | 3* |                                       |                               |                  |                     |                    |                    |        |
| Youth referred to diversion                | 9  | 0%                                    | <mark>11.10%</mark>           | 0%               | 0%                  | 0%                 | 0%                 | 88.90% |
| Youth enrolled in diversion                | 8  | 0%                                    | <mark>12.50%</mark>           | 0%               | 0%                  | 0%                 | 0%                 | 87.50% |
| Successful completion diversion            | 7  | 0%                                    | 0%                            | 0%               | 0%                  | 0%                 | 0%                 | 100%   |
| Youth with multiple charges                | 1  | 0%                                    | 0%                            | 0%               | 0%                  | 0%                 | 100%               | 0%     |
| Filed on in adult court                    | 5  | 0%                                    | 0%                            | 0%               | 20%                 | 0%                 | 40%                | 40%    |
| RAI Override: More<br>Severe               | 2  | 0%                                    | 0%                            | 50%              | 50%                 | 0%                 | 0%                 | 0%     |
| RAI Override: Less<br>Severe               | 0  | 0%                                    | 0%                            | 0%               | 0%                  | 0%                 | 0%                 | 0%     |
| Probation intake                           | 2  | 0%                                    | 0%                            | <mark>50%</mark> | <mark>50%</mark>    | 0%                 | 0%                 | 0%     |
| Successful probation                       | 7  | 0%                                    | 14.30%                        | 28.60%           | 0%                  | 0%                 | 0%                 | 57.10% |
| Revocation of probation                    | 2  | 0%                                    | 0%                            | 0%               | 0%                  | 0%                 | 0%                 | 100%   |
| Youth in OJS custody                       |    |                                       |                               |                  | 1                   |                    |                    |        |
| OJS custody: placed in detention           |    |                                       |                               |                  | 1                   |                    |                    | -      |
| Youth booked into detention                |    |                                       |                               |                  | -1                  |                    |                    |        |
| Youth booked into detention more than once |    |                                       |                               |                  |                     |                    |                    |        |

<sup>\*</sup>Deuel County sheriff only partially reported in 2015



# **Family Level**

- Table 15: Deuel County's poverty rate is comparable to the rest of the state. But youth at 185% below poverty –is much higher than the state average.
  - o Relative high rates of high school graduation,
  - o High computer ownership lower broadband internet access (for purposes of COVID.)
  - o Higher rate of homeownership.
- Table 16: 10<sup>th</sup> graders report higher rates of people there to listen to them (as compared to the rest of the state.).
- Table 17: Very low rates of violence, domestic assault.
- Table 18: Only 35 cases were reported to CPS, and only 6% were substantiated, lower than the rest of the state.

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

| Measurement                          |                          | Deuel              | Nebraska |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------|
| Poverty/SES                          | Children <18 in Poverty  | <mark>14.4%</mark> | 14.8%    |
| -                                    | Number of children 12-   | 44                 | 43,814   |
|                                      | 17 below 185% poverty    |                    |          |
|                                      | Percent of children 12-  | 46.8%              | 28.9%    |
|                                      | 17 below 185% poverty    |                    |          |
|                                      |                          |                    |          |
| Educational attainment               | Age 25+ with B.D.        | 15.8%              | 31.3%    |
|                                      | County rank              | 88                 | -        |
|                                      | Age 25+ with some        | 30.3%              | 23.0%    |
|                                      | college, no degree       |                    |          |
|                                      | County rank              | 7                  | -        |
|                                      | Age 25+ with HS degree   | <mark>89.8%</mark> | 91.1%    |
|                                      | County Rank              | 71                 | -        |
|                                      |                          |                    |          |
| Technology and computers in the home | % under 18 with a        | 97.9%              | 96.9%    |
|                                      | computer at home         |                    |          |
|                                      | County rank              | 54                 | -        |
|                                      | % under 18 with an       | 88.1%              | 91.0%    |
|                                      | internet subscription at |                    |          |
|                                      | home                     |                    |          |
|                                      | County rank              | 64                 | -        |
|                                      | % under 18 with          | 88.1%              | 90.8%    |
|                                      | broadband internet       |                    |          |
|                                      | access at home           |                    |          |
|                                      | County Rank              | 61                 | -        |
|                                      |                          |                    |          |





| Housing        | Owner-occupied households            | 624   | 498,567 |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------|---------|
|                | Total households                     | 824   | 754,063 |
|                | Owner %                              | 75.7% | 66.1%   |
|                | Renters                              | 200   | 255,496 |
|                | Renter %                             | 24.3% | 33.9%   |
| Transportation | Households with no vehicle available | 31    | 40,465  |
|                | Total households                     | 824   | 754,063 |
|                | No vehicle %                         | 3.8%  | 5.4%    |
|                |                                      |       |         |

Table 16. Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2016) <sup>d</sup>

|          |                             | 8 <sup>th</sup> | 10 <sup>th</sup>    | 12 <sup>th</sup> |
|----------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Deuel    | Adult at home who listens   | 84.60%          | <mark>89.50%</mark> | 84.80%           |
| Nebraska |                             | 87.3%           | 85.0%               | 85.6%            |
| Deuel    | Adult at school who listens | 88.50%          | <mark>94.70%</mark> | 84.80%           |
| Nebraska |                             | 85.2%           | 85.0%               | 87.4%            |

Table 17.

Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means (2019) 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             |                   |                   |
| Deuel    | 1                 | 0                 | 0                 | 0                 |
| Nebraska | 562               | 402               | 2512              | 2019              |

Table 18. Child Abuse and Neglect Reports (2018) i

|          | Abuse/Neglect Calls | Reports Assessed | Substantiated | Unfounded |
|----------|---------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Deuel    | 35                  | 49%              | 6%            | 82%       |
| Nebraska | 36,480              | 33.4%            | 16.0%         | 68.3%     |



# **Community Level**

- Table 19: no assaults reported in 2019.
- Table 20: Youth in your community understand that adult think marijuana use (across all age groups), alcohol and cigarettes are "wrong" to use. Fewer 10th graders think their parent(s) oppose alcohol use.
- Table 21: 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). Diversion appears to have an in-depth policy for sealing records.

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

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

No data presented, or frequencies are 0

Table 20. Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2016) d

|          |                               | 8 <sup>th</sup>     | 10 <sup>th</sup>   | 12 <sup>th</sup>   |
|----------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Deuel    | Wrong/very wrong – Marijuana  | <mark>100.0%</mark> | <mark>94.7%</mark> | <mark>93.9%</mark> |
| Nebraska |                               | 94.4%               | 89.8%              | 85.2%              |
| Deuel    | Wrong/very wrong – alcohol    | 88.5%               | <mark>68.4%</mark> | 66.7%              |
| Nebraska |                               | 89.1%               | 80.4%              | 68.7%              |
| Deuel    | Wrong/very wrong – cigarettes | 92.3%               | 89.5%              | 81.8%              |
| Nebraska |                               | 92.9%               | 89.0%              | 78.7%              |





Table 21.

Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>

#### see Appendix for yearly data

|   | Number of charges<br>Sealed | Total Number of<br>charges | Sealed<br>(%)      |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Dismissed or Dropped                    | 19                          | 23                         | <mark>82.6%</mark> |
| Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ     |                             | -                          | <mark></mark>      |
| Filed in Juv. Court                     | 18                          | 30                         | <mark>60.0%</mark> |
| Filed in Adult Court (M or I)           | 12                          | 12                         | 100.0%             |
| Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to |                             |                            |                    |
| Juv. Court                              |                             |                            |                    |
| Total                                   | 49                          | 70                         | 70.0%              |

<sup>\*</sup>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

Table 22: JUSTICE data indicates that your county has a higher rate of legal representation compared to the rest of the state.

Table 23-24: No curfew filings- excellent. Why? These types of low level cases that could be diverted from court system, and this seems to be the case in Deuel County.

Table 25: With respect to diversion practices, the community seems to be using best practices:

- o Allow a youth to do diversion more than once (dependent in circumstances).
- Allowing warning letters for the lowest risk youth
- Develop a process for sealing diversion cases.

Table 22.

Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) <sup>n</sup>

|                   | Deuel        | Nebraska |
|-------------------|--------------|----------|
| Access to Counsel | 80.0% 100.0% | 73.5%    |

<u>Neb. Rev. 43-272</u>. 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 43-247, counsel shall be appointed for such juvenile.

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

|                     | Deuel | Nebraska |
|---------------------|-------|----------|
| Curfew Court Filing | 0     | 352      |





Table 24. Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019)  $^{\rm m}$ 

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

|                                 |      | 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) °

|                                       | Deuel               | Nebraska *       |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Refer ALL juveniles who are first     | Not sure            | 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 | Sometimes           | Always: 47.7%    |
| unsuccessful on diversion             |                     | Sometimes: 47.7% |
|                                       |                     | Not sure: 4.5%   |
| Allow a juvenile to complete          | Not sure            | Yes: 61.4%       |
| diversion more than once              |                     | No: 34.1%        |
|                                       |                     | Not sure: 4.5%   |
| Charges/offenses that make a          | Yes; Felony charges | Yes: 86.4%       |
| juvenile ineligible for diversion     |                     | No: 9.1%         |
|                                       |                     | Not sure: 4.5%   |
| Warning letters instead of            | Yes                 | 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                       | No   | Yes: 86.4%<br>No: 13.6%<br>Not sure: 0.0%  |
|---|--|--|
| Use of graduated responses prior to discharge | Yes; send letters and other options to address barriers that may prevent successful completion | Yes: 47.7%<br>No: 25.0%<br>Not sure: 27.3% |
| Sealing diversion records                     | No   | Yes: 59.1%<br>No: 22.7%<br>Not sure: 18.2% |

<sup>\*</sup>responses included 44 juvenile diversion programs; representing 68 counties/tribe (91.9% response rate)

# **Community Team Level**

- Table 26-27: A community lead should be able to get roughly a 75% response, to ensure
  active participation on planning issues; your response rate was quite low, at 11.7%. However,
  this is likely because it went to a very large team of 137. The sixteen people that responded
  gave the team good scores on collective impact.
- Table 28: It might be beneficial to add diversity to your team.
  - Very few younger people on the team (perhaps did not reply to the survey).
  - Need diverse representation (especially because of the patterns of over and under representation.) You may have Black, Hispanic, and Asian community members on your team, perhaps they didn't take the survey.
  - o Are probation, law enforcement, county attorney and defense counsel on your teams?
  - o Good representation of persons formerly involved in the system.
  - Roughly 25% of your team reported not feeling heard, but that is likely not representative – due to low response rate.

Table 26.
Collective Impact Survey Response Rates P

|                             | Panhandle |                    | Nebr  | aska  |
|-----------------------------|-----------|--------------------|-------|-------|
| Year of survey              | 2019      | 2020               | 2019  | 2020  |
| Number of surveys sent      | 24        | <mark>137</mark>   | 1407  | 780   |
| Number of completed surveys | 12        | <mark>16</mark>    | 221   | 345   |
| Response rate               | 50.0%     | <mark>11.7%</mark> | 28.3% | 24.5% |

Table 27.
Collective Impact Survey Scores <sup>p</sup>

|                          | Panhan     | dle               | Nebra      | aska |            |  |      |       |
|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|------------|------|------------|--|------|-------|
| Year of survey           | 2019       | 2020              | 2019       | 2020 |            |  |      |       |
|                          | Mean Score |                   | Mean Score |      | Mean Score |  | Mean | Score |
| Common agenda            | 5.33       | <mark>5.27</mark> | 5.29       | 5.69 |            |  |      |       |
| Mutually reinforcing     | 5.52       | <mark>5.13</mark> | 5.37       | 5.50 |            |  |      |       |
| Shared measurement       | 5.57       | <u>5.60</u>       | 5.21       | 5.45 |            |  |      |       |
| Continuous communication | 5.98       | <mark>5.15</mark> | 5.49       | 5.55 |            |  |      |       |
| Backbone agency          | 6.16       | <u>5.64</u>       | 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 <sup>q</sup>

Table 28.
Community Planning Team Diversity P

|                             | Panha         | Panhandle |         | raska |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------|-------|
|                             | N = 16        | (%)       | N = 345 | (%)   |
| Gender                      |               |           |         |       |
| Male                        | 2             | 12.5%     | 101     | 29.3% |
| Female                      | 13            | 81.3%     | 229     | 66.4% |
| Missing                     | 1             | 6.3%      | 15      | 4.3%  |
| Age                         |               |           |         |       |
| Under 30                    |               |           | 19      | 5.6%  |
| 30-39                       | <mark></mark> | <u></u>   | 68      | 19.6% |
| 40-49                       | 3             | 18.9%     | 88      | 25.4% |
| 50-59                       | 8             | 50.2%     | 90      | 25.8% |
| 60 and over                 | 3             | 18.9%     | 44      | 13%   |
| Missing                     | 2             | 12.5%     | 36      | 10.4% |
| Race/Ethnicity              |               |           |         |       |
| White                       | 9             | 56.3%     | 230     | 66.7% |
| Black                       |               |           | 10      | 2.9%  |
| Hispanic                    |               |           | 13      | 3.8%  |
| Native American             | 1             | 6.3%      | 6       | 1.7%  |
| Asian                       | <b></b>       |           | 1       | 0.3%  |
| Other                       |               |           | 2       | 0.6%  |
| Provided town name          | 4             | 25.0%     | 63      | 18.3% |
| Missing                     | 2             | 12.5%     | 19      | 5.5%  |
| Previous System Involvement |               |           |         |       |





| Yes                               | 5              | 31.3%              | 98  | 28.4% |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----|-------|
| No                                | 11             | 68.8%              | 242 | 70.1% |
| Missing                           |                |                    | 5   | 1.4%  |
|                                   |                |                    |     |       |
| System Point *                    |                |                    |     |       |
| Law enforcement                   |                |                    | 34  | 7.8%  |
| County attorney/ juvenile court   |                |                    | 32  | 7.3%  |
| K-12 or secondary education       | 5              | 29.4%              | 65  | 14.9% |
| Ministry/faith based              | 1              | 5.9%               | 10  | 2.3%  |
| Diversion                         | 3              | 17.6%              | 55  | 12.6% |
| <b>Probation</b>                  |                |                    | 31  | 7.1%  |
| Public defender/ defense counsel/ |                |                    | 8   | 1.8%  |
| guardian ad litem                 |                |                    |     |       |
| DHHS or Child Welfare             | 1              | 5.9%               | 13  | 3.0%  |
| Treatment provider                | 1              | 5.9%               | 40  | 9.2%  |
| Post adjudication or detention    |                |                    | 8   | 1.8%  |
| Community based program           | 5              | 29.4%              | 109 | 25.0% |
| Elected official or government    |                |                    | 6   | 1.4%  |
| Restorative practices             |                |                    | 6   | 1.4%  |
| Backbone or system improvement    | 1              | 5.9%               | 3   | 0.7%  |
| Other                             |                |                    | 16  | 3.7%  |
|                                   |                |                    |     |       |
| Voice on Team                     |                |                    |     |       |
| Feel heard                        | 12             | 75.0%              | 270 | 78.3% |
| Do not feel heard                 | <mark>4</mark> | <mark>25.0%</mark> | 75  | 21.7% |

Banner n = 3, Box Butte n = 3, Cheyenne n = 5, Dawes n = 5, Deuel n = 3, Garden n = 3, Kimball n = 3, Morrill n = 2, Scotts Bluff n = 7, Sioux n = 2, Sheridan n = 2 (three people named more than one county they represent

<sup>\*</sup>note. Team members could have selected more than one system point; as such, they do not add up to 100%

#### References and Resources

- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>b</sup> School membership, chronic absenteeism, student disability, and free/reduced lunch: Prepared by Sara Simonsen, Nebraska Department of Education
- <sup>c</sup> **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
- <sup>d</sup> 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: <a href="https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx">https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx</a>
  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
- <sup>1</sup>Child abuse and neglect
- <sup>j</sup> **Community violence:** Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics: https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx
- <sup>k</sup> Distance to detention facility: Google Maps
- <sup>1</sup>Racial 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

- <sup>m</sup> 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
- <sup>n</sup> **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
- <sup>o</sup> **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
- <sup>q</sup> Collective Impact Elements: Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective Impact. Stanford Social Innovation Review.

# **Appendix: Sealed Court 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<br>Sealed | Total Number of charges | Sealed<br>(%) |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| Dismissed or Dropped                    | 9                           | 9                       | 100.0%        |
| Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ     |                             | -                       |               |
| Filed in Juv. Court                     | 5                           | 5                       | 100.0%        |
| Filed in Adult Court (M or I)           | 5                           | 5                       | 100.0%        |
| Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to |                             |                         |               |
| Juv. Court                              |                             |                         |               |
| Total                                   | 19                          | 19                      | 100.0%        |

| 2016                                    | Number of charges<br>Sealed | Total Number of<br>charges | Sealed<br>(%) |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Dismissed or Dropped                    |                             |                            |               |
| Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ     |                             |                            |               |
| Filed in Juv. Court                     |                             |                            |               |
| Filed in Adult Court (M or I)           | 2                           | 2                          | 100.0%        |
| Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to |                             |                            |               |
| Juv. Court                              |                             |                            |               |
| Total                                   | 2                           | 2                          | 100.0%        |

| 2017                                    | Number of charges<br>Sealed | Total Number of<br>charges | Sealed<br>(%) |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Dismissed or Dropped                    | 8                           | 8                          | 100.0%        |
| Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ     |                             | -                          |               |
| Filed in Juv. Court                     | 8                           | 15                         | 53.3%         |
| Filed in Adult Court (M or I)           | 1                           | 1                          | 100.0%        |
| Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to |                             |                            |               |
| Juv. Court                              | 47                          | 24                         | 70.00/        |
| Total                                   | 17                          | 24                         | 70.8%         |





| 2018                                    | Number of charges<br>Sealed | Total Number of<br>charges | Sealed<br>(%) |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Dismissed or Dropped                    | 0                           | 1                          | 0.0%          |
| Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ     |                             |                            |               |
| Filed in Juv. Court                     | 5                           | 5                          | 100.0%        |
| Filed in Adult Court (M or I)           |                             |                            |               |
| Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to |                             |                            |               |
| Juv. Court                              |                             |                            |               |
| Total                                   | 5                           | 11                         | 45.5%         |

| 2019                                    | Number of charges<br>Sealed | Total Number of<br>charges | Sealed<br>(%) |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Dismissed or Dropped                    | 2                           | 5                          | 40.0%         |
| Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ     |                             |                            |               |
| Filed in Juv. Court                     | 0                           | 5                          | 0.0%          |
| Filed in Adult Court (M or I)           | 4                           | 4                          | 100.0%        |
| Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to |                             |                            |               |
| Juv. Court                              |                             |                            |               |
| Total                                   | 6                           | 14                         | 42.9%         |