



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Douglas 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	4
School Membership by Race/ Ethnicity and School Year (2014-2019) ^b	4
Disabilities, English Proficiency, Eligibility for Free/Reduced Lunch and School Year (2014 – 2019) ^b	5
Nebraska Public High School 4-Year Graduation Rates by County (5-year estimates, 2015-2019) ^c	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
Estimated Gang Involvement by Local Law Enforcement	7
Arrest Rates for Adults and Juveniles for 2018 and 2019 with Percent Change ^f	7
Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017-2019) ^g	9
Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) by Sex ^g	9
Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) by Race/Ethnicity ^g	9
Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019) ⁱ	10
Family Level	12
Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportation (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a	12
Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) ^d	13
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means ^h	13
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ	13
Community Level	14
Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) ^j	14
Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d	14
Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) ^m	15
Policy, Legal and System Level	16
Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) ⁿ	16
Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) ^m	16
Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) ^m	17
County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) ^o	17
Community Team Level	19
Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^p	19
Collective Impact Survey Scores ^p	19



UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

EVIDENCE-BASED
NEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Community Planning Team Diversity ^P	20
References and Resources	22
Appendix: RED Descriptives	24
Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year	30



Youth Level

- Black, Hispanic/Latino, youth of multiple races have disproportionately higher chronic absenteeism as compared to the school membership population (and compared to the state averages) – with the disproportionality higher for Black youth. The trend for both Hispanic and Black youth has increased over the past 5 school years.
- Fewer youth have IDEA and 504 plans as compared to the state; there are higher rates of limited English proficiency and free/reduced lunch. Graduation rates are lower than the state average, and the county is ranked 89 of 93.
- Fewer youth report depression, worry, and suicidal ideation; and more youth report feeling hopeful as compared to the state averages.
- Substance use appears to be similar, if not less of a problem, than the state averages – with the exception of 12th graders in which alcohol use, binge drinking, marijuana use, and vaping are higher.
- Gang activity is increasing for girls, and most violent crime is attributed to gangs
- Burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, other assaults, fraud, and weapons possession crimes increased at a higher rate from 2018 to 2019 for juveniles than all ages; however, DUIs, liquor laws, and drug possession decreased from 2018 to 2019 for all ages, but especially for juveniles
- Risk assessment domains for youth assessed at the JAC for diversion suggest Education/Employment, Peer Relationships, and Personality/Behavior are the areas of highest need. Males have higher needs than females for Education/Employment, Substance Use, and Attitudes/Orientation. Risk assessment scores were higher for youth of color than White youth. For Hispanic, Black, and youth of multiple races, several domains were higher than the comparison White group: Family, Education/Employment, Leisure/Recreation, Personality/Behavior, and Attitudes/Orientation, while Substance Use was higher for White youth.
- Black youth are over-represented at all system points compared to the population (unfortunately, we do not have law enforcement data by race/ethnicity to see if Black youth are being referred to these system point at a rate that is proportional to law enforcement stops of citations/referrals). Once referred to diversion, Black youth are enrolling and are successful at the same rate as they are referred. The disproportionality for Black youth is even higher for Crossover diversion, filed on with multiple charges, filed on in adult court, and probation intake. Black youth have both higher RAI overrides to more severe and less severe placements. Once on probation, Black youth have a higher rate of revocation.
- Hispanic youth are referred to diversion at a rate proportional to the juvenile population and are referred to Crossover diversion at a lower rate than to the population. Hispanic youth have a higher rate of being filed on in adult court, and once on probation have a higher rate of successful completion as compared to the population rate.
- Refer to the yearly RED tables in the Appendix to see if RED patterns have improved, declined, or stayed the same from 2015 to 2019.



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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%
Douglas	31,263	58.0%	19.6%	14.1%	0.9%	2.9%	4.5%

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%
Douglas	30,510	58.3%	18.3%	12.5%	0.8%	3.9%	6.3%

[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
2014-2015	Douglas	95,226	21.69%	4.39%	0.73%	15.66%	0.16%	52.88%	4.48%
	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-2016	Douglas	96,413	22.03%	4.75%	0.68%	15.44%	0.18%	52.32%	4.60%
	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-2017	Douglas	97,656	22.64%	5.05%	0.64%	15.34%	0.19%	51.41%	4.73%
	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-2018	Douglas	99,303	23.00%	5.41%	0.60%	15.17%	0.18%	50.76%	4.89%
	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-2019	Douglas	100,404	23.48%	5.64%	0.58%	14.90%	0.18%	50.25%	4.96%
	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
2014-2015	Douglas	13,878	27.13%	2.69%	1.97%	26.81%	0.25%	35.24%	5.91%
	Nebraska	35,638	24.54%	1.64%	4.42%	12.93%	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-2016	Douglas	15,488	28.97%	2.37%	1.68%	27.20%	0.37%	33.61%	5.81%
	Nebraska	38,812	25.73%	1.55%	4.27%	13.68%	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
2016-2017	Douglas	17,486	29.89%	2.68%	1.58%	27.71%	0.35%	32.07%	5.71%
	Nebraska	42,290	26.90%	1.66%	4.40%	14.22%	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-2018	Douglas	19,294	30.48%	3.00%	1.38%	27.75%	0.25%	31.08%	6.06%
	Nebraska	46,365	26.81%	1.77%	4.18%	14.49%	0.22%	47.37%	5.15%
2018-2019	Douglas	19,424	31.31%	3.04%	1.33%	28.07%	0.29%	29.95%	6.02%
	Nebraska	46,356	27.64%	1.76%	4.16%	14.71%	0.23%	46.27%	5.23%

Table 4.

Disabilities, English Proficiency, Eligibility for Free/Reduced Lunch and School Year (2014 – 2019)^b

Year	Geographic Area	Total Count	IDEA	504 Plan	Limited English Proficiency	Free/Reduced Lunch
2014-2015	Douglas	95,226	13.84%	0.42%	8.96%	49.32%
	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	44.53%
2015-2016	Douglas	96,413	13.92%	0.54%	8.60%	49.46%
	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-2017	Douglas	97,656	14.02%	0.60%	10.46%	47.93%
	Nebraska	318,853	13.80%	0.93%	6.99%	44.76%
2017-2018	Douglas	99,303	15.81%	0.62%	9.73%	51.15%
	Nebraska	323,391	15.87%	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-2019	Douglas	100,404	15.98%	0.32%	10.40%	48.23%
	Nebraska	325,984	16.13%	0.85%	6.78%	45.42%

Table 5.

Nebraska Public High School 4-Year Graduation Rates by County (5-year estimates, 2015-2019)^c

County	Total in Last 5 Years		Yearly Averages		Graduation Rate	Rank
	Graduates	Students	Graduates	Students		
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	-



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Douglas	28,125	32,995	703.1	824.9	85.2%	89
----------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	-----------

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.

Table 6.

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

		8th	10th	12th
Douglas	Loss of sleep from worry	16.1%	14.3%	15.0%
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
Douglas	Depressed	29.2%	30.7%	34.4%
Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
Douglas	Considered/Attempted suicide	14.4%	15.8%	12.0%
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
Douglas	Current alcohol	10.9%	19.4%	41.8%
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
Douglas	Current binge drinking	1.1%	4.7%	17.9%
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%
Douglas	Current marijuana	2.7%	8.6%	19.1%
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
Douglas	Current tobacco	2.8%	4.7%	8.9%
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%
Douglas	Current vaping	13.4%	26.4%	40.4%
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
Douglas	Hopeful for future (past week)	75.7%	79.4%	78.5%
Nebraska		72.1%	74.7%	78.4%

****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
Douglas	Youth Reported Gang Involvement	4.3%	4.6%	4.4%
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

Table 11b.

Estimated Gang Involvement by Local Law Enforcement

Per Sergeant Jon Waller with Omaha Police Department Gang Intelligence via email on September 11, 2020:

Omaha currently has recognized 86 different gangs with 3024 suspected members with 201 of those members being between the ages of 13 and 17. The Police Department is conservative when documenting new gang members and will use the criteria of self-admission before classifying someone as a member. The gangs are made up of all races and ethnicities, and can be diverse, however there are some that are primarily Black, Hispanic, African, or by other ethnic groups. Most of the gang members are male, but **female membership is one of the rising demographics** – the Police Department has recently hired a female civilian gang specialist to address this issue.

Most of the violent crime in Omaha can be attributed to gang activity, although the gangs are involved in a wide array of crimes, ranging from destruction of property to homicide. The department uses a three-part approach of prevention, intervention, and enforcement, and works closely with community groups that focus on interacting with juveniles between the ages of 10-17.

Table 12.

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

Arrestee Age	All Arrestee Ages			Under 18		
Summary Arrest Date	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %
Jurisdiction by Geography	DOUGLAS COUNTY					
Arrest Offense						
Total	21,895	21,896	0.00	2,746	3,131	14.02
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	24	20	-16.67	4	1	-75.00
Manslaughter by Negligence	0	1	-	0	0	-
Rape Total	112	115	2.68	26	22	-15.38



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Robbery Total	203	263	29.56	82	99	20.73
Aggravated Assault Total	603	617	2.32	36	34	-5.56
Burglary Total	148	173	16.89	21	28	33.33
Larceny-Theft Total	3,031	3,111	2.64	656	788	20.12
Motor Vehicle Theft Total	194	213	9.79	45	75	66.67
Other Assaults	3,661	3,844	5.00	526	656	24.71
Arson	40	33	-17.50	14	13	-7.14
Forgery and Counterfeiting	105	76	-27.62	5	1	-80.00
Fraud	517	504	-2.51	25	32	28.00
Embezzlement	24	18	-25.00	1	2	100.00
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	515	451	-12.43	65	78	20.00
Vandalism	808	832	2.97	148	182	22.97
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	467	551	17.99	51	75	47.06
Prostitution	3	11	266.67	0	0	-
Assisting or Promoting Prostitution	6	1	-83.33	0	0	-
Prostitution Total for Summary	41	31	-24.39	0	0	-
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	175	181	3.43	32	29	-9.38
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	709	677	-4.51	31	34	9.68
Drug Violations - Possession	2,625	2,200	-16.19	286	259	-9.44
NIBRS Unable to Classify	-	1	-			-
Gambling	0	3	-	0	0	-
All Other Gambling	0	3	-	0	0	-
Offenses Against Family and Children	347	379	9.22	4	1	-75.00
Driving Under the Influence	1,985	1,962	-1.16	22	15	-31.82
Liquor Laws	438	397	-9.36	102	60	-41.18
Disorderly Conduct	1,006	1,104	9.74	201	222	10.45
Vagrancy	6	9	50.00	0	0	-
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	4,063	4,084	0.52	325	397	22.15
Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	39	30	-23.08	38	28	-26.32
Human Trafficking/Commercial Sex Acts	0	1	-	0	0	-



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Table 13.

Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017-2019) ^g

Score	Douglas (2017-2019)		All YLS Counties (2015-2017)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Family Circumstance/Parenting	1.28	1.48	1.20	1.32
Education/Employment	1.63	1.49	1.27	1.35
Peer Relationships	1.72	1.17	1.78	1.08
Substance Use	1.15	1.43	1.29	1.40
Leisure/Recreation	0.90	0.97	0.88	0.95
Personality/Behavior	1.62	1.62	1.34	1.52
Attitudes/Orientation	0.51	0.90	0.45	0.79
Mean Score	<i>M</i> = 8.80, <i>SD</i> = 6.42, 0-31		<i>M</i> = 8.23, <i>SD</i> = 5.22, 0-31	

Douglas County *n* = 2514; Statewide *n* = 2124

Table 13b.

Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) by Sex ^g

	Female	Male
Family Circumstance/Parenting	1.28	1.29
Education/Employment ***	1.49	1.72
Peer Relationships	1.68	1.75
Substance Use ***	.98	1.26
Leisure/Recreation	.90	.90
Personality/Behavior	1.59	1.64
Attitudes/Orientation ***	.43	.57
Total YLS Score	8.32	9.12

Note. ANOVA for sex indicated Education/Employment, Substance Use, and Attitudes/Orientation were greater issues for males than females. *** *p* < .001

Table 13c.

Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) by Race/Ethnicity ^g

	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Other/Multiple	White ^a
Family Circumstance/Parenting***	1.37*	1.39	1.61*	1.20	1.09
Education/Employment ***	1.97*	1.06	1.91*	1.88*	1.24
Peer Relationships **	1.68	1.67	1.89*	1.87	1.66
Substance Use ***	0.94*	0.78*	1.22	1.00*	1.33
Leisure/Recreation ***	0.91*	0.59	1.33*	1.01*	0.72
Personality/Behavior ***	1.77*	1.27	1.79*	1.87*	1.43
Attitudes/Orientation ***	0.61*	0.45	0.56*	0.53	0.42
Total YLS Score ***	9.24*	7.17	10.33*	9.27*	7.88



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Note. ANOVA for race/ethnicity indicated significant differences by race/ethnicity on YLS total score and all YLS domains (except Prior Offenses, which is not reported).*** p<.001 ** p <.01

^a White youth were the comparison group and a * indicates that group was statistically different from White youth

Table 14.
Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019) ¹

[Click here to see Census and School Population Data](#)

See [Appendix for yearly data](#)

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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	14,309*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	6157	1.0%	1.8%	36.2%	19.7%	0.8%	0.1%	40.4%
Youth enrolled in diversion	3683	1.0%	1.7%	34.6%	19.7%	0.7%	0.1%	42.2%
Successful completion diversion	2952	0.8%	1.7%	32.1%	18.1%	0.9%	0.1%	46.3%
Crossover Youth referred to diversion	743	2.6%	1.6%	51.3%	11.8%	4.3%	0.0%	28.4%
Crossover Youth enrolled in diversion	163	3.1%	1.2%	47.9%	16.0%	5.5%	0.0%	26.4%
Crossover Youth Successful completion diversion	85	5.9%	2.4%	41.2%	14.1%	4.7%	0.0%	31.8%
Youth with multiple charges	649	0.8%	0.9%	46.5%	17.4%	0%	7.60%	26.8%
Filed on in adult court	459	1.3%	0.7%	53.8%	24.4%	0%	2%	17.9%
RAI Override: More Severe	1281	3.7%	1.2%	53.9%	17.8%	0.5%	0%	22.9%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

RAI Override: Less Severe	475	1.9%	1.3%	52.0%	20.8%	1.3%	0%	22.7%
Probation intake	3829	3.1%	1.4%	52.5%	20.6%	0.9%	0%	21.5%
Successful probation	3284	2.3%	1.4%	42.2%	24.4%	2.1%	0%	27.6%
Revocation of probation	1133	4.9%	1.1%	51.4%	21.7%	1.3%	0%	19.5%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Waterloo PD did not report to NCC 2015 - 2018

Family Level

- The rate of children <18 in poverty is slightly higher for the county than the state average rate. The rate of technology and computers in the home is slightly lower than the state average. The proportion of renters and homes without a vehicle is slightly higher than the state average.
- Youth in all grades report having a supportive adult at home at a rate similar to the state; but 8th graders report not having a supportive adult at school.

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

Measurement		Douglas	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	17.2%	14.8%
	Number of children 12-17 below 185% poverty	13,877	43,814
	Percent of children 12-17 below 185% poverty	31.6%	28.9%
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	38.9%	31.3%
	County Rank	2	-
	Age 25+ with some college, no degree	22.1%	23.0%
	County Rank	74	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	90.0%	91.1%
	County Rank	69	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a computer at home	94.9%	96.9%
	County Rank	80	-
	% under 18 with an internet subscription at home	89.5%	91.0%
	County Rank	58	-
	% under 18 with broadband internet access at home	89.3%	90.8%
	County Rank	57	-



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Housing	Owner-occupied households	132,654	498,567
	Total households	215,787	754,063
	Owner %	61.5%	66.1%
	Renters	83,133	255,496
	Renter %	38.5%	33.9%
Transportation	Households with no vehicle available	15,437	40,465
	Total households	215,787	754,063
	No vehicle %	7.2%	5.4%

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Douglas	Adult at home who listens	87.6%	87.3%	87.3%
Nebraska		87.3%	85.0%	85.6%
Douglas	Adult at school who listens	77.6%	88.6%	89.8%
Nebraska		85.2%	85.0%	87.4%

Table 17.
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means ^h

	Aggravated Domestic Assaults Reported	Aggravated Domestic Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means	Simple Domestic Assaults Reported	Simple Domestic Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means
Douglas	7	7	138	129
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

Table 18.
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Douglas	13,303	34%	17%	68%
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%

Community Level

- The county comprises of most of the arrests for violent crime in the state – especially robberies.
- Youth report that people in their community find marijuana, alcohol, and cigarettes wrong or very wrong at a higher rate than the state averages.
- 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.
- There are higher levels of missing data at the court level. Data for race and ethnicity at each juvenile justice system point is imperative for an accurate Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) analysis.

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

Type of Violence	Douglas		Nebraska
	<i>n</i>	% within state	
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	20	58.8%	34
Rape	115	43.6%	264
Robbery	263	71.7%	367
Aggravated Assault	617	37.6%	1,639
Other Assaults	3,844	43.8%	8,782

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Douglas	Wrong/very wrong – Marijuana	93.6%	88.8%	83.6%
Nebraska		94.4%	89.8%	85.2%
Douglas	Wrong/very wrong – alcohol	89.7%	83.5%	71.9%
Nebraska		89.1%	80.4%	68.7%
Douglas	Wrong/very wrong – cigarettes	92.7%	90.9%	84.7%
Nebraska		92.9%	89.0%	78.7%



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	6202	7363	84.2%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	5008	9309	53.8%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	792	1084	73.1%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	61	230	26.5%
Total			

*Cases offered diversion, mediation or RJ are not available data points in in JUSTICE. Many 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 required under statute to provide an attorney when a youth is filed on in court, but the rate from 2018 appears to still have from 20-40% of youth without access to counsel.
- Curfew filings do not appear to be an issue in the county.
- Truancy court filings peaked in 2017 but appear to have decreased since that time. This county comprises of about 20% of the Truancy filings.
- Diversion practices and procedures are consistent with evidence-based practices. 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

	Douglas	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	60.0% -- 79.9%	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 43-247, counsel shall be appointed for such juvenile.

Table 23.

Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) ^m

	Douglas	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	3	352



Table 24.

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

	Douglas					
Filed Subtype	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	28	153	209	150	138	678
3B - Uncontrollable	2	1	0	0	0	3
3C – Mentally Ill 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 Ill and Dangerous	22	48	37	22	23	306

Table 25.

County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) ^o

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



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Fees beyond restitution	No	Yes: 86.4% No: 13.6% Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior to discharge	Yes; if failure to comply with services then may get amended case plan	Yes: 47.7% No: 25.0% Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	Yes; warning letters and successfully completed are sealed. Once agreed by the county attorney, a notification is automatically sent from case management system to seal. Staff periodically also check to see if any eligible charges were overlooked.	Yes: 59.1% No: 22.7% Not sure: 18.2%

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



Community Team Level

- A community lead should be able to get roughly a 75% response, to ensure active participation on planning issues. The community team in this county was undergoing some changes at the time of the survey, which likely affected the response rate from 2020.
- Of those that responded, the collective impact domains were lower than the state but appeared to improve from 2019 to 2020 (but again, with the lower response rate, please use this information with caution). It appears that shared measurement has been the consistently lowest domain in the county.
- The community team should be representative of the population of that community but should also include diverse populations. Although the response rate was low, of those that responded, the team could benefit from additional Hispanic members to match the population of the county.
- There is good representation of persons formerly involved in the system and other system points.
- About 25% of those who responded did not feel heard, which is similar to community teams across the state.

Table 26.

Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^P

	Douglas		Nebraska	
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020
Number of surveys sent	15	439	1407	780
Number of completed surveys	8	38	221	345
Response rate	53.3%	8.7%	28.3%	24.5%

Table 27.

Collective Impact Survey Scores ^P

	Douglas		Nebraska	
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020
	Mean Score		Mean Score	
Common agenda	4.05	5.34	5.29	5.69
Mutually reinforcing	4.94	4.94	5.37	5.50
Shared measurement	4.25	4.97	5.21	5.45



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Continuous communication	4.78	5.14	5.49	5.55
Backbone agency	5.17	5.09	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

	Douglas		Nebraska	
	N = 38	(%)	N = 345	(%)
Gender				
Male	12	31.6%	101	29.3%
Female	22	57.9%	229	66.4%
Missing	4	10.5%	15	4.3%
Age				
Under 30	1	2.6%	19	5.6%
30-39	6	15.8%	68	19.6%
40-49	11	28.9%	88	25.4%
50-59	8	21.0%	90	25.8%
60 and over	5	13.0%	44	13%
Missing	7	18.4%	36	10.4%
Race/Ethnicity				
White	15	39.5%	230	66.7%
Black	5	13.2%	10	2.9%
Hispanic	1	2.6%	13	3.8%
Native American	1	2.6%	6	1.7%
Asian	--	--	1	0.3%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Other	3	7.9%	2	0.6%
Provided town name	8	21.1%	63	18.3%
Missing	5	13.2%	19	5.5%
Previous System Involvement				
Yes	11	28.9%	98	28.4%
No	24	63.2%	242	70.1%
Missing	3	7.9%	5	1.4%
System Point *				
Law enforcement	2	3.7%	34	7.8%
County attorney/ juvenile court	2	3.7%	32	7.3%
K-12 or secondary education	5	9.3%	65	14.9%
Ministry/faith based	1	1.9%	10	2.3%
Diversion	7	13.0%	55	12.6%
Probation	4	7.4%	31	7.1%
Public defender/ defense counsel/ guardian ad litem	2	3.7%	8	1.8%
DHHS or Child Welfare	1	1.9%	13	3.0%
Treatment provider	3	5.6%	40	9.2%
Post adjudication or detention	2	3.7%	8	1.8%
Community based program	20	37.0%	109	25.0%
Elected official or government	1	1.9%	6	1.4%
Restorative practices	--	--	6	1.4%
Backbone or system improvement	1	1.9%	3	0.7%
Other	--	--	16	3.7%
Voice on Team				
Feel heard	29	76.3%	270	78.3%
Do not feel heard	9	23.7%	75	21.7%

*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

ⁱ Child 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

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



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics:

<https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browseables.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

^o **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: RED Descriptives

[Click to go back to RED Summary Data](#)

2015

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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	2870*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	1206	0.8%	1.1%	33.6%	18.7%	0.3%	0.2%	45.3%
Youth enrolled in diversion	809	1.2%	1.0%	30.8%	19.5%	0.4%	0.1%	47.0%
Successful completion diversion	654	0.9%	1.1%	28.9%	17.0%	0.5%	0.2%	51.5%
Crossover Youth referred to diversion	127	3.9%	0.0%	58.3%	7.1%	6.3%	0.0%	24.4%
Crossover Youth enrolled in diversion	26	3.8%	0.0%	53.8%	15.4%	3.8%	0.0%	23.1%
Crossover Youth Successful completion diversion	18	5.6%	0.0%	50.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	27.8%
Youth with multiple charges	53	0%	0%	47.20%	11.30%	0%	9.40%	32.10%
Filed on in adult court	31	0%	0%	58.10%	16.10%	0%	0%	25.80%
RAI Override: More Severe	371	4.90%	0.30%	60.90%	12.70%	0.50%	0%	20.80%
RAI Override: Less Severe	100	2%	4%	49%	19%	0%	0%	26%
Probation intake	821	4.30%	0.70%	60.70%	13.60%	0.20%	0%	20.50%
Successful probation	1031	2%	1.10%	47.90%	22.40%	1.70%	0%	24.80%
Revocation of probation	212	3.80%	0.90%	47.20%	23.60%	2.40%	0%	22.20%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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

*Waterloo PD did not report to NCC 2015 - 2018

2016

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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	2825*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	1301	0.7%	1.5%	37.2%	18.9%	0.5%	0.1%	41.0%
Youth enrolled in diversion	803	0.4%	1.4%	37.6%	17.6%	0.5%	0.0%	42.6%
Successful completion diversion	632	0.3%	0.9%	34.5%	16.3%	0.5%	0.0%	47.5%
Crossover Youth referred to diversion	140	1.3%	2.0%	51.3%	12.0%	5.3%	0.0%	28.0%
Crossover Youth enrolled in diversion	35	2.9%	0.0%	51.4%	20.0%	8.6%	0.0%	17.1%
Crossover Youth Successful completion diversion	21	4.8%	0.0%	38.1%	19.0%	9.5%	0.0%	28.6%
Youth with multiple charges	137	0%	0.70%	50.40%	9.50%	0%	10.90%	28.50%
Filed on in adult court	68	0%	0%	39.70%	26.50%	0%	2.90%	30.90%
RAI Override: More Severe	319	2.50%	1.30%	55.80%	14.70%	0.60%	0%	25.10%
RAI Override: Less Severe	65	1.50%	0%	56.90%	15.40%	3.10%	0%	23.10%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Probation intake	785	2.20%	1.40%	54%	18.20%	1.10%	0%	23.10%
Successful probation	636	3.30%	1.90%	40.30%	24.10%	1.70%	0%	28.80%
Revocation of probation	279	5%	1.10%	57.30%	15.40%	0.40%	0%	20.80%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Waterloo PD did not report to NCC 2015 - 2018

2017

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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	2737*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	1308	1.1%	2.2%	36.5%	18.3%	1.1%	0.2%	40.6%
Youth enrolled in diversion	774	0.9%	2.2%	35.7%	16.5%	0.9%	0.1%	43.7%
Successful completion diversion	603	1.0%	2.5%	32.0%	15.6%	1.2%	0.2%	47.6%
Crossover Youth referred to diversion	149	2.0%	2.0%	52.3%	8.1%	2.7%	0.0%	32.9%
Crossover Youth enrolled in diversion	32	0.0%	6.2%	40.6%	12.5%	3.1%	0.0%	37.5%
Crossover Youth Successful completion diversion	13	0.0%	15.4%	30.8%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	46.2%
Youth with multiple charges	174	2.30%	1.10%	42%	21.80%	0%	4.60%	28.20%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Filed on in adult court	102	3.90%	2%	57.80%	17.60%	0%	2.90%	15.70%
RAI Override: More Severe	226	3.50%	0.40%	49.10%	23.50%	0.40%	0%	23%
RAI Override: Less Severe	91	1.10%	1.10%	52.70%	25.30%	1.10%	0%	18.70%
Probation intake	752	3.10%	0.80%	48.40%	24.70%	1.30%	0%	21.70%
Successful probation	492	0.80%	1%	44.50%	20.50%	1.80%	0%	31.30%
Revocation of probation	220	5.50%	0.50%	49.50%	25%	0%	0%	19.50%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Waterloo PD did not report to NCC 2015 - 2018

2018

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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	2746*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	1200	1.1%	1.9%	35.2%	20.8%	1.2%	0.1%	39.7%
Youth enrolled in diversion	681	1.2%	1.8%	33.2%	22.5%	1.2%	0.0%	40.2%
Successful completion diversion	417	0.7%	1.4%	31.2%	20.4%	1.4%	0.0%	44.8%
Crossover Youth referred to diversion	150	2.7%	2.7%	49.3%	10.0%	3.3%	0.0%	32.0%
Crossover Youth enrolled in diversion	33	3.0%	0.0%	48.5%	9.1%	9.1%	0.0%	30.3%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Crossover Youth Successful completion diversion	14	7.1%	0.0%	35.7%	7.1%	14.3%	0.0%	35.7%
Youth with multiple charges	122	0.80%	0.80%	41%	20.50%	0%	9%	27.90%
Filed on in adult court	109	0.90%	0%	50.50%	28.40%	0%	0.90%	19.30%
RAI Override: More Severe	187	4.80%	3.70%	42.20%	24.60%	0.50%	0%	24.10%
RAI Override: Less Severe	108	3.70%	0%	44.40%	23.10%	1.90%	0%	26.90%
Probation intake	714	3.50%	2.10%	44.40%	27.70%	0.60%	0%	21.70%
Successful probation	615	3.30%	2%	40.30%	23.90%	3.40%	0%	27.20%
Revocation of probation	233	5.60%	0.40%	51.50%	21.50%	2.60%	0%	18.50%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Waterloo PD did not report to NCC 2015 - 2018

2019

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	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	3131*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	1142	1.3%	2.1%	38.6%	21.8%	0.8%	0.1%	35.3%
Youth enrolled in diversion	616	1.1%	2.3%	36.0%	23.9%	0.8%	0.0%	35.9%
Successful completion diversion	502	1.0%	2.2%	34.1%	21.7%	1.0%	0.0%	40.0%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Crossover Youth referred to diversion	167	3.0%	1.2%	46.7%	20.4%	4.2%	0.0%	24.6%
Crossover Youth enrolled in diversion	37	5.4%	0.0%	45.9%	21.6%	2.7%	0.0%	24.3%
Crossover Youth Successful completion diversion	19	10.5%	0.0%	47.4%	15.8%	0.0%	0.0%	26.3%
Youth with multiple charges	163	0%	1.20%	52.10%	19%	0%	6.10%	21.50%
Filed on in adult court	149	0.70%	0.70%	59.10%	26.80%	0%	2%	10.70%
RAI Override: More Severe	178	2.20%	1.70%	54.50%	19.70%	0%	0%	21.90%
RAI Override: Less Severe	111	0.90%	0.90%	58.60%	19.80%	0.90%	0%	18.90%
Probation intake	757	2.20%	2.10%	53.80%	19.90%	1.20%	0%	20.70%
Successful probation	510	1.60%	1.40%	32.90%	33.10%	2%	0%	29%
Revocation of probation	189	4.80%	3.20%	49.20%	25.40%	1.60%	0%	15.90%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Waterloo PD did not report to NCC 2015 - 2018

**Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year**

*Cases offered diversion, mediation or RJ are not available data points 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	977	1203	81.2%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	1382	2017	68.5%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	154	248	62.1%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	11	17	64.7%
Total	2535	3610	70.2%

2016	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	1315	1487	88.4%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	1286	2131	60.3%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	171	229	74.7%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	--	--	--
Total	2789	4003	69.7%

2017	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	1480	1686	87.8%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	1292	2216	58.3%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	168	203	82.8%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	19	45	42.2%
Total	2978	4341	68.6%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	1159	1356	85.5%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	695	1527	45.5%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	159	206	77.2%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	--	--	--
Total	2039	3338	61.1%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	1271	1631	77.9%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	353	1418	24.9%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	140	198	70.7%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	--	--	--
Total	1792	3592	49.9%