



Dakota 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	6
Youth Who Report Mental Health Symptoms and Substance Use by Grade (2016) ^d	6
Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2016) ^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 (2015 - 2017) ^g	8
Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019) ^l	9
Family Level	10
Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportation (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a	10
Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2016) ^d	11
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means ^h	11
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ	11
Community Level	12
Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) ^j	12
Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2016) ^d	12
Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) ^m	13
Policy, Legal and System Level	14
Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) ⁿ	14
Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) ^m	15
Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) ^m	15
County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) ^o	15
Community Team Level	17
Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^p	17
Collective Impact Survey Scores ^p	17
Community Planning Team Diversity ^p	18
References and Resources	20



UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

EVIDENCE-BASED
NEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Appendix: RED Descriptives

22

Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year

27



Youth Level

- Native American youth are over-represented in chronic absenteeism as compared to the juvenile population and student population; this over-representation has been fairly consistent over time. Black youth are over-represented in chronic absenteeism as compared to the juvenile population and student population for the last two school years.
- 12th graders report more loss of sleep, suicidal ideation, and current tobacco use than the state average. 12th graders also report a very high rate of current alcohol use and binge drinking, as compared to the state averages. 8th and 10th graders report mental health or substance use issues similar to the state averages.
- Data for the BOSR study is from 2016 (not the most recent 2018). The county should ensure participation each year of the survey.
- There is a recent increase in 504 plans that are higher than the state average; limited English proficiency and eligibility for free and reduced lunch are much higher in this county than the state average.
- Youth do not report having gang involvement and an interview with local police indicated the gang issue has gone down, especially compared to 10 years ago.
- In general, crime for all ages decreased from 2018 to 2019, but increased for juvenile only crime. It appears drug violations have increased, as well as “all other offenses (except for traffic offenses)”.
- Risk assessment data from youth assessed for diversion were highest for the following domains: Personality/Behavior, Education/Employment, Leisure/Recreation, and Peer Relationships. Knowing these domains can assist in understanding diversion programming needed.
- It appears the county is beginning to utilize diversion more than probation in recent years; this means that cases are being funneled through the system better. In 2015-2017, about half of law enforcement citations were referred to diversion and half to probation from 2015-2017. In 2018 and 2019, more cases were referred to diversion than probation.
- Once referred to diversion, it appears most youth are enrolling and completing diversion successfully; however, Native American youth are not enrolling at the rate to which they are referred to diversion.
- Native American youth are over-represented at all juvenile justice system points (diversion, court filings, and probation)– as compared to the juvenile population of the county. Black youth are over-represented at diversion referrals, being filed with multiple charges, probation intakes, RAI overrides, and being put on probation. Asian youth are over-represented in being filed with multiple charges and in adult court. (unfortunately, we do not have law enforcement data by race/ethnicity to see if youth are being referred to these system points at a rate that is proportional to law enforcement stops of citations/referrals).



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%
Dakota	1,442	26.8%	63.0%	0.6%	4.6%	1.1%	3.8%

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%
Dakota	1,141	35.8%	51.0%	0.0%	4.6%	3.9%	4.6%

[Click here to go back to RED analysis](#)

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

Year	Geographic Area	Total Count	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific islander	White	Two or More Races
2014-2015	Dakota	4,346	57.66%	2.99%	3.77%	4.03%	0.35%	28.30%	2.90%
	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-2016	Dakota	4,322	58.03%	2.96%	3.93%	4.91%	0.28%	27.12%	2.78%
	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-2017	Dakota	4,277	59.29%	3.06%	3.79%	5.24%	0.30%	25.49%	2.83%
	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-2018	Dakota	4,232	59.10%	3.24%	3.76%	6.50%	0.24%	24.36%	2.81%
	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-2019	Dakota	4,255	58.45%	3.03%	3.74%	7.05%	0.54%	24.02%	3.17%
	Nebraska	325,984	19.13%	2.83%	1.33%	6.63%	0.15%	66.02%	3.91%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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	Dakota	592	55.07%	2.20%	7.77%	4.22%	*	26.86%	3.89%
	Nebraska	35,638	24.54%	1.64%	4.42%	12.93%	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-2016	Dakota	468	53.42%	2.35%	7.26%	4.27%	*	29.27%	3.42%
	Nebraska	38,812	25.73%	1.55%	4.27%	13.68%	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
2016-2017	Dakota	533	56.29%	*	10.88%	4.50%	*	25.14%	3.19%
	Nebraska	42,290	26.90%	1.66%	4.40%	14.22%	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-2018	Dakota	500	48.80%	*	12.40%	9.20%	*	26.60%	3.00%
	Nebraska	46,365	26.81%	1.77%	4.18%	14.49%	0.22%	47.37%	2389
2018-2019	Dakota	883	53.79%	*	10.08%	10.19%	2.60%	19.03%	4.30%
	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)^b

Year	Geographic Area	Total Count	IDEA	504 Plan	Limited English Proficiency	Free/Reduced Lunch
2014-2015	Dakota	4,346	12.43%	0.85%	10.45%	63.09%
	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	44.53%
2015-2016	Dakota	4,322	12.68%	1.13%	11.61%	62.45%
	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-2017	Dakota	4,277	12.74%	1.73%	13.05%	63.81%
	Nebraska	318,853	13.80%	0.93%	6.99%	44.76%
2017-2018	Dakota	4,232	13.19%	2.48%	13.14%	84.10%
	Nebraska	323,391	15.87%	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-2019	Dakota	4,255	12.76%	2.84%	15.70%	84.84%
	Nebraska	325,984	16.13%	0.85%	6.78%	45.42%

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



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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%	-
Dakota	1,406	1,582	140.6	158.2	88.9%	81

Table 6.
 Youth Who Report Mental Health Symptoms and Substance Use by Grade (2016) ^d

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Dakota	Loss of sleep from worry	17.8%	14.3%	28.6%
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
Dakota	Depressed	31.6%	14.3%	28.6%
Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
Dakota	Considered/Attempted suicide	10.6%	7.1%	19.0%
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
Dakota	Current alcohol	12.0%	13.3%	57.1%
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
Dakota	Current binge drinking	0.9%	0.0%	52.4%
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%
Dakota	Current marijuana	2.5%	0.0%	14.3%
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
Dakota	Current tobacco	2.9%	7.1%	28.6%
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%
Dakota	Current vaping	3.7%	0.0%	33.3%
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
Dakota	Hopeful for future (past week)	80.2%	78.6%	85.7%
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.



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Types of Services Utilized ^eTable 11.
Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2016) ^d

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Dakota	Youth Reported Gang Involvement	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

Table 11b.
Estimated Gang Involvement by Local Law Enforcement

Per Lieutenant Steve Heidi via phone on August 26, 2020: **There is not a gang issue in South Sioux City right now; 10 years ago, it was worse.** They used to have issues with Hispanic gangs but rarely deal with them anymore. One type of gang-related criminal activity – graffiti – is way down. There is one small group of Somalian juvenile males who are not really organized but the police are watching them. The juveniles are centralized to one apartment complex and play loud music, harass people, and smoke marijuana in parking lots. They may drive around here and there but focus mainly on that one apartment complex.

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

Arrestee Age	All Arrestee Ages			Under 18		
	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %
Summary Arrest Date						
Jurisdiction by Geography	DAKOTA COUNTY					
Arrest Offense						
Total	1,010	771	-23.66	46	83	80.43
Aggravated Assault Total	14	9	-35.71	0	1	-
Burglary Total	4	2	-50.00	0	-	-
Larceny-Theft Total	68	52	-23.53	6	6	0.00
Motor Vehicle Theft Total	5	-	-100.00	0	-	-
Other Assaults	106	80	-24.53	17	14	-17.65
Forgery and Counterfeiting	1	1	0.00	0	0	-
Fraud	16	14	-12.50	0	3	-
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	1	1	0.00	-	-	-
Vandalism	6	2	-66.67	1	2	100.00
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	5	5	0.00	1	3	200.00



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	1	-	-100.00	0	-	-
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	3	5	66.67	-	1	
Drug Violations - Possession	66	67	1.52	7	12	71.43
NIBRS Unable to Classify		3	-	-	3	-
Offenses Against Family and Children	2	4	100.00	0	0	-
Driving Under the Influence	112	74	-33.93	0	1	-
Liquor Laws	31	18	-41.94	4	5	25.00
Disorderly Conduct	52	41	-21.15	6	8	33.33
Vagrancy	1	-	-100.00	0	-	-
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	516	393	-23.84	4	24	500.00

Table 13.

Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) ⁹

Score	Dakota			All NYS Counties		
	0	1	2	0	1	2
Family Circumstance/Parenting	70.6%	23.5%	5.9%	60.1%	26.7%	13.1%
Education/Employment	51.3%	45.4%	3.4%	43.0%	44.0%	13.1%
Peer Relationships	57.1%	40.3%	2.5%	44.7%	46.6%	8.6%
Substance Use	74.8%	21.8%	3.4%	61.4%	30.3%	8.3%
Leisure/Recreation	55.5%	42.0%	2.5%	50.6%	33.0%	16.5%
Personality/Behavior	31.1%	65.5%	3.4%	50.1%	39.4%	10.4%
Attitudes/Orientation	61.3%	32.8%	5.9%	61.3%	33.7%	5.0%
Mean Score	<i>M</i> = 4.98, <i>SD</i> = 3.36, 0-16			<i>M</i> = 5.64, <i>SD</i> = 3.65, 0-17		

Dakota County *n* = 119; Statewide *n* = 1512



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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	510*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	345	20.0%	1.20%	7.50%	42.00%	0.90%	2.60%	25.80%
Youth enrolled in diversion	306	16.70%	1.30%	7.50%	44.80%	1%	1.60%	27.10%
Successful completion diversion	285	16.10%	1.10%	8.10%	45.30%	1.10%	1.80%	26.70%
Youth with multiple charges	27	40.70%	7.40%	11.10%	29.60%	0%	0%	11.10%
Filed on in adult court	27	11.10%	3.70%	0%	40.70%	0%	25.90%	18.50%
RAI Override: More Severe	57	33.30%	0%	8.80%	28.10%	0%	0%	29.80%
RAI Override: Less Severe	17	29.40%	0%	17.60%	29.40%	0%	0%	23.50%
Probation intake	197	34.0%	2.50%	10.20%	31%	0.50%	0%	21.80%
Successful probation	207	16.40%	4.30%	8.20%	46.40%	1.40%	0%	23.20%
Revocation of probation	92	40.20%	0%	3.30%	40.20%	0%	0%	16.30%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



*Emerson PD only partially reported in 2017, did not report in 2015-2016

Family Level

- Poverty (and related measures) are a problem in this community as compared to the state average.
- Fewer adults have bachelor's degrees and high school degrees, fewer youth have access to Internet at home, and fewer households have a vehicle than the state average.
- Youth in all grades are less likely to report having a supportive adult at home than the state; 10th graders are less likely to report having a supportive adult at school than the state average.

Table 15.

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

Measurement		Dakota	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	24.2%	14.8%
	Number of children 12-17 below 185% poverty	801	43,814
	Percent of children 12-17 below 185% poverty	43.8%	28.9%
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	12.5%	31.3%
	County Rank	95	-
	Age 25+ with some college, no degree	18.0%	23.0%
	County Rank	90	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	74.6%	91.1%
	County Rank	92	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a computer at home	96.0%	96.9%
		76	-
	% under 18 with an internet subscription at home	80.3%	91.0%
		83	-
	% under 18 with broadband internet access at home	80.2%	90.8%
	County Rank	83	-



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Housing	Owner-occupied households	4,908	498,567
	Total households	7,456	754,063
	Owner %	65.8%	66.1%
	Renters	2,548	255,496
	Renter %	34.2%	33.9%
Transportation	Households with no vehicle available	236	40,465
	Total households	1,704	754,063
	No vehicle %	13.8%	5.4%

Table 16.
Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2016) ^d

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Dakota	Adult at home who listens	80.4%	64.3%	71.4%
Nebraska		87.3%	85.0%	85.6%
Dakota	Adult at school who listens	88.3%	69.2%	90.5%
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
Dakota	5	3	48	28
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

Table 18.
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Dakota	323	40%	16%	64%
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%



Community Level

- 12th graders report that people in their community do not find marijuana, alcohol and cigarettes wrong or very wrong, as compared to the state.
- 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. In this county, the rates of sealing records is quite low for dropped/dismissed cases across all years. The county should examine whether this is the case for the other types of case closures.
- 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)

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

Type of Violence	Dakota	Nebraska
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	0	34
Rape	0	264
Robbery	0	367
Aggravated Assault	9	1,639
Other Assaults	80	8,782

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Dakota	Wrong/very wrong – Marijuana	92.9%	87.9%	79.7%
Nebraska		94.4%	89.8%	85.2%
Dakota	Wrong/very wrong – alcohol	86.0%	93.3%	57.1%
Nebraska		89.1%	80.4%	68.7%
Dakota	Wrong/very wrong – cigarettes	91.5%	93.3%	66.7%
Nebraska		92.9%	89.0%	78.7%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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	87	129	67.4%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	482	1154	41.8%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	159	210	75.7%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	0	2	0.0%
Total	728	1499	48.6%

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



Policy, Legal and System Level

- This county is not required under statute to provide an attorney when a youth is filed on in court, yet the rate is similar to the state average.
- Curfew filings have been problematic in this county (2016 and 2017), but this appears to be less of a problem recently. Research has demonstrated that Juvenile curfews are not effective at reducing juvenile crime and can result in net-widening/pulling youth into the system. Curfew violations should be something that is referred to diversion, if it is necessary to the community to have a curfew ordinance.
- The rate for 3B filings for truancy has increased over the 5-year period. The county should refer truancy cases to diversion and/or a truancy program; or examine why youth are unsuccessfully completing a truancy diversion program and are being filed on.
- The diversion program may consider the following:
 - exploring the use of warning letters for low risk youth
 - only drug testing youth with a substance use need
 - ensure fees are similar to court costs or having a sliding scale
 - using graduated sanctions to give youth who are not completing diversion requirements graduation sanctions before discharging them unsuccessfully.
 - strengthening the process for sealing records with law enforcement (not needed at court-level because it is pre-file).

Table 22.
Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) ⁿ

	Dakota	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.



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Table 23.
 Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) ^m

	Dakota	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	29	352

2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
2	15	6	3	3	29

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

Filed Subtype	Dakota					Total
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	0	3	4	4	6	17
3B - Uncontrollable	0	0	1	0	0	1
3C – Mentally Ill and Dangerous	0	1	0	0	0	1

Filed Subtype	Nebraska					Total
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	
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

	Dakota	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%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

		Not sure: 4.5%
Charges/offenses that make a juvenile ineligible for diversion	Yes; serious violent felonies	Yes: 86.4% No: 9.1% Not sure: 4.5%
Warning letters instead of intervention	No	Yes: 27.3% No: 61.4% Not sure: 11.4%
Currently drug test	Yes	Yes: 31.8% No: 65.9% Not sure: 2.3%
Fees beyond restitution	Yes; \$50	Yes: 86.4% No: 13.6% Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior to discharge	Not sure; not formally but willing to "meet the youth where they are at" to adjust the diversion plan as necessary	Yes: 47.7% No: 25.0% Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	No; There is no court filing so there is nothing to seal.	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 response rate decreased slightly from 2019 to 2020.
- Continuous Communication had the lowest mean for the collective impact domains in 2020 (but this could be related to the pandemic). Scores improved for common agenda and shared measurement.
- While we recognize this could be due to response rate, the community team should be representative of the population of that community but should also include diversity. It might be beneficial to add more People of Color (Hispanic/Latino, Black, Asian, Native American) to your team, especially because of the patterns of over and under representation.
- The team has good representation from people who represent a diversity of system points; including people with previous system involvement.
- Only 10% reported (1 person) not feeling heard at team meetings, which is much lower than the state average.

Table 26. Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^P

Year of survey	Dakota		Nebraska	
	2019	2020	2019	2020
Number of surveys sent	29	30	1407	780
Number of completed surveys	13	10	221	345
Response rate	44.8%	33.3%	28.3%	24.5%

Table 27. Collective Impact Survey Scores ^P

Year of survey	Dakota		Nebraska	
	2019	2020	2019	2020
	Mean Score		Mean Score	
Common agenda	6.12	6.20	5.29	5.69
Mutually reinforcing	6.24	6.20	5.37	5.50
Shared measurement	6.24	6.40	5.21	5.45
Continuous communication	6.30	5.90	5.49	5.55



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Backbone agency	6.33	6.30	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

	Dakota		Nebraska	
	N = 10	(%)	N = 345	(%)
Gender				
Male	3	30.0%	101	29.3%
Female	7	70.0%	229	66.4%
Missing	--	--	15	4.3%
Age				
Under 30	1	10.0%	19	5.6%
30-39	1	10.0%	68	19.6%
40-49	4	40.0%	88	25.4%
50-59	1	10.0%	90	25.8%
60 and over	3	30.0%	44	13%
Missing	--	--	36	10.4%
Race/Ethnicity				
White	8	80.0%	230	66.7%
Black	--	--	10	2.9%
Hispanic	--	--	13	3.8%
Native American	--	--	6	1.7%
Asian	--	--	1	0.3%
Other	--	--	2	0.6%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Provided town name	2	20.0%	63	18.3%
Missing	--	--	19	5.5%
Previous System Involvement				
Yes	5	50.0%	98	28.4%
No	5	50.0%	242	70.1%
Missing	--	--	5	1.4%
System Point *				
Law enforcement	4	16.7%	34	7.8%
County attorney/ juvenile court	2	8.3%	32	7.3%
K-12 or secondary education	2	8.3%	65	14.9%
Ministry/faith based			10	2.3%
Diversion	4	16.7%	55	12.6%
Probation	2	8.3%	31	7.1%
Public defender/ defense counsel/ guardian ad litem	1	4.2%	8	1.8%
DHHS or Child Welfare	1	4.2%	13	3.0%
Treatment provider	1	4.2%	40	9.2%
Post adjudication or detention	1	4.2%	8	1.8%
Community based program	4	16.7%	109	25.0%
Elected official or government	1	4.2%	6	1.4%
Restorative practices	--	--	6	1.4%
Backbone or system improvement	--	--	3	0.7%
Other	1	4.2%	16	3.7%
Voice on Team				
Feel heard	9	90.0%	270	78.3%
Do not feel heard	1	10.0%	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/browsetables.aspx>

Nebraska Crime Commission, Juvenile Case Management System

Nebraska Judicial Branch Trial Court Case Management System, JUSTICE

Nebraska Judicial Branch, Juvenile Services Division

^m **Court Filings and Juvenile Record Sealing:** Data provided by the Nebraska Judicial Branch Trial Court Case Management System, JUSTICE. Prepared by: Lindsey Wylie, UNO Juvenile Justice Institute on 9-1-20

ⁿ **Access to Counsel:** Kids County in Nebraska Report, Voices for Children, retrieved from: www.voicesforchildren.com/kidscount. Data originally from Nebraska Judicial Branch Trial Court Case Management System, JUSTICE

^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

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	156*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	76	25%	0%	7.90%	31.60%	0%	0%	35.50%
Youth enrolled in diversion	68	20.60%	0%	7.40%	35.30%	0%	0%	36.80%
Successful completion diversion	65	20%	0%	7.70%	35.40%	0%	0%	36.90%
Youth with multiple charges	1	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Filed on in adult court	7	0%	0%	0%	42.90%	0%	42.90%	14.30%
RAI Override: More Severe	7	71.40%	0%	0%	14.30%	0%	0%	14.30%
RAI Override: Less Severe	1	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Probation intake	38	28.90%	2.60%	2.60%	36.80%	0%	0%	28.90%
Successful probation	59	11.90%	6.80%	1.70%	59.30%	1.70%	0%	18.60%
Revocation of probation	22	50%	0%	4.50%	27.30%	0%	0%	18.20%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Emerson PD only partially reported in 2017, did not report in 2015-2016



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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	129*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	44	15.90%	2.30%	9.10%	50%	0%	2.30%	20.50%
Youth enrolled in diversion	41	14.60%	2.40%	9.80%	48.80%	0%	2.40%	22%
Successful completion diversion	40	15%	2.50%	10%	47.50%	0%	2.50%	22.50%
Youth with multiple charges	5	20%	0%	0%	60%	0%	0%	20%
Filed on in adult court	15	20%	6.70%	0%	40%	0%	20%	13.30%
RAI Override: More Severe	11	18.20%	0%	0%	45.50%	0%	0%	36.40%
RAI Override: Less Severe	2	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Probation intake	31	32.30%	6.50%	6.50%	35.50%	0%	0%	19.40%
Successful probation	50	18%	4%	6%	42%	4%	0%	26%
Revocation of probation	15	13.30%	0%	0%	86.70%	0%	0%	0%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Emerson PD only partially reported in 2017, did not report in 2015-2016



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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	96*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	82	11%	0%	9.80%	45.10%	2.40%	6.10%	25.60%
Youth enrolled in diversion	72	8.30%	0%	9.70%	48.60%	2.80%	4.20%	26.40%
Successful completion diversion	67	9%	0%	10.40%	47.80%	3%	4.50%	25.40%
Youth with multiple charges	9	44.40%	0%	11.10%	22.20%	0%	0%	22.20%
Filed on in adult court	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
RAI Override: More Severe	13	7.70%	0%	7.70%	23.10%	0%	0%	61.50%
RAI Override: Less Severe	3	33.30%	0%	0%	66.70%	0%	0%	0%
Probation intake	44	25%	0%	9.10%	31.80%	0%	0%	34.10%
Successful probation	42	26.20%	2.40%	16.70%	38.10%	0%	0%	16.70%
Revocation of probation	18	27.80%	0%	11.10%	50%	0%	0%	11.10%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

*Emerson PD only partially reported in 2017, did not report in 2015-2016



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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	46	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	66	31.80%	1.50%	3%	40.90%	1.50%	1.50%	19.70%
Youth enrolled in diversion	54	25.90%	1.90%	3.70%	46.30%	1.90%	0%	20.40%
Successful completion diversion	51	25.50%	0%	3.90%	49%	2%	0%	19.60%
Youth with multiple charges	7	42.90%	14.30%	14.30%	28.60%	0%	0%	0%
Filed on in adult court	3	0%	0%	0%	66.70%	0%	0%	33.30%
RAI Override: More Severe	15	40%	0%	13.30%	33.30%	0%	0%	13.30%
RAI Override: Less Severe	5	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	60%
Probation intake	37	48.60%	0%	8.10%	24.30%	2.70%	0%	16.20%
Successful probation	35	11.40%	5.70%	5.70%	40%	0%	0%	37.10%
Revocation of probation	23	65.20%	0%	0%	4.30%	0%	0%	30.40%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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	83	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	77	16.90%	2.60%	7.80%	45.50%	0%	2.60%	24.70%
Youth enrolled in diversion	71	15.50%	2.80%	7%	46.50%	0%	1.40%	26.80%
Successful completion diversion	62	12.90%	3.20%	8.10%	48.40%	0%	1.60%	25.80%
Youth with multiple charges	5	60%	20%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Filed on in adult court	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%	NA%
RAI Override: More Severe	11	45.50%	0%	18.20%	18.20%	0%	0%	18.20%
RAI Override: Less Severe	6	33.30%	0%	33.30%	16.70%	0%	0%	16.70%
Probation intake	47	36.20%	4.30%	21.30%	27.70%	0%	0%	10.60%
Successful probation	21	14.30%	0%	19%	47.60%	0%	0%	19%
Revocation of probation	14	28.60%	0%	0%	57.10%	0%	0%	14.30%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**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 Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	22	33	66.7%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	110	224	49.1%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	45	56	80.4%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	0	1	0.0%
Total	177	315	56.2%

2016	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	36	48	75.0%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	101	269	37.5%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	53	78	67.9%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	--	--	--
Total	190	397	47.9%

2017	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	11	18	61.1%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	124	273	45.4%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	16	22	72.7%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	--	--	--
Total	151	313	48.2%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	10	16	62.5%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	77	194	39.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	24	26	92.3%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	0	1	0.0%
Total	111	238	46.6%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	8	14	57.1%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	70	194	36.1%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	21	28	75.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	--	--	--
Total	99	236	41.9%