EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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





COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year

JTE EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Youth Level

- Compared to school enrollment data, Hispanic and Black youth are overrepresented in chronic absenteeism.
- Dodge County has higher than state averages of youth who qualify for free/reduced lunch, a little more than ½ of the students in the last five years. There are also more students with limited English proficiency in Dodge County compared to the state.
 - Dodge County also has more youth under IDEA compared to the state, with a jump in 2017-2018.
 - Since 2017, the number of students in Dodge County with 504 plans has increased and became higher than the state averages.
- This community has not participated in the NRPFSS and should consider participating in the next survey year (2021) to get youth-level data on mental health, gangs, supportive adults and community perceptions of substance use.
- There has been a decrease in arrests for all ages and under 18 from 2018 to 2019. The most notable decrease is in drug possession, weapons possession, larceny, and runaways.
 - There was an increase in arrests for juvenile vandalism
- Risk assessment domains for youth assessed for diversion suggest Family Circumstance/Parenting, Peer Relationships, Substance Use, and Leisure Recreation are the areas of highest need.
- Law enforcement data by race and ethnicity would be very beneficial to have a clearer picture
 of RED. Compared to the overall population of Dodge County, Native American youth are
 overrepresented at probation RAI overrides and probation intake; Asian youth are
 overrepresented at probation RAI overrides and underrides, and probation intakes; Black youth
 are overrepresented at having multiple charges filed and all probation system points; Hispanic
 youth are overrepresented at probation revocation; and White youth are underrepresented with
 probation intakes, probation RAI overrides and underrides, and probation revocations.
 - Race/ethnicity is missing at court system points of youth with multiple charges and being filed on in adult court.
- The majority of youth referred to diversion are enrolled, but a smaller percent successfully complete diversion.
 - The rates of Native American, Black, and Hispanic youth that are referred to diversion are the same as those enrolling, but the successful completion rates for these races/ethnicities is lower.
 - The rates of White youth referred to diversion are the same as those enrolling, but the successful completion rates are higher.

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) *

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%
Dodge	1,968	71.4%	23.1%	1.0%	1.6%	0.4%	2.5%

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%
Dodge	1,897	82.5%	12.5%	0.4%	1.3%	0.4%	3.0%

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-	Dodge	6,100	22.30%	0.51%	0.49%	1.23%	0.18%	74.30%	1.00%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-	Dodge	6,102	23.91%	0.44%	0.46%	1.26%	0.16%	72.71%	1.05%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-	Dodge	6,159	25.17%	0.45%	0.45%	1.32%	0.23%	71.18%	1.20%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-	Dodge	6,133	26.24%	0.44%	0.34%	1.14%	0.34%	70.29%	1.21%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-	Dodge	6,094	27.32%	0.49%	0.39%	1.25%	0.23%	69.00%	1.31%
2019	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-	Dodge	726	<mark>27.69%</mark>	*	*	<mark>1.52%</mark>	*	70.80%	*
2015	Nebraska	35,638	<mark>24.54%</mark>	1.64%	4.42%	<mark>12.93%</mark>	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-	Dodge	788	<mark>33.50%</mark>	*	*	<mark>2.54%</mark>	*	63.96%	*
2016	Nebraska	38,812	<mark>25.73%</mark>	1.55%	4.27%	<mark>13.68%</mark>	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
2016-	Dodge	787	<mark>35.96%</mark>	*	*	<mark>3.68%</mark>	*	60.36%	*
2017	Nebraska	42,290	<mark>26.90%</mark>	1.66%	4.40%	<mark>14.22%</mark>	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-	Dodge	869	<mark>37.74%</mark>	*	*	<mark>2.65%</mark>	*	59.61%	*
2018	Nebraska	46,365	<mark>26.81%</mark>	1.77%	4.18%	<mark>14.49%</mark>	0.22%	47.37%	2389
2018-	Dodge	<mark>869</mark>	<mark>38.09%</mark>	*	<mark>1.61%</mark>	<mark>2.53%</mark>	*	56.50%	1.27%
2019	Nebraska	46,356	<mark>27.64%</mark>	1.76%	4.16%	<mark>14.71%</mark>	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-	Dodge	6,100	<mark>17.02%</mark>	0.54%	<mark>6.51%</mark>	<mark>55.64%</mark>
2015	Nebraska	312,281	<mark>13.66%</mark>	0.76%	<mark>5.97%</mark>	<mark>44.53%</mark>
2015-	Dodge	6,102	<mark>16.50%</mark>	0.69%	<mark>7.31%</mark>	<mark>52.52%</mark>
2016	Nebraska	315,542	<mark>13.64%</mark>	0.90%	<mark>5.90%</mark>	<mark>44.23%</mark>
2016-	Dodge	6,159	<mark>16.54%</mark>	0.55%	<mark>8.15%</mark>	<mark>55.93%</mark>
2017	Nebraska	318,853	<mark>13.80%</mark>	0.93%	<mark>6.99%</mark>	<mark>44.76%</mark>
2017-	Dodge	6,133	<mark>18.39%</mark>	<mark>0.91%</mark>	<mark>8.98%</mark>	<mark>56.07%</mark>
2018	Nebraska	323,391	<mark>15.87%</mark>	<mark>0.88%</mark>	<mark>6.59%</mark>	<mark>46.24%</mark>
2018-	Dodge	6,094	<mark>18.12%</mark>	<mark>0.97%</mark>	<mark>9.50%</mark>	<mark>55.58%</mark>
2019	Nebraska	325,984	<mark>16.13%</mark>	<mark>0.85%</mark>	<mark>6.78%</mark>	<mark>45.42%</mark>

Table 5.

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

County	Total in Las	st 5 Years	Yearly Av	/erages	Graduation	
	Graduates	Students	Graduates	Students	Rate	Rank
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	-
Dodge	1,970	2,234	98.5	111.7	88.2%	84

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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

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

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

*Dodge County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

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

EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Table 10.

Types of Services Utilized ^e

Table 11.

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

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

*Dodge County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

Table 12.

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

Arrestee Age		All Arres	stee Ages		Und	der 18
Summary Arrest Date	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %
Jurisdiction by Geography			DODGE	COUNT	Ϋ́	
Arrest Offense						
Total	<mark>1,966</mark>	<mark>1,474</mark>	-25.03	<mark>278</mark>	<mark>239</mark>	-14.03
Rape Total	5	5	0.00	1	1	0.00
Robbery Total	1	2	100.00	-	1	-
Aggravated Assault Total	17	13	-23.53	1	1	0.00
Burglary Total	13	9	-30.77	6	4	-33.33
Larceny-Theft Total	<mark>73</mark>	<mark>59</mark>	-19.18	<mark>27</mark>	<mark>12</mark>	-55.56
Motor Vehicle Theft Total	6	5	-16.67	3	2	-33.33
Other Assaults	178	171	-3.93	47	50	6.38
Arson	1	-	-100.00	1	-	-100.00
Forgery and Counterfeiting	<mark>1</mark>	<mark>6</mark>	500.00	-	0	-
Fraud	22	25	13.64	1	1	0.00
Embezzlement	2	1	-50.00	-		-
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	<mark>24</mark>	<mark>11</mark>	-54.17	2	4	100.00
Vandalism	40	48	20.00	<mark>11</mark>	<mark>22</mark>	100.00
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	<mark>40</mark>	<mark>18</mark>	-55.00	1	1	0.00
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	4	4	0.00	2	1	-50.00
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	47	26	-44.68	3	0	-100.00
Drug Violations - Possession	<mark>518</mark>	<mark>357</mark>	-31.08	<mark>47</mark>	<mark>33</mark>	-29.79



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

NIBRS Unable to Classify	1	-	-100.00	-	-	-
Offenses Against Family and Children	20	19	-5.00	0	1	-
Driving Under the Influence	161	148	-8.07	1	1	0.00
Liquor Laws	<mark>203</mark>	<mark>129</mark>	-36.45	38	17	-55.26
Drunkenness	1	-	-100.00	1		-100.00
Disorderly Conduct	<mark>59</mark>	<mark>39</mark>	-33.90	<mark>2</mark>	<mark>4</mark>	100.00
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	<mark>485</mark>	<mark>345</mark>	-28.87	39	49	25.64
Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	2	2	0.00	2	2	0.00
Runaways	42	32	-23.81	<mark>42</mark>	<mark>32</mark>	-23.81

Table 13.

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

	Do	odge	All YLS Counties		
Score	М	SD	М	SD	
Family Circumstance/Parenting	0.71	0.88	1.20	1.32	
Education/Employment	0.65	0.86	1.27	1.35	
Peer Relationships	1.05	1.13	1.78	1.08	
Substance Use	0.84	0.93	1.29	1.40	
Leisure/Recreation	0.73	0.91	0.88	0.95	
Personality/Behavior	0.55	0.81	1.34	1.52	
Attitudes/Orientation	0.11	0.45	0.45	0.79	
Mean Score	<i>M</i> = 4.67, S	D = 3.43, 0-12	M = 8.23, SD = 5.22, 0-31		

Dodge County n = 75; Statewide n = 2124

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

Click here to see Census and School Population Data

See Appendix for yearly data

System Point	Ν	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact								
Youth taken to temporary custody								





COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Youth referred to diversion 261 0.80% 0.40% 0.80% 23.80% 0% 0% 74.30% Youth enrolled in diversion 252 0.80% 0.40% 0.80% 22.20% 0% 0% 75.80% Successful completion diversion 204 0% 0.50% 0% 19.10% 0% 0% 80.40% Youth with multiple charges 64 0% 0% 1.60% 4.70% 0% 70.30% 23.40% Filed on in adult court 6 0% 0% 1.60% 4.70% 0% 70.30% 23.40% RAI Override: 38 5.30% 2.60% 21.10% 0% 0% 66.70% Severe 36 0% 2.80% 13.90% 16.70% 0% 62.60% Successful probation 460 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 71.70% Probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70%	Youth issued	4000*							
diversion	citation/referral	1282*	0.00%	0.400/	0.000/	00.00%	00/	00/	74.000/
Youth enrolled in diversion 252 0.80% 0.40% 0.80% 22.20% 0% 0% 75.80% Successful completion 204 0% 0.50% 0% 19.10% 0% 0% 80.40% Vouth with multiple charges 64 0% 0% 1.60% 4.70% 0% 70.30% 23.40% Filed on in adult court 6 0% 0% 0% 16.70% 0% 33.30% 50% Court 38 5.30% 2.60% 21.10% 0% 0% 66.70% RAI Override: 38 5.30% 2.60% 13.90% 16.70% 0% 66.70% Severe 70.20% 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 66.70% Successful probation 460 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 65.70% Successful probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70%		<mark>261</mark>	0.80%	0.40%	0.80%	23.80%	0%	0%	74.30%
diversion Image: square s									
Successful completion diversion 204 0% 0.50% 0% 19.10% 0% 0% 80.40% Youth with multiple charges 64 0% 0% 1.60% 4.70% 0% 70.30% 23.40% Filed on in adult court 6 0% 0% 0% 16.70% 0% 33.30% 50% RAI Override: 38 5.30% 2.60% 21.10% 0% 0% 68.40% More Severe 36 0% 2.80% 13.90% 16.70% 0% 66.70% RAI Override: Less Severe 36 0% 2.80% 13.90% 16.70% 0% 66.70% Severe 9 2% 1% 11.10% 22.70% 0.50% 0% 62.60% Successful probation 460 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 71.70% Revocation of probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% OJS cu		<mark>252</mark>	0.80%	0.40%	0.80%	22.20%	0%	0%	75.80%
completion diversion Image: Completion diversion Image: Completion diversion <thimage: completion="" diversion<="" th=""> Image:</thimage:>									
diversion -		<mark>204</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	0.50%	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>19.10%</mark>	0%	0%	<mark>80.40%</mark>
Youth with multiple charges 64 0% 0% 1.60% 4.70% 0% 70.30% 23.40% Filed on in adult court 6 0% 0% 0% 16.70% 0% 33.30% 50% RAI Override: 38 5.30% 2.60% 21.10% 0% 0% 68.40% More Severe 36 0% 2.80% 13.90% 16.70% 0% 0% 66.70% RAI Override: Less 36 0% 2.80% 13.90% 16.70% 0% 0% 66.70% Severe 2% 1% 11.10% 22.70% 0.50% 0% 62.60% Successful 460 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 71.70% probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% Youth in OJS <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>									
charges Image <									
Filed on in adult court 6 0% 0% 0% 16.70% 0% 33.30% 50% RAI Override: 38 5.30% 2.60% 21.10% 0% 0% 68.40% More Severe 36 0% 2.60% 16.70% 0% 0% 66.70% RAI Override: Less Severe 36 0% 2.80% 13.90% 16.70% 0% 0% 66.70% Probation intake 198 2% 1% 11.10% 22.70% 0.50% 0% 62.60% Successful 460 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 71.70% probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% Youth in OJS	Youth with multiple	64	0%	0%	<mark>1.60%</mark>	4.70%	0%	<mark>70.30%</mark>	23.40%
court </td <td>charges</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	charges								
RAI Override: More Severe 38 5.30% 2.60% 21.10% 0% 0% 68.40% RAI Override: Less Severe 36 0% 2.80% 13.90% 16.70% 0% 0% 66.70% Probation intake 198 2% 1% 11.10% 22.70% 0.50% 0% 62.60% Successful probation 460 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 71.70% Revocation of probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% Youth in OJS -	Filed on in adult	6	0%	0%	0%	16.70%	0%	<mark>33.30%</mark>	50%
More Severe Image: Constraint of the second se	court								
RAI Override: Less 36 0% 2.80% 13.90% 16.70% 0% 0% 66.70% Severe 198 2% 1% 11.10% 22.70% 0.50% 0% 62.60% Successful 460 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 71.70% probation 460 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% Youth in OJS OJS custody:	RAI Override:	38	<mark>5.30%</mark>	<mark>2.60%</mark>	<mark>2.60%</mark>	21.10%	0%	0%	<mark>68.40%</mark>
Severe Image: Constraint of the second	More Severe								
Probation intake 198 2% 1% 11.10% 22.70% 0.50% 0% 62.60% Successful 460 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 71.70% probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% Youth in OJS QJS custody: placed in detention	RAI Override: Less	36	0%	<mark>2.80%</mark>	<mark>13.90%</mark>	16.70%	0%	0%	<mark>66.70%</mark>
Successful probation 460 0.20% 0% 3.70% 22.60% 1.70% 0% 71.70% Revocation of probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% Youth in OJS <	Severe								
probationImage: state of the sta	Probation intake	198	<mark>2%</mark>	<mark>1%</mark>	<mark>11.10%</mark>	22.70%	0.50%	0%	<mark>62.60%</mark>
Revocation of probation 140 0.70% 0% 5% 27.10% 1.40% 0% 65.70% Youth in OJS <t< td=""><td>Successful</td><td>460</td><td>0.20%</td><td>0%</td><td><mark>3.70%</mark></td><td>22.60%</td><td>1.70%</td><td>0%</td><td>71.70%</td></t<>	Successful	460	0.20%	0%	<mark>3.70%</mark>	22.60%	1.70%	0%	71.70%
probation Image: Constraint of the second	probation								
probationYouth in OJScustodyOJS custody:placed in detention	Revocation of	140	0.70%	0%	<mark>5%</mark>	<mark>27.10%</mark>	1.40%	0%	<mark>65.70%</mark>
custody placed in detention	probation								
OJS custody:	Youth in OJS								
placed in detention	custody								
	OJS custody:								
	placed in detention								
Youth booked into	Youth booked into								
detention	detention								
Youth booked into	Youth booked into								
detention more	detention more								
than once	than once								

*Scribner PD did not report to NCC in 2018

EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Family Level

- Dodge County has a higher rate of poverty compared to the state
- Number of people with bachelor's degrees is lower compared to the state; this could be a result of residents going to college in a different community and not returning to Dodge County.
- The number of youth with access to computers and internet at home is lower than the state average.
- The rates of home owners in Dodge County is lower than the state average, while the rates of home renters is higher.

Table 15.

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

Measurement		Dodge	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	<mark>20.8</mark> %	14.8%
	Number of children 12-	1,282	43,814
	17 below 185% poverty		
	Percent of children 12-	<mark>42.6%</mark>	28.9%
	17 below 185% poverty		
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	<mark>18.6%</mark>	31.3%
	County Rank	70	-
	Age 25+ with some	23.7%	23.0%
	college, no degree		
	County Rank	54	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	<mark>89.3%</mark>	91.1%
	County Rank	74	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a	<mark>96.0%</mark>	96.9%
	computer at home		
	County Rank	75	-
	% under 18 with an	<mark>84.8%</mark>	91.0%
	internet subscription at		
	home		
	County Rank	73	-
	% under 18 with	<mark>84.6%</mark>	90.8%
	broadband internet		
	access at home		
	County Rank	73	-





COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Housing	Owner-occupied households	9,552	498,567
	Total households	15,289	754,063
	Owner %	<mark>62.5%</mark>	66.1%
	Renters	5,737	255,496
	Renter %	<mark>37.5%</mark>	33.9%
Transportation	Households with no vehicle available	743	40,465
	Total households	15,289	754,063
	No vehicle %	4.9%	5.4%

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

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

*Dodge County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

Table 17.

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

	Aggravated Domestic Assaults Reported	Aggravated Domestic Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means	Simple Domestic Assaults Reported	Simple Domestics Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means
Dodge	6	6	118	60
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

Table 17. Child Abuse and Neglect Reportsⁱ

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Dodge	776	36%	18%	64%
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE DOLUMENT NIEEDO ADDEDOMENT EV 0000 0001

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Community Level

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

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

Type of Violence	Dodge	Nebraska
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	0	34
Rape	5	264
Robbery	2	367
Aggravated Assault	13	1,639
Other Assaults	<mark>171</mark>	8,782

Table 20.

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

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

*Dodge County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey



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	272	369	<mark>73.7%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	1071	2006	53.4%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	168	170	98.8%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court			
Total	1512	2552	59.2%

*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



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Policy, Legal and System Level

- Despite not being in a county required to provide counsel under statute, access to counsel is similar to the state average, but still lower than ideal.
- There are few curfew filings in court, and no 3A filings. Absenteeism and uncontrollable fillings were up in 2018, but decreased in 2019.
- With respect to diversion practices, the community may want to consider a few things:
 - o Not filing all unsuccessful cases, if the youth completed most of the diversion plan
 - Comparing diversion fees to court costs so they are comparable. With a higher proportion of children <18 in poverty, perhaps offering scholarships.
 - Having a process for sealing records for youth on diversion with law enforcement and JCMS, as required by statute.

Table 22.

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

	Dodge	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	60.0% 79.9%	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)^m

	Dodge	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	1	352

EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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

		Dodge								
Filed Subtype	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total				
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0				
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	2	7	<mark>10</mark>	<mark>15</mark>	<mark>11</mark>	45				
3B - Uncontrollable	9	7	3	<mark>14</mark>	<mark>11</mark>	44				
3C – Mentally III and Dangerous	0	0	0	0	1	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) °

	Dodge	Nebraska *
Refer ALL juveniles who are first	No	Yes: 27.3%
time offenders to diversion		No: 63.6%
		Not sure: 9.1%
File a juvenile's charges at the	No	Yes: 18.2%
time of the referral to diversion		No: 70.5%
		Not sure: 11.4%
File a juvenile's charges if they are	Always	Always: 47.7%
unsuccessful on diversion		Sometimes: 47.7%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Allow a juvenile to complete	Yes	Yes: 61.4%
diversion more than once		No: 34.1%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Charges/offenses that make a	Yes; violent felonies, greater than	Yes: 86.4%
juvenile ineligible for diversion	a class IIA, sexual assault	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%





COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

		Not sure: 2.3%
Fees beyond restitution	Yes; \$50 to \$200 (depending on	Yes: 86.4%
	income)	No: 13.6%
		Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior	Yes; extensions of further terms if	Yes: 47.7%
to discharge	original terms are not completed	No: 25.0%
	by the target discharge date	Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	Not sure	Yes: 59.1%
		No: 22.7%
		Not sure: 18.2%

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



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Community Team Level

- A community lead should be able to get roughly a 75% response, to ensure active participation on planning issues, your response rate was 56.0%.
 - The response rate is lower than 2019, but the total number of responses increased; the size of the team increased as well.
- Mean score on Collective Impact is higher than in 2019.
- The community team should be representative of the population of that community but should also include diversity. It might be beneficial to add diverse member to your team (especially because of the patterns of over and under representation.)
 - \circ $\;$ This pertains to gender as well as race/ethnicity.
- On the survey, there were no law enforcement, post adjudication or detention, , or elected officials in your team–but perhaps they did not respond to the survey.
- Almost 86% of people who responded indicated they do feel heard on the team.

Table 26. Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^p

	Do	dge	Nebraska		
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020	
Number of surveys sent	10	25	1407	780	
Number of completed surveys	8	14	221	345	
Response rate	80.0%	<mark>56.0%</mark>	28.3%	24.5%	

Table 27. Collective Impact Survey Scores ^p

	Dodge		Nebraska		
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020	
	Mean Sc	ore	Mean	Score	
Common agenda	5.35	<mark>5.71</mark>	5.29	5.69	
Mutually reinforcing	5.03	<mark>5.07</mark>	5.37	5.50	
Shared measurement	4.49	<mark>5.07</mark>	5.21	5.45	
Continuous communication	5.59	<mark>5.86</mark>	5.49	5.55	
Backbone agency	5.68	<mark>5.92</mark>	5.52	5.78	

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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

	Doc	lge	Neb	raska
	N = 14	(%)	N = 345	(%)
Gender				
Male			101	29.3%
Female	14	100%	229	66.4%
Missing			15	4.3%
Age				
Under 30	2	14.2%	19	5.6%
30-39	8	56.9%	68	19.6%
40-49			88	25.4%
50-59	3	21.3%	90	25.8%
60 and over	1	7.1%	44	13%
Missing			36	10.4%
Race/Ethnicity				
White	12	85.7%	230	66.7%
Black			10	2.9%
Hispanic	1	7.1%	13	3.8%
Native American			6	1.7%
Asian			1	0.3%
Other			2	0.6%
Provided town name	1	7.1%	63	18.3%
Missing			19	5.5%





COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Previous System Involvement				
Yes	2	14.3%	98	28.4%
Νο	12	85.7%	242	70.1%
Missing			5	1.4%
System Point *				
Law enforcement			34	7.8%
County attorney/ juvenile court	2	9.5%	32	7.3%
K-12 or secondary education	2	9.5%	65	14.9%
Ministry/faith based			10	2.3%
Diversion	3	14.3%	55	12.6%
Probation	1	4.8%	31	7.1%
Public defender/ defense counsel/	1	4.8%	8	1.8%
guardian ad litem				
DHHS or Child Welfare	1	4.8%	13	3.0%
Treatment provider	4	19.0%	40	9.2%
Post adjudication or detention	<mark></mark>		8	1.8%
Community based program	5	23.8%	109	25.0%
Elected official or government	<mark></mark>		6	1.4%
Restorative practices	2	9.5%	6	1.4%
Backbone or system improvement			3	0.7%
Other			16	3.7%
Voice on Team				
Feel heard	12	85.7%	270	78.3%
Do not feel heard	2	14.3%	75	21.7%

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



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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

[°] 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 iuvenile 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%2 0by%20County 0.pdf ¹Child abuse and neglect

^jCommunity violence: Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics: https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx ^k Distance to detention facility: Google Maps

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

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics: <u>https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx</u> 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: <u>www.voicesforchildren.com/kidscount</u>. 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*.





COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Appendix: RED Descriptives

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	282							
Youth referred to diversion	69	0%	0%	<mark>1.40%</mark>	23.20%	0%	0%	75.40%
Youth enrolled in diversion	68	0%	0%	<mark>1.50%</mark>	23.50%	0%	0%	75%
Successful completion diversion	59	0%	0%	0%	20.30%	0%	0%	79.70%
Youth with multiple charges	11	0%	0%	0%	9.10%	0%	45.50%	45.50%
Filed on in adult court	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RAI Override: More Severe	10	10%	0%	<mark>10%</mark>	20%	0%	0%	60%
RAI Override: Less Severe	5	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	80%
Probation intake	28	<mark>3.60%</mark>	0%	<mark>10.70%</mark>	14.30%	0%	0%	71.40%
Successful probation	100	0%	0%	<mark>3%</mark>	18%	0%	0%	79%
Revocation of probation	48	0%	0%	<mark>8.30%</mark>	18.80%	2.10%	0%	70.80%
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

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	240							
Youth referred to diversion	52	0%	0%	<mark>1.90%</mark>	9.60%	0%	0%	88.50%
Youth enrolled in diversion	51	0%	0%	<mark>2%</mark>	7.80%	0%	0%	90.20%
Successful completion diversion	41	0%	0%	0%	7.30%	0%	0%	92.70%
Youth with multiple charges	10	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%
Filed on in adult court	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RAI Override: More Severe	5	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	80%
RAI Override: Less Severe	3	0%	0%	<mark>33.30%</mark>	0%	0%	0%	66.70%
Probation intake	33	<mark>3%</mark>	0%	<mark>18.20%</mark>	12.10%	0%	0%	66.70%
Successful probation	86	0%	0%	<mark>3.50%</mark>	23.30%	1.20%	0%	72.10%
Revocation of probation	42	0%	0%	0%	<mark>33.30%</mark>	2.40%	0%	64.30%
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

System Point	Ν	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	243							
Youth referred to diversion	51	0%	0%	0%	17.60%	0%	0%	82.40%
Youth enrolled in diversion	51	0%	0%	0%	17.60%	0%	0%	82.40%
Successful completion diversion	43	0%	0%	0%	18.60%	0%	0%	81.40%
Youth with multiple charges	12	0%	0%	<mark>8.30%</mark>	0%	0%	41.70%	50%
Filed on in adult court	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
RAI Override: More Severe	8	<mark>12.50%</mark>	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	62.50%
RAI Override: Less Severe	12	0%	0%	0%	8.30%	0%	0%	91.70%
Probation intake	39	<mark>2.60%</mark>	0%	<mark>2.60%</mark>	23.10%	0%	0%	71.80%
Successful probation	89	0%	0%	<mark>5.60%</mark>	25.80%	1.10%	0%	67.40%
Revocation of probation	15	<mark>6.70%</mark>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	93.30%
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

2018

System Point	Ν	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	278*							
Youth referred to diversion	44	<mark>2.30%</mark>	0%	0%	<mark>40.90%</mark>	0%	0%	56.80%
Youth enrolled in diversion	43	<mark>2.30%</mark>	0%	0%	<mark>39.50%</mark>	0%	0%	58.10%
Successful completion diversion	35	0%	0%	0%	<mark>31.40%</mark>	0%	0%	68.60%
Youth with multiple charges	16	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Filed on in adult court	2	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
RAI Override: More Severe	4	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%
RAI Override: Less Severe	6	0%	0%	<mark>16.70%</mark>	16.70%	0%	0%	66.70%
Probation intake	40	<mark>2.50%</mark>	2.50%	<mark>7.50%</mark>	25%	0%	0%	62.50%
Successful probation	90	<mark>1.10%</mark>	0%	1.10%	20%	4.40%	0%	73.30%
Revocation of probation	10	0%	0%	0%	<mark>30%</mark>	0%	0%	70%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								

*Scribner PD did not report to NCC in 2018





COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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	239							
Youth referred to diversion	45	<mark>2.20%</mark>	2.20%	0%	<mark>31.10%</mark>	0%	0%	64.40%
Youth enrolled in diversion	39	<mark>2.60%</mark>	2.60%	0%	25.60%	0%	0%	69.20%
Successful completion diversion	26	0%	3.80%	0%	19.20%	0%	0%	76.90%
Youth with multiple charges	15	0%	0%	0%	13.30%	0%	73.30%	13.30%
Filed on in adult court	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
RAI Override: More Severe	11	0%	0%	0%	27.30%	0%	0%	72.70%
RAI Override: Less Severe	10	0%	10%	<mark>30</mark> %	30%	0%	0%	30%
Probation intake	58	0%	1.70%	<mark>15.50%</mark>	<mark>31%</mark>	1.70%	0%	50%
Successful probation	95	0%	0%	<mark>5.30%</mark>	26.30%	2.10%	0%	66.30%
Revocation of probation	25	0%	0%	<mark>12%</mark>	<mark>48%</mark>	0%	0%	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

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	65	81	80.2%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	377	643	58.6%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	43	43	100.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	485	767	63.2%

2016	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	34	43	79.1%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	226	397	56.9%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	35	35	100.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	295	475	100.0%

2017	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	57	68	83.8%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	209	364	57.4%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	33	35	94.3%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	299	473	63.2%





COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	66	96	68.8%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	202	390	51.8%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	27	27	100.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	295	513	57.5%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	50	81	61.7%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	57	212	26.9%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	30	30	100.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court			
Total	138	324	100.0%