



## Garden County

## **Table of Contents**

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







## Youth Level

- While we could not get race/ethnicity data for chronic absenteeism in this community for most years because the frequency was too low to report, Hispanic, Native American, and Black youth are over-represented statewide in chronic absenteeism.
  - In 2018/2019 the rate of Hispanic youth with chronic absenteeism is disproportionately high compared to the school population.
- More youth have IDEA plans than the state comparison across all years.
- This community has not participated in the NRPFSS and should consider participating in the next survey year (2020) to get youth-level data on mental health, gangs, supportive adults and community perceptions of substance use.
- JJI did not have risk assessment scores for diversion from the 2015-2017 assessment
  evaluation to include. If the county is not using a validated assessment tool, then it should begin
  doing so (there will be a statewide tool coming in July 2021). If the county does have
  assessment data in digital format for JJI to analyze, we would be happy to update this table.
- Law enforcement data by race and ethnicity would be very beneficial to have a clearer picture of RED.
  - Although the Census and school data indicate few Black youth, they are overrepresented in successful probation discharges.
  - Diversion data at all 3 points is missing race/ethnicity or marked unspecified. Data for race and ethnicity at each juvenile justice system point is imperative for an accurate Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) analysis.

Table 1.

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

#### Males

Geographic	Total Count	Non-Hispanic	Hispanic or		American	Asian or	2+
Area		White	Latino	Black	Indian	Pacific Islander	Races
Nebraska	108,494	70.4%	16.2%	5.7%	1.4%	2.0%	4.4%
Garden	107	98.1%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

#### **Females**

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





Garden	115	78.3%	21.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
--------	-----	-------	-------	------	------	------	------	--

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

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

Year	Geographic 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-	Garden	257	8.56%	0.00%	1.17%	0.00%	0.00%	87.16%	3.11%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-	Garden	285	10.18%	0.00%	1.05%	0.00%	0.00%	85.96%	2.81%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-	Garden	280	9.64%	0.00%	0.71%	0.36%	0.00%	87.50%	1.79%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-	Garden	250	12.40%	0.00%	1.60%	0.00%	0.00%	84.00%	2.00%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-	Garden	264	9.85%	0.00%	1.14%	0.00%	0.00%	87.12%	1.89%
2019	Nebraska	325,984	19.13%	2.83%	1.33%	6.63%	0.15%	66.02%	3.91%

Table 3.
Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity and School Year <sup>b</sup>

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-	Garden	15	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2015	Nebraska	35,638	24.54%	1.64%	4.42%	12.93%	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-	Garden	46	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2016	Nebraska	38,812	25.73%	1.55%	4.27%	13.68%	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
2016-	Garden	27	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2017	Nebraska	42,290	26.90%	1.66%	4.40%	14.22%	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-	Garden	14	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2018	Nebraska	46,365	26.81%	1.77%	4.18%	14.49%	0.22%	47.37%	2389
2018-	Garden	92	<mark>15.22%</mark>	*	*	*	*	84.78%	*
2019	Nebraska	46,356	27.64%	1.76%	4.16%	14.71%	0.23%	46.27%	5.23%

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





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

Year	Geographic	Total	IDEA	504	Limited English	Free/Reduced
	Area	Count		Plan	Proficiency	Lunch
2014-	Garden	257	10.51%	*	*	59.14%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	44.53%
2015-	Garden	285	13.68%	*	*	55.44%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-	Garden	280	<mark>14.64%</mark>	*	*	54.29%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	<mark>13.80%</mark>	0.93%	6.99%	44.76%
2017-	Garden	250	<mark>22.00%</mark>	*	*	52.80%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	<mark>15.87%</mark>	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-	Garden	264	<mark>25.76%</mark>	*	*	61.36%
2019	Nebraska	325,984	<mark>16.13%</mark>	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

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	verages	Graduation	
	Graduates	Students	Graduates Students		Rate	Rank
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	-
Garden	85	86	17.0	17.2	98.8%	5

Table 6. Youth Who Report Mental Health Symptoms and Substance Use by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>

		8 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
Garden	Loss of sleep from worry			
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
Garden	Depressed			
Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
Garden	Considered/Attempted suicide			
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
Garden	Current alcohol			
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
Garden	Current binge drinking			
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%



Garden	Current marijuana			
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
Garden	Current tobacco			
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%
Garden	Current vaping			
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
Garden	Hopeful for future (past week)			
Nebraska		72.1%	74.7%	78.4%

<sup>\*</sup>Garden County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

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

Table 7.

Juveniles Referred to Services e

Table 8.

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

Table 9.

Juveniles Who Utilized Services <sup>e</sup>

Table 10.

Types of Services Utilized e

Table 11. Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>

		8 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
Garden	Youth Reported Gang Involvement			
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

<sup>\*</sup>Garden 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 <sup>f</sup>

Arrestee Age	All Arrestee Ages Under 18			der 18		
Summary Arrest Date	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Crowth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019
Jurisdiction by Geography			Growth % GARDEN	I COLINI	ΓΥ	Growth %
Arrest Offense	CARDEN GOONT					
Total	11	2	-81.82	0	0	-
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	1	-	-100.00	0	-	-
Driving Under the Influence	1	-	-100.00	0	-	-
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	9	2	-77.78	0	0	-

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

	Garden			All NYS Counties		
Score	0	1	2	0	1	2
Family Circumstance/Parenting	I			60.1%	26.7%	13.1%
Education/Employment	I			43.0%	44.0%	13.1%
Peer Relationships	-			44.7%	46.6%	8.6%
Substance Use				61.4%	30.3%	8.3%
Leisure/Recreation				50.6%	33.0%	16.5%
Personality/Behavior				50.1%	39.4%	10.4%
Attitudes/Orientation				61.3%	33.7%	5.0%
Mean Score	M:	=, SD =	,	M = 5.6	4, SD = 3.	65, 0-17

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





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

### Click here to see Census and School Population Data

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

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact								
Youth taken to temporary custody					-			
Youth issued citation/referral	1*							
Youth referred to diversion	13	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<mark>69.20%</mark>	30.80%
Youth enrolled in diversion	13	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	69.20%	30.80%
Successful completion diversion	11	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<mark>72.70%</mark>	27.30%
Youth with multiple charges	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Filed on in adult court	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RAI Override: More Severe	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Probation intake	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Successful probation	13	<mark>7.70%</mark>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	92.30%
Revocation of probation	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Youth in OJS custody					-			
OJS custody: placed in detention					1			
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								

<sup>\*</sup>Garden County sheriff did not report to NCC 2015 - 2018





## **Family Level**

- 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 Garden County.
- The percentage of youth with internet subscription and access to broadband internet at home is lower than the rest of the state.

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

Measurement		Garden	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	8.8%	14.8%
-	Number of children 12-	38	43,814
	17 below 185% poverty		
	Percent of children 12-	24.4%	28.9%
	17 below 185% poverty		
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	<mark>24.9%</mark>	31.3%
	County rank	21	-
	Age 25+ with some	25.2%	23.0%
	college, no degree		
	County rank	32	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	93.2%	91.1%
	County Rank	32	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a	100.0%	96.9%
	computer at home		
	County rank	1	-
	% under 18 with an	<mark>84.0%</mark>	91.0%
	internet subscription at		
	home		
	County rank	76	-
	% under 18 with	<mark>84.0%</mark>	90.8%
	broadband internet		
	access at home		
	County Rank	75	-





Housing	Owner-occupied households	672	498,567
	Total households	871	754,063
	Owner %	77.2%	66.1%
	Renters	199	255,496
	Renter %	22.8%	33.9%
Transportation	Households with no vehicle available	23	40,465
	Total households	871	754,063
	No vehicle %	2.6%	5.4%

Table 16. Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>

		8 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
Garden	Adult at home who listens	-		-
Nebraska		87.3%	85.0%	85.6%
Garden	Adult at school who listens			
Nebraska		85.2%	85.0%	87.4%

<sup>\*</sup>Garden County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

Table 17.
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means <sup>h</sup>

	Aggravated	Aggravated	Simple Domestic	Simple Domestics
	Domestic Assaults	Domestic Assaults	Assaults Reported	Assaults Cleared
	Reported	Cleared by Arrest		by Arrest or
		or Exceptional		Exceptional Means
		Means		·
Garden	0	0	1	0
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

Table 18. Child Abuse and Neglect Reports <sup>i</sup>

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Garden	33	39%	23%	62%
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%

## **Community Level**

- There are no violent arrests in this community.
- Garden County is doing very well with sealing of juvenile court records. Dismissed or dropped cases should be sealed at 100%, which they are in this community.
  - 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), in which Garden County appears to also be doing very well.

Table 19.
Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) <sup>j</sup>

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

Table 20. Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>

		8 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
Garden	Wrong/very wrong – Marijuana	-	-	-
Nebraska		94.4%	89.8%	85.2%
Garden	Wrong/very wrong – alcohol	1	•	•
Nebraska		89.1%	80.4%	68.7%
Garden	Wrong/very wrong – cigarettes			
Nebraska		92.9%	89.0%	78.7%

<sup>\*</sup>Garden County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey





Table 21. Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019)  $^{\rm m}$ 

#### see Appendix for yearly data

	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	49	49	<mark>100</mark> %
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	51	55	92.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	9	9	100%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court			
Total	109	113	96.5%

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

## Policy, Legal and System Level

- Despite not being in a county required to provide counsel under statute, access to counsel is higher than the state average.
- There are few curfew and 3A, 3B, and 3C filings in court so the community is diverting appropriately.
- 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
  - o Allowing warning letters for the lowest risk youth
  - Comparing diversion fees to court costs so they are comparable. With a higher proportion of children <18 in poverty, perhaps offering scholarships.</li>
  - Having a process for sealing records for youth on diversion with law enforcement and JCMS, as required by statute.
  - o If drug testing is needed, it should only be used on cases where the youth demonstrates a substance use issue.

Table 22.

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

	Garden	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	80.0% 100.0%	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.

Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>

	Garden	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	0	352

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

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

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

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

	Garden	Nebraska *
Refer ALL juveniles who are first	yes	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	<u>Always</u>	Always: 47.7%
unsuccessful on diversion		Sometimes: 47.7%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Allow a juvenile to complete	No	Yes: 61.4%
diversion more than once		No: 34.1%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Charges/offenses that make a	Yes; certain felony charges	Yes: 86.4%
juvenile ineligible for diversion		No: 9.1%
		Not sure: 4.5%





Warning letters instead of	No	Yes: 27.3%
intervention		No: 61.4%
		Not sure: 11.4%
Currently drug test	Yes	Yes: 31.8%
		No: 65.9%
		Not sure: 2.3%
Fees beyond restitution	Yes; \$ <mark>100</mark> and cost of drug test	Yes: 86.4%
		No: 13.6%
		Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior	No	Yes: 47.7%
to discharge		No: 25.0%
		Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	Yes; filed away as completed	Yes: 59.1%
		No: 22.7%
		Not sure: 18.2%

<sup>\*</sup>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, your response rate was 11.7%.
  - This is a decrease from the 2019 survey, but more people completed the survey; the number of people the survey was sent to increased.
  - The 2020 mean score for Collective Impact is lower than both the Panhandle 2019 response and overall Nebraska mean score, except for shared measurement.
- 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. This includes age of team members.
  - There were 4 responses (25%) to race/ethnicity that had town name and two that are missing (12.5), so there may be more diversity than the survey revealed.
- Survey results show no probation, law enforcement, or attorneys on your team, but this may be due to the low response rate.

Table 26. Collective Impact Survey Response Rates <sup>p</sup>

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

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

	Panhand	lle	Nebra	aska				
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020				
	Mean Score		Mean Score		Mean Score		Mean	Score
Common agenda	5.33	<mark>5.27</mark>	5.29	5.69				
Mutually reinforcing	5.52	<mark>5.13</mark>	5.37	5.50				
Shared measurement	5.57	5.60	5.21	5.45				
Continuous communication	5.98	<mark>5.15</mark>	5.49	5.55				
Backbone agency	6.16	<mark>5.64</mark>	5.52	5.78				



The five elements of Collective Impact are:

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

Table 28. Community Planning Team Diversity <sup>p</sup>

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





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

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

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

### References and Resources

- <sup>a</sup> **Population data:** Table B01001 race series, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Compiled and Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on July 10, 2020
- <sup>a</sup> **Youth employment:** Table B23001, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Compiled and Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on July 10, 2020
- <sup>a</sup> **Poverty/SES:** Table B10724, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 3-18-2020
- <sup>a</sup> **Technology in household:** Table B28005, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Compiled by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 8-11-20
- <sup>a</sup> **Home owner/transportation:** Table B25045, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Compiled and Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 8-11-20
- <sup>a</sup> **Education attainment:** Table B15002, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 3-18-2020
- <sup>b</sup> School membership, chronic absenteeism, student disability, and free/reduced lunch: Prepared by Sara Simonsen, Nebraska Department of Education
- <sup>c</sup> **Graduation rates:** Special Tabulation by Sara Simonsen, Nebraska Department of Education Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 7-24-2020
- <sup>d</sup> Mental health, Substance use, gang, and community perceptions of substance use: Bureau of Sociological Research, Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey: <a href="https://bosr.unl.edu/current-nrpfss-county-level-data">https://bosr.unl.edu/current-nrpfss-county-level-data</a>
- e Referral to and utilization of services: Department of Health and Human Services
- <sup>f</sup> **Adult and juvenile arrests:** Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics: <a href="https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx">https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx</a>
  <sup>g</sup> 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
  Oby%20County 0.pdf

<sup>1</sup>Child abuse and neglect

<sup>j</sup> **Community violence:** Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics: <a href="https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx">https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx</a>

<sup>k</sup> Distance to detention facility: Google Maps

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





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

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



## **Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year**

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

2015	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	17	17	100%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	29	29	100%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	5	5	100%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	51	51	100%

2016	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	7	7	100%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	14	14	100%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	3	3	100%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	24	24	100%

2017	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	10	10	100%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	6	6	100%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)			
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	16	16	100%





2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	9	9	100%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	2	2	100%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	1	1	100%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	12	12	100%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	6	6	100%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	0	4	0.0%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)			
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	6	40	60.0%