



Lancaster County

Table of Contents

Y	outh 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
	Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity and School Year (2014 - 2019) ^b	5
	Disabilities, English Proficiency, Eligibility for Free/Reduced Lunch and School Year (2014 – 2019) ^b	5
	Nebraska Public High School 4-Year Graduation Rates by Lancaster (5-year estimates, 2015-2019) °	5
	Youth Who Report Mental Health Symptoms and Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d	6
	Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) ^d	7
	Estimated Gang Involvement by Local Law Enforcement	7
	Arrest Rates for Adults and Juveniles for 2018 and 2019 with Percent Change ^f	7
	Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) ^g	8
	Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) by Sex ^g	9
	Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) by Race/Ethnicity ^g	9
	Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019)	10
	Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportation year estimates, 2014-2018) $^{\rm a}$	(5- 11
	Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) ^d	12
	Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means (2019) h	12
	Child Abuse and Neglect Reports (2018) ⁱ	12
С	ommunity Level	13
	Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) ^j	13
	Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d	13
	Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) ^m	14
P	olicy, Legal and System Level	15
	Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) ⁿ	15
	Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) ^m	15
	Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) ^m	16
	County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) °	16
С	ommunity Team Level	18
	Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^p	18
	Collective Impact Survey Scores ^p	18





Community Planning Team Diversity ^p	19
References and Resources	21
Appendix: RED Descriptives	23
Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year	28



Youth Level

- Hispanic, Native American, and Black youth are over-represented in chronic absenteeism as compared to enrollment rates in the schools.
- Youth reported mental health and substance abuse rates are all lower than state numbers, nothing stands out as a high rate.
- Arrests for juveniles for larceny/theft, motor vehicle theft and other assaults are all up from 2018 to 2019. Arrests for robberies decreased from 2018 to 2019 for all age groups, but especially so for juveniles.
- NYS domains with the highest scores are Family Circumstance/Parenting,
 Education/Employment, Leisure/Recreation, Personality/Behavior. There should be programs in
 the community to address these. Peer Relationships and Leisure/Recreation were greater issues
 for females than males. Native American, Hispanic and Black youth have higher needs for
 Education/Employment, Peer relationships and overall scores, as compared to White youth.;
 White youth have higher substance use needs; Black and Hispanic youth have higher needs for
 Personality/Behavior, and Attitudes/Orientation; and Black and Asian youth have higher
 Leisure/Recreation needs.
- While juveniles are not reporting high rates of gang involvement in the BOSR survey, law enforcement is aware of gang memberships and affiliations.
- Approximately 22% of youth citations are being referred to diversion and 30% of citations on probation. It is not clear where the other cases are (perhaps dropped or dismissed); the community to further examine whether cases are properly funneling through the juvenile justice system.
- Law enforcement data by race and ethnicity would be very beneficial to have a clearer picture of RED. With the exception of Asian/Pacific Islander and White, all other race/ethnicities are overrepresented compared to the demographics of Lancaster County at diversion and probation, to have cases filed in adult court, have more than one charge filed, to be over and under-ridden, be successful in probation and have probation revoked. Unfortunately, we did not receive law enforcement data by race/ethnicity so we cannot determine whether youth of each race/ethnicity are being referred to diversion and probation at a similar rate as they are receiving a citation from law enforcement.
- The disproportionality is highest for Black youth being filed on in adult court, filed on for multiple charges, probation intakes, and RAI overrides that are more severe/
- Once referring, youth of all race/ethnicity are enrolling and successfully completing diversion at the rate to which they were referred.





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

Males

Geographic Area Name	Total Count	Non- Hispanic White	Hispanic or Latino	Blac k	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	2+ Races
Nebraska	108,494	70.4%	16.2%	5.7%	1.4%	2.0%	4.4%
Lancaster	15,849	74.8%	9.9%	3.7%	0.7%	4.0%	7.0%

Females

Geographic Area Name	Total Count	Non- Hispanic White	Hispanic or Latino	Blac k	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	2+ Races
Nebraska	102,658	69.9%	15.8%	5.2%	1.2%	2.5%	5.4%
Lancaster	15,650	71.4%	11.0%	4.9%	0.5%	3.4%	8.8%

Click 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-	Lancaster	44,272	11.87%	4.17%	0.68%	5.63%	0.06%	70.85%	6.76%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-	Lancaster	45,243	12.04%	4.14%	0.63%	5.67%	0.07%	70.55%	6.90%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-	Lancaster	45,613	12.31%	4.24%	0.63%	5.71%	0.07%	70.00%	7.04%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-	Lancaster	47,400	12.35%	4.23%	0.61%	5.69%	0.07%	69.95%	7.10%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-	Lancaster	47,817	12.51%	4.20%	0.59%	5.73%	0.08%	69.52%	7.37%
2019	Nebraska	325,984	19.13%	2.83%	1.33%	6.63%	0.15%	66.02%	3.91%





Table 3.
Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity and School Year (2014 - 2019)^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-	Lancaster	4,106	<mark>16.78%</mark>	2.65%	<mark>2.26%</mark>	<mark>10.23%</mark>	*	59.30%	8.77%
2015	Nebraska	35,638	<mark>24.54%</mark>	1.64%	<mark>4.42%</mark>	<mark>12.93%</mark>	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-	Lancaster	5,228	<mark>19.30%</mark>	2.37%	<mark>2.10%</mark>	10.39%	*	56.62%	9.22%
2016	Nebraska	38,812	<mark>25.73%</mark>	1.55%	<mark>4.27%</mark>	<mark>13.68%</mark>	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
2016-	Lancaster	5,585	20.36%	2.24%	<mark>1.93%</mark>	10.60%	0.21%	55.08%	9.58%
2017	Nebraska	42,290	<mark>26.90%</mark>	1.66%	<mark>4.40%</mark>	<mark>14.22%</mark>	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-	Lancaster	6,357	<mark>19.79%</mark>	2.06%	<mark>1.93%</mark>	<mark>11.44%</mark>	*	54.82%	9.96%
2018	Nebraska	46,365	<mark>26.81%</mark>	1.77%	<mark>4.18%</mark>	<mark>14.49%</mark>	0.22%	47.37%	2389
2018-	Lancaster	6,376	<mark>19.87%</mark>	2.10%	<mark>1.77%</mark>	10.52%	*	55.60%	10.13%
2019	Nebraska	46,356	<mark>27.64%</mark>	1.76%	<mark>4.16%</mark>	<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-	Lancaster	44,272	12.99%	<mark>0.99%</mark>	5.68%	39.33%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	44.53%
2015-	Lancaster	45,243	13.33%	1.35%	5.67%	38.89%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-	Lancaster	45,613	14.00%	<mark>1.27%</mark>	7.46%	42.22%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	13.80%	0.93%	6.99%	44.76%
2017-	Lancaster	47,400	16.32%	0.46%	6.91%	42.35%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	15.87%	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-	Lancaster	47,817	16.84%	1.67%	6.66%	42.47%
2019	Nebraska	325,984	16.13%	0.85%	6.78%	45.42%

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

Lancaster	Total in Las	st 5 Years	Yearly Av	Graduation		
	Graduates	Students	Graduates	Students	Rate	Rank
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	n/a
Lancaster 13,119		15,689	437.3	523.0	<mark>83.6%</mark>	91





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
Lancaster	Loss of sleep from worry	14.7%	18.0%	19.4%
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
Lancaster	Depressed	23.8%	32.4%	32.2%
Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
Lancaster	Considered/Attempted suicide	12.5%	18.8%	15.6%
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
Lancaster	Current alcohol	7.0%	20.6%	28.4%
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
Lancaster	Current binge drinking	0.3%	4.4%	11.3%
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%
Lancaster	Current marijuana	3.3%	6.3%	11.0%
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
Lancaster	Current tobacco	1.9%	7.2%	10.6%
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%
Lancaster	Current vaping	7.3%	21.4%	29.2%
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
Lancaster	Hopeful for future (past week)	84.2%	77.5%	78.8%
Nebraska		78.0%	76.1%	77.6%

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

Table 7.

Juveniles Referred to Services e

Table 8

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

Table 9.

Juveniles Who Utilized Services e

Table 10.

Types of Services Utilized e





Table 11. Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) ^d

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Lancaster	Youth Reported Gang Involvement	2.0%	3.1%	3.8%
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

Table 11b. Estimated Gang Involvement by Local Law Enforcement ^r

Lancaster County has a program called Operation Tipping Point (OTP) through the Lincoln Police Department. The goal of the program is to intervene with youth who are identified as gang affiliated or likely to become gang affiliated. OTP served 173 youth, primarily male (88-96%). The goal of the program is to catch youth before becoming gang members, so the program targets younger youth, but serves youth ages 9-17. OTP served more Black and Hispanic youth in 2016, 2017, and 2019, but in 2018 they served more White and Black youth. When the youth in the program reported an association, Bloods and South Side Winos were the two gangs named the most often.

Lincoln Police Department also provided information about gangs in Lincoln. Known gang membership has increased since 2015, but the number of members in the age range of 14-18 has stayed steady since 2018.

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

Arrestee Age		All Arrest	ee Ages	Under 18		
Summary Arrest Date	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %
Jurisdiction by Geography			LANCASTE	R COUN	NTY	
Arrest Offense						
Total	14,935	13,591	-9.00	1,639	1,615	-1.46
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	6	6	0.00	2	0	-100.00
Rape Total	20	21	5.00	5	6	20.00
Robbery Total	83	53	-36.14	<mark>50</mark>	<mark>17</mark>	-66.00
Aggravated Assault Total	380	400	5.26	2	0	-100.00
Burglary Total	114	78	-31.58	37	13	-64.86
Larceny-Theft Total	1,945	2,119	8.95	349	<mark>411</mark>	17.77
Motor Vehicle Theft Total	73	94	28.77	36	<mark>53</mark>	47.22
Other Assaults	1,365	1,409	3.22	276	<mark>324</mark>	17.39
Arson	23	14	-39.13	14	7	-50.00
Forgery and Counterfeiting	59	56	-5.08	0	0	-
Fraud	363	361	-0.55	20	21	5.00





Embezzlement	7	3	-57.14	6	2	-66.67
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	64	36	-43.75	7	7	0.00
Vandalism	562	519	-7.65	145	132	-8.97
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	304	258	-15.13	<mark>24</mark>	<mark>15</mark>	-37.50
Prostitution Total for Summary	43	32	-25.58	0	0	-
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	110	115	4.55	16	22	37.50
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	251	197	-21.51	17	12	-29.41
Drug Violations - Possession	3,114	2,676	-14.07	274	245	-10.58
Offenses Against Family and Children	469	473	0.85	2	2	0.00
Driving Under the Influence	1,382	1,223	-11.51	11	14	27.27
Liquor Laws	1,193	821	-31.18	73	79	8.22
Disorderly Conduct	701	720	2.71	98	96	-2.04
Vagrancy	12	2	-83.33	0	0	-
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	2,292	1,905	-16.88	175	137	-21.71

Table 13a. Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) ^g

	Lancaster (2017-2019)			All NYS Counties (2015-2017)		
Score	0	1	2	0	1	2
Family Circumstance/Parenting	60.8%	20.5%	<mark>18.7%</mark>	60.1%	26.7%	13.1%
Education/Employment	33.4%	52.0%	<mark>14.6%</mark>	43.0%	44.0%	13.1%
Peer Relationships	34.9%	56.0%	9.1%	44.7%	46.6%	8.6%
Substance Use	56.9%	34.7%	8.4%	61.4%	30.3%	8.3%
Leisure/Recreation	43.0%	31.4%	<mark>25.5%</mark>	50.6%	33.0%	16.5%
Personality/Behavior	41.6%	44.9%	<mark>13.5%</mark>	50.1%	39.4%	10.4%
Attitudes/Orientation	52.9%	40.7%	6.4%	61.3%	33.7%	5.0%
Mean Score	M = 6.42	2, SD = 3.	90, 0-20	M = 5.6	64, SD = 3.6	65, 0-17

Lancaster County n = 1978; Statewide n = 2124





Table 13b.

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

	Female	Male
Family Circumstance/Parenting	.62	.55
Education/Employment	.80	.82
Peer Relationships **	<mark>.79</mark>	<mark>.71</mark>
Substance Use	.51	.52
Leisure/Recreation *	<mark>.87</mark>	<mark>.80</mark>
Personality/Behavior	.69	.74
Attitudes/Orientation	.52	.54
Total NYS Score	6.34	6.46

Note. ANOVA for sex indicated Peer Relationships and Leisure/Recreation were greater issues for females than males. ** p <.01; * p <.05

Table 13c. Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) by Race/Ethnicity ^g

	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Native Amer.	White
Family Circumstance/Parenting	.61	.58	.69	.62	.55
Education/Employment ***	.43*	<mark>.95*</mark>	<mark>.94*</mark>	<mark>1.08*</mark>	.75
Peer Relationships **	.63*	<mark>.78*</mark>	<mark>.82*</mark>	<mark>1.04*</mark>	.71
Substance Use ***	.35	.36*	.45*	.50*	<mark>.60</mark>
Leisure/Recreation *	<mark>.86*</mark>	.78*	<mark>.96*</mark>	1.04	.80
Personality/Behavior ***	.45*	<mark>.89*</mark>	<mark>.75*</mark>	.88	.65
Attitudes/Orientation ***	.39	<mark>.63*</mark>	<mark>.59*</mark>	.69	.50
Total NYS Score ***	4.90*	7.20*	<mark>7.18*</mark>	8.12*	6.01

Note. ANOVA for race/ethnicity indicated significant differences by race/ethnicity on NYS total score and all NYS domains (except for Family Circumstances/Parenting).*** p<.001 ** p<.01; * p<.05

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





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

Click here to see Census and School population data

See yearly data in the Appendix

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	1							
Youth issued citation/referral	9165							
Youth referred to diversion	2044	<mark>2.70%</mark>	2.40%	21.40%	11.70%	2.30%	7.20%	52.30%
Youth enrolled in diversion	1791	2.90%	2.60%	<mark>21.50%</mark>	12.70%	2.60%	1.40%	56.40%
Successful completion diversion	1478	2.40%	2.60%	20.0%	12.20%	2.90%	1.60%	58.30%
Youth with multiple charges	540	<mark>3.50%</mark>	1.10%	<mark>25.20%</mark>	<mark>14.10%</mark>	0%	8.0%	48.10%
Filed on in adult court	136	3.70%	2.20%	33.80%	14.70%	0%	7.4%	38.20%
RAI Override: More Severe	583	<mark>6.50%</mark>	0.90%	31.70%	17.50%	3.40%	0%	40%
RAI Underride: Less Severe	57	0%	1.80%	21.10%	<mark>21.10%</mark>	7%	0%	49.10%
Probation intake	1047	<mark>5.60%</mark>	1.10%	32.60%	<mark>17.20%</mark>	3.90%	0%	39.60%
Successful probation	1929	<mark>3.70%</mark>	1.20%	<mark>18.60%</mark>	<mark>16.90%</mark>	3.30%	0%	56.20%
Revocation of probation	837	<mark>4.80%</mark>	1.90%	30.20%	<mark>15.90%</mark>	4.90%	0%	42.30%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								



Family Level

- Compared to state data, Lancaster County has slightly higher rate of household renters and low rates of household owners.
- A large percentage of students have access to internet at home.
- Almost 75% of child abuse and neglect reports are unfounded.

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

Measurement		Lancaster	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	14.4%	14.8%
•	Number of children 12-	5,982	43,814
	17 below 185% poverty		
	Percent of children 12-	26.4	28.9
	17 below 185% poverty		
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	38.8%	31.3%
	Lancaster Rank	3	-
	Age 25+ with some	21.6%	23.0%
	college, no degree		
	Lancaster Rank	77	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	93.5%	91.1%
	Lancaster Rank	28	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a	98.5%	96.9%
	computer at home		
	Lancaster Rank	43	-
	% under 18 with an	93.3%	91.0%
	internet subscription at		
	home		
	Lancaster Rank	30	-
	% under 18 with	93.1%	90.8%
	broadband internet		
	access at home		
	Lancaster Rank	27	-
Housing	Owner-occupied	73,619	498,567
	households		
	Total households	122,646	754,063
	Owner %	<mark>60.0%</mark>	66.1%
	Renters	49,027	255,496
	Renter %	<mark>40.0%</mark>	33.9%





Transportation	Households with no vehicle available	7,033	40,465
	Total households	122,646	754,063
	No vehicle %	5.7%	5.4%

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Lancaster	Adult at home who listens	90.0%	85.6%	88.5%
Nebraska		87.3%	85.0%	85.6%
Lancaster	Adult at school who listens	88.4%	85.9%	90.2%
Nebraska		85.2%	85.0%	87.4%

Table 17.
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means (2019) 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
Lancaster	228	130	1510	669
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

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

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Lancaster	7,014	31%	16%	<mark>72%</mark>
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%

Community Level

- For all ages, there are high arrest numbers for violent crimes, especially aggravated assault.
- 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).
- There are high rates of missing race/ethnicity data at the trial court (JUSTICE) and older diversion data. Data for race and ethnicity at each juvenile justice system point is imperative for an accurate Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) analysis.

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

Type of Violence	Lancaster	% in the state	Nebraska
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	6	17.6%	34
Rape	21	8.0%	264
Robbery	53	14.4%	367
Aggravated Assault	400	24.4%	1,639
Other Assaults	1,409	16.0%	8,782

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Lancaster	Wrong/very wrong – Marijuana	96.3%	89.3%	86.5%
Nebraska		94.4%	89.8%	85.2%
Lancaster	Wrong/very wrong – alcohol	91.8%	81.2%	72.0%
Nebraska		89.1%	80.4%	68.7%
Lancaster	Wrong/very wrong – cigarettes	94.6%	88.9%	83.7%
Nebraska		92.9%	89.0%	78.7%





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	1499	2797	<mark>53.6%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	0	13	0.0%
Filed in Juv. Court	5514	14645	37.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	698	1259	54.7%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to	3	27	11.1%
Juv. Court			
Total	7724	19063	40.5%

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

Policy, Legal and System Level

- This county is required under statute to provide an attorney when a youth is filed on in court; the rate is above the state average.
- There are few curfew and 3A, 3B uncontrollable, and 3C filings in court so the community is diverting appropriately; however, truancy filings increased in 2019 after demonstrating a decline in 2017 and 2018.
- Diversion practices and procedures are consistent with evidence-based practices. Lancaster County may want to compare diversion fees to court costs to ensure they are comparable.

Table 22.

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

	Lancaster	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	80.0% 100.0 <mark>%</mark>	73.5%

Neb. Rev. 43-272. Right to counsel; appointment; payment; guardian ad litem; appointment; when; duties; standards for guardians ad litem; standards for attorneys who practice in juvenile court.

(1)(a) In counties having a population of less than one hundred fifty thousand inhabitants, when any juvenile shall be brought without counsel before a juvenile court, the court shall advise such juvenile and his or her parent or guardian of their right to retain counsel and shall inquire of such juvenile and his or her parent or guardian as to whether they desire to retain counsel.

(b) In counties having a population of one hundred fifty thousand or more inhabitants, when any juvenile court petition is filed alleging jurisdiction of a juvenile pursuant to subdivision (1), (2), (3)(b), or (4) of section 43-247, counsel shall be appointed for such juvenile.

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

	Lancaster	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	0	352



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

		Lancaster						
Filed Subtype	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total		
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0		
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	23	123	1	46	<mark>102</mark>	355		
3B - Uncontrollable	0	5	5	2	0	12		
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) $^\circ$

	Lancaster	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	Sometimes	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; none specified	Yes: 86.4%
juvenile ineligible for diversion		No: 9.1%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Warning letters instead of	Yes	Yes: 27.3%
intervention		No: 61.4%
		Not sure: 11.4%
Currently drug test	No	Yes: 31.8%
		No: 65.9%
		Not sure: 2.3%





Fees beyond restitution	Yes; \$60 for regular diversion and	Yes: 86.4%
	\$100 for intensive diversion	No: 13.6%
		Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior	Yes; not specified	Yes: 47.7%
to discharge		No: 25.0%
		Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	Yes; not specified	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, your response rate was 80%. This is in increase in response rate from 2019.
- Having a common agenda is the domain of collective impact where the team has rated the lowest for both years. The mean score for mutually reinforcing went down slightly, but all other mean scores increased.
- 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.
- Good representation of system points by team members and persons formerly involved in the system.
- About 22% of those who responded did not feel heard, which is similar to community teams across the state.

Table 26. Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^p

	Land	aster	Nebraska		
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020	
Number of surveys sent	24	40	1407	780	
Number of completed surveys	<mark>10</mark>	<mark>32</mark>	221	345	
Response rate	<mark>41.7%</mark>	<mark>80.0%</mark>	28.3%	24.5%	

Table 27. Collective Impact Survey Scores ^p

	Lancast	er	Nebra	aska
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020
	Mean Sco	ore	Mean	Score
Common agenda	<mark>5.39</mark>	<mark>5.59</mark>	5.29	5.69
Mutually reinforcing	5.62	5.59	5.37	5.50
Shared measurement	5.64	5.94	5.21	5.45
Continuous communication	5.78	6.16	5.49	5.55





Backbone agency 5.62	6.16	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

	Lanca	ster	Neb	raska
	N = 32	(%)	N = 345	(%)
Gender				
Male	11	34.4%	101	29.3%
Female	20	62.5%	229	66.4%
Missing	1	3.1%	15	4.3%
Age				
Under 30	1	3.1%	19	5.6%
30-39	10	31.2%	68	19.6%
40-49	10	31.2%	88	25.4%
50-59	7	21.9	90	25.8%
60 and over	3	9.4	44	13%
Missing	1	3.1%	36	10.4%
Race/Ethnicity				
White	22	68.8%	230	66.7%
Black	3	9.4%	10	2.9%
Hispanic		3.1%	13	3.8%
Native American	1	3.1%	6	1.7%
Asian			1	0.3%





Other			2	0.6%
Provided town name	5	15.6%	63	18.3%
Missing			19	5.5%
Previous System Involvement				
Yes	7	21.9%	98	28.4%
No	25	78.1%	242	70.1%
Missing			5	1.4%
System Point *				
Law enforcement	2	4.2%	34	7.8%
Lancaster attorney/ juvenile court	1	2.1%	32	7.3%
K-12 or secondary education	3	6.3%	65	14.9%
Ministry/faith based	1	2.1%	10	2.3%
Diversion	6	12.5%	55	12.6%
Probation	3	6.3%	31	7.1%
Public defender/ defense counsel/ guardian ad litem	1	2.1%	8	1.8%
DHHS or Child Welfare	2	4.2%	13	3.0%
Treatment provider	5	10.4%	40	9.2%
Post adjudication or detention	1	2.1%	8	1.8%
Community based program	23	47.9%	109	25.0%
Elected official or government			6	1.4%
Restorative practices			6	1.4%
Backbone or system improvement			3	0.7%
Other			16	3.7%
Voice on Team				
Feel heard	25	78.1%	270	78.3%
Do not feel heard	7	21.9%	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%2
 Oby%20County 0.pdf

¹Child 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

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





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

- ^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*.
- r Estimated Gang Involvement by Local Law Enforcement: Lincoln Police Department Memo, Descriptive Analysis of Operation Tipping Point data prepared by: Officer Luke Bonkiewicz, and Lincoln Police Department Memo, Gang Data prepared by: Jeff Peterson, LPD CAIU Manager. Both reports provided to JJI by Matt Baker.





Appendix: RED Descriptives

2015

Click back to RED Summary 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					1	1		
Youth issued citation/referral	2120				1	1		
Youth referred to diversion	506	4.50%	4.30%	13%	12.10%	2.20%	18%	45.80%
Youth enrolled in diversion	404	5.40%	5.20%	14.40%	15.10%	2.70%	1%	56.20%
Successful completion diversion	282	3.90%	5%	10.60%	15.20%	2.80%	0.70%	61.70%
Youth with multiple charges	51	2%	2%	<mark>27.50%</mark>	13.70%	0%	7.80%	47.10%
Filed on in adult court	7	0%	0%	14.30%	14.30%	0%	14.30%	57.10%
RAI Override: More Severe	167	3.60%	1.20%	38.90%	12.60%	1.80%	0%	41.90%
RAI Override: Less Severe	10	0%	0%	30%	10%	10%	0%	50%
Probation intake	259	3.50%	0.80%	37.10%	12.40%	3.50%	0%	42.90%
Successful probation	515	2.90%	0.80%	18.60%	15.90%	3.90%	0%	57.90%
Revocation of probation	193	5.20%	3.60%	29%	12.40%	5.20%	0%	44.60%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once		<u></u>						



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	1857							
Youth referred to diversion	435	2.80%	2.30%	18.90%	9.90%	0.70%	9.90%	55.60%
Youth enrolled in diversion	367	2.70%	2.70%	20.20%	10.40%	0.80%	2.20%	61%
Successful completion diversion	320	2.20%	3.10%	19.10%	10.30%	0.90%	2.50%	61.90%
Youth with multiple charges	149	6%	0.70%	24.80%	14.10%	0%	8.70%	45.60%
Filed on in adult court	29	0%	0%	31%	17.20%	0%	3.40%	48.30%
RAI Override: More Severe	83	6%	1.20%	27.70%	15.70%	3.60%	0%	45.80%
RAI Override: Less Severe	5	0%	0%	20%	0%	20%	0%	60%
Probation intake	176	4.50%	2.30%	29.50%	14.80%	3.40%	0%	45.50%
Successful probation	434	3.70%	0.90%	20.30%	17.10%	4.10%	0%	53.90%
Revocation of probation	222	4.10%	1.40%	28.80%	15.30%	4.50%	0%	45.90%
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	1934							
Youth referred to diversion	364	0.50%	1.60%	28%	11.30%	0.80%	0%	57.70%
Youth enrolled in diversion	333	0.60%	1.50%	27.90%	11.40%	0.60%	0%	58%
Successful completion diversion	280	0.70%	1.80%	26.80%	10.70%	0.70%	0%	59.30%
Youth with multiple charges	135	0.70%	1.50%	24.40%	17%	0%	7.40%	48.90%
Filed on in adult court	26	0%	0%	42.30%	15.40%	0%	3.80%	38.50%
RAI Override: More Severe	73	5.50%	1.40%	31.50%	21.90%	1.40%	0%	38.40%
RAI Override: Less Severe	7	0%	0%	14.30%	14.30%	0%	0%	71.40%
Probation intake	143	5.60%	1.40%	34.30%	18.20%	0.70%	0%	39.90%
Successful probation	451	3.80%	1.60%	13.70%	16.40%	3.30%	0%	61.20%
Revocation of probation	202	4%	1.50%	33.20%	16.80%	4%	0%	40.60%
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	1639							
Youth referred to diversion	355	2%	0.80%	<mark>22.80%</mark>	14.60%	3.70%	2%	54.10%
Youth enrolled in diversion	326	2.10%	0.60%	<mark>19.90%</mark>	14.70%	4%	2.10%	56.40%
Successful completion diversion	277	1.40%	0.70%	18.40%	14.10%	4.70%	2.50%	58.10%
Youth with multiple charges	112	4.50%	0.90%	24.10%	10.70%	0%	7.10%	52.70%
Filed on in adult court	38	10.50%	0%	44.70%	13.20%	0%	7.90%	23.70%
RAI Override: More Severe	95	11.60%	1.10%	<mark>29.50%</mark>	18.90%	3.20%	0%	35.80%
RAI Override: Less Severe	10	0%	10%	20%	40%	0%	0%	30%
Probation intake	190	<mark>8.40%</mark>	1.60%	32.60%	18.90%	3.70%	0%	34.70%
Successful probation	337	<mark>3.90%</mark>	1.80%	20.80%	20.20%	2.10%	0%	51.30%
Revocation of probation	122	<mark>4.10%</mark>	1.60%	26.20%	23.80%	2.50%	0%	41.80%
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
			4%	6%	13%			66%
Law enforcement contact								
Youth taken to temporary custody								
Youth issued citation/referral	1615							
Youth referred to diversion	384	2.90%	2.30%	<mark>27.60%</mark>	10.90%	4.40%	1.60%	50.30%
Youth enrolled in diversion	361	3%	2.20%	<mark>26.30%</mark>	11.60%	4.70%	1.70%	50.40%
Successful completion diversion	319	3.40%	2.20%	24.80%	11.30%	5.30%	1.90%	51.10%
Youth with multiple charges	93	3.20%	1.10%	<mark>26.90%</mark>	14%	0%	8.60%	46.20%
Filed on in adult court	36	2.80%	8.30%	<mark>22.20%</mark>	13.90%	0%	11.10%	41.70%
RAI Override: More Severe	165	7.30%	0%	<mark>27.90%</mark>	20.60%	6.10%	0%	38.20%
RAI Override: Less Severe	25	0%	0%	20%	24%	8%	0%	48%
Probation intake	279	6.50%	0%	<mark>29.40%</mark>	21.50%	6.50%	0%	36.20%
Successful probation	192	5.20%	1.60%	22.40%	14.60%	2.10%	0%	54.20%
Revocation of probation	98	8.20%	1%	34.70%	12.20%	10.20%	0%	33.70%
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

Click back to Record Sealing Summary data

2015	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	288	497	<mark>57.9%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	1237	2922	42.3%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	213	318	67.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	1744	3760	46.4%

2016	Number of charges	Total Number of	Sealed
	Sealed	charges	(%)
Dismissed or Dropped	435	757	<mark>57.5%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	1774	4212	42.1%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	183	315	58.1%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	2401	5346	44.9%

2017	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	316	559	<mark>56.5%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	1457	2948	49.4%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	90	235	38.3%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	1866	3810	49.0%





2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	208	528	<mark>39.4%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	716	2456	29.2%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	76	198	38.4%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to	1	2	50.0%
Juv. Court			
Total	1003	3315	30.3%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	252	456	<mark>55.3%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	0	13	0.0%
Filed in Juv. Court	330	2107	15.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	127	193	65.8%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to	0	12	0.0%
Juv. Court			
Total	710	2832	25.1%