



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Lincoln 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	3
Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity and School Year (2014 - 2019) ^b	4
Disabilities, English Proficiency, Eligibility for Free/Reduced Lunch and School Year (2014 – 2019) ^b	5
Nebraska Public High School 4-Year Graduation Rates by County (5-year estimates, 2015-2019) ^c	5
Youth Who Report Mental Health Symptoms and Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d	6
Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) ^d	7
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) ⁱ	9
Family Level	11
Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportation (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a	11
Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) ^d	12
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means ^h	12
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ	12
Community 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
Policy, 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	16
Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) ^m	16
County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) ^o	16
Community 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



UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

EVIDENCE-BASED
NEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year

28



Youth Level

- Hispanic youth are over-represented in chronic absenteeism as compared to the juvenile population and student population; this over-representation has been fairly consistent over time.
- 10th and 12th graders report more loss of sleep from worry than the state average; 8th and 10th graders report being more depressed than the state average; 8th graders report higher marijuana use than the state average; and 12th graders report higher levels of binge drinking, tobacco use, and vaping compared to the state.
- 8th and 10th graders report more gang involvement than the state average.
- From 2018 to 2019, larceny-theft has declined for all ages, and even more for juveniles. While drug possession violations declined for all ages, they increased for juveniles. Liquor laws increased for all age groups and curfew violations increased for juveniles.
- Risk assessment data from youth assessed for diversion were highest for the following domains: Family, Peer Relationships, and Personality/Behavior.
- It appears cases may not be funneling to diversion as they could; more juvenile cases should be referred to diversion (currently about 18%), and fewer cases should be funneled to probation (currently about 50%). Once referred to diversion, youth are enrolling and successful at a similar rate as they are referred (total and by race/ethnicity).
- Black youth are over-represented in court filings with multiple charges, RAI overrides to a more severe placement, probation intakes and are not as successful on probation – as compared to the juvenile population of the county (unfortunately, we do not have law enforcement data by race/ethnicity to see if Black youth are being referred to these system point at a rate that is proportional to law enforcement stops of citations/referrals).
- Native American youth are over-represented in probation intakes as compared to the juvenile population of the county; and Hispanic youth are more likely to be successful on probation.

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	Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	2+ Races
Nebraska	108,494	70.4%	16.2%	5.7%	1.4%	2.0%	4.4%
Lincoln	2,053	83.9%	9.2%	1.8%	0.2%	0.0%	4.8%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Females

Geographic Area Name	Total Count	Non-Hispanic White	Hispanic or Latino	Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	2+ Races
Nebraska	102,658	69.9%	15.8%	5.2%	1.2%	2.5%	5.4%
Lincoln	2,122	76.4%	13.3%	1.1%	0.6%	0.1%	8.5%

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

Table 2.

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

Year	Geographic Area	Total Count	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian or Alaska Native	Black or African American	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific islander	White	Two or More Races
2014-2015	Lincoln	5764	12.32%	0.45%	0.36%	1.04%	0.16%	82.81%	2.86%
	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-2016	Lincoln	5852	12.56%	0.50%	0.46%	1.04%	0.15%	82.60%	2.68%
	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-2017	Lincoln	5779	12.98%	0.62%	0.45%	1.26%	0.16%	82.14%	2.39%
	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-2018	Lincoln	5784	13.42%	0.54%	0.48%	1.23%	0.14%	81.74%	2.46%
	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-2019	Lincoln	5752	13.94%	0.59%	0.50%	1.37%	0.12%	80.81%	2.66%
	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
2014-2015	Lincoln	930	21.61%	*	*	2.04%	*	72.37%	3.98%
	Nebraska	35,638	24.54%	1.64%	4.42%	12.93%	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-2016	Lincoln	969	20.74%	*	*	1.24%	*	74.10%	3.92%
	Nebraska	38,812	25.73%	1.55%	4.27%	13.68%	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
	Lincoln	863	20.39%	*	1.39%	2.32%	*	71.03%	4.87%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

2016-2017	Nebraska	42,290	26.90%	1.66%	4.40%	14.22%	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-2018	Lincoln	894	20.92%	*	1.57%	2.13%	*	71.36%	4.03%
	Nebraska	46,365	26.81%	1.77%	4.18%	14.49%	0.22%	47.37%	2389
2018-2019	Lincoln	666	21.77%	*	*	2.10%	*	72.52%	3.60%
	Nebraska	46,356	27.64%	1.76%	4.16%	14.71%	0.23%	46.27%	5.23%

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

Table 4.

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

Year	Geographic Area	Total Count	IDEA	504 Plan	Limited English Proficiency	Free/Reduced Lunch
2014-2015	Lincoln	5764	14.16%	0.78%	0.88%	40.98%
	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	44.53%
2015-2016	Lincoln	5852	13.77%	0.80%	1.18%	39.25%
	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-2017	Lincoln	5779	13.69%	0.62%	1.26%	44.99%
	Nebraska	318,853	13.80%	0.93%	6.99%	44.76%
2017-2018	Lincoln	5784	15.82%	0.55%	1.49%	47.32%
	Nebraska	323,391	15.87%	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-2019	Lincoln	5752	16.53%	0.38%	1.69%	48.45%
	Nebraska	325,984	16.13%	0.85%	6.78%	45.42%

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

Table 5.

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

County	Total in Last 5 Years		Yearly Averages		Graduation Rate	Rank
	Graduates	Students	Graduates	Students		
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	n/a
Lincoln	1,881	2,087	62.7	69.6	90.1%	76

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%.



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Table 6.

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Lincoln	Loss of sleep from worry	18.8%	28.7%	28.3%
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
Lincoln	Depressed	35.6%	39.5%	37.1%
Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
Lincoln	Considered/Attempted suicide	19.3%	20.3%	16.7%
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
Lincoln	Current alcohol	12.5%	19.2%	36.8%
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
Lincoln	Current binge drinking	2.6%	6.2%	18.6%
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%
Lincoln	Current marijuana	6.2%	7.9%	15.6%
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
Lincoln	Current tobacco	5.9%	9.3%	21.4%
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%
Lincoln	Current vaping	13.9%	26.3%	47.4%
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
Lincoln	Hopeful for future (past week)	73.2%	73.9%	75.0%
Nebraska		72.1%	74.7%	78.4%

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

Table 7.

Juveniles Referred to Services ^e

Table 8.

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

Table 9.

Juveniles Who Utilized Services ^e

Table 10.

Types of Services Utilized ^e



Table 11.

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Lincoln	Youth Reported Gang Involvement	7.1%	7.9%	5.5%
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

Table 12.

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

Arrestee Age	All Arrestee Ages			Under 18		
Summary Arrest Date	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %
Jurisdiction by Geography	LINCOLN COUNTY					
Arrest Offense						
Total	2,085	1,871	-10.26	230	221	-3.91
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	4	1	-75.00	2	-	-100.00
Rape Total	4	7	75.00	-	2	-
Robbery Total	5	8	60.00	-	-	-
Aggravated Assault Total	48	45	-6.25	-	1	-
Burglary Total	24	7	-70.83	3	2	-33.33
Larceny-Theft Total	209	188	-10.05	40	14	-65.00
Motor Vehicle Theft Total	12	8	-33.33	3	-	-100.00
Other Assaults	233	213	-8.58	35	26	-25.71
Arson	1	3	200.00	-	-	-
Forgery and Counterfeiting	19	25	31.58	0	-	-
Fraud	73	45	-38.36	2	2	0.00
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	39	29	-25.64	1	1	0.00
Vandalism	76	58	-23.68	19	21	10.53
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	19	24	26.32	0	0	-
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	5	6	20.00	0	1	-
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	53	31	-41.51	3	0	-100.00
Drug Violations - Possession	434	378	-12.90	19	29	52.63
NIBRS Unable to Classify	1	2	100.00	-	-	-
Offenses Against Family and Children	38	26	-31.58	0	2	-
Driving Under the Influence	155	121	-21.94	1	4	300.00
Liquor Laws	110	151	37.27	23	38	65.22



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Disorderly Conduct	104	69	-33.65	3	4	33.33
Vagrancy	1	-	-100.00	-	-	-
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	390	395	1.28	48	43	-10.42
Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	21	29	38.10	21	29	38.10
Runaways	7	2	-71.43	7	2	-71.43

Table 13.

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

Score	Lincoln		All YLS Counties	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Family Circumstance/Parenting	3.09	1.51	1.20	1.32
Education/Employment	1.82	1.72	1.27	1.35
Peer Relationships	3.00	1.41	1.78	1.08
Substance Use	0.91	1.30	1.29	1.40
Leisure/Recreation	1.36	1.36	0.88	0.95
Personality/Behavior	3.27	2.24	1.34	1.52
Attitudes/Orientation	1.73	0.91	0.45	0.79
Mean Score	<i>M</i> = 15.18, <i>SD</i> = 4.85, 9-24		<i>M</i> = 8.23, <i>SD</i> = 5.22, 0-31	

Lincoln County *n* = 11; Statewide *n* = 2124



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

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

See [Appendix for yearly data](#)

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	1258	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
JAC – Assessment								
Youth referred to diversion	225	0%	0.40%	2.20%	8%	0.90%	0%	88.40%
Youth enrolled in diversion	163	0%	0.60%	3.10%	8%	1.20%	0%	87.10%
Successful completion diversion	127	0%	0.80%	3.10%	8.70%	0.80%	0%	86.60%
Youth with multiple charges	49	0%	0%	6.10%	6.10%	0%	4.10%	83.70%
Filed on in adult court	172	0%	0%	1.20%	10.50%	0%	10.50%	77.90%
RAI Override: More Severe	18	0%	0%	27.80%	11.10%	5.60%	0%	55.60%
RAI Override: Less Severe	8	0%	0%	12.50%	12.50%	0%	0%	75%
Probation intake	98	4.10%	0%	12.20%	13.30%	2%	0%	68.40%
Successful probation	492	2%	0.20%	2.40%	16.90%	1.20%	0%	77.20%
Revocation of probation	169	3%	0%	3%	20.70%	1.80%	0%	71.60%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

EVIDENCE-BASED
NEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021



Family Level

- Poverty (and related measures) does not seem to be a problem in this community as compared to the state average.
- There is a lower rate of people 25+ with bachelor's degrees as compared to the state, which is not an uncommon pattern in rural communities. There is a slightly lower rate of homes with vehicles, as compared to the state.
- 10th graders are less likely to report having a supportive adult at home than the state; while 8th and 10th graders are less likely to report having a supportive adult at school who listens as compared to the state.
- The county has a higher rate of child abuse reports assessed, as well as substantiated cases of child abuse and neglect compared to the state.

Table 15.

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

Measurement		Lincoln	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	14.6%	14.8%
	Number of children 12-17 below 185% poverty	698	43,814
	Percent of children 12-17 below 185% poverty	24.7%	28.9%
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	22.1%	31.3%
	County rank	39	-
	Age 25+ with some college, no degree	27.3%	23.0%
	County rank	21	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	93.2%	91.1%
	County Rank	31	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a computer at home	99.8%	96.9%
	County rank	21	-
	% under 18 with an internet subscription at home	92.1%	91.0%
	County rank	41	-
	% under 18 with broadband internet access at home	91.8%	90.8%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

	County Rank	40	-
Housing	Owner-occupied households	9,780	498,567
	Total households	14,985	754,063
	Owner %	65.3%	66.1%
	Renters	5,205	255,496
	Renter %	34.7%	33.9%
Transportation	Households with no vehicle available	1,031	40,465
	Total households	14,985	754,063
	No vehicle %	6.9%	5.4%

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

		8th	10th	12th
Lincoln	Adult at home who listens	86.5%	81.0%	85.8%
Nebraska		87.3%	85.0%	85.6%
Lincoln	Adult at school who listens	81.7%	79.8%	86.2%
Nebraska		85.2%	85.0%	87.4%

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

	Aggravated Domestic Assaults Reported	Aggravated Domestic Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means	Simple Domestic Assaults Reported	Simple Domestic Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means
Lincoln	43	38	72	68
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

Table 18.
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Lincoln	628	42%	25%	61%
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%



Community Level

- 12th graders report that people in their community find marijuana and cigarettes wrong or very wrong at a lower rate than the state averages.
- Juvenile record sealing is not “automatic” even if statute requires it to seal. Sealing a record requires administrative staff to initiate the process. Dismissed or dropped cases should be sealed at a rate of 100%. All others should be sealed at the rate to which youth successfully complete their court requirements (completion of diversion, probation, restorative practice, or other treatment). Yearly data is available in the Appendix to see if the rate has improved because of legislation, but newer cases should naturally have lower rates of sealing than older cases. In this county, the rates of sealing records is quite low for dropped/dismissed cases across all years. The county should examine whether this is the case for the other types of case closures.
- There are higher levels of missing data at the court level. Data for race and ethnicity at each juvenile justice system point is imperative for an accurate Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED)

Table 19.

Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) ⁱ

Type of Violence	Lincoln	Nebraska
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	1	34
Rape	7	264
Robbery	8	367
Aggravated Assault	45	1,639
Other Assaults	213	8,782

Table 20.

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Lincoln	Wrong/very wrong – Marijuana	91.3%	88.0%	81.8%
Nebraska		94.4%	89.8%	85.2%
Lincoln	Wrong/very wrong – alcohol	88.8%	83.4%	67.3%
Nebraska		89.1%	80.4%	68.7%
Lincoln	Wrong/very wrong – cigarettes	91.8%	89.2%	71.6%
Nebraska		92.9%	89.0%	78.7%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Table 21.
Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) ^m

see [Appendix for yearly data](#)

	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	1499	2797	53.6%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	0	13	0.0%
Filed in Juv. Court	5514	14645	37.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	689	1259	54.7%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	3	27	11.1%
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 not required under statute to provide an attorney when a youth is filed on in court, yet the rate is similar to the state average.
- Curfew filings are problematic in this county and continue to increase. Research has demonstrated that Juvenile curfews are not effective at reducing juvenile crime and can result in net-widening/pulling youth into the system. Curfew violations should be something that is referred to diversion, if necessary to the community to have a curfew ordinance.
- There is a high rate of 3B filings for truancy and uncontrollable juveniles (some of the highest we see in the state). The county should refer truancy cases to diversion and/or a truancy program. The county may also benefit from a crisis response program to divert the uncontrollable court filings.
- The diversion program may consider the following:
 - Not always filing on unsuccessful cases (i.e., if youth have met most conditions)
 - exploring the use of warning letters for low risk youth
 - ensure fees are similar to court costs or having a sliding scale
 - using graduated sanctions to give youth who are not completing diversion requirements graduation sanctions before discharging them unsuccessfully.
 - strengthening the process for sealing records in JCMS and with law enforcement (not needed at court-level because it is pre-file).

Table 22.

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

	Lincoln	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	60.0% -- 79.9%	73.5%

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

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

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



Table 23.

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

	Lincoln	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	76	352

2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
4	13	20	14	25	76

Table 24.

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

	Lincoln					
Filed Subtype	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	1	12	9	12	8	42
3B - Uncontrollable	8	15	15	20	13	71
3C – Mentally Ill and Dangerous	3	6	2	1	3	15

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

Table 25.

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

	Lincoln	Nebraska *
Refer ALL juveniles who are first time offenders to diversion	Not sure	Yes: 27.3% No: 63.6% Not sure: 9.1%
File a juvenile's charges at the time of the referral to diversion	No	Yes: 18.2% No: 70.5% Not sure: 11.4%
File a juvenile's charges if they are unsuccessful on diversion	Always	Always: 47.7% Sometimes: 47.7% Not sure: 4.5%
Allow a juvenile to complete diversion more than once	Yes	Yes: 61.4% No: 34.1%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

		Not sure: 4.5%
Charges/offenses that make a juvenile ineligible for diversion	Yes; felonies	Yes: 86.4% No: 9.1% Not sure: 4.5%
Warning letters instead of intervention	No	Yes: 27.3% No: 61.4% Not sure: 11.4%
Currently drug test	No	Yes: 31.8% No: 65.9% Not sure: 2.3%
Fees beyond restitution	Yes; \$50 a month (with scholarships for some community programs)	Yes: 86.4% No: 13.6% Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior to discharge	Not sure	Yes: 47.7% No: 25.0% Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	Not sure; I believe the county attorney does this	Yes: 59.1% No: 22.7% Not sure: 18.2%

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

Community Team Level

- A community lead should be able to get roughly a 75% response, to ensure active participation on planning issues. The response rate increased from 2019 to 2020.
- Shared measurement had the lowest mean for the collective impact domains in both 2019 and 2020.
- The community team should be representative of the population of that community but should also include diversity. It might be beneficial to add more Hispanics/Latinos to your team (especially because of the patterns of over and under representation).
- Although the low response rate may affect the results of community team diversity, there could be more representation from other system points not currently represented.
- Only 10% reported (1 person) not feeling heard at team meetings, which is much lower than the state average.

Table 26.
Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^P

	Lincoln		Nebraska	
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020
Number of surveys sent	16	18	1407	780
Number of completed surveys	6	11	221	345
Response rate	37.5%	61.1%	28.3%	24.5%

Table 27.
Collective Impact Survey Scores ^P

	Lincoln		Nebraska	
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020
	Mean Score		Mean Score	
Common agenda	5.96	6.45	5.29	5.69
Mutually reinforcing	6.01	6.27	5.37	5.50
Shared measurement	5.90	5.91	5.21	5.45
Continuous communication	6.02	5.91	5.49	5.55
Backbone agency	6.46	6.45	5.52	5.78

The five elements of Collective Impact are:



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

- **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

	Lincoln		Nebraska	
	N = 11	(%)	N = 345	(%)
Gender				
Male	5	45.5%	101	29.3%
Female	5	45.5%	229	66.4%
Missing	1	9.1%	15	4.3%
Age				
Under 30	--	--	19	5.6%
30-39	1	9.1%	68	19.6%
40-49	4	36.4%	88	25.4%
50-59	4	36.4%	90	25.8%
60 and over	1	9.1%	44	13%
Missing	1	9.1%	36	10.4%
Race/Ethnicity				
White	6	54.5%	230	66.7%
Black	--	--	10	2.9%
Hispanic	--	--	13	3.8%
Native American	1	9.1%	6	1.7%
Asian	--	--	1	0.3%
Other	--	--	2	0.6%
Provided town name	3	27.3%	63	18.3%
Missing	1	9.1%	19	5.5%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Previous System Involvement				
Yes	3	27.3%	98	28.4%
No	8	72.7%	242	70.1%
Missing	--	--	5	1.4%
System Point *				
Law enforcement	2	16.7%	34	7.8%
County attorney/ juvenile court	1	8.3%	32	7.3%
K-12 or secondary education	--	--	65	14.9%
Ministry/faith based	--	--	10	2.3%
Diversion	1	8.3%	55	12.6%
Probation	2	16.7%	31	7.1%
Public defender/ defense counsel/ guardian ad litem	1	8.3%	8	1.8%
DHHS or Child Welfare	--	--	13	3.0%
Treatment provider	2	16.7%	40	9.2%
Post adjudication or detention	--	--	8	1.8%
Community based program	2	16.7%	109	25.0%
Elected official or government	--	--	6	1.4%
Restorative practices	--	--	6	1.4%
Backbone or system improvement	--	--	3	0.7%
Other	1	8.3%	16	3.7%
Voice on Team				
Feel heard	10	90.9%	270	78.3%
Do not feel heard	1	9.1%	75	21.7%

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

References and Resources

^a **Population data:** Table B01001 race series, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
Compiled and Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on July 10, 2020

^a **Youth employment:** Table B23001, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
Compiled and Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on July 10, 2020

^a **Poverty/SES:** Table B10724, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 3-18-2020

^a **Technology in household:** Table B28005, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
Compiled by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 8-11-20

^a **Home owner/transportation:** Table B25045, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
Compiled and Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 8-11-20

^a **Education attainment:** Table B15002, 2014-2018 American Community Survey, U.S. Census Bureau
Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 3-18-2020

^b **School membership, chronic absenteeism, student disability, and free/reduced lunch:** Prepared by
Sara Simonsen, Nebraska Department of Education

^c **Graduation rates:** Special Tabulation by Sara Simonsen, Nebraska Department of Education
Prepared by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on 7-24-2020

^d **Mental health, Substance use, gang, and community perceptions of substance use:** Bureau of
Sociological Research, Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey:
<https://bosr.unl.edu/current-nrpfss-county-level-data>

^e **Referral to and utilization of services:** Department of Health and Human Services

^f **Adult and juvenile arrests:** Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics:
<https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx>

^g Diversion programs

^h **Domestic violence:** Nebraska Crime Commission, Domestic Assault:
https://ncc.nebraska.gov/sites/ncc.nebraska.gov/files/doc/2019%20Domestic%20Assault%20and%20Arrest%20by%20County_0.pdf

ⁱ Child abuse and neglect

^j **Community violence:** Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics:
<https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx>

^k **Distance to detention facility:** Google Maps

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



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics:

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

Nebraska Crime Commission, Juvenile Case Management System

Nebraska Judicial Branch Trial Court Case Management System, JUSTICE

Nebraska Judicial Branch, Juvenile Services Division

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

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

^o **Diversion procedures and protocols:** Diversion survey distributed to Juvenile Diversion programs, 2020. Prepared by: Lindsey Wylie, UNO Juvenile Justice Institute

^p **Collective impact:** Collective impact surveys distributed to Community Planning Teams, 2019 and 2020. Prepared by: Anne Hobbs and Erin Wasserburger, UNO Juvenile Justice Institute

^q **Collective Impact Elements:** Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective Impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*.



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Appendix: RED Descriptives

2015

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	268	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	71	0%	0%	5.60%	8.50%	0%	0%	85.90%
Youth enrolled in diversion	58	0%	0%	6.90%	10.30%	0%	0%	82.80%
Successful completion diversion	48	0%	0%	8.30%	10.40%	0%	0%	81.20%
Youth with multiple charges	3	0%	0%	0%	33.30%	0%	33.30%	33.30%
Filed on in adult court	20	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	10%	85%
RAI Override: More Severe	8	0%	0%	37.50%	0%	12.50%	0%	50%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
Probation intake	20	10%	0%	15%	10%	10%	0%	55%
Successful probation	121	2.50%	0.80%	3.30%	19%	1.70%	0%	72.70%
Revocation of probation	45	2.20%	0%	2.20%	20%	0%	0%	75.60%
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

2016

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	250	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	56	0%	1.80%	1.80%	3.60%	0%	0%	92.90%
Youth enrolled in diversion	36	0%	2.80%	2.80%	2.80%	0%	0%	91.70%
Successful completion diversion	28	0%	3.60%	0%	3.60%	0%	0%	92.90%
Youth with multiple charges	15	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	80%
Filed on in adult court	49	0%	0%	4.10%	10.20%	0%	2%	83.70%
RAI Override: More Severe	3	0%	0%	0%	33.30%	0%	0%	66.70%
RAI Override: Less Severe	2	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
Probation intake	22	4.50%	0%	4.50%	13.60%	0%	0%	77.30%
Successful probation	77	2.60%	0%	2.60%	16.90%	0%	0%	77.90%
Revocation of probation	40	7.50%	0%	2.50%	25%	5%	0%	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

2017

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	289	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	45	0%	0%	0%	6.70%	0%	0%	93.30%
Youth enrolled in diversion	33	0%	0%	0%	6.10%	0%	0%	93.90%
Successful completion diversion	23	0%	0%	0%	4.30%	0%	0%	95.70%
Youth with multiple charges	13	0%	0%	0%	7.70%	0%	7.70%	84.60%
Filed on in adult court	40	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	10%	85%
RAI Override: More Severe	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RAI Override: Less Severe	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Probation intake	16	0%	0%	6.20%	12.50%	0%	0%	81.20%
Successful probation	119	0.80%	0%	0.80%	16.80%	0.80%	0%	80.70%
Revocation of probation	22	0%	0%	4.50%	9.10%	0%	0%	86.40%
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

2018

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	230	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	35	0%	0%	0%	8.60%	2.90%	0%	88.60%
Youth enrolled in diversion	21	0%	0%	0%	9.50%	4.80%	0%	85.70%
Successful completion diversion	15	0%	0%	0%	13.30%	0%	0%	86.70%
Youth with multiple charges	7	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Filed on in adult court	23	0%	0%	0%	17.40%	0%	13%	69.60%
RAI Override: More Severe	2	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
Probation intake	19	0%	0%	10.50%	26.30%	0%	0%	63.20%
Successful probation	93	3.20%	0%	4.30%	11.80%	1.10%	0%	79.60%
Revocation of probation	31	0%	0%	6.50%	19.40%	0%	0%	74.20%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

2019

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	221	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	18	0%	0%	0%	22.20%	5.60%	0%	72.20%
Youth enrolled in diversion	15	0%	0%	0%	13.30%	6.70%	0%	80%
Successful completion diversion	13	0%	0%	0%	15.40%	7.70%	0%	76.90%
Youth with multiple charges	11	0%	0%	0%	9.10%	0%	0%	90.90%
Filed on in adult court	40	0%	0%	0%	15%	0%	20%	65%
RAI Override: More Severe	3	0%	0%	33.30%	33.30%	0%	0%	33.30%
RAI Override: Less Severe	5	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	0%	80%
Probation intake	21	4.80%	0%	23.80%	4.80%	0%	0%	66.70%
Successful probation	82	1.20%	0%	1.20%	19.50%	2.40%	0%	75.60%
Revocation of probation	31	3.20%	0%	0%	25.80%	3.20%	0%	67.70%
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

2015	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	288	497	57.9%
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 Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	435	757	57.5%
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	56.5%
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%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	208	528	39.4%
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 Juv. Court	1	2	50.0%
Total	1003	3315	30.3%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	252	456	55.3%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	0	13	100.0%
Filed in Juv. Court	330	2107	15.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	127	193	65.8%
0	12	0.0%	--
Total	710	2832	25.1%