



Loup 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 |
| School Membership by Race/ Ethnicity and School Year (2014-2019) | 4 |
| Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity and School Year (2014 - 2019) ^b | 4 |
| Nebraska Public High School 4-Year Graduation Rates by County (5-year estimates, 2015-2019) $^{\circ}$ | 5 |
| Youth Who Report Mental Health Symptoms and Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d | 5 |
| Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) ^d | 6 |
| 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 | 7 |
| Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019) | 8 |
| Family Level | 9 |
| Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportatio year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a | n (5- 9 |
| Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) ^d | 10 |
| Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means (2019) h | 10 |
| Child Abuse and Neglect Reports (2018) i | 10 |
| Community Level | 11 |
| Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) j | 11 |
| Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2018) ^d | 11 |
| Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) ^m | 12 |
| Policy, Legal and System Level | 13 |
| Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) ⁿ | 13 |
| Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) ^m | 13 |
| Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) ^m | 14 |
| County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) ° | 14 |
| Community Team Level | 16 |
| Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^p | 16 |
| Collective Impact Survey Scores ^p | 16 |
| Community Planning Team Diversity ^p | 17 |
| References and Resources | 19 |







Youth Level

- While we could not get race/ethnicity data for chronic absenteeism in this community because the frequency was too low to report, Hispanic, Native American, and Black youth are over-represented statewide in chronic absenteeism.
- There were more youth under IDEA and eligible for Free and Reduced lunch (but less so in recent years), as compared to the state.
- 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.
- Although there is not much juvenile crime, crime for all ages decreased from 2018 to 2019.
- A RED analysis could not be conducted because there was no juvenile data from any agency.

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% |
| Loup | 19 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

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% |
| Loup | 16 | 100.0% | 0.0% | 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) ^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- | Loup | 77 | 9.09% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.30% | 2.60% | 87.01% | 0.00% |
| 2015 | Nebraska | 312,281 | 17.74% | 2.43% | 1.42% | 6.70% | 0.13% | 68.20% | 3.38% |
| 2015- | Loup | 66 | 10.61% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 1.52% | 3.03% | 84.85% | 0.00% |
| 2016 | Nebraska | 315,542 | 18.08% | 2.53% | 1.38% | 6.67% | 0.14% | 67.72% | 3.47% |
| 2016- | Loup | 66 | 9.09% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 3.03% | 3.03% | 84.85% | 0.00% |
| 2017 | Nebraska | 318,853 | 18.61% | 2.66% | 1.38% | 6.69% | 0.15% | 66.92% | 3.59% |
| 2017- | Loup | 69 | 10.14% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 2.90% | 4.35% | 82.61% | 0.00% |
| 2018 | Nebraska | 323,391 | 18.80% | 2.76% | 1.35% | 6.67% | 0.14% | 66.50% | 3.78% |
| 2018- | Loup | 70 | 8.57% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 2.86% | 0.00% | 82.86% | 5.71% |
| 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- | Loup | 0 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2015 | Nebraska | 35,638 | 24.54% | 1.64% | 4.42% | 12.93% | 0.19% | 51.61% | 4.68% |
| 2015- | Loup | 0 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2016 | Nebraska | 38,812 | 25.73% | 1.55% | 4.27% | 13.68% | 0.27% | 49.68% | 4.83% |
| 2016- | Loup | 0 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2017 | Nebraska | 42,290 | 26.90% | 1.66% | 4.40% | 14.22% | 0.24% | 47.66% | 4.92% |
| 2017- | Loup | 0 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 2018 | Nebraska | 46,365 | 26.81% | 1.77% | 4.18% | 14.49% | 0.22% | 47.37% | 2389 |
| 2018- | Loup | 0 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| 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) ^b

| Year | Geographic Area | Total Count | IDEA | 504 Plan | Limited English Proficiency | Free/Reduced Lunch |
|-------|--------------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 2014- | Loup | 77 | <mark>22.86%</mark> | * | * | <mark>54.29%</mark> |
| 2015 | Nebraska | 312,281 | 13.66% | 0.76% | 5.97% | 44.53% |
| 2015- | Loup | 66 | <mark>26.09%</mark> | * | * | * |
| 2016 | Nebraska | 315,542 | 13.64% | 0.90% | 5.90% | 44.23% |
| 2016- | Loup | 66 | * | * | * | <mark>46.97%</mark> |
| 2017 | Nebraska | 318,853 | 13.80% | 0.93% | 6.99% | 44.76% |
| 2017- | Loup | 69 | 16.67% | * | * | 43.94% |
| 2018 | Nebraska | 323,391 | 15.87% | 0.88% | 6.59% | 46.24% |
| 2018- | Loup | 70 | <mark>25.97%</mark> | * | * | 40.26% |
| 2019 | 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) °

| County | Total in Last 5 Years | | Yearly Averages | | Graduation | |
|----------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------|------------|------|
| | Graduates | Students | Graduates | Graduates Students | | Rank |
| Nebraska | 100,111 | 112,857 | 20,022.2 | 22,571.4 | 88.7% | n/a |
| Loup | 30 | 31 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 96.8% | 21 |

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 |
|----------|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Loup | Loss of sleep from worry | | | |
| Nebraska | | 18.0% | 20.6% | 21.6% |
| Loup | Depressed | | 1 | - |
| Nebraska | | 31.1% | 34.8% | 35.3% |
| Loup | Considered/Attempted suicide | | 1 | - |
| Nebraska | | 22.9% | 18.2% | 16.2% |
| Loup | Current alcohol | | 1 | - |
| Nebraska | | 9.8% | 20.1% | 34.2% |
| Loup | Current binge drinking | | | |



| Nebraska | | 1.3% | 6.2% | 15.0% |
|----------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Loup | Current marijuana | | | - |
| Nebraska | | 3.0% | 7.3% | 13.9% |
| Loup | Current tobacco | | | |
| Nebraska | | 3.7% | 8.0% | 15.3% |
| Loup | Current vaping | | | |
| Nebraska | | 10.4% | 24.7% | 37.3% |
| Loup | Hopeful for future (past week) | | | - |
| Nebraska | | 78.0% | 76.1% | 77.6% |

^{*}Loup 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 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 |
|----------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Loup | Youth Reported Gang Involvement | | | - |
| Nebraska | | 3.8% | 4.4% | 3.8% |

^{*}Loup County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey





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

| Arrestee Age | All Arrestee Ages Under 18 | | | der 18 | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--------|--------|------|-------------------------|--|
| Summary Arrest Date | 2018 2019 2018 - 2019 Growth % | | | 2018 | 2019 | 2018 - 2019 Growth % | |
| Jurisdiction by Geography | LOUP COUNTY | | | | | | |
| Arrest Offense | | | | | | | |
| Total | 2 | 3 | 50.00 | 0 | 0 | - | |
| Driving Under the Influence | 1 | 2 | - | - | 0 | - | |
| Liquor Laws | 2 | 1 | -50.00 | 0 | 0 | - | |

Table 13. Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) ^g

| | | Loup | | All NYS Counties | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------|---|------------------|-----------------------------|-------|--|
| Score | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | |
| Family Circumstance/Parenting | ŀ | | | 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 | I | | | 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 | | | M = 5.6 | .64, <i>SD</i> = 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

No juvenile data reported for any agency

| 0 1 2 5 1 1 | | A | A / | DI I | 111 | B# 141 1 1 | | 38/1.14 |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------|
| 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 | | | - | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Youth referred to diversion | - | - | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Youth enrolled in diversion | | | | | | | | |
| Successful completion diversion | | | | | | | | |
| Youth with multiple charges | | | | | | | | |
| Filed on in adult court | | | | | | | | |
| RAI Override: More Severe | | -1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| RAI Override: Less Severe | - | - | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | |
| Probation intake | | | | | | | | |
| Successful probation | | | | | | | | |
| Revocation of probation | | | | | - | - | | |
| Youth in OJS custody | | | | | | | | |
| OJS custody: placed in detention | | | | | | | | |
| Youth booked into detention | | | | | | | | |
| Youth booked into detention more than once | | | | | | - | | |

No juvenile data reported for any agency; Loup County sheriff did not report to NCC 2015 - 2018





Family Level

- Rates of poverty do not appear to be an issue as compared to the state average.
- Number of adults with bachelor's degrees is lower than the state average; it may be possible that
 residents who go to college outside of the County find employment where they go to school and
 do not return to the County.

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

| Measurement | | Loup | Nebraska |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Poverty/SES | Children <18 in Poverty | 5.7% | 14.8% |
| | Number of children 12- | 7 | 43,814 |
| | 17 below 185% poverty | | |
| | Percent of children 12- | 24.1% | 28.9% |
| | 17 below 185% poverty | | |
| | | | |
| Educational attainment | Age 25+ with B.D. | <mark>23.2%</mark> | <mark>31.3%</mark> |
| | County rank | 28 | - |
| | Age 25+ with some | 29.3% | 23.0% |
| | college, no degree | | |
| | County rank | 12 | - |
| | Age 25+ with HS degree | 97.8% | 91.1% |
| | County Rank | 1 | - |
| | | | |
| Technology and computers in the home | % under 18 with a | 100.0% | 96.9% |
| | computer at home | | |
| | County rank | 1 | - |
| | % under 18 with an | 79.5% | 91.0% |
| | internet subscription at | | |
| | home | | |
| | County rank | 86 | - |
| | % under 18 with | 79.5% | 90.8% |
| | broadband internet | | |
| | access at home | | |
| | County Rank | 86 | - |
| | | | |
| Housing | Owner-occupied | 234 | 498,567 |
| | households | | |
| | Total households | 279 | 754,063 |
| | Owner % | 83.9% | 66.1% |
| | Renters | 45 | 255,496 |

| | Renter % | 16.1% | 33.9% |
|----------------|--------------------|-------|---------|
| Transportation | Households with no | 2 | 40,465 |
| | vehicle available | | |
| | Total households | 279 | 754,063 |
| | No vehicle % | 0.7% | 5.4% |
| | | | |

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

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

^{*}Loup County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

Table 17.
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means (2019) ^h

| | 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 | | |
| Loup | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nebraska | 562 | 402 | 2512 | 2019 |

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

| | Abuse/Neglect Calls | Reports Assessed | Substantiated | Unfounded |
|----------|---------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Loup | 6 | 33% | 0% | 100% |
| Nebraska | 36,480 | 33.4% | 16.0% | 68.3% |



Community Level

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

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

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

No data presented, or frequencies are 0

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

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

^{*}Loup County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey





Table 21.

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

| | Number of charges Sealed | Total Number of charges | Sealed (%) |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|
| Dismissed or Dropped | 1 | 1 | 100.0% |
| Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ | | | |
| Filed in Juv. Court | | | |
| Filed in Adult Court (M or I) | 3 | 3 | 100.0% |
| Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to | | | |
| Juv. Court | | | |
| Total | 4 | 4 | 100.0% |

^{*}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

- There are no juvenile court cases in 2018 to look at access to counsel.
- With respect to diversion practices, the community may want to consider a few things:
 - Allowing warning letters for the lowest risk youth
 - Having a process for sealing records for youth on diversion with law enforcement and JCMS, as required by statute.
 - ensure fees are similar to court costs (even with the sliding scale)
 - o use graduated sanctions, where youth are given incremental consequences or rewards, as opposed to discharging them unsuccessfully as a first response.

Table 22.

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

| | Loup | Nebraska |
|-------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Access to Counsel | No Juvenile Court Cases | 73.5% |

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

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

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

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

| | Loup | Nebraska |
|---------------------|------|----------|
| Curfew Court Filing | 0 | 352 |





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

| | | Loup | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|--|
| Filed Subtype | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | Total | |
| 3A- Homeless/Neglect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3B – Absenteeism/Truancy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3B - Uncontrollable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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) $^{\circ}$

| | Loup | 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 | No | 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 | No | Yes: 31.8% |
| | | No: 65.9% |
| | | Not sure: 2.3% |
| Fees beyond restitution | Yes; \$150 with a sliding scale | Yes: 86.4% |





| | | No: 13.6% Not sure: 0.0% |
|---|----------|-----------------------------|
| Use of graduated responses prior to discharge | No | Yes: 47.7% No: 25.0% |
| | | Not sure: 27.3% |
| Sealing diversion records | Not sure | Yes: 59.1% |
| | | No: 22.7% |
| | | Not sure: 18.2% |

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



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 for the collective impact survey decreased from 2019 to 2020. With the low response rate, the collective impact domains and diversity of the team are not reliable.
- The community team should be representative of the community; however, there should be representation from groups that are over-represented in the juvenile justice system (i.e., Hispanic/Latino and Black).

Table 26. Collective Impact Survey Response Rates ^p

| | Custer Team | | Nebraska | |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------|----------|-------|
| Year of survey | 2019 | 2020 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Number of surveys sent | 30 | 34 | 1407 | 780 |
| Number of completed surveys | 3 | 2 | 221 | 345 |
| Response rate | 10.0% | 5.9% | 28.3% | 24.5% |

Table 27.
Collective Impact Survey Scores ^p

| | Custer Team | | Nebraska | |
|--------------------------|-------------|------|------------|------|
| Year of survey | 2019 | 2020 | 2019 | 2020 |
| | Mean Score | | Mean Score | |
| Common agenda | 4.55 | 5.00 | 5.29 | 5.69 |
| Mutually reinforcing | 5.04 | 4.50 | 5.37 | 5.50 |
| Shared measurement | 5.00 | 4.50 | 5.21 | 5.45 |
| Continuous communication | 5.30 | 5.00 | 5.49 | 5.55 |
| Backbone agency | 5.33 | 5.00 | 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

| | Custer Team | | Nebraska | |
|--------------------|-------------|-------|----------|-------|
| | N = 2 | (%) | N = 345 | (%) |
| Gender | | | | |
| Male | 1 | 50.0% | 101 | 29.3% |
| Female | 1 | 50.0% | 229 | 66.4% |
| Missing | | | 15 | 4.3% |
| Age | | | | |
| Under 30 | | | 19 | 5.6% |
| 30-39 | | | 68 | 19.6% |
| 40-49 | 1 | 50.0% | 88 | 25.4% |
| 50-59 | 1 | 50.0% | 90 | 25.8% |
| 60 and over | | | 44 | 13% |
| Missing | | | 36 | 10.4% |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | |
| White | 1 | 50.0% | 230 | 66.7% |
| Black | | | 10 | 2.9% |
| Hispanic | | | 13 | 3.8% |
| Native American | | | 6 | 1.7% |
| Asian | | | 1 | 0.3% |
| Other | | | 2 | 0.6% |
| Provided town name | 1 | 50.0% | 63 | 18.3% |
| Missing | | | 19 | 5.5% |





| Previous System Involvement | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-------|-----|-------|
| Yes | 1 | 50.0% | 98 | 28.4% |
| No | 1 | 50.0% | 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 | 1 | 50.0% | 65 | 14.9% |
| Ministry/faith based | | | 10 | 2.3% |
| Diversion | | | 55 | 12.6% |
| Probation | | | 31 | 7.1% |
| Public defender/ defense counsel/ | | | 8 | 1.8% |
| guardian ad litem | | | | |
| DHHS or Child Welfare | 1 | 50.0% | 13 | 3.0% |
| Treatment provider | | | 40 | 9.2% |
| Post adjudication or detention | | | 8 | 1.8% |
| Community based program | | | 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 | 2 | 100% | 270 | 78.3% |
| Do not feel heard | | | 75 | 21.7% |

Custer n = 2

^{*}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

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*.