



Morrill County

Table of Contents

Youth Level	3
Distribution of the Population Age 10-17 by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (5-year estimates, 2014-2018)	a3
School Membership by Race/ Ethnicity and School Year (2014-2019)	4
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) °	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 Transportative year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a	
Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) d	10
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means h	10
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports 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	12
Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) n	12
Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) ^m	13
Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) ^m	13
County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) °	13
Community Team Level	15
Collective Impact Survey Response Rates p	15
Collective Impact Survey Scores p	15
Community Planning Team Diversity ^p	16
References and Resources	18





Youth Level

- Table 1: Morrill County has a larger Hispanic youth population as compared to the rest of the state, accounting for 30.7% of the population 10-17. Data indicate that roughly 8.8% of the 256 youth are Black females.
- Table 2: Dept. of Education data show that an even higher percent of youth enrolled are Hispanic in 2018-2019 (33.6%)
- Table 3: Hispanic youth are over represented in the population chronically absent. (We could not get data for chronic absenteeism for Asian, Black or Native American or Hawaiian because the frequency was too low to report. Chronic absenteeism seems to be less of a problem among white youth (76% enrolled compared to 66% of the chronically absent).
- Table 4: IDEA rates are lower than the rest of the state. However, the percent of youth on free and reduced lunch is higher than the rest of the state.
- Table 5: High school graduation rates are slightly higher than the overall state average.
- Table 6: Morrill County may want to participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey. This tool provides good information on binge drinking, drug use, depression, suicide ideation, etc. and often provides guidance for juvenile justice interventions.
- Table 7-11: Data not available.
- Table 12: Overall, juvenile crime was down almost 80%. The community should verify the law enforcement data because there are so few cases (58 juvenile stops from 2015-2020?).
- Table 13: Team should have a discussion about the state wide assessment tool.
- Table 14: Minority youth move through the diversion program at very equitable rates- and have higher rates of successful completion, compared to White youth.
 - Hispanic youth are more likely to have multiple charges filed.
 - Probation data: Hispanic youth make up 32% of intakes, but 50% of revocations? (Look at five year data in the attachments)

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

Males

Geographic Area	Total Count	Non- Hispanic White	Hispanic or Latino	Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	2+ Races
Nebraska	108,494	70.4%	16.2%	5.7%	1.4%	2.0%	4.4%
Morrill	256	63.7%	<mark>30.1%</mark>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%



Females

Geographic Area	Total Count	Non- Hispanic White	Hispanic or Latino	Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific Islander	2+ Races
Nebraska	102,658	70.4%	16.2%	5.7%	1.4%	2.0%	4.4%
Morrill	274	66.1%	<mark>25.2%</mark>	<mark>8.8%</mark>	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-	Morrill	921	21.06%	0.22%	0.98%	0.22%	0.00%	75.68%	1.85%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-	Morrill	893	21.05%	0.34%	1.46%	0.00%	0.00%	76.04%	1.12%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-	Morrill	892	20.63%	0.22%	1.01%	0.11%	0.00%	76.79%	1.23%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-	Morrill	860	<mark>20.00%</mark>	0.23%	0.70%	0.35%	0.00%	77.79%	0.93%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-	Morrill	854	<mark>21.08%</mark>	0.47%	0.94%	0.12%	0.00%	<mark>76.00%</mark>	1.41%
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-	Morrill	122	25.41%	*	*	*	*	74.59%	*
2015	Nebraska	35,638	24.54%	1.64%	4.42%	12.93%	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-	Morrill	152	31.58%	*	*	*	*	68.42%	*
2016	Nebraska	38,812	25.73%	1.55%	4.27%	13.68%	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
2016-	Morrill	139	34.53%	*	*	*	*	65.47%	*
2017	Nebraska	42,290	26.90%	1.66%	4.40%	14.22%	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-	Morrill	170	<mark>30.59%</mark>	*	*	*	*	69.41%	*
2018	Nebraska	46,365	26.81%	1.77%	4.18%	14.49%	0.22%	47.37%	2389

2018-	Morrill	122	33.61%	*	*	*	*	<mark>66.39%</mark>	*
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-	Morrill	921	11.83%	1.85%	3.15%	<mark>49.40%</mark>
2015	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	44.53%
2015-	Morrill	893	12.43%	2.24%	2.91%	<mark>48.94%</mark>
2016	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-	Morrill	892	12.56%	2.47%	2.58%	<mark>51.79%</mark>
2017	Nebraska	318,853	13.80%	0.93%	6.99%	44.76%
2017-	Morrill	860	13.84%	2.79%	3.02%	<mark>53.60%</mark>
2018	Nebraska	323,391	15.87%	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-	Morrill	854	14.17%	*	2.69%	<mark>55.85%</mark>
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) $^\circ$

County	Total in Las	t 5 Years	Yearly Averages		Graduation	
	Graduates	Students	Graduates	Students	Rate	Rank
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	-
Morrill	306	331	30.6	33.1	<mark>92.4%</mark>	65

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
Morrill	Loss of sleep from worry			-
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
Morrill	Depressed			

Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
Morrill	Considered/Attempted suicide			
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
Morrill	Current alcohol	•	ı	
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
Morrill	Current binge drinking	-	-	
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%
Morrill	Current marijuana			
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
Morrill	Current tobacco			
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%
Morrill	Current vaping	-	-	
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
Morrill	Hopeful for future (past week)			
Nebraska		72.1%	74.7%	78.4%

^{*}Morrill County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey (last was 2014)

**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
Morrill	Youth Reported Gang Involvement			
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

^{*}Morrill County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey (last was 2014)





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

Arrestee Age		All Arres	stee Ages	Under 18		
Summary Arrest Date	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %
Jurisdiction by Geography			MORRILI	COUN	TY	
Arrest Offense						
Total	75	56	-25.33	5	1	<mark>-80.00</mark>
Rape Total	2	1	-50.00	0	-	-
Burglary Total	3	-	-100.00	0	-	-
Larceny-Theft Total	3	2	-33.33	1	-	-100.00
Other Assaults	9	11	22.22	0	0	
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	2	1	-50.00	1	-	-100.00
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	2	1	-50.00	0	-	-
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	2	4	100.00	0	0	-
Drug Violations - Possession	15	14	-6.67	1	1	0.00
Offenses Against Family and Children	-	1	-	-	0	-
Driving Under the Influence	17	11	-35.29	0	0	-
Liquor Laws	7	3	-57.14	0	0	-
Disorderly Conduct	8	3	-62.50	2	0	-100.00
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	5	4	-20.00	0	0	-

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

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

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





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

Click here to see Census and School Population Data

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

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact								
Youth taken to temporary custody								
Youth issued citation/referral	58*							
Youth referred to diversion	65	<mark>1.50%</mark>	0%	0%	12.30%	0%	0%	<mark>86.20%</mark>
Youth enrolled in diversion	65	<mark>1.50%</mark>	0%	0%	<mark>12.30%</mark>	0%	0%	<mark>86.20%</mark>
Successful completion diversion	46	<mark>2.20%</mark>	0%	0%	<mark>15.20%</mark>	0%	0%	<mark>82.60%</mark>
Youth with multiple charges	11	0%	0%	0%	<mark>18.20%</mark>	0%	9.10%	72.70%
Filed on in adult court	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33.30%	66.70%
RAI Override: More Severe	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Probation intake	1	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	0%	0%	100%
Successful probation	<mark>28</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>32.10%</mark>	3.60%	0%	64.30%
Revocation of probation	<mark>2</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>0%</mark>	<mark>50%</mark>	0%	0%	50%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention					-			
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								

^{*}Morrill County sheriff only partially reported to the NCC in 2017



Family Level

- Table 15: Morrill County's has lower poverty compared to the rest of the state (9.5% compared to 14.8%). This county does have relatively high rates (almost 27%) of extreme poverty (185% below poverty level.)
 - Lower number of people have HS degree, and college education.
 - We looked at broadband internet access for purposes of COVID. Many youth have access to a computer (91.3%), but fewer have an internet subscription at home -79.9% (this may have gone up in 2020).
 - Higher percent of home owner rates compared to the entire state.
- Table 16: data not available on adults at home or school who listen.
- Table 18: Of the CPS complaints assessed, only 7% were found to be "substantiated," which is much lower than the rest of the state.

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

Measurement		Morrill	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	<mark>9.5%</mark>	14.8%
	Number of children 12-	96	43,814
	17 below 185% poverty		
	Percent of children 12-	<mark>26.6%</mark>	28.9%
	17 below 185% poverty		
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	<mark>18.1%</mark>	31.3%
	County rank	77	-
	Age 25+ with some	24.0%	23.0%
	college, no degree		
	County rank	49	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	<mark>86.6%</mark>	91.1%
	County Rank	86	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a	<mark>91.3%</mark>	96.9%
	computer at home		
	County rank	86	-
	% under 18 with an	<mark>79.9%</mark>	91.0%
	internet subscription at		
	home		
	County rank	85	-



	% under 18 with broadband internet access at home	<mark>79.9%</mark>	90.8%
	County Rank	85	-
Housing	Owner-occupied households	1,435	498,567
	Total households	1,982	754,063
	Owner %	72.4%	66.1%
	Renters	547	255,496
	Renter %	27.6%	33.9%
Transportation	Households with no vehicle available	68	40,465
	Total households	1,982	754,063
	No vehicle %	3.4%	5.4%

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

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

^{*}Morrill County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey (last was 2014)

Table 17.
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means ^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		
Morrill	0	0	5	4
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

Table 18. Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ





	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Morrill	74	<mark>39%</mark>	<mark>7%</mark>	<mark>76%</mark>
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%

Community Level

- Table 19: Measures of community violence were not bad compared to other counties, only 11 assaults!
- Table 20: No data available
- Table 21: Sealing juvenile records is problematic. 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).

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

Type of Violence	Morrill	Nebraska
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	0	34
Rape	1	264
Robbery	0	367
Aggravated Assault	0	1,639
Other Assaults	<mark>11</mark>	8,782

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

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

^{*}Morrill County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey (last was 2014)



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	42	50	<mark>84.0%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			<mark></mark>
Filed in Juv. Court	100	136	<mark>73.5%</mark>
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	22	26	<mark>84.6%</mark>
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	164	212	<mark>77.4%</mark>

^{*}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

- Table 22: Despite not being in a county required to provide counsel under statute, it appears that some youth have access to counsel, but still lower than ideal.
- Table 23-24: There are almost no curfew and 3A, and 3C filings in court so the community is diverting appropriately. Only four 3B cases absenteeism and truancy cases.
- Table 25: with respect to diversion practices, the community may want to consider:
 - Allowing warning letters for the lowest risk youth

Table 22.

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

	Morrill	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	<mark>60.0% 79.9%</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) ^m

	Morrill	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	2	352

2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
0	1	1	0	0	2

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

		Morrill					
Filed Subtype	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total	
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0	
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	1	0	0	1	2	4	
3B - Uncontrollable	0	1	0	0	0	1	
3C – Mentally III and Dangerous	1	0	0	0	0	1	

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

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

	Morrill	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 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	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; some felonies	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	No	Yes: 86.4%
		No: 13.6%
		Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior	No	Yes: 47.7%
to discharge		No: 25.0%
		Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	Yes; The file is closed and placed	Yes: 59.1%
	in a locked file cabinet	No: 22.7%
		Not sure: 18.2%

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

Community Team Level

- Table 26: A community lead should be able to get roughly a 75% response, to ensure active participation on planning issues, your response rate was 11.7%.
- Table 27: In most instance, you had slightly lower collective impact scores than the rest of the state. You average went down from 2019 to 2020.
- Table 28: 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. (Could be that people just didn't respond.) On the survey —no probation, law enforcement, county attorney, defense counsel, government official on your team.
 - o Good representation of persons formerly involved in the system.
 - o 25% of the people who responded, reported "not feeling heard," in meeting.

Table 26.
Collective Impact Survey Response Rates P

	Panhandle		Nebr	aska
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020
Number of surveys sent	24	137	1407	780
Number of completed surveys	12	16	221	345
Response rate	50.0%	11.7%	28.3%	24.5%

Table 27.
Collective Impact Survey Scores ^p

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

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





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

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

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

References and Resources

- ^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

Child abuse and neglect

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.



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	7	12	58.3%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	23	43	53.5%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	11	11	100%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	41	66	62.1%

2016	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	5	5	100%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	26	30	86.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	4	4	10%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	35	39	89.7%

2017	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	17	17	100%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	28	33	84.8%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	1	2	50.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	46	52	88.5%





2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	6	6	100%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	13	14	92.9%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)			
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	1	1	100%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	7	10	70.0%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	10	16	62.5%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	5	8	62.5%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court			
Total	22	34	64.7%