



Scotts Bluff 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)	5
Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity and School Year (2014 - 2019) b	5
Disabilities, English Proficiency, Eligibility for Free/Reduced Lunch and School Year (2014 – 2019) b	
Nebraska Public High School 4-Year Graduation Rates by County (5-year estimates, 2015-2019) °	6
Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) d	7
Estimated Gang Involvement by Local Law Enforcement	7
Arrest Rates for Adults and Juveniles for 2018 and 2019 with Percent Change ^f	8
Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) ^g	9
Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019) ¹	9
Family Level	10
Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportat year estimates, 2014-2018) ^a	•
Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) d	12
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means (2019) h	12
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ	12
Community Level	12
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	15
Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) ^m	16
County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) °	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







Youth Level

- Table 1: Scotts Bluff County has a larger Hispanic youth population as compared to the rest of the state. Census data reflects an Asian/ Pacific Islander male population of 3.0%, higher than the rest of the state. Hispanic youth account for 30.7%.
- Table 2: Dept. of Education data show that an even higher percent of youth enrolled are Hispanic. Interestingly Asian youth is a much smaller percent than the census. Why are Asian youth so underrepresented in school enrollment?
- Table 3: Hispanic and Native American youth are over represented in the population chronically absent. (We could not get data for chronic absenteeism for Asian, Black or Native Hawaiian because the frequency was too low to report.
- 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.
- High school graduation rates are slightly higher than the overall state average.
- Table 6: Scotts Bluff County 8th, 10th and 12th graders reporter higher rate of loss of sleep from worry, and depression. Slightly more 8th graders reported attempting or considering suicide as compared to the state average. Youth who report using alcohol is higher than the rest of the state. (19.3% of 8th graders report current alcohol use, compared to 9.8% statewide; 23.8 % of 10th graders and 38.4% of seniors! Slightly higher percent of youth report marijuana use. Twice as many 8th graders are vaping compared to the state.
- Slightly fewer 8th and 12th graders report feeling hopeful.
- Table 11: Reports of gang involvement are slightly higher than the state.
- Table 12: Overall, juvenile crime was down almost 89%. The community should verify the law
 enforcement data: Larceny-theft went from 33 in 2018 to 1 in 2019. Was there a change in
 definitions? Filing? County attorney? Other assaults also went down from 21 to 2? Drug
 Violations Possession, Driving under the Influence, Liquor Laws, and Disorderly Conduct,
 runaway –all down dramatically. This could be a reporting issue.
- Table 13: Many of the youth assessed on diversion did not score across any domains.
- Table 14: Minority youth move through the diversion program at very equitable rates- this is great to see! Hispanic youth are more likely to have multiple charges filed and be filed on through the adult system.
 - o Probation outcomes: Native America youth make up 14% of intakes, and are likely to have an underride. Hispanic youth are represented equitably across probation points.

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%





Scotts Bluff	2,113	58.2%	30.7%	0.6%	1.2%	<mark>3.0%</mark>	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%
Scotts Bluff	2,058	58.3%	<mark>29.7%</mark>	3.3%	2.2%	1.3%	5.2%

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-	Scotts Bluff	6,620	<mark>37.28%</mark>	<mark>0.69%</mark>	2.27%	0.71%	0.06%	57.02%	1.96%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	<mark>17.74%</mark>	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-	Scotts Bluff	6,638	37.48%	<mark>0.56%</mark>	2.23%	0.63%	0.11%	56.96%	2.03%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	<mark>18.08%</mark>	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-	Scotts Bluff	6,668	<mark>37.55%</mark>	<mark>0.58%</mark>	2.31%	0.63%	0.04%	56.97%	1.90%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-	Scotts Bluff	6,720	37.28%	0.52%	2.19%	0.63%	0.07%	57.16%	2.16%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-	Scotts Bluff	6748	37.15%	<mark>0.50%</mark>	<mark>2.07%</mark>	0.58%	0.06%	<mark>57.57%</mark>	2.06%
2019	Nebraska	325,984	<mark>19.13%</mark>	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-	Scotts Bluff	976	<mark>47.03%</mark>	*	6.05%	*	*	44.16%	2.77%
2015	Nebraska	35,638	<mark>24.54%</mark>	1.64%	4.42%	12.93%	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-	Scotts Bluff	1,039	<mark>45.91%</mark>	*	5.49%	*	*	44.75%	3.85%
2016	Nebraska	38,812	<mark>25.73%</mark>	1.55%	4.27%	13.68%	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
2016-	Scotts Bluff	1,085	48.76%	*	4.70%	*	*	44.15%	2.40%
2017	Nebraska	42,290	<mark>26.90%</mark>	1.66%	4.40%	14.22%	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-	Scotts Bluff	1,201	<mark>47.79%</mark>	*	5.08%	*	*	44.38%	2.75%
2018	Nebraska	46,365	<mark>26.81%</mark>	1.77%	4.18%	14.49%	0.22%	47.37%	2389
2018-	Scotts Bluff	1,251	49.24%	*	<mark>5.52%</mark>	*	*	<mark>42.77%</mark>	2.48%
2019	Nebraska	46,356	<mark>27.64%</mark>	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	Total	IDEA	504	Limited English	Free/Reduced
	Area	Count		Plan	Proficiency	Lunch
2014-	Scotts Bluff	6,620	10.14%	1.75%	4.11%	<mark>54.08%</mark>
2015	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	44.53%
2015-	Scotts Bluff	6,638	10.09%	1.97%	3.77%	<mark>55.65%</mark>
2016	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-	Scotts Bluff	6,668	10.06%	2.22%	3.99%	<mark>56.87%</mark>
2017	Nebraska	318,853	13.80%	0.93%	6.99%	44.76%
2017-	Scotts Bluff	6,720	11.74%	2.29%	3.99%	<mark>58.53%</mark>
2018	Nebraska	323,391	15.87%	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-	Scotts Bluff	6,748	12.54%	*	4.19%	<mark>57.93%</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	st 5 Years	Yearly Av	Graduation		
	Graduates	Students	Graduates	Graduates Students		Rank
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	-
Scotts Bluff	2,062	2,280	82.5 91.2		90.4%	74

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
Scotts Bluff	Loss of sleep from worry	<mark>28.5%</mark>	<mark>26.7%</mark>	<mark>27.6%</mark>
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
Scotts Bluff	Depressed	<mark>44.7%</mark>	<mark>48.9%</mark>	<mark>42.5%</mark>
Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
Scotts Bluff	Considered/Attempted suicide	<mark>25.1%</mark>	18.6%	14.0%
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
Scotts Bluff	Current alcohol	19.3%	23.8%	38.4%
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
Scotts Bluff	Current binge drinking	4.4%	9.2%	15.5%
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%
Scotts Bluff	Current marijuana	<mark>6.0%</mark>	<mark>9.2%</mark>	<mark>16.3%</mark>
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
Scotts Bluff	Current tobacco	7.8%	9.2%	14.0%
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%



EVIDENCE-BASEDNEBRASKA

COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Scotts Bluff	Current vaping	<mark>21.2%</mark>	25.4%	36.0%
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
Scotts Bluff	Hopeful for future (past week)	<mark>69.0%</mark>	74.0%	<mark>75.9%</mark>
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
Scotts Bluff	Youth Reported Gang Involvement	4.3%	4.0%	4.1%
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

Table 11b.
Estimated Gang Involvement by Local Law Enforcement

Per Scotts Bluff Police Department Captain Brain Wasson via phone on September 9, 2020:

When Captain Wasson began working with the Scotts Bluff Police Department in 1997, gangs were present in the city, but then died down for about 10-15 years, and have started back up again. The Police Department does not have a lot of statistics at this time, but they are starting to see gangs forming in the high school. These are not really organized, and they are not using criminal activity to support themselves with the current gang-related criminal activity being centered on fighting in the schools and claiming affiliations/turf. During disturbance investigations is when police officers wind up identifying gang members. They currently have 11





identified gangs with about five to 10 identified members in each gang (although they are just starting identification of members). There are some females involved with the gangs, but 98% of the identified members are male. All current gangs have Caucasian members, some are Hispanic, no identified black gang members at this time. The only gang in Scotts Bluff that is also found nationally is the Sureños, and this year they are seeing less activity from them and no ties to other Sureños groups. Captain Wasson provided the following names of active gangs: East Side Pure Bloods, Scotts Bluff Bloods, Trained to Bust, and Them Terry Town Boys (or Them Trainer Boys per some members). They have a zero-tolerance policy at the schools for gang involvement/activity and the School Resource Officers will cite for gang related activity in the schools in an attempt to control gangs/gang activity.

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	2018	2019	2018 - 2019		
			Growth %			Growth %		
Jurisdiction by Geography	SCOTTS BLUFF COUNTY							
Arrest Offense								
Total	1,873	943	-49.65	253	28	<mark>-88.93</mark>		
Rape Total	2	2	0.00	-	-	-		
Robbery Total	3	1	-66.67	-	-	-		
Aggravated Assault Total	26	21	-19.23		0	-		
Burglary Total	17	14	-17.65	3	2	-33.33		
Larceny-Theft Total	157	36	-77.07	<mark>33</mark>	1	<mark>-96.97</mark>		
Motor Vehicle Theft Total	13	3	-76.92	8	-	-100.00		
Other Assaults	203	182	-10.34	<mark>21</mark>	<mark>2</mark>	<mark>-90.48</mark>		
Forgery and Counterfeiting	10	2	-80.00	-	-	-		
Fraud	6	3	-50.00	-	-	-		
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	5	4	-20.00	-	-	-		
Vandalism	26	17	-34.62	3		-100.00		
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	17	3	-82.35	1	1	0.00		
Prostitution	7	-	-100.00	-	-	-		
Assisting or Promoting Prostitution	1	-	-100.00	-	-	-		
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	4	1	-75.00	-	-	-		
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	15	25	66.67	-	0	-		
Drug Violations - Possession	413	271	-34.38	<mark>32</mark>	3	<mark>-90.63</mark>		
NIBRS Unable to Classify	1	-	-100.00	-	-	-		
Offenses Against Family and Children	1	-	-100.00	0	-	-		

Driving Under the Influence	114	153	34.21	<mark>5</mark>	1	-80.00
Liquor Laws	228	25	-89.04	<mark>41</mark>	0	- 100.00
Disorderly Conduct	68	38	-44.12	<mark>16</mark>	0	- 100.00
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	480	129	-73.13	<mark>34</mark>	<mark>5</mark>	-85.29
Runaways	56	13	-76.79	<mark>56</mark>	<mark>13</mark>	-76.79

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

	Scotts Bluff			All NYS Counties		
Score	0	1	2	0	1	2
Family Circumstance/Parenting	<mark>84.4%</mark>	6.5%	9.1%	60.1%	26.7%	13.1%
Education/Employment	<mark>72.7%</mark>	11.7%	15.6%	43.0%	44.0%	13.1%
Peer Relationships	<mark>74.0%</mark>	23.4%	2.6%	44.7%	46.6%	8.6%
Substance Use	<mark>78.9%</mark>	11.8%	9.2%	61.4%	30.3%	8.3%
Leisure/Recreation	54.5%	32.5%	13.0%	50.6%	33.0%	16.5%
Personality/Behavior	61.0%	32.5%	6.5%	50.1%	39.4%	10.4%
Attitudes/Orientation	<mark>85.7%</mark>	11.7%	2.6%	61.3%	33.7%	5.0%
Mean Score	M = 3.7	'5, <i>SD</i> = 2	.59, 1-12	M = 5.6	4, SD = 3.	65, 0-17

Scotts Bluff County n = 77; Statewide n = 1512

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

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	1089*							
Youth referred to diversion	343	3.50%	0%	1.50%	40.50%	0.30%	1.50%	52.80%
Youth enrolled in diversion	330	3.30%	0%	1.50%	40%	0.30%	1.50%	53.30%
Successful completion diversion	266	3.40%	0%	1.50%	37.20%	0.40%	1.50%	56%
Youth with multiple charges	92	4.30%	0%	1.10%	<mark>16.30%</mark>	0%	45.70%	32.60%
Filed on in adult court	44	0%	0%	6.80%	<mark>34.10%</mark>	0%	22.70%	36.40%
RAI Override: More Severe	43	18.60%	0%	0%	48.80%	2.30%	0%	30.20%
RAI Override: Less Severe	11	<mark>27.30%</mark>	0%	0%	45.50%	0%	0%	27.30%
Probation intake	191	<mark>14.10%</mark>	0%	2.60%	<mark>50.30%</mark>	2.10%	0%	30.90%
Successful probation	637	10%	0%	1.40%	45.50%	2.70%	0%	40.30%
Revocation of probation	220	18.60%	0%	0.90%	49.50%	2.70%	0%	28.20%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								

*Mitchell PD only partially reported in 2017; Morrill PD only partially reported in 2018 and did not report 2015 - 2017

Family Level





- Table 15: Scotts Bluff County's rate are of poverty compared to the rest of the state (18.7% compared to 14.8%). This county also has very high rates (almost 36%) of extreme poverty (185% below poverty level.)
 - o Relative high rates of high school graduation,
 - We looked at broadband internet access for purposes of COVID. Many youth have access to a computer (98.1%), but fewer have an internet subscription at home (may have gone up in 2020).
 - Higher percent of home owner rates compared to the entire state.
- Table 16: Scotts Bluff County youth report fewer adults at home who listen, but 12th graders appear to have an adult at school who listens.
- Table 18: Of the CPS complaints assessed, only 10% were found to be "substantiated," which is lower than the rest of the state.

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

Measurement		Scotts Bluff	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	<mark>18.7%</mark>	14.8%
	Number of children 12-	1,108	43,814
	17 below 185% poverty		
	Percent of children 12-	<mark>35.8%</mark>	28.9%
	17 below 185% poverty		
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	22.4%	31.3%
	County rank	35	-
	Age 25+ with some	26.1%	23.0%
	college, no degree		
	County rank	26	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	<mark>87.5%</mark>	91.1%
	County Rank	84	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a	<mark>98.1%</mark>	96.9%
	computer at home		
	County rank	51	-
	% under 18 with an	<mark>89.7%</mark>	91.0%
	internet subscription at		
	home		
	County rank	57	
	% under 18 with	89.6%	90.8%
	broadband internet		
	access at home		
	County Rank	55	



Housing	Owner-occupied	10,082	498,567
	households		
	Total households	14,613	754,063
	Owner %	<mark>69.0%</mark>	66.1%
	Renters	4,531	255,496
	Renter %	31.0%	33.9%
Transportation	Households with no	750	40,465
	vehicle available		
	Total households	14,613	754,063
	No vehicle %	5.1%	5.4%

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Scotts Bluff	Adult at home who listens	83.0%	83.7%	<mark>83.1%</mark>
Nebraska		87.3%	85.0%	85.6%
Scotts Bluff	Adult at school who listens	77.0%	80.2%	<mark>93.3%</mark>
Nebraska		85.2%	85.0%	87.4%

Table 17. Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means (2019) $^{\rm h}$

	Aggravated	Aggravated	Simple Domestic	Simple Domestics
	Domestic Assaults Reported	Domestic Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional	Assaults Reported	Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means
		Means		Exceptional wearis
Scotts Bluff	18	10	120	84
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

Table 18. Child Abuse and Neglect Reports ⁱ

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Scotts Bluff	825	41%	10%	77%
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%

Community Level





Table 19: Measures of community violence were not bad compared to other counties, but there were a fair amount of assaults happening in the community.

- Table 20: Youth view the community as thinking alcohol, marijuana are not appropriate to use (in some communities youth think the adults are accepting of these substances.)
- 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	Scotts Bluff	Nebraska
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	0	34
Rape	2	264
Robbery	1	367
Aggravated Assault	21	1,639
Other Assaults	182	8,782

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

		8 th	10 th	12 th
Scotts Bluff	Wrong/very wrong – Marijuana	89.5%	90.6%	83.1%
Nebraska		94.4%	89.8%	85.2%
Scotts Bluff	Wrong/very wrong – alcohol	85.0%	81.3%	68.7%
Nebraska		89.1%	80.4%	68.7%
Scotts Bluff	Wrong/very wrong – cigarettes	90.6%	87.4%	75.9%
Nebraska		92.9%	89.0%	78.7%



Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) m

see Appendix for yearly data

Table 21.

	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	502	746	67.3%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	1100	2394	<mark>45.9%</mark>
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	138	236	<mark>58.5%</mark>
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to	0	14	0.0%
Juv. Court			
Total	1740	3420	<mark>50.9%</mark>

^{*}Cases offered diversion, mediation or RJ are not available data points in in JUSTICE. Some cases filed in adult court and transferred to juvenile court overlapped with cases that were filed in adult court as a misdemeanor or infraction.

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 few curfew and 3A, and 3C filings in court so the community is diverting appropriately. 3B cases absenteeism and truancy cases appear to be on the rise.
- Table 25: with respect to diversion practices, the community may want to consider a few things:
 - Allowing warning letters for the lowest risk youth
 - Comparing diversion fees to court costs so they are comparable. With a higher proportion of children <18 in poverty, perhaps offering scholarships.
 - o Consider possible felony offenses (i.e. damage over \$250.)

Table 22.

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

	Scotts Bluff	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	40.0% 59.9%	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

	Scotts Bluff	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	2	352

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



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

	Scotts Bluff							
Filed Subtype	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total		
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	1	1		
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	<mark>16</mark>	<mark>41</mark>	<mark>29</mark>	<mark>34</mark>	<mark>54</mark>	<mark>174</mark>		
3B - Uncontrollable	5	5	5	2	1	18		
3C – Mentally III and Dangerous								

	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) $^{\circ}$

	Scotts Bluff	Nebraska *
Refer ALL juveniles who are first	Yes	Yes: 27.3%
time offenders to diversion		No: 63.6%
		Not sure: 9.1%
File a juvenile's charges at the	No	Yes: 18.2%
time of the referral to diversion		No: 70.5%
		Not sure: 11.4%
File a juvenile's charges if they are	Sometimes	Always: 47.7%
unsuccessful on diversion		Sometimes: 47.7%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Allow a juvenile to complete	Yes	Yes: 61.4%
diversion more than once		No: 34.1%
		Not sure: 4.5%
Charges/offenses that make a	Yes; case-by-case basis but	Yes: 86.4%
juvenile ineligible for diversion	normally do not take felonies	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; \$75\$100	Yes: 86.4%
		No: 13.6%





		Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior	Not sure; we will add services if	Yes: 47.7%
to discharge	not successful on current plan but	No: 25.0%
	not additional restrictions or	Not sure: 27.3%
	punishment	
Sealing diversion records	Yes; All juveniles released	Yes: 59.1%
	satisfactorily from diversion have	No: 22.7%
	their records "sealed". We do not	Not sure: 18.2%
	pre-file, so the only thing we need	
	to seal is the citation/police report.	
	We notify the department that	
	wrote the citation or report by	
	email to tell them to seal the	
	record as soon as the juvenile	
	completes diversionusually	
	within days.	

^{*}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

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

Table 27.
Collective Impact Survey Scores p

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

The five elements of Collective Impact are:





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

Table 28.
Community Planning Team Diversity P

	Panha	andle	Neb	raska
	N = 16	(%)	N = 345	(%)
Gender				
Male	2	12.5%	101	29.3%
Female	13	81.3%	229	66.4%
Missing	1	6.3%	15	4.3%
Age				
Under 30			19	5.6%
30-39			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	<mark>5</mark>	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
- 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: <u>www.voicesforchildren.com/kidscount</u>. 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: RED Descriptives

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino 30%	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact					-			
Youth taken to temporary custody								
Youth issued citation/referral	246*							
Youth referred to diversion	48	0%	0%	2.10%	39.60%	0%	0%	58.30%
Youth enrolled in diversion	48	0%	0%	2.10%	39.60%	0%	0%	58.30%
Successful completion diversion	34	0%	0%	2.90%	35.30%	0%	0%	61.80%
Youth with multiple charges	5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%
Filed on in adult court	5	0%	0%	0%	40%	0%	0%	60%
RAI Override: More Severe	22	27.30%	0%	0%	40.90%	0%	0%	31.80%
RAI Override: Less Severe	1	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Probation intake	55	21.80%	0%	3.60%	<mark>40%</mark>	3.60%	0%	30.90%
Successful probation	94	10.60%	0%	0%	48.90%	1.10%	0%	39.40%
Revocation of probation	48	18.80%	0%	2.10%	<mark>52.10%</mark>	0%	0%	27.10%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								

^{*} Mitchell PD only partially reported in 2017; Morrill PD only partially reported in 2018 and did not report 2015 - 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	234*							
Youth referred to diversion	58	3.40%	0%	1.70%	34.50%	1.70%	1.70%	56.90%
Youth enrolled in diversion	52	3.80%	0%	1.90%	28.80%	1.90%	1.90%	61.50%
Successful completion diversion	45	4.40%	0%	2.20%	31.10%	2.20%	2.20%	57.80%
Youth with multiple charges	17	0%	0%	5.90%	17.60%	0%	58.80%	17.60%
Filed on in adult court	12	0%	0%	8.30%	50%	0%	8.30%	33.30%
RAI Override: More Severe	4	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	75%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
Probation intake	37	10.80%	0%	0%	54.10%	0%	0%	35.10%
Successful probation	146	13%	0%	0%	45.20%	5.50%	0%	36.30%
Revocation of probation	46	30.40%	0%	0%	47.80%	4.30%	0%	17.40%
Youth in OJS custody			1		1	1		
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention					-1			
Youth booked into detention more than once								

^{*} Mitchell PD only partially reported in 2017; Morrill PD only partially reported in 2018 and did not report 2015 -





System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact					-	-1		
Youth taken to temporary custody		-			1	-		
Youth issued citation/referral	328*							
Youth referred to diversion	75	4%	0%	2.70%	37.30%	0%	1.30%	54.70%
Youth enrolled in diversion	75	4%	0%	2.70%	37.30%	0%	1.30%	54.70%
Successful completion diversion	62	3.20%	0%	1.60%	37.10%	0%	0%	58.10%
Youth with multiple charges	19	0%	0%	0%	15.80%	0%	31.60%	52.60%
Filed on in adult court	5	0%	0%	0%	40%	0%	20%	40%
RAI Override: More Severe	6	16.70%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	33.30%
RAI Override: Less Severe	5	40%	0%	0%	40%	0%	0%	20%
Probation intake	32	15.60%	0%	0%	56.20%	0%	0%	28.10%
Successful probation	107	2.80%	0%	0%	42.10%	1.90%	0%	53.30%
Revocation of probation	46	15.20%	0%	0%	45.70%	0%	0%	39.10%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								

^{*} Mitchell PD only partially reported in 2017; Morrill PD only partially reported in 2018 and did not report 2015 - 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	253*							
Youth referred to diversion	90	5.60%	0%	1.10%	36.70%	0%	2.20%	54.40%
Youth enrolled in diversion	89	5.60%	0%	1.10%	37.10%	0%	2.20%	53.90%
Successful completion diversion	74	6.80%	0%	1.40%	33.80%	0%	2.70%	55.40%
Youth with multiple charges	27	7.40%	0%	0%	11.10%	0%	55.60%	25.90%
Filed on in adult court	9	0%	0%	0%	11.10%	0%	33.30%	55.60%
RAI Override: More Severe	4	25%	0%	0%	75%	0%	0%	0%
RAI Override: Less Severe	3	0%	0%	0%	66.70%	0%	0%	33.30%
Probation intake	32	15.60%	0%	0%	50%	3.10%	0%	31.20%
Successful probation	124	13.70%	0%	1.60%	48.40%	0%	0%	36.30%
Revocation of probation	43	9.30%	0%	2.30%	55.80%	9.30%	0%	23.30%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								

^{*} Mitchell PD only partially reported in 2017; Morrill PD only partially reported in 2018 and did not report 2015 - 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	28*							
Youth referred to diversion	72	2.80%	0%	0%	54.20%	0%	1.40%	41.70%
Youth enrolled in diversion	66	1.50%	0%	0%	<mark>56.10%</mark>	0%	1.50%	40.90%
Successful completion diversion	51	0%	0%	0%	<mark>49%</mark>	0%	2%	49%
Youth with multiple charges	24	8.30%	0%	0%	25%	0%	29.20%	37.50%
Filed on in adult court	13	0%	0%	15.40%	30.80%	0%	38.50%	15.40%
RAI Override: More Severe	7	0%	0%	0%	71.40%	14.30%	0%	14.30%
RAI Override: Less Severe	2	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
Probation intake	35	2.90%	0%	8.60%	<mark>57.10%</mark>	2.90%	0%	28.60%
Successful probation	166	9%	0%	4.20%	44%	3.60%	0%	39.20%
Revocation of probation	37	18.90%	0%	0%	45.90%	0%	0%	35.10%
Youth in OJS custody	1							
OJS custody: placed in detention	-							
Youth booked into detention					-			
Youth booked into detention more than once								

^{*} Mitchell PD only partially reported in 2017; Morrill PD only partially reported in 2018 and did not report 2015 - 2017

Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year

*Cases offered diversion, mediation or RJ are not available data points in in JUSTICE. Some 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	66	126	<mark>52.4%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ		-	
Filed in Juv. Court	257	517	49.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	28	69	40.6%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to	0	3	0.0%
Juv. Court			
Total	351	723	48.5%

2016	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	110	133	<mark>82.7%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	241	412	58.5%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	38	61	62.3%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	389	606	64.2%

2017	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	107	188	<mark>56.9%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	245	533	46.0%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	35	40	87.5%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	387	768	50.4%





2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	84	125	<mark>67.2%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	222	479	46.3%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	19	31	61.3%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to	0	1	100%
Juv. Court			
Total	325	637	51.0%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	135	174	<mark>77.6%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	135	453	29.8%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	18	35	51.4%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to	0	10	0.0%
Juv. Court			
Total	288	686	42.0%