



# **Stanton County**

## **Table of Contents**

Youth Level	3
Distribution of the Population Age 10-17 by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) <sup>a</sup>	3
School Membership by Race/ Ethnicity and School Year (2014-2019) <sup>b</sup>	4
Disabilities, English Proficiency, Eligibility for Free/Reduced Lunch and School Year (2014 – 2019) <sup>b</sup>	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) <sup>d</sup>	5
Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>	6
Arrest Rates for Adults and Juveniles for 2018 and 2019 with Percent Change <sup>f</sup>	7
Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) <sup>g</sup>	8
Racial and Ethnic Disparities Descriptives (2015-2019)	8
Family Level	10
Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportation year estimates, 2014-2018) <sup>a</sup>	on (5- 10
Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>	11
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means h	11
Child Abuse and Neglect Reports <sup>i</sup>	11
Community Level	12
Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) <sup>j</sup>	12
Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>	12
Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>	13
Policy, Legal and System Level	14
Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) <sup>n</sup>	14
Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>	14
Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>	15
County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) °	15
Community Team Level	17
Collective Impact Survey Response Rates <sup>p</sup>	17
Collective Impact Survey Scores p	17
Community Planning Team Diversity <sup>p</sup>	18
References and Resources	20
Annandiy: PED Descriptives	22



Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year



### 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 overrepresented statewide in chronic absenteeism.
- In the last few year, the number of students under IDEA has increased and is now above the state average.
- Stanton County has almost 96% graduation rate over the last five years.
- This community has not participated in the NRPFSS and should consider participating in the
  next survey year (2021) to get youth-level data on mental health, gangs, supportive adults and
  community perceptions of substance use.
- Both the all age and under 18 age groups showed a decrease in arrests/citations from 2018-2019. The most notable decrease was in liquor law violations for both age groups
  - There was a sizable increase in drug possession arrests in the all age groups.
- 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.
- Law enforcement data by race and ethnicity would be very beneficial to have a clearer picture
  of RED. However, compared to census and school data, Native American youth are
  overrepresented at probation intake, Black youth are overrepresented at probation RAI
  overrides, probation intakes, and probation revocations, Hispanic youth are overrepresented at
  all diversion points, having multiple charges filed, probation intake, and successful probation
  completion, and youth in the multiple/other have high rates of probation RAI overrides and
  probation revocations.
- White youth are underrepresented at all system points compared to census and school data.
   Youth with multiple charges and filed on in adult court are missing race/ethnicity data.
- Once referred, youth of all race/ethnicities are enrolling and successfully completing diversion at rates similar to the rates at which they were referred.

Table 1.

Distribution of the Population Age 10-17 by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) <sup>a</sup>

#### **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%
Stanton	337	89.0%	5.3%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%



### **Females**

Geographic Area	Total Count	Non- Hispanic White	Hispanic or Latino	Black	American Indian	Asian or Pacific	2+ Races
Nebraska	102,658	70.4%	16.2%	5.7%	1.4%	2.0%	4.4%
Stanton	347	92.5%	4.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%

Click here to go back to RED analysis

Table 2.
School Membership by Race/ Ethnicity and School Year (2014-2019) <sup>b</sup>

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-	Stanton	465	2.80%	0.00%	0.22%	0.65%	0.00%	92.47%	3.87%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-	Stanton	437	2.75%	0.00%	0.46%	1.37%	0.00%	91.53%	3.89%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-	Stanton	411	2.19%	0.00%	0.49%	0.00%	0.00%	92.94%	4.38%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-	Stanton	420	3.33%	0.48%	1.19%	0.48%	0.00%	90.71%	3.81%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-	Stanton	387	4.65%	0.26%	0.78%	0.52%	0.00%	88.89%	4.91%
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 <sup>b</sup>

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-	Stanton	35	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2015	Nebraska	35,638	24.54%	1.64%	4.42%	12.93%	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-	Stanton	25	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2016	Nebraska	38,812	25.73%	1.55%	4.27%	13.68%	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
2016-	Stanton	26	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2017	Nebraska	42,290	26.90%	1.66%	4.40%	14.22%	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%

2017-	Stanton	49	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
2018	Nebraska	46,365	26.81%	1.77%	4.18%	14.49%	0.22%	47.37%	2389
2018-	Stanton	25	*	*	*	*	*	100.00%	*
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) <sup>b</sup>

Year	Geographic Area	Total Count	IDEA	504 Plan	Limited English Proficiency	Free/Reduced Lunch
2014-	Stanton	465	13.12%	4.52%	*	43.01%
2015	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	44.53%
2015-	Stanton	437	13.50%	3.43%	*	42.11%
2016	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-	Stanton	411	<mark>14.11%</mark>	4.14%	*	42.58%
2017	Nebraska	318,853	13.80%	0.93%	6.99%	44.76%
2017-	Stanton	420	<mark>16.43%</mark>	4.05%	*	39.76%
2018	Nebraska	323,391	<mark>15.87%</mark>	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-	Stanton	387	<mark>16.80%</mark>	*	*	39.28%
2019	Nebraska	325,984	<mark>16.13%</mark>	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 Las	t 5 Years	Yearly Av	verages	Graduation	
	Graduates	Students	Graduates Students		Rate	Rank
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	-
Stanton	161	168	32.2	33.6	<mark>95.8%</mark>	32

Table 6. Youth Who Report Mental Health Symptoms and Substance Use by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>





		8 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
Stanton	Loss of sleep from worry	-	-	
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
Stanton	Depressed			
Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
Stanton	Considered/Attempted suicide			-
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
Stanton	Current alcohol			-
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
Stanton	Current binge drinking			
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%
Stanton	Current marijuana			
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
Stanton	Current tobacco	-	-	
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%
Stanton	Current vaping	•	1	
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
Stanton	Hopeful for future (past week)	-	-	
Nebraska		72.1%	74.7%	78.4%

<sup>\*</sup>Stanton 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 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
Stanton	Youth Reported Gang Involvement			
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

<sup>\*</sup>Stanton 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 <sup>f</sup>

Arrestee Age		All Arres	stee Ages		Und	der 18
Summary Arrest Date	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %
Jurisdiction by Geography			STANTO	A COUN	TY	
Arrest Offense						
Total	<mark>370</mark>	<mark>329</mark>	-11.08	<mark>46</mark>	<mark>22</mark>	-52.17
Aggravated Assault Total	4	4	0.00	0	0	-
Burglary Total	5	4	-20.00	3	0	-100.00
Larceny-Theft Total	3	5	66.67	1	1	0.00
Motor Vehicle Theft Total	2	ı	-100.00	0	-	-
Other Assaults	9	8	-11.11	1	0	-100.00
Forgery and Counterfeiting	-	2	-	-	0	-
Fraud	1	1	0.00	0	0	-
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	-	2	-	-	0	-
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	1	3	200.00	0	0	-
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	-	3	-	-	0	-
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	2	6	200.00	1	0	-100.00
Drug Violations - Possession	<mark>51</mark>	<mark>76</mark>	49.02	4	5	25.00
Offenses Against Family and Children	1		-100.00	0	-	-
Driving Under the Influence	61	63	3.28	0	0	-
Liquor Laws	<mark>104</mark>	<mark>37</mark>	-64.42	<mark>20</mark>	<mark>3</mark>	-85.00
Disorderly Conduct	3	6	100.00	0	1	-
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	123	101	-17.89	16	4	-75.00

Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	-	1	-	-	1	-
Runaways	-	7	-	-	7	-

Table 13. Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) <sup>g</sup>

	Stanton			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) <sup>1</sup>

### 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	221							
Youth referred to diversion	26	0%	0%	<mark>3.80%</mark>	<mark>26.90%</mark>	0%	0%	<mark>69.20%</mark>
Youth enrolled in diversion	25	0%	0%	<mark>4%</mark>	<mark>28%</mark>	0%	0%	<mark>68%</mark>
Successful completion diversion	23	0%	0%	<mark>4.30%</mark>	30.40%	0%	0%	<mark>65.20%</mark>





Youth with multiple charges	22	0%	0%	0%	<mark>9.10%</mark>	0%	18.20%	72.70%
Filed on in adult court	14	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<mark>35.70%</mark>	64.30%
RAI Override: More Severe	8	0%	0%	<mark>12.50%</mark>	0%	<mark>12.50%</mark>	0%	75%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Probation intake	17	<mark>5.90%</mark>	0%	<mark>11.80%</mark>	<mark>5.90%</mark>	5.90%	0%	70.60%
Successful probation	100	2%	1%	2%	9%	1%	0%	85%
Revocation of probation	14	0%	0%	<mark>7.10%</mark>	0%	28.60%	0%	64.30%
Youth in OJS custody					-			
OJS custody: placed in detention					-			-
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								



## **Family Level**

- Stanton County's rate of children below 185% poverty is very similar to the state rate.
- 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 Stanton County find employment where they go to school
  and do not return to Stanton County.
- A large percentage of students have access to internet at home.

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

Measurement		Stanton	Nebraska
Poverty/SES	Children <18 in Poverty	7.8%	14.8%
	Number of children 12-	149	43,814
	17 below 185% poverty		
	Percent of children 12-	<mark>28.8%</mark>	<mark>28.9%</mark>
	17 below 185% poverty		
Educational attainment	Age 25+ with B.D.	<mark>16.6%</mark>	31.3%
	County rank	85	-
	Age 25+ with some	24.8%	23.0%
	college, no degree		
	County rank	38	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	93.0%	91.1%
	County Rank	36	-
Technology and computers in the home	% under 18 with a	99.5%	96.9%
	computer at home		
	County rank	27	-
	% under 18 with an	94.5%	91.0%
	internet subscription at		
	home		
	County rank	26	-
	% under 18 with	94.3%	90.8%
	broadband internet		
	access at home		
	County Rank	23	-
Housing	Owner-occupied households	2,001	498,567





	Total households	2,410	754,063
	Owner %	83.0%	66.1%
	Renters	409	255,496
	Renter %	17.0%	33.9%
Transportation	Households with no vehicle available	52	40,465
	Total households	2,410	754,063
	No vehicle %	2.2%	5.4%

Table 16. Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>

		8 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
Stanton	Adult at home who listens		-	
Nebraska		87.3%	85.0%	85.6%
Stanton	Adult at school who listens		-	
Nebraska		85.2%	85.0%	87.4%

<sup>\*</sup>Stanton County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey

Table 17.
Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means <sup>h</sup>

	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		
Stanton	1	1	2	2
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

Table 18. Child Abuse and Neglect Reports <sup>i</sup>

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
Stanton	39	44%	35%	53%
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).
- There are high rates of missing race/ethnicity data at the trial court (JUSTICE) and older diversion data. Data for race and ethnicity at each juvenile justice system point is imperative for an accurate Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) analysis.

Table 19.
Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) <sup>j</sup>

Type of Violence	Stanton	Nebraska
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	0	34
Rape	0	264
Robbery	0	367
Aggravated Assault	4	1,639
Other Assaults	8	8,782

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

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

<sup>\*</sup>Stanton County did not participate in the Nebraska Risk and Protective Factors Survey





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	38	66	<mark>57.6%</mark>
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	233	497	46.9%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	16	30	53.3%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court			
Total	287	603	47.6%

<sup>\*</sup>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

- This county is not a county required to provide counsel under statute; notably, access to counsel is very low in this community.
- Curfew filings were relatively high in the previous years, but have decreased in recent years. Curfew violations, if not diverted, can net-widen juveniles into the juvenile justice system. With respect to diversion practices, the community may want to consider a few things:
  - o Not filing all unsuccessful cases, if the youth completed most of the diversion plan
  - 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.</li>
  - If drug testing is needed, it should only be used on cases where the youth demonstrates a substance use issue.

# Table 22. Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) <sup>n</sup>

	Stanton	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	<mark>0.0% 19.9%</mark>	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) <sup>m</sup>

	Stanton	Nebraska		
Curfew Court Filing	<mark>16</mark>	352		

2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
3	10	3	0	0	16

Table 25.

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

		Stanton							
Filed Subtype	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total			
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	0	0			
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	0	0	2	1	4	7			
3B - Uncontrollable	0	0	0	0	2	2			
3C – Mentally III and Dangerous	0	0	2	2	0	4			

	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)  $^\circ$ 

	Stanton	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	<mark>Always</mark>	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; Homicide, 1st Degree Sexual	Yes: 86.4%
juvenile ineligible for diversion	Assault, Armed Robbery	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	Yes	Yes: 31.8%





		No: 65.9%
		Not sure: 2.3%
Fees beyond restitution	Yes; \$100	Yes: 86.4%
		No: 13.6%
		Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior	Yes; may include extending	Yes: 47.7%
to discharge	another month or additional	No: 25.0%
	activities, depending on the need	Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	Yes; The Diversion assistant	Yes: 59.1%
	notifies the arresting agency that	No: 22.7%
	the juvenile has completed the	Not sure: 18.2%
	diversion program. If the Juvenile	
	completes the diversion program	
	then the letter is sent and record	
	sealed.	

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



## **Community Team Level**

- A community lead should be able to get roughly a 75% response, to ensure active participation on planning issues, your response rate was 37.0%.
- The rates of collective impact went up for three elements, but down for two. The community team should look at shared measurement and continuous communication amongst the team.
- The community team should be representative of the population of that community but should also include diversity. It might be beneficial to add diverse member to your team (especially because of the patterns of over and under representation.)
- The Northeast Team has good representation of previous system involvement.
- There were no probation, defense counsel, DHHS, ministry/faith based, or detention system point mentioned on your team; it could be that your team does include members at these system points but did not respond to the survey.
- 3/4 of the team felt heard by the group, but that may not be representative due to low response rate.

Table 26.
Collective Impact Survey Response Rates p

	Northea	st Team	Nebraska		
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020	
Number of surveys sent	29	46	1407	780	
Number of completed surveys	5	17	221	345	
Response rate	17.2%	<mark>37.0%</mark>	28.3%	24.5%	

Table 27.
Collective Impact Survey Scores p

	Northeast 7	Геат	Nebraska		
Year of survey	2019	2020	2019	2020	
	Mean Score		Mean	Score	
Common agenda	5.14	5.65	5.29	5.69	
Mutually reinforcing	5.25	5.29	5.37	5.50	
Shared measurement	<mark>5.18</mark>	<mark>4.94</mark>	5.21	5.45	
Continuous communication	5.50	<mark>5.41</mark>	5.49	5.55	
Backbone agency	5.25	5.35	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 <sup>q</sup>

Table 28.
Community Planning Team Diversity P

	Northeas	st Team	Neb	raska
	N = 17	(%)	N = 345	(%)
Gender				
Male	8	47.1%	101	29.3%
Female	8	47.1%	229	66.4%
Missing	1	5.9%	15	4.3%
Age				
Under 30			19	5.6%
30-39	6	35.3%	68	19.6%
40-49	6	35.3%	88	25.4%
50-59	2	11.8%	90	25.8%
60 and over	2	11.8%	44	13%
Missing	1	5.9%	36	10.4%
Race/Ethnicity				
White	15	88.2%	230	66.7%
Black			10	2.9%
Hispanic	<del></del>		13	3.8%
Native American			6	1.7%
Asian	1	5.9%	1	0.3%
Other			2	0.6%





Provided town name	1	5.9%	63	18.3%
Missing			19	5.5%
Previous System Involvement				
Yes	7	41.2%	98	28.4%
No	10	58.8%	242	70.1%
Missing			5	1.4%
System Point*				
Law enforcement	4	19.0%	34	7.8%
County attorney/ juvenile court	5	23.8%	32	7.3%
K-12 or secondary education	7	33.3%	65	14.9%
Ministry/faith based			10	2.3%
Diversion	2	9.5%	55	12.6%
Probation			31	7.1%
Public defender/ defense counsel/	<del></del>		8	1.8%
guardian ad litem				
DHHS or Child Welfare			13	3.0%
Treatment provider	1	4.8%	40	9.2%
Post adjudication or detention			8	1.8%
Community based program	1	4.8%	109	25.0%
Elected official or government			6	1.4%
Restorative practices			6	1.4%
Backbone or system improvement			3	0.7%
Other	1	4.8%	16	3.7%
Voice on Team				
Feel heard	13	76.5%	270	78.3%
Do not feel heard	4	23.5%	75	21.7%

Boone n = 1, Burt n = 1, Cuming n = 1, Madison n = 10, Stanton n = 1, Wayne n = 1 (one person 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

- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>a</sup> **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
- <sup>b</sup> School membership, chronic absenteeism, student disability, and free/reduced lunch: Prepared by Sara Simonsen, Nebraska Department of Education
- <sup>c</sup> **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
- <sup>d</sup> 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: <a href="https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx">https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx</a>
  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

<sup>1</sup>Child abuse and neglect

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

<sup>k</sup> Distance to detention facility: Google Maps

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





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

- <sup>m</sup> 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
- <sup>n</sup> **Access to Counsel:** Kids County in Nebraska Report, Voices for Children, retrieved from: <a href="https://www.voicesforchildren.com/kidscount">www.voicesforchildren.com/kidscount</a>. Data originally from Nebraska Judicial Branch Trial Court Case Management System, JUSTICE
- ° **Diversion procedures and protocols:** Diversion survey distributed to Juvenile Diversion programs, 2020. Prepared by: Lindsey Wylie, UNO Juvenile Justice Institute
- <sup>p</sup> **Collective impact:** Collective impact surveys distributed to Community Planning Teams, 2019 and 2020. Prepared by: Anne Hobbs and Erin Wasserburger, UNO Juvenile Justice Institute
- <sup>q</sup> 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	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact								
Youth taken to temporary custody								
Youth issued citation/referral	39							
Youth referred to diversion	8	0%	0%	12.50%	75%	0%	0%	12.50%
Youth enrolled in diversion	8	0%	0%	12.50%	75%	0%	0%	12.50%
Successful completion diversion	8	0%	0%	12.50%	75%	0%	0%	12.50%
Youth with multiple charges	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Filed on in adult court	6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33.30%	66.70%
RAI Override: More Severe	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
Probation intake	1	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Successful probation	18	0%	0%	0%	16.70%	5.60%	0%	77.80%
Revocation of probation	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Youth in OJS custody		1	-		1			
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								





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	50							
Youth referred to diversion	9	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Youth enrolled in diversion	9	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Successful completion diversion	9	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Youth with multiple charges	5	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	0%	80%
Filed on in adult court	4	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
RAI Override: More Severe	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
Probation intake	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Successful probation	16	0%	0%	6.20%	12.50%	0%	0%	81.20%
Revocation of probation	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								





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	64				1			
Youth referred to diversion	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Youth enrolled in diversion	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Successful completion diversion	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Youth with multiple charges	6	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Filed on in adult court	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RAI Override: More Severe	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
Probation intake	3	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Successful probation	28	0%	0%	0%	7.10%	0%	0%	92.90%
Revocation of probation	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once		-			1			





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	46							
Youth referred to diversion	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Youth enrolled in diversion	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Successful completion diversion	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%
Youth with multiple charges	8	0%	0%	0%	12.50%	0%	25%	62.50%
Filed on in adult court	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%	NA%
RAI Override: More Severe	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
Probation intake	6	0%	0%	0%	0%	16.70%	0%	83.30%
Successful probation	16	12.50%	6.20%	0%	12.50%	0%	0%	68.80%
Revocation of probation	7	0%	0%	14.30%	0%	42.90%	0%	42.90%
Youth in OJS custody					-			
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once								





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	22					-		
Youth referred to diversion	4	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	75%
Youth enrolled in diversion	4	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	75%
Successful completion diversion	4	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	75%
Youth with multiple charges	2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
Filed on in adult court	1	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
RAI Override: More Severe	2	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
RAI Override: Less Severe	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
Probation intake	4	25%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	25%
Successful probation	22	0%	0%	4.50%	0%	0%	0%	95.50%
Revocation of probation	0	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	NA%	0%	NA%
Youth in OJS custody								
OJS custody: placed in detention								
Youth booked into detention								
Youth booked into detention more than once						1		

# **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	9	18	50.0%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	57	88	64.8%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	3	12	25.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	69	118	58.5%

2016	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	4	10	40.0%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	45	95	47.4%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	9	12	75.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court			
Total	58	127	45.7%

2017	Number of charges	Total Number of	Sealed
	Sealed	charges	(%)
Dismissed or Dropped	13	21	61.9%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	52	138	37.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	2	4	50.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	67	163	41.1%





2018	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	10	15	66.7%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	70	131	53.4%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	1	1	100%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	81	147	551.7%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	2	2	100%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ			
Filed in Juv. Court	9	45	20.0%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	1	1	100%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to			
Juv. Court			
Total	12	48	25.0%