



Sarpy 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>..... 4

    School Membership by Race/ Ethnicity and School Year (2014-2019)..... 4

    Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity and School Year (2014 - 2019) <sup>b</sup>..... 5

    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) <sup>c</sup> ..... 6

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

    Youth Who Report Gang Involvement by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup> ..... 7

    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) <sup>l</sup> ..... 10

**Family Level**..... 11

    Poverty/SES, Educational Attainment, Technology and Computers in Home, Housing, and Transportation (5-year estimates, 2014-2018) <sup>a</sup> ..... 11

    Youth Who Report Supportive Adults by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>..... 12

    Domestic Violence Reports and Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means <sup>h</sup>..... 12

    Child Abuse and Neglect Reports <sup>i</sup> ..... 12

**Community Level**..... 13

    Community Violence Measured by Arrests for Violent Crime (2019) <sup>j</sup>..... 13

    Youth Perceptions of Community Attitudes on Substance Use by Grade (2018) <sup>d</sup>..... 13

    Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>..... 14

**Policy, Legal and System Level**..... 15

    Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court Who Had Access to Counsel (2018) <sup>n</sup>..... 15

    Frequency of Youth with a Curfew Violation (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>..... 15

    Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup> ..... 16

    County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) <sup>o</sup> ..... 16

**Community Team Level** ..... 18

    Collective Impact Survey Response Rates <sup>p</sup> ..... 18

    Collective Impact Survey Scores <sup>p</sup> ..... 18

    Community Planning Team Diversity <sup>p</sup> ..... 19

**References and Resources**..... 21



UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

**JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE**

**EVIDENCE-BASED**  
NEBRASKA

**COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021**

**Appendix: RED Descriptives ..... 23**

**Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year ..... 28**



## Youth Level

- Black and Hispanic/Latino have a slightly higher rate of chronic absenteeism as compared to the school membership population (and compared to the state averages). The trend for both Hispanic and Black youth has remained fairly stable over the past 5 school years.
- More youth have 504 plans as compared to the state. Graduation rates are higher than the state average, and the county is ranked 45 of 93.
- 8<sup>th</sup> graders report mental health symptoms and substance use at a rate similar or below the state average; 10<sup>th</sup> graders report greater use of alcohol and marijuana currently as compared to the state average; and 12<sup>th</sup> graders report higher levels of depression, suicidal ideation, current marijuana use and tobacco vaping at a higher rate than the state average (with tobacco vaping one of the highest in the state).
- Crime in general is slightly lower from 2018 to 2019, similar to juvenile crime. For juveniles, robbery, burglary, vandalism, and liquor laws all increased; motor vehicle theft, other assaults, disorderly conduct, and curfew violations all decreased.
- Risk assessment domains for youth assessed for diversion suggest Peer Relationships and Substance Use are the areas of highest need. Sex differences revealed males had higher Substance Use and Attitudes/Orientation. Racial/ethnic differences revealed Black youth had greater Family Circumstances/Parenting needs and lower Substance Use needs (as compared to White youth); Hispanic youth had greater Education/Employment and Leisure/Recreation needs (as compared to White youth).
- Cases appear to be funneling appropriately through the juvenile justice system with approximately 43% of cases referred to diversion and 17% to probation.
- Black and Hispanic youth are over-represented at all system points compared to the population (unfortunately, we do not have law enforcement data by race/ethnicity to see if Black and Hispanic youth are being referred to these system point at a rate that is proportional to law enforcement stops of citations/referrals).
- Once referred to diversion, Black and Hispanic youth are not enrolling or successful at the same rate as they are referred (especially compared to White youth).
- The disproportionality for Black youth is even higher for being filed on in adult court, probation intake, and revocation of probation.
- Refer to the yearly RED tables in the Appendix to see if RED patterns have improved, declined, or stayed the same from 2015 to 2019.



**COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021**

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%
<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>11,303</b>	<b>75.9%</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>5.4%</b>

**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%
<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>10,405</b>	<b>76.0%</b>	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>6.4%</b>

[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
2014-2015	<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>26,567</b>	<b>7.92%</b>	<b>2.00%</b>	<b>0.59%</b>	<b>5.75%</b>	<b>0.16%</b>	<b>79.95%</b>	<b>3.63%</b>
	Nebraska	312,281	17.74%	2.43%	1.42%	6.70%	0.13%	68.20%	3.38%
2015-2016	<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>27,029</b>	<b>8.41%</b>	<b>1.97%</b>	<b>0.54%</b>	<b>5.58%</b>	<b>0.18%</b>	<b>79.48%</b>	<b>3.84%</b>
	Nebraska	315,542	18.08%	2.53%	1.38%	6.67%	0.14%	67.72%	3.47%
2016-2017	<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>27,622</b>	<b>9.16%</b>	<b>1.90%</b>	<b>0.54%</b>	<b>5.42%</b>	<b>0.21%</b>	<b>78.52%</b>	<b>4.26%</b>
	Nebraska	318,853	18.61%	2.66%	1.38%	6.69%	0.15%	66.92%	3.59%
2017-2018	<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>28,077</b>	<b>9.67%</b>	<b>1.88%</b>	<b>0.48%</b>	<b>5.26%</b>	<b>0.21%</b>	<b>77.98%</b>	<b>4.52%</b>
	Nebraska	323,391	18.80%	2.76%	1.35%	6.67%	0.14%	66.50%	3.78%
2018-2019	<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>28,617</b>	<b>10.06%</b>	<b>1.89%</b>	<b>0.48%</b>	<b>5.32%</b>	<b>0.23%</b>	<b>77.13%</b>	<b>4.89%</b>
	Nebraska	325,984	19.13%	2.83%	1.33%	6.63%	0.15%	66.02%	3.91%



## COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Table 3.

Chronic Absenteeism by Race/Ethnicity and School Year (2014 - 2019)<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
2014-2015	Sarpy	2,265	11.43%	1.90%	1.32%	7.59%	*	73.95%	3.80%
	Nebraska	35,638	24.54%	1.64%	4.42%	12.93%	0.19%	51.61%	4.68%
2015-2016	Sarpy	2,338	12.70%	1.37%	1.37%	8.17%	*	71.34%	5.05%
	Nebraska	38,812	25.73%	1.55%	4.27%	13.68%	0.27%	49.68%	4.83%
2016-2017	Sarpy	2,565	14.31%	1.36%	0.94%	7.72%	*	71.11%	4.56%
	Nebraska	42,290	26.90%	1.66%	4.40%	14.22%	0.24%	47.66%	4.92%
2017-2018	Sarpy	2,844	13.57%	1.20%	1.05%	7.24%	0.39%	71.45%	5.10%
	Nebraska	46,365	26.81%	1.77%	4.18%	14.49%	0.22%	47.37%	2389
2018-2019	Sarpy	3,182	14.27%	1.01%	0.75%	7.73%	*	70.77%	5.47%
	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
2014-2015	Sarpy	26,567	12.76%	1.64%	1.41%	27.43%
	Nebraska	312,281	13.66%	0.76%	5.97%	44.53%
2015-2016	Sarpy	27,029	12.89%	1.84%	1.24%	26.28%
	Nebraska	315,542	13.64%	0.90%	5.90%	44.23%
2016-2017	Sarpy	27,622	13.13%	2.08%	1.39%	24.65%
	Nebraska	318,853	13.80%	0.93%	6.99%	44.76%
2017-2018	Sarpy	28,077	15.76%	2.23%	1.23%	25.79%
	Nebraska	323,391	15.87%	0.88%	6.59%	46.24%
2018-2019	Sarpy	28,617	15.88%	2.53%	1.43%	25.17%
	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



**COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021**

Table 5.  
 Nebraska Public High School 4-Year Graduation Rates by County (5-year estimates, 2015-2019) °

County	Total in Last 5 Years		Yearly Averages		Graduation Rate	Rank
	Graduates	Students	Graduates	Students		
Nebraska	100,111	112,857	20,022.2	22,571.4	88.7%	-
<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>9,309</b>	<b>9,876</b>	<b>465.5</b>	<b>493.8</b>	<b>94.3%</b>	<b>45</b>

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 <sup>th</sup>	10 <sup>th</sup>	12 <sup>th</sup>
<b>Sarpy</b>	Loss of sleep from worry	<b>20.4%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>15.5%</b>
Nebraska		18.0%	20.6%	21.6%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Depressed	<b>33.5%</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>40.8%</b>
Nebraska		31.1%	34.8%	35.3%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Considered/Attempted suicide	<b>16.3%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>20.6%</b>
Nebraska		22.9%	18.2%	16.2%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Current alcohol	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>34.6%</b>
Nebraska		9.8%	20.1%	34.2%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Current binge drinking	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>15.7%</b>
Nebraska		1.3%	6.2%	15.0%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Current marijuana	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>13.2%</b>	<b>26.0%</b>
Nebraska		3.0%	7.3%	13.9%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Current tobacco	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>10.6%</b>
Nebraska		3.7%	8.0%	15.3%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Current vaping	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>24.4%</b>	<b>57.7%</b>
Nebraska		10.4%	24.7%	37.3%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Hopeful for future (past week)	<b>78.9%</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>75.5%</b>
Nebraska		72.1%	74.7%	78.4%



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

\*\*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>
<b>Sarpy</b>	Youth Reported Gang Involvement	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>
Nebraska		3.8%	4.4%	3.8%

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

Arrestee Age	All Arrestee Ages			Under 18		
	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %	2018	2019	2018 - 2019 Growth %
<b>Summary Arrest Date</b>						
<b>Jurisdiction by Geography</b>	SARPY COUNTY					
<b>Arrest Offense</b>						
Total	4,121	3,676	-10.80	1,050	1,012	-3.62
Murder and Nonnegligent Manslaughter	4	2	-50.00	-	-	-
Rape Total	18	14	-22.22	3	3	0.00
Robbery Total	4	9	125.00	1	7	600.00
Aggravated Assault Total	50	43	-14.00	5	5	0.00
Burglary Total	12	27	125.00	1	16	1500.00
Larceny-Theft Total	435	418	-3.91	119	129	8.40



## COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Motor Vehicle Theft Total	29	24	-17.24	18	12	-33.33
Other Assaults	758	634	-16.36	227	180	-20.70
Arson	1	2	100.00	1	1	0.00
Forgery and Counterfeiting	23	14	-39.13	0	-	-
Fraud	62	63	1.61	16	5	-68.75
Stolen Property; Buying, Receiving, Possessing	67	41	-38.81	20	17	-15.00
Vandalism	118	134	13.56	52	67	28.85
Weapons; Carrying, Possessing, etc.	31	27	-12.90	7	6	-14.29
Prostitution	6	5	-16.67	-	-	-
Assisting or Promoting Prostitution	3	2	-33.33	-	-	-
Prostitution Total for Summary	-	1	-	-	0	-
Sex Offenses (Except Rape and Prostitution)	32	29	-9.38	14	5	-64.29
Drug Violations - Sale/Manufacturing	20	18	-10.00	8	3	-62.50
Drug Violations - Possession	1,036	906	-12.55	194	222	14.43
Offenses Against Family and Children	184	170	-7.61	100	82	-18.00
Driving Under the Influence	561	501	-10.70	4	5	25.00
Liquor Laws	126	135	7.14	47	68	44.68
Disorderly Conduct	80	49	-38.75	21	12	-42.86
All Other Offenses (Except Traffic)	340	298	-12.35	71	57	-19.72
Curfew and Loitering Law Violations	41	19	-53.66	41	19	-53.66
Runaways	80	91	13.75	80	91	13.75

Table 13a.

Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2015 - 2017) <sup>9</sup>

Score	Sarpy		All YLS Counties	
	M	SD	M	SD
Family Circumstance/Parenting	1.01	1.29	1.20	1.32
Education/Employment	0.92	1.29	1.27	1.35
Peer Relationships	1.83	1.23	1.78	1.08
Substance Use	1.37	1.43	1.29	1.40
Leisure/Recreation	0.90	1.04	0.88	0.95
Personality/Behavior	0.92	1.47	1.34	1.52
Attitudes/Orientation	0.32	0.75	0.45	0.79
Mean Score	M = 7.28, SD = 5.62, 0-31		M = 8.23, SD = 5.22, 0-31	

Sarpy County  $n = 119$ ; Statewide  $n = 2124$





## COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Table 13b.

Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) by Sex <sup>9</sup>

	Female	Male
Family Circumstance/Parenting	1.10	0.94
Education/Employment	0.89	0.94
Peer Relationships	1.84	1.82
Substance Use *	1.24	1.47
Leisure/Recreation	0.95	0.86
Personality/Behavior	0.85	0.97
Attitudes/Orientation ***	0.21	0.40
Total YLS Score	7.10	7.42

Note. ANOVA for sex indicated Substance Use and Attitudes/Orientation were greater issues for males than females. \* p<.05, \*\*\* p <.001

Table 13c.

Risk Assessment Domains for Youth Assessed on Diversion (2017 - 2019) by Race/Ethnicity <sup>9</sup>

	Black	Asian	Hispanic	Other/Multiple	White <sup>a</sup>
Family Circumstance/Parenting**	1.39	0.56	0.97	--	0.95
Education/Employment	1.04	0.56	1.25	--	0.85
Peer Relationships	1.82	1.56	1.94	--	1.82
Substance Use	1.00	1.22	1.48	--	1.42
Leisure/Recreation *	0.73	1.11	1.15	--	0.88
Personality/Behavior *	0.99	0.33	0.89	--	0.91
Attitudes/Orientation	0.34	0.11	0.32	--	0.32
Total YLS Score	7.35	5.44	8.00	--	7.17

Note. ANOVA for race/ethnicity indicated significant differences by race/ethnicity on Family Circumstances/Parenting, Leisure/Recreation, and Personality Behavior. p<.001, \*\* p <.01, \* p<.05

<sup>a</sup> White youth were the comparison group and a \* indicates that group was statistically different from White youth

we did not include Other/Multiple as there were only 3 youth



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

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 .48%	Asian/ Pacific Islander 1.89%	Black 5.32%	Hispanic/ Latino 10.06%	Multiple/ Other 4.89%	Unspec/ Missing	White 77.13%
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	5286	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	2268	0.30%	1%	11.90%	16.80%	0.90%	2.60%	66.40%
Youth enrolled in diversion	1537	0.30%	1.20%	9.80%	15.70%	0.90%	1.80%	70.30%
Successful completion diversion	1109	0.20%	1.40%	9.40%	14.90%	1%	1.70%	71.40%
Youth with multiple charges	300	0.30%	0.30%	13%	0.70%	0%	21.30%	64.30%
Filed on in adult court	69	0%	0%	26.10%	0%	0%	0%	73.90%
RAI Override: More Severe	338	2.70%	1.80%	9.80%	21.30%	2.40%	0%	62.10%
RAI Override: Less Severe	171	2.90%	1.80%	7.60%	21.60%	2.90%	0%	63.20%
Probation intake	885	2.70%	1.10%	12.70%	22.10%	2.70%	0%	58.60%
Successful probation	803	1.40%	0.40%	8.30%	18.80%	5%	0%	66.10%
Revocation of probation	129	2.30%	3.10%	10.90%	20.90%	5.40%	0%	57.40%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



## Family Level

- Poverty and other related measures do not appear to be an issue in this county.
- All grades report a similar rate of having adults who listen at school and at home; most 10<sup>th</sup> graders report having an adult at home who listens.
- The county has some violent arrests and comprises of 20% of the state's simple domestic assaults.
- The county has a higher rate of substantiated child abuse and neglect cases than the state average.

Table 15.

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

Measurement		Sarpy	Nebraska
<b>Poverty/SES</b>	Children <18 in Poverty	6.2%	14.8%
	Number of children 12-17 below 185% poverty	2,570	43,814
	Percent of children 12-17 below 185% poverty	16.5%	28.9%
<b>Educational attainment</b>	Age 25+ with B.D.	40.1%	31.3%
	County Rank	1	-
	Age 25+ with some college, no degree	24.2%	23.0%
	County Rank	46	-
	Age 25+ with HS degree	95.2%	91.1%
	County Rank	13	-
<b>Technology and computers in the home</b>	% under 18 with a computer at home	99.4%	96.9%
	County Rank	34	-
	% under 18 with an internet subscription at home	97.3%	91.0%
	County Rank	7	-
	% under 18 with broadband internet access at home	97.2%	90.8%
	County Rank	7	-



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

<b>Housing</b>	Owner-occupied households	44,950	498,567
	Total households	65,045	754,063
	Owner %	69.1%	66.1
	Renters	20,095	255,496
	Renter %	30.9%	33.9%
<b>Transportation</b>	Households with no vehicle available	1,850	40,465
	Total households	65,045	754,063
	No vehicle %	2.8%	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>
<b>Sarpy</b>	Adult at home who listens	<b>86.6%</b>	<b>94.8%</b>	<b>91.3%</b>
Nebraska		87.3%	85.0%	85.6%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Adult at school who listens	<b>86.7%</b>	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>85.9%</b>
Nebraska		85.2%	85.0%	87.4%

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

	Aggravated Domestic Assaults Reported	Aggravated Domestic Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means	Simple Domestic Assaults Reported	Simple Domestic Assaults Cleared by Arrest or Exceptional Means
<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>18; 3%</b>	<b>13; 3%</b>	<b>510; 20%</b>	<b>185; 9%</b>
Nebraska	562	402	2512	2019

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

	Abuse/Neglect Calls	Reports Assessed	Substantiated	Unfounded
<b>Sarpy</b>	<b>2,079</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>65%</b>
Nebraska	36,480	33.4%	16.0%	68.3%



## Community Level

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

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

Type of Violence	Sarpy		Nebraska
	<i>n</i>	% within state	Nebraska
Murder and Nonnegligent manslaughter	2	5.8%	34
Rape	14	5.3%	264
Robbery	9	2.5%	367
Aggravated Assault	43	2.6%	1,639
Other Assaults	633	7.2%	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>
<b>Sarpy</b>	Wrong/very wrong – Marijuana	<b>96.8%</b>	<b>88.3%</b>	<b>79.6%</b>
Nebraska		94.4%	89.8%	85.2%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Wrong/very wrong – alcohol	<b>92.8%</b>	<b>76.6%</b>	<b>69.4%</b>
Nebraska		89.1%	80.4%	68.7%
<b>Sarpy</b>	Wrong/very wrong – cigarettes	<b>97.1%</b>	<b>85.7%</b>	<b>79.6%</b>
Nebraska		92.9%	89.0%	78.7%



Table 21.  
Juvenile Court Record Sealing Analysis (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>

see [Appendix for yearly data](#)

	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	3005	4349	• 69.1%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	0	7	0.0%
Filed in Juv. Court	1287	2839	45.3%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	218	262	83.2%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	8	34	23.5%
Total	4529	7541	60.1%

\*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



## Policy, Legal and System Level

- This county is required under statute to provide an attorney when a youth is filed on in court, and a high rate of youth have access to counsel.
- There were some curfew violations, but these were mostly in earlier years.
- Absenteeism/Truancy filings have remained consistent over the years; and uncontrollable filings have decreased.
- The diversion program in the county may want to consider:
  - Implementing warning letters for youth assessed as lowest risk
  - If necessary, only drug testing youth with a substance use need
  - Ensure diversion fees are comparable to court costs so that costs does not deter youth from enrolling in diversion

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

### Percent of Youth in Juvenile Court who Had Access to Counsel (2018)

	Sarpy	Nebraska
Access to Counsel	80.0% -- 100.0%	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) <sup>m</sup>

	Sarpy	Nebraska
Curfew Court Filing	9	352



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
0	3	6	0	0	9

Table 24.  
Court Filing for 3A, 3B, and 3C cases (2015 – 2019) <sup>m</sup>

Filed Subtype	Sarpy					
	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
3A- Homeless/Neglect	0	0	0	0	1	1
3B – Absenteeism/Truancy	1	15	17	9	18	61
3B - Uncontrollable	3	6	1	1	2	13
3C – Mentally Ill and Dangerous	0	1	0	0	1	2

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

Table 25.  
County Diversion Procedures and Protocols Compared to Statewide Responses (2020) <sup>o</sup>

	Sarpy	Nebraska *
Refer ALL juveniles who are first time offenders to diversion	No	Yes: 27.3% No: 63.6% Not sure: 9.1%
File a juvenile's charges at the time of the referral to diversion	No	Yes: 18.2% No: 70.5% Not sure: 11.4%
File a juvenile's charges if they are unsuccessful on diversion	Sometimes	Always: 47.7% Sometimes: 47.7% Not sure: 4.5%
Allow a juvenile to complete diversion more than once	Yes	Yes: 61.4% No: 34.1% Not sure: 4.5%
Charges/offenses that make a juvenile ineligible for diversion	Yes; Serious felony charges (murder, etc.), most sexual assaults, or a pattern of repeated offenses.	Yes: 86.4% No: 9.1% Not sure: 4.5%
Warning letters instead of intervention	No	Yes: 27.3% No: 61.4% Not sure: 11.4%





COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Currently drug test	Yes	Yes: 31.8% No: 65.9% Not sure: 2.3%
Fees beyond restitution	Yes; varies based on level of offense	Yes: 86.4% No: 13.6% Not sure: 0.0%
Use of graduated responses prior to discharge	Not sure; all cases are reviewed by the team on case-by-case basis	Yes: 47.7% No: 25.0% Not sure: 27.3%
Sealing diversion records	Yes; Notification is given to the County Attorney's office, as well as the arresting agency (agency that cited the youth). Juveniles that successfully complete the program have their record sealed, this process is done by the County Attorney's office, upon confirmation of completion.	Yes: 59.1% No: 22.7% Not sure: 18.2%

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



### Community Team Level

- A community lead should be able to get roughly a 75% response, to ensure active participation on planning issues. The county had an increase in response rate from 2019 to 2020; however, the survey was sent to fewer people in 2020.
- Measures of collective impact improved from 2019 to 2020. The area with the lowest score has been Mutually Reinforcing activities (see definition below). Continuous communication is the highest domain.
- The community team should be representative of the population of that community but should also include diverse populations. Although the response rate was low, of those that responded, the team could benefit from additional Black and Hispanic members to match the population of the county and because of issues of over-representation.
- There could be additional representation from people previously system involved and from people in other juvenile justice system points (e.g., DHHS, elected officials, education)
- The team should ensure all voices are heard, perhaps trying different methods of gathering input to increase team members feeling heard.

Table 26. Collective Impact Survey Response Rates <sup>P</sup>

Year of survey	Sarpy		Nebraska	
	2019	2020	2019	2020
Number of surveys sent	27	13	1407	780
Number of completed surveys	10	6	221	345
Response rate	37.0%	46.2%	28.3%	24.5%

Table 27. Collective Impact Survey Scores <sup>P</sup>

Year of survey	Sarpy		Nebraska	
	2019	2020	2019	2020
	Mean Score		Mean Score	
Common agenda	5.32	5.67	5.29	5.69
Mutually reinforcing	5.33	5.33	5.37	5.50
Shared measurement	5.42	5.83	5.21	5.45
Continuous communication	5.68	6.17	5.49	5.55



## COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Backbone agency	5.24	5.83	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 <sup>p</sup>

	Sarpy		Nebraska	
	N = 6	(%)	N = 345	(%)
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	1	16.7%	101	29.3%
Female	3	50.0%	229	66.4%
Missing	2	33.3%	15	4.3%
<b>Age</b>				
Under 30	--	--	19	5.6%
30-39	--	--	68	19.6%
40-49	3	50.0%	88	25.4%
50-59	--	--	90	25.8%
60 and over	1	16.7%	44	13%
Missing	2	33.3%	36	10.4%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
White	4	66.7%	230	66.7%
Black	--	--	10	2.9%
Hispanic	--	--	13	3.8%
Native American	--	--	6	1.7%
Asian	--	--	1	0.3%
Other	--	--	2	0.6%



## COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Provided town name	--	--	63	18.3%
Missing	2	33.3%	19	5.5%
<b>Previous System Involvement</b>				
Yes	1	16.7%	98	28.4%
No	5	83.3%	242	70.1%
Missing	--	--	5	1.4%
<b>System Point *</b>				
Law enforcement	--	--	34	7.8%
County attorney/ juvenile court	1	16.7%	32	7.3%
K-12 or secondary education	--	--	65	14.9%
Ministry/faith based	--	--	10	2.3%
Diversion	1	16.7%	55	12.6%
Probation	1	16.7%	31	7.1%
Public defender/ defense counsel/ guardian ad litem	--	--	8	1.8%
DHHS or Child Welfare	--	--	13	3.0%
Treatment provider	--	--	40	9.2%
Post adjudication or detention	2	33.3%	8	1.8%
Community based program	--	--	109	25.0%
Elected official or government	--	--	6	1.4%
Restorative practices	--	--	6	1.4%
Backbone or system improvement	1	16.7%	3	0.7%
Other	--	--	16	3.7%
<b>Voice on Team</b>				
Feel heard	5	83.3%	270	78.3%
Do not feel heard	1	16.7%	75	21.7%

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



## References and Resources

- <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>
- <sup>e</sup> **Referral to and utilization of services:** Department of Health and Human Services
- <sup>f</sup> **Adult and juvenile arrests:** Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics:  
<https://crimestats.ne.gov/public/Browse/browsetables.aspx>
- <sup>g</sup> Diversion programs
- <sup>h</sup> **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](https://ncc.nebraska.gov/sites/ncc.nebraska.gov/files/doc/2019%20Domestic%20Assault%20and%20Arrest%20by%20County_0.pdf)
- <sup>i</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>l</sup> **Racial and ethnic disparities:** Prepared by Mitch Herian, University of Nebraska-Lincoln with data provided  
by:



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Nebraska Crime Commission, Crime Statistics:

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

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: [www.voicesforchildren.com/kidscount](http://www.voicesforchildren.com/kidscount). Data originally from Nebraska Judicial Branch Trial Court Case Management System, JUSTICE

<sup>o</sup> **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*.



**COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021**

**Appendix: RED Descriptives**

2015

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	992	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	397	0%	0%	11.80%	12.80%	0.30%	0%	75.10%
Youth enrolled in diversion	295	0%	0%	9.50%	13.60%	0%	0%	76.90%
Successful completion diversion	217	0%	0%	8.30%	11.50%	0%	0%	80.20%
Youth with multiple charges	32	0%	0%	6.20%	0%	0%	18.80%	75%
Filed on in adult court	7	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RAI Override: More Severe	84	3.60%	0%	8.30%	28.60%	0%	0%	59.50%
RAI Override: Less Severe	43	2.30%	4.70%	4.70%	16.30%	4.70%	0%	67.40%
Probation intake	187	3.20%	1.10%	7.50%	24.60%	1.10%	0%	62.60%
Successful probation	218	0.50%	0%	8.70%	18.30%	5%	0%	67.40%
Revocation of probation	23	4.30%	0%	17.40%	21.70%	4.30%	0%	52.20%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



**COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021**

2016

<b>System Point</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian/ Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Hispanic/ Latino</b>	<b>Multiple/ Other</b>	<b>Unspec/ Missing</b>	<b>White</b>
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	967	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	411	0.50%	1.50%	12.70%	13.10%	0.50%	0.50%	71.30%
Youth enrolled in diversion	290	0.30%	1.70%	10.70%	13.10%	0.70%	0.30%	73.10%
Successful completion diversion	201	0%	2.50%	10%	15.40%	0.50%	0.50%	71.10%
Youth with multiple charges	44	0%	0%	20.50%	0%	0%	20.50%	59.10%
Filed on in adult court	16	0%	0%	18.80%	0%	0%	0%	81.20%
RAI Override: More Severe	67	3%	3%	14.90%	19.40%	1.50%	0%	58.20%
RAI Override: Less Severe	34	5.90%	2.90%	2.90%	23.50%	0%	0%	64.70%
Probation intake	168	4.80%	1.80%	14.30%	19.60%	0.60%	0%	58.90%
Successful probation	161	1.90%	0.60%	6.80%	23%	3.10%	0%	64.60%
Revocation of probation	30	0%	0%	10%	23.30%	10%	0%	56.70%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--





**COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021**

2017

<b>System Point</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian/ Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Hispanic/ Latino</b>	<b>Multiple/ Other</b>	<b>Unspec/ Missing</b>	<b>White</b>
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	1266	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	551	0.40%	1.10%	13.40%	14.50%	0.50%	0.50%	69.50%
Youth enrolled in diversion	377	0.30%	1.60%	10.30%	13.80%	0.50%	0.30%	73.20%
Successful completion diversion	270	0.40%	1.50%	10.40%	11.90%	0.70%	0%	75.20%
Youth with multiple charges	81	1.20%	0%	14.80%	0%	0%	19.80%	64.20%
Filed on in adult court	9	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
RAI Override: More Severe	87	0%	2.30%	4.60%	19.50%	0%	0%	73.60%
RAI Override: Less Severe	26	3.80%	0%	7.70%	34.60%	0%	0%	53.80%
Probation intake	209	1%	1.40%	10%	24.90%	1.40%	0%	61.20%
Successful probation	116	0.90%	0.90%	9.50%	22.40%	6%	0%	60.30%
Revocation of probation	26	0%	15.40%	7.70%	7.70%	7.70%	0%	61.50%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



**COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021**

2018

<b>System Point</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native</b>	<b>Asian/ Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Hispanic/ Latino</b>	<b>Multiple/ Other</b>	<b>Unspec/ Missing</b>	<b>White</b>
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	1050	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	416	0.20%	1.20%	10.80%	20.40%	1.40%	5.80%	60.10%
Youth enrolled in diversion	265	0.40%	1.50%	9.10%	17.70%	1.50%	4.50%	65.30%
Successful completion diversion	196	0.50%	2%	7.70%	16.80%	1.50%	5.10%	66.30%
Youth with multiple charges	69	0%	1.40%	18.80%	2.90%	0%	27.50%	49.30%
Filed on in adult court	6	0%	0%	16.70%	0%	0%	0%	83.30%
RAI Override: More Severe	51	5.90%	0%	7.80%	23.50%	5.90%	0%	56.90%
RAI Override: Less Severe	44	2.30%	0%	9.10%	18.20%	4.50%	0%	65.90%
Probation intake	173	4%	0%	18.50%	19.70%	5.20%	0%	52.60%
Successful probation	157	2.50%	0.60%	5.10%	11.50%	6.40%	0%	73.90%
Revocation of probation	29	3.40%	0%	3.40%	20.70%	3.40%	0%	69%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



## COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

2019

System Point	N	Amer. Indian/ Alaskan Native	Asian/ Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic/ Latino	Multiple/ Other	Unspec/ Missing	White
Law enforcement contact	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth taken to temporary custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth issued citation/referral	1011	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth referred to diversion	493	0.40%	1%	10.80%	22.70%	1.60%	6.30%	57.20%
Youth enrolled in diversion	310	0.30%	1.30%	9%	20.60%	1.90%	4.50%	62.30%
Successful completion diversion	225	0%	1.30%	10.20%	19.60%	2.20%	3.60%	63.10%
Youth with multiple charges	74	0%	0%	4.10%	0%	0%	18.90%	77%
Filed on in adult court	31	0%	0%	45.20%	0%	0%	0%	54.80%
RAI Override: More Severe	49	2%	4.10%	16.30%	12.20%	8.20%	0%	57.10%
RAI Override: Less Severe	24	0%	0%	16.70%	20.80%	4.20%	0%	58.30%
Probation intake	148	0.70%	1.40%	14.20%	20.90%	6.10%	0%	56.80%
Successful probation	151	1.30%	0%	11.90%	19.90%	4.60%	0%	62.30%
Revocation of probation	21	4.80%	0%	19%	33.30%	0%	0%	42.90%
Youth in OJS custody	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
OJS custody: placed in detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth booked into detention more than once	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--



## COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

**Appendix: Sealed Court Records by Year**

\*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

<b>2015</b>	<b>Number of charges Sealed</b>	<b>Total Number of charges</b>	<b>Sealed (%)</b>
Dismissed or Dropped	509	604	84.3%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	411	543	75.7%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	54	57	94.7%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	1	3	33.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>1218</b>	<b>80.0%</b>

<b>2016</b>	<b>Number of charges Sealed</b>	<b>Total Number of charges</b>	<b>Sealed (%)</b>
Dismissed or Dropped	504	622	81.0%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	319	405	78.8%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	48	52	92.3%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	7	7	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>884</b>	<b>1097</b>	<b>80.6%</b>

<b>2017</b>	<b>Number of charges Sealed</b>	<b>Total Number of charges</b>	<b>Sealed (%)</b>
Dismissed or Dropped	818	1167	70.1%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--
Filed in Juv. Court	368	591	62.3%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	54	60	90.0%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	0	3	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1242</b>	<b>1825</b>	<b>68.1%</b>

<b>2018</b>	<b>Number of charges Sealed</b>	<b>Total Number of charges</b>	<b>Sealed (%)</b>
Dismissed or Dropped	651	1090	59.7%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	--	--	--



COUNTY NEEDS ASSESSMENT FY 2020-2021

Filed in Juv. Court	125	503	24.9%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	41	46	89.1%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	--	--	--
Total	820	1642	49.9%

2019	Number of charges Sealed	Total Number of charges	Sealed (%)
Dismissed or Dropped	523	866	60.4%
Offered Diversion, mediation, or RJ	0	7	0.0%
Filed in Juv. Court	64	797	8.0%
Filed in Adult Court (M or I)	21	47	44.7%
Filed in Adult Court and Transferred to Juv. Court	0	21	0.0%
Total	608	1759	34.6%