EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA

ANNUAL REPORT 2022-2023

Tier 1 Basic Program Evaluation

Marijana Kotlaja, Ph.D.
Julie Garman, Ph.D.
Amy Gathje, M.A.
Anne Hobbs, J.D., Ph.D.
Aaron Lockee, M.B.A.

University of Nebraska

EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA

2022-2023 Annual Report

Tier 1 Basic Program Evaluation

June 2023

Marijana Kotlaja, Ph.D.
Julie Garman, Ph.D.
Amy Gathje, M.A.
Anne Hobbs, J.D., Ph.D.
Aaron Lockee, M.B.A.

Layout by Tara Grell, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research

This project is supported by Contract CC-23-733 awarded by the Nebraska Crime Commission. Points of view or opinions contained in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Nebraska Crime Commission or the Community-based Juvenile Services Aid Program.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Beginning for FY22/23, JJI proposed a tiered-approach for Evidence-based Nebraska program evaluation of Community-based Aid (CBA) funded programs. The Tier 1 Basic Process Evaluation includes a simple program-level analysis of all funded programs in Nebraska. This report is laid out by program type and includes statewide information as well as demographic, process, and outcome measures. JJI relied on process and outcome measures identified as necessary to assess program effectiveness as outlined in Preliminary Measures of Program Effectiveness report (Hobbs et al., 2019) which was part of the JJI FY19/20 statement of work.[1] These identified specific process and outline variables by program type are reported in the following pages. This Tier 1 evaluation report includes data on youth referred to a funded CBA program from July 1, 2021, through November 30, 2022.

The report contains information on all programs funded during the reporting period by program type. Information on funded programs is broken down with one page for each program type reporting statewide data, and additional pages with tables reporting program specific data. Statewide program type sheet values may not add up to 100% and/or the entire sample size of youth included due to missing and/or unspecified data on youth demographics.

Table 1. Number of Funded Programs by Year

Program Type	FY 21-22	FY 22-23
Assessment	3	3
ATD	31	26
Crisis Response	0	2
Diversion	66	67
Family Support	23	23
Mediation	9	10
Mental Health	21	18
Mentoring	3	2
Promotion Prevention	17	16
Referral Services	6	11
School Based	9	11
Truancy	27	29

Note: Program names in red along with shading of a rows indicates that the program had zero data entered from FY 21-22 and FY 22-23. Therefore, they were immediately marked as red with shading, or a no data program. However, dashed lines seen in rows indicate that the program was funded but either had no data entered or had less than 10 lines of data which did not allow for meaningful analysis.

[1] Hobbs et al., 2019; Referral Services were not originally covered in the Effective Measures document.



ABSENTEEISM/ TRUANCY PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 29 | Total Youth Served: 1,377

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (13.95 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

1.7%	1.4%	6.0%	0.7%
Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention

Measures for Absenteeism/Truancy Programs

Absenteeism/Truancy programs focus on youth with unauthorized absences to prevent system involvement. Programs can become involved with youth at different stages of absenteeism, with schools referring youth who have 5-10 unexcused absences up to the county attorney's officer referring youth to the program when their level of absences requires legal intervention. Truancy programs can also be part of diversion.

Measures[2] reported for Absenteeism/Truancy programs include number of youth enrolled, number of youth assessed with validated assessment tool, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., percent excused absences, percent unexcused absences, and percent successful in program). Outcome measures for Absenteeism/Truancy programs include school attachment (up arrow = improved, down arrow = got worse, or = stayed the same from intake to discharge), GPA (up arrow = improved, down arrow = got worse, or = stayed the same from intake to discharge), overall percent changed of unexcused and excused absences from pre-enrollment, and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Absenteeism/Truancy Programs

Table 2. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures		
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	% Youth Assessed[1]	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	% Excused Absences (Pre/Enroll/Post)	% Unexcused Absences
Buffalo County Truancy	Buffalo	86	0%	77.9%	15.1%	47.7%	13.05/12	22.45/12.23/NA	9.34/17.28/NA
Butler County Attendance Support Program	Butler	75	14.6%	86.7%	9.3%	42.7%	13.68/.71	16.65/14.62/NA	3.32/3.27/NA
Seward County Attendance Support Program	Seward	59	28.8%	89.8%	5.1%	49.2%	13.64/2.01	16.26/14.96/21.38	8.36/11.60/7.77
Truancy Program/ Truancy Tracker	Cass	21	28.6%	16.2	14.3%	33.3%	15.67/1.06	3.98/5.33/2.00	40.20/10.93/4.29
Truancy Program	Chase	17	17.6%	17.6%	82.4%	41.2%	14.65/1.2	.10/.04/NA	.11/.05/NA
Truancy	Cheyenne	27	92.6%	85.2%	3.7%	40.7%	16.04/1.37	7.02/9.83/12.22	18.90/29.04/22.14
STARS Truancy Program	Adams	70	27.0%	61.4%	4.3% (3/70)	42.9%	14.01/3.06	1.7/2.07/.69	25.90/25.26/18.50
Colfax County Truancy Program (Schuyler Public Schools)	Colfax								
Colfax County Truancy Program	Colfax	32	34.4%	21.9%	31.3%	59.4%	15.50/2.20	8.32/9.63/NA	13.79/19.78/NA
Truancy Mediation	Dodge								
Truancy Diversion	Dodge	43		51.2%	37.2%	27.9%	14.91/1.70	7.35/.20/NA	32.41/46.45/NA
GOALS Center Family Advocate	Douglas	40	0%	47.5%	10.0%	40.0%	13.38/2.44	.00/.00/NA	47.71/29.29/NA
Pathways to Success	Douglas	41	0%	17.1%	43.9%	68.3%	13.07/1.70	7.04/7.73/NA	16.35/8.82/NA
Youth Attendance Navigators	Douglas	115	0%	7.8%	3.7%	57.4%	12.15/.96	6.90/5.76/NA	8.79/10.00/NA
Attendance Support	Jefferson	154	0%	85.7%	8.4%	55.2%	12.75/3.52	20.75/NA/NA	10.91/NA/NA
Truancy Circles	Gage								
Gage County Truancy Program	Gage	2	0%	–	–	–	–	–	–
Boyd County Truancy Prevention Program	Boyd								
Holt County Truancy Prevention Program	Holt	18	0%	77.8%	22.2%	38.9%	15.00/1.45	1.87/1.48/NA	14.55/6.67/NA
Truancy Diversion	Lancaster	147	60.0%	51.7%	10.9%	49.7%	15.31/.87	5.24/5.82/5.48	32.20/24.80/38.18
Madison County Truancy Program	Madison	21	0%	47.6%	23.8%	57.1%	14.52/1.72	8.18/4.34/NA	22.48/13.65/NA
Attendance Matters	Merrick	42	16.7%	78.6%	0%	54.8%	12.10/4.03	4.47/5.27/NA	11.38/4.46/NA
Truancy Tracker/ Mediation Truancy Conferences	Otoe	51	0%	90.2%	5.9%	51.0%	15.61/1.79	3.49/3.55/3.14	31.68/29.58/25.64
Attendance Monitor	Platte	28	3.5%	46.4%	46.4%	53.6%	13.14/2.22	10.62/8.40/NA	21.72/10.25/NA
Pass Program-Truancy	Sarpy	92	95.6%	87.0%	2.2%	53.3%	15.23/1.39	3.55/1.20/NA	43.47/33.46/NA
ARRIVE	Saunders	107	59.8%	89.7%	4.7%	46.7%	13.00/3.10	3.27/3.01/2.34	19.29/12.23/11.70
Truancy Mediation	Sherman	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

[2] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures		
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	% Youth Assessed[1]	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	% Excused Absences (Pre/Enroll/Post)	% Unexcused Absences
Thayer County Attendance Support	Thayer	29	0%	86.2%	0%	48.3%	14.38/3.34	NA/NA/NA	18.35/NA/NA
Truancy	York	53	17.1%	81.1%	3.8%	58.5%	16.06/1.21	4.51/1.28/.00	14.59/7.00/20.93

Table 3. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program			Outcome Measures				Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	% School Attachment[3]	GPA[4]	% Change in	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Buffalo County Truancy	Buffalo	29	13.8% (4)	↓	↑	-2.28	3.4% (1)	3.4% (1)	10.3% (3)	3.4% (1)
Butler County Attendance Support Program	Butler	52	65.4% (34)	(=)	↑	-2.13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Seward County Attendance Support Program	Seward	47	57.4% (27)	↓	↓	+2.76	4.2% (2)	2.1% (1)	8.5% (4)	0% (0)
Truancy Program/ Truancy Tracker	Cass	21	19.0% (4)	(=)	↓	-27.92	4.7% (1)	0% (0)	9.5% (2)	0% (0)
Truancy Program	Chase	1	0% (0)	(=)	↑	-.117	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Truancy	Cheyenne	20	30.0% (6)	↑	↑	+12.93	0% (0)	5.0% (1)	5.0% (1)	0% (0)
STARS Truancy Program	Adams	22	40.1% (9)	↑	(=)	-.336	9.1% (2)	13.6% (3)	18.2% (4)	0% (0)
Colfax County Truancy program (Schuyler Public Schools)	Colfax									
Colfax County Truancy Program (Attorney's)	Colfax	6	33.3% (2)	↓	↓	+10.13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Truancy Mediation	Dodge									
Truancy Diversion	Dodge	31	35.5% (11)	↑	↑	+5.71	9.6% (3)	0% (0)	29.0% (9)	3.2% (1)
GOALS Center Family Advocate	Douglas	26	34.6% (11)	↓	↓	-15.42	11.5% (3)	0% (0)	11.5% (3)	0% (0)
Pathways to Success	Douglas	10	0% (0)	↓	↓	-6.71	0% (0)	10.0% (1)	10% (1)	0% (0)
Youth Attendance Navigators	Douglas	28	42.9% (12)	(=)	↑	+.10	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3.6% (1)
Jefferson County Attendance Support Program	Jefferson	15	80.0% (12)	(=)	(=)	N/A	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	6.7% (1)

[3] ↑ = improved, ↓ = got worse, or = stayed the same
[4] From pre-enrollment to enrollment

Program			Outcome Measures				Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	% School Attachment[3]	GPA[4]	% Change in	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Truancy Circles	Gage									
Gage County Truancy Program	Gage	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Boyd County Truancy Prevention Program	Boyd									
Holt County Truancy Prevention Program	Holt	18	66.7% (12)	↓	↓	-8.26	0% (0)	0% (0)	5.6% (1)	0% (0)
Truancy Diversion	Lancaster	123	40.6% (50)	↑	↑	-6.64	0% (0)	.8% (1)	2.4% (3)	0% (0)
Madison County Truancy Program	Madison	18	16.7% (3)	↓	(=)	-13.48	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Attendance Matters	Merrick	13	16.7% (3)	↑	(=)	-6.59	7.7% (1)	0% (0)	7.7% (1)	0% (0)
Truancy Tracker/ Mediation Truancy Conferences	Otoe	51	58.8% (30)	↑	↓	-2.91	0% (0)	2.0% (1)	7.8% (4)	0% (0)
Attendance Monitor	Platte	17	70.6% (12)	↓	↓	-13.69	5.9% (1)	5.9% (1)	2.4% (4)	5.9% (1)
Pass Program-Truancy	Sarpy	88	34.1% (30)	↑	↑	-12.28	0% (0)	0% (0)	2.3% (2)	0% (0)
ARRIVE	Saunders	72	40.2% (29)	↑	↑	-7.31	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Truancy Mediation	Sherman	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Thayer County Attendance Support	Thayer	3	100% (3)	(=)	N/A	N/A	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Truancy	York	11	27.2% (3)	↓	↓	-10.84	9.1% (1)	0% (0)	9.1% (1)	0% (0)



SCHOOL BASED PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 14 | Total Youth Served: 360

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (14.38 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

0.9%	4.1%	9.0%	1.4%
Status Offense	**Law Violation**	**Probation**	**Detention**

Measures for School Based Programs

School-based programs provide educational support, training, and/or supervision for youth where academic or behavioral problems originated in the school setting. School-Based programs are broken down into three subprograms: after school programs, alternative schools, and school interventionist. After school programs are operated in the summer and after school hours. The program aims to reduce crime through constructive activity. Alternative schools are academic enrichment programs where services are focused on youth who have been expelled or suspended from their school system. The last school-based program is school interventionists. A school interventionist is responsible for identifying and coordinating behavioral and academic intervention for students.

Measures[5] reported for School-based programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., percent successful in program[6]). Outcome measures for School-based programs include misses school, school attachment, and GPA (up arrow = improved, down arrow = got worse, or = stayed the same from intake to discharge), attendance in program (after school programs only, reported as number of youth with attendance data), and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

School Based Programs: After School & School Interventionist Programs

Table 4. Demographic and Process Measures

Program			Youth Served				
Name (N)	County	Program Type[7]	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)
School Interventionist	Buffalo	INTV	0	-	-	-	-
Math/Science Tutor	Box Butte	ALSC	8	-	-	-	-
Dawes County School Social Work Program	Dawes	INTV	16	62.5%	6.3%	81.3%	14.19/1.3
Creative Writing Program	Douglas	ALSC	0	-	-	-	-
High School/Middle School Interventionist & SANKOFA	Hall	INTV	77	54.3%	12.0%	54.3%	14.43/2.36
School Interventionist	Howard	INTV	43	93.0%	0%	39.5%	12.51/3.63
Back on Track	Lancaster	INTV	52	42.3%	1.9%	38.5%	17.1/1.14
Lighthouse Afterschool Program	Lancaster	AFSC	23	26.1%	21.7%	47.8%	13.91/1.64
Lighthouse Alternative to Suspension	Lancaster	ALSC	32	43.8%	6.3%	68.8%	13.44/1.66
North Platte Public Schools	Lincoln	INTV	8	-	-	-	-
Tutoring Services	Madison	AFSC	18	44.4%	16.7%	66.7%	15.56/1.5
Madison County Day Reporting	Madison	ALSC	75	45.3%	13.3%	70.7%	14.44/1.5
Youth for Christ Out of School Suspension Program	Platte	ALSC	0	-	-	-	-
Interventionist	York	INTV	8	-	-	-	-

[5] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.
[6] Successful case closures are a combined rate of cases coded as "Other (moved away/death/etc.)," "Transferred Schools," "Graduated," "Youth/Parent Refused," "Completed Program Requirements," and "Other Commitments." Unsuccessful case closures include cases where youth "Dropped Out," "Stopped Attending," "New Charges/Probation," and "Did Not Complete Program Requirements
[7] INTV = School Interventionist, AFSC = After School, ALSC = Alternative School

Table 5. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program					Outcome Measures				Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Program Type	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	Misses School[8]	School Attachment[9]	GPA[10]	Attendance in Program[11]	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
School Interventionist	Buffalo	INTV	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Math/Science Tutor	Box Butte	ALSC	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Dawes County School Social Work Program	Dawes	INTV	5	100% (5)	⬆	⬇	⬇	N/A	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Creative Writing Program	Douglas	ALSC	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
High School/ Middle School Interventionist & SANKOFA	Hall	INTV	54	81.4% (44)	⬇	⬇	⬇	N/A	1.9% (1)	7.4% (4)	9.3% (5)	0% (0)
School Interventionist	Howard	INTV	–	–	⬇	⬇	(=)	N/A	–	–	–	–
Back on Track	Lancaster	INTV	21	95.2% (20)	⬇	⬆	(=)	N/A	0% (0)	0% (0)	4.8% (1)	4.8% (1)
Lighthouse Afterschool Program	Lancaster	AFSC	21	100% (21)	(=)	(=)	(=)	0	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Lighthouse Alternative to Suspension Program	Lancaster	ALSC	31	100% (31)	(=)	(=)	(=)	0	3.2% (1)	9.6% (3)	0% (0)	3.2% (1)
Tutoring Services	Madison	AFSC	15	46.7% (7)	(=)	(=)	⬆	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	26.6% (4)	6.6% (1)
Madison County Day Reporting	Madison	ALSC	75	2.7% (2)	(=)	⬇	⬆	57	0% (0)	3.5% (2)	13.3% (10)	0% (0)
Youth For Christ Out of School Suspension Program	Platte	ALSC	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Interventionist	York	INTV	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

[8] ⬆ = improved, ⬇ = got worse, or = stayed the same from intake to discharge
[9] ⬆ = improved, ⬇ = got worse, or = stayed the same from intake to discharge
[10] ⬆ = improved, ⬇ = got worse, or = stayed the same from intake to discharge
[11] After School Programs only, reported as number of youth with attendance data



ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 3 | Total Youth Served: 98

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (14.09 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

7.3%	1.0%	32.3%	0%
Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention

Measures for Assessment Programs

Assessment programs provide a brief process to identify immediate mental health and/or behavioral risks and needs. Assessment centers provide an area where staff can meet with juveniles to assess the risks and needs of juveniles. Referral service programs help juveniles and families locate community services based on the needs of the juvenile.

Measures[12] reported for Assessment programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., percent of youth assessed, percent assessed with validated assessment tool). Outcome measures for Assessment programs include referrals made (percent made referral, percent referred to, and percent youth attended), risk/needs domain (primary domain and percent), and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Assessment Programs

Table 6. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures	
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, range, SD)	% Youth Assessed	% Validated Tool
Assessment-Furnas	Furnas							
Assessment-Red Willow[13]	Red Willow	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lincoln County Juvenile Assessment Center	Lincoln	96	74.0%	13.5%	50.0%	14.09/1.53	59.0%	58.0%

Table 7. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program		Outcome Measures				Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	% Referral Made	% Youth Referred To	% Youth Attended	% Primary Risk/Needs Domain	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Assessment-Furnas	Furnas								
Assessment-Red Willow	Red Willow	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lincoln County Juvenile Assessment Center	Lincoln	58.3%	146/48.2%	67.9%	13 Primary (6.3%)	7.4% (7)	1.0% (1)	32.3% (31)	0% (0)

[12] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.
[13] There is a Red Willow Family Skill Building with only 2 cases but it is not the same ORI.



ALTERNATIVE TO DETENTION PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 35 | Total Youth Served: 340

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (11.40 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

6.1%	0.4%	7.3%	10.6%
Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention

Measures for Alternative to Detention Programs

Alternatives to detention programs provide supervision of a youth that would otherwise be securely detained, to ensure the youth attends court and refrains from committing a new law violation. Electronic monitoring is one type of ATD that uses an electronic device using either a global positioning system, non-digital landline home-based system, or phone application that provides intensive supervision by monitoring the location of a youth. Reporting centers are intensive supervision programs that provide youth a physical location instead of being in pretrial custody. Community youth coaching/tracking services provides youth with a person to work with to ensure compliance with attendance, curfew, employment counseling, and drug/alcohol conditions.

Measures[14] reported for Alternative to Detention programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., percent of youth detained at discharge, percent of youth who attended court, percent of youth reporting program progress, percent of youth discharged to home, and percent of youth successfully discharged). Outcome measures for Alternative to Detention programs include number of cases closed with a discharge date and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Alternative to Detention Programs

Table 8. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures			
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	% Detained at Discharge	% Court Attendance	% Reporting Progress	% Discharge to Home
Alternatives to Detention-Trackers	Buffalo	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-EM	Buffalo	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pre-Adjudicated Electronic Monitor	Cass	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pre-Adjudicated Tracker Service	Cass	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-Tracker	Dakota	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-EM	Dakota	12	41.7%	16.7%	50.0%	15.00/1.35	8.3%	58.3%	41.7%	8.3%
Alternatives to Detention-Tracker	Dodge	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-EM	Dodge	11	63.6%	9.1%	63.6%	15.18/4	9.1%	45.5%	81.8%	9.1%
Alternatives to Detention	Gage	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electronic Monitor	Gage	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Detention Alternatives-Tracker	Hall	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Detention Alternatives-EM	Hall	20	15.0%	25.0%	70.0%	15.60/1.47	10.0%	55.0%	55.0%	0%
PreAdjudicated Community Services[15]	Lancaster	72	33.3%	2.8%	75.0%	14.78/1.55	18.1%	48.6%	56.9%	4.2%
Reporting Centers	Lancaster	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NNJJP Pre-Adjudication Services-EM	Madison	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
NNJJP Pre-Adjudication Services-Tracker	Madison	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-Tracker	Richardson	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-EM	Richardson	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tracker	Otoe	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tracker	Saline	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EM Services	Saline	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sarpy County CARE Program-EM	Sarpy	54	66.7%	14.8%	68.5%	15.72/1.27	9.3%	50.0%	55.6%	0%
Reporting Center	Sarpy	129	76.0%	20.2%	63.6%	15.8/1.39	0.8%	21.7%	61.2%	0%
CARE Program-Tracker	Sarpy	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Detention Alternatives-Tracker	Washington	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Detention Alternatives-EM	Washington	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pre-Adjudicated Tracker Service	Cass	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jefferson County-EM	Jefferson	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jefferson County Tracker	Jefferson	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thayer County-EM	Thayer	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thayer County Tracker	Thayer	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Better Living-EM Services	Saline	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Better Living Contract	Saline	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electronic Monitoring Services	Saunders	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tracker Service	Saunders	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[14] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.

[15] Tracker and EM reported together

Table 9. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program				Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Alternatives to Detention-Trackers	Buffalo	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-EM	Buffalo	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pre-Adjudicated Electronic Monitor	Cass	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pre-Adjudicated Tracker Service	Cass	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-Tracker	Dakota	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-EM	Dakota	10	20.0% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (1)	0% (0)
Alternatives to Detention-Tracker	Dodge	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-EM	Dodge	11	81.8% (9)	9.1% (1)	0% (0)	9.1% (1)	9.1% (1)
Alternatives to Detention	Gage	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electronic Monitor	Gage	-	-	-	-	-	-
Detention Alternatives-Tracker	Hall	-	-	-	-	-	-
Detention Alternatives-EM	Hall	18	44.4% (8)	11.1% (2)	0% (0)	1.7% (3)	22.2% (4)
PreAdjudicated Community Services	Lancaster	72	63.9% (46)	8.3% (6)	0% (0)	11.1% (8)	22.2% (16)
Reporting Centers	Lancaster	-	-	-	-	-	-
NNJJP Pre-Adjudication Services-EM	Madison	-	-	-	-	-	-
NNJJP Pre-Adjudication Services-Tracker	Madison	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-Tracker	Richardson	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-EM	Richardson	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tracker	Otoe	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tracker	Saline	-	-	-	-	-	-
EM Services	Saline	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sarpy County CARE Program-EM	Sarpy	50	58.0% (29)	4.0% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	2.0% (1)
Reporting Center	Sarpy	85	94.1% (80)	2.4% (2)	1.2% (1)	5.9% (5)	4.7% (4)
CARE Program-Tracker	Sarpy	-	-	-	-	-	-
Detention Alternatives-Tracker	Washington	-	-	-	-	-	-
Detention Alternatives-EM	Washington	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pre-Adjudicated Tracker Service	Cass	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jefferson County-EM	Jefferson	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jefferson County Tracker	Jefferson	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thayer County-EM	Thayer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thayer County Tracker	Thayer	-	-	-	-	-	-
Better Living EM Services	Saline	-	-	-	-	-	-
Better Living Contract	Saline	-	-	-	-	-	-
Electronic Monitoring Services	Saunders	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tracker Services	Saunders	-	-	-	-	-	-



CRISIS RESPONSE PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 2 | Total Youth Served: 7

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (15.86 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Measures for Crisis Response Programs

Crisis Response comprises of teams trained to intervene in cases where juvenile's health or safety is threated, resolves serious conflict between parent/guardian and juvenile regarding conduct/repeated disregard for authority, a pattern of repeated absence from school, or runaway behaviors. Law enforcement notifies crisis response teams when they are called to a location where there is a situation as mentioned above, and the staff/team works with the youth and their family in the situation to come to a solution.

Measures[16] reported for Crisis Response programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., number of calls for crisis response services, time on call, percent of most common presenting situation, percent of situation de-escalation, and percent of intervention closure that was positive). Outcome measures for Crisis Response programs include percent plan implemented, percent referred, and most common referral reason, and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Crisis Response Programs

Table 10. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures				
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	Calls (n)	Time on Call (m, range, SD)	% Presenting Situation[17]	% Situation De-escalated	% Positive Intervention
Crisis Continuum Services	Lancaster	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Community Action Partnership of Western Nebraska	Scotts Bluff										

Table 11. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program		Outcome Measures			Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	% Plan Implemented	Referred (n)	Most Common Referral[18]	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Crisis Continuum Services	Lancaster	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Community Action Partnership of Western Nebraska	Scotts Bluff							

[16] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.
[17] Percent of most common presenting situation
[18] Percent of most common referral



DIVERSION PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 65 | Total Youth Served: 4,066

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (15.76 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

3.2%	0.6%	8.5%	2.1%
Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention

Measures for Diversion Programs

Diversion is aimed at steering minor law violations and low-risk youth away from the juvenile justice system who would otherwise have charges filed or be adjudicated. The county attorney grants diversion for youth after considering the youth's age, the nature of the offense, the youth's history and future risk, and the recommendation of the referring agency. When a youth is granted diversion, the diversion officer should tailor a program for the youth based on the youth's specific needs and areas he/she needs to focus on. If diversion is completed successfully, the youth's charges are either dismissed or not filed in court. Diversion programs may also work with crossover youth, or youth dually involved in child welfare and juvenile justice system.

Measures[19] reported for Diversion programs include number of youth enrolled[20], demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., percent of youth assessed, percent teen court, percent crossover, percent petition filed, and percent of youth successfully discharged). Outcome measures for Diversion programs include number of cases closed with a discharge date and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Diversion Programs

Table 12. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures				
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	% Success (n)[21]	% Assessed	% Teen Court	% Crossover	% Petition Filed
Adams County Diversion	Adams	96	69.8%	6.3%	54.2%	1.56/.52	68.9% (51)	61.5%	0%	0%	3.1%
Arthur County Diversion	Arthur										
Banner County Diversion	Banner										
Boone County Diversion Program	Boone	11	100%	0%	36.4%	16.09/1.45	50.0% (1)	90.9%	18.2%	0%	0%
Boyd County Diversion	Boyd										
Brown County Diversion	Brown										
Buffalo County Diversion	Buffalo	379	82.8%	10.6%	58.0%	15.59/2.39	70.8% (235)	43.5%	0%	3.4%	1.8%
Burt County Diversion Program	Burt	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Butler County Diversion Program	Butler	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Cass	40	90.0%	2.5%	60.0%	18.98/11.08	58.8% (20)	37.5%	0%	5.0%	7.5%
Chase County Diversion	Chase	20	65.0%	95.0%	35.0%	16.15/1.35	90.9% (10)	100%	100%	0%	95.0%
Cheyenne County Diversion	Cheyenne	52	82.7%	3.8%	57.7%	15.31/1.42	77.8% (28)	67.3%	0%	0%	3.8%
Clay County Diversion	Clay										
Colfax County Diversion Program	Colfax	62	12.9%	66.1%	69.4%	15.34/1.39	44.6% (25)	56.5%	0%	0%	6.5%
Cuming County Diversion Program	Cuming	22	95.5%	0%	72.7%	16.05/1.33	66.7% (14)	50.0%	0%	9.1%	18.2%
Custer County Diversion Blaine County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Custer/ Blaine	44	90.9%	6.8%	56.8%	16.82/2.12	94.9% (37)	79.6%	0%	0%	2.3%
Diversion	Dakota	105	35.2%	27.6%	62.9%	15.35/1.54	85.3% (64)	75.2%	1.9%	1.0%	0%
Dawson County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Dawson	70	48.6%	22.9%	55.7%	14.97/1.96	75.0% (42)	77.1%	1.4%	0%	0%
Deuel County Diversion	Deuel	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Dodge	179	68.7%	12.3%	52.5%	15.49/1.55	76.6% (118)	87.2%	0%	3.9%	6.1%
Dundy County Diversion (NB029013A)	Dundy	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fillmore County Diversion	Fillmore	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Furnas County Diversion	Furnas										

[19] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.
[20] Number of youth enrolled includes every case served by programs
[21] Percent success indicates the percentage of youth discharged successfully out of the total of cases closed with a discharge date and reason. Total cases closed includes those cases discharged as "did not participate" or "unsuccessful."

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures				
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	% Success (n)[21]	% Assessed	% Teen Court	% Crossover	% Petition Filed
Gosper County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Gosper	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Greeley County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Greeley										
Hall County Pre-trial Juvenile Diversion Program	Hall	335	0%	28.4%	60.6%	15.41/2.21	67.4% (196)	86.0%	0%	0%	0%
Hamilton County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Hamilton	15	86.7%	0%	66.7%	15.6/1.72	53.3% (8)	80.0%	0%	6.7%	20.0%
Hayes County Diversion	Hayes	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hitchcock County Diversion	Hitchcock	22	100%	0%	31.8%	17.45/1.47	95.0% (19)	0%	100%	68.2%	95.5%
Holt County Diversion	Holt	27	85.2%	7.4%	74.1%	16.63/2.13	86.4% (19)	85.2%	0%	0%	0%
Howard County Diversion	Howard	13	100%	0%	76.9%	17.46/1.76	92.3% (12)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Jefferson County Diversion Program	Jefferson	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Johnson County Diversion	Johnson	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Keith County Diversion	Keith	50	76.0%	10.0%	50.0%	15.18/1.87	87.8% (36)	98.0%	0%	4.0%	70.0%
Kimball County Diversion	Kimball	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Knox County Diversion Program	Knox	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Lancaster	542	53.0%	7.9%	57.7%	14.81/1.72	78.0% (379)	92.4%	0.7%	1.5%	1.7%
Diversion	Lincoln	86	84.9%	2.3%	60.5%	15.62/1.29	61.3% (38)	36.0%	2.3%	0%	2.3%

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures				
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	% Success (n)[21]	% Assessed	% Teen Court	% Crossover	% Petition Filed
Loup County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Loup										
Madison County Diversion Program	Madison	162	79.0%	9.3%	61.1%	15.24/1.85	72.4% (89)	73.5%	0%	2.5%	0%
Merrick County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Merrick	32	84.4%	3.1%	71.9%	14.91/1.75	69.0% (20)	84.4%	0%	0%	3.1%
Morrill County Diversion	Morrill	16	75.0%	18.8%	62.5%	16.31/1.58	93.3% (14)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Nance County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Nance	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nemaha County Diversion	Nemaha	24	70.8%	4.2%	70.8%	16.38/1.95	90.9% (20)	25.0%	4.2%	4.2%	8.3%
Nuckolls County Diversion	Nuckolls	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Otoe	48	87.5%	6.3%	60.4%	15.19/1.54	76.1% (35)	66.7%	0%	0%	0%
Pawnee County Diversion	Pawnee	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Perkins County Diversion	Perkins	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pierce County Diversion	Pierce	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Platte Valley Diversion Program	Platte	170	57.6%	22.4%	70.0%	15.52/1.57	84.2% (139)	67.7%	0%	0%	0%
Polk County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Polk	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Red Willow County Diversion	Red Willow	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures				
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	% Success (n)[21]	% Assessed	% Teen Court	% Crossover	% Petition Filed
Richardson County Diversion	Richardson	20	80.0%	0%	70.0%	16.8/3.205	85.7% (12)	35.0%	0%	0%	0%
Saline Diversion program	Saline	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Sarpy	866	53.2%	8.5%	57.2%	15.3/1.49	36.4% (256)	50.7%	7.6%	1.2%	6.7%
Scotts Bluff County Diversion	Scotts Bluff	172	37.8%	26.2%	57.0%	15.48/1.72	58.7% (84)	73.3%	0%	0%	16.3%
Seward County Diversion Program	Seward	53	90.6%	1.9%	58.5%	15.19/1.55	80.6% (25)	18.9%	0%	0%	0%
Sherman County Diversion	Sherman	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stanton County Diversion	Stanton	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Valley County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Valley	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Juvenile Diversion Coordinator	Washington	32	87.5%	3.1%	71.9%	15.22/1.43	81.5% (22)	0%	0%	0%	3.1%
Wayne County Diversion	Wayne	20	85.0%	5.0%	55.0%	15.2/1.77	66.7% (8)	65.0%	0%	0%	0%
Webster County Diversion	Webster										
Wheeler County Diversion	Wheeler										
Juvenile Diversion & Juvenile Support Worker	York	13	61.5%	15.4%	61.5%	15.62/.96	90.0% (9)	92.3%	0%	0%	15.4%
Juvenile Diversion/ Community Service	Gage	145	91.0%	2.1%	63.4%	23.84/12.37	82.4% (89)	97.9%	0%	1.4%	80.7%

Table 13. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program			Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Cases Closed (n)	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Adams County Diversion	Adams	74	0% (0)	0% (0)	6.8% (5)	0% (0)
Arthur County Diversion	Arthur					
Banner County Diversion	Banner					
Boone County Diversion Program	Boone	2	0% (0)	0% (0)	50.0% (1)	0% (0)
Boyd County Diversion	Boyd					
Brown County Diversion	Brown					
Buffalo County Diversion	Buffalo	332	2.4% (8)	0% (0)	6.0% (20)	2.4% (8)
Burt County Diversion Program	Burt	-	-	-	-	-
Butler County Diversion Program	Butler	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Cass	34	0% (0)	0% (0)	8.8% (3)	0% (0)
Chase County Diversion	Chase	11	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Cheyenne County Diversion	Cheyenne	36	2.8% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Clay County Diversion	Clay					
Colfax County Diversion Program	Colfax	56	7.1% (4)	0% (0)	12.5% (7)	0% (0)
Cuming County Diversion Program	Cuming	21	4.8% (1)	4.8% (1)	9.5% (2)	4.8% (1)
Custer County Diversion Blaine County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Custer/ Blaine	39	2.6% (1)	2.6% (1)	2.6% (1)	2.6% (1)
Diversion	Dakota	75	4.0% (3)	0% (0)	4.0% (3)	2.7% (2)
Dawson County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Dawson	56	0% (0)	0% (0)	7.1% (4)	0% (0)
Deuel County Diversion	Deuel	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Dodge	154	2.0% (3)	0% (0)	14.9% (23)	1.3% (2)
Dundy County Diversion	Dundy	-	-	-	-	-
Fillmore County Diversion	Fillmore	-	-	-	-	-
Furnas County Diversion	Furnas					
Gosper County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Gosper	-	-	-	-	-
Greeley County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Greeley					
Hall County Pre-trial Juvenile Diversion Program	Hall	291	2.8% (8)	0% (0)	8.2% (24)	0% (0)
Hamilton County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Hamilton	15	0% (0)	0% (0)	20.0% (3)	6.7% (1)
Hayes County Diversion	Hayes	-	-	-	-	-
Hitchcock County Diversion	Hitchcock	20	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

Program			Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Cases Closed (n)	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Holt County Diversion	Holt	22	0% (0)	4.6% (1)	4.5% (1)	0% (0)
Howard County Diversion	Howard	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Jefferson County Diversion Program	Jefferson	-	-	-	-	-
Johnson County Diversion	Johnson	-	-	-	-	-
Keith County Diversion	Keith	41	0% (0)	2.4% (1)	2.4% (1)	0% (0)
Kimball County Diversion	Kimball	-	-	-	-	-
Knox County Diversion Program	Knox	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Lancaster	486	4.5% (22)	0.6% (3)	8.2% (40)	2.7% (13)
Diversion	Lincoln	62	8.1% (5)	3.2% (2)	16.1% (10)	3.2% (2)
Loup County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Loup					
Madison County Diversion Program	Madison	123	1.6% (2)	2.4% (3)	18.7% (23)	4.9% (6)
Merrick County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Merrick	29	3.5% (1)	0% (0)	10.3% (3)	0% (0)
Morrill County Diversion	Morrill	15	0% (0)	0% (0)	6.7% (1)	6.7% (1)
Nance County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Nance	-	-	-	-	-
Nemaha County Diversion	Nemaha	22	0% (0)	0% (0)	4.5% (1)	0% (0)
Nuckolls County Diversion	Nuckolls	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Otoe	46	4.4% (2)	0% (0)	8.7% (4)	0% (0)
Pawnee County Diversion	Pawnee	-	-	-	-	-
Perkins County Diversion	Perkins	-	-	-	-	-
Pierce County Diversion	Pierce	-	-	-	-	-
Platte Valley Diversion Program	Platte	165	3.6% (6)	0% (0)	10.9% (18)	2.5% (4)
Polk County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Polk	-	-	-	-	-
Red Willow County Diversion	Red Willow	-	-	-	-	-
Richardson County Diversion	Richardson	14	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	7.1% (1)
Saline Diversion program	Saline	-	-	-	-	-
Diversion	Sarpy	703	4.1% (29)	0.1% (4)	9.5% (67)	3.5% (25)
Scotts Bluff County Diversion	Scotts Bluff	143	4.2% (6)	2.1% (3)	7.0% (10)	0.7% (1)
Seward County Diversion Program	Seward	31	3.2% (1)	0% (0)	6.5% (2)	0% (0)
Sherman County Diversion	Sherman	-	-	-	-	-
Stanton County Diversion	Stanton	-	-	-	-	-
Valley County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Valley	-	-	-	-	-
Juvenile Diversion Coordinator	Washington	27	0% (0)	0% (0)	7.4% (2)	0% (0)
Wayne County Diversion	Wayne	12	0% (0)	0% (0)	8.3% (1)	0% (0)
Webster County Diversion	Webster					
Wheeler County Diversion	Wheeler					
Juvenile Diversion & Juvenile Support Worker	York	10	10.0% (1)	0% (0)	10.0% (1)	0% (0)
Juvenile Diversion/Community Service	Gage	108	0% (0)	0.9% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)



FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 27 | Total Youth Served: 427

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (14.21 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

3.6%	1.2%	4.2%	1.8%
Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention

Measures for Family Support Programs

Family supports programs promote the well-being of children and families as well as increase the strength and stability of families. Services can be for youth and/or parents and can occur within the home or at community locations.

Measures[22] reported for Family Support programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measure (i.e., percent of youth successfully discharged). Outcome measures for Family Support programs include improvement in family function from intake to discharge (+ = improved, - = got worse, or = stayed the same from intake to discharge), improvement in family communication from intake to discharge (up arrow = improved, down arrow = got worse, or = stayed the same from intake to discharge), number of classes offered, percent reporting primary class objective, number of closed cases, and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Family Support Programs

Table 14. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served				
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)
Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	Sheridan					
OMNI-Parent Management Training	Lancaster					
Ecological In-Home Services	Buffalo	13	69.2%	23.1%	46.2%	13.92/2.63
Family Services for Truancy Risk	Buffalo	6	-	-	-	-
Family Support-Boys Town	Cass	9	-	-	-	-
Family Support-Owens	Cass					
Youth Services	Cheyenne	4	-	-	-	-
Hearts Program	Custer	13	76.9%	15.4%	46.2%	14.38/2.84
Family Support	Dakota	12	16.7%	41.7%	83.3%	15.58/1.0
LIFT Together with Boys Town (previously Prevention Services)	Douglas	73	8.2%	37.0%	41.1%	13.15/3.46
CSI Missing Youth Services-Child Saving Institute	Douglas	182	16.5%	33.5%	45.6%	14.71/1.80
Missing Youth Services Intake Specialist/Family Support Worker-Project Harmony	Douglas	69	1.4%	52.2%	33.3%	14.52/1.94
Family Support (ATD)	Gage					
Better Living Family Support-Gage County Schools	Gage	1	-	-	-	-
Jefferson County Family Support-Better Living	Jefferson					
YWCA Lifeskills-CATCH	Lancaster	33	33.3%	6.1%	0%	15.24/1.06
Sudanese Advocacy	Lancaster	13	0%	0%	38.5%	7.54/4.56

[22] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.

Program		Youth Served				
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)
Family Support-FSB	Lincoln	7	-	-	-	-
Family Support-Boys Town	Lincoln	9	-	-	-	-
Family Support	Otoe					
Family Support	Platte	0	-	-	-	-
Family Support-Platte County Juvenile Services	Platte					
Family Support-Better Living	Richardson					
Family Support-Better Living	Saline					
Family Support Services	Saunders	7	-	-	-	-
Juvenile Advancement Center	Scotts Bluff	21	61.9%	0%	42.9%	14.86/1.68
Thayer County Family Support	Thayer					

Table 15. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program				Outcome Measures				Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	% Improvement Family Function	% Improvement Family Communication	Classes Offered (n)	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	% Primary Class Objective[23]	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Family Support-Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	Sheridan										
OMNI-Parent Management Training	Lancaster										
Ecological In-Home Services	Buffalo	↓	↑	0	8	62.5% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	12.5% (1)	0% (0)
Family Services for Truancy Risk	Buffalo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Family Support-Boys Town	Cass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Family Support-Owens	Cass										
Youth Services	Cheyenne	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hearts Program	Custer	↑	↑	1	4	50.0% (2)	Not Listed	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Family Support	Dakota	↓	↓	0	11	45.5% (5)	0.0%	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
LIFT Together with Boys Town (previously Prevention Services)	Douglas	↓	↓	1	49	71.4% (35)	100% (4)	2.0% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
CSI Missing Youth Services-Child Saving Institute	Douglas	↑	↑	1	172	9.3% (16)	4	4.7% (8)	0.6% (1)	4.1% (7)	2.9% (5)
Missing Youth Services Intake Specialist/ Family Support Worker-Project Harmony	Douglas	↑	↑	0	64	7.8% (5)	-	1.6% (1)	0% (0)	1.6% (1)	1.6% (1)
Family Support (ATD)	Gage										
Better Living Family Support-Gage County Schools	Gage	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Jefferson County Family Support-Better Living	Jefferson										
YWCA Lifeskills-CATCH	Lancaster	↑	↑	0	5	0.0% (0)	N/A	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Sudanese Advocacy	Lancaster	N/A	N/A	-	-	0.0% (0)	-	-	-	-	-
Family Support-FSB	Lincoln	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Family Support-Boys Town	Lincoln	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Family Support	Otoe										
Family Support	Platte	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[23] Primacy class objective (1) General Parenting Skills, (2) Teen Parenting Skills, (3) Social-Cognitive Functioning of Youth, (4) Family Functioning, (5) School Attachment, (6) Behavioral Issues, and (7) General Life Skills.

Program				Outcome Measures				Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	% Improvement Family Function	% Improvement Family Communication	Classes Offered (n)	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	% Primary Class Objective[23]	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Family Support-Platte County Juvenile Services	Platte										
Family Support-Better Living	Richardson										
Family Support-Better Living	Saline										
Family Support Services	Saunders	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Juvenile Advancement Center	Scotts Bluff	⬆	(=)	1	21	9.5% (2)	100% (3)	9.5% (2)	14.8% (3)	23.8% (5)	0% (0)
Thayer County Family Support	Thayer										



MEDIATION PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 9 | Total Youth Served: 481

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (14.19 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

1.6%	0.5%	6.1%	0.2%
Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention

Measures for Mediation Programs

Mediation is a form of conflict resolution in which trained leaders help the victim and offender work together to resolve disputes. Mediators do not make judgements or offer advice, and they have no power to force decisions. Victims are allowed to have input in the offender's sentence and may make an impact statement. Mediation may define the restitution owed or other forms of affecting resolution of the juvenile justice case.

Measures[24] reported for Mediation programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., percent of cases with a reparation agreement made, percent of cases with a conference held, percent of cases with a youth/victim conference, percent of youth/surrogate conference). Outcome measures for Mediation programs include number of cases closed with a discharge date, and percent of fulfillment of mediation agreement (i.e., successful fulfillment, partial fulfillment, and unsuccessful fulfillment), and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Mediation Programs

Table 16. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures			
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	Reparation Agreement Made[25]	Conference Held	Youth/ Victim Conference	Surrogate Conference
Mediation (for diversion) Nebraska Mediation Center	Dodge	13	76.9%	7.7%	69.2%	14.85/1.21	61.5%	46.2%	15.4%	30.8%
Mediation Program Central Mediation Center	Buffalo	19	68.4%	5.3%	89.5%	12.79/1.266	78.9%	73.7%	71.4%	21.4%
Victim Youth Conferencing	Adams	29	69.0%	24.1%	89.7%	14.14/1.88	82.8%	86.2%	20.7%	62.1%
Restorative Justice/ Restorative Conferencing Concord Mediation Center	Douglas	123	40.7%	0%	65.0%	14.94/1.61	48.0%	64.9%	10.6%	54.3%
Restorative Justice Gage County MAPS Community Coalition	Gage									
Diversion Restorative Justices Practices	Lancaster	233	36.9%	15.0%	51.1%	14.11/1.65	72.5%	92.7%	36.5%	54.9%
Lighthouse Restorative Justices	Lancaster	55	45.5%	5.5%	67.3%	13.38/1.63	83.6%	0%	0%	0%
Mediation (for diversion) JCMS Sarpy County	Sarpy									
Mediation (for diversion) Mediation West	Scotts Bluff	3	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mediation/ VYC Conferencing (Sherman)	Sherman	6	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

Table 17. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program		Outcome Measures				Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Successful Agreement Reached	Partial Agreement Reached	Unsuccessful Agreement Reached	Cases Closed (n)	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Mediation (for diversion) Nebraska Mediation Center	Dodge	46.2%	15.4%	15.4%	12	8.3% (1)	0% (0)	16.7% (2)	0% (0)
Mediation Program Central Mediation Center	Adams/ Buffalo	78.9%	0%	15.8%	19	5.2% (1)	0% (0)	10.5% (2)	5.2% (1)
Victim Youth Conferencing	Adams	86.2%	0%	13.8%	29	0% (0)	0% (0)	6.9% (2)	0% (0)
Restorative Justice/ Restorative Conferencing Concord Mediation Center	Douglas	47.2%	0%	29.3%	94	1.1% (1)	1.1% (1)	2.1% (2)	0% (0)
Restorative Justice Gage County MAPS Community Coalition	Gage								
Diversion Restorative Justice Practices	Lancaster	82.6%	2.6%	6.9%	233	1.3% (1)	0% (0)	6.9% (16)	0% (0)
Lighthouse Restorative Justices	Lancaster	83.6%	0%	14.5%	54	5.6% (3)	1.9% (1)	5.6% (3)	0% (0)
Mediation (for diversion) JCMS Sarpy County	Sarpy								
Mediation (for diversion) Mediation West	Scotts Bluff	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mediation/VYC Conferencing (Sherman)	Sherman	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–

[24] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.
[25] Percent reporting reparation agreement reached



MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 21 | Total Youth Served: 585

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (13.21 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

1.8%	0.7%	2.9%	0.7%
Status Offense	**Law Violation**	**Probation**	**Detention**

Measures for Mental Health Programs

Mental Health programs work with youth to promote the youth's recognition of their abilities and help identify coping skills to assist with promoting mental health well-being. Mental health programs utilize screening tools and assessments to help identify if the youth have a mental health diagnosis to further tailor the program to meet the needs of the youth.

Measures[26] reported for Mental Health programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., percent of youth assessed with a validated tool, primary diagnosis – most common and percent of cases, and percent of youth successfully discharged). Outcome measures for Mental Health programs include number of cases closed with a discharge date, percent of cases reporting progress at discharge, and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Mental Health Programs

Table 18. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures	
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	Assessed with Validated Tool[27]	Primary Diagnosis[28]
Heartland Family Services-Behavioral Health Services	Cass							
Mental Health - Chase	Chase	14	7.1%	92.9%	42.9%	14.62/1.27	100%	16 (71.4%)
Mental Health Services	Cheyenne	25	96.0%	0%	56.0%	14.0/2.63	0%	16 (92.0%)
Mental Health Assessment	Colfax	22	27.3%	63.6%	31.8%	15.68/2.19	0%	16 (40.9%)
Group Therapy	Dodge	54	48.1%	0%	51.9%	17.09/1.05	0%	13 (100%)
Completely Kids	Douglas	102	49.0%	-	57.8%	11.46/1.15	-	16 (96.1%)
Missing Youth Services Therapist	Douglas	16	0%	37.5%	43.8%	14.50/1.63	0%	15 (6.3%)
Mental Health-Dundy	Dundy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mental Health-Furnas	Furnas	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mental Health-Hayes and Hitchcock	Hayes/Hitchcock	1	–	–	–	–	–	–
On-Site Mental Health Therapy (was School-based therapy)	Howard	41	97.6%	0%	36.3%	10.93/2.94	0%	3 (29.3%)
Family Service School Therapy	Lancaster	73	68.5%	2.7%	68.5%	15.10/1.69	0%	3 (38.4%)
Pilots of Change-HopeSpoke	Lancaster	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Take Pause	Lancaster	48	4.2%	-	52.1%	9.46/2.67	-	16 (75.0%)
NJJDP Mental Health Services	Madison	15	66.7%	13.3%	33.3%	15.00/1.69	0%	15 (33.3%)

[26] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.
[27] Percent reporting yes
[28] Most common primary diagnosis and percent

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures	
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/ Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	Assessed with Validated Tool[27]	Primary Diagnosis[28]
Mental Health Services	Platte	2	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mental Health-Red Willow	Red Willow							
Behavioral Health Therapist	Saline	11	27.3%	9.1%	54.5%	14.91/2.02	0%	15 (54.5%)
Post-Crisis Response Services	Sarpy	20	70.0%	5.0%	75.0%	15.60/1.09	0%	16 (90.0%)
Saunders County In-Home Therapy	Saunders	56	91.1%	0%	37.5%	13.14/2.63	0%	15 (33.9%)
School Based Behavioral Health Program	Saunders	85	87.1%	0%	45.9%	12.01/3.48	0%	16 (43.5%)

Table 19. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program		Outcome Measures			Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Progress at Discharge[29]	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Heartland Family Services-Behavioral Health Services	Cass							
Mental Health-Chase	Chase	0%	0	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	–	0% (0)
Mental Health Services	Cheyenne	24.0%	15	6.7% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Mental Health Assessment	Colfax	0%	16	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Group Therapy	Dodge	0%	0	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	–	0% (0)
Completely Kids	Douglas	89.2%	102	90.2% (92)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Missing Youth Services Therapist	Douglas	31.3%	13	0% (0)	7.7% (1)	0% (0)	15.4% (2)	0% (0)
Mental Health-Dundy	Dundy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mental Health-Furnas	Furnas	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mental Health-Hayes and Hitchcock)	Hayes/ Hitchcock	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
On-Site Mental Health Therapy (was School-based therapy)	Howard	12.2%	13	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Family Service School Therapy	Lancaster	34.3%	32	40.6% (13)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3.1% (1)	0% (0)
Pilots of Change-HopeSpoke	Lancaster	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Take Pause	Lancaster	39.6%	13	38.5% (5)	0% (0)	7.7% (1)	7.7% (1)	0% (0)
NJJDP Mental Health Services	Madison	33.3%	10	40.0% (4)	20.0% (2)	0% (0)	10% (1)	0% (0)
Mental Health Services	Platte	–	–	-	–	–	–	–

[29] Percent reporting progress at discharge

Program		Outcome Measures			Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Progress at Discharge[29]	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Mental Health-Red Willow	Red Willow							
Behavioral Health Therapist	Saline	36.4%	4	50.0% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Post-Crisis Response Services	Sarpy	0%	20	100% (20)	10.0% (2)	5.0% (1)	15.0% (3)	10.0% (2)
Saunders County In-Home Therapy	Saunders	17.9%	20	25.0% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
School Based Behavioral Health Program	Saunders	17.7%	16	68.8% (11)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)



MENTORING PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 4 | Total Youth Served: 247

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (10.75 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

0%	0%	0%	0%
Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention

Measures for Mentoring Programs

Mentoring takes place between a young person and a more experienced person who are acting in a non-professional helping capacity to provide support that benefits one or more areas of the mentee's development.

Measures[30] reported for Mentoring programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., percent of youth successfully discharged). Outcome measures for Mentoring programs include number of cases closed with a discharge date, number of matches, average match length of cases in minutes, and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Mentoring Programs

Table 20. Demographic Measures

Program		Youth Served				
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)
Bridge to Prosperity	Douglas	39	0%	0%	64.1%	13.79/.486
Mentor-Aspire for Greatness	Dodge	–	–	–	–	–
Community-based Mentoring	Lancaster	19	31.6%	10.5%	21.1%	12.21/1.47
Goal Setting	Douglas	189	30.7%	–	49.2%	10.01/3.59

Table 21. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program		Outcome Measures				Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Matches (n)[31]	Match Length (average)[32]	% Success	Cases Closed (n)	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Bridge to Prosperity	Douglas	38	9.20 months	2.6% (1)	6	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Mentor-Aspire for Greatness (JC027JCMF)	Dodge	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Community-based Mentoring	Lancaster	19	–[33]	0% (0)	3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Goal Setting	Douglas	–	–	40% (2)	5	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

[30] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.
[31] Number of youth with mentor relationship data
[32] In Days
[33] No data for match length entered for Community-based Mentoring (JC055JCND).



PROMOTION/ PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 18 | Total Youth Served: 1,148

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (13.87 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

4.2%	0%	8.7%	1.0%
Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention

Measures for Promotion/Prevention Programs

Prevention/Promotion programs provide methods or activities that seek to reduce or deter specific or predictable problems, protect the current state of well-being, or promote desired outcomes or behaviors. Prevention/Promotion programs aim to promote positive behaviors that focus on employment skills, life skills, or be pro-social activities which are designed to encourage youth to behave in a way that benefits others.

Measures[34] reported for Promotion/Prevention programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., youth match target population and percent of youth successfully discharged). Outcome measures for Promotion/Prevention programs include number of cases closed with a discharge date, number of cases with activity data, percent of youth who attended most days, most common activity type and percent of cases), and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Promotion/Prevention Programs

Table 22. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served					Process Measures
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)	Youth match Target Population[35]
Horizon Lifeskills (was LifeSkills)	Adams	30	80.0%	16.7%	60.0%	15.07/1.53	17
Alliance Public Schools Job Coach	Box Butte	28	50%	3.6%	53.6%	16.46/.744	16
CJ Family Navigator	Dodge	0	–	–	–	–	–
Mentor-Aspire for Greatness	Dodge						
All-Access Pass	Lancaster	0	–	–	–	–	–
Healing Circulos Facilitator	Douglas	61	6.6%	39.3%	96.7%	15.46/1.18	9
Girl Scouts Juvenile Justice Outreach	Douglas	78	19.2%	10.3%	0%	15.45/1.86	2
Urban B.O.L.T.	Douglas	66	0%	0%	60.6%	14.71/1.41	14
Creative Writing Program	Douglas						
You Turn (Previously Violence Prevention Initiative)	Douglas	37	0%	5.4%	70.3%	16.22/1.48	0
Strenghtfinder Coaching & Cop Club	Lancaster	17	29.4%	5.9%	47.1%	15.18/1.29	0
Life Quest Services	Lancaster	0	–	–	–	–	–
Take Pause	Lancaster	142	2.8%	2.1%	66.9%	13.69/2.41	0
Latina Leaders & Joven Noble	Lancaster	468	4.1%	26.3%	46.8%	12.9/1.33	120
ACCC Serving Immigrant and Refugee Youth	Lancaster	100	19.0%	3.0%	51.0%	13.38/1.69	25
Changing Behaviors Alternative Program	Lincoln	76	71.1%	11.8%	50.0%	13.8/1.42	17
1st Job	Seward	10	70.0%	0%	50.0%	15.3/1.06	0
Behavioral Health	Sheridan	35	65.7%	2.9%	54.3%	14.49/.61	22

[34] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.
[35] Percent of youth with modified R&P survey

Table 23. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program				Outcome Measures			Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	Youth with Activity Data (n)	Youth attending most Days[36]	Activity[37]	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Horizon Lifeskills (was LifeSkills)	Adams	30	100% (30)	3	10.0%	10.0% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Alliance Public Schools Job Coach	Box Butte	10	40.0% (4)	27	96.4%	28.6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Family Navigator	Dodge	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Mentor-Aspire for Greatness	Dodge									
All-Access Pass	Lancaster	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Healing Circulos Facilitator	Douglas	27	70.4% (19)	50	82.0%	42.6% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	7.4% (2)	0% (0)
Girl Scouts Juvenile Justice Outreach	Douglas	76	100% (76)	63	80.8%	35.9% (3)	–	–	–	–[38]
Urban B.O.L.T.	Douglas	66	7.6% (5)	66	100%	98.5% (5)	7.6% (5)	0% (0)	12.1% (8)	3.0% (2)
Creative Writing Program	Douglas									
You Turn (Previously Violence Prevention Initiative)	Douglas	5	40.0% (2)	0	0%	N/A (0)	40.0% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20.0% (1)
Strenghtfinder Coaching &Cop Club	Lancaster	17	88.2% (15)	16	94.1%	94.1% (3)	5.9% (1)	0% (0)	11.8% (2)	0% (0)
Life Quest Services	Lancaster	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Take Pause	Lancaster	29	96.6% (28)	0	0%	N/A (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Latina Leaders & Joven Noble	Lancaster	28	100% (28)	467	99.8%	98.7% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
ACCC Serving Immigrant and Refugee Youth	Lancaster	12	100% (12)	95	95.0%	48.0% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Changing Behaviors Alternative Program	Lincoln	59	32.2% (19)	58	76.3%	59.2% (3)	15.3% (9)	0% (0)	39.0% (23)	1.7% (1)
1st Job	Seward	8	100% (8)	9	90.0%	90.0% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Behavioral Health	Sheridan	35	91.4% (32)	0	0%	N/A (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

[36] Percent of youth attending most days
[37] Activity type categories (1) homework/tutoring, (2) art, (3) life skills, (4) employment skills, (5) prosocial activities, (6) health and wellness, (7) recreation, (8) gang prevention, (9) substance abuse, (10) anger management, and (11) restorative practices.
[38] All discharge was June 30, 2023, multiple cases were discharged on a date that does not exist yet at the writing of this report.



REFERRAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

Total Programs: 13 | Total Youth Served: 121

POPULATION DEMOGRAPHICS



AGE (15.14 YEARS)



GENDER



FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

0%	6.8%	9.1%	0%
Status Offense	Law Violation	Probation	Detention

Measures for Referral Services Programs

Referral service programs are agencies that help juveniles and families locate community services based on the needs of the juvenile. They may also cover the costs of the services for the family.

Measures[39] reported for Referral Services programs include number of youth enrolled, demographic information for enrolled youth (i.e., race, ethnicity, gender, and age), process measures (i.e., percent of cases with a referral made). Outcome measures for Referral Services programs include number of cases referred and future system involvement (i.e., law violation, status offense, probation, and detention). Program names in red indicate that the program reported no data during the report period.

Referral Services Programs

Table 24. Demographic and Process Measures

Program		Youth Served				
Name (N)	County	Youth Enrolled (n)	Race % White	Ethnicity % Hispanic/Latino	Gender % Male	Age (m, SD)
Douglas County Juvenile Assessment Center	Douglas	73	32.9%	4.1%	61.6%	15.25/1.56
Family Navigation	Douglas	35	0%	0%	54.3%	14.46/1.61
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Heartland Family Service	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-CBS	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Vigilnet						
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-All Communities						
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Paradigm	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Boys Town	Sarpy	1	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Omni	Sarpy	1	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-KVC	Sarpy	1	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Cedars	Sarpy	10	80.0%	0%	80.0%	16.20/1.31
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Changes	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Owens						

[39] Variables with more than 20% missing data were not reported and programs with fewer than 10 youth enrolled have the data masked.

Table 25. Outcome Measures and Future System Involvement

Program				Outcome Measures	Future System Involvement			
Name (N)	County	Cases Closed (n)	% Success	Youth Referred[40]	% Status Offense	% Law Violation	% Probation	% Detained
Douglas County Juvenile Assessment Center	Douglas	0	0% (0)	60	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Family Navigation	Douglas	35	97.1% (34)	5	0% (0)	5.7% (2)	8.6% (3)	0% (0)
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Heartland Family Service	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-CBS	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Vigilnet								
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-All Communities								
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Paradigm	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Boys Town	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Omni	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-KVC	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Cedars	Sarpy	9	100% (9)	10	0% (0)	10.0% (1)	11.1% (1)	0% (0)
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Changes	Sarpy	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services-Owens								

[40] Percent of youth referred

Missing Data Extract Reports

The Nebraska Crime Commission provided JJI with missing data extracts for all referrals to programs from July 1, 2020, through, roughly, September 15, 2022, for program types included in the Tier 1 evaluation report. These missing data extracts were compiled into the tables below. For each program type, the table includes the number of cases and average percent missing for each JCMS screen. As program screens do not always apply to all youth, only those cases matched to each program screen are included. Further, in some cases there may be multiple matches per single youth (e.g., charges, contacts). Dashes in cells represent no cases entered in the screen. Programs should review the missing data for their program to assess data entry fidelity.

Table 26. ATD Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)								
		Intake	Classes	Contacts	Incentives	Monitor	Scores	UA_ Screen	Charges	Objectives
Alternatives to Detention-EM/Trackers	Buffalo	17, 2.8%	-	2, 0%	-	5, 0%	-	-	10, 0%	-
Pre-Adjudicated Tracker Service	Cass	4, 1.2%	-	32, 0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention EM/Tracker	Dakota	22, 1.3%	-	-	-	2, 0%	19, 0%	-	1, 100%	-
Alternatives to Detention EM/Tracker	Dodge	21, 4.8%	-	1, 100%	-	1, 100%	1, 0%	-	2, 66.7%	-
[41]	Douglas	2, 14.3%	-	4, 0%	-	2, 0%	1, 100%	2, 25.0%	-	-
Electronic Monitor/ Alternatives to Detention	Gage	1, 4.8%	-	-	-	1, 0%	-	-	-	-
Detention alternatives-EM/Tracker	Hall	69, 4.1%	-	61, 0%	-	32, 0%	-	-	1, 100%	-
Jefferson County Tracker/EM	Jefferson	1, 0%	-	7, 0%	-	-	-	-	-	-
PreAdjudicated Community Services	Lancaster	98, 3.1%	-	839, 3.5%	-	126, 0.4%	74, 6.8%	138, 1.6%	287, 0.5%	-
Reporting Centers	Lancaster	19, 2.5%	71, 1.4%	16, 8.3%	17, 94.1%	-	17, 96.1%	17, 50.0%	40, 20.0%	19, 3.5%
NNJJP Pre-Adjudication Services-Trackers/EM	Madison	25, 1.3%	-	94, 1.2%	1, 100%	14, 0%	2, 100%	23, 2.2%	92, 2.2%	34, 9.8%
Tracker	Otoe	3, 1.6%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Alternatives to Detention-Tracker/EM	Richardson	2, 0%	-	6, 22.2%	-	15, 0%	-	-	-	-
Better Living EM services/Better Living Contract	Saline	4, 1.2%	-	55, 1.2%	-	107, 0%	-	-	-	-
Tracker/EM services	Saline	5, 4.8%	-	2, 100%	-	-	2, 100%	-	1, 100%	1, 100%
Reporting Center/Sarpy County CARE Program EM/CARE Program-Tracker	Sarpy	372, 3.7%	2502, 0.0%	12889, 0.0%	-	220, 0%	599, 34.6%	505, 21.1%	1101, 0.2%	334, 0%
Detention Alternativs-Tracker/EM	Washington	2, 4.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[41] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type

Table 27. Assessment Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)			
		Intake	Charges	Scores	Referral
CSI Missing Youth Services	Douglas	3, 6.67%	3, 22.22%	2, 66.67%	1, 20.00%
Lincoln County Juvenile Assessment Center	Lincoln	107, 0.06%	129, 0.26%	95, 0%	355, 0%
[42]	Red Willow	2, 0%	-	2, 33.33%	2, 0%
Juvenile Advancement Center	Scotts Bluff	3, 33.33%	1, 100%	9, 0%	3, 0%
Winnebago Youth Crisis Intervention Center		34, 0.20%	-	-	-

Table 28. Diversion Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)				
		Intake	Charges	Scores	Activity	Drug_Test
Adams County Diversion	Adams	150, 3.6%	162, 5.6%	3076, 0.1%	1258, 6.6%	-
Banner County Diversion	Scotts Bluff	1, 0%	1, 0%	1, 50.0%	3, 0%	-
Boone County Diversion Program	Madison	5, 5.6%	7, 0%	5, 0%	6, 12.5%	12, 22.2%
BB County Diversion Officer	Box Butte	3, 22.2%	4, 50.0%	-	-	-
Buffalo County Diversion	Buffalo	451, 8.0%	647, 0.8%	787, 0.3%	1204, 1.2%	177, 3.0%
Burt County Diversion Program	Madison	17, 1.0%	20, 0%	7, 0%	64, 0.2%	-
Butler County Diversion Program	Seward	21, 2.7%	34, 1.0%	20, 0%	224, 0%	368, 10.7%
Diversion	Cass	50, 5.4%	4, 16.7%	22, 4.6%	189, 7.5%	8, 0%
Chase County Diversion	Chase	13, 5.6%	14, 0%	48, 5.2%	5, 25.0%	-
[43]	Cherry	3, 3.7%	3, 0%	-	-	-
Cheyenne County Diversion	Cheyenne	55, 10.4%	73, 0%	51, 0%	210, 3.8%	-
Colfax County Diversion Program	Colfax	51, 18.3%	74, 5.4%	44, 0%	68, 5.9%	-
Cuming County Diversion Program	Madison	33, 1.2%	36, 1.9%	12, 0%	94, 1.3%	-
Custer & Blaine County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Custer	47, 3.7%	69, 3.4%	248, 0%	194, 0.3%	-
Diversion	Dakota	140, 2.9%	198, 0.5%	973, 0.3%	755, 1.9%	-
Dawson County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Custer	82, 3.5%	104, 0%	433, 0.5%	226, 2.2%	-

[42] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[43] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)				
		Intake	Charges	Scores	Activity	Drug_Test
Diversion	Dodge	214, 5.9%	290, 2.9%	193, 2.1%	571, 7.8%	-
Dundy County Diversion	Chase	8, 44.4%	9, 0%	-	-	-
Fillmore County Diversion	Adams	3, 5.6%	5, 0%	155, 0%	33, 5.3%	-
[44]	Frontier	33, 18.5%	34, 2.9%	-	-	-
Furnas County Diversion	Chase	1, 55.6%	1, 0%	-	-	-
Juvenile Diversion/Community Service	Gage	251, 2.9%	296, 1.1%	248, 16.1%	727, 7.8%	-
[45]	Garden	6, 4.6%	8, 4.2%	-	-	-
Gosper County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Custer	6, 10.2%	6, 16.7%	27, 0%	14, 0%	-
Greeley County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Custer	5, 0%	7, 14.3%	14, 0%	21, 0%	-
Hall County Pre-Trial Juvenile Diversion Program	Hall	465, 19.3%	646, 0.2%	501, 19.1%	2895, 3.4%	865, 0.3%
Hamilton County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Hamilton	18, 7.7%	26, 7.7%	17, 0%	61, 0.2%	-
[46]	Harlan	16, 8.7%	16, 2.1%	14, 50.0%	4, 3.1%	-
Hayes County Diversion	Chase	6, 7.4%	11, 3.0%	-	17, 8.8%	-
Hitchcock County Diversion	Chase	22, 3.8%	27, 4.9%	-	62, 6.5%	-
Holt County Diversion	Holt	51, 1.7%	65, 0%	342, 0%	272, 3.3%	-
Howard County Diversion	Hall	32, 19.4%	34, 1.0%	53, 10.4%	168, 2.2%	-
Jefferson County Diversion Program	Jefferson	30, 0.4%	37, 0%	30, 0%	222, 0.4%	1, 33.3%
Johnson County Diversion	Nemaha	6, 0%	8, 0%	6, 16.7%	25, 0%	-
[47]	Kearney	29, 20.3%	29, 0%	-	130, 9.2%	-
Keith County Diversion	Chase	87, 12.5%	112, 6.0%	278, 2.2%	-	-
Kimball County Diversion	Cheyenne	4, 8.3%	5, 0%	3, 16.7%	16, 3.9%	-
Knox County Diversion Program	Madison	13, 0.9%	140, 0%	13, 3.9%	69, 0.4%	3, 33.3%
Diversion	Lancaster	653, 4.4%	799, 0%	651, 0.4%	4312, 4.8%	363, 6.3%

[44] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[45] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[46] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[47] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)				
		Intake	Charges	Scores	Activity	Drug_Test
[48]		1, 44.4%	1, 0%	1, 100%	1, 25.0%	6, 33.3%
Diversion	Lincoln	83, 4.1%	123, 0%	51, 0%	652, 8.1%	-
Madison County Diversion Program	Madison	251, 3.0%	353, 1.3%	208, 2.2%	1473, 6.6%	44, 7.6%
Merrick County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Merrick	46, 4.7%	52, 0%	91, 0%	255, 0.3%	-
Morrill County Diversion	Scotts Bluff	41, 11.1%	42, 0%	41, 0%	42, 9.2%	-
Nance County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Merrick	10, 4.4%	8, 0%	10, 0%	42, 0%	-
Nemaha County Diversion	Nemaha	42, 1.2%	64, 1 0%	47, 4.3%	160, 2.3%	-
Nuckolls County Diversion	Adams	16, 4.9%	26, 3.9%	435, 0%	109, 4.9%	-
Diversion	Otoe	74, 3.4%	89, 0.8%	57, 0%	158, 1.1%	-
Pawnee County Diversion	Nemaha	9, 2.5%	9, 0%	5, 0%	30, 4.6%	-
Perkins County Diversion	Chase	7, 13.5%	14, 7.1%	3, 83.3%	1, 50.0%	-
[49]	Phelps	11, 27.8%	13, 7.7%	-	31, 22.2%	-
Pierce County Diversion	Madison	8, 3.5%	8, 0%	8, 0%	37, 6.4%	-
Platte Valley Diversion Program	Platte	248, 5.2%	303, 4.0%	519, 0.9%	1118, 1.5%	125, 2.7%
Polk County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Merrick	17, 8.5%	14, 2.4%	15, 0%	78, 0%	-
Red Willow County Diversion	Chase	32, 12.3%	20, 0%	-	-	-
Richardson County Diversion	Nemaha	22, 2.0%	31, 3.2%	90, 0%	97, 3.6%	-
Saline Diversion Program	Saline	6, 3.7%	9, 0%	41, 0%	40, 0.3%	-
Diversion	Sarpy	742, 7.0%	1104, 0.1%	4178, 0%	2021, 0%	30702, 1.8%
[50]	Saunders	72, 4.8%	97, 0%	478, 0%	403, 0.7%	145, 1.6%
Scotts Bluff County Diversion	Scotts Bluff	198, 2.9%	232, 1.9%	191, 0%	910, 1.9%	-
Seward County Diversion Program	Seward	65, 5.0%	113, 3.5%	39, 0%	659, 0.3%	648, 9.6%
Sherman County Diversion	Buffalo	34, 7.2%	36, 0%	28, 3.6%	94, 0.5%	-
Stanton County Diversion	Madison	27, 1.4%	32, 1.0%	26, 25.0%	161, 3.7%	17, 15.7%

[48] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[49] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[50] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)				
		Intake	Charges	Scores	Activity	Drug_Test
[51]	Thomas	1, 0%	1, 0%	7, 100%	5, 0%	-
Valley County Diversion (Healing Hearts & Families)	Custer	4, 1.4%	4, 0%	25, 0%	17, 0%	-
Juvenile Diversion Coordinator	Washington	61, 16.5%	61, 1.6%	61, 0%	-	-
Wayne County Diversion	Madison	32, 3.7%	39, 2.6%	25, 24.0%	234, 13.2%	3, 33.3%
Juvenile Support Worker	York	25, 2.9%	28, 14.3%	21, 2.4%	5, 15.0%	-
	System Administration	1, 61.1%	-	-	-	-

Table 29. Family Support Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)			
		Intake	Contacts	Classes	Scores
Family Services for Truancy Risk	Buffalo	14, 0%	233, 0%	1, 100%	67, 1.1%
Ecological In-Home Services	Buffalo	10, 4%	19, 5.3%	-	2, 100%
Family Support-Boys Town	Cass	5, 4.0%	10, 10.0%	-	2, 100%
Youth Services	Cheyenne	2, 0%	1, 0%	-	2, 0%
Hearts Program	Custer	19, 34.0%	-	-	37, 2.7%
Family Support	Dakota	12, 2.9%	39, 7.3%	-	4, 0%
Juvenile Assessment Center	Douglas	51, 23.2%	-	-	-
LIFT Together with Boys Town	Douglas	138, 6.3%	317, 0.3%	33, 3.0%	-
[52]		91, 17.1%	661, 2.1%	-	39, 5.1%
[53]		1, 15.0%	1, 57.1%	-	-
Family Navigator Program	Douglas	4, 28.8%	11, 6.5%	2, 100%	-
Missing Youth Services Intake Specialist/Family Support Worker	Douglas	76, 31.9%	500, 14.3%	-	-
Better Living Family Support-Gage County Schools	Gage	4, 10.0%	47, 0%	-	-
Sudanese Advocacy	Lancaster	16, 35.3%	1, 100%	-	-
YWCA Lifeskills-CATCH	Lancaster	31, 13.1%	96, 1.2%	-	-

[51] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[52] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[53] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)			
		Intake	Contacts	Classes	Scores
Family Support-FSB	Lincoln	5, 0%	-	-	-
[54]	Lincoln	8, 2.5%	15, 6.7%	-	1, 100%
Family Support	Saline	1, 70.0%	-	-	-
Family Support Services	Saunders	14, 2.1%	24, 0%	-	-
Juvenile Advancement Center	Scotts Bluff	12, 5.4%	43, 3.0%	1, 0%	8, 0%

Table 30. Mediation Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)				
		Intake	Contacts	Conference	Agreement	Follow Up
Victim Youth Conferencing	Adams	37, 1.1%	293, 1.7%	32, 0%	26, 6.4%	8, 67.2%
Mediation Program	Buffalo	45, 2.5%	734, 1.9%	36, 0%	34, 7.4%	-
Mediation (for diversion)	Dodge	17, 9.3%	163, 0%	10, 0%	8, 12.5%	-
Restorative Justice/ Restorative Conferencing	Douglas	138, 3.0%	1109, 0.2%	73, 0%	61, 2.5%	1, 100%
Diversion Restorative Justice Practices	Lancaster	258, 0%	265, 0%	247, 0%	517, 0%	-
Lighthouse Restorative Justices	Lancaster	113, 0.6%	-	-	-	27, 22.7%
Mediation (for diversion)	Scotts Bluff	3, 9.8%	85, 1.5%	3, 0%	2, 0%	-
Mediation	Buffalo	10, 9.4%	78, 0%	7, 0%	6, 69.4%	-

Table 31. Mental Health Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)			
		Intake	Contacts	Groups	Scores
Mental Health-Chase	Chase	21, 16.1%	77, 8.4%	1, 100%	88, 2.3%
Mental Health Services	Cheyenne	26, 6.0%	25, 0%	4, 0%	4, 100%
Mental Health Assessment	Colfax	34, 16.0%	137, 0%	-	-
Group Therapy	Dodge	1, 66.7%	-	346, 100%	1, 100%
Youth Mental Health Services	Douglas	214, 12.7%	-	346, 3.0%	-

[54] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)			
		Intake	Contacts	Groups	Scores
Missing Youth Services Therapist	Douglas	25, 27.3%	270, 0.1%	-	3, 100%
Mental Health-Furnas	Chase	2, 2.8%	5, 3.3%	-	-
Mental Health-Hitchcock	Hitchcock	3, 7.4%	-	-	-
On-Site Mental Health Therapy	Howard	74, 16.9%	253, 0.5%	-	-
School Based Therapy	Lancaster	24, 8.8%	127, 0%	-	44, 0%
Cultural Specific Therapy	Lancaster	158, 16.0%	47, 17.0%	1, 100%	-
Family Service School Therapy	Lancaster	80, 5.4%	175, 1.4%	-	-
Pilots of Change-HopeSpoke	Lancaster	13, 10.3%	-	-	-
NJJDP Mental Health Services	Madison	15, 4.4%	55, 1.8%	-	1, 100%
Mental Health Services	Platte	9, 30.3%	40, 0%	-	-
Behavioral Health Therapist	Saline	18, 11.1%	46, 2.5%	-	4, 75.0%
Post-Crisis Response Services	Sarpy	20, 3.6%	-	27, 0%	-
School Based Behavioral Health Program	Saunders	101, 7.8%	54, 0%	-	-
Saunders County In-Home Therapy	Saunders	77, 8.7%	31, 0%	-	-

Table 32. Mentoring Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)		
		Intake	Mentors	Activity
CareerConnect	Adams	17, 38.8%	-	-
Youth Initiated Mentoring	Douglas	28, 35.6%	3, 77.8%	-
Success Prep	Douglas	8, 36.9%	9, 33.3%	61, 13.1%
Goal Setting	Douglas	287, 30.7%	25, 37.0%	4, 75.0%
Bridge to Prosperity	Douglas	150, 31.0%	205, 30.5%	5615, 4.6%
[55]	-	1, 40.0%	1, 25.0%	1, 0%
Community-based Mentoring	Lancaster	28, 38.0%	31, 34.1%	265, 0.7%

[55] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)		
		Intake	Mentors	Activity
Community Connections Mentoring	Lincoln	19, 20.10%	18, 35.19%	98, 0.85%
Stanton High School TeamMates	Stanton	3, 31.82%	2, 25.00%	6, 0%

Table 33. Prevention/Promotion Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)			
		Intake	Program_ Info	Scores	Activity
Horizon Lifeskills	Adams	94, 0.1%	95, 1.1%	19, 0%	3, 0%
Alliance Public Schools Job Coach	Box Butte	45, 6.9%	78, 22.6%	35, 0%	264, 12.8%
Decision Making Classes	Buffalo	21, 2.4%	20, 14.0%	16, 0%	18, 19.4%
Healing Hearts & Families	Custer	2, 18.8%	-	-	-
City of South Sioux City	Dakota	5, 0%	1, 100%	1, 0%	1, 100%
Skill Builders	Dodge	21, 20.5%	-	9, 0%	-
Healing Circulos Facilitator	Douglas	48, 10.9%	44, 22.7%	14, 0%	224, 0.2%
Restorative Justice	Douglas	14, 1.8%	3, 100%	-	241, 0.1%
Police Athletics for Community Engagement	Douglas	1130, 0.2%	1788, 0.2%	69, 0%	113, 0.9%
Community Alternatives to Suspension	Douglas	14, 12.1%	1, 100%	-	-
Urban B.O.L.T	Douglas	101, 7.1%	88, 4.6%	34, 0%	86, 6.4%
YouTurn	Douglas	69, 22.3%	3, 100%	9, 0%	-
Character Strong SEL Program	Jefferson	1, 62.5%	-	-	-
El Centro de las Americas	Lancaster	373, 11.7%	374, 13.7%	245, 0%	372, 16.9%
Malone Community Center	Lancaster	110, 13.6%	-	-	-
Community Youth Services	Lancaster	90, 0.1%	90, 0.4%	89, 0%	90, 0.6%
5-0 Club (Community Policing)	Lancaster	39, 5.6%	62, 8.1%	-	12, 47.9%
Lighthouse	Lancaster	21, 3.3%	21, 7.6%	3, 0%	107, 1.9%
ACC Serving Immigrant and Refugee Youth	Lancaster	160, 12.8%	459, 2.4%	37, 0%	922, 0%
Girl Scouts Juvenile Justice Outreach	Lancaster	167, 6.8%	167, 2.8%	4, 0%	196, 1.0%

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)			
		Intake	Program_ Info	Scores	Activity
All-Access Pass	Lancaster	40, 35.8%	-	-	403, 0%
Asset Building	Lincoln	16, 0%	31, 0%	6, 0%	-
Changing Behaviors Alternative Program	Lincoln	98, 3.5%	94, 8.3%	55, 0%	290, 1.7%
Platte County Juvenile Services	Platte	68, 7.1%	67, 0%	-	1, 0%
1st Job	Seward	4, 9.4%	4, 45.0%	4, 0%	4, 25.0%
Behavioral Health	Sheridan	36, 1.7%	37, 6.0%	34, 0%	1, 100%

Table 34. Referral Services Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)		
		Intake	Charges	Referrals
Douglas County Juvenile Assessment Center	Douglas	39, 11.7%	47, 28.4%	53, 30.2%
Family Navigation	Douglas	27, 10.7%	-	3, 55.6%
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court Referral Services-Cedars	Sarpy	13, 1.7%	2, 100%	18, 33.3%
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court Referral Services-KVC	Sarpy	9, 7.4%	2, 100%	-
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court Referral Services-Omni	Sarpy	5, 2.2%	1, 100%	2, 0%

Table 35. School Based Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)			
		Intake	Attendance	Contacts	Activity
Zone Homework	Adams	71, 23.3%	116, 1.9%	-	-
Math/Science Tutor	Box Butte	14, 3.7%	4, 0%	-	-
School Resource Officer	Dakota	4, 9.8%	-	-	-
Dawes County School Social Work Program	Dawes	36, 8.9%	-	55, 2.6%	-
Creative Writing Program	Douglas	1, 52.2%	1, 0%	-	-
High School/Middle School Interventionist/SANKOFA	Hall	148, 3.6%	-	2158, 14.3%	-
School Interventionist	Howard	44, 24.1%	-	61, 1.9%	-
School Resource Officer	Howard	5, 19.1%	-	-	-

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)			
		Intake	Attendance	Contacts	Activity
FYI Center CASTLE Program	Jefferson	8, 25.0%	3, 40.0%	-	-
[56]	-	86, 0.8%	-	173, 0.3%	-
Lighthouse Afterschool Program/Lighthouse Alternative to Suspension Program	Lancaster	73, 5.1%	-	-	52, 0.5%
[57]	Lancaster	360, 52.4%	-	-	-
Madison County Day Reporting/Tutoring Services	Madison	201, 1.2%	793, 1.0%	-	-
Youth For Christ Out of School Suspension Program	Platte	24, 37.3%	24, 30.0%	-	-
[58]	Platte	59, 27.3%	64, 2.5%	-	-
School Interventionist	Saline	20, 2.8%	-	56, 0.8%	-
[59]	Saunders	1, 0%	1, 0%	-	-
SRO Gordon-Rushville Public Schools	Sheridan County	61, 6.7%	-	4, 35.7%	-
[60]	York	23, 17.2%	-	-	-

Table 36. Truancy Programs

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)				
		Intake	Pre_ Enrollment	Enrollment	Post_ Enrollment	Scores
Stars Truancy Program	Adams	92, 9.0%	149, 11.4%	174, 5.1%	33, 0.2%	30, 4.2%
Dawes County School Social Work Program	Dawes	3, 12.7%	2, 0%	2, 33.3%	-	1, 50.0%
Pathways to Success	Douglas	54, 13.0%	39, 5.3%	53, 5.0%	1, 80.0%	1, 0%
Youth Attendance Navigators	Douglas	98, 15.8%	106, 4.7%	131, 9.2%	-	-
GOALS Center Family Advocate	Douglas	74, 3.2%	73, 0%	181, 0%	-	-
Truancy Diversion	Lancaster	1, 38.1%	-	-	-	1, 0%
Truancy Diversion	Lancaster	70, 6.0%	158, 0%	97, 0.1%	76, 0%	173, 5.2%
Truancy Diversion	Lancaster	48, 7.2%	105, 26.3%	69, 27.1%	39, 33.5%	57, 1.8%

[56] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[57] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[58] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[59] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type
[60] FY20/21, FY21/22, and FY22/23 databases do not reflect that this program was funded for this program type

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)				
		Intake	Pre_ Enrollment	Enrollment	Post_ Enrollment	Scores
Truancy Diversion	Lancaster	19, 6.3%	33, 0.2%	24, 0%	16, 4.1%	53, 0.5%
Truancy Diversion	Lancaster	21, 5.7%	52, 0%	36, 0%	14, 0%	32, 3.1%
Truancy Diversion	Lancaster	58, 7.2%	126, 0.4%	68, 0.9%	60, 0%	56, 0%
PASS Program-Truancy	Sarpy	128, 10.3%	198, 0.1%	147, 0.5%	4, 0%	1744, 0.1%
Truancy Mediation (Sherman)	Buffalo	11, 1.3%	18, 13.3%	8, 10.0%	8, 10.0%	1, 100%
Buffalo County Truancy	Buffalo	112, 10.4%	122, 1.9%	120, 0.6%	-	1, 100%
Burt County Diversion Program	Madison	12, 2.0%	31, 0%	6, 4.4%	-	-
Butler County Attendance Support Program	Seward	117, 2.2%	142, 0%	157, 0.5%	15, 4.0%	184, 2.2%
Truancy Program/Truancy Tracker	Cass	46, 20.5%	11, 4.2%	8, 34.2%	-	10, 7.5%
Truancy Program	Chase	20, 21.2%	18, 6.3%	16, 1.7%	-	24, 22.9%
Truancy	Cheyenne	25, 0.8%	18, 0%	16, 0%	14, 0%	22, 1.1%
Colfax County Truancy Program	Colfax	50, 18.7%	71, 0.9%	112, 2.5%	2, 0%	26, 75.0%
Cuming County Diversion Program	Madison	74, 4.0%	186, 0%	113, 0.5%	5, 0%	-
Diversion	Dakota	5, 0%	8, 5.8%	5, 6.7%	-	-
Deuel County Diversion	Cheyenne	2, 0%	1, 0%	1, 0%	1, 0%	2, 0%
Truancy Diversion	Dodge	66, 8.7%	29, 3.9%	35, 29.7%	-	31, 7.3%
Gage County Truancy Program	Gage	11, 25.1%	-	2, 0%	-	-
Hamilton County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion	Merrick	28, 12.1%	20, 25.7%	18, 25.6%	-	19, 75.0%
Harlan County Attorney's Office	Harlan	1, 19.1%	-	-	-	-
Holt County Truancy Prevention Program	Holt	23, 2.9%	25, 0%	34, 0%	-	-
Attendance Support	Jefferson	196, 15.9%	86, 0.2%	1, 0%	-	-
Kearney County Attorney's Office	Kearney	1, 47.6%	-	-	-	-
Kimball County Diversion	Cheyenne	1, 0%	2, 0%	1, 0%	-	-
Diversion	Lancaster	100, 21.1%	72, 15.6%	98, 9.9%	3, 31.1%	733, 0.3%
Diversion	Lincoln	3, 7.9%	4, 35.0%	1, 46.7%	-	-

Program	County	Screens (n, average % missing)				
		Intake	Pre_ Enrollment	Enrollment	Post_ Enrollment	Scores
Madison County Truancy Program	Madison	50, 5.6%	89, 1.8%	79, 0.8%	-	-
Attendance Matters	Merrick	53, 10.3%	55, 9.1%	46, 9.9%	-	9, 75.0%
Nance County Diversion (Central Nebraska Diversion)	Merrick	14, 13.3%	13, 24.6%	13, 26.7%	-	11, 75.0%
Nemaha County Diversion	Richardson	4, 23.8%	2, 80.0%	-	-	-
Mediation Truancy Conferences Attendance Advocate/Truancy Tracker	Otoe	63, 1.7%	63, 2.8%	94, 0.4%	31, 0%	1, 0%
Attendance Monitor	Platte	40, 14.6%	20, 6.3%	23, 7.8%	-	-
Richardson County Diversion	Richardson	2, 28.6%	-	-	-	-
ARRIVE	Saunders	94, 5.9%	116, 0%	133, 0.1%	40, 0%	358, 1.3%
Scotts Bluff County Diversion	Scotts Bluff	26, 5.3%	27, 17.0%	10, 9.3%	20, 2.3%	148, 0%
Seward County Attendance Support Program	Seward	121, 1.3%	143, 0%	157, 0.2%	3, 0%	204, 0%
Stanton County Diversion	Madison	1, 71.4%	-	-	-	-
Thayer County Attendance Support	Jefferson	38, 7.1%	12, 0%	2, 26.7%	-	1, 75.0%
Juvenile Diversion Coordinator	Washington	11, 31.2%	-	-	-	-
Truancy	York	25, 10.5%	3, 33.3%	5, 60.0%	2, 63.3%	5, 55.0%

JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY
AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Juvenile Justice Institute
Email: unojji@unomaha.edu
juvenilejustice.unomaha.edu
jjinebraska.org

The University of Nebraska does not discriminate based on race, color, ethnicity, national origin, sex, pregnancy, sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, disability, age, genetic information, veteran status, marital status, and/or political affiliation in its education programs or activities, including admissions and employment. The University prohibits any form of retaliation taken against anyone for reporting discrimination, harassment, or retaliation for otherwise engaging in protected activity.