

2019

## Annual Report 2019: Triumphs and Challenges of the Evidence-based Nebraska Project and Examining Youth Served by Community-based Aid Programs Funded in FY 15/16

Erin Wasserburger

Lindsey Wylie

*University of Nebraska at Omaha, slwylie@unomaha.edu*

Anne M. Hobbs

*University of Nebraska at Omaha, ahobbs@unomaha.edu*

Marcus Woodman

Juvenile Justice Institute, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/jjireports>

---

### Recommended Citation

Wasserburger, Erin; Wylie, Lindsey; Hobbs, Anne M.; Woodman, Marcus; and Juvenile Justice Institute, University of Nebraska at Omaha, "Annual Report 2019: Triumphs and Challenges of the Evidence-based Nebraska Project and Examining Youth Served by Community-based Aid Programs Funded in FY 15/16" (2019). *Reports*. 35.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/jjireports/35>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Juvenile Justice Institute at DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).



# EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA

## ANNUAL REPORT 2019

Triumphs and Challenges of the  
Evidence-based Nebraska Project and  
Examining Youth Served by Community-based  
Aid Programs Funded in FY 15/16

Erin Wasserburger  
Lindsey Wylie, J.D., Ph.D.  
Anne Hobbs, J.D., Ph.D.  
Marcus Woodman

UNIVERSITY OF  
**Nebraska** |   
Omaha

# **Evidence-Based Nebraska 2019 Annual Report:**

## **Triumphs and Challenges of the Evidence-based Nebraska Project and Examining Youth Served by Community-based Aid Programs Funded in FY 15/16**

**Erin Wasserburger**

**Lindsey E. Wylie, J.D., Ph.D.**

**Anne Hobbs, J.D., Ph.D.**

**Marcus Woodman**

This project is supported by Contract CC-19-680 awarded by the Nebraska Crime Commission. Points of view or opinions contained in this document are those of the author 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 .....	1
Evidence-based Nebraska Timeline .....	3
History and Process of Evidence-based Nebraska .....	4
Initially-Funded Programs (2015) .....	5
Triumphs and Challenges .....	6
Creating the Juvenile Case Management System (JCMS) and Data Collection .....	8
Initial Lack of Understanding by Programs .....	10
Staff Turnover .....	10
Missing Data in JCMS .....	10
Counties with CBA-funded Programs (2019) .....	14
Continuum of Services .....	16
Juvenile Justice System Involvement .....	17
Juvenile Detention Centers of Nebraska .....	17
Future System Involvement by Program Type .....	18
Promotion/Prevention .....	19
Direct Events .....	23
Incentives .....	25
Afterschool .....	26
Mentoring .....	27
School Interventionists .....	29
Alternative Schools .....	30
School Resource Officers .....	31
Family Support .....	32
Assessment and Referral Services .....	34
Mental Health .....	36
Crisis Response .....	37
Truancy/Absenteeism .....	39
Diversion .....	42
Mediation/Restorative Justice .....	45
ATD: Electronic Monitoring .....	46
ATD: Tracker .....	48
ATD: Reporting Centers .....	50
ATD: Shelter Care .....	51
Reentry .....	52
Appendix	
A: Continual Funding of Programs as of October 31, 2019 .....	53
B: Definition of Future System Involvement for the Purposes of Community-based Aid Evaluation .....	69

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As of 2019, the Evidence-based Nebraska project (EB-Nebraska) has been funded for four years. Sometimes, in the excitement to analyze data and generate reports, as researchers, we forget to take a step back and relish in the process that got us here. We also thought it would be important to document this process in an effort to inform other jurisdictions thinking of developing a statewide evaluation such as this. Furthermore, we hope that by better understanding the process behind EB-Nebraska, the reader may leave with a stronger appreciation for the work that the State of Nebraska is doing for Nebraska’s young people. Now that four years have passed, we thought it ripe to examine EB-Nebraska with a wide angle lens.

The aim of this report is twofold:

First, we summarize EB-Nebraska, including the process for classifying programs into program types, building the Juvenile Case Management System (JCMS), training program staff on common definitions and entering data, and the ongoing process of improving the quality of data entered.

Second, we examine the trajectory of youth who were served by Community-based Aid (CBA) funded programs in the first year of the project (FY 15/16); specifically, whether they moved deeper into the juvenile or adult criminal system by being filed on in court, having an intake at probation, or being admitted to a secure or staff secure detention facility (Neb.Rev. Stat. § 43-2404.02(b)).

Although we have accomplished several things over the past four years, there is still room for growth. As any large project that includes the three branches of government and a university might, EB-Nebraska has experienced both triumphs and challenges. While the ultimate goal is to determine “what works” in juvenile justice programming, there are methodological and data reasons that can limit conclusions. The gold standard for evaluating “what works” is an experiment where youth are randomly assigned to receive an intervention or not. This can be a difficult methodology to implement within juvenile justice because random assignment can feel unfair to those not receiving the intervention (or visa versa). To overcome this challenge, researchers are urged to collect information about the youth and program to control for any factors (e.g., juvenile’s risk level, demographics, program specifics) that may influence outcomes and then report any limitations.

While there are limitations to the data and research design, there is no doubt that EB-Nebraska has contributed to improvements for young people in Nebraska despite challenges. Using our wide angle lens, in the last four years the Nebraska Crime Commission (NCC) and the Juvenile Justice Institute (JJI) have created a secure online data entry system (i.e., JCMS) that captures variables based on scientific research literature for 24 program types and approximately 50,000 youth served by CBA-funded programs. From this data, JJI has generated four annual reports, several program-specific evaluations (e.g., diversion, truancy, mentoring, alternatives to detention programs, school resource officers), as well as specific research question-based reports (e.g., diversion drug testing policies and outcomes, reliability and validity of assessment tools, approaches for retaining and recruiting higher risk youth, and evidence-based principles

for promotion/prevention programs).

In addition to reports and research briefs, however, there have also been less tangible gains. Although not inclusive of all youth-serving programs in Nebraska, we currently know the number of youth served in the state under the Community-based Aid fund, by whom, and when. For CBA-funded programs, we now know where state dollars are going and there is strong effort to ensure those dollars are being spent on quality youth programming. While in the early years of EB-Nebraska some program staff did not always understand the value of entering individual-level data for the purposes of evaluation, over the last four years, program staff have increased their awareness and implementation of evidence-based practices and better understand the importance of evaluation.

In the pages that follow, we provide a brief overview of the implementation of EB-Nebraska, including both policy and practical milestones. Then, we provide a descriptive analysis of the youth served, as well as the varying measures of future system involvement for each program funded during FY 15/16. Although statute requires that the “effectiveness” of programs be determined by “recidivism” and “other measures,” most of the EB-Nebraska publications to date have included “recidivism” (a term we have redefined as “future system involvement,” as discussed later) as an outcome measure. Moving forward, however, we intend to broaden the scope of EB-Nebraska to include “other measures” because future system involvement is a limiting measure of program effectiveness. In addition to preventing youth from moving deeper into the system, programs hope to improve academic outcomes, youth well-being, parental and adult support, connections to needed services, reduce delinquency, prevent substance abuse, improve feelings of hope, and others. In the coming months and years, we will be expanding data collected for EB-Nebraska to include attitude and behavioral measures to supplement the measure of future system involvement.

In addition to broadening the scope of what is collected, we hope to also more efficiently calculate future system involvement with the completion of the common dataset as designated in statute. Currently in Nebraska, the various state data systems (court, probation, detention) do not link electronically. Although it is possible to match names and dates of birth that are exact matches, there are often misspellings, nicknames, mistyped dates, hyphenated last names, and other data entry nuances that make direct matches less valid. As such, the Juvenile Justice Institute has calculated future system involvement for all youth served by CBA-funded programs each year of the project (FY 15/16, FY 16/17, FY 17/18, FY 19/20) using probabilistic matching software (e.g., LinkPlus) by matching youth served by CBA-funded programs to each of the other data systems using name and date of birth. Once cases are identified as potential matches, a person must then further make a decision of whether the person is indeed a match. As such, calculating future system involvement by hand is a time-intensive task. In the months and years to come, however, this process will become more efficient with the completion of the common dataset, which will link youth entered into JCMS to these other data systems for the purposes of research.

With these exciting advancements on the horizon, we look forward to continuing to improve outcomes for Nebraska’s young people.

## EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA TIMELINE

To illustrate the ongoing efforts of the Evidence-based Nebraska project, we created a timeline of events that spans the bottom of pages 3 to 15.

Specifically, we provide a detailed process of how JJI and the NCC developed the JCMS, starting with categorizing programs into types and then selecting variables based on scientific literature to build a tailored data collection screen for each program type (see program types on p.16). As part of our ongoing communication with programs about the JCMS, we also detail any follow-up trainings and dialogues aimed at improving data collection.

We denote important legislative and policy changes, as well as all reports and publications that have emerged from the Evidence-based Nebraska project to date. We also include other important events—such as official statements from government agencies and detention facility closings. The legend below displays the categorized events by color:

## EVIDENCE-BASED NEBRASKA TIMELINE

JCMS Development
JJI Trainings & Dialogues
Legislation & Policy Changes
JJI Reports and Publications

**LB 1167:** Nebraska requires all counties to have a three-year comprehensive juvenile services plan completed by June 2001.

2000

Nebraska creates the County Juvenile Services Aid (County Aid) fund for communities to use for juvenile programs identified in the community plan, administered by the Office of Juvenile Services.

2001

**LB 640:** Nebraska creates funds to assist counties in developing comprehensive juvenile services plan administered by the Nebraska Crime Commission (NCC).



The first four years of this project had many challenges and triumphs as the processes became more refined and users adjusted to the JCMS and data entry requirements of the grant.

**Triumphs:**



- Creation of the JCMS
- Common definitions and statewide training
- Increased satisfaction by program staff with data entry
- Programs utilizing evidence-based practices and curriculums
- Evidence-based Nebraska Resource website (<https://www.jjinebraska.org>)

**Challenges:**

- Initial lack of understanding by program staff of JCMS and data concerns over youth privacy
- Staff turnover within funded programs
- Missing individual youth data in the JCMS
- Lack of continual funding during the year or from year to year (see Appendix A)

“A pessimist sees the **difficulty** in every opportunity; an optimist sees the **opportunity** in every difficulty.”

**Winston Churchill**



## CREATING THE JUVENILE CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JCMS) AND DATA COLLECTION

The vision for the Evidence-based Nebraska project follows the idea that evaluation moves along a continuum.<sup>1</sup> First, program staff are informed of the importance of collecting and analyzing outcomes, but over time, program staff become invested in the evaluation process and begin to internalize the importance of measuring program outcomes. Eventually, program staff become engaged in analyzing their own outcomes more effectively.


To perform the statewide evaluations, JJI worked with the University of Nebraska Omaha College of Information Science and Technology (IS&T) and the Nebraska Crime Commission to build the Juvenile Case Management System (JCMS), a data entry system that utilizes common definitions across programs. For each juvenile served by CBA-funded programs, program staff enter demographic information and the activities and/or programming the youth participated in while enrolled in the program.

Before designing the JCMS, programs requesting funding were classified into program types and subtypes so that the JCMS would be built to include outcomes relevant to that program type. For example, a program with the goal of increasing school attendance is classified as an absenteeism program; a program with the goal of assessing a juvenile's risk and needs to provide appropriately-tailored services is classified as an assessment program.

Next, JJI performed literature reviews for each program type and generated a list of control and outcome variables. To ensure we included all relevant variables, program staff were included in the process of selecting variables via conference calls and webinars. Mock JCMS data entry interfaces ("screens") were created and program staff were again given an opportunity to provide feedback on the variables collected. Once the JCMS screens were built and went "live" (be available for users to enter data in the JCMS), JJI provided common definitions for each field, user guides, and additional training (e.g., webinars, phone calls, or in-person sessions).

Each program type was built into the JCMS sequentially using the above steps to allow for immediate data entry once the JCMS screen for that program type was complete. While a JCMS screen was being developed for a particular program type, a temporary reporting system was created to meet statutory obligations and capture youth demographics using spreadsheets. Once a spreadsheet was completed, users uploaded them to a secure site. When a screen went live in the JCMS, JJI staff pulled together all the spreadsheets for that program type and provided them to IS&T to upload individual level data into the JCMS. Because first name, last name, and date of birth are required to create a new youth case in the JCMS, spreadsheets missing these fields could not be saved in the JCMS; thus, some earlier cases were not retained.

<sup>1</sup> Newman, E., & Baharav, H. (2018). Where data lead, success follows. *The Learning Professional*, 39(5), 54-59.





## INITIAL LACK OF UNDERSTANDING BY PROGRAMS

Some program had parents raise concerns about their child's name being listed in a dataset maintained by the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. Parents indicated that they felt their child would be labeled as delinquent. Both JJI and individual programs worked to educate parents on the purpose of JCMS, as well as the fact that it is not accessible to the public.

A secondary question was raised by specific program types regarding compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). JJI worked closely with NCC and legal counsel to ensure that programs were not violating federal law in their compliance with Nebraska law.

## STAFF TURNOVER

Individuals who staff juvenile justice programs are often paid a relatively low rate of pay, and work long hours, including weekends. People fill these positions because they care about youth, not for the large paycheck or the ideal hours. However, eventually it begins to wear on staff and managers alike, and the result is a relatively high rate of staff turnover. JJI is responsible for keeping staff certificates up to date and training new staff and managers that work with JCMS data. On average, every quarter there are new staff entering the field who require training and new certificates.

## MISSING DATA IN JCMS

### In-Person Trainings and Dialogues

When most of the JCMS screens were available for data entry in June 2017 (two were remaining), we began work on improving the quality and completeness of the data being entered into


the JCMS because JJI observed that many key variables were either missing or had low completion rates. To do so, JJI hosted eight in-person trainings (termed "dialogues") held in several statewide locations in FY 17/18. The goal of these trainings was to meet with program staff from each of the program types to discuss missing data and any barriers staff have for gathering data to formulate consensus-based solutions. Following the trainings, we modified the JCMS screens for each program type so data collection would be more accurate and efficient.

## Required Variables


During the in-person trainings, program staff expressed feeling burdened by both data entry and serving youth; we were often asked, "What variables are absolutely required?" While we think that all variables in the JCMS are important and play a role in the evaluation of programs, there is a process in balancing what researchers want to measure (everything!) and program staff time. As such, NCC and JJI denoted required variables, effective FY 18/19, and provide quarterly missing data reports (with a timeframe of the previous four quarters/one year) to each program so staff can update any missing required data. After each report, JJI staff contacts program staff to follow up on why data is missing. Reasons reported for missing data include inadvertently leaving it blank or difficulty in obtaining the necessary information from referral sources. When necessary, JJI staff provide technical support to assist with data completion. Thus far, the missing data reports appear to be worthwhile. The number of required variables missing decreased within the first year of utilizing them; program staff also reported the process helped them become more familiar with the required variables and update cases more efficiently.

## Lack of Continual Funding

In addition to missing data within cases, there are other systematic reasons data may be lacking. One of the greatest challenges of the Evidence-based Nebraska project has been the fluctuation of programs that receive CBA funding because the grant cycle is annual and communities



(counties and tribes) may apply to fund new programs each grant cycle. Furthermore, if communities have additional funds to spend in a given year, they may request to fund a program for part of the year. As such, some programs are only funded for a year or a partial year, while others may come and go from year to year. This lack of continual funding can be problematic for completing an evaluation because programs only enter data while they are funded, so JCMS can lack complete case information for these programs (e.g., cases never get discharged). Furthermore, the shorter period means a smaller case size, resulting in a less reliable evaluation of the program. Appendix A displays how programs may move through the funding cycles from July 1, 2015 through July 1, 2019. As you can see, there are differences across communities in how they decide to fund programs. While some communities have funded the same programs for five years (including the current FY), others demonstrate more fluctuation. A solution for this is to reconsider the current policies and practices surrounding the one year grant cycle and ability to perform grant adjustments during the funding period.



**July:** System Improvement data entry screens go live in JCMS.

- JJI releases Nebraska Mentoring Programs Evaluation.

- Required variable policy in effect at the start of the fiscal year.

**August:** JJI and the NCC release *Evidence-based Brief #2: Preventing Delinquency and Promoting Prosocial Activities*.

**September:** Mediation/Restorative Justice program data entry screens go live in JCMS.

- Incentive programs determined to be a sub-type of Promotion/Prevention; JCMS modified.

- JJI releases process report for Family Support, Mental Health, Crisis Response, Assessment, and System Improvement programs.

- Assessment screens updated based on user feedback from training/dialogue.


**October:** Programs receive initial missing data report; JJI contacts all programs missing a specific threshold of data to offer technical assistance for identifying and updating any missing required variables in JCMS.

- JJI and the Community Planning Subcommittee create the definition of “future system involvement for CBA evaluations” (Appendix B) because the Nebraska Supreme Court definition of “recidivism” was determined to be inappropriate for this population.

**November:** JJI releases *Evidence-based Nebraska Annual Report* for youth served during FY 16/17.

- Programs receive next missing data report.

# COUNTIES WITH CBA-FUNDED PROGRAMS (2019)



The map to the left highlights counties with CBA-funded programs as of October 31, 2019. Within each county, the number of programs is also represented. Some counties serve programs in multiple, different counties; in these cases, only the lead county is represented here.

The Panhandle Partnership is a collection of 11 counties: Banner, Box Butte, Cheyenne, Dawes, Deuel, Garden, Kimball, Morrill, Scotts Bluff, Sheridan, and Sioux. Of those, Box Butte, Cheyenne, Dawes, Scotts Bluff, and Sheridan receive CBA funding, and part of those funds goes towards the Panhandle Partnership as a whole.

**January:** ATD screens updated in the JCMS based on feedback from users at training/dialogue.

**April:** JJI and NCC re-release *Evidence-based Nebraska Brief #3: Drug Testing in Juvenile Diversion Programs*.

**February:** Programs receive next missing data report.

**May:** Programs receive next missing data report.


- Email from the Federal Department of Education confirms schools may provide individual youth data under FERPA.
- JJI completes *Recruiting and Retaining Higher Risk Youth in Promotion and Prevention Programs* report.

- June:** JJI completes *Reliability and Predictive Validity of Screener/Assessment Tools in Nebraska Juvenile Diversion* evaluation.
- JJI completes *School Resource Officer Contacts and Perceptions* evaluation.
  - JJI completes *Preventing Delinquency and Promotion Prosocial Activities* evaluation.

- Moving Forward:**
- Broadening the scope of EB-NE to include "other measures"
  - Completion of the common data set with NCC

2019

# CONTINUUM OF SERVICES



## EXAMINING YOUTH SERVED BY CBA PROGRAMS FUNDED IN FY 15/16


When requesting funds under CBA, communities focus on ensuring there is a continuum of services available in their area. To do so, communities assess areas of highest need, find any gaps in services that may exist, and request funds for programming to address those needs and gaps. Communities have funded a range of programs along this continuum of services, from preventive programs aiming to provide support, reduce the presence of criminogenic risk factors, and increase protective factors; to intervention programs where youth are not yet system involved but higher risk, to programs aiming to avoid formal system involvement, and to programs/processes keeping youth from moving deeper into the juvenile justice system or adult system.

# JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT

Research has shown the unintended negative consequences of being involved in the juvenile justice system. As such, juvenile justice reform has included identifying programs and processes to prevent youth from entering the juvenile justice system, or moving deeper into the juvenile justice or adult criminal systems. There are a number of paths a juvenile may take once system involved. After being cited for a status offense<sup>2</sup> and/or law violation, a juvenile may be referred to court or to a juvenile diversion program based on the county attorney's recommendation. The county attorney will determine whether a youth is eligible for diversion or other programs based on that juvenile's offense, age, previous legal violations, and other mitigating or aggravating factors. Youth can then move deeper into the juvenile justice system after initial contact. Generally, this happens when they commit a new law violation; however, youth can also move deeper into the system by failing to meet the expectations or requirements at a specific point of the juvenile justice system.

For example, if a juvenile is referred to diversion and does not complete the intake, or does not comply with the agreement created during diversion, the case will generally go back through the court process and be filed on. By returning to court in this manner, the youth moves deeper into the system. Similarly, if a youth is placed on probation and repeatedly fails urine analyses, misses school, or does not comply with a court order, then probation may be revoked or the youth may be placed in detention for violating probation (i.e., technical violation)<sup>3</sup>. Another avenue for moving deeper into the system includes youth who miss a court date and are issued a warrant. By failing to comply, these youth often get one foot caught in the adult system and may move even deeper into the system.<sup>4</sup> When youth move deeper into the system, it is important to examine whether this is due to additional criminal behavior or simple adolescent noncompliance. A system's over-response can put youth on a pathway associated with increased criminality over their life course, including increased exposure to delinquent peers.

## JUVENILE DETENTION CENTERS OF NEBRASKA



Since 2015, two detention centers have closed: Scotts Bluff County (September 2016) and Lancaster County Staff Secure Facility (August 2017). The detention centers in Douglas, Sarpy, and Madison are open as of October, 2019.

<sup>2</sup> A status offense is an act that is only illegal because of a juvenile's age (e.g., curfew, truant).  
<sup>3</sup> Steinhard, D. (2006). Juvenile detention risk assessment: A practical guide to juvenile detention reform. The Annie E. Casey Foundation. Retrieved from <https://www.aecf.org/m/resourceimg/aecf-juvenile-detention-risk-assessment1-2006.pdf>  
<sup>4</sup> In 2019, the Nebraska Administrative Office of Probation introduced a matrix of graduated sanctions that may prevent youth from going to detention for technical violations. However, this policy change was not the practice for the years JJI received data.

## FUTURE SYSTEM INVOLVEMENT BY PROGRAM TYPE

To examine whether youth who participated in a CBA-funded program “moved deeper into the system” as required under statute, the Juvenile Justice Institute (JJI) examined whether youth referred in FY 15/16 had any future system involvement through various system points. For the purposes of this work, we examine whether each juvenile was filed on in court for a status offense and/or law violation. Although typically definitions of “recidivism” do not include status offenses, with this work we chose to also examine status offenses because youth with status offenses can often be pulled into the juvenile justice system following a status offense.

Under statute, the Juvenile Justice Institute is to evaluate “the effectiveness” of programs, including

- (i) The varying rates of recidivism, as defined by rules and regulations adopted and promulgated by the commission, and other measures for juveniles participating in community-based programs; and
- (ii) Whether juveniles are sent to staff secure or secure juvenile detention after participating in a program funded by the Community-based Juvenile Services Aid Program” (Neb. Rev. 43-2404.02).

The following tables show the rates of future system involvement of youth who were enrolled in CBA-funded programs during FY 15/16, including the rate at which youth progressed deeper into the juvenile and adult criminal justice system by being filed on in court (as a juvenile or adult), placed on juvenile probation, or placed in juvenile detention. To measure future system involvement, JJI matched youth entered into the JCMS to data obtained from three sources over a three year timeframe. Three years was selected as the timeframe to ensure enough time has passed for a juvenile to move deeper into the juvenile and adult criminal justice system.<sup>5</sup>


- (1) Nebraska state court data to answer whether youth moved deeper into the system with a technical violation, warrant, or a new law violation
- (2) Nebraska juvenile probation to answer whether a youth came to probation for an intake
- (3) County detention centers three years post program discharge to answer whether youth were detained to either staff secure or secure detention facility

Maps in the upper-right corner of each program type page display which counties had at least one CBA-funded program of that type for FY 15/16.

<sup>5</sup> Appendix B includes the CBA definition for future system involvement. Please note that we deviated from the one year timeframe for future system involvement because of the longitudinal approach to this report. If being compared to other Evidence-based Nebraska reports, know that measuring future system involvement over a longer period of time may increase the percentage of youth with future system involvement by program.

## PROMOTION/PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Promotion/prevention programs use methods or activities to reduce or deter specific problem behaviors such as bullying, gang involvement, substance abuse, or to promote positive behaviors and outcomes. Promotion/prevention programs that aim to promote positive behaviors can focus on employment skills, life skills, or be pro-social activities that are designed to encourage youth to behave in ways that benefit others. Some Promotion/prevention programming can touch on different areas of promoting positive behaviors, while working to prevent the problem behaviors within the same program. Programs in this category will meet with youth on an ongoing basis over an extended period of time.



Often, the effectiveness of promotion/prevention programs is measured by whether problem behavior is reduced at the community level.<sup>6</sup> As such, promotion/prevention programs also have each juvenile complete a risk and protective factors survey, a modified version of the biannual Risk and Protective Factors Survey administered by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Bureau of Sociological Research (BOSR). JJI provides reports to each program that compares their aggregate youth data to community-level BOSR data. These reports are available upon request.

As the table displays, promotion/prevention programs serve youth who are at various levels of risk to enter the juvenile system. Between 0.0% and 38.9% of youth who completed a prevention or promotion program went on to have future system involvement because of a law violation. Similarly, some youth ended up in secure detention after participating in the program.

These data may be useful for programs to direct their programming. For example, 2.2% of one program’s youth later went on the run. Although this may be a phenomena unique to that cohort of youth, the program may wish to run one session directed at reasons youth run and how to prevent it.

While subsequent law violations and detention admission provide information on the trajectory of youth who participated in CBA programs, we should exercise caution when interpreting these results absent risk scores for youth served. Programs with high rates of future system involvement may have served very high risk youth and are not necessarily reflective of the program’s effectiveness.

Table 2. Promotion/Prevention Programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Horizon Lifeskills (n=18)	Adams	16.4	61.1	83.3	0.0	38.9	0.0	5.6	5.6	11.1	5.6
Alliance Public Schools Job Coach (n=31)	Box Butte	16.8	58.1	54.8	0.0	32.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CAST Program <sup>6</sup>	Buffalo										
Spirit Horse Ranch (n=18)	Cass	14.2	88.9	16.7	5.6	5.6	0.0	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Students Making Awesome Choices (n=105)	Cheyenne	- <sup>8</sup>	87.6	54.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hearts Program <sup>9</sup>	Custer										
Law Enforcement Recreation <sup>10</sup>	Garden										
Hamilton County Youth Center <sup>11</sup>	Hamilton										
5-0 Club (Community Policing) (n=45)	Lancaster	15.1	55.6	64.4	0.0	24.4	2.2	15.6	8.9	4.4	6.7
Latina Leaders (n=28)	Lancaster	13.5	0.0 <sup>12</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0
Joven Noble (n=72)	Lancaster	13.5	0.0 <sup>13</sup>	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Malone Leadership Academy (Talented Tenth) (n=17)	Lancaster	- <sup>14</sup>	0.0 <sup>15</sup>	100	0.0	17.6	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Malone Leadership Academy for Young Women (Strong and Smart Girls) (n=26)	Lancaster	-	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Community Youth Services (-)	Lancaster										
Project HIRE (-)	Lancaster										
The HUB <sup>16</sup> (n=1)	Lancaster	17.0	100	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
Shields Unite Program (sports with police) <sup>17</sup>	Lancaster										
Juvenile services/facilitator (n=12)	Lincoln	15.2	91.7	83.3	0.0	25.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	25.0
Asset Building (n=19)	Lincoln	11.3	89.5	26.3	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Youth Leadership Development (n=52)	Lincoln	11.2	84.2	38.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Community Connections <sup>18</sup> (n=34)	Lincoln	- <sup>19</sup>	59.6	29.4	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Changing Behaviors Alternative Program (n=23)	Lincoln	13.5	56.5	69.6	17.4	26.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	4.3
Crofton Youth Program (n=9)	Madison	10.1	55.6	55.6	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Voluntary Diversion <sup>20</sup>	Madison										
Junior Deputy Program <sup>21</sup>	Merrick										
Triumph Builders Club (n=1)	Platte	10.0	0.0 <sup>22</sup>	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0
Time for Change (n=12)	Platte	13.0	0.0 <sup>23</sup>	91.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Upward Movement <sup>24</sup>	Platte										
40 Developmental Assets (n=2)	Platte	- <sup>25</sup>	50.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Platte County Promotion/Prevention <sup>26</sup> (n=128)	Platte	13.3	28.1	25.0	0.8	3.1	0.0	2.3	0.8	0.0	0.8
Tribal Culture day camp <sup>27</sup>	Santee Sioux Nation										
4-H Afterschool Program <sup>28</sup>	Seward										
All Promotion/Prevention Programs (n=653)	State of Nebraska	13.6	46.2 <sup>29</sup>	49.5	1.5	7.5	0.2	2.5	1.2	0.9	1.7

**NOTES**

<sup>6</sup> Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P., & Hawkins, J. D. (2014). More evidence that prevention works: Communities that care significantly reduced substance abuse, delinquency, and violence through grade 12. *JAMA Pediatrics*; Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., & Davino, K. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American psychologist*, 58(6-7), 449.

<sup>7</sup> No individual level data entered

<sup>8</sup> No referral dates entered so unable to calculate age

<sup>9</sup> No referrals during FY 15/16

<sup>10</sup> No individual level data entered

<sup>11</sup> Unable to utilize data from this agency as they stated they were entering incorrect dates of birth if they did not know the real one

<sup>12</sup> 100% of the youth served are reported as Hispanic

<sup>13</sup> 100% of the youth served are reported as Hispanic

<sup>14</sup> No referral dates entered so unable to calculate age

<sup>15</sup> 70.6% of youth served are reported as Black, African American; the rest are "Multiple" or "Other" races

<sup>16</sup> There are two programs at The HUB - Community Youth Services and Project HIRE. There is no program name entered on this case in the JCMS to differentiate which program the youth participated in.

<sup>17</sup> No individual level data entered

<sup>18</sup> There are two programs at Community Connections - Asset Building and Youth Leadership Development. There are no program names entered on these 34 cases in the JCMS to differentiate which program the youth participated in.

<sup>19</sup> There are only five referral dates entered, so the mean age cannot be accurately calculated.

<sup>20</sup> No individual level data entered

<sup>21</sup> No individual level data entered

<sup>22</sup> The one youth served was reported as Hispanic

<sup>23</sup> 100% of the youth served are reported as Hispanic

<sup>24</sup> There are no cases with the program name "Upward Movement" in Platte County's data

<sup>25</sup> Only one of the two cases had an age calculation

<sup>26</sup> There are three programs in Platte County - Triumph Builders Club, 40 Developmental Assets, and Upward Movement. There are no program names entered on these 128 cases in the JCMS to differentiate which program the youth participated in.


<sup>27</sup> No individual level data entered

<sup>28</sup> No individual level data entered

<sup>29</sup> 31.7% of the youth served are reported as Hispanic

**DIRECT EVENTS**

Direct events, or one-time events, are a type of Promotion/Prevention activity with one occurrence; examples include guest speakers, movie nights, two- or three-day retreats, or community events. These events have the same goals of either reducing or deterring specific problem behaviors (or promoting positive behaviors and outcomes) that the ongoing Promotion/Prevention Programs have, but facilitators will only interact with the youth once during the event. Depending on the type of event, they are more likely to focus on one topic or area (e.g. speaker about drunk driving), although some events could cover more than one area of focus (e.g. a movie night about avoiding gangs while becoming involved in prosocial activities).




Direct events are unlikely to produce long-lasting deterrence from the juvenile justice system because the dosage of the intervention is low<sup>37</sup>; however, the intent is generally to help youth avoid a situation that could draw them into the system at the time of the event. Only one CBA Promotion/Prevention Program entered data for youth served, and the 23 youth involved in that program appear to have avoided subsequent juvenile justice involvement. These youth were 7th graders at the time of the program, so they would have been in 10th grade at the time of the future system involvement data extracts. This illustrates one of the challenges with measuring future system involvement as the primary outcome for Promotion/Prevention programs. Because youth are served prior to any system involvement, it is hard to know whether low future system involvement rates are due to program effectiveness, or because youth were just low risk of ever being involved in the juvenile or criminal justice systems.

Direct events have not been funded since FY 15/16. Because of the large number of youth served at direct events, data reporting requirements were cumbersome and some programs did not request funds in subsequent years. There were several discussions with direct event programs, JJI, and NCC on best methods for collecting youth data; however, these methods were not successful for these programs and the one direct event that requested FY 17/18 funding was denied for previous data non-compliance. In FY 19/20, the CBA grant review board determined that direct events do not have sufficient dosage to be evidence-based programs for preventing system involvement and will no longer be funded under CBA.

Table 3. Direct Events FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Save a Life Tour <sup>30</sup>	Adams										
Rocktober-fest <sup>31</sup>	Cheyenne										
7th Grade "Start Smart" Retreat (n=23)	Garfield	— <sup>32</sup>	100	65.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pure Performance <sup>33</sup>	Garfield										

## INCENTIVES



CBA funds in the FY 15/16 were utilized to offer incentives to youth for achieving a goal (e.g. free sporting event tickets for perfect attendance) or provide scholarships for youth who could not afford the fees. Currently, incentives are no longer a standalone program type, but instead are tracked under the Promotion/Prevention programs they are funded through.

As the table below indicates, incentives as standalone programs (as they were classified in FY 15/16) were not adequately tracked. The absence of data prevents us from any determination of the effectiveness of incentives. Ideally, an evaluation should consist of randomized assignment of incentives, across multiple programs, to see if they have an impact on youth outcomes. Although research indicates that positive reinforcement is more effective than punishment, incentives target short-term behavior and may not have lasting effects.

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Kindness Retreat (n <sup>34</sup> )	Howard										
Knox County Cares (n <sup>35</sup> )	Madison										
All Direct Event Programs (n=23)	State of Nebraska	- <sup>36</sup>	100	65.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

### NOTES

- <sup>30</sup> No individual level data reported in FY 15/16
- <sup>31</sup> No individual level data reported in FY 15/16
- <sup>32</sup> No referral date entered so age could not be calculated
- <sup>33</sup> Garfield County had data entered for Direct Events, but did not have the program name entered to differentiate between the two funded programs
- <sup>34</sup> No individual level data reported in FY 15/16
- <sup>35</sup> No individual level data reported in FY 15/16
- <sup>36</sup> No referral date entered so age could not be calculated
- <sup>37</sup> Lipsey, M. W., Howell, J. C., Kelly, M. R., Chapman, G., & Carver, D. (2010). *Improving the effectiveness of juvenile justice programs: a new perspective on evidence-based practice.*

Table 4. Incentives FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Motivational Reinforcement <sup>38</sup>	Box Butte										
Cheyenne County Community Center Youth Scholarships <sup>39</sup>	Cheyenne										
Paying for Diversion <sup>40</sup>	Garden										
Scholarships for Recreation <sup>41</sup>	Garden										
Stanton County Youth Program <sup>42</sup>	Madison										
Incentive Youth Trips <sup>43</sup>	Santee Sioux Nation										
Incentives <sup>44</sup>	Sarpy										
All Incentive Programs	State of Nebraska										


### NOTES

- <sup>38</sup> No individual level data reported
- <sup>39</sup> No individual level data reported
- <sup>40</sup> No individual level data reported
- <sup>41</sup> No individual level data reported
- <sup>42</sup> No individual level data reported
- <sup>43</sup> No referral, enrollment, or discharge dates reported to indicate that youth served during FY 15/16
- <sup>44</sup> Incentives were used for other CBA-funded programs and reported in the JCMS on those program types (e.g. EM)



## AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMS

Afterschool programs provide activities during the summer and after-school time frames to give youth a place to be engaged in constructive activity with the hopes of reducing juvenile crime. This can include tutoring services or other educational support for youth, but also offer supervised time when violent juvenile crime is highest after school hours when parental supervision is limited.<sup>45</sup> A meta-analysis found that afterschool programs improved behavior inside and outside the classroom, improved academic outcomes,<sup>46</sup> and reduced violent crime.<sup>47</sup>



While some afterschool programs served higher-risk youth based on subsequent legal contact (i.e., Zone Homework), the mean age statewide is low in terms of the scope of the CBA fund grant. Afterschool programs are likely most effective when the program is targeted to youth needing academic improvement, or older youth at risk of engaging in delinquency during the after school hours.

Table 5. Afterschool Programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Zone Homework (n=57)	Adams	11.4	31.6	54.5	1.8	5.3	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	1.8
Cool Kids/No Limits (n=364)	Cheyenne	- <sup>48</sup>	77.5	55.8	0.3	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Afterschool Program <sup>49</sup>	Otoe										
Seward County Youth Center (n=75)	Seward	10.5	84.0	48.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
All After-school Programs (n=496)	State of Nebraska	10.9	73.2	54.4	0.4	1.4	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.2

## NOTES

<sup>45</sup> U.S. DOJ. OJJDP Statistical Briefing Book.

<sup>46</sup> A Meta-Analysis of After-School Programs That Seek to Promote Personal and Social Skills in Children and Adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 45, 94-309.


<sup>47</sup> Thinking, Fast and Slow? Some Field Experiments to Reduce Crime and Dropout in Chicago. NBER

<sup>48</sup> No referral dates entered into the system, so age could not be calculated

<sup>49</sup> No individual level data entered

## MENTORING PROGRAMS

Mentoring programs match a young person (mentee) with a more experienced person who is working in a non-professional capacity (mentor) to provide support and guidance to the mentee in one or more areas of the mentee's development. There are four types of mentoring programs: Community (CB), Juvenile Justice (JJ), School-based (SB), and Youth Initiated Mentoring™ (YIM). Mentoring programs have been found to be an effective strategy for improving several outcomes, including behavioral, social, emotional, and academic domains.<sup>50</sup>



Overall, mentoring programs were serving younger youth in FY 15/16—especially community- and school-based programs, where the mean age ranged from 9.4 to 14.7. Many programs serve predominantly White youth, but YIM serves the non-white teenagers. TeamMates in Platte County serves a diverse elementary age population. It was difficult to estimate a profile of the youth served by a TeamMates' program because of the missing data. Some of these programs dropped out of the grant (and reporting requirements) and others were encouraged to serve older youth.

YIM is the only mentoring program (funded by CBA) that is serving juvenile justice-involved youth, which makes future system involvement a poor outcome measure for programs aimed at improving behavioral, social, emotional, and academic domains.<sup>56</sup> Although data indicates 10% of youth had a subsequent law violation, and 12.5% of youth were later placed in secure detention, this program is serving the highest-risk youth. We recommend uniformly assessing youth risk moving forward to provide a detailed profile of youth served in CBA-funded programs.

Table 6. Mentoring Programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Beyond School Walls (CB) (n=18)	Adams	16.6	77.8	77.8	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Friends Mentoring (CB) (n=133)	Buffalo	10.0	81.2	43.6	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8
TeamMates (SB) <sup>51</sup>	Buffalo										
Leadership in a Fun Environment (CB) <sup>52</sup>	Cass										
TeamMates (SB) <sup>53</sup>	Cheyenne										
Youth Initiated Mentoring™ (n=80)	Douglas	14.7	25.0 <sup>54</sup>	47.5	1.3	25.0	0.0	10.0	11.3	0.0	12.5

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Community Connections Mentoring (CB) (n=21)	Lincoln	10.8	66.7	33.3	4.8	4.8	0.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
TeamMates (SB) (n=2)	Lincoln	14.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
40 Assets Shipmates (SB) (n=21)	Platte	9.4	28.6	61.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TeamMates (SB) <sup>55</sup>	Saunders										
Centennial TeamMates (SB) (n=7)	Seward	9.5	100	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Mentoring Programs (n=282)	State of Nebraska	12.0	60.3	47.5	0.7	8.5	0.0	3.5	3.2	0.0	3.9

**NOTES**

<sup>50</sup> DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthron, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(2), 57-91.

<sup>51</sup> No individual level youth data entered.

<sup>52</sup> No individual level youth data entered.


<sup>53</sup> No individual level youth data entered.

<sup>54</sup> 48.8% of youth served reported as Black, African American.

<sup>55</sup> No individual level youth data entered.

<sup>56</sup> DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthron, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(2), 57-91.

**SCHOOL INTERVENTIONISTS**



At first, many of these programs were classified as truancy/absenteeism programs. However, over time we identified that school interventionists were doing more than attendance work. As such, we created a program type called “school interventionist.” School interventionists follow a social work model by identifying and coordinating behavioral or academic interventions for students in matters of attendance, poor grades, lack of engagement, or behavioral problems. The intervention can include other supports for the youth within the school or community.

Data indicate that school interventionists are working with youth with a higher risk profile than, for example, school resource officers. This is indicated by the higher mean age, higher diversity in the county, as well as subsequent contacts for law violations (compared to status offenses). A relatively high number of youth were later placed on probation and also eventually sent to a staff or secure detention facility.

School interventionists funded through CBA provide services in some of the most diverse counties in Nebraska. This is reflected in the populations served: 94.7% of youth served in Colfax County were non-white and 57.7% of youth served in Hall County were non-white. While Dawes County has a racially/ethnically diverse population, this is not reflected in the small number of youth served by the interventionist. Many of the youth served by the interventionists had later contact with law enforcement, probation, and detention.

Table 7. School Interventionists FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Colfax County Truancy Program (n=57)	Colfax	16.2	1.8 <sup>57</sup>	52.6	0.0	17.5	0.0	7.0	1.8	3.5	3.5
Dawes County Social Work Program (n=10)	Dawes	13.1	100	70.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
High school/middle school Interventionist (n=130)	Hall	13.9	36.9 <sup>58</sup>	60.0	1.5	10.8	0.0	8.5	3.8	3.8	0.8
All Interventionist Programs (n=197)	State of Nebraska	14.3	29.9	58.4	0.5	11.7	0.0	7.6	3.0	3.6	1.5


**NOTES**

<sup>57</sup> 94.7% of youth served were Hispanic

<sup>58</sup> 56.9% of youth served were Hispanic

## ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

Alternative schools are available for youth who have been expelled or suspended from their home school system to provide academic support. This helps them earn credits while waiting to return to school so they do not fall behind and can graduate in a timely manner. The best measures for evaluating the effectiveness are academic outcomes (grades, credit recovery, and graduation status); however, these measures are difficult to obtain.



Like school interventionists, alternative schools also serve higher-risk youth. Overall, youth were predominantly male and older, as compared to early intervention programs. A relatively high number of youth went on to commit a subsequent law violation. Some were placed on probation. Others were sent to a staff or secure facility.

Table 8. Alternative Schools FY 15/16


Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (M)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
BEST School <sup>59</sup>	Lancaster										
Madison County Day Reporting (n=83)	Madison	14.4	50.6	72.3	2.4	24.1	3.6	7.2	1.2	7.2	2.4
Youth for Christ Out of School Suspension Program (n=5)	Platte	13.6	20.0	100	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0
All Alternative School Programs (n=88)	State of Nebraska	14.3	48.9	73.9	3.4	23.9	3.4	8.0	2.3	6.8	3.4

### Notes

<sup>59</sup> No youth served during FY 15/16

## SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS

School resource officers (SROs) are career law enforcement officers with sworn authority who are assigned by the local law enforcement agency to work in collaboration with school and community-based organizations. The officer is on the school campus, and youth can be referred to the SRO for criminal activity, behavior problems, and/or academic issues.



The profile of youth served by CBA-funded school resource officers appears to be relatively low risk, but because data was not available in two of the larger SRO programs, this may not be an accurate reflection of the population SROs work with. Based on the data available, some of the youth went on to commit a law violation, and none of the youth served were later involved in status offenses. Similarly, none of the youth served in 2015-2016 were subsequently placed on probation or detained.

One of the concerns with SROs is that they may funnel youth into the “school-to-prison-pipeline;”<sup>60</sup> however, without school and law enforcement data, we cannot determine whether the funded SROs are increasing or decreasing the rate at which youth are referred to the juvenile justice system.

Table 9. School Resource Officers FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (M)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Hemingford School Resource Officer <sup>61</sup>	Box Butte										
Alliance School Resource Officer <sup>62</sup>	Box Butte										
School Resource Officer (n=2)	Howard	16.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SRO Gordon-Rushville Public School (n=72)	Sheridan	13.0	43.1 <sup>63</sup>	56.9	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All School Resource Officer Programs (n=74)	State of Nebraska	13.1	43.2	56.8	0.0	6.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

### Notes

<sup>60</sup> Fisher, B., W., & Hennessy, E. A. (2016). School resources officers and exclusionary discipline in US high schools: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Adolescent Research Review*, 1(3), 217-233.


<sup>61</sup> The school superintendent would not allow this program to report youth names and dates of birth to JJI or NCC

<sup>62</sup> The principal would not allow this program to report youth names and dates of birth to JJI or NCC

<sup>63</sup> 26.4% of youth served are reported as American Indian

## FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Family support programs are community-based services that help to promote the well-being of children and families, as well as increase the relationship strength and stability of families. The services can be for youth and/or parents, and can occur within the home or at community locations. Family support workers can help families work out communication issues, resolve school attendance problems, locate resources within the community to help the families meet the needs of all family members, or many other services that can be individualized for the youth and/or family's needs. There are four sub-types of family support programs: Parenting Class (PC), Advocacy (AV), Social Workers (SW), and Family Support (FS).



The majority of CBA-funded family support programs operate in the state's largest communities (Lancaster, Douglas, and Buffalo Counties). Some of these programs are directed at specialized populations. For example, some are providing support to refugee communities, like the Refugee Juvenile Justice Advocate, the Mother Daughter Circles, and the Sudanese Advocates. Other programs are working with youth involved in the foster care system, like Intensive Family Preservation, through Capstone or KVC. Having programs that support unique populations is important for a full continuum of juvenile services because it allows curriculum to be targeted to the specific needs of the youth involved. The hope is that by offering a more relevant program, youth are likely to attend and gain important skills that will help keep them out of our systems.

Table 10. Family Support Programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Parent Connectors (FS) <sup>64</sup>	Buffalo										
Juvenile Facilitator (PC) (n=25)	Buffalo	15.0	72.0	44.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0
Intensive Family Preservation (FS) <sup>65</sup>	Cass										
Refugee Juvenile Justice Advocate (AV) (n=43)	Douglas	14.4	0.0 <sup>66</sup>	65.1	2.3	27.9	0.0	9.3	9.3	0.0	7.0
Community Coaching - Owens (AD) (n=22)	Douglas	15.2	31.8	59.1	22.7	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0	4.5
Intensive Family Preservation - Capstone (FS) (n=25)	Douglas	14.6	40.0	44.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Intensive Family Preservation - KVC (FS) (n=17)	Douglas	14.9	35.3	29.4	0.0	29.4	0.0	0.0	17.6	5.9	5.9
Mother Daughter Circles (PC) (n=3)	Lancaster	12.3	0.0 <sup>67</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sudanese Program (AD) (n=15)	Lancaster	- <sup>68</sup>	0.0 <sup>69</sup>	46.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Youth for Christ (PC) (n=12)	Lancaster	17.2	58.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7
Social Worker (Public Defender's Office) (SW) (n=32)	Lancaster	15.3	59.4	34.4	3.1	15.6	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	6.3
Family Support (FS) (n=1)	Platte	15.0	100	0.0 <sup>70</sup>	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0
Family Nights (PC) <sup>71</sup>	Seward										
All Family Support Programs (n=195)	State of Nebraska	14.9	34.9	45.6	3.6	11.8	0.0	5.1	5.6	0.5	5.1

### NOTES

<sup>64</sup> No youth served during FY 15/16

<sup>65</sup> No youth served during FY 15/16

<sup>66</sup> 90.7% of youth served were Black, African American

<sup>67</sup> 66.7% of youth served were marked as "Unspecified" with regard to race

<sup>68</sup> No date of referrals entered so age could not be calculated

<sup>69</sup> 100% of youth served were Black, African American

<sup>70</sup> The one case entered had "Unspecified" selected for gender

<sup>71</sup> Data was not able to be uploaded from spreadsheets to JCMS in 2017 because of missing date of birth and/or name fields

## ASSESSMENT AND REFERRAL SERVICES

Assessment programs are a direct service program that meets with a youth a few times to conduct a singular service. Assessment programs evaluate the youth to identify mental health and/or behavioral risks and needs. Programs may use any number of different assessment tools to assess the risks and needs of the youth, and then provide recommendations for services for prevention and intervention. Assessment centers are a location where staff can meet with youth to complete the assessment. Referral services (RS) are agencies that help youth and families find services within their communities based on their assessed needs.




Table 11. Assessment and Referral Services Programs FY 15/16

Program*		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Assessment (n=25)	Adams	15.2	72.0	44.0	0.0	28.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Douglas County Juvenile Assessment Center (n=340)	Douglas	14.2	34.4	46.8	4.1	20.6	0.0	1.5	3.5	0.0	11.5
Douglas County Attorney's Office Alternatives Unit (RS) <sup>72</sup>	Douglas										
40 Developmental Assets Assessment <sup>73</sup>	Jefferson										
Assessment Specialist (n=828)	Lancaster	14.6	62.7	12.2 <sup>74</sup>	0.7	8.9	0.2	6.8	2.5	0.7	12.4
Assessment Specialist (n=22)	Platte	14.9	72.2	22.7	0.0	27.3	0.0	9.1	4.5	9.1	0.0
Mental/Behavioral Health/Substance Abuse Evaluations <sup>75</sup>	Sarpy										
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court Referral Services (RS) (n=13)	Sarpy	15.2	53.8	46.2	0.0	30.8	0.0	15.4	53.8	15.4	0.0

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Juvenile Assessment Center (n=1)	Scotts Bluff	13	0.0 <sup>76</sup>	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Assessment Programs (n=876)	State of Nebraska	14.6	55.1	13.5 <sup>77</sup>	1.6	12.9	0.3	6.7	2.5	0.9	11.8
All Referral Services Programs (n=13)	State of Nebraska	15.2	53.8	46.2	0.0	15.4	0.0	15.4	53.8	15.4	0.0

\* During FY15/16, JCMS did not collect whether the assessment was completed or not; therefore, data includes all referrals and not just those assessed, with the exception of Douglas County that provided this information separately.

### NOTES

<sup>72</sup> No cases entered in the JCMS - data feed from Douglas County system and the JCMS not built for this case type

<sup>73</sup> No individual level data reported

<sup>74</sup> 79.1% of cases entered had "Unspecified" as gender


<sup>75</sup> No individual data reported, may have been part of the diversion cases and reported within those profiles

<sup>76</sup> The one profile has race marked as "Multiple Races"

<sup>77</sup> 74.8% of cases entered have "Unspecified" as gender

## MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

Mental health programs work with youth to promote coping skills and well-being. CBA-funded mental health programs may be funded to provide assessment services for ongoing treatment. Although studies indicate that mental health issues alone do not increase risk of future system involvement,<sup>78</sup> treating a juvenile's mental health needs is a responsive treatment in conjunction with addressing their specific criminogenic needs.<sup>79</sup>



In the earlier years, these funds were not accessed for mental health services, but this has changed and increased over time. In FY 15/16, there were only five funded mental health programs ( $n = 54$  youth served). However, in the following years, the number of mental health programs has increased to 11 in FY 16/17 ( $n = 226$ ), 10 in FY 17/18 ( $n = 168$ ), and 12 in FY 18/19 ( $n = 384$ , an increase in part due to a newly-funded program in Douglas County). Some barriers may include finding therapists for rural areas, the expense of mental health services, and youth ability to access services (e.g. lack of transportation).

Table 12. Mental Health Programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Behavioral Health Services ( $n=4$ )	Douglas	15.8	50.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0
On-Site Mental Health Therapy ( $n=8$ )	Howard	11.5	100	62.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
School Based Therapy ( $n=34$ )	Lancaster	12.2	47.1	55.9	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pre-treatment Assessments for Diversion Youth <sup>80</sup>	Lancaster										
Mental Health Services ( $n=8$ )	Platte	13.9	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0
All Mental Health Programs ( $n=54$ )	State of Nebraska	12.6	53.7	53.7	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	1.9

### NOTES


<sup>78</sup> Guebert, A. F., & Olver, M. E. (2014). An examination of criminogenic needs, mental health concerns, and recidivism in a sample of violent young offenders: Implications for risk, need, and responsivity. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 13, 295-310; Wylie, L. E., & Rufino, K. A. (2018). The impact of victimization and mental health symptoms on recidivism for early system-involved juvenile offenders. *Law and Human Behavior*, 42, 558-569.

<sup>79</sup> Andrews, D. A., Zinber, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically-relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28(3), 369-404.

<sup>80</sup> No individual level data reported, may have been included as part of diversion data

## CRISIS RESPONSE PROGRAMS

Crisis response programs are made up of teams of individuals trained to intervene in cases where youth's health or safety is threatened, resolve serious conflicts between parents/guardians and the youth regarding the youth's conduct or disregard for authority, or runaway behavior. If necessary, law enforcement notifies the crisis response team (CRT) 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/those involved in the situation to come to a solution to make sure the youth and others are safe. The solution can include creating a safety plan with the youth and family, providing services to the youth and family to keep the youth at home, and/or placing the youth outside of the home. The CRT can also recommend services within the community to address the needs of the youth/family as part of the resolution process, and follow up with the family if needed.



Crisis response programs generally address an immediate issue, so one might argue that these programs are not designed to prevent later involvement in the system. Ideally, crisis response programs set a therapeutic response in motion that the family continues to access after the crisis has been resolved. Overall, relatively few youth later go on to have a new law violation, or be placed on probation, compared to youth involved in diversion, for example.

Table 13. Crisis Response Programs FY 15/16


Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M) <sup>81</sup>	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Family Crisis Mediation Team ( $n=13$ )	Cass	14.0	84.6	69.2	0.0	15.4	0.0	7.7	0.0	15.4	0.0
In-Home Crisis Response - Capstone ( $n=11$ )	Douglas	15.6	36.4	54.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
In-Home Crisis Response - KVC ( $n=16$ )	Douglas	- <sup>82</sup>	31.3	31.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	18.8	0.0	0.0
Emergency Respite Care - KVC <sup>83</sup>	Douglas										
Crisis Response - Early Intervention <sup>84</sup>	Red Willow										
Crisis Mediation Team ( $n=77$ )	Sarpy	15.1	76.6	59.7	1.3	6.5	1.3	10.4	3.9	1.3	0.0

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Crisis Response Team (n=6)	Saunders	- <sup>85</sup>	66.7	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7
All Crisis Response Teams (n=123)	State of Nebraska	- <sup>86</sup>	67.5	56.9	0.8	7.3	0.8	8.9	4.9	2.4	0.8
All Crisis Respite Programs <sup>87</sup>	State of Nebraska										

**NOTES**

- <sup>81</sup> Crisis response uses date of call to determine age of youth served
- <sup>82</sup> Only three cases had date of call; could not determine age of youth served
- <sup>83</sup> No individual level data entered into the system
- <sup>84</sup> No referrals during FY 15/16
- <sup>85</sup> Only one case had date of call; could not determine age of youth served
- <sup>86</sup> Due to number of cases missing age, state average could not accurately be calculated
- <sup>87</sup> No individual level data entered for one funded program during FY 15/16

**TRUANCY/ABSENTEEISM PROGRAMS**



Truancy/Absenteeism programs focus on students with attendance problems to prevent immediate system involvement (i.e., truancy filing) with diversion or improve school engagement and prevent future delinquency.

As the table indicates, truancy/absenteeism programs vary across the state, with the exception of age. Most truancy programs direct their efforts at teens. The racial and ethnic composition of the youth served tends to reflect the community where the program is located. For example, 90% of youth served in Butler County were White, while Douglas County programs have far greater diversity.

Truancy is often cited as a precursor to delinquency.<sup>88</sup> The data illustrates a similar pattern: many youth who participated in truancy/absenteeism programs had subsequent system involvement. Overall, future system involvement is not as high as for youth served in programs that are later in the continuum of services (e.g., diversion programs, see Table 15) and varied greatly by program, ranging from 3.9% to 50% of youth with future system involvement.

Truancy/Absenteeism programs also have shorter term goals, including increasing student attendance. CBA-funded truancy/absenteeism programs were evaluated (i.e., programs only had 1 year of attendance data) by the Juvenile Justice Institute and most programs successfully improved individual student attendance while students were in the program.<sup>89</sup> Next steps include analyzing data post-enrollment in a truancy/absenteeism program, including post-attendance, grades, and graduation.

Table 14. Truancy/Absenteeism Programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
STARS (n=42)	Adams	13.3	59.5	52.4	7.1	26.2	0.0	4.8	4.8	4.8	2.4
Buffalo County Truancy (n=123)	Buffalo	13.7	72.4	51.2	8.1	23.6	1.6	4.1	0.8	2.4	1.6
Butler County Attendance Support Program (n=43)	Butler	13.6	90.7	53.5	0.0	7.0	0.0	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
Truancy Diversion (n=4)	Cass	14.3	75.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Truancy Diversion (n=7)	Cheyenne	14.7	71.4	42.9	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Truancy Diversion (n=2)	Dakota	16.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dawes County School Social Work Program (n=11)	Dawes	14.6	18.2	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Truancy Diversion (n=17)	Dodge	14.5	88.2	35.3	5.9	47.1	5.9	5.9	0.0	11.8	0.0

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Truancy Diversion - JAC (n=226)	Douglas	14.7	29.2 <sup>90</sup>	51.8	22.6	16.8	0.0	6.2	11.1	0.0	14.2
Youth Attendance Navigators (n=52)	Douglas	16.1	0.0 <sup>91</sup>	67.3	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	5.8
ReConnect, Inc. - Triage Youth Program (n=35)	Douglas	15.3	8.6 <sup>92</sup>	34.3	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	8.6	0.0	17.1
Student-Staff Advocate and Truancy Prevention (n=58)	Gage	14.4	82.8	50.0	0.0	20.7	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Boyd County Truancy Prevention Program (n=13)	Holt	16.0	100	23.1	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Holt County Truancy Prevention Program (n=180)	Holt	15.3	78.3	44.4	0.0	9.4	0.6	1.7	0.0	0.6	0.6
Truancy Diversion (n=51)	Lancaster	13.6	37.3 <sup>93</sup>	25.5	2.0	3.9	0.0	3.9	5.9	2.0	5.9
Graduate Links Project (n=23)	Lancaster	16.3	39.1 <sup>94</sup>	65.2	0.0	21.7	0.0	4.3	8.7	0.0	13.0
Truancy Diversion (n=3)	Lincoln	15.0	100	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Madison County Truancy Program (n=46)	Madison	13.4	39.1 <sup>95</sup>	28.3	2.2	19.6	2.2	2.2	0.0	6.5	0.0
Attendance Monitor (n=12)	Merrick	15.6	100.	33.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Truancy Diversion (n=8)	Morrill	11.8	37.5 <sup>96</sup>	62.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5
Truancy Diversion (n=5)	Otoe	15.6	100	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Attendance Monitor (n=34)	Platte	13.3	32.4 <sup>97</sup>	47.1	8.8	14.7	0.0	8.8	0.0	5.0	0.0

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Attendance, Grades and Life Success Program (n=3)	Red Willow (Hayes)	14.3	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Truancy Diversion Program (n=23)	Santee Sioux Nation	15.2	0.0 <sup>98</sup>	56.5	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Truancy (n=58)	Sarpy	15.7	82.8	50.0	1.7	5.2	1.7	1.7	6.9	0.0	0.0
ARRIVE (n=31)	Saunders	13.2	100	48.4	3.2	6.5	3.2	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0
Truancy Diversion (n=87)	Scotts Bluff	13.1	26.4 <sup>99</sup>	47.1	5.7	13.8	1.1	0.0	1.1	3.4	0.0
Seward County Attendance Support Program (n=40)	Seward	14.7	77.5	50.0	2.5	17.5	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	2.5
Truancy Diversion (n=15)	Washington	14.2	80.0	60.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0
Truancy (n=10)	Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska	16.8	0.0 <sup>100</sup>	80.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HOPE (n=8)	York	11.9	75.0	37.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Truancy Programs (n=1278) <sup>101</sup>	State of Nebraska	14.5	54.0	47.6	6.3	15.0	0.7	3.4	3.7	1.6	4.2

**NOTES**

<sup>89</sup> Hobbs, A., Kotlaja, M., & Wylie, L. (2018). Absenteeism interventions: an approach for common definitions in statewide program evaluations. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, 1, 215-232.

<sup>90</sup> 31.0% of youth served are reported as Black, African American, and 31.9% of youth served are reported as Hispanic

<sup>91</sup> 88.5% of youth served are reported as Black, African American

<sup>92</sup> 54.3% of youth served are reported as Black, African American

<sup>93</sup> 33.3% of youth served are reported as Hispanic

<sup>94</sup> 30.4% of youth served are reported as "Multiple Races"

<sup>95</sup> 30.4% of youth served are reported as Hispanic

<sup>96</sup> 37.5% of youth served are reported as Hispanic

<sup>97</sup> 61.8% of youth served are reported as Hispanic

<sup>98</sup> 100% of youth served are reported as American Indian

<sup>99</sup> 41.4% of youth served are reported as Hispanic


<sup>100</sup> 100% of youth served are reported as American Indian

<sup>101</sup> Includes youth served by county attorneys not receiving CBA funding



## DIVERSION PROGRAMS

Diversion programs divert low-risk youth with minor law violations from the juvenile system by connecting them to needed services or no services. In Nebraska, if diversion is completed successfully, the youth's charges are either dismissed or not filed in court.



Almost 20% of the 3,198 youth who completed a diversion program had subsequent law violations. Roughly 4% ended up on probation for a new law violation. One interesting pattern was that using warning letters as a means of early diversion had one of the lowest rates of later law violation, but a relatively high percent of later placement in detention (3.5%).

Table 15. Diversion Programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Teen Court and Diversion (n=94)	Adams <sup>102</sup>	16.4	74.5	62.8	1.1	25.5	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	1.1
Box Butte County Diversion (n=31)	Box Butte	15.3	77.4	61.3	0.0	19.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Buffalo County Diversion (n=233)	Buffalo	16.9	87.6	61.4	1.3	24.9	0.9	2.1	0.0	0.4	1.7
Diversion (n=34)	Cass	15.7	94.1	64.7	2.9	17.6	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Diversion (n=21)	Cheyenne	15.1	90.5	47.6	0.0	23.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colfax County Diversion (n=43)	Colfax	15.1	20.9 <sup>103</sup>	51.2	0.0	20.9	0.0	4.7	2.3	0.0	2.3
Healing Hearts and Families (n=42)	Custer <sup>104</sup>	17.0	90.5	71.4	0.0	26.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Diversion (n=62)	Dakota	14.9	40.3 <sup>105</sup>	45.2	3.2	21.0	1.6	1.6	3.2	1.6	0.0
Teen Court	Dakota										
Dawson County Diversion (n=13)	Dawson	15.8	7.7 <sup>106</sup>	38.5	0.0	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Diversion Crossover Youth (n=86)	Dodge	15.7	87.2	60.5	1.2	22.1	0.0	3.5	2.3	3.5	0.0


Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Warning Letters (n=199)	Douglas	15.1	56.3	54.8	0.0	6.5	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	3.5
Diversion (n=840)	Douglas	15.2	45.4	54.6	2.1	20.6	0.2	7.3	6.0	0.4	12.9
Juvenile Diversion/Community Service (n=77)	Gage	16.4	90.9	50.6	1.3	32.5	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.6
Diversion (n=3)	Garfield	16.7	100	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hall County Pre-trial Juvenile Diversion Program (n=255)	Hall	15.4	57.6	66.3	0.8	33.3	0.4	5.9	1.2	2.7	1.6
Jefferson County Diversion Program (n=2)	Jefferson	17.0	100	100	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Diversion (n=3)	Kimball	9.7	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Diversion (n=643)	Lancaster	15.2	49.1	60.5	1.6	24.4	0.2	4.0	2.3	0.5	2.5
Diversion (n=59)	Lincoln	15.0	88.1	55.9	3.4	37.3	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.7	5.1
Antelope County Diversion Program (n=4)	Madison	16.3	100	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Boone County Diversion Program (n=8)	Madison	15.1	100	87.5	0.0	37.5	0.0	12.5	0.0	12.5	0.0
Burt County Diversion Program (n=16)	Madison	16.0	87.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cuming County Diversion Program (n=10)	Madison	15.1	100	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
Madison County Diversion Program (n=163)	Madison	16.4	66.9	60.1	2.5	19.6	1.8	3.1	0.6	4.3	1.2

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Stanton County Diversion (n=13)	Madison	12.9	46.2 <sup>107</sup>	100	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	0.0	15.4	0.0
Central Nebraska Diversion (n=21)	Merrick <sup>108</sup>	16.3	95.2	52.4	0.0	38.1	0.0	9.5	0.0	4.8	0.0
Diversion (n=22)	Morrill	15.5	81.8	68.2	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Juvenile Diversion (n=25)	Otoe	15.8	92.0	52.0	0.0	24.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Platte Valley Diversion Program (n=145)	Platte	15.3	57.2	55.9	1.4	22.1	0.0	5.5	1.4	3.4	0.7
Diversion (n=38)	Red Willow <sup>109</sup>	16.7	92.1	63.2	5.3	23.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Diversion (n=37)	Richardson <sup>110</sup>	16.8	91.9	48.6	0.0	21.6	0.0	2.7	0.0	2.7	0.0
Diversion (n=460)	Sarpy	15.6	71.1	57.6	2.2	20.9	0.2	3.9	5.0	2.4	3.5
Teen Court	Sarpy										
Diversion (n=104)	Scotts Bluff	15.3	55.8	54.8	3.8	23.1	0.0	3.8	1.0	1.0	5.8
Juvenile Diversion Coordinator (n=42)	Washington	15.5	90.5	57.1	0.0	38.1	2.4	9.5	2.4	9.5	2.4
All Diversion Programs (n=4116)	State of Nebraska <sup>111</sup>	15.6	62.9	58.1	1.6	22.4	0.4	4.1	2.6	1.3	4.2

**NOTES**

- <sup>102</sup> Includes Clay, Nuckolls, and Fillmore County diversion
- <sup>103</sup> 76.7% of youth served are reported as Hispanic
- <sup>104</sup> Includes Greeley and Valley County diversion
- <sup>105</sup> 41.9% of youth served are reported as Hispanic
- <sup>106</sup> 76.9% of youth served are reported as Hispanic
- <sup>107</sup> 46.2% of youth served are reported as Hispanic
- <sup>108</sup> Includes Nance County diversion
- <sup>109</sup> Includes Chase, Dundy, Furnas, Hayes, and Hitchcock County diversion
- <sup>110</sup> Includes Nemaha and Pawnee County diversion
- <sup>111</sup> Includes diversion programs which do not receive CBA funding

**MEDIATION/RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PROGRAMS**



Mediation/restorative justice is a form of conflict resolution in which trained leaders help the victim(s) and offender work together to resolve disputes.

Restorative approaches are often presented as promising ways to implement meaningful experiences for youth who have committed a law violation, and thereby reducing recidivism.<sup>112</sup> When we compared Diversion Restorative Justice re-offense to traditional diversion, the restorative approach resulted in higher recidivism. This is an unexpected outcome based on prior research, and may be skewed due to the sample size, or it may have been that the youth were simply higher-risk to begin with. This should be examined each year to determine whether the pattern continues for youth going through a restorative process.

Table 12. Mediation/Restorative Justice Programs FY 15/16


Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Mediation Program (n=22)	Buffalo	14.1	86.4	54.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Restorative Justice/Peer Mediation <sup>113</sup>	Douglas										
Diversion Restorative Justice Practices (n=9)	Lancaster	14.8	0.0 <sup>114</sup>	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	22.2	0.0	0.0	22.2
All Mediation/Restorative Justice Programs (n=31)	State of Nebraska	14.3	61.3	58.1	0.0	9.7	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	6.5

**NOTES**

- <sup>112</sup> Bradshaw, W., & Roseborough, D. (2005). Restorative justice dialogue: The impact of mediation and conferencing on juvenile recidivism. *Federal Probation*, 69, 15.
- <sup>113</sup> No individual level data reported
- <sup>114</sup> 88.9% of youth served were marked as "Unspecified" race

## ALTERNATIVE TO DETENTION - ELECTRONIC MONITORING PROGRAMS

Pre-adjudication alternatives to detention (ATDs) increase youth supervision to prevent out-of-home placement while waiting for court. Although there is little research on the effectiveness of ATDs, research supports the use of ATDs because of the potential unintended consequences of juvenile detention.<sup>115</sup> Electronic monitor (EM) programs use electronic devices, usually worn on the ankle, that monitor the youth's location and movement centered around their home, allowing them to go to school, jobs, activities, etc. as approved by the person monitoring their movement.



Because the central goal of pre-adjudication ATDs is not therapeutic, but rather a short-term solution to ensure a higher-risk youth attends court, future system involvement will be higher for all ATDs than other program types.

Table 17. Alternatives to Detention - Electronic Monitor Programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Electronic Monitoring (n=23)	Cass	16.9	78.3	73.9	0.0	30.4	4.3	4.3	47.8	17.4	8.7
Alternatives to Detention - EM (n=6)	Dakota	15.3	0.0 <sup>116</sup>	83.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7
Alternatives to Detention - EM (n=5)	Dodge	14.6	80.0	80.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
HOME Program - EM (n=86)	Douglas	15.2	20.9	81.4	0.0	33.7	0.0	15.1	32.6	0.0	48.8
Detention Alternatives - EM (n=1)	Hamilton	- <sup>117</sup>	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pre-Adjudicated Community Services (n=44)	Lancaster	14.8	47.7	59.1	0.0	18.2	2.3	13.6	9.1	4.5	25.0
NNJP Pre-Adjudication Services - EM (n=14)	Madison	15.8	64.3	92.9	0.0	28.6	7.1	14.3	0.0	0.0	7.1
Electronic Monitoring <sup>118</sup>	Otoe										
Sarpy County CARE Program EM (n=127)	Sarpy	16.3	70.1	64.6	.08	9.4	2.4	10.2	32.2	9.4	1.6
Owens EM <sup>119</sup>	Saunders										

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Detention Alternatives - EM <sup>120</sup>	Washington										
All EM Programs (n=306)	State of Nebraska	15.7	52.3	70.9	0.3	20.6	2.0	12.4	27.5	5.9	19.6

### NOTES

<sup>115</sup> See Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, <https://www.aecf.org/work/juvenile-justice/jdai/>

<sup>116</sup> Reported 33.3% American Indian and Black, African American

<sup>117</sup> No date of referral so cannot calculate age


<sup>118</sup> No individual level youth data entered

<sup>119</sup> No individual level youth data entered

<sup>120</sup> No referrals were made for EM services in FY 15/16

## ALTERNATIVE TO DETENTION - TRACKER SERVICES

Pre-adjudication alternatives to detention (ATDs) increase youth supervision to prevent out-of-home placement while waiting for court. Although there is little research on the effectiveness of ATDs, research supports the use of ATDs because of the potential unintended consequences of juvenile detention.<sup>121</sup> Tracking services assign a program staff member (a tracker) to monitor youth behavior and help the youth make it to case-related appointments.



Because the central goal of pre-adjudication ATDs is not therapeutic, but rather a short-term solution to ensure a higher-risk youth attends court, future system involvement will be higher for all ATDs than other program types.

Table 18. Alternatives to Detention - Tracker Services FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Tracker Services (n=25)	Cass	16.2	56.0	72.0	0.0	16.0	4.0	8.0	24.0	20.0	0.0
Alternatives to Detention - Tracker (n=5)	Dakota	11.8	0.0 <sup>122</sup>	60.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
Alternatives to Detention - Tracker (n=5)	Dodge	14.6	80.0	80.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
HOME Program - Tracker (n=40)	Douglas	15.3	37.5	55.0	5.0	5.0	2.5	12.5	17.5	0.0	17.5
Detention Alternatives - Tracker <sup>123</sup>	Hamilton										
Community Services Coordinator (n=6)	Holt	15.2	66.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
NNJP Pre-Adjudication Services - Tracker (n=29)	Madison	14.9	65.5	69.0	0.0	41.4	10.3	6.9	3.4	34.5	6.9
Tracker <sup>124</sup>	Otoe										
Tracker (n=13)	Sarpy	16.6	76.9	76.9	0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0
Owens Tracker <sup>125</sup>	Saunders										

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Detention Alternatives - Tracker <sup>126</sup>	Washington										
All Tracker Services Programs (n=123)	State of Nebraska	15.3	53.7	63.4	1.6	17.9	4.1	8.9	11.4	13.0	8.1

### NOTES

<sup>121</sup> See Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, <https://www.aecf.org/work/juvenile-justice/jdai/>

<sup>122</sup> 60.0% of youth served are reported as American Indian

<sup>123</sup> No referrals in FY 15/16

<sup>124</sup> No individual level data reported

<sup>125</sup> No referrals in FY 15/16

<sup>126</sup> No individual level data reported

## ALTERNATIVE TO DETENTION - REPORTING CENTERS

Pre-adjudication alternatives to detention (ATDs) increase youth supervision to prevent out-of-home placement while waiting for court. Although there is little research on the effectiveness of ATDs, research supports the use of ATDs because of the potential unintended consequences of juvenile detention.<sup>127</sup> Day and evening reporting centers are held at a specific location that provide intensive supervision during and after school hours. Reporting centers use structured activities and classes that focus on needs and/or skills such as anger management, job skills, independent living, etc., but do not typically provide treatment services.




Table 19. Alternatives to Detention - Reporting Centers FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Day/Evening Reporting - Owens (n=8)	Douglas	15.0	25.0 <sup>128</sup>	62.5	0.0	2.5	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0
Reporting Centers (n=276)	Lancaster	15.9	48.6	62.7	0.0	33.3	2.2	14.1	6.9	1.8	26.4
Reporting Center (n=162)	Sarpy	16.1	85.2	72.2	0.0	23.5	3.7	4.9	13.0	17.3	5.6
All Reporting Center Programs (n=446)	State of Nebraska	16.0	61.4	66.1	0.0	29.6	2.7	10.8	9.2	7.4	18.4

### Notes

<sup>127</sup> See Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, <https://www.aecf.org/works/juvenile-justice/jdai/>

<sup>128</sup> 50.0% of youth served are reported as Black, African American

## ALTERNATIVE TO DETENTION - SHELTER CARE

Pre-adjudication alternatives to detention (ATDs) increase youth supervision to prevent out-of-home placement while waiting for court. Although there is little research on the effectiveness of ATDs, research supports the use of ATDs because of the potential unintended consequences of juvenile detention.<sup>129</sup> Shelter care is a non-secure residential care program for youth in need of short-term placement. Youth at the shelters require more supervision than can be provided in the community-based level of care (EM, tracker, and reporting centers). Youth at the shelter participate in daily schedules and structured activities.




Table 20. Alternatives to Detention - Shelter Care programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Alternatives to Detention - Shelter <sup>130</sup>	Dakota										
Alternatives to Detention - Shelter <sup>131</sup>	Dodge										
Crisis Stabilization Emergency Shelter - Heartland <sup>132</sup>	Douglas										
Shelter - CSI (n=26)	Douglas	14.6	19.2 <sup>133</sup>	57.7	0.0	26.9	3.8	11.5	26.9	3.8	30.8
Shelter - Boys Town (n=1)	Douglas	- <sup>134</sup>	0.0	100	0.0	100	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	100
Enhanced Shelter - Boys Town	Douglas										
Shelter Services (n=1)	Madison	14.0	100	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0
Detention Alternatives - Shelter <sup>135</sup>	Washington										
All Shelter Care Programs (n=28)	State of Nebraska	14.5	21.4 <sup>136</sup>	57.1	3.6	28.6	3.6	14.3	25.0	7.1	32.1

### NOTES

<sup>129</sup> See Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, <https://www.aecf.org/works/juvenile-justice/jdai/>

<sup>130</sup> No referrals in FY 15/16

<sup>131</sup> No referrals in FY 15/16

<sup>132</sup> No individual level data reported

<sup>133</sup> 46.2% of youth served are reported as Black, African American


<sup>134</sup> No referral date so unable to calculate age

<sup>135</sup> No referrals in FY 15/16

<sup>136</sup> 42.9% of youth served are reported as Black, African American

## REENTRY PROGRAMS

Reentry programs are programs that intentionally prepare youth and families for return from an out-of-home placement back to their communities. Activities and communications prior to discharge strengthen the connection between the youth in placement with their family, home, and community.



Historically, communities have been unsure about directing CBA funding toward adjudicated youth, so it is not surprising that few programs have developed to assist with reentry into communities, despite the fact that this is a critical area of importance in the continuum.

Table 21. Reentry Programs FY 15/16

Program		Youth Served			Court Filings		Probation			Detention	
Name (N)	County/Tribe	Age (M)	White (%)	Male (%)	Status Offense (%)	Law Violation (%)	Runaway/Technical Violation (%)	New Law Violation (%)	Warrant (%)	Staff Secure (%)	Secure (%)
Reentry <sup>137</sup>	Winnebago Tribe										
All Reentry Programs	State of Nebraska										

### NOTES

<sup>137</sup> No individual level data reported

## APPENDIX A: Continual Funding of Programs as of October 31, 2019

x = Funded entire fiscal year

p = Partially funded

s = Program type reclassified; footnote details what the program was reclassified to

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
<b>Adams County</b>						
Save a Life Tour	Direct Events	x				
Horizon Lifeskills	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Teen Court Volunteers	Promotion/Prevention		x	x		
Beyond School Walls	Mentoring - Community-based	x	x	x	x	x
Victim Youth Conferencing	Mediation - Restorative Justice					x
Zone Homework	Afterschool	x	x	x	x	x
Community Planning	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
Assessment	Assessment	x		x	x	
STARS	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Teen Court and Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Electronic Monitor	Electronic Monitor		x	x	x	
Tracker Services	Tracker Services			p	x	
Videoconferencing	System Improvement	x	x			
RENEW Training	System Improvement	p				
<b>Box Butte County</b>						
Alliance Public Schools Job Coach	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Lacrosse Camp	Promotion/Prevention		p			
Motivational Reinforcements	Incentives	x				
Math Tutor	Alternative school			x	x	x
Hemingford School Resource Officer	School Resource Officer	x	x			
Alliance School Resource Officer	School Resource Officer	x	x			
Parenting Class	Family Support			x	x	x
Box Butte County Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Box Butte Family Focus Coalition Director	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
Panhandle Partnership	System Improvement	x			x	x
<b>Buffalo County</b>						
Ravenna 40 Developmental Assets	Direct Events		x			
Second Step Middle School	Promotion/Prevention				x	
Decision Making Class	Promotion/Prevention			x	x	
Photo Voice	Promotion/Prevention			x	x	
CAST Program	Promotion/Prevention	x				

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Friends Mentoring	Mentoring - Community-based	x	x	x	x	x
TeamMates	Mentoring - School-based	p				
COS-P	Family Support		x	x	x	x
Ecological In-Home Services	Family Support					x
Parent Connectors	Family Support	x	x			
Juvenile Facilitator	Family Support	x				
WRAP	Mental Health			x	x	x
Teen Power	Mental Health		x			
Family Services for Truancy Risk	Truancy					x
Buffalo County Truancy	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Buffalo County Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Mediation Program	Mediation - Restorative Justice	x	x	x	x	x
Pre-adjudication Services - EM	Electronic Monitor		x	x	x	
Pre-adjudication Services - Tracker	Tracker Services		x	x	x	
Pre-adjudication Services - Reporting Center	Reporting Center		x	x		
Pre-adjudication Services - Shelter	Shelter Care		x			
Youth Services Coordination	System Improvement					x
NE SHARP YRBS	System Improvement				x	
Grant Management	System Improvement		x			
Buffalo County Juvenile Coordinator	System Improvement	x	x			
Travel and NJJA	System Improvement		x			
PAX Good Behavior Game	System Improvement		x			
Positive Pressure	System Improvement	x				
Kearney Catholic School 40 Developmental Assets	System Improvement		p			
<b>Butler County</b>						
Butler County Truancy Program	Truancy	x				
<b>Cass County</b>						
Leadership in a fun environment	Mentoring	p				
Intensive Family Preservation	Family Support	x				
MST Services	Mental Health				p	x
Spirit Horse Ranch	Mental Health	x		xs <sup>1</sup>		
Family Crisis Mediation Team	Crisis Response	x	x	x	x	x

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Truancy	Truancy		x	x	x	x
Diversion	Diversion	p	x	x	x	x
Electronic Monitoring	Electronic Monitor	x	x	x	x	x
Tracker Services	Tracker Services	x	x	x	x	x
Grant Administration	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
<b>Chase County</b>						
Mental Health	Mental Health				p	x
Diversion	Diversion				p	x
<b>Cheyenne County</b>						
Rocktoberfest	Direct Events	x	x			
Kimball Teen Program	Promotion/Prevention				x	x
Unified Raiders	Promotion/Prevention			x	x	x
Students Making Awesome Choices	Promotion/Prevention	x				
Cheyenne County Community Center Youth Scholarships	Incentives	x				
TeamMates	Mentoring - School-based	p				
Cool Kids/No Limits	Afterschool	x	x	x		
Mental Health Services	Mental Health					x
Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Panhandle Partnership	System Improvement		x	x	x	x
<b>Colfax County</b>						
Colfax County Truancy Program	School Interventionist	x	xs <sup>2</sup>	x	x	x
Colfax County Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Alternatives to Detention	Electronic Monitor		x	x	x	
<b>Custer County</b>						
Hearts Program	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Multiple Choices	Afterschool			x	x	
Healing Hearts and Families	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
<b>Dakota County</b>						
Teen Court Volunteers	Promotion/Prevention				p	x
School Resource Officer	School Resource Officer		x	x	x	x
Family Support	Family Support				x	
Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Teen Court	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Alternatives to Detention - EM	Electronic Monitor	x	x	x	x	x
Alternatives to Detention - Tracker	Tracker Services	x	x	x	x	x
Alternatives to Detention - Shelter	Shelter Care	p	x	x	p	
<b>Dawes County</b>						
Dawes County School Social Work Program	School Interventionist	x	x	xs <sup>3</sup>	x	x
Panhandle Partnership	System Improvement				x	x
<b>Dawson County</b>						
Dawson County Diversion	Diversion	x				
<b>Dodge County</b>						
Life Skills	Promotion/Prevention					x
Mentoring	Mentoring - Youth Initiated Mentoring				x	x
Truancy Diversion	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Early Assessment	Assessment					x
Preventative and Aftercare Services	Referral services			x	x	
Diversion Crossover youth	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Alternatives to Detention - EM	Electronic Monitor	x	x	x	x	x
Alternatives to Detention - Tracker	Tracker Services	x	x	x	x	x
Alternatives to Detention - Shelter	Shelter Care	x				
<b>Douglas County</b>						
Police Athletics for Community Engagement (PACE)	Promotion/Prevention		p	x	x	x
Lead and Seed	Promotion/Prevention			x	x	x
Violence Prevention Initiative	Promotion/Prevention					x
Urban B.O.L.T.	Promotion/Prevention				x	x
Jaguar Football Program	Promotion/Prevention				x	
Step-Up Omaha	Promotion/Prevention			p		
Youth Prevention Services - Latino Center	Promotion/Prevention			x		
Goodwill Youth Employment Skills	Promotion/Prevention		p			

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Youth Initiated Mentoring	Mentoring - Youth Initiated Mentoring	x	x	x	x	x
Juvenile Justice Mentoring	Mentoring - Community-based				x	
Creative Writing Program	Alternative School				x	x
Refugee Juvenile Justice Advocate	Family Support	x	x	x	x	x
Community Coaching - Owens	Family Support	p	x	xs <sup>4</sup>	x	x
Family Support	Family Support				x	x
Community Based Initiative	Family Support				x	
Intensive Family Preservation - Capstone	Family Support	p	x	x	x	
Intensive Family Preservation - KVC	Family Support	p	x	x	x	
Community coaching - CBS	Family Support		x	xs <sup>5</sup>	p	
Community coaching - MAYS	Family Support		x	xs <sup>6</sup>	x	
Prevention Services: Common Sense Parenting, Parent Connector, & Care Coordination	Family Support				x	x
Douglas County Juvenile Assessment Center	Assessment	x	x	x	x	x
Omaha Reception Center	Assessment				p	x
Douglas County Attorney's Office Alternatives Unit	Referral Services	x	xs <sup>7</sup>	x	x	x
Intensive Family Preservation	Mental Health				x	x
Mental Health Services	Mental Health				x	x
Behavioral Health Services	Mental Health	p	x	x	x	
Bridge Program	Mental Health		x			
In-Home Crisis Response - Capstone	Crisis Response	p	x	x	x	
In-Home Crisis Response - KVC	Crisis Response	p	x	x	x	
Emergency Respite Care - KVC	Crisis Respite	p	x	x		
Truancy Diversion	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
GOALS Center Family Advocate	Truancy					x
Pathways to Success	Truancy				x	x
Youth Attendance Navigators	Truancy	x			x	x
ReConnect, Inc - Triage Youth Program	Truancy	x				
Youth Impact	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Status Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x



	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Restorative Justice/Peer Mediation	Mediation - Restorative Justice	x		x	x	x
Restorative Justice	Mediation - Restorative Justice					x
HOME Program - EM	Electronic Monitor	x	x	x	x	x
HOME Program - Tracker	Tracker Services	x	x	x	x	x
Day/Evening Reporting - Owens	Reporting Center	p	x	x	x	x
Day/evening reporting - MAYS	Reporting Center		x	x	x	
Crisis Stabilization/Emergency Shelter - Heartland	Shelter Care	p	x	x		
Shelter - CSI	Shelter Care	p	x	x		
Shelter - Boys Town	Shelter Care	p	x	x		
Enhanced Shelter	Shelter Care	p				
Douglas County Grant Specialist	System Improvement		x	x	x	x
JDAI Coordinator	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
JDAI Data Analyst	System Improvement			x	x	x
Operation Youth Success - backbone	System Improvement		x	x	x	x
SRO Training	System Improvement					x
Attendance Services OYS Evaluation	System Improvement		x			
Trauma Training	System Improvement		x			
NASRO Training	System Improvement		x			
JDAI Data Committee Evaluation	System Improvement	x	p			
JJ Collective Impact Executive Director	System Improvement	x				
JDAI ATD Committee	System Improvement	x				
OYS Georgetown University Certificate Program	System Improvement	x				
Reentry Working Group	System Improvement	x				
Concord Mediation Center	System Improvement		p			
<b>Gage County</b>						
4-H Enrichment	Promotion/Prevention				x	
Family Support	Family Support					x
Student-Staff Advocate and Truancy Prevention	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Juvenile Diversion/Community Service	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Restorative Justice	Mediation - Restorative Justice		x		x	x

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Electronic Monitor	Electronic Monitor					x
Alternatives to Detention	Tracker Services		x	x	x	x
Community Coalition/Prevention	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
Travel and Professional Development	System Improvement		x	x		
<b>Garden County</b>						
Paying for Diversion	Incentives	x				
Scholarships for Recreation	Incentives	x				
Law Enforcement Recreation	Promotion/prevention	x				
<b>Garfield County</b>						
7th Grade "Start Smart" Retreat	Direct Events	x	x			
Pure Performance	Direct Events	x				
All Stars Curriculum	Promotion/Prevention		x			
Atlas and Athena	Promotion/Prevention		x			
Diversion	Diversion	x				
Travel/trainings/conferences, education	System Improvement	p	x			
Sustaining the office	System Improvement	x				
<b>Hall County</b>						
High school / Middle school Interventionist	School Interventionist	x	xs <sup>8</sup>	x	x	x
Mental Health/Substance Abuse Assessments	Referral Services		x			
Mental Health - Student Wellness Center	Mental Health		x			
Hall County Pre-trial Juvenile Diversion Program	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Detention alternatives - EM	Electronic Monitor		x	x	x	x
Detention alternatives - Tracker	Tracker Services		x	x	x	x
Detention alternatives - shelter	Shelter Care		x			
Hall County Community Collaboration (H3C)	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
SANKOFA (training materials and program)	System Improvement	x				
<b>Hamilton County</b>						
Hamilton County Youth Center	Promotion/Prevention	x				
Diversion	Diversion	x				

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Detention Alternatives - EM	Electronic Monitor	x				
Detention Alternatives - Tracker	Tracker Services	x				
Grant Coordinator	System Improvement	x				
<b>Holt County</b>						
Holt County Truancy Prevention Program	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Boyd County Truancy Prevention Program	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Boyd County Diversion	Diversion					x
Holt County Diversion	Diversion		p	x	x	x
Community Services Coordinator	Tracker Services	p	ps <sup>9</sup>			
Program Director	System Improvement		x	x	x	x
<b>Howard County</b>						
Kindness Retreat	Direct Events	x	x			
School Resource Officer	School Resource Officer	x	x	x	x	x
On-Site Mental Health Therapy	Mental Health	x	x	x	x	x
Educational sessions	System Improvement	x				
<b>Jefferson County</b>						
40 Developmental Assets	Promotion/Prevention		x			
Character Strong SEL Program	Mentoring - School-based					x
Family and Youth Involvement Center	Afterschool			p	x	x
40 Developmental Assets assessment	Assessment	p				
Jefferson County Attendance Support Program	Truancy					x
Jefferson County Diversion Program	Diversion	x	x	p		x
40 Developmental Assets Data Improvement	System Improvement		x			
<b>Kimball County</b>						
Diversion	Diversion	x	p			
Panhandle Partnership	System Improvement		p			
<b>Lancaster County</b>						
5-0 Club (Community Policing)	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Latina Leaders	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Joven Noble	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Malone Leadership Academy (Talented Tenth)	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Malone Leadership Academy for Young Women (Strong and Smart Girls)	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Community Youth Services	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Project HIRE	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Operation Tipping Point	Promotion/Prevention		x		x	
Youth for Christ REAL Essentials Program	Promotion/Prevention		p			
Shields Unite Program (sports with police)	Promotion/Prevention	x	x			
ACC Serving Refugee and Immigrant Youth	Promotion/Prevention		p			
YWCA Girls Circle	Promotion/Prevention		p			
HBBBS Mentoring	Mentoring - Community-based			x		
BEST School	Alternative school	x	x	x	x	
Lighthouse School Suspension Program	Alternative school		p			
Mother Daughter Circles	Family Support	x	x	x		
Sudanese Program	Family Support	x	x			
Youth for Christ	Family Support	x	x			
Social Worker (Public Defender's Office)	Family Support	x				
Assessment Specialist	Assessment	x	x	x	x	x
School based therapy	Mental Health	x	x	x	x	x
Family Service School Therapy	Mental Health			x	x	x
Immigrant & Refugee Mental Health Program	Mental Health		p			
Pre-treatment Assessments for diversion youth	Mental Health	x				
Crisis Continuum	Crisis Respite		x	x		x
Truancy Diversion	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Graduate Links Project	Truancy	x				
Diversion	Diversion	x		x	x	x
Lighthouse Restorative Justice	Mediation - Restorative Justice		x	x	x	x
Diversion Restorative Justice Practices	Mediation - Restorative Justice	x	x	x	x	x
PreAdjudicated Community Services	Electronic Monitor	x	x	x	x	x
Tracker	Tracker Services			x		
Reporting Centers	Reporting Center	x	x	x	x	x
Shelter	Shelter Care		x			

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Crisis Response Coordination	System Improvement				x	x
Training	System Improvement				x	x
Data	System Improvement		x	p		
Gang Training	System Improvement		x			
Youth Thrive Training	System Improvement		p			
Restorative Justice Training	System Improvement		x			
NJJA and Heartland Conferences	System Improvement	x	x			
Implicit Bias Training	System Improvement	x				
Wrap Around Training	System Improvement	x				
Teen Problem Gambling Gaming Awareness	System Improvement	x				
Evaluations	System Improvement	x				
Statewide Training/Conference	System Improvement	x				
<b>Lincoln County</b>						
Juvenile services/facilitator	Promotion/Prevention	x				
Asset Building	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Youth Leadership Development	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	
Changing Behaviors Alternative Program	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Community Connections Mentoring	Mentoring - Community-based	x	x	x	x	x
TeamMates	Mentoring - School-based	x				
Lincoln County Juvenile Assessment Center	Assessment		x	x	x	x
Safe Harbor	Crisis Response		x			
Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Electronic Monitoring - Counseling Center	Electronic Monitor		x	x		
Electronic Monitoring - FSB	Electronic Monitor		x			
Community Planning Team/ Three Year Plan Implementation	System Improvement		x	x	x	x
<b>Madison County</b>						
Knox County Cares	Direct Events	x	x			
Crofton Youth Program	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	
Connected Youth Initiative	Promotion/Prevention		p	x	x	p
Zone Afterschool Program	Promotion/Prevention		x	x		
Stanton Library Afterschool program	Promotion/Prevention		x	x		

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Youth for Christ	Promotion/Prevention		x			
Voluntary Diversion	Promotion/Prevention	x	p			
Stanton County Youth Program	Incentives		p			
BeFriend Program	Mentoring - Community-based				p	x
Stanton High School Team-Mates	Mentoring - School-based		p	x	x	x
Madison County Day Reporting	Alternative School	x	xs <sup>10</sup>	x	x	x
Your Life (was Elective and Effective Youth Program)	School Interventionist		p	x	x	x
Tutoring Services	Afterschool		x	x	x	x
Teen Mom support group	Family Support		x			
NJJDP Mental Health Services	Mental Health		x	x	x	x
Madison County Truancy Program	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Boone County Diversion Program	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Burt County Diversion Program	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Cuming County Diversion Program	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Antelope County Diversion Program	Diversion	x	x	x	x	p
Pierce County Diversion	Diversion				p	x
Madison County Diversion Program	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Stanton County Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Wayne County Diversion	Diversion				p	x
Knox County Diversion	Diversion				p	x
NNJJP Pre-Adjudication Services - EM	Electronic Monitor	x	x	x	x	x
NNJJP Pre-Adjudication Services - Tracker	Tracker Services	p	x	x	x	x
Shelter Services	Shelter Care	x				
Training (Heartland, NJJA, Northeast Nebraska Drug Symposium)	System Improvement		x	x	x	x
NNJJP Partnership & Community Planning	System Improvement		x		x	x
NNJJP Administrative Assistant	System Improvement			x		
Northeast Nebraska Drug Symposium	System Improvement			x		
Trauma Informed Care Training	System Improvement		x			
Accounting	System Improvement					p

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
<b>Merrick County</b>						
Youth Center/ Tutoring	Promotion/Prevention		x	x		
Junior Deputy Program	Promotion/Prevention	p				
Edgerton Afterschool Program	Afterschool			x	x	
Attendance Matters	Truancy		x	x	x	x
Central Nebraska Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Pre-adjudication services - EM	Electronic Monitor		x	x		
Pre-adjudication services - Tracker	Tracker Services		x	x		
<b>Morrill County</b>						
Diversion	Diversion	x	x		x	
Panhandle Partnership	System Improvement				x	
<b>Otoe County</b>						
Afterschool Program	Afterschool	x				
IFP/Family Support	Family Support			p	x	x
Crisis Response	Crisis Response		p	x		
Truancy Tracker	Truancy				x	x
Juvenile Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x		
Electronic Monitoring	Electronic Monitor	x	x	x	x	x
Tracker	Tracker Services	x	x	x	x	x
Grant Management-Juvenile Services Planning	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
Data Manager: JDAI	System Improvement					x
Project Coordinator: JDAI	System Improvement					x
<b>Platte County</b>						
Revolution	Direct Events		x			
Triumph Builders Club	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Time for Change	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
Upward Movement	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
40 Developmental Assets	Promotion/Prevention	x	x	x	x	x
40 Assets Shipmates	Mentoring - School-based	x	x	x	x	x
Youth For Christ Out of School Suspension Program	Alternative School	x	x	xs <sup>11</sup>	x	x
Family Support	Family Support	x	x	x	x	x
Assessment Specialist	Assessment	x	x	x	x	x
Mental Health Services	Mental Health	x	x	x	x	x

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Attendance Monitor	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Platte Valley Diversion Program	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Bookkeeper	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
Community Planner	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
<b>Red Willow County</b>						
Crisis Response - Early Intervention	Crisis Response	x	x			
Attendance, Grades and Life Success Program	Truancy	x	x	x		
Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x		
<b>Richardson County</b>						
Youth Assistance Program (YAP)	School Interventionist		x	x	x	x
Family Support	Family Support			x		x
Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Alternatives to Detention - EM	Electronic Monitor		x	x		x
Alternatives to Detention - Tracker	Tracker Services		x	x		x
Program Coordination	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
Travel	System Improvement		x			
<b>Saline County</b>						
Positive Youth Leadership/Development	Promotion/Prevention				x	
4H Youth Governance Workshop	Promotion/Prevention		x	xs <sup>12</sup>		
School Interventionist	School Interventionist			x	x	x
Family Support	Family Support				x	x
Saline Diversion program	Diversion		x	x	x	x
Better Living EM services	Electronic Monitor			p	x	x
Better Living Contract	Tracker Services		x	x	x	x
Grant Management	System Improvement				x	x
<b>Santee Sioux Nation of Nebraska</b>						
Incentive Youth Trips	Incentives	x				
Tribal Culture day camp	Promotion/prevention	x				
Truancy Diversion Program	Truancy	x	x			
<b>Sarpy County</b>						
Teen Court Volunteers/Law Academy	Promotion/Prevention		x	x	x	

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
<b>Incentives</b>	Incentives	x				
Refugee Assistance	Family Support				x	
Mental/behavioral health/substance abuse evaluations	Assessment	x				
Judges Pre-Adjudicated Court referral services	Referral Services	x	x	x	x	x
Crisis Mediation Team	Crisis Response	x	x	x	x	x
Truancy	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Diversion	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Teen Court	Diversion	x	x	x	x	
Sarpy County CARE Program EM	Electronic Monitor	x	x	x	x	x
Tracker	Tracker Services	x	x	x		
Reporting Center	Reporting Center	x	x	x	x	x
Utilities	System Improvement		x	x		
JDAI Coordinator	System Improvement	x	x	x		
NJJA Conference	System Improvement	x				
<b>Saunders County</b>						
TeamMates	Mentoring - School-based	p				
School based behavioral health	Mental Health		x	x	x	x
Crisis Response Team	Crisis Response	p	x			
ARRIVE	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x
Owens EM	Electronic Monitor	x	x			
Owens Tracker	Tracker Services	x	x			
NJJA Conference	System Improvement		x			
Grant Administrator	System Improvement		x			
<b>Scotts Bluff County</b>						
Juvenile Assessment Center	Assessment	x	xs <sup>13</sup>	x	x	x
Diversion (Banner, Morrill)	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Panhandle Partnership	System Improvement			p	x	x
<b>Seward County</b>						
4-H Afterschool program	Promotion/Prevention	x	x			
1st Job-Seward	Promotion/Prevention		x	x	x	x
Centennial TeamMates	Mentoring - School-based	x	x	x	x	x
Seward Teammates	Mentoring - School-based					x
Seward County Youth Center	Afterschool	x	x	x		
Family Nights	Family Support	x	x			
Seward County Attendance Support Program	Truancy	x	x	x	x	x

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
Butler County Attendance Support Program	Truancy		x	x	x	x
Seward County Diversion Program	Diversion		x	x	x	x
Butler County Diversion Program	Diversion		x	x	x	x
Seward County Probation	Electronic Monitor		x	x		
Seward County Bridges	System Improvement	x	x	x	x	x
County Aid Grant Manager	System Improvement		x	x	x	x
SCIP Team	System Improvement					x
<b>Sheridan County</b>						
SRO Gordon-Rushville Public School	School Resource Officer	x	x	x	x	x
Panhandle Partnership	System Improvement		x	x	x	x
<b>Sherman County</b>						
Community Prevention Education	Promotion/Prevention		x	x		
Truancy Mediation	Truancy					x
Sherman County Diversion	Diversion				x	x
Victim Youth Conferencing	Mediation - Restorative Justice					x
<b>Thayer County</b>						
Attendance Support Program	Truancy					x
<b>Washington County</b>						
Juvenile Diversion Coordinator	Diversion	x	x	x	x	x
Detention Alternatives - EM	Electronic Monitor	x	x	x	x	x
Detention Alternatives - Tracker	Tracker Services	x	x	x	x	x
Detention Alternatives - Shelter	Shelter Care	x	x			
<b>Winnebago Tribe of NE</b>						
Juvenile Community Service and Restitution Program	Promotion/Prevention			x		
Youth Intervention Specialist	Assessment					x
Mental health Assessment	Mental Health		x			
Truancy	Truancy	x				
Diversion	Diversion				x	x
Reentry	Reentry	x				

	Program Type	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20
<b>York County</b>						
Interventionist	School Interventionist				x	x
Pre-Adjudicative Services	Family Support				x	
HOPE	Truancy	x	p			
Truancy	Truancy				x	x
Juvenile Support Worker	Diversions				x	x
Electronic Monitor	Electronic Monitor				x	

**Notes**

<sup>1</sup>Program type reclassified from Promotion/Prevention to Mental Health

<sup>2</sup>Program type reclassified from Truancy to School Interventionist

<sup>3</sup>Program type reclassified from Truancy to School Interventionist

<sup>4</sup>Program type reclassified from Mentoring – Juvenile Justice based to Family Support

<sup>5</sup>Program type reclassified from Mentoring – Juvenile Justice based to Family Support

<sup>6</sup>Program type reclassified from Mentoring – Juvenile Justice based to Family Support

<sup>7</sup>Program type reclassified from Assessment to Referral Services

<sup>8</sup>Program type reclassified from Truancy to School Interventionist

<sup>9</sup>Program type reclassified from Promotion/Prevention to Tracker Services

<sup>10</sup>Program type reclassified from Reporting Center to Alternative School

<sup>11</sup>Program type reclassified from Promotion/Prevention to Alternative School

<sup>12</sup>Program type reclassified from Direct Event to Promotion/Prevention

<sup>13</sup>Program type reclassified from System Improvement to Assessment

## APPENDIX B: Definition of Future System Involvement for Purposes of Community-based Aid Program Evaluation

For the purpose of accurately assessing post-program future law violations across Community-Based Aid (CBA) funded programs, the Juvenile Justice Institute and other researchers, shall utilize the following uniform definition of future law violations for juveniles who participated in a CBA-funded program.

### I. Court Filings

(A) This definition shall apply to both juveniles, and individuals who have aged out of the juvenile justice system:

(1) Future System Involvement shall mean that within 1 year following discharge from a CBA-funded program the juvenile has:

(a) been filed on, which has not been dismissed or dropped, for an act that would constitute a felony under the laws of this state, and who, beginning on July 1, 2017, was eleven years of age or older at the time the act was committed.

(b) been filed on, which has not been dismissed or dropped, for an act that would constitute a misdemeanor or an infraction under the laws of this state, or violation of a city or village ordinance, and who, beginning on July 1, 2017, was eleven years of age or older at the time the act was committed.

(i) Future system involvement **shall** include minor in possession under Neb. Rev. Statute 53-180.02 and is coded as a law violation.

(ii) Future system involvement **shall not** include less serious misdemeanors or infractions that do not impact community safety, including animal(s) at large, failure to return library materials, and littering.

(iii) Future system involvement **shall not** include failure to appear.

(c) been filed on, which has not been dismissed or dropped, for an act that would constitute a status offense to include truancy under Neb. Rev. Statute 43-247(3)(b)(3) or Neb. Rev. Statute 79-201 (“compulsory attendance”), uncontrollable juvenile under Rev. Statute 43-247(3)(b)(1), curfew violations under city or village ordinance, or Tobacco use by a Minor under Neb. Rev. Statute 28-1418.

(i) Although status offenses are included in the definition of future system involvement, status offenses **shall be** reported separately from law violations.

(d) been filed on, which has not been dismissed or dropped, for an act that would constitute a serious traffic offense to include driving under the influence under Neb Rev Statute 60-6, 196 or similar city/village ordinance, leaving the scene of an accident under Neb. Rev. Statute 60-696(A), willful reckless driving under Neb. Rev. Statute 60-6, 214(A), engaging in speed contest/racing under Neb Rev. Statute 60-6, 195 (a) or (b) or related city/village ordinance

(i) Future system involvement **shall not** include less serious traffic violations that do not impact community safety, including careless driving, failure to yield, failing to stop, speeding, violating learner’s permit, driving on suspended license, no valid insurance, no helmet, following to close, failure to display plates

(2) Future law violation **shall not** include the following:

(a) been filed on and that has not been dismissed or dropped, for an act which would constitute a Games and Parks violation as found in Neb. Rev. Statute Chapter 37

(b) been filed on for being mentally ill and dangerous, under Neb Rev. Statute 43-247(3)(c) or harmful to self or other under 43-247(3)(b)(2)

## II. Probation

(A) Future System Involvement shall mean that following discharge from a CBA-funded programs the juvenile had Juvenile Probation intake as a result of:

(1) Running away or a technical probation violation

(2) A new law violation

(3) Warrant

(a) Although running away/technical violations are included in the definition of future system involvement, running away/technical violations **shall be** reported separately from a new law violation.

(b) Although warrants are included in the definition of future system involvement, warrants **shall be** reported separately from a new law violation.

## III. Detention

(A) Future System Involvement shall mean that following discharge from a CBA-funded program the juvenile was booked into a staff secure or secure detention center.



UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA

# JUVENILE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

**941 O Street, Suite 706**

**Lincoln, NE 68508**

**402.476.0113 | [unojji@unomaha.edu](mailto:unojji@unomaha.edu)**

**[juvenilejustice.unomaha.edu](http://juvenilejustice.unomaha.edu)**

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 programs, activities, or employment.