

2015

Justice Assistance Grant Strategic Plan 2016 to 2018

Anne M. Hobbs

University of Nebraska at Omaha, ahobbs@unomaha.edu

Ryan E. Spohn

University of Nebraska at Omaha, rspohn@unomaha.edu

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

 Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Hobbs, Anne M. and Spohn, Ryan E., "Justice Assistance Grant Strategic Plan 2016 to 2018" (2015).
Reports. 80.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/ncjrreports/80>

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Nebraska Center for Justice Research 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.

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT

STRATEGIC PLAN



2016 to 2018

Anne Hobbs, J.D., Ph.D.
Ryan Spohn, Ph.D.

UNIVERSITY OF
Nebraska
Omaha

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The University of Nebraska at Omaha would like to acknowledge the hard work and commitment of the individuals who contributed to the 2016 – 2018 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Strategic Plan.

A special thank you to the stakeholders from across the state who took time away from their schedules to meet and discuss specific funding needs.

Thank you to the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NCC), which is the State Administrating Agency for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG), for partnering with the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Your partnership has been crucial to completing this planning and facilitating agency participation. We wish to specifically acknowledge Executive Director Darrell Fisher and Grants Division Chief Lisa Stamm.

Lastly, thank you to Kim Trost, Sage Jensen, and Jennifer Miller, who helped format and edit, gather data, write and collect surveys, and summarize findings.



This strategic plan was supported by federal funds received from the Department of Justice, Justice Assistance Grant, Grant #2015-DJ-BX-0748 and Grant #2013-DJ-BX-0021. Points of view or opinions contained within this document are based on the information and opinions reported to the authors by the planning process participants and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the University of Nebraska Omaha or the Nebraska Crime Commission.

INTRODUCTION

In 2015, the University of Nebraska at Omaha (UNO) began working in conjunction with Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Nebraska Crime Commission or NCC) to create a 3-year strategic plan for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) funding. The JAG Program, (42 U.S.C. § 3751(a)) is the primary provider of federal criminal justice funding to state and local jurisdictions, providing critical funding necessary to support a range of program areas. JAG funding is awarded annually and the applicant must show how funds will be used to improve or enhance the criminal justice system.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

Planning Process Participants

The UNO team contacted stakeholders utilizing the Nebraska Crime Commission's contact lists and network of agencies. We specifically sought a list of persons that represented agencies across the seven priority areas.

Focus Groups and Stakeholder Meetings

JAG Strategic Planning Committee meetings were held in January, March, and May 2016, with a wide variety of organizations, including representatives from the Scotts Bluff County Sheriff's Office; Nebraska Attorney General's Office; Nebraska State Penitentiary Reentry Program; U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Nebraska; Youth for Christ; Lincoln Police Department; Omaha Police Department; Nebraska Law Enforcement Training Center; Nebraska State Patrol; Sarpy County Pretrial Services; Seward County Diversion; Horizon Recovery and Counseling Center; Lincoln Commission of Human Rights; Men With Dreams; Lutheran Family Services of Nebraska, Inc.; Nebraska Department of Correctional Services; Dakota Tiwahe Service Unit, Santee Sioux of Nebraska; Many Nations Healing Counseling Services; Society of Care, Indian Center Inc.; Douglas County Attorney's Office; Douglas County Public Defender's Office; and the Lancaster County Attorney's Office.

UNO employed several means for collecting information for the strategic plan, including focus groups, surveys, and interviews with professionals in the field. Details about each of these are listed below and results from each are further discussed below.

Examination of JAG Priority Areas

For years the state of Nebraska has directed JAG funds primarily towards law enforcement and prosecutorial efforts. Beginning in 2009, the Federal Government sent a directive to all State Administering Agencies (SAAs)¹ to include with the grant announcement instructions that one of the shifts being made with respect to receiving funding is the JAG grant applicant must show that their program is evidence-based. To ascertain the level of readiness to break out of those two areas, the Crime Commission and UNO team recruited a range of strategic planning stakeholders across the seven priority areas:

¹ For the state of Nebraska, that agency is the Nebraska Crime Commission.

1. Law enforcement programs
2. Prosecution and courts programs
3. Prevention and education programs
4. Corrections and community corrections programs
5. Drug treatment and enforcement programs
6. Planning, evaluation and technology improvement programs
7. Crime victim and witness programs (other than compensation)

Interactive Focus Group with Strategic Planning Committee

On January 14, 2016, UNO began the strategic planning process with a focus group that included an interactive survey using Turning Technologies ResponseWare software. ResponseWare collects participant responses online and provides the results in real time so participants can see and discuss them. A total of 32 individuals were involved in the interactive voting process during the first session, but only 22-25 persons voted per question, indicating that some skipped questions or elected not to vote. During the meeting, UNO outlined the seven priority areas and then asked participants to rate the area where Nebraska should devote funds. Via ResponseWare, participants were asked to provide some general information, then assign a priority (high, medium, low) to each priority area.

Geographic Response Patterns


Although some focus areas have more agency representation, overall there was excellent geographic representation. Nine agencies reported providing services statewide. Of the statewide agencies, four of the agencies (44 percent) indicated that they offer all types of victim services (victim witness, child advocacy, law enforcement, domestic violence, and sexual assault), while the remaining statewide agencies focused more specifically on: domestic violence and sexual assault (1), law enforcement (1), child advocacy (1), and victim witness unit (2). Agencies that provide statewide services identified services for victims of child abuse, neglect, and/or sexual assault as a foremost need in Nebraska.

Agency and Personnel Survey

Following the initial two focus groups, the team developed an online survey that was distributed to juvenile and criminal justice professionals across the state. At the end of the survey, providers were asked if they were interested in participating in an interview; a total of five providers indicated they would be interested in doing so.

Nebraska has 12 legal districts (Figure A) and 11 of them experienced a modicum of growth, ranging from 1-7 percent population increase. District 10, which comprises some of the poorest counties in the US was the only legal district that experienced a population decrease.

Figure A. Nebraska's 12 Judicial Districts²



ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT

According to 2014 census data, Nebraska has an estimated population of 1,881,503 and spans 77,359 square miles, making it the 16th largest state geographically. The state is predominantly rural, with 93 counties, many of which are sparsely populated. From 2008 to 2012, the population of Nebraska increased a mere 3 percent.

² Source: State of Nebraska Judicial Branch.


Nebraska has a diverse population, ranging from affluent, populated communities to some of the poorest counties in the nation. The different economic levels impact resources that are available to the juvenile and criminal justice professionals (Table B).

District	Counties	Pop. Est. (2014)	% Non-white (2014)	% HS Grad or Higher (2014)	Median Household Income (2014)	% All Ages in Poverty (2014)	% Civilian Unemp. (2014)
1	Clay, Fillmore, Gage, Jefferson, Nemaha, Nuckolls, Pawnee, Richardson, Saline, Thayer	88,015	8.42	89.87	\$44,476	12.60	3.35
2	Cass, Otoe, Sarpy	213,514	17.53	93.83	\$56,981	7.67	3.57
3	Lancaster	301,795	18.67	93.40	\$51,916	14.90	2.90
4	Douglas	543,244	30.25	89.30	\$47,636	14.70	3.70
5	Boone, Butler, Colfax, Hamilton, Merrick, Nance, Platt, Polk, Saunders, Seward, York	134,500	11.16	89.85	\$54,345	9.96	3.05
6	Burt, Cedar, Dakota, Dixon, Dodge, Thurston, Washington	105,786	19.77	87.80	\$49,870	14.20	4.13
7	Antelope, Cuming, Knox, Madison, Pierce, Stanton, Wayne	81,783	11.90	91.13	\$48,657	11.96	2.84
8	Blaine, Boyd, Brown, Cherry, Custer, Garfield, Greeley, Holt, Howard, Keya Paha, Loup, Rock, Sherman, Valley, Wheeler	54,103	3.74	92.50	\$46,797	12.94	3.10
9	Buffalo, Hall	109,716	23.17	87.80	\$48,083	14.00	3.25
10	Adams, Franklin, Harlan, Kearney, Phelps, Webster	57,514	9.23	91.48	\$49,181	10.48	2.98
11	Arthur, Chase, Dawson, Dundy, Frontier, Furnas, Gosper, Hayes, Hitchcock, Hooker, Keith, Lincoln, Logan, McPherson, Perkins, Red Willow, Thomas	104,167	14.65	91.66	\$47,986	11.37	3.13
12	Banner, Box Butte, Cheyenne, Dawes, Deuel, Garden, Grant, Kimball, Morrill, Scotts Bluff, Sheridan, Sioux	87,366	17.71	91.66	\$45,540	14.47	2.95
Statewide		1,881,503	18.80	90.50	\$52,400	12.90	3.29

³ Nebraska Center for Justice Research. 2015. "Adult Justice in Nebraska." Data drawn from the Environmental Context table on page 4.


As Figure C illustrates, the majority of Nebraska's population is concentrated in the eastern third of the state and predominantly in District 4 (Douglas county), District 3 (Lancaster county), and District 2 (Cass, Otoe, and Sarpy counties). Population density outside of these districts is highest in the counties surrounding these areas, along the Interstate 80 corridor, and in the northeast corner of the state.

Figure C. Population Density, All Nebraska Counties



In comparison with surrounding states and national averages (Figure D)⁴, Nebraska has a lower reported violent crime rate. Reported property crime rates are higher than many surrounding states but lower than the average rate across the US.

Figure D. Reported Offenses per 100,000 Residents



⁴ Nebraska Center for Justice Research, 2014 Adult Justice Report

Law Enforcement Statistics

Law enforcement numbers were received from data that the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice maintains on sworn officers (Law Enforcement Employment in Nebraska Series). Rates are calculated using population estimates drawn from the Annual Estimates of the Residents Population (2010 & 2014) from the United States Bureau of the Census.

In 2014, the largest number of officers were employed in District 4, the State Patrol, and District 3 respectively (Table E). Across the state, only Districts 4 and 12 have more male than female full-time civilian employees. Districts 11 and 12 had the highest number of officers for every 1,000 residents.

District	Full-Time Sworn Officers (2014)			Full-Time Civilian Employees (2014)		Officers per 1000 Population	
	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	2010	2014
1	136	10	146	25	41	1.43	1.66
2	338	54	392	28	70	2.01	1.84
3	368	66	434	4	14	1.53	1.44
4	783	163	946	80	39	1.82	1.74
5	184	21	205	56	59	1.44	1.52
6	161	9	170	21	33	1.13	1.61
7	119	2	121	26	44	1.49	1.48
8	70	4	74	22	25	1.26	1.37
9	183	15	198	7	21	1.70	1.80
10	98	7	105	26	32	1.67	1.83
11	191	17	208	37	68	1.91	2.00
12	164	11	175	32	29	1.88	2.00
NE State Patrol	420	27	447	86	155	-	-
State of NE	3215	406	3621	450	630	1.92	1.92

Turning to Table F, District 4 boasts a significantly higher percentage of female officers than other districts and the Nebraska State Patrol. District 6 added 49 more officers in 2014 compared to 2010, 43 of which were male while only 6 were female. The largest increase in female officers occurred in District 5, which added 11 female officers between 2010 and 2014. Of the 83 individuals added to law enforcement ranks statewide over these four years, 13.3 percent were female; excluding District 5, there was no increase in female officers from 2010 to 2014 in Nebraska.

District	Percent (%) of Total Officers		Difference in Officers (2010-2014)	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
1	93.15	6.85	21	-3
2	86.22	13.78	-10	-2
3	84.79	15.21	-10	6
4	82.77	17.23	3	-2
5	89.76	10.24	1	11
6	94.71	5.29	43	6
7	98.35	1.65	2	-4
8	94.59	5.41	6	-1
9	92.42	7.58	19	1
10	93.33	6.67	11	-2
11	91.83	8.17	7	-1
12	93.71	6.29	9	0
NE State Patrol	93.96	6.04	-30	2
State of NE	88.79	11.21	72	11

Arrest Statistics

An arrest is counted each time a person is taken into custody or issues a citation or summons. While an individual may be charged with multiple crimes at the time of arrest, only one arrest is counted. An arrest is counted for the most serious charge at the time of arrest. Violent arrests include arrest for homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Property arrests include arrest for burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson.

Average arrest rates across Nebraska increased from 2010 to 2014 (Table G). Violent arrests increased by an average of 0.07 per 1000 individuals while property arrest rates increased by an average of 0.81 per 1000 individuals. Violent arrest rates declined in Districts 2, 4, 5, 9, and 10 and increased in all other districts.

Property arrest rates decreased from 2010 to 2014 in Districts 2, 4, and 12. Total arrest rates fell by an average of 3.8 across the state, with the largest decreases occurring in District 4 (-15.27), District 2 (-11.76), and District 9 (-7.55). Increases in total arrest rates during this time were seen in Districts 5, 6, 7, and 8.


District	2010						2014					
	Violent Arrests		Property Arrests		Total Arrests		Violent Arrests		Property Arrests		Total Arrests	
	No.	Rate per 1000	No.	Rate per 1000	No.	Rate per 1000	No.	Rate per 1000	No.	Rate per 1000	No.	Rate per 1000
1	36	.51	156	2.23	1898	27.13	38	.55	209	3.05	1800	26.28
2	48	.35	531	3.83	4752	34.27	52	.34	414	2.69	3469	22.51
3	364	1.69	971	4.52	15819	73.56	456	1.96	2120	9.13	15884	68.44
4	770	2.06	2795	7.48	22153	59.30	775	1.93	2685	6.68	17701	44.03
5	46	.46	144	1.45	3026	30.45	37	.37	249	2.47	3274	32.48
6	47	.60	305	3.90	2807	35.87	102	1.30	434	5.53	3233	41.22
7	26	.42	174	2.80	2002	32.25	35	.56	231	3.73	2170	35.00
8	14	.33	31	.73	818	19.34	15	.36	52	1.25	856	20.52
9	311	4.09	674	8.87	6685	87.93	298	3.65	735	8.99	6570	80.38
10	29	.66	132	3.01	1610	36.75	24	.55	250	5.68	1547	35.16
11	77	.97	349	4.40	4965	62.59	108	1.38	441	5.62	4419	56.32
12	74	1.10	388	5.76	3540	52.57	77	1.15	264	3.94	3131	46.75
NE	1842	1.37	6650	4.94	70075	52.07	2017	1.43	8084	5.74	64054	45.40

In terms of total arrests over time (Table H), the number of violent arrests increased across the state by an average of 9.5 percent from 2010 to 2014; during that same time, property arrest counts increased by an average of 21.6 percent. Violent arrest increases in 2014 were most significant in District 6, where violent arrest counts more than doubled from 2010. Property arrest increases from 2010 to 2014 were most significant in Districts 3, 10, and 5 respectively. However, total arrests declined across the state, with the largest decreases in Districts 2 and 4.

District	Violent Arrests	Property Arrests	Total Arrests
1	5.56	33.97	-5.16
2	8.33	-22.03	-27.00
3	25.27	118.33	.41
4	.65	-3.94	-20.10
5	-19.57	72.92	8.20
6	117.02	42.30	15.18
7	34.62	32.76	8.39
8	7.14	67.74	4.65
9	-4.18	9.05	-1.72
10	-17.24	89.39	-3.91
11	40.26	26.36	-11.00
12	4.05	-31.96	-11.55
NE	9.50	21.56	-8.59


With respect to the age distribution of those who were arrested (Figure I), approximately 60 percent of the individuals arrested were age 29 or younger statewide, except in District 2. The arrest rate in 2014 in District 2 for individuals age 17 or younger was nearly twice the statewide average for that demographic group.

Figure I: Distribution of Arrests by Age Group and District



Looking at arrest rates between blacks and whites in all districts (Figure J)⁵, arrest rates for blacks across the state of Nebraska in 2014 were an average of 4.35 times higher than arrest rates for whites. Districts 3 and 10 had the highest rates of black arrests in 2014. The discrepancy between arrest rates for whites and blacks is highest in District 10, where the black arrest rate is 9.6 times higher than the white arrest rate, and lowest in District 9, where the black arrest rate is 3.5 times higher than the white arrest rate.

Figure J: Arrest Rate by Race (White/Black) & District



Prosecution and Court Statistics

District courts hear all felony criminal cases, equity cases, and civil cases involving more than \$52,000.⁶ These courts also function as appellate courts in deciding appeals from county court. District court caseload statistics are drawn from the District Court Annual Caseload Report created and published by the Nebraska Judicial Branch.

In Nebraska, Districts 3 (Lancaster County) and 4 (Douglas County) account for nearly 50 percent of the District caseload (Table K). Across all districts, the majority of the caseload was comprised of domestic relations cases. The proportion of criminal cases relative to overall caseloads ranged from 18.5 to 34.6 percent across the state; the percent of criminal cases in district courts was highest in Districts 9, 7, and 11 respectively.

⁵ Nebraska Center for Justice Research, 2014 Adult Justice Report

⁶ County courts in Nebraska, which are not included in the statistics in Table 6, handle misdemeanor cases, traffic and municipal ordinance violations, preliminary hearings in felony cases, and civil cases involving less than \$52,000.


District	Criminal		Civil (Regular)		Domestic Relations		Appellate		Total Caseload
	No.	% of Total Case-load	No.	% of Total Case-load	No.	% of Total Case-load	No.	% of Total Case-load	
1	358	18.56	313	16.23	1225	63.50	33	1.71	1929
2	678	21.61	472	15.04	1945	61.98	43	1.37	3138
3	1708	28.63	902	15.12	3255	54.57	100	1.68	5965
4	3433	25.82	2087	15.70	7655	57.58	119	0.90	13294
5	677	27.78	322	13.21	1417	58.15	21	0.86	2437
6	492	26.81	275	14.99	1050	57.22	18	0.98	1835
7	413	33.88	159	13.04	638	52.34	9	0.74	1219
8	166	21.17	188	23.98	422	53.83	8	1.02	784
9	878	34.61	285	11.23	1349	53.17	25	0.99	2537
10	330	26.79	170	13.80	712	57.79	20	1.62	1232
11	860	32.36	370	13.92	1413	53.16	15	0.56	2658
12	459	21.39	512	23.86	1135	52.89	40	1.86	2146
NE	10452	26.68	6055	15.46	22216	56.71	451	1.15	39174

Problem-Solving Courts

Problem-solving courts have been developed to accommodate offenders with needs that do not fall within the realm of the traditional court structure; these courts focus on promoting effective responses to issues such as alcohol and drug abuse.⁷ Nebraska has a total of 26 problem-solving courts (Figure L): 14 adult drug courts, four juvenile drug courts, six family dependency drug courts, one DUI court, and one young adult court.

⁷ Nebraska Supreme Court. 2016. "Problem-Solving Courts". Available at <https://supremecourt.nebraska.gov/5250/problem-solving-courts>.

Figure L: Nebraska's Problem-Solving Courts⁸
June, 2012



Considering the demographics of those who have been served by problem-solving courts (Table M), the overall number of individuals addressed by problem-solving courts dropped from 2011 to 2012 but then rose in 2013, with a total increase of 7.3 percent in individuals served between 2011 and 2013. Of those served during this time, between 67 and 75 percent were white. The proportion of individuals served who were minorities has decreased from 2011 to 2013.

Table M: Problem-Solving Court Demographics⁹

Race	2011	2012	2013
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	14 2.1%	16 2.4%	18 2.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	7 1.0%	8 1.2%	7 1.0%
Black	78 11.6%	70 10.6%	67 9.3%
Hispanic	64 9.5%	51 7.8%	48 6.7%
Other	60 8.9%	48 7.3%	43 6.0%
White	449 66.8%	465 70.7%	538 74.6%
Total	672	658	721

8 Administrative Office of the Courts/Problem-Solving Courts. 2012. 2013-2017 Strategic Plan for Nebraska Problem-Solving Courts. Image from page 32.


9 Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 13.

Community Corrections Statistics

Community corrections consists of both programs and facilities used to supervise offenders outside of the standard jail or prison setting. This includes probation and parole. All data on community corrections is drawn from the 2015 "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report authored by the Nebraska Crime Commission.

In terms of overall community supervision (Figure N)¹⁰, the vast majority of individuals in community corrections are on probation, either adult or juvenile. However, the number of adults on parole has steadily declined while parole and juvenile probation numbers have remained largely consistent.

Figure N: Community Corrections by Supervision Type



Demographic statistics (Table O) indicate approximately 57-58 percent of those under community supervision from 2011 to 2013 were white. In terms of actual counts, the number of American Indians, African-Americans, Hispanics, and whites has declined from 2011 to 2013. The proportion of minorities on community supervision has increased for all groups except African-Americans.

Table O: Community Supervision Racial Demographics¹¹

Race	2011	2012	2013
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	654 2.60%	658 2.79%	605 2.80%
Asian or Pacific Islander	236 0.94%	214 0.91%	222 1.03%
Black	3,164 12.58%	2,911 12.36%	2,534 11.71%
Hispanic	3,292 13.09%	3,235 13.74%	3,103 14.34%
Other	3,122 12.41%	3,044 12.93%	2,831 13.08%
White	14,679 58.37%	13,485 57.27%	12,344 57.05%
Total	25,147	23,547	21,639


10 Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 24.

11 Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 24.

Probation Statistics

The overall number of individuals on probation has declined from 2011 to 2013 (Figure P)¹². While the number of adults placed on probation has notably dropped since 2011, the number of juveniles has remained fairly consistent resulting in juveniles constituting a larger proportion of probation cases in 2013 (24.1 percent) versus 2011 (21.8 percent). This is somewhat surprising as Nebraska has undergone significant juvenile justice reform; however, a significant result of these reform efforts is an increased role for juvenile probation in terms of juvenile supervision.

Figure P: Probation by Type



From 2011 to 2013, approximately one-third of juveniles on probation were white (Table Q). Between 20 and 25 percent of juvenile probationers during this time identified as Hispanic or other, while between 14 and 17 percent were black and approximately three percent were Native American. In comparison to Nebraska state census numbers, these values indicate disproportionate minority presence at the probation level for each of these respective minority groups.

12 Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 5.

Table Q: Juveniles Placed on Probation by Race and Ethnicity ¹³			
Race	2011	2012	2013
American Indian /Alaskan Native	150 3.1%	133 3.0%	132 2.9%
Asian or Pacific Islander	46 1.0%	30 0.7%	54 1.2%
Black	801 16.8%	734 16.3%	651 14.5%
Hispanic	1,023 21.4%	1,040 23.1%	1,057 23.5%
Other	1,052 22.0%	1,074 23.8%	1,027 22.9%
White	1,700 35.6%	1,494 33.2%	1,568 34.9%
Total	4,772	4,505	4,489

Juvenile probation intake consists of administration of the standard risk assessment instrument (RAI) and a subsequent decision regarding the placement of juveniles. At the point of intake (Table R), over 63 percent of juveniles were placed in detention (secure or staff secure) between August 2013 and June 2014. Approximately 6.5 percent of juveniles received some other non-home placement (shelter, alternative, mental health); 28 percent were returned to parents/an adult or released without restrictions.

Table R: Juvenile Probation Intake & Placement - August 2013 to June 2014 ¹⁴		
Placement	Count	Percent
Detain (Secure)	731	43.6
Detain (Staff Secure)	337	20.1
Release Without Restriction	261	15.6
Return to Parent	183	10.9
Shelter Care	61	3.6
Other Available Alternative	45	2.7
*Intake Not Scored	32	1.9
Non-Custodial Parent or Responsible Adult	24	1.4
Mental Health Placement	3	0.2
Grand Total	1,677	100.0

The racial and ethnic composition of adults on probation (Table S) from 2011 to 2013 differs significantly from that of juveniles. Among adults, whites constituted between 56 and 58 percent of adults on probation; Hispanics and African-American adults comprised approximately 14-15 and 10-11 percent of the population on probation respectively. These numbers also indicate disproportionate minority contact although at lower levels than those seen with juveniles.

13 Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 10.


14 Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 11.

Table S: Adult Probation Racial Demographics ¹⁵			
Race	2011	2012	2013
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	560 2.56%	544 2.71%	508 2.72%
Asian or Pacific Islander	203 0.93%	180 0.90%	196 1.05%
Black	2,527 11.55%	2,226 11.10%	1,954 10.48%
Hispanic	2,889 13.20%	2,824 14.08%	2,808 15.06%
Other	3,034 13.86%	2,966 14.79%	2,766 14.83%
White	12,674 57.91%	11,320 56.43%	10,414 55.85%
Total	21,887	20,060	18,646

Parole Population Served

Parole is offered to offenders in Nebraska as a method of providing community supervision for a portion of a court-ordered sentence. The number of individuals (Figure T) on parole peaked in 2012 but saw a significant decline of approximately 20 percent in 2013.¹⁶

Figure T: Parole Population Served by Year



¹⁵ Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 5.

¹⁶ Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 17.


As with probation, the majority of individuals (around 60-61 percent) receiving parole between 2011 and 2013 were white (Table U). African-Americans were the second largest demographic group and constituted 21-23 percent of the parole population followed by Hispanics who comprised between 11-13 percent of those on parole. Although the proportion of minorities on parole has declined very slightly from 2011 to 2013, blacks and American Indians/Alaskan Natives now constitute a larger segment of those on parole.

Table U : Parole Demographics ¹⁷			
Race	2011	2012	2013
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	80 3.1%	98 3.5%	79 3.5%
Asian or Pacific Islander	26 1.0%	26 0.9%	19 0.8%
Black	559 21.6%	615 21.7%	513 22.6%
Hispanic	339 13.1%	360 12.7%	247 10.9%
Other	28 1.1%	30 1.1%	22 1.0%
White	1,556 60.1%	1,700 60.1%	1,392 61.3%
Total	2,588	2,829	2,272

Electric Monitoring¹⁸

Electronic monitoring is among the methods employed for community corrections alongside probation and parole. The use of electronic monitoring (Figure V) with those on parole has risen substantially from 2011 to 2013, more than doubling in that time. The number of probationers on electronic monitoring has, in contrast, remained generally unchanged over this time period.

Figure V: Electronic Monitoring by Type



¹⁷ Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 17.

¹⁸ Nebraska Crime Commission. 2015. "Community Supervision in Nebraska" report, page 32.

Corrections Statistics


In Nebraska, the Department of Corrections maintains 10 distinct correctional facilities currently housing over 5,000 inmates.¹⁹ All corrections facilities in Nebraska operated at or over their intended capacity in 2014 (Table W). Of all the facilities in the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS), the Diagnostic and Evaluation Unit was the most crowded in that year. The overall inmate population has grown over 2.5% each year from 2010 to 2014.

Facility	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Average % Growth	Design Capacity (2014)	% Design Capacity (2014)
NE State Penitentiary	1108	1155	1226	1261	1311	4.30%	718	182.59%
Lincoln Correctional Center	486	490	481	499	496	0.51%	308	161.04%
Diagnostic & Evaluation Unit	358	375	440	484	438	5.64%	160	273.75%
Omaha Correctional Center	656	605	559	584	747	4.25%	396	188.64%
Community Corrections	528	524	516	531	515	-0.60%	290	177.59%
NE Correctional Youth Facility	91	90	74	66	71	-5.53%	68	104.41%
NE Center for Women	265	281	265	242	291	2.98%	275	105.82%
Tecumseh State Correctional Institution	925	943	936	955	1002	2.04%	960	104.38%
Work Ethic Camp	126	166	168	137	154	6.73%	100	154.00%
NE Corrections Total	4543	4629	4675	4759	5025	2.57%	3275	153.44%

In comparison to statewide demographics (Figure X), the inmate population in Nebraska is far more heavily comprised of minorities than the general populace. Although Hispanics and African-Americans comprise 9 and 4 percent of the Nebraska population respectively, they make up 26 and 12 percent of the prison population.

¹⁹ Nebraska Department of Correctional Services. 2015. "Strategic Plan, 2015-2017." Page 2.

Figure X: Racial Composition of Inmate Population vs. State



According to 2014 statistics (Table Y), racial and ethnic disparity in the rate of incarceration is considerable. Rates of incarceration for African-Americans and Hispanics are nearly four times as high as the incarceration rate for whites. However, Nebraska's rates of incarceration of minorities still falls well below the national average.

Race	Rate of Incarceration per 100,000 citizens (NE)	Rate of Incarceration per 100,000 citizens (US)	% Difference (NE vs. US)
White	192	257	-28.95
Hispanic	776	1042	-29.26
Black	730	857	-16.01
Other	355	553	-43.61

The most common commitment offenses for both men and women in 2014 (Table Z) were drug-related offenses; these offenses are the reason for admission of a much larger proportion of the incarcerated female population than the male population. Over two-thirds of the women in Nebraska are incarcerated due to drugs, theft, or fraud; male inmates showed a wider diversity of criminal offenses at the time of admission. Violent offenses were the most serious offense for 34.1 percent of new male admissions but only 11.6 percent of new female admissions.


Offense Category	Male Inmates		Female Inmates	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Drugs	415	19.4	137	38.5
Assault	319	14.9	30	8.4
Theft	263	12.3	74	20.8
Motor Vehicle	261	12.2	31	8.7
Sex Offenses	194	9.1	2	0.6
Weapons	193	9.0	9	2.5
Burglary	183	8.6	14	3.9
Robbery	97	4.5	7	2.0
Other	80	3.7	18	5.1
Fraud	66	3.1	32	9.0
Homicide	32	1.5	2	0.6
Restraint	12	0.6	0	0.0
Arson	10	0.5	0	0.0
Morals	10	0.5	0	0.0
Total New Admissions	2135	100.0	356	100.0

With respect to location (Table AA), the majority of prison inmates come from the Omaha and Lincoln areas, respectively. Approximately 43 percent of inmates are located in the rest of the state.

Region	Male Inmates		Female Inmates	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Metro Omaha	1878	39.7	140	35.5
Metro Lincoln	881	18.6	85	21.6
Southeast	425	9.0	29	7.4
Northeast	533	11.3	54	13.7
South Central	679	14.4	57	14.5
North Central	51	1.1	7	1.8
Panhandle	241	5.1	18	4.6
Out-of-State	16	0.3	4	1.0
Not Available	21	0.4	0	0.0

Considering the various age groups of the inmate population (Figure AB), the largest group of both male and female inmates falls into the 25-29 age range. Beyond this age range, each subsequent age group decreases as a proportion of the total inmate population.

Figure AB: Inmate Population by Age Group and Gender



Victim Award Statistics

The Nebraska Crime Commission is responsible for the administration of awards to victims as established by the Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Act of 1978.²⁰ Awards are granted to compensate victims for costs that are directly related to a violent crime. From fiscal year 2010/2011 to 2013/2014 (Table AC), the total value of amounts awarded has grown from \$92,257 to \$222,740, an increase of 241 percent.²¹

²⁰ Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. 2015. Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Sixth Report. All reports at <https://ncc.nebraska.gov/annual-reports-0>.

²¹ Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Sixth Report (2014/2015), page 4.

Table AC: Victim Awards by Amount and Type				
Cost Categories	FY 2010/11 ²²	FY 2011/2012 ²³	FY 2012/2013 ²⁴	FY 2013/2014 ²⁵
Physicians' Fees	12,934.32	17,487.21	41,141.91	60,092.20
Hospital Expenses	20,412.26	47,062.11	54,621.89	70,325.35
Dental Expenses	160.00	2,245.00	-0-	3,813.60
Prescriptions	242.85	192.54	485.05	420.66
Out-of-Pocket Expenses	556.20	-	-	-
Other Expenses	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Mental Health Counseling	-0-	-0-	-0-	4,537.50
Loss of Wages	-0-	5,881.31	2,703.60	7,464.88
Funeral Expenses	57,951.42	46,938.40	94,783.04	70,457.49
Loss of Support	-0-	-0-	20,000.00	5,628.60
Crime Scene Clean-up	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Attorney Fees	-0-	-0-	1,500.00	-0-
Total	\$92,257.05	\$119,806.57	\$215,235.49	\$222,740.25

With respect to the crimes for which claims were awarded from 2010 through 2014 (Table AD), the majority of claims have resulted from domestic violence (assault) and homicide except for fiscal year 2013/2014 when felony assaults comprised the largest portion of claims awarded.

Table AD: Victim Claims Awarded by Type of Crime				
Type of Crime	FY 2010/11 ²⁶	FY 2011/12 ²⁷	FY 2012/13 ²⁸	FY 2013/14 ²⁹
Arson	-	-	-	1924.77
Assault	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Assault (Domestic)	13,087.12	35,610.34	74,449.58	16,046.19
Assault (Felony)	-	12,663.10	5,378.77	116,786.60
Homicide	57,951.42	52,448.40	123,262.04	71,494.04
Sexual Assault = Adult	11,218.51	5,425.89	2,930.48	1,1122.75
Child Sexual Assault/Physical Abuse	-0-	2,601.02	-0-	3,875.35
DWI/DUI	-0-	3,513.00	-0-	-0-
Vehicular	-0-	-0-	-0-	-
Kidnapping	-0-	-	-	6,046.80

22 Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Fourth Report (2011), page 6.
 23 Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Fifth Report (2012/2013), page 6.
 24 Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Fifth Report, page 14.
 25 Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Sixth Report, page 13.
 26 Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Fourth Report, page 7.
 27 Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Fifth Report, page 7.
 28 Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Fifth Report, page 15.
 29 Nebraska Crime Victim's Reparations Program Twenty-Sixth Report, page 9.

Table AD: Victim Claims Awarded by Type of Crime				
Robbery	-0-	7,544.82	9,214.62	5,443.77
Other	10,000.00	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	\$92,257.05	\$119,806.57	\$215,235.49	\$222,740.25

JAG PRIORITIES

In the initial JAG focus group, key stakeholders from across Nebraska met to discuss JAG priorities, and how funding should be allocated to best meet the needs of Nebraska. We started by reviewing the seven JAG priority areas; we then asked each participant to indicate the priority areas that would best meet the state's needs. This section contains a summary of the discussion and process.

Establishing representation of the various regions throughout the state was a focus through the engagement process. Half of the stakeholders involved were drawn from Districts 3 or 4; approximately 22 percent of those involved were considered statewide representatives (Table AE).

Table AE: Representation of Stakeholders by Region of the State		
Region of Nebraska	Percent	Number
Omaha & Douglas County	23	5
Lincoln & Lancaster County	27	6
Central Nebraska	5	1
Northeast Nebraska	5	1
Panhandle	9	2
Statewide	32	7
Totals	100	22³⁰

Involved stakeholders represented diverse groups, including not for profit agencies (29 percent); state agencies (29 percent), and units of local government (Table AF).³¹


Table AF: Representation of Stakeholders by Type of Agency		
Type of Agency	Percent	Number
Prevention & Education	32	8
Prosecution	16	4
Law Enforcement	40	10
Victim Services	8	2
Other	4	1
Totals	100	25

As Figure AG illustrates, law enforcement agencies were well represented in the stakeholder group, comprising 40 percent of the stakeholders present at the initial meeting. Individuals from agencies conducting prevention and education activities comprised 32 percent of the individuals who voted.

30 Although there were 32 stakeholders, not all of the individuals voted on each question, so responses ranged from 22 to 25.

31 Although there is a member of the Santee Sioux tribe on the stakeholders, she was not present during the voting portion of the first meeting.

Figure AG: Agencies Represented During Interactive Voting Focus Group



In addition to discussing the seven priority areas, stakeholders also discussed the long-term funding of programs and how a step down process might allow emerging evidence-based practices to begin receiving funding.

Step down of funds is defined as an incremental reduction of funds over time. Using a step down approach, a program would receive an awarded amount in the first year of funding, and a percentage of that funding in subsequent funded years. One step down convention is the quarter step down, which allows for the full amount in year one, and then 75 percent of the original amount awarded (Year 2) 50 percent of the original amount (Year 3) and finally 25 percent of the original amount in year 4 in the final year of funding for that project. When Nebraska stakeholders weighed in on step down options, 70 percent indicated that they were in favor of the quarter step down process (100/75/50/25/0 percent).

Another topic that stakeholders discussed and voted upon was the number of years that programs should be funded in the full amount before the step down process begins. When stakeholders were asked when the step down process should begin, many indicated that they felt funding should be consistent for an extended period: 40 percent said 3 years while another 40 percent indicated the funding should be consistent for 5 years, and then begin the step down process (Table AH). Extended periods of time such as these would not permit new programs to receive funding; our recommendation is that a more conventional step down process be implemented (i.e. step down begins in year 2 of the funding cycle).

Timeline Options	Percent in Favor	Count
After 2 years of funding	5	1
After 3 years of funding	40	8
After 4 years of funding	15	3
After 5 years of funding	40	8
Totals	100	20

JAG Funding in Nebraska

In order to better understand the needs of the state, stakeholders examined criminal and juvenile justice trends in Nebraska (Section 2 – Environmental Context). The group then discussed JAG priority areas and an allocation scheme that will best meet those needs.

One of the goals of the JAG Strategic Planning Committee was to ensure that the funding was more evenly distributed across the seven federally defined priority areas. Stakeholders were asked to indicate which of the purposes areas were most pressing in Nebraska, by ranking them as low, medium or high priority areas. Law Enforcement was voted as a priority with 60 percent of stakeholder voting it as a top priority. Prosecution and Courts was also consistently marked as a high priority, with 58 percent of stakeholders ranking this JAG priority as a top priority (Table AI).

	Law Enforcement Responses		Prosecution and the Courts Responses	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Low	4	1	4	1
Medium	36	9	38	9
High	60	15	58	14
Totals	100	25	100	24


Based upon the stakeholders’ discussion and consensus, the Crime Commission, as the State Administrating Agency (SAA) met to determine allocations. On March 9, 2016, the Nebraska Crime Commission Executive Director Darrell Fisher disseminated communication informing JAG Strategic Planning Committee members that JAG funds would be allocated according to the following percentages (Figure AJ), beginning fiscal year 2016.³² A discretionary category was included in the event that funds are not requested or awarded within a specific purpose area.

³² JAG funds are schedule for release in October in 2016.

The allocations were decided as follows:

1. Law enforcement programs — 25 percent³³
2. Prosecution and court programs, including indigent defense — 25 percent
3. Drug treatment and enforcement programs — 15 percent
4. Prevention and education programs — 15 percent
5. Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs — 15 percent
6. Corrections and community corrections programs — 2.5 percent
7. Crime victim and witness programs (other than compensation) — 2.5 percent
8. Discretionary — 0 percent

Figure AJ: Nebraska Byrne JAG Fund Allowances by Percent



The Nebraska Crime Commission noted that, in order to receive JAG funding, the grant applicant must meet all JAG requirements in addition to giving priority to programs that demonstrate evidence-based practices, new initiatives, and data driven projects.

RESEARCH INFORMED PRACTICES & PROGRAMS

The label “evidence-based” refers to the incorporation of data and evidence regarding the effectiveness of specific treatments or interventions.³⁴ In the context of criminal justice and juvenile justice, evidence-based refers to policies and practices that have been empirically shown to produce positive outcomes such as reduced rates of recidivism and improvements in public safety.³⁵

Evidence-based practices differ from best practices in that they are proven through rigorous research that produces consistent findings across multiple sites; best practices in contrast are procedures that have been utilized with good effect over time but have not been substantiated through empirical

³³ This amount does not include monies earmarked for Nebraska State Patrol.

³⁴ Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice. 2009. “Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections.” <https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/024107.pdf>.

³⁵ The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) notes that a program or practice can be labeled as evidence-based when “their effectiveness has been demonstrated by causal evidence, generally obtained through high quality outcome evaluations.” Quote drawn from page 5 of “An Introduction to Evidence-Based Practices” by Stan Orchowsky of the Justice Research and Statistics Association; http://www.jrsa.org/projects/ebp_briefing_paper_april2014.pdf.

testing.³⁶ Since the mid-1990s, the federal government has actively pursued and funded research focused on determining program effectiveness through the evaluation of state and local practices with respect to both youth and adults engaged in justice systems.

Existing evidence-based practices which are currently utilized in criminal justice (as identified by the National Institute of Justice, or NIJ) include a wide range of activities conducted by various entities. Hot spot policing, mentoring for at-risk youth, and motivational interviewing for substance abuse are among the evidence-based practices that have demonstrated effectiveness in terms of promoting positive outcomes.³⁷

Programs, which differ from *practices* in that they are a specific set of activities as opposed to a general category of procedures, have also been evaluated with respect to their effectiveness. In Nebraska, only three programs have been identified by NIJ as promising and no programs have been identified as effective to date.³⁸

The challenges of implementing evidence-based practices in criminal justice are many. Primary among these challenges are the need for organizational change and development. Not only do many justice entities require significant alterations in practice and policy, but often there is also a need for a fundamental philosophical shift among both leaders and employees working in this sector. Collaboration on multiple levels, from policymakers down to front-line staff, is essential for the successful implementation of evidence-based approaches. Beyond such changes, it is also necessary to devote substantial resources (education, monies, training, etc.) to new or different techniques and technologies. While such changes are difficult, these modifications often provide better individual and societal-level outcomes in terms of resource investment and reduced crime rates.

Research informed programs, practices and examples were presented at each of the strategic planning session. In a final attempt to promote research informed practices, the focus group leaders requested programs from entities who planned to submitted proposal in the next funding cycle. Participants worked together in teams to discuss the elements of research and best practice that were present in the proposals. A sampling of most of the programs and practices discussed throughout the entire planning process can be found in the Appendix.

SURVEY RESULTS

Following the initial two JAG strategic planning focus groups, the strategic planning team developed an online survey that was distributed to juvenile and criminal justice professionals across the state. The online survey was made available to participants of the strategic planning meetings, as well as to other interested stakeholders. The survey was made available on May 23, 2016 and the final respondent completed the survey on June 27, 2016.

A total of 36 individuals responded to at least portions of the survey. Twenty of these individuals

³⁶ Austin/Travis County Reentry Roundtable. “Frequently Asked Questions: Evidence-Based Practices in Criminal Justice Settings.” http://canatx.org/CAN-Issue-Area-Groups/Reentry_Roundtable/CJP_EBP_FAQ.pdf.

³⁷ National Institute of Justice. 2016. “All Programs & Practices.” <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/Programs.aspx?Rating=1&type=Programs#practices>.

³⁸ National Institute of Justice. 2016. “Program Records: Nebraska.” <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/advsearch.aspx#programrecords>.

indicated that their agency had previously received JAG funding and 22 respondents indicated that they were a member of the 2016 JAG Strategic Planning Committee. A majority of respondents had attended all three planning meetings (Table AK) and about one-third of respondents had attended two planning meetings.


Number of Meetings	Percent	Number
Three Meetings	61	14
Two Meetings	31	7
One Meeting	4	1
Zero Meetings	4	1

Survey respondents were asked which JAG priority area was most closely associated with their work. The largest proportion (41.7%) of respondents stated affiliation with Law Enforcement (Figure AL). The second largest representation by priority area was Victim Services with five respondents (13.9%). The smallest areas of representation were Drug Treatment & Enforcement and Corrections & Community Corrections with two respondents each.

Perceptions of Crime and Criminal Justice in Nebraska

Respondents were surveyed on their perceptions of the current state of crime and criminal justice in Nebraska. The following instructional statement guided their responses: *“Now we would like to ask you a little about your perceptions of crime and crime prevention. This information will strengthen the JAG strategic plan by providing a baseline measure of perceptions of how the system currently functions. In responding to these questions, please limit your response to your perceptions of systems in Nebraska, not national or international systems or trends.”*

Figure AL: Distribution of Survey Respondents by JAG Priority Area



Responses were captured by Likert-scale response categories where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. Survey responses are summarized in Table AM. Three items have a fairly high level of agreement: 1) “My agency currently has the knowledge and capacity to implement evidence-based practices into our work” (mean = 3.64), 2) “The adoption and use of evidence-based practices are effective methods of ensuring public safety” (mean = 3.56), and 3) “Prisons keep the public safe by securely housing offenders” (mean = 3.48). In contrast, two items have particularly low scores: 1) “Prisons give offenders the help they need to stop offending” (mean = 1.68)

and 2) “Prison successfully deters people who have been to prison from committing crime in future” (mean = 1.76). In summary, there is a fairly high level of agreement that one’s agency has the ability to implement EBPs, that EBPs promote public safety, and that prisons do a good job in keeping us secure from offenders. However, there is little faith that prisons make inmates better or deter inmates from recidivating.

		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Prisons keep the public safe by securely housing offenders	1=SD	0	0	3.48
	2=D	8	32	
	3=N	2	8	
	4=A	10	40	
	5=SA	5	20	
Most people who appear before the Parole Board are initially turned down	1=SD	2	8	3.40
	2=D	2	8	
	3=N	8	32	
	4=A	10	40	
	5=SA	3	12	
Prisons give offenders the help they need to stop offending	1=SD	10	40	1.68
	2=D	13	52	
	3=N	2	8	
	4=A	0	0	
	5=SA	0	0	
People serving their sentence in the community, in lieu of prison, are well managed	1=SD	2	8	2.64
	2=D	10	40	
	3=N	8	32	
	4=A	5	20	
	5=SA	0	0	
The parole system can be relied upon to safely manage the release of offenders	1=SD	3	12	2.48
	2=D	11	44	
	3=N	7	28	
	4=A	4	16	
	5=SA	0	0	
Prison successfully deters people who have been to prison from committing crime in future	1=SD	11	44	1.76
	2=D	10	40	
	3=N	3	12	
	4=A	1	4	
	5=SA	0	0	
The adoption and use of evidence-based practices are effective methods of ensuring public safety	1=SD	1	4	3.56
	2=D	2	16	
	3=N	7	16	
	4=A	12	40	
	5=SA	3	24	

My agency currently has the knowledge and capacity to implement evidence-based practices into our work	1=SD	1	4	3.64
	2=D	4	16	
	3=N	4	16	
	4=A	10	40	
	5=SA	6	24	

Confidence in the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice in Nebraska

Respondents were surveyed on their confidence in the effectiveness of criminal justice in Nebraska. The following instructional statement guided their responses: *“Now, please think about all the different parts of the criminal justice system in Nebraska (law enforcement, the courts, the prison, probation and parole systems), and rate how confident YOU personally are in the effectiveness of the criminal justice system.”*

Responses were captured by Likert-scale response categories where 1 = not at all confident, 2 = not very confident, 3 = confident, 4 = fairly confident, and 5 = completely confident. Survey responses are summarized in Table AN. Confidence is rated as relatively high (mean = 3.68) for only one area: law enforcement. Confidence is rates low (mean = 1.96) in Nebraska’s prisons. Confidence in the system as a whole is relatively low (mean = 2.80). In summary, stakeholder survey respondents are not very confident in the effectiveness of any element of criminal justice other than law enforcement.

Table AN: Confidence in the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice in Nebraska (25 respondents)				
		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of law enforcement in Nebraska	1 = Not at all	0	0	3.68
	2 = Not very	3	12	
	3 = Confident	6	24	
	4 = Fairly	12	48	
	5 - Completely	4	16	
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of probation in Nebraska	1 = Not at all	0	0	2.80
	2 = Not very	13	52	
	3 = Confident	5	20	
	4 = Fairly	16	24	
	5 - Completely	1	4	
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of parole in Nebraska	1 = Not at all	0	0	2.64
	2 = Not very	15	60	
	3 = Confident	5	20	
	4 = Fairly	4	16	
	5 - Completely	1	4	
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of prisons in Nebraska	1 = Not at all	6	24	1.96
	2 = Not very	15	60	
	3 = Confident	3	12	
	4 = Fairly	1	4	
	5 - Completely	0	0	
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of courts in Nebraska	1 = Not at all	3	13	2.71
	2 = Not very	8	33	
	3 = Confident	8	33	
	4 = Fairly	3	13	
	5 - Completely	2	8	

Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of Nebraska’s criminal justice system as a whole	1 = Not at all	1	4	2.80
	2 = Not very	8	32	
	3 = Confident	11	44	
	4 = Fairly	5	20	
	5 - Completely	0	0	

Confidence in the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice in Nebraska

Respondents were surveyed on their confidence in the effectiveness of juvenile justice in Nebraska. The following instructional statement guided their responses: *“Now, please think about all the different parts of the juvenile justice system in Nebraska—law enforcement, the courts, local detention centers, probation, Youth Rehabilitation and Treatment Centers (YRTC), and rate how confident YOU personally are in the effectiveness of these sections of the juvenile system.”*

Responses were captured by Likert-scale response categories where 0 = no opinion, 1 = not at all confident, 2 = not very confident, 3 = confident, 4 = fairly confident, and 5 = completely confident. Survey responses are summarized in Table AO. Confidence is rated as highest (mean = 2.68) for law enforcement interactions with juveniles.

Table AO: Confidence in the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice in Nebraska (25 respondents)				
		Frequency	Percent	Mean Score
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of law enforcement interactions with juveniles in Nebraska	0 = No opinion	1	4	2.68
	1 = Not at all	3	12	
	2 = Not very	5	20	
	3 = Confident	10	40	
	4 = Fairly	6	24	
	5 = Completely	0	0	
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of juvenile probation in Nebraska	0 = No opinion	2	8	1.96
	1 = Not at all	5	20	
	2 = Not very	13	52	
	3 = Confident	2	8	
	4 = Fairly	3	12	
	5 = Completely	0	0	
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of local detention centers in Nebraska	0 = No opinion	2	8	2.25
	1 = Not at all	3	13	
	2 = Not very	9	38	
	3 = Confident	8	33	
	4 = Fairly	1	4	
	5 = Completely	1	4	
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of YRTCs in Nebraska	0 = No opinion	3	12	1.80
	1 = Not at all	5	20	
	2 = Not very	11	44	
	3 = Confident	6	24	
	4 = Fairly	0	0	
	5 = Completely	0	0	

Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of Nebraska's juvenile justice system as a whole	1 = Not at all	5	20	2.20
	2 = Not very	11	44	
	3 = Confident	8	32	
	4 = Fairly	1	4	
	5 = Completely	0	0	

Confidence is rated as lowest (mean = 1.80) for the effectiveness of YRTC's. Confidence in the juvenile justice system as a whole is relatively low (mean = 2.80), which is lower than the overall level of confidence in the adult criminal justice system.

Ratings of Perceptions of Crime and Criminal Justice in Nebraska by Priority Area

Of the 25 respondents to these attitudinal survey questions, identification by JAG priority areas was distributed in the following manner: Law Enforcement, 13; Planning, Evaluation, & Technology, 2; Courts, 3; Victim Services, 2; Prevention & Education, 3; and Drug Treatment & Education, 2. Table AP indicates the manner in which these attitudes vary depending on the priority area identification of the respondents. Mean response scores by group are presented in Table AP. A color key is used in this table in which groups with a mean above the overall sample mean scores are presented in green, whereas groups with a mean below the overall sample mean scores are presented in red. Moving from left to right for each question, this allows the reader to determine differences in mean attitudes by each Priority Area towards the content of each question. Moving from top to bottom, this allows the reader to determine how often each Priority Area group mean is higher or lower than the group mean. For instance, Planning, Evaluation & Technology and Victim Services have group mean scores that exceed the average 75% of the time (6 of 8 questions), whereas Law Enforcement has group mean scores that exceed the average only 38% of the time (3 of 8 questions). It is rare to find significant differences in data with multiple categories and only 25 respondents due to limitations in statistical power. However, for the question rating perceptions of parole, the mean score for the Courts is statistically significantly higher than the mean score for Law Enforcement.

Table AP: Mean Ratings of Perceptions of Crime and Criminal Justice in Nebraska by Priority Area						
	Law Enforcement	Planning, Evaluation, & Technology	Courts	Victim Services	Prevention & Education	Drug Treatment & Enforcement
Prisons keep the public safe by securely housing offenders	3.54	3.00	3.67	4.50	3.00	3.00
Most people who appear before the Parole Board are initially turned down	3.15	3.50	3.33	3.50	4.33	3.50
Prisons give offenders the help they need to stop offending	1.84	1.50	2.00	1.50	1.00	1.50
People serving their sentence in the community, in lieu of prison, are well managed	2.31	3.00	2.67	3.00	3.67	2.50
The parole system can be relied upon to safely manage the release of offenders	1.92*	2.50	3.67*	3.00	3.33	2.50
Prison successfully deters people who have been to prison from committing crime in future	1.77	2.00	2.33	1.50	1.00	2.00
The adoption and use of evidence-based practices are effective methods of ensuring public safety	3.46	4.00	2.33	4.00	4.00	4.50
My agency currently has the knowledge and capacity to implement evidence-based practices into our work	3.46	4.50	2.67	4.00	3.67	5.00

Notes: For each question, a number in red represents a score lower than the mean for all respondents, whereas a number in green represents a group mean score that is higher than the mean for all respondents. Overall mean scores can be found in Table AM. An asterisk represents differences that are significant at $p < .05$.

Ratings of Confidence in the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice in Nebraska by Priority Area

Mean response scores by group are presented in Table AQ. A color key is used in this table in which groups with a mean above the overall sample mean scores are presented in green, whereas groups with a mean below the overall sample mean scores are presented in red. Moving from left to right for each question, this allows the reader to determine differences in mean attitudes by each Priority Area towards the content of each question. Moving from top to bottom, this allows the reader to determine how often each Priority Area group mean is higher or lower than the group mean. For instance, Drug Treatment & Enforcement has group mean scores that exceed the average 83% of the time (5 of 6 questions), whereas Law Enforcement has group mean scores that exceed the average only 17% of the time (1 of 6 questions).

Table AQ: Mean Ratings of Perceptions of Confidence in the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice in Nebraska by Priority Area						
	Law Enforcement	Planning, Evaluation, & Technology	Courts	Victim Services	Prevention & Education	Drug Treatment & Enforcement
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of law enforcement in Nebraska	3.69	3.50	3.67	3.50	3.67	4.00
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of probation in Nebraska	2.38	2.50	2.67	3.50	3.67	4.00
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of parole in Nebraska	2.38	2.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.00
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of prisons in Nebraska	1.85	2.00	2.33	3.00	1.67	1.50
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of courts in Nebraska	2.54	2.50	3.33	2.00	2.00	4.50
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of Nebraska's criminal justice system as a whole	2.77	2.00	3.33	2.50	2.33	4.00

Note: For each question, a number in red represents a score lower than the mean for all respondents, whereas a number in green represents a group mean score that is higher than the mean for all respondents. Overall mean scores can be found in Table AN.

Ratings of Confidence in the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice in Nebraska by Priority Area

Mean response scores by group are presented in Table AR. A color key is used in this table in which groups with a mean above the overall sample mean scores are presented in green, whereas groups with a mean below the overall sample mean scores are presented in red. Moving from left to right for each question, this allows the reader to determine differences in mean attitudes by each Priority Area towards the content of each question. Moving from top to bottom, this allows the reader to determine how often each Priority Area group mean is higher or lower than the group mean.

For instance, Planning, Evaluation, & Technology and Drug Treatment & Enforcement consistently have group mean scores that exceed the average (6 of 6 questions), whereas Law Enforcement has group mean scores that exceed the average only 20% of the time (1 of 5 questions).

Table AR: Mean Ratings of Perceptions of Confidence in the Effectiveness of Juvenile Justice in Nebraska by Priority Area						
	Law Enforcement	Planning, Evaluation, & Technology	Courts	Victim Services	Prevention & Education	Drug Treatment & Enforcement
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of law enforcement interactions with juveniles in Nebraska	2.54	3.00	3.00	2.50	2.00	4.00
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of juvenile probation in Nebraska	1.54	2.50	1.67	3.00	2.33	3.00
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of local detention centers in Nebraska	1.85	3.00	2.00	2.50	3.33	2.50
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of YRTC's in Nebraska	1.85	2.50	1.33	2.50	0.67	2.50
Please rate how confident you feel in the effectiveness of Nebraska's juvenile justice system as a whole	2.08	3.00	1.67	2.50	1.67	3.50

Note: For each question, a number in red represents a score lower than the mean for all respondents, whereas a number in green represents a group mean score that is higher than the mean for all respondents. Overall mean scores can be found in Table AO.

Suggestions for Most Useful Programs or Practices for Promoting Public Safety

The online survey provided an open-ended opportunity for respondents to provide their suggestion for the most useful program or practice that could be implemented in Nebraska to promote public safety. Some specific programs were mentioned, whereas most suggestions represented broader trainings, programs, initiatives, and practices. Responses that were duplicative or not specific to the question were not included.

Drug Treatment Public Safety Law Enforcement Violent Crimes Programs Limited Funds Address Mental Health

Specific programs:

- *Men With Dreams*: currently implemented in Lincoln; a system-wide integrated model that uses positive self-psychology to promote self-improvement.
- Providing parents with resources and information related delinquency prevention, such as the Boys Town hotline. Drug prevention and education programs for middle and high school students.
- Multi-jurisdictional drug task forces.
- Intensive outpatient alcohol/drug treatment.

Broader trainings, programs, initiatives, and practices:

- Focus on violent crime, and less on traffic violations and drug violations.
- Systematic risk assessment protocols and training.
- Drug treatment and mental health treatment for low income individuals and smaller communities.
- Resources to combat the heroin epidemic and to fund crime lab efforts.
- Prevention/education diversion programs.
- Interventions for addressing disproportionate minority contact.
- Increased support of mental and behavioral health services to offenders and their families.
- State Attorney General support and assistance to all levels of state law enforcement.
- Advanced law enforcement training.
- Behavior training in county jails and parole.
- Address narcotic sales and dilapidated properties associated with the narcotics trade.
- Facilitate the work of the crime laboratory by alerting them when cases have been adjudicated and do not need to be analyzed.
- Programs targeting juvenile justice recidivism.

Suggestions for Coordinating or Leveraging of State Resources

The online survey provided an open-ended opportunity for respondents to provide their suggestion for coordinating or leveraging state resources. Some of the suggestions are provided below, divided into three categories: 1) suggestions focusing on coordination, 2) suggestions focusing on leveraging resources, and 3) general suggestions. Responses that were duplicative or not specific to the question were not included.

Law Enforcement Entities Resources Violent Agencies Funding Training Positively Impact Youth

Coordination

- Programs for engaging and encouraging youth coordinated with law enforcement efforts where officers engage youth in their communities in order to build relationships.
- Interagency networking in order to collaborate to produce a cohesive approach to care.
- A collaborative approach where multiple organizations come together and work toward mutually agreed upon goals with a trauma-informed perspective. A coordinated effort to bring together agencies with similar goals to positively impact the well-being of Nebraska youth.
- Statewide assistance in the investigation of violent crimes to include support services, and provide multifaceted training to officers involved in the investigation of those crimes.
- State probation and parole should be more in tune with some of the non-profits in the outlying counties of the state.
- I believe that communities that use a CRT type of coordination receive the most benefit for their dollars where all agencies come together to work on the problem without selfishness of promoting their agency.
- Coordination with other agencies not categorized as "criminal justice" (e.g., behavioral health; homelessness; economic development/labor).

Leveraging resources:

- Leverage the existing narcotics cooperative with resources from the community, such as neighborhood associations, HUD, the Real Estate Owners and Managers Association.

General:

- Fund programs that have previously been proven successful.
- Decentralize control of resources to include agencies in addition to the Crime Commission
- Provide regional training sites.

Suggestions for Increasing Confidence in Nebraska's Criminal Justice System

Respondents who indicated that they had low levels of confidence in aspects of Nebraska's criminal justice system were provided an opportunity to provide suggestions for increasing their level of confidence. Suggestions were placed into one of three categories: 1) training and education, 2) new programs or enhancing existing programs, and 3) systems change. Responses that were duplicative or not specific to the question were not included.

Sentences Trying Probation Matters Prison Law Enforcement Court Training Cases Justice System

Training and education:

- Judges training from experts (not their peers) in common subject matters, such as domestic and sexual violence.
- Better education of and accountability by Judges. Better communication and collaboration among different entities in the criminal justice system.
- Educating the public about how the system works and dispelling myths through research would go a long way to helping increase confidence in the system.
- Require law enforcement officers to be certified before allowing them to work in any type of enforcement capacity.

New programs or enhancing existing programs:

- Diversion program implementation that includes more minority offenders and innovation in the existing system, for example, night court or later office hours to allow people to attend to court matters without missing time at work.
- More prison programming to assist clients when they are released – especially sex offenders; more programming and assistance by probation instead of just policing the clients.
- More therapy and educational opportunities in prison.
- Implement the right programs in prisons to promote rehabilitation.
- Provide better and more reentry services for those leaving prison and jails that meet the needs of individuals trying to transition back into a community.

Systems change:

- Treatment and available resources need to be provided in order to address underlying issues correlated with involvement in the justice system. Instead of spending resources on sending people away, put the money into strengthening families and providing them with supports.
- Probation and parole violations are not dealt with effectively and that should change. With some offenders, when they know they can get away with things they will.
- Improve the supervision of probationers/parolees and reform the system that supervises and computes the sentences a prisoner receives at court sentencing into the number of years a prisoner actually serves within the state prison system.
- Make judges elected positions.
- Have judges or probation/parole officers demand where their clients receive services and not give the offender the choice of the agency, as some agencies are somewhat weak in their program provision.

- Hold probation/parole clients more accountable to what is expected.
- Eliminate "good-time" sentencing.
- Keep better track of persons released from our prison system.
- Prisons are so overcrowded, they cannot be managed effectively. Increase the use of diversion for minor offenders to reduce prison overcrowding.
- Provide a more comprehensive approach to the criminal justice population beyond just law enforcement, correctional system, probation, courts and parole.

Follow-Up Interviews to Online Stakeholder Survey

Survey respondents were invited to provide contact information to UNO researchers if they desired to be contacted for a follow-up interview to further contribute feedback for the strategic planning process. Stakeholders who provided contact information were emailed twice in order to confirm an interview. If no response was received, research staff concluded that individuals were no longer interested in participating in the follow-up. Follow-up phone interviews occurred in the last two weeks of June 2016. Below is a summary of questions asked and highlighted responses.

- 1. How are you feeling about the federal emphasis on JAG funds moving to fund evidence based programs?**
 - Positive feelings. We have a lot of good programs out there that have been evaluated. Good programs that do not have documented evidence are receiving opportunities to obtain that document.
 - To serve clients, data needs to be in place for assessing effectiveness.
 - The cost/benefit sheet on juvenile services that was presented in a strategic planning meeting was useful, because Nebraska is using some of the programs that do not have a good return on investment. State agency leadership should see that information.
 - That's just the way it is. The EBPs fit what we do. We've had to respond and change the application process for grants and what we track, but otherwise fine with it.
- 2. In your opinion is this federal emphasis on EBPs (evidence-based programs and practices) a good fit for Nebraska? Why or why not?**
 - Yes. It provides a framework for helping local agencies assess what is working elsewhere.
 - It is a good fit. It is a good thing to show what you are doing and how you are doing it and how you use evidence to prioritize what you do.
- 3. What are the primary benefits that you see from this move?**
 - Ensures that money is not being invested in programs that have not worked or do not appear to be cost effective. The benefits come back to focusing on the people we serve.
 - Giving advisory board guidance in what the state expects and what JAG expects and provides guidance for implementation.
- 4. What are the primary obstacles that you see from this move?**
 - Negative thinkers
 - Probation should be involved in collaborating with JAG-funded programs. Most of the youth that some grantees are serving are probation youth. Maybe also parole.
 - Really understanding how to articulate what we are doing in an evidence-based practice manner. Working with performance measures...we are dealing with new terminology, so can sometimes be difficult to clearly understand what is requested.
- 5. What are the primary challenges that you see in our JAG strategic planning process in Nebraska?**

- Representation from Western Nebraska: transportation and communication challenges. Rural counties have restrictions on the space and time in which they can provide services to youth: no spaces to hold classes. No reasons to seek money if no space to provide the programs.
 - Changes in what is targeted for funding and understanding how these changes will have a real impact on public safety in Nebraska: might be detrimental to our crime rate.
- 6. What do you feel most positive about regarding our JAG strategic planning process in Nebraska?**
- The educational piece.
 - Gives people a say when votes are held.
 - Have been very inclusive and willing to listen to stakeholders. Opportunities for stakeholders to participate and be heard.
- 7. Anything else you would like to add to inform our strategic planning process?**
- Struggling with data collection requirements that are tied to grant funding. Some families do not want to answer some of the questions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Nebraska recently announced budget shortfalls that will likely impact every state funded agency and many of the juvenile and criminal justice systems across the state. Given the current fiscal limitation, we must continue to focus on ways that JAG grantees can partner, coordinate, and/or leverage resources.

Grantees should look to partner, coordinate, and/or leverage with state, county, and local agencies, as well as with other grant programs. For instance, one interviewee suggested that probation should be more involved with the strategic planning process, as many of the grantees are providers for probation. To ensure that JAG Byrne-funded programs are implemented successfully and efficiently, coordination among funded programs must occur at both the state and local level. Coordination will be facilitated if JAG applicants collaborate with other criminal justice partners. We encourage a demonstrated collaborative effort by all JAG-funded entities, which can include shared goals, coordinated action plans, shared outcomes, etc. Potential initiatives that provide opportunities for coordination of activities and leveraging of funds include Evidence-Based Nebraska/Community-Based Juvenile Services Aid Program, the Council of State Governments' justice reinvestment efforts, STOP Violence Against Women, Office of Violence Prevention grants, Victims of Crime Act grants, and the Nebraska Department of Correctional Services' Vocational and Life Skills Initiative.

Secondly, just like every other process in juvenile justice and criminal justice, stakeholder philosophies extend across the spectrum: from the "social work" perspective on one hand, to the "law and order" perspective on the other. In reality, a complex, statewide system probably requires and must accommodate the full range of philosophies.

Moreover, holding people accountable does not have to conflict with a perspective that people can change, if given the proper services and assistance, and that the work of stakeholders can help them to change for the positive. This is a particular strength of EBPs. Evidence-based programs are an investment in at-risk individuals in an effort to promote sustainable change. But EBP participation is not

a passive process. Professionals must want to change and must take an active role in changing their agency practices for the better.

It is imperative that the JAG Byrne grant in Nebraska be able to support stakeholders across this spectrum and "meet them where they are at." Stakeholders with different roles and different philosophies must come together with a common agenda and respect, support, and cooperate with each other. If we achieve these two broad based goals, promoting public safety in Nebraska will be enhanced.

Thirdly, evidence-based programs and practices (EBPs) were a clear focus of the entire process: substantial effort was included in the strategic planning process, the creation of this document, and the creation of the Nebraska Crime Commission's JAG application kit. Our goal was to provide information on relevant EBPs, as well as resources for learning more about EBPs, that could potentially be implemented across the JAG federal purpose areas. We recommend a preference for funding EBPs over programs that do not have corresponding evidence of effectiveness. Moreover, when resources and funding allow, we recommend that promising practices and evidence-based practices be tracked by process evaluations that assess fidelity to their model of implementation and outcome evaluations that assess effectiveness in outcomes.

Finally, the data collected as part of this strategic planning process identify a number of specific areas of perceived acute need.

Law Enforcement: As indicated by Figure J, the ratio of black arrests to white arrests is large, both state-wide and in each judicial district. Although we do not suggest a direct causal impact of race on the actions of criminal justice professionals, we do suggest that initiatives that directly or indirectly address disproportionate minority contact be a preference for grant funds. Data on law enforcement arrests is not uniformly collected in the state of Nebraska.

Corrections: The online survey and interviews conducted as a part of this. For example, two areas of our justice system were perceived as particularly lacking: "Prisons give offenders the help they need to stop offending" and "Prison successfully deters people who have been to prison from committing crime in future". A subsequent survey question also indicated that stakeholders had a level of confidence in the effectiveness of our prisons that is lower than their level of confidence in other areas of criminal justice in Nebraska. Hence, Nebraska prisons are viewed as neither successfully serving as a deterrent, nor adequately providing offenders with assistance that would reduce recidivism, highlighting our prison system as a potential target for grant funds.

Prevention and Education: Regarding juvenile justice, areas with the lowest levels of confidence in effectiveness include probation and Youth Rehabilitation and Treatment Centers (YRTC's). Recent reform efforts (e.g. LB 561) in Nebraska have targeted these entities and progress has been made. However, the impact of reforms should be carefully tracked and promising practices and evidence-based practices must continue to be introduced and implemented with fidelity in both of these areas. As the effectiveness of our juvenile justice system direct influences adult offending, these areas are also clear potential targets for grant funds.

Proposed

Lincoln Police Department:

Plans to apply for JAG funding for a Law Enforcement Task Force. Will coordinate with: Lancaster County Sheriff's Dept., University of Nebraska Police Dept., Lancaster County Attorneys, Nebraska State Patrol, FBI, Omaha Police Department, U.S. Attorney's Office and Lancaster County Drug Court. Will share resources with: Intelligence, gang member information, information from community organizations, man power and equipment. Desired outcome: Reduction in narcotics sales/use, early intervention with youths potentially at risk for gang involvement and building positive relations with community members to gain more information about what is going on in their communities.

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Law Enforcement programs
- Prosecution and courts programs, including indigent defense
- Drug treatment and enforcement programs

Evidence-Based Program

Hot Spots Policing (Lowell, Mass.): A crime-reduction policing strategy that uses a disorder policing approach to concentrate on improving physical and social order in high-crime locations in Lowell, Mass. The program is rated **Effective**. There was a statistically significant reduction of the total number of calls for service in the treatment areas relative to the control. Observed disorder was alleviated and calls for service were not significantly displaced into surrounding treatment areas. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=208> and <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/PracticeDetails.aspx?ID=8>

Similar programs at CrimeSolutions.gov

High Point Drug Market Intervention: A problem-oriented policing program that aims to eliminate overt drug markets and the problems associated with them through a deterrence-based, pulling-levers framework. The program is rated **Effective**. The Intervention had a statistically significant impact on reducing violent incidents in the target areas. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=361>

Focused Deterrence Strategies: Problem-oriented policing strategies that follow the core principles of deterrence theory. The practice is rated **Promising**. The evaluation found that focused deterrence strategies (also referred to as "pulling levers" policing) can reduce crime. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/PracticeDetails.aspx?ID=11>

Proposed

Lutheran Family Services:

Plans to apply for JAG funding to help juveniles and adults impacted by sexual abuse, with emphasis on those with problematic sexual behavior toward friends/family members. Plan to coordinate with: Child Advocacy Centers, Probation, Courts, Law Enforcement, Nebraska Families Collaborative and other various non-profit agencies. The plan is to incorporate elements of TF-CBT, PSB-CBT, Good Lives Model and Darkness to Light End Child Sexual Abuse. Desired outcome: Educate providers and the public about issues surrounding sexual abuse and education regarding how to prevent, educate, and treat youth and adults in this realm.

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Prevention and education programs
- Crime victims and victim witness programs
- Prosecution and courts programs, including indigent defense

Evidence-Based Program

The National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN), University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center: <http://www.nctsn.org/resources/topics/treatments-that-work/promising-practices#q4>

Similar programs at CrimeSolutions.gov

Multisystemic Therapy for Youth With Problem Sexual Behaviors (MST-PSB): An adaptation of Multisystemic Therapy aimed at adolescents who have committed sexual offenses and demonstrated other problem behaviors. The program is rated **Promising**. Participants showed symptom decrease over time, and parents reported decreased behavior problems. Participants showed increases in cohesion and adaptability. There was an improvement in peer relations, a decrease in self-reported delinquent behavior, fewer arrests and incarceration. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=62>

Juvenile Sex Offender Treatment: A variety of treatment modalities (including cognitive behavioral therapy, relapse prevention, and multisystemic therapy) designed to reduce the risks and harms associated with juveniles at risk of committing sexual offenses. The practice is rated **Promising** for reducing juveniles' rates of general recidivism and sexual recidivism, but rated No Effects on violent recidivism rates. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/PracticeDetails.aspx?ID=36>

Program Profile: Sexual Abuse: Family Education and Treatment Program (SAFE-T): A community-based program that provides sexual abuse-specific assessment, treatment, consultation, and long-term support to adolescent sexual offenders and their families. The program is rated **Promising**. At the 20-year follow-up, adolescents who received treatment were significantly less likely to be charged for a sexual reoffense, a nonsexual violent offense, a nonviolent offense, or any criminal reoffense. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=203>

Proposed

Sarpy County Pretrial Mental Health Case Management:

Plans to apply for JAG funding for: A service that helps people with resources and ongoing support. Currently is the only program of its kind in the state of Nebraska. There is one employee, with a case load that varies, generally around 18-30 adult clients. This agency plans to coordinate with Region 6 funded agencies, including various service providers within the community, and Sarpy County Offices: Mental Health Diversion, County Attorney's Office, Public Defender's Office, District Court, County Court, Sheriff's Office and Law Enforcement Center, Department of Health and Human Services, Community Services, and Office of Veteran's Affairs. A Pretrial Screen is completed with each client, to determine which agency's available resources will best suit that specific client.

The program plans to share the following resources: Partnership with Mental Health Diversion for a continuum of care for client who qualify for Mental Health Diversion, Shared office space with Mental Health Diversion 1 day a week or more as needed to meet the needs of clients who need to meet with the case manager in the community, Mental Health Diversion offices, Referrals to service providers for mental health and substance abuse services for client's involved in the program, Ability to conduct the Brief Mental Health Screening and Pretrial Release Screening on inmates at the Sarpy County Law Enforcement Center so to identify appropriate clients for the Mental Health Case Management (MHCM) program, Referrals from County Attorney's office and Public Defender's office for clients to be screened for the MHCM program, Directly committing clients to the MHCM program by the County and District Court, Referring identified client to services provided by Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services, Sarpy County Human Services office, and the Office of Veteran's Affairs. Desired outcome: Reduce recidivism among individuals with mental illness and reduce the number of failures to appear for participants.

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Prosecution and courts programs, including indigent defense
- Corrections and community corrections programs
- Prevention and education programs
- Crime victims and witness programs

Evidence-Based Program

Sarpy County Pretrial Mental Health Case Management is assessing programs from three states:

1. Iowa: The First Judicial District in Waterloo, Iowa received JAG/Byrne funding to implement a dual-diagnosis program which is a comprehensive approach to providing mental health and co-occurring substance abuse treatment for offenders. The program was established to identify, educate, and treat offenders. It brought together the three professions – mental health, substance abuse, and corrections. The program expects offenders to comply with supervision requirements, medication management, participation in services, and other programming. This program was a JAG Showcase Program for FY2007. www.ncjp.org/policy_practice/practice/jag_showcase
2. Tennessee: According to the National Center for Justice Planning, JAG/Byrne funds are being used in Tennessee to provide mental health services to inmates and those on a post-booking program. Case managers assist the offenders with issues including accessing benefits and continuing treatment care upon release. www.ncjp.org/policy_practice
3. Colorado: JAG/Byrne funds support a Pretrial project that helps defendants spend less time in jail and more time in the community under professional pretrial supervision. The project demonstrated that new practices for bail/bond administration and pretrial services are more effective and sustainable. www.ncjp.org/policy_practice

Similar program at CrimeSolutions.gov

Auglaize County (Ohio) Transition (ACT) Program: The program works to reduce recidivism of jail inmates once they reenter the community, in part by linking inmates to various resources. The program is rated **Promising**. The program was successful in reducing recidivism rates among participants.

<http://www.crimelutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=130>

Similar program at BJA Success Story

Comprehensive Regional Adult Forensic Treatment (CRAFT) Project: The CRAFT Project provides services for co-occurring offenders upon incarceration and continue through release into the community and subsequent supervision and treatment. The Community Re-entry Plan will ensure connection to all relevant supports and services for participants. Inmates are assessed upon entry to jail/prison for eligibility. Eligibility criteria includes those with a non-violent offense(s), co-occurring mental health and substance abuse (MH/SA) issues, and voluntary program participation. The forensic therapists then complete a MH/SA assessment, risk assessment, and develops a Community Re-entry Plan with the inmate. Services commence during incarceration and follow seamlessly into the community. The Community Re-entry team meets bi-weekly and includes representatives from MH treatment providers, drug and alcohol treatment providers, employment providers, probation, case management, county MH program, jail/prison representative and employment, peer support, housing supports, and employment supports supervisor. The ultimate goal is to reduce recidivism among the target population. <https://www.bja.gov/SuccessStoryDetail.aspx?ssid=16>

<https://www.bja.gov/SuccessStoryDetail.aspx?ssid=16>

Proposed
Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Law Enforcement programs
- Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs
- Crime victims and victim witness

Evidence-Based Program

Biting Back in Huddersfield (England): A program designed to reduce repeat victimization in domestic burglary and thefts from cars. The program is rated **Effective**. There was a greater decrease in recorded and repeats crime than the surrounding areas. There was an increase in satisfaction with police services and no evidence of displaced crime. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=126>

Proposed
Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Law Enforcement programs
- Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs
- Crime victims and victim witness programs
- Drug treatment and enforcement programs

Evidence-Based Program

Checkpoint Tennessee: A year-long statewide sobriety checkpoint program in Tennessee intended to combat impaired driving and reduce alcohol-related car crashes. The program is rated **Effective**. Researchers observed a 20.4 percent reduction over the projected number of drunk-driving fatal crashes that would have occurred with no intervention. There was a statistically significant reduction in nighttime single-vehicle injury crashes after the start of the program, positive public opinion and awareness of the program. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=136>

Proposed
Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Law Enforcement programs
- Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs

Evidence-Based Program

Engine Immobilizers: Devices that prevent a vehicle from starting unless they receive the correct signal from the driver. The goal of these systems is to reduce car theft. The program is rated **Effective**. Cars fitted with immobilizers reduced rates of theft compared with cars not fitted with the device. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=160>

Proposed
Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Law Enforcement programs
- Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs

Evidence-Based Program

Integrated Ballistics Identification System (IBIS): An automated ballistics imaging and analysis system that populates a computerized database of digital ballistic images of bullets and casings from crime guns. The system assists forensic experts in making identifications for investigations and trials. The program is rated **Effective**. There was an increase in cold hits after system implementation. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=164>

Proposed
Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Law Enforcement programs
- Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs
- Corrections and community corrections programs
- Drug treatment and enforcement programs

Evidence-Based Program

Maryland Ignition Interlock Program: Maryland introduced this program for drivers with multiple alcohol offenses to decrease the number of subsequent alcohol-related traffic violations. The program is rated **Effective**. Being in the interlock program reduced a driver's risk of committing a violation within the first year by approximately 64 percent. There was a reduction in the risk for new alcohol-related traffic violations, and less recidivism after the program. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=63>

Proposed
Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Law Enforcement programs
- Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs
- Crime victims and witness programs

Evidence-Based Program

Safer Cities Programme (UK): An initiative designed to reduce crime, fear of crime, and to create safer environments for economic and community life to flourish. The program is rated **Effective**. There was a reduction in burglary rates, burglary risk and the fear of burglary. For programs of moderate to high intensity, crime rates dropped in surrounding areas, while displacement was found more with the low-intensity programs. <http://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=156>

Proposed
Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Crime victim and witness programs

Evidence-Based Program

Cognitive-Processing Therapy for Female Victims of Sexual Assault: This is a cognitive therapeutic program that is intended to assist female victims of sexual assault with posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). The program is rated **Promising**. Both PTSD and depression symptoms decreased with cognitive treatment, when compared with the control group. <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=437>

Proposed
Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Crime victim and witness programs
- Drug treatment and enforcement programs

Evidence-Based Program

Adolescent Community Reinforcement Approach: An outpatient program targeting 13 to 25 year olds that aims to replace activities supporting alcohol and drug use with positive behaviors that support recovery. The program is rated **Effective**. Participants were more likely to seek out and continue care services, abstain from substance use (in particular, marijuana), had less reported depression and internalized behaviors problems, and more social stability (i.e., working, receiving education, in a home or shelter, or receiving medical care). <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=137>

Proposed

Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Prevention and education programs
- Corrections and community corrections
- Prosecution and courts programs, including indigent defense

Evidence-Based Program

Kentucky Alternative Sentencing Social Work Program: The Department of Public Advocacy's (DPA) Alternative Sentencing Social Worker Program provides social worker services to indigent criminal defendants who are represented by Kentucky's public defenders. DPA began this pilot program to assess defendants' mental health and substance abuse needs and to plan viable community treatment options to relieve the courts' burden and potentially the burden of custody for corrections and jails. The pilot program began in 2006 pairing social workers with attorneys to facilitate more efficient use of court time and probation resources, and reduce incarceration costs.

During the JAG award period, funded social workers were based out of five field offices located throughout Kentucky. The program currently has social workers based out of eight field offices located throughout Kentucky. <https://www.bja.gov/SuccessStoryDetail.aspx?ssid=30>

Proposed

Not Aware of a Similar JAG-Funded Proposal in Nebraska

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Prosecution and courts programs, including indigent defense
- Drug treatment and enforcement programs
- Crime victims and victim witness programs

Evidence-Based Program

Queens (NY) Treatment Court: A drug court program for first-time nonviolent felony drug offenders who are arrested in Queens County, New York. The court provides drug or alcohol treatment services to persistent drug offenders with a history of substance abuse. The program is rated **Effective**. Program participation had a significant impact on recidivism rates. In fact, the program produced one of the largest recidivism impacts of any drug court nationwide that has been evaluated to date. <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=93>

Proposed

Possible proposal from U.S. Attorney's Office: Statewide Victim Notification System. This service will greatly expand services already available (VINE) by: Providing ability for victim services, prosecution, and investigators to make initial contact with victim; Allowing communication with victim; Providing website for victim information; Sending out notifications. Victim will be notified if there is a probation or parole violation committed by the offender. This service would be provided until successful conclusion of probation/parole by the offender. Example of victim notification: the offender has absconded; Allowing victim to easily update their current contact information; Allows victim to be informed and involved. Enhanced communication with the victim has the potential to make the victim feel more comfortable, therefore more likely to be involved in the system; Tap into VINE; Be measureable, because there is currently accessible data to compare against; Allowing victim to paint picture of "This is what justice looks like for me"; Tracking timeframes—example: How quickly the victim is receiving information; Ability to easily track victim impact statements, and victim satisfaction; Be of benefit to Criminal Justice professionals, who are mandated by statute to contact victims.

JAG Priority Group(s)

- Crime victim and victim witness programs
- Prosecution and courts programs, including indigent defense
- Planning, evaluation, and technology programs

Evidence-Based Program

Crime Victims' Rights – Victim Notification Systems: The right to notification is supported by each state, the U.S. Department of Justice through the [Victim Notification System \(VNS\)](#), and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement's (ICE) [Victim Notification Program \(VNP\)](#). The system by which victim notification is performed in each state may vary. If you are seeking information about an offender that has been incarcerated, the best place to start to ensure you receive victim notification is your state's department of corrections. Victims of federal crimes are able to obtain information about events pertaining to the criminal case and/or any defendants in the case through [VNS](#), a cooperative effort between the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the United States Postal Inspection Service, the United States Attorneys' offices, and the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Launched in 2001 as a pilot program with funding support from OVC, it became fully operational in 2002 under the development and oversight of the Executive Office for United States Attorneys. This free, computer-based system provides important information to victims of federal crimes. This information is also available in English and Spanish on the Internet and through a toll-free telephone number (1-866-365-4968).

[VNP](#) is another type of notification system and is a service of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Homeland Security Investigations, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Once a person that has entered the United States illegally has been convicted of a crime and served their prison sentence, he/she is transferred to ICE for deportation proceedings. The VNP provides information to eligible victims and witnesses about the offender's release and/or deportation activities. Eligible victims and witnesses can register to receive notifications by completing a Victim Request for Notification of Criminal Alien Status form found on the VNP website.

http://ojp.gov/ovc/rights/notification_VNS.html

<https://www.notify.usdoj.gov/>

<https://www.ice.gov/victim-notification>



justiceresearch.unomaha.edu
juvenilejustice.unomaha.edu