

DISTRICT

1

# 2016-2017

Nebraska Court Improvement Project

# Data Report



## Team 1

Gage, Jefferson, Johnson, Nemaha, Pawnee,  
Richardson, Saline and Thayer Counties



STATE OF  
**NEBRASKA**  
JUDICIAL BRANCH

Court Improvement  
Project

NURTURE. PROTECT. RESTORE.

THROUGH THE EYES  
OF THE  
CHILD INITIATIVE





Dear Judges, Team Members, Nebraska Legislators,  
and Members of the Community:

On behalf of the Through the Eyes of the Child Initiative, I would like to thank you for taking time to learn more about Nebraska’s Juvenile Court data.

At the end of the first Nebraska Children’s Summit in 2006, the Through the Eyes of the Child Initiative was officially inaugurated. The idea was to work to improve the court process in abuse/neglect cases in Nebraska by looking at the court system “through the eyes” of children and youth who are affected by the courts. This involves collaboration by stakeholders from a variety of disciplines, with the idea that those individuals are in the best place to understand the court process.

In 2012, the Through the Eyes of the Child Initiative was expanded, recognizing the importance of improving court processes for those involved in juvenile justice cases. In order to effectuate expansion of the scope of the Initiative, the Through the Eyes teams have worked to include stakeholders who are regularly engaged in juvenile justice work in their local communities.

As is common in numerous states, many of Nebraska’s children are in foster care without permanent homes and families. Too many of our youth do not get the intervention and support needed to become productive, safe, and contributing members of our communities. National court practice and studies have consistently shown that collaboration of individuals involved in the court process improves permanency and outcomes for children and youth. Over the last ten years, our Initiative has sought to accomplish these results. Outstanding work has already been done, but there is more to do in order to continue moving in a positive direction and achieving ever-improving results.

If you are not currently a member of your local team, I would encourage you to become involved. The support of the community, from citizens to members of the Legislature, is vital in such endeavors.

Thank you for the work you do to improve the lives of children and families in Nebraska.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael G. Heavican". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

**Michael G. Heavican,**  
Chief Justice of the Nebraska Supreme Court

# Contents

|                         |    |  |
|-------------------------|----|--|
|                         | 4  | Introduction                           |
|                         | 5  | District/Team Map                      |
|                         | 6  | Demographics                           |
| <b>Child Welfare</b>    | 8  | Child Welfare                          |
|                         | 12 | Permanency of Child Welfare Cases      |
|                         | 15 | Child Welfare   <b>JUSTICE</b> Data    |
| <b>Juvenile Justice</b> | 18 | Entry Into the Juvenile Justice System |
|                         | 23 | Juvenile Justice   <b>JUSTICE</b> Data |
|                         | 28 | Probation Supervision                  |
|                         | 34 | References                             |
|                         | 35 | Appendix                               |

# Introduction

The Court Improvement Project produces annual data reports that include demographics, data on entry into foster care and permanency, and juvenile justice data. The following sources are referenced throughout the report, including full citation information for data that is publicly available.




On behalf of the “Eyes” initiative we all want to thank you for your participation and commitment to the youth and families we serve.

You will find among the various materials provided updated data reports for your team as well as overall statewide statistics.

The Court Improvement Project has worked closely with JUSTICE to improve how data is initially entered and ensure that the results are accurate. While there are still areas to address, the reports provided to you reflect these ongoing efforts and represent the most accurate data collected about our system to date. While this data cannot be the exclusive reason to pursue certain changes we know it can be a guide for team discussions about where improvements can be made and how best to address them.

As always, please feel free to contact anyone affiliated with the Court Improvement Project or myself if you have any questions or concerns. Thanks to your efforts we have made important changes since we started the initiative in 2006. These latest reports will help us continue to move forward.




**Lawrence D. Gendler,**

*Judge, Sarpy County Separate Juvenile Court*

# District/Team Map 1

- |                    |                    |                               |                             |                   |                   |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>District 1</b>  | <b>District 2</b>  | <b>District 3 (Lancaster)</b> | <b>District 4 (Douglas)</b> | <b>District 5</b> | <b>District 6</b> |
| Team ML            | Team 1 - MAH       | Team MAH                      | Team ML                     | Team 1 - MAH      | Team 1 - MAH      |
|                    | Team 2 - MAH       |                               |                             | Team 2 - MAH      | Team 2 - MAH      |
|                    | Team 3 - MAH       |                               |                             | Team 3 - MAH      |                   |
| <b>District 12</b> | <b>District 11</b> | <b>District 10</b>            | <b>District 9</b>           | <b>District 8</b> | <b>District 7</b> |
| Team 1 - MAH       | Team 1 - MAH       | Team 1c - MAH                 | Team 1 - MAH                | Team 1 - MAH      | Team - MAH        |
| Team 2 - MAH       | Team 2 - ML        | Team 2e - ML                  | Team 2 - MAH                | Team 2 - ML       |                   |
| Team 3 - ML        | Team 3 - ML        | Team 3w - ML                  |                             | Team 3 - MAH      |                   |
|                    | Team 4 - ML        |                               |                             |                   |                   |




# Demographics


The most recent available data from the U.S. Census Bureau was used to estimate the percent of children under 19 living in poverty<sup>1</sup> the youth population<sup>2</sup> and the youth population of color for your team and the state. Information regarding the youth population in your area can be helpful to determine what resources may be needed through a culturally-competent framework. Children living in poverty are at a higher risk of maltreatment and offending, and may need access to increased resources.

## Youth Population<sup>2</sup>

District 1: Youth Population by County



All Youth Under 19 for District 1




**Total youth across District 1 = 16,667.5**

**Team 1: Total youth under 19 = 23.2%**

### Child Poverty Rate<sup>3</sup>

|       |                   |
|-------|-------------------|
| State | District/<br>Team |
| 16.4% | 17.1%             |


Poverty rate (%) for children under age 18 by County in District 1



In an ideal world there would be no poverty and monetary inequality would not exist. However, this is not the case, the graph (below or adjacent for teams with more than 3 counties) shows what an equal distribution of wealth would look like at different levels (i.e. the grey line). The blue line shows how poverty is actually affecting your team and district. The closer the blue line is to the center of the graph the less poverty there is in its corresponding county while those further out represent more poverty.

**For poverty comparison across the state by county, see Appendix, page 35.**

### District 1: Diversity by County<sup>2</sup>




# Child Welfare

This section presents data on youth in the Nebraska Child Welfare System provided by the Fostering Court Improvement (FCI) team. DHHS does not directly give data to CIP; instead, like all states, data is submitted to the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) and the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS). The FCI uses the AFCARS and NCANDS to create a report that inform the courts and child welfare agencies in an effort to facilitate discussions among local decision makers. More data than what is provided in this report can be found at their website: <http://fosteringcourtimprovement.org/ne/>. Please note that this data is provided in aggregate and not in its raw form. Data is broken down by county, DHHS service area, judicial district, and Through the Eyes of a Child teams. Data presented in this report corresponds with data provided for the teams as FCI currently has the teams broken down. The Nebraska Court Improvement team is work with FCI and DHHS to update the changes of the teams for future reports.

## Re-entries into Foster Care<sup>4</sup>


State





## Re-entries into Foster Care<sup>4</sup>


Re-entry to foster care is when a child who was previously removed and placed in foster care later returns home and then is again removed from the home. This does not include cases where a family with a prior removal later becomes involved in a voluntary case.



## Type of Out-of-Home Care<sup>5</sup>


Because of the rapid changes in the foster care population, the data on "Type of Out-of-Home Care" are a breakdown of the placement of all children in foster care on a single day – September 30, 2017.

Placement Settings of Children in Care



## Type of Out-of-Home Care<sup>5</sup>

Average Per-Diem Foster Care Payments by Placement Setting




# Permanency of Child Welfare Cases

The permanency data examine the population of youth who were discharged from the child welfare system.


## Type of Discharge<sup>7</sup>

The data show the types of discharges from the Nebraska Child Welfare System for your team


### Reasons for Discharge District 1



## Median Months to Discharge by Year, FFY 2003 to FFY 2017<sup>7</sup> for Team



## Reunifications within 12 Months<sup>8</sup>



Note: Data from Pawnee county was not provided. The months of September and October do not have any data from Nemaha County.

# Child Welfare | JUSTICE Data

The Child Welfare Case data is obtained from the Judicial Users System To Improve Court Efficiency (**JUSTICE**), the Nebraska Supreme Court's Case and Financial Management System for Nebraska trial courts. Clerks enter court information on hearings and orders into **JUSTICE** as they occur in a case. The Court Improvement Project extracts data from Cognos, the Administrative Office of the Court's data management system, which extracts data directly from **JUSTICE** for reporting purposes. This report presents an overview of data entered into **JUSTICE** for fiscal year 2016-2017 as well as the first half of fiscal year 2017-2018. Fiscal years run from June 30th to July 1st each year.

Since the last data report, there have been some changes in case progression standards based on Nebraska Rule § 6-104. The Nebraska Court Improvement Project is working closely with **JUSTICE** staff, Judges, business analysts, and clerks to improve measurement and standardize data entry into **JUSTICE** to create a real time data dashboard for each Through the Eyes of a Child (TEOC) team. This will be found on our website, estimated time of completion is October, 2018.

The data presented in this report, depict the number of cases terminated in fiscal year 2016-2017 as well as the first half of 2017-2018 data from **JUSTICE**. To get a measure of case termination, a calculation of total days is computed from the date the petition was submitted to the date the case was terminated. Any case that was closed during the fiscal year is presented in this report. Additionally, the average months for the state, TEOC district, and TEOC team's case termination is included. This data does not include any youth who was transferred in or out because **JUSTICE** does not currently track where the youth transferred from or where they transferred. Not knowing all of the information for the youth's case does not allow for proper data analysis. The Nebraska Court Improvement Project (CIP) is working with **JUSTICE** developers to better tracking transfer cases.


The state of Nebraska had a total of 1,602 child welfare cases terminated in fiscal year 2016-2017; 26 were for abandonment, 205 were for abuse, 176 were for homelessness, and 1,195 were for neglect. The following graph depicts the length of time it took your team to terminate a case, as well as the length of time it took your district to terminate a case, and for the state as a whole to terminate their cases. Additionally, it is important to note that 6 of these youth did not have a judge assigned to their case. An analysis of variance shows that the youth who did not have a judge assigned to their case had their case open more days ( $M = 947.66$ ) than youth who had a judge assigned [ $M = 525.9$ ;  $F(1,1,600) = 3.837$ ,  $p = .050$ ].

For the first half of fiscal year 2017-2018, a total of 1,017 child welfare cases were terminated. Of these 1,017 cases, 32 were for abandonment, 136 were for abuse, 109 were for homelessness, and 740 were for neglect. All youth had a judge assigned for this fiscal year. However, because the full year has not come to an end a statistical analysis that compares time to termination for youth with a judge assigned to those without a judge assigned is not possible at this time. The graphs pertaining to fiscal year 2017-2018 depict the length of time it took your team to terminate a case, as well as the length of time it took your district to terminate a case, and for the state as a whole to terminate their cases.

## Time to Case Termination<sup>6</sup>

The data represent the amount of time between the date the petition is filed to the date the case is terminated in **JUSTICE** for all cases terminated in state fiscal years 2016-17 and 2017-18.

FY 2017 July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017: State, District/Team Comparisons



| FY 2017                   |      |
|---------------------------|------|
| Average Months - Team     | 10.0 |
| Average Months - District | 10.0 |
| Average Months - State    | 17.6 |

- 1096 days and up over 3 years
- 731-1095 days within 3 years
- 545-730 days within 2 years
- 366-545 days within 18 months
- 181-365 days within 1 year
- 0-180 days within 6 months




The data represent the amount of time between the date the petition is filed to the date the case is terminated in **JUSTICE** for all cases terminated in state fiscal years 2016-17 and 2017-18.



## Time to Case Termination<sup>6</sup>

FY 2018 July 1, 2017-February 26, 2018: State, District/Team Comparisons



| FY 2018                   |      |
|---------------------------|------|
| Average Months - Team     | 14.0 |
| Average Months - District | 16.6 |
| Average Months - State    | 19.6 |

- 1096 days and up over 3 years
- 731-1095 days within 3 years
- 545-730 days within 2 years
- 366-545 days within 18 months
- 181-365 days within 1 year
- 0-180 days within 6 months


# Entry into the Juvenile Justice System

Although the two primary child-serving entities perform different functions, they have the same objective: improving the lives of youth. The child welfare system responds to well-being, abuse, neglect, and permanency concerns. On the other hand, the juvenile justice system focuses on youth accountability and community safety by utilizing targeted case management and services that seek sustained behavioral change. In Nebraska, the juvenile justice system supervises not only those youth who were found responsible for a delinquent act, but also status youth or those who have participated in behaviors that are prohibited by law due to their status as a juvenile. The ultimate goal in juvenile justice is to prevent youth from returning to the system or becoming involved in the adult criminal justice system (recidivism) while also ensuring the juvenile does not pose a threat to the community.

## Number of Arrests<sup>9</sup>

The chart and table reflect the number of arrests of youth 17 and under per 100 youths, aged 10-17 in 2016. If team/county is not listed they did not have any youth arrests.

| County       | Arrests    |
|--------------|------------|
| Gage         | 120        |
| Richardson   | 37         |
| Saline       | 43         |
| Jefferson    | 31         |
| Nemaha       | 12         |
| Pawnee       | 1          |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>244</b> |




## Youth Referred to Diversion Programs<sup>10</sup>

Youth charged with minor offenses may have the chance to participate in voluntary diversion programs. Juvenile diversion programs allow youths who commit offenses to be directed away from more formal juvenile justice system involvement. This chart demonstrates the use of diversion program across Nebraska in 2016. For county level information, please reference the "Kids Count" report produced by Voices for Children in Nebraska.

| Team | Youth on Diversion | % Youth in Diversion |
|------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1    | 168                | 4.2%                 |
| 2.1  | 54                 | 1.4%                 |
| 2.2  | 30                 | 0.8%                 |
| 2.3  | 466                | 11.8%                |
| 3    | 555                | 14.0%                |
| 4    | 790                | 19.9%                |
| 5.1  | 56                 | 1.4%                 |
| 5.2  | 209                | 5.3%                 |
| 5.3  | 54                 | 1.4%                 |
| 6.1  | 63                 | 1.6%                 |
| 6.2  | 112                | 2.8%                 |
| 7    | 243                | 6.1%                 |
| 8.1  | 25                 | 0.6%                 |
| 8.2  | 19                 | 0.5%                 |
| 8.3  | 43                 | 1.1%                 |
| 9.1  | 273                | 6.9%                 |
| 9.2  | 298                | 7.5%                 |
| 10.1 | 101                | 2.5%                 |
| 10.2 | 19                 | 0.5%                 |
| 10.3 | 18                 | 0.5%                 |
| 11.1 | 53                 | 1.3%                 |
| 11.2 | 22                 | 0.6%                 |
| 11.3 | 26                 | 0.7%                 |
| 11.4 | 77                 | 1.9%                 |
| 12.1 | 32                 | 0.8%                 |
| 12.2 | 47                 | 1.2%                 |
| 12.3 | 73                 | 1.8%                 |


# Map of Formal Diversion Programs in Nebraska | 2016<sup>11</sup>




## Detention<sup>12</sup>

A young person is screened with the Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) if they come into contact with law enforcement and the officer believes the youth may need to be detained. The RAI tool is designed to assess the risk to re-offend, potential community safety concerns, and the risk of flight from the court's jurisdiction. The tool is designed to aid probation intake officers in the decision to detain youth. The RAI will provide the officer with an intake decision. The officer may use discretion to determine if the intake decision will be utilized, or should be overridden to a higher or lower level of supervision. The graphs show the final intake decision made by officers during the 2016-17 fiscal year, and the percent of overrides to lower and higher levels of supervision.

### Detention State of Nebraska




### Detention Team 1



## Juvenile Court Petitions Filed<sup>13</sup>

These charts show the subtypes of juvenile justice petitions filed and entered into **JUSTICE** during state fiscal year 2016-17. The data represent the most serious charge from original filings only and do not include any charges filed as supplemental petitions. Cases that transferred between courts or to adult criminal court are excluded from the analysis.



The Juvenile Justice Case data is also obtained from **JUSTICE**, this portion of the report also presents an overview of data entered into **JUSTICE** for fiscal year 2016-2017 as well as the first half of fiscal year 2017-2018. As a reminder, fiscal years run from June 30th to July 1st each year.

Like the child welfare case progression standards, juvenile justice case progression standards have also been updated (see Nebraska Rule § 6-104). The Nebraska CIP team will also include these data updates to the forthcoming dashboard for all TEOC teams. This will be found on our website, estimated time of completion is October 2018.

The data presented in the following section of this report depict the number of juvenile justices cases terminated in fiscal year 2016-2017 as well as the first half of 2017-2018 data from **JUSTICE**. Separate analyses were conducted for youth status offenses and youth delinquent acts. To get a measure of case termination for each, a calculation of total days is computed from the date the petition was submitted to the date the case was terminated. At this time, time on diversion is not in Cognos and cannot be included in the analysis. The Nebraska CIP is working with the Cognos' framework management team to get diversion start and end dates added into Cognos. Additionally, like the child welfare data, this data does not include any youth who was transferred in or out because **JUSTICE** does not currently track where the youth transferred from or where they transferred. Not knowing all of the information for the youth's case does not allow for proper data analysis. The Nebraska Court Improvement Project (CIP) is working with **JUSTICE** developers to better tracking transfer cases. Thus, any case that was closed during the fiscal year is presented in this report. Additionally, the average months for the state, TEOC district, and TEOC team's case termination is included.

### Status Offenses

The state of Nebraska had a total of 1,153 status/truancy cases terminated in fiscal year 2016-2017. The following graph pertaining to status offenses depict the length of time it took your team to terminate status cases, as well as the length of time it took your district to terminate these types of cases, and for the state as a whole to terminate their cases. Of these, 22 of these youth did not have a judge assigned to their case. An analysis of variance shows that the youth who did not have a judge assigned to their case had their case open more days ( $M = 4157$ ) than youth who had a judge assigned [ $M = 499$ ;  $F(1,1151) = 984$ ,  $p < .001$ ].

A total of 732 status/truancy cases terminated in fiscal year 2016-2017. Of these, 2 of these youth did not have a judge assigned to their case. An analysis of variance shows that the youth who did not have a judge assigned to their case had their case open more days ( $M = 3397$ ) than youth who had a judge assigned [ $M = 419$ ;  $F(1,730) = 91.5$ ,  $p < .001$ ].

### Delinquent Acts


The state of Nebraska had a total of 5,008 delinquency cases terminated in fiscal year 2016-2017, 166 were for traffic offenses, 4,224 were for misdemeanors, and 622 were for a felony. The graphs on pages 26-27 depicts the length of time it took your team to terminate delinquency cases, as well as the length of time it took your district to terminate delinquency cases, and for the state as a whole to terminate their delinquency cases. Additionally, it is important to note that 199 of these youth did not have a judge assigned to their case. An analysis of variance shows that the youth who did not have a judge assigned to their case had their case open more days ( $M = 3,518$ ) than youth who had a judge assigned [ $M = 508$ ;  $F(1,5006) = 3102$ ,  $p < .001$ ].

For the first half of fiscal year 2017-2018, a total of 2,902 delinquency cases were terminated. Of these 2,902 cases, 113 were for traffic offenses, 2,406 were for misdemeanors, and 383 were for a felony. Additionally, 71 of the youth terminated this fiscal year did not have a judge assigned to their case, an analysis of variance shows that the youth who did not have a judge assigned to their case had their case open more days ( $M = 3,435$ ) than youth who had a judge assigned [ $M = 366$ ;  $F(1,2897) = 2719$ ,  $p < .001$ ].

## Time to Case Termination - Status Offenses<sup>13</sup>

The data represent the amount of time between the date the petition is filed to the date the case is terminated in **JUSTICE** for all cases terminated in state fiscal years 2016-17 and 2017-18. The analysis separates youth adjudicated for delinquent behaviors and youth adjudicated for status offenses.


FY 2017 July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017: State, District/Team Comparisons






## Time to Case Termination - Status Offenses<sup>13</sup>

FY 2018 July 1, 2017-February 26, 2018: State, District/Team Comparisons




## Time To Case Termination - Delinquency Offenses<sup>13</sup>

FY 2017 July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017: State, District/Team Comparisons



## Time To Case Termination - Delinquency Offenses<sup>13</sup>

FY 2018 July 1, 2017-February 26, 2018: State, District/Team Comparisons



| FY 2018                   |      |
|---------------------------|------|
| Average Months - Team     | 8.8  |
| Average Months - District | 8.8  |
| Average Months - State    | 14.7 |

- 1096 days and up over 3 years
- 731-1095 days within 3 years
- 545-730 days within 2 years
- 366-545 days within 18 months
- 181-365 days within 1 year
- 0-180 days within 6 months

# Probation Supervision

Juvenile probation in Nebraska may work with youth at many stages of their court case(s), not just youth who receive a disposition of probation. The data represented is derived from 3 different samples provided by the Administrative Office of Probation through the Cognos reporting environment as well as the YRTC annual report. They are the following:

## **Youth Placed in OHP for FY 16-17<sup>6</sup>**

This population of youth are those that had an admission to an out-of-home placement (OHP) between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017. Please note: there may be duplicate placements for youth on this list due to youth having a court case in more than one county.

## **Youth at YRTC FY16-17**

Data was provided by the Youth Rehabilitation & Treatment Centers in Nebraska through their annual report numbers. These include all admittances by Service Area and County for fiscal year 2016-2017. Only counties with data were included in this report.

## **Youth with Discharges FY16-17<sup>7</sup>**

Youth that had a court case discharged during the fiscal year are included in this analysis. This includes data of youth of all ages and from all counties. All types of discharges are included (completion of pre-adjudication [which is different than traditional probation], successful and unsuccessful discharges). If a youth had more than one court case discharged in a year, they will be included multiple times within the data set. Court cases that were ultimately dismissed are not included in this data set.

## Out-of-Home Placements for FY 16-17<sup>14</sup>

This population of youth had an admission to an out-of-home placement (OHP) between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017.

Youth served by Juvenile Probation may be placed out-of-home for several reasons, including a court-ordered placement to receive services, a placement arranged by parents for treatment or care, or a placement related to a Department of Health and Human Services case. Juvenile Probation tracks all placements of youth who are under their supervision and out of home. This data is the number of placements by placement type for all youth out of home for the 2016-17 fiscal year.

### **Placements were categorized as one of the following:**

- Congregate non-treatment (Group Home A and B, Independent Living, Therapeutic Group Home)
- Congregate treatment (Psychiatric Residential Treatment)
- Crisis stabilization or shelter (Crisis Stabilization, Enhanced Shelter Care, Shelter Care)
- Detention (Detention Secure, Detention Staff Secure)
- Foster care/specialized homes (Developmental Disability Group Home, Developmental Disability Extended Family Home, Relative/Kinship, Respite Care)
- Acute inpatient hospitalization and short-term residential (Acute Inpatient Hospitalization, Short-Term Residential)
- Jail
- Missing from care (Runaway from Home, Runaway from Placement)

The tables in this report include the percent of each placement type which ended during the fiscal year and the median days the youth spent in those ended placements as well as the minimum days in placement and the maximum days in placement.

## Out-of-Home Placements for FY 16-17<sup>14</sup>

This population of youth that had an admission to an out-of-home placement (OHP) between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017.

### State

|  | Youth in Placement | Days in Placement |         |         |         |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|
|  | Total              | Median            | Minimum | Maximum | % Ended |
| Congregate non-treatment                                   | 697                | 106               | 0       | 434     | 76.2%   |
| Congregate treatment                                       | 314                | 92                | 0       | 467     | 90.1%   |
| Crisis Stabilization or Shelter                            | 849                | 25                | 0       | 247     | 99.8%   |
| Detention  | 1858               | 18                | 0       | 300     | 99.5%   |
| Foster Care/Specialized Homes                              | 425                | 71                | 0       | 458     | 87.3%   |
| Acute inpatient Hospitalization and Short Term Residential | 130                | 4.5               | 0       | 164     | 100.0%  |
| Jail   | 291                | 112               | 0       | 358     | 76.0%   |
| Missing from care  | 579                | 15                | 0       | 364     | 95.7%   |

### Team

|  | Youth in Placement | Days in Placement |         |         |         |
|--|--------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|
|  | Total              | Median            | Minimum | Maximum | % Ended |
| Congregate non-treatment                                   | 32                 | 83                | 0       | 361     | 91.0%   |
| Congregate treatment                                       | 10                 | 93                | 13      | 312     | 90.0%   |
| Crisis Stabilization or Shelter                            | 19                 | 27                | 1       | 83      | 100.0%  |
| Detention  | 35                 | 13                | 0       | 87      | 100.0%  |
| Foster Care/Specialized Homes                              | 15                 | 143               | 11      | 378     | 80.0%   |
| Acute inpatient Hospitalization and Short Term Residential | 1                  | 15                | 15      | 15      | 100.0%  |
| Jail   | 6                  | 128               | 37      | 347     | 100.0%  |
| Missing from care  | 3                  | 3                 | 1       | 11      | 100.0%  |


## Youth at YRTC FY16-17<sup>15</sup>

Data from Kearney and Geneva YRTC annual reports: Probation and courts placed 172 youth at YRTC facilities, 169 had a corresponding TEOC team and 4 youth were tribal youth. If team is not listed they did not have youth in the YRTC.

| Team         | YRTC Location |         | Total Youth in YRTC | Team % |
|--------------|---------------|---------|---------------------|--------|
|              | Geneva        | Kearney |                     |        |
| 2.1          | 0             | 1       | 1                   | 0.6%   |
| 2.2          | 0             | 1       | 1                   | 0.6%   |
| 2.3          | 1             | 0       | 1                   | 0.6%   |
| 3            | 15            | 31      | 46                  | 26.7%  |
| 4            | 10            | 36      | 46                  | 26.7%  |
| 5.1          | 1             | 0       | 1                   | 0.6%   |
| 5.2          | 1             | 5       | 6                   | 3.5%   |
| 6.1          | 0             | 5       | 5                   | 2.9%   |
| 6.2          | 0             | 4       | 4                   | 2.3%   |
| 7            | 1             | 12      | 13                  | 7.6%   |
| 8.1          | 1             | 0       | 1                   | 0.6%   |
| 9.1          | 2             | 9       | 11                  | 6.4%   |
| 9.2          | 1             | 5       | 6                   | 3.5%   |
| 10.1         | 0             | 2       | 2                   | 1.2%   |
| 10.3         | 0             | 1       | 1                   | 0.6%   |
| 11.1         | 1             | 2       | 3                   | 1.7%   |
| 11.2         | 1             | 0       | 1                   | 0.6%   |
| 11.3         | 0             | 1       | 1                   | 0.6%   |
| 11.4         | 3             | 11      | 14                  | 8.1%   |
| 12.3         | 1             | 3       | 4                   | 2.3%   |
| Tribal Youth | 1             | 3       | 4                   | 2.3%   |


## Youth with Discharges FY16-17<sup>16</sup>

Youth that had a court case discharged during the fiscal year are included in this analysis. The charts show the breakdown of youth discharged from probation by court case discharge for the 2016-17 fiscal year by state and by team. Court cases that were dismissed are not included in the analysis.





## Average Age of Discharges FY16-17<sup>16</sup>



| Age at Discharge | Total | Percent |
|------------------|-------|---------|
| 11 Years         | 1     | 0.5%    |
| 13 Years         | 4     | 2.1%    |
| 14 Years         | 13    | 6.9%    |
| 15 Years         | 22    | 11.6%   |
| 16 Years         | 23    | 12.2%   |
| 17 Years         | 33    | 17.5%   |
| 18 Years         | 58    | 30.7%   |
| 19 Years         | 35    | 18.5%   |
|                  | 189   |         |

**Team**

# References

---

- <sup>1</sup> Webber, T., Through the Eyes of a Child Team and District Nebraska State Map. (2017). Nebraska Court Improvement Project. Retrieved from: [https://supremecourt.nebraska.gov/sites/default/files/Programs/CIP/events/TEOC\\_District\\_Teams\\_Map\\_with\\_County\\_Seats.pdf](https://supremecourt.nebraska.gov/sites/default/files/Programs/CIP/events/TEOC_District_Teams_Map_with_County_Seats.pdf)
- <sup>2</sup> United States Census Bureau. (2017, December). [Poverty status in the past 12 months by sex by age]. Raw Data Table B1700, 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.
- <sup>3</sup> United States Census Bureau. (2017, December). [Under 19 Total Population and non-Hispanic White and Minority Populations: Nebraska and Its Counties 2012-2016 timeframe]. Raw Data tables B01001 and B01001H, 2012-2016 American Community Survey. Data pulled by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on December 7, 2017.
- <sup>4</sup> Fostering Court Improvement: Nebraska. (2018, January). Children Removed to Foster Care During October 2016 through September 2017. Retrieved from: <http://fosteringcourtimprovement.org/ne/>
- <sup>5</sup> Fostering Court Improvement: Nebraska. (2018, January). Children in Foster Care During October 2016 through September 2017. Retrieved from: <http://fosteringcourtimprovement.org/ne/>
- <sup>6</sup> Administrative Office of the Courts (2017, December). [JUSTICE: Child Welfare 3(a)] Cognos: Raw Data July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.
- <sup>7</sup> Fostering Court Improvement: Nebraska. (2018, January). Children Discharged During October 2016 through September 2017. Retrieved from: <http://fosteringcourtimprovement.org/ne/>
- <sup>8</sup> Nebraska DHHS. (2018, January). Exits to Reunification in less than 12 Months - Entry Cohort. Retrieved from Children's Outcomes Measured in Protection and Safety Statistics – COMPASS: [http://dhhs.ne.gov/children\\_family\\_services/Pages/COMPASS.aspx](http://dhhs.ne.gov/children_family_services/Pages/COMPASS.aspx)
- <sup>9</sup> Nebraska Crime Commission. (2018, January). [2016, January through December, Juvenile (0-17 yrs.) Arrests across all counties, across all agencies, for all offenses]. Retrieved from: [http://www.nebraska.gov/crime\\_commission/arrest/arrest.cgi](http://www.nebraska.gov/crime_commission/arrest/arrest.cgi)
- <sup>10</sup> Nebraska Crime Commission. (2018, January). [2017 Diversion data – Kids Count to include all data from 2016] Data pulled by: Amy Hoffman, Nebraska Crime Commission on January 11, 2018.
- <sup>11</sup> Nebraska Crime Commission. (2018, January). 2016 Diversion Map. Provided by Amy Hoffman: <https://ncc.nebraska.gov/juvenile-diversion>
- <sup>12</sup> Administrative Office of the Courts & Probation. (2017, October). [Youth with Intake FY 16-17] Cognos: Raw Data July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.
- <sup>13</sup> Administrative Office of the Courts (2017, February). [JUSTICE: Juvenile Justice Data] Cognos: Raw Data July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.
- <sup>14</sup> Nebraska Administrative Office of the Courts & Probation. (2017, October). [Youth Placed in OHP for FY 16-17] Cognos: Raw Data July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.
- <sup>15</sup> Division of Children & Family Services Office of Juvenile Services. Youth Rehabilitation & Treatment Center- Kearney and Geneva (2017). Retrieved: <http://dhhs.ne.gov/Reports/Youth%20Rehabilitation%20and%20Treatment%20Center%20Kearney%20Annual%20Report%20-%202016-2017.pdf> as well as <http://dhhs.ne.gov/Reports/Youth%20Rehabilitation%20and%20Treatment%20Center%20Kearney%20Annual%20Report%20-%202016-2017.pdf>
- <sup>16</sup> Nebraska Administrative Office of the Courts & Probation. (2017, October). [Youth with Discharges FY 16-17] Cognos: Raw Data July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

# Appendix

## County Rankings by Youth Poverty Rate

| Rank of child poverty rate | Team  | County              | Total Children under age 18 in poverty | Poverty rate (%) for children under age 18 |
|----------------------------|-------|---------------------|--|--|
| n/a                        |       | Nebraska            | 75,250                                 | 16.4                                       |
| 1                          | 6.2   | Thurston County     | 1,042                                  | 42.7                                       |
| 2                          | 1     | Pawnee County       | 195                                    | 34.7                                       |
| 3                          | 1     | Richardson County   | 518                                    | 30.4                                       |
| 4                          | 12.1  | Sheridan County     | 365                                    | 30.0                                       |
| 5                          | 10.2w | Harlan County       | 229                                    | 29.3                                       |
| 6                          | 8.1   | Brown County        | 162                                    | 26.6                                       |
| 7                          | 11.3  | Hitchcock County    | 154                                    | 26.3                                       |
| 8                          | 11.3  | Furnas County       | 277                                    | 25.8                                       |
| 9                          | 8.3   | Sherman County      | 158                                    | 23.8                                       |
| 10                         | 8.1   | Blaine County       | 33                                     | 22.9                                       |
| 11                         | 11.1  | Dawson County       | 1,480                                  | 22.8                                       |
| 12                         | 12.1  | Box Butte County    | 632                                    | 22.5                                       |
| 13                         | 11.2  | Keith County        | 362                                    | 21.9                                       |
| 14                         | 9.1   | Hall County         | 3,527                                  | 21.8                                       |
| 15                         | 7     | Cuming County       | 466                                    | 21.4                                       |
| 16                         | 6.2   | Dakota County       | 1,275                                  | 21.3                                       |
| 17                         | 12.3  | Scotts Bluff County | 1,841                                  | 20.8                                       |
| 18                         | 12.3  | Banner County       | 38                                     | 20.5                                       |
| 19                         | 8.1   | Keya Paha County    | 30                                     | 20.4                                       |
| 20                         | 7     | Knox County         | 409                                    | 20.0                                       |
| 21                         | 1     | Jefferson County    | 311                                    | 19.8                                       |
| 22                         | 7     | Madison County      | 1,686                                  | 19.6                                       |
| 23                         | 4     | Douglas County      | 26,942                                 | 19.5                                       |
| 24                         | 12.1  | Grant County        | 24                                     | 19.4                                       |
| 24                         | 11.4  | McPherson County    | 18                                     | 19.4                                       |
| 26                         | 6.2   | Dixon County        | 273                                    | 19.1                                       |
| 27                         | 11.4  | Hooker County       | 18                                     | 18.4                                       |
| 28                         | 1     | Thayer County       | 194                                    | 17.8                                       |
| 29                         | 11.4  | Logan County        | 34                                     | 17.6                                       |
| 30                         | 10.2w | Franklin County     | 100                                    | 17.4                                       |
| 31                         | 10.3e | Nuckolls County     | 140                                    | 17.0                                       |
| 32                         | 12.1  | Morrill County      | 193                                    | 16.9                                       |
| 33                         | 11.3  | Red Willow County   | 409                                    | 16.4                                       |
| 34                         | 3     | Lancaster County    | 11,178                                 | 16.3                                       |
| 35                         | 11.4  | Lincoln County      | 1,372                                  | 16.3                                       |

| Rank of child poverty rate | Team  | County            | Total Children under age 18 in poverty | Poverty rate (%) for children under age 18 |
|----------------------------|-------|-------------------|--|--|
| 36                         | 6.1   | Dodge County      | 1,361                                  | 16.2                                       |
| 37                         | 5.2   | Colfax County     | 480                                    | 16.0                                       |
| 38                         | 12.2  | Deuel County      | 56                                     | 15.8                                       |
| 39                         | 8.2   | Valley County     | 145                                    | 15.6                                       |
| 40                         | 11.2  | Dundy County      | 56                                     | 15.4                                       |
| 41                         | 11.4  | Frontier County   | 79                                     | 15.3                                       |
| 42                         | 6.2   | Cedar County      | 320                                    | 15.1                                       |
| 43                         | 2.2   | Otoe County       | 555                                    | 15.0                                       |
| 44                         | 9.2   | Buffalo County    | 1,645                                  | 14.9                                       |
| 45                         | 12.2  | Cheyenne County   | 350                                    | 14.8                                       |
| 46                         | 10.1c | Adams County      | 1,061                                  | 14.8                                       |
| 47                         | 10.3e | Clay County       | 222                                    | 14.6                                       |
| 48                         | 12.1  | Sioux County      | 38                                     | 14.6                                       |
| 49                         | 5.2   | Saunders County   | 762                                    | 14.5                                       |
| 50                         | 7     | Antelope County   | 214                                    | 14.5                                       |
| 51                         | 12.1  | Dawes County      | 232                                    | 14.5                                       |
| 52                         | 5.1   | Hamilton County   | 315                                    | 14.4                                       |
| 53                         | 1     | Saline County     | 488                                    | 14.3                                       |
| 54                         | 10.3e | Fillmore County   | 152                                    | 13.8                                       |
| 55                         | 1     | Johnson County    | 134                                    | 13.7                                       |
| 56                         | 8.2   | Greeley County    | 80                                     | 13.7                                       |
| 57                         | 1     | Gage County       | 633                                    | 13.3                                       |
| 58                         | 6.2   | Washington County | 647                                    | 13.3                                       |
| 59                         | 11.2  | Chase County      | 128                                    | 13.2                                       |
| 60                         | 8.3   | Custer County     | 319                                    | 12.9                                       |
| 61                         | 1     | Nemaha County     | 188                                    | 12.8                                       |
| 62                         | 11.4  | Thomas County     | 20                                     | 12.7                                       |
| 63                         | 8.3   | Loup County       | 13                                     | 12.4                                       |
| 64                         | 10.1c | Webster County    | 94                                     | 12.0                                       |
| 65                         | 8.3   | Howard County     | 178                                    | 11.9                                       |
| 66                         | 5.2   | Platte County     | 917                                    | 11.0                                       |
| 67                         | 5.1   | York County       | 328                                    | 10.6                                       |
| 68                         | 12.2  | Kimball County    | 89                                     | 10.6                                       |
| 69                         | 6.2   | Burt County       | 153                                    | 10.6                                       |
| 70                         | 11.2  | Perkins County    | 70                                     | 10.3                                       |
| 71                         | 5.3   | Nance County      | 84                                     | 10.3                                       |

## Appendix, continued

| Rank of child poverty rate | Team  | County          | Total Children under age 18 in poverty | Poverty rate (%) for children under age 18 |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------------|--|--|
| 72                         | 8.2   | Holt County     | 248                                    | 10.2                                       |
| 73                         | 8.2   | Boyd County     | 47                                     | 10.1                                       |
| 74                         | 5.2   | Butler County   | 195                                    | 10.1                                       |
| 75                         | 10.2w | Phelps County   | 221                                    | 10.0                                       |
| 76                         | 5.1   | Seward County   | 367                                    | 9.3  |
| 77                         | 5.3   | Polk County     | 106                                    | 8.8  |
| 78                         | 5.3   | Merrick County  | 145                                    | 8.7  |
| 79                         | 11.1  | Gosper County   | 36                                     | 8.5  |
| 80                         | 2.3   | Sarpy County    | 3,961                                  | 8.3  |
| 81                         | 2.1   | Cass County     | 505                                    | 8.2  |
| 82                         | 7     | Stanton County  | 127                                    | 8.1  |
| 83                         | 10.2w | Kearney County  | 124                                    | 8.0  |
| 84                         | 5.3   | Boone County    | 95                                     | 7.7  |
| 85                         | 12.2  | Garden County   | 28                                     | 7.6  |
| 86                         | 7     | Wayne County    | 131                                    | 7.2  |
| 87                         | 7     | Pierce County   | 109                                    | 6.3  |
| 88                         | 8.2   | Wheeler County  | 9                                      | 6.2  |
| 89                         | 8.1   | Cherry County   | 68                                     | 5.8  |
| 90                         | 11.3  | Hayes County    | 9                                      | 4.6  |
| 91                         | 8.1   | Rock County     | 10                                     | 4.4  |
| 92                         | 8.2   | Garfield County | 17                                     | 4.3  |
| 93                         | 11.2  | Arthur County   | 1                                      | 0.7  |





## Nebraska Court Improvement Project

5001 Central Park Drive, Suite 200

Lincoln, NE 68504

(402) 471-2864



STATE OF  
**NEBRASKA**  
JUDICIAL BRANCH

Court Improvement  
Project

[www.cip.nebraska.gov](http://www.cip.nebraska.gov)  
[NSC.CIP@nebraska.gov](mailto:NSC.CIP@nebraska.gov)