

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION IN NEBRASKA

A REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR AND THE LEGISLATURE ON
INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY CRIMINAL JUSTICE PARTNERS WITHIN
THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

JANUARY 7, 2015

DARRELL FISHER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
NEBRASKA CRIME COMMISSION
PO BOX 94946
LINCOLN, NE 68509
402-471-2194

LINDA KRUTZ
CHIEF, COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS DIVISION

LAURIE HOLMAN
POLICY ANALYST

MICHAEL FARGEN
RESEARCH ANALYST



TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	3
<u>COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS DIVISION MISSION & HISTORY</u>	4
<u>SECTION I: PROBATION</u>	5
PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATION, CASE MANAGEMENT & SUPERVISION	6
PROBATION PROGRAMS	7
OFFENDERLINK & RISE	8
DRUG TESTING	9
JUVENILE SERVICE DIVISION	10
JUVENILE SERVICE & PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS	11
JUVENILE PLACEMENT, REENTRY, & CASE MANAGEMENT	12
<u>SECTION II: PROBLEM SOLVING COURTS</u>	13
ADULT DRUG COURT & FAMILY DRUG COURT	14
JUVENILE DRUG COURT & DUI COURT	15
YOUNG ADULT COURT	16
<u>SECTION III: PAROLE</u>	17
PAROLE PROGRAMS & SERVICES	18-19
<u>SECTION IV: WORK RELEASE & WORK DETAIL PROGRAMS</u>	20
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CENTERS	21
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS	22
ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS	23
<u>SECTION V: COMMUNITY SUPERVISION</u>	24
COMMUNITY SUPERVISION SERIOUS OFFENDER POPULATION	25
OFFENSE BREAKOUT (PROBATION & PSC)	26
OFFENSE BREAKOUT (PAROLE, CCO, & CCL)	27
COMMUNITY SUPERVISION BY OFFENSE TYPE	28
SHARED RESOURCES: REPORTING CENTERS	29
SHARED RESOURCES: SPECIALIZED SUBSTANCE ABUSE SUPERVISION	30
SHARED RESOURCES: FEE FOR SERVICE VOUCHER PROGRAM	31
ELECTRONIC MONITORING	32
CONTINUOUS ALCOHOL MONITORING	33

INTRODUCTION

The Community Corrections Division of the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice is responsible for reporting annually to the Legislature and the Governor on the development and performance of community corrections facilities and programs by Nebraska Revised Statute §47-624 . We are charged with collecting data and analyzing the effectiveness of the programs and facilities used in the supervision and treatment of offenders, and specifically reporting on recidivism rates and outcome data for these offenders served within Probation, Parole, Nebraska Department of Correctional Services (NDCS), and Problem Solving Courts. We feel this report is of critical importance to the Legislature and Governor's office. The agencies are staffed with administrators and employees who are not subject to the election process, therefore an independent analysis of the effectiveness of programs and subsequent use of taxpayer dollars for these programs is of the utmost importance for transparency and accountability to the citizens of Nebraska.

The purpose of this report is to properly define the most important factors related to the offender population on community supervision, evaluate costs of programming, and to conduct an evaluation of the progress made in expanding community corrections facilities and programs statewide. Additional analysis is to include the impact that community corrections programs and facilities have on the offender population and the recidivism rates and outcome data for probationers, parolees, and problem solving court clients participating in these programs.

We acknowledge that this report has not been submitted to the Legislature prior to this year, and that it has been due since 2010 when Neb.Rev.Stat. §47-624 was amended, requiring the report be submitted annually from that time forward. There has been significant difficulty in obtaining the data we need from the agencies we are required to gather the data from, despite statutory guidelines that have been in place for five years.

The Uniform Data Fund^[1] is administered by the Community Corrections Division, and exists for the purpose of assisting agencies in the creation and maintenance of data collection systems, to assist in fulfilling the requirement to report data to the Division for analysis and reporting. Since its creation in 2003, more than \$2.76 million dollars have been contractually awarded to agencies, to assist in the building of their data systems, yet we are routinely frustrated due to the difficulty in obtaining even the most basic information on offenders who are utilizing programs and services within these agencies. We have been informed that data is not being kept on offenders who are using available programming, or the systems currently being used do not have the capability to generate a report for data submission to the Crime Commission. The necessary data is either non-existent, poorly designed, or access to said data systems is unattainable by the Community Corrections Division. Without data submission compliance, there is no opportunity to better understand or serve the community supervision offender population. We have no insight into the development of protocol to measure outcomes using data. The statutory guidelines call for outcome measurement, but this is currently unattainable and will continue to be until there are compliance standards set in place, along with effort between agencies to achieve accountability and transparency regarding shared resources for offenders.

One key element to the Community Corrections Act is the requirement for collaboration between the Community Corrections Division and Probation Administration, Parole Administration, and NDCS to develop and implement a plan to establish statewide operation and use of a continuum of community correctional facilities and programs, develop standards for these facilities and programs, and develop standardized definitions of outcome measures for community corrections facilities and programs, including, but not limited to, recidivism, employment, and substance abuse.^[2] Definitions are the first necessary step in the measurement and analysis process. We must first define so we can make improvements when indicated. Improving community corrections offender outcomes should be our first priority, yet this collaborative process has not been initiated, and definitions and outcome measures between agencies are not currently in place. Measurement tools are currently absent or inconsistent throughout the offenders' continuum of care, and this makes it impossible to improve the programming and services we have available to offenders due to poorly integrated data systems across the spectrum of community corrections supervision.

This report is generated using demographic data on offender populations where it was available. It is our goal that subsequent iterations will be expanded so that the full reporting requirements will be met.

^[1] Neb. Rev. Stat. §47-632, ^[2] Neb. Rev. Stat. §47-624

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS DIVISION MISSION & HISTORY

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS DIVISION MISSION

The mission of the Community Corrections Division is to develop and monitor the implementation of a comprehensive community corrections strategy in Nebraska for the purpose of reducing the incarceration of certain, targeted felony offenders while supporting the use of a continuum of community facilities and programs to ensure a consistent and rational statewide sentencing policy; to advance the use of specific and enhanced programming and treatment by the Office of Probation Administration and the Office of Parole Administration; to encourage creativity at the local level to support alternatives to incarceration; and to promote equity and fairness within Nebraska's criminal justice system.

Our primary mandate is the development and implementation of statewide use of, and standards for, community correctional facilities and programs. To carry out this mandate the Community Corrections Division, in collaboration with the Offices of Probation and Parole administration, is tasked with studying and recommending improvements to existing community based programs and services for offenders.

The philosophy of the Community Corrections Division is that criminal sentences should be imposed fairly, rationally and consistently; public safety should be promoted; and incarceration should be reserved for the most serious offenders.

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS HISTORY

In September 2001, then Governor Mike Johanns created the Community Corrections Working Group to "plan a way out" of the impending offender population crisis without constructing a new prison. The Working Group was mandated to propose policies to control the prison population, maintain and enhance justice, reduce taxpayer cost, and ensure public safety. In December 2002, the Working Group developed a proposal which became Legislative Bill 46 (2003), a comprehensive piece of legislation which created the Community Corrections Council and established a statutory framework to promote the use of community based alternatives to incarceration and fund the services through the collection of fees from offenders sentenced to probation, and released on parole.

The Community Corrections Council consisted of 20 members representing both the private and public sectors. Membership included representatives from Probation Administration, Parole Administration, the Department of Corrections, law enforcement, the Judiciary including the Court Administrator, the Legislature, substance abuse and behavioral health providers, the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, criminal defense attorneys, and county attorneys. The diverse membership on the Council encouraged collaboration among members and across branches of government.

The Council met as needed to address the issues surrounding community corrections, develop policy, and monitor and evaluate programs supported by offender fees. The Council had supported and encouraged the development of a number of community based programs to divert targeted offenders from incarceration and reduce recidivism. These included Reporting Centers, the Fee-For-Service Voucher Treatment program (Voucher Program), Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision (SSAS), and Problem-Solving Courts.

In 2011 LB 390 eliminated the Community Corrections Council, transferred portions of the Council's budget to the Supreme Court, and transitioned agency staff into the Community Corrections Division of the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (Crime Commission).

The basis for this report comes from Neb. Rev. Stat. §47-624(11), amended in 2010 by AM 1679 to LB864, which requires the Community Corrections Division to report annually to the Legislature and the Governor on the development and performance of community corrections facilities and programs. The Community Corrections Division is charged with researching and evaluating the existing community corrections facilities and programs within the state, as well as educating the courts, the Board of Parole, criminal justice stakeholders, and the general public about the availability, use, and benefits of community correctional facilities and programs. This report is in fulfillment of this statutory duty.

SECTION I: PROBATION

Probation provides an alternative to jail or prison for many offenders convicted of a variety of offenses in Nebraska. Probation is intended to work with those who can be supervised successfully in the community. The overall goal of Probation is to provide safe communities by creating sustainable change in a probationers' behavior, so they can become productive, law-abiding citizens. While some probationers pose a relatively low risk to recidivate, or commit another offense, other probationers may pose a higher risk to recidivate. Based on this risk, each probationer's supervision will vary. High risk probationer's supervision and case management involves high levels of engagement and accountability by highly skilled and experienced officers and specialized programs. To better serve the community, Probation works hard to stay on the cutting edge and provide specialized programming statewide whenever possible.

The Nebraska State Probation mission is to deliver a system of services and supervision as ordered by the courts to help rehabilitate offenders and promote community safety. The three main goals pursued by Probation are as follows:

- 1) Providing the courts quality investigations and effective sentencing alternatives;
- 2) Reducing recidivism in both juvenile and adult offender populations; and
- 3) Providing for more efficient and effective use of Probations' resources


To accomplish these goals, Probation has a number of programs to assist both juveniles and adults under their supervision to become productive citizens.

In Nebraska, Probation is a part of the Supreme Court, under the Judicial Branch of government. Probation has two primary functions in its service to the court, presentence investigations and probationer case management/supervision.

ADULT & JUVENILE DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	6,921 31.62%	6,365 31.73%	5,975 32.04%
	Male	14,966 68.38%	13,695 68.27%	12,671 67.96%
	Total	21,887 100.00%	20,060 100.00%	18,646 100.00%
Age Group	18-20	2,402 10.97%	2,064 10.29%	1,841 9.87%
	21-25	4,205 19.21%	3,747 18.68%	3,440 18.45%
	26-30	2,878 13.15%	2,591 12.92%	2,271 12.18%
	31-35	1,955 8.93%	1,921 9.58%	1,741 9.34%
	36-40	1,566 7.15%	1,378 6.87%	1,294 6.94%
	41 +	3,790 17.32%	3,613 18.01%	3,371 18.08%
	Under 18	4,772 21.80%	4,505 22.46%	4,489 24.07%
UNK (age)	319 1.46%	241 1.20%	199 1.07%	
Total	21,887 100.00%	20,060 100.00%	18,646 100.00%	
Race	American Indian Or Alaska 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	21,887 100.00%	20,060 100.00%	18,646 100.00%
Education	8th or Less	1,231 5.62%	1,175 5.86%	1,225 6.57%
	9th - 11th	4,954 22.63%	4,557 22.72%	4,557 24.44%
	12th or GED	8,969 40.98%	8,448 42.11%	7,598 40.75%
	College or Above	1,954 8.93%	1,770 8.82%	1,659 8.90%
	UNK (education)	273 1.25%	197 0.98%	182 0.98%
	Vocational/Some College	4,506 20.59%	3,913 19.51%	3,425 18.37%
	Total	21,887 100.00%	20,060 100.00%	18,646 100.00%
Marital	Married	3,409 15.58%	3,080 15.35%	2,799 15.01%
	Separated/Divor..	2,765 12.63%	2,630 13.11%	2,326 12.47%
	Single	15,114 69.05%	13,786 68.72%	12,809 68.70%
	UNK (marital)	599 2.74%	564 2.81%	712 3.82%
	Total	21,887 100.00%	20,060 100.00%	18,646 100.00%

PROBATION BY TYPE




PRE-SENTENCE INVESTIGATIONS, CASE MANAGEMENT & SUPERVISION

Pre-Sentence Investigation

A Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) is a document that is ordered by the Court to assist the Judge in making sentencing decisions for adult offenders. The information provided includes prior criminal history, employment and educational background, any drug or alcohol use, family and friends, victim information, as well as overall attitude regarding the offense. Additionally, information is obtained through risk assessment instruments that relate to the offenders risk of recidivism as well as any strengths. Officers will consult with others who can provide additional information about the offender. This may include family, friends, employers, victims, and treatment providers.

Although Probation Officers complete the PSI for the Courts, a defendant may or may not receive probation as a sentence. If probation is considered, specific rehabilitative programs may also be recommended. Presentence investigations are available for the statewide adult offender population. Pre-Disposition Interviews (PDI) are used for juvenile cases and are similar to the PSI process.



Case Management & Supervision

Judges place offenders on probation as an alternative to jail or prison. Probation is intended to work with those who can be supervised successfully in the community. The overall goal of probation is to provide safe communities by creating sustainable change in a probationers' behavior, so that they can become productive law-abiding citizens. Each probationer's supervision will vary based on their recidivism risk level and assessments. High risk probationer's supervision and case management involves high levels of engagement and accountability by highly skilled and experienced officers. In Nebraska, the probation officers meet regularly with probationers both in the office and in the community, and their level of engagement with that offender is directly related to the assessed risk level.

ADULT PROBATION DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	5,248 30.7%	4,778 30.7%	4,327 30.6%
	Male	11,867 69.3%	10,777 69.3%	9,830 69.4%
	Total	17,115 100.0%	15,555 100.0%	14,157 100.0%
Age Group	18-20	2,402 14.0%	2,064 13.3%	1,841 13.0%
	21-25	4,205 24.6%	3,747 24.1%	3,440 24.3%
	26-30	2,878 16.8%	2,591 16.7%	2,271 16.0%
	31-35	1,955 11.4%	1,921 12.3%	1,741 12.3%
	36-40	1,566 9.1%	1,378 8.9%	1,294 9.1%
	41 +	3,790 22.1%	3,613 23.2%	3,371 23.8%
Under 18	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
UNK (age)	319 1.9%	241 1.5%	199 1.4%	
Total	17,115 100.0%	15,555 100.0%	14,157 100.0%	
Race	American Indian Or Ala..	410 2.4%	411 2.6%	376 2.7%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	157 0.9%	150 1.0%	142 1.0%
	Black	1,726 10.1%	1,492 9.6%	1,303 9.2%
	Hispanic	1,866 10.9%	1,784 11.5%	1,751 12.4%
	Other	1,982 11.6%	1,892 12.2%	1,739 12.3%
	White	10,974 64.1%	9,826 63.2%	8,846 62.5%
Total	17,115 100.0%	15,555 100.0%	14,157 100.0%	
Education	8th or Less	533 3.1%	468 3.0%	454 3.2%
	9th - 11th	2,091 12.2%	1,842 11.8%	1,689 11.9%
	12th or GED	7,980 46.6%	7,503 48.2%	6,861 48.5%
	College or Above	1,949 11.4%	1,769 11.4%	1,657 11.7%
	UNK (education)	96 0.6%	91 0.6%	101 0.7%
	Vocational/ Some College	4,466 26.1%	3,882 25.0%	3,395 24.0%
Total	17,115 100.0%	15,555 100.0%	14,157 100.0%	
Marital	Married	3,402 19.9%	3,078 19.8%	2,798 19.8%
	Separated/Di..	2,744 16.0%	2,608 16.8%	2,307 16.3%
	Single	10,457 61.1%	9,399 60.4%	8,584 60.6%
	UNK (marital)	512 3.0%	470 3.0%	468 3.3%
	Total	17,115 100.0%	15,555 100.0%	14,157 100.0%

PROBATION PROGRAMS

The Community-Based Programs and Field Services division is responsible for developing and implementing all adult programs and services provided to the courts for probationers. This includes specialized domestic violence, sex offender, and behavioral health programming. Specialized services offered include Reporting Centers, Fee for Service Voucher Program, Rural Improvement for Schooling and Employment (RISE), and the Standardized Model for Delivery of Substance Use Services.

Community Based Intervention

Community Based Intervention (CBI) is used by Probation to supervise high risk adult probationers. Community Based Intervention encompasses many specialized programs to better serve these high risk offenders.


- 1) Driving while Intoxicated (DWI) 3rd offense or greater;
- 2) Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision (SSAS);
- 3) Drug court participants;
- 4) Probationers with a Level of Service/Case Management Inventory (LS/CMI) score of 20 or above;
- 5) Domestic violence cases;
- 6) Sex offender cases; and
- 7) Intensive Supervision Probation (ISP).

ISP for adults was created in the early 1990's by statute as a sentencing option for judges. This program of supervision has evolved over time and is currently managed by CBI officers. To become a CBI officer, candidates must have previous experience with case management and complete the rigorous specialized training.

ISP Demographics

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	85 18.9%	57 18.0%	66 19.9%
	Male	364 81.1%	259 82.0%	266 80.1%
Race	American Indian Or Alaska Native	15 3.3%	6 1.9%	11 3.3%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	0 0.0%	3 0.9%	1 0.3%
	Black	28 6.2%	25 7.9%	17 5.1%
	Hispanic	62 13.8%	48 15.2%	42 12.7%
	Other	63 14.0%	48 15.2%	40 12.0%
	White	281 62.6%	186 58.9%	221 66.6%
	UNK	13 2.9%	5 1.6%	1 0.3%
Age Group	18-20	107 23.8%	60 19.0%	52 15.7%
	21-25	98 21.8%	64 20.3%	62 18.7%
	26-30	67 14.9%	63 19.9%	63 19.0%
	31-35	56 12.5%	45 14.2%	55 16.6%
	36-40	34 7.6%	25 7.9%	32 9.6%
	41 +	74 16.5%	54 17.1%	67 20.2%
	Under 18	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

ISP Population Served Trendline



THE NEBRASKA CRIME COMMISSION REQUESTED ISP DRUG TESTING DATA SEPARATED OUT FROM CBI DRUG TESTING FIGURES, BUT NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WAS PROVIDED.

OFFENDERLINK & RISE

OffenderLink

OffenderLink is an automated Interactive Voice Response telephone reporting and web-based monitoring system designed to improve workload efficiencies and increase accountability for low or very low risk cases.


The offender calls in monthly to an automated telephone system to report any changes in addresses, phone numbers, employment, or contact with law enforcement. This allows Probation Officers to hold these probationers more accountable.

OffenderLink provides 24 hour access to all case files and all call reporting data. This system automatically monitors an offender's compliance with their conditions of supervision so officers can focus more of their attention on the non-compliant probationers without spending time unnecessarily on those who are satisfying their supervision conditions. OffenderLink assists Probation Officers by maintaining all case notes and contact history. It also makes calls automatically to offenders who are not in compliance with the program requirements.

OffenderLink improves officer efficiency and reduces workload while at the same time increases offender accountability for low or very low-risk populations where an office visit is replaced by an automated telephone contact. This technology allows Probation Officers to spend more time with offenders under their supervision who pose a greater risk to the community.

This resource is available to offenders assessed as low or very low risk of recidivism, with minimal probation requirements, is offered statewide, and is paid for by Probation's cash funds.

There has been a significant decrease in its utilization of OffenderLink between 2011 and 2013. To better understand this downward trend, the Crime Commission will be requesting additional information on how this program is assigned based on risk level.



OFFENDERLINK DEMOGRAPHIC DATA WAS REQUESTED, BUT WAS NOT PROVIDED BY PROBATION.

Rural Improvement for Schooling and Employment Program (RISE)

RISE is an AmeriCorps program launched in 2007 by Probation to increase opportunities for probationers in rural communities, as well as to increase community safety and reduce recidivism by increasing attention to the educational and employment aspects of the offender's probation plan.

RISE focuses on providing supportive services for adult and juvenile probationers in a group setting, with one-on-one sessions available as necessary in all 12 of Nebraska's probation districts, covering 32 counties. Probation's RISE Program Specialists work with a developed curriculum targeted for specific educational and/or employment skills. The RISE program curriculum consists of different tracks to fit the individual probationer. Adults can participate in the employment track, focused on attaining a GED and higher education; or a dual track, meaning probationers receive support in areas of education and employment together. The Navigator Program adds additional support to those who are assessed as the highest risk probationers.

The RISE juvenile school support track is designed to specifically target youth struggling in school academically, as well as with attendance and attitude.

The Nebraska RISE program has been nationally recognized with over 70% of RISE graduates not reoffending or having their probation revoked within one year of their RISE graduation date.

The RISE program is available for adults or juveniles under supervision throughout the state. It is funded through state general fund appropriations and also receives federal financial support.

DRUG TESTING

Drug Testing

As drug abuse is a critical factor in criminal behavior and juvenile delinquency, drug testing identifies offenders with substance abuse problems. Identifying these probationers makes it possible to provide the appropriate level of treatment for drug addiction and rehabilitate these offenders to become productive citizens.

Drug testing has a reported average cost of \$1.79 per adult test paid for from Probation's cash fund. Probation charges a fee of \$3.00 to \$9.00 to each probationer required by the court to undergo drug testing as a condition of probation.



Drug testing has increased 21.3% when comparing FY 2011/2012 to FY 2013-2014, although the percentage of offenders placed on probation for the crime category of dangerous drugs has increased only 4.1%. In addition, the percentage of offenders placed on probation for the crime category of traffic offenses - which included DUI - has decreased by 25.7%. Without further data, we are unable to completely understand how drug testing is being implemented or find justification for the overall increase. Previously published reports by Probation note that during the calendar year of 2010 there were 73,930 drug tests completed, which then increased to 186,864 in 2011.

Even without additional information, one can estimate that drug testing has tripled in four years, even though the overall population served has decreased significantly.

DRUG TESTING DEMOGRAPHIC DATA WAS REQUESTED, BUT WAS NOT PROVIDED BY PROBATION.

Drug Testing Classification by Year (Table & Stacked Line Graph)

Classification	2011		2012		2013	
CBR	99,553	52.7%	101,646	49.9%	101,975	44.5%
CBI	51,206	27.1%	54,125	26.6%	66,070	28.8%
CBI DUI	10,317	5.5%	14,800	7.3%	16,723	7.3%
SSAS	5,949	3.1%	10,154	5.0%	20,993	9.2%
CBI Domestic Violence	9,868	5.2%	10,330	5.1%	11,492	5.0%
Other	8,770	4.6%	8,798	4.3%	6,934	3.0%
Sex Offender	3,222	1.7%	3,967	1.9%	5,005	2.2%
Unclassified	62	0.0%	37	0.0%	44	0.0%
Grand Total	188,947	100.0%	203,857	100.0%	229,236	100.0%



JUVENILE SERVICES DIVISION

The Juvenile Services Division is responsible for statewide administration of intake and detention alternatives, investigation, assessments and evaluations, case management, supervision and services, placement, reentry, and funding for juveniles under Probation supervision.

In 2013, the Nebraska Legislature passed LB561, which charged Probation with the authority to treat and rehabilitate court involved youth as opposed to punishing them. This included the creation of diversion services, mental health treatment, and reentry programming.

Under this system reform, Juvenile Probation is striving to provide a balanced approach to justice. Juvenile Probation Officers still have a primary responsibility to hold youth accountable, enforce orders of the court, and ensure public safety, with the goal of potentially diminishing the punitive aspect for youth under their supervision. Probation Officers also have a primary responsibility to facilitate youth rehabilitation. In coordination with judicial support, Juvenile Probation is devoted to the successful futures of juveniles and their families. Juvenile Probation strives to empower families to be a part of the decision making process, which has been shown to greatly aid the success of youth. Juveniles should be provided access to necessary services, without barriers, at all stages of the court process under this new system. This includes financial resources for services, both treatment and non-treatment.

The goal of reforming juvenile probation is to prevent juveniles from returning to the juvenile justice system or entering the criminal justice system by engaging juveniles and their families in the juvenile court process, eliminating barriers to accessing effective treatment and services, and partnering with educational and community stakeholders.

Juvenile Investigations, Assessments, and Evaluations

Probation utilizes a variety of investigation, assessment, and evaluative tools not only to support the juvenile and their family in the early stages of the court process, but also to aid the court in making the best decision possible surrounding the needs of each juvenile. If necessary, and as ordered by the court, a juvenile can receive services and supervision at their first court appearance. After being found responsible for the delinquent act, the court may order a Pre-Disposition Investigation, during which the probation office coordinates a plan with the family to assess why the juvenile is appearing in court. Proper evaluation and assessment early on in the juvenile justice process assists in establishing recommendations for the court, including targeted supervision and service needs that are designed to be the most effective in reducing the juvenile's risk for continued delinquent behaviors.

JUVENILE DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	1,673 35.1%	1,587 35.2%	1,648 36.7%
	Male	3,099 64.9%	2,918 64.8%	2,841 63.3%
	Total	4,772 100.0%	4,505 100.0%	4,489 100.0%
Age Group	18-20	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	21-25	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	26-30	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	31-35	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	36-40	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	41 +	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	Under 18	4,772 100.0%	4,505 100.0%	4,489 100.0%
UNK (age)	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
Total	4,772 100.0%	4,505 100.0%	4,489 100.0%	
Race	American Indian Or Alaska 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	4,772 100.0%	4,505 100.0%	4,489 100.0%	
Education	8th or Less	698 14.6%	707 15.7%	771 17.2%
	9th - 11th	2,863 60.0%	2,715 60.3%	2,868 63.9%
	12th or GED	989 20.7%	945 21.0%	737 16.4%
	College or Above	5 0.1%	1 0.0%	2 0.0%
	UNK (education)	177 3.7%	106 2.4%	81 1.8%
	Vocational/Some College	40 0.8%	31 0.7%	30 0.7%
Total	4,772 100.0%	4,505 100.0%	4,489 100.0%	
Marital	Married	7 0.1%	2 0.0%	1 0.0%
	Separated/Divorced/..	21 0.4%	22 0.5%	19 0.4%
	Single	4,657 97.6%	4,387 97.4%	4,225 94.1%
	UNK (marital)	87 1.8%	94 2.1%	244 5.4%
Total	4,772 100.0%	4,505 100.0%	4,489 100.0%	

JUVENILE SERVICES & PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

Pre-Adjudicated Juvenile Custody & Placement

Nebraska Revised Statutes §43-250 authorizes Probation to take temporary custody of a juvenile in three specific situations, those being violation of law, run-away, and violation of probation. The Probation Officer is authorized by §43-260.01 to determine whether secure or non-secure detention is needed by utilizing the standardized risk assessment tool that is administered when law enforcement contacts Probation for the purpose of assessing an intake decision.

The detention screening instrument examines the youth's risk of reoffending before the next court hearing and also the risk of failing to appear for the court hearing. Juvenile intake is designed to promote the most appropriate services which are the least intrusive and the least restrictive to the juvenile and their family, balancing what is in the best interest of the juvenile and the safety of the community.

Juvenile Intake Placement (08/05/13-06/30/14)

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%

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI)

The Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative began in Nebraska in 2011 in Douglas County, and in 2012 in Sarpy County. JDAI was started by the Annie E. Casey Foundation in 1992 and is based on eight core strategies that address the primary reasons why youth are unnecessarily or inappropriately detained. These core strategies are:

- 1) Collaboration;
- 2) Data driven decisions;
- 3) Objective admissions;
- 4) Alternatives to detention;
- 5) Case processing;
- 6) Special detention cases;
- 7) Reducing racial disparity; and
- 8) Conditions of confinement.

These core strategies were adopted by the Nebraska legislature with the passage of LB561 in 2013, and Probation is working towards developing a purposeful alternative to detention statewide as a result of this legislation. JDAI is looked at as a process, not a conventional program, to restructure policy and practice to create system improvements that will hopefully reach far beyond detention alone. Goals of the JDAI include decreasing the number of youth inappropriately or unnecessarily detained, reduce the number of youth who fail to appear in court or re-offend pending adjudication, redirect public funds towards effective juvenile justice processes and public safety strategies, reduce the disproportionate minority confinement and contact of the juvenile justice system, and improve the juvenile justice system overall.

Juvenile Crossover Youth Practice Model

Georgetown University's Center for Juvenile Justice Reform has developed a model that describes the specific practices that need to be in place within a jurisdiction in order to reduce the number of youth who "crossover" between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. This model is the Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM), and it employs the use of values and standards, evidence based practices, policies, procedures, and quality assurance processes. It also provides a template for how states can impact their response to "crossover" youth and improve their outcomes. Overall goals for sites participating in the CYPM are

- 1) A reduction in the number of youth placed in out-of-home care;
- 2) A reduction in the use of facility placements;
- 3) A reduction in the over-representation of children of color; and
- 4) A reduction in the number of youth becoming supervised under both child welfare and juvenile justice agencies.

Nebraska has one local CYPM site in Douglas County, and implementation team efforts began in 2012. Earlier this year (2014), Gage, Lancaster, and Dodge counties also commenced planning discussions for incorporating the CYPM.

JUVENILE PLACEMENT, REENTRY, & CASE MANAGEMENT

Juvenile Placement

Placement in a variety of out-of-home settings for care and treatment is an option for youth involved in the juvenile justice system. These temporary placement options range from detention facilities, state-licensed group or foster homes, residential treatment centers, Youth Rehabilitation and Treatment Centers (YRTC), or shelters. Those youth in out-of-home placement continue to be supervised by a Probation Officer who monitors the juvenile's progress, behavior, treatment, and continued need for placement.

In 2014, the Nebraska Legislature passed LB464, which granted authority to the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to enter into an agreement with Probation to act as a surrogate for DHHS to administer Title IV-E state plans for children in its placement and care authority. Title IV-E is a program for Federal payments to the states for Foster Care and Adoption Assistance. This program enables each state to provide, in appropriate cases, Foster Care and transitional independent living programs for children who are eligible, and adoption assistance for children with special needs. The responsibility to supervise Probation's activities regarding the Title IV-E requirements for eligible children rests with DHHS.

The bill specifically gave Probation placement and care responsibility for juveniles in out-of-home placement. Placement and care are defined by this bill as constituting accountability for the day-to-day care and protection of juveniles. The responsibility of having placement and care includes the development of an individual case plan for the juvenile, including periodic review of the appropriateness and suitability of the plan and the foster care placement of the juvenile, to ensure that proper care and services are provided to facilitate return to the juvenile's own home or to make an alternative placement. Specifics for the case plan include such items as assessing family strength and needs, identifying and using community resources, and the periodic review and determination of continued appropriateness of placement. The rights of the legal custodian of the juvenile were specifically listed as not being included in the responsibility of placement and care, including but not limited to provisions and decisions surrounding education, morality, religion, discipline, and medical care. These are reserved for the legal custodian.

This bill became effective as law on July 18, 2014. More information on this expansion of Probation's services and oversight for juveniles within its jurisdiction will be forthcoming in 2015.

Juvenile Reentry

Reentry is a process that is intended to intentionally prepare youth and families for return from Youth Rehabilitation and Treatment Centers (YRTC) and any other out-of-home placement back to their communities. Activities and communications prior to discharge are designed to strengthen the connection between the youth in placement with their family, home, and community. Reentry officers are trained to use a balanced approach between the services provided and the supervision of youth within a highly developed case management framework. The program emphasizes community supports and multi-agency collaboration, and is designed to be family focused and youth driven.

The time period when a youth returns to their communities or leaves placement is a time of increased risk, yet this time also presents a great opportunity to work with families, informal supports, community partners, and organizations for the benefit of the youth and their futures.

Case Management, Supervision, and Services

Probation encompasses both the enforcement of the terms and conditions set by the court and rehabilitation. Probation Officer training has shifted its approach to focus more on effecting change and rehabilitation over strict enforcement. The focus is intended to be more on the development of the juvenile and delivery of services to restore them and influence long lasting behavioral changes. Rehabilitation with appropriate supervision and enforcement are both necessary but must be appropriately balanced. A large part of case management is providing opportunities to juveniles to change their behaviors and thought processes.

Probation has the capability for service delivery for juvenile probationers and their families. The priority is on the delivery of services which target interventions needed by juvenile probationers to help reduce their risk of re-offending. The services and interventions that a Juvenile Probation Officer utilizes should directly correlate to the youth's assessed risk level and risk reduction.


SECTION II: PROBLEM SOLVING COURTS

Problem Solving Courts (PSC) were first introduced in the United States in the 1990's to accommodate offenders with specific needs and problems that were not or could not be adequately addressed in traditional courts. PSC seek to promote outcomes that will benefit not only the offender, but the victim and society as well. Thus, PSC were developed as an innovative response to address offenders' problems, including drug abuse, mental illness, and domestic violence. Although most PSC models are relatively new, states are seeing a positive effect on the lives of offenders and victims, and in some instances, are saving jail and prison costs. PSC typically focus on the following:

- 1) Outcomes, designed to provide positive case outcomes for victims, society, and the offender, typically by reducing recidivism or creating safer communities;
- 2) System Change, promoting reform in how the government responds to problems such as drug addiction and mental illness;
- 3) Judicial Involvement, where judges take a more hands-on approach to addressing problems and changing behaviors of defendants;
- 4) Collaboration by working with external parties to achieve certain goals, such as developing partnerships with mental health providers;
- 5) Non-traditional Roles, where the courts and their personnel take on roles or processes not common in traditional courts;
- 6) Screening and Assessment tools to identify appropriate individuals for the court; and
- 7) Early identification of potential candidates through use of the screening and assessment tools to determine a defendant's eligibility for the problem solving courts earlier in the defendant's involvement with the criminal justice system.

PSC include Adult Drug Courts, Adult Problem Solving Court, Juvenile Drug Courts, Family Drug Courts, Young Adult Drug Court, and DUI Court.

All PSC are governed by the Nebraska Supreme Court Committee on Problem-Solving Courts. Members include representatives of courts, Probation, law enforcement and the legal community along with judges, prosecutors and defense attorneys.



PSC DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	242 36.0%	231 35.1%	256 35.5%
	Male	430 64.0%	427 64.9%	465 64.5%
	Total	672 100.0%	658 100.0%	721 100.0%
Age Group	18-20	112 16.7%	120 18.2%	122 16.9%
	21-25	163 24.3%	157 23.9%	171 23.7%
	26-30	114 17.0%	120 18.2%	136 18.9%
	31-35	65 9.7%	82 12.5%	96 13.3%
	36-40	47 7.0%	49 7.4%	57 7.9%
	41 +	90 13.4%	78 11.9%	98 13.6%
	Under 18	80 11.9%	52 7.9%	41 5.7%
UNK (age)	1 0.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
Total	672 100.0%	658 100.0%	721 100.0%	
Race	American Indian Or Alas..	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	672 100.0%	658 100.0%	721 100.0%
Education	8th or Less	12 1.8%	14 2.1%	17 2.4%
	9th - 11th	143 21.3%	152 23.1%	132 18.3%
	12th or GED	422 62.8%	398 60.5%	454 63.0%
	College or Above	21 3.1%	15 2.3%	24 3.3%
	UNK (education)	2 0.3%	2 0.3%	0 0.0%
	Vocational/ Some College	72 10.7%	77 11.7%	94 13.0%
	Total	672 100.0%	658 100.0%	721 100.0%
Marital	Married	91 13.5%	83 12.6%	91 12.6%
	Separated/Div..	86 12.8%	85 12.9%	95 13.2%
	Single	471 70.1%	442 67.2%	470 65.2%
	UNK (marital)	24 3.6%	48 7.3%	65 9.0%
Total	672 100.0%	658 100.0%	721 100.0%	

ADULT DRUG COURT & FAMILY DRUG COURT

Adult Drug Courts


Adult Drug Court is designed to achieve a reduction in recidivism and substance abuse among non-violent offenders. This court's goal is to increase the offender's likelihood of successful rehabilitation through early, continuous, and intense judicially supervised treatment, mandatory periodic drug testing, community supervision, and use of appropriate sanctions and other rehabilitation services.

There are nine Adult Drug Courts in Fremont, Gering, Grand Island, Lexington, Lincoln, Norfolk, Omaha, Pappillion, & Wilbur.

ADULT DRUG COURT DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	206	207	235
	Male	342	351	405
Race	American Indian Or Alaska Native	2.0%	2.7%	2.5%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	3	5	6
	Black	64	62	59
	Hispanic	44	36	40
	Other	41	33	35
	White	385	407	484
		70.3%	72.9%	75.6%
Age Group	18-20	99	103	109
	21-25	149	144	164
	26-30	107	114	131
	31-35	64	74	86
	36-40	45	50	59
	41 +	84	72	90
	Under 18	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.2%	0.2%


ADULT DRUG COURT TRENDLINE



Family Drug Court

Family Drug Court is a juvenile or family court docket which selects specific abuse, neglect, and dependency cases where parental substance abuse is a primary circumstance. Judges, attorneys, child protection services, and treatment personnel unite with the goal of providing safe, nurturing, and permanent homes for children while simultaneously providing parents the necessary support and services to encourage abstinence from drugs and alcohol. Family Drug Courts aid parents in regaining control of their lives and promote long-term stabilized recovery to enhance the possibility of family reunification within mandatory legal timeframes. There are five Family Drug Courts located in Holdrege, Lincoln, & Omaha (3).

FAMILY DRUG COURT TRENDLINE



JUVENILE DRUG COURT & DUI COURT

Juvenile Drug Court


A Juvenile Drug Court is a docket within the juvenile courts to which selected delinquency cases, and in some instances, status offenders, are referred for handling by a designated judge. The juveniles referred to this docket are identified as having problems with alcohol and/or other drugs. The Juvenile Drug Court Judge maintains close oversight of each case through regular status hearings with the parties involved. The Judge both leads and works as a member of a team that comprises representatives from treatment, juvenile justice, social and mental health services, school and vocational training programs, law enforcement, probation, the prosecution, and the defense.

Over the course of a year or more, the team meets frequently to determine how best to address the substance abuse and related problems of the youth and their family that have brought the youth into contact with the justice system. There are five Juvenile Drug Courts located in Gering, Lincoln, Norfolk, Omaha, & Papillion.

JUVENILE DRUG COURT DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011	2012	2013
Sex	Female	11	9
	27.8%	21.6%	23.1%
Male	57	40	30
	72.2%	78.4%	76.9%
Race	American Indian Or Alaska Native	3	1
	3.8%	2.0%	2.6%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	4	3
	5.1%	5.9%	2.6%
	Black	7	1
	8.9%	2.0%	5.1%
	Hispanic	14	10
17.7%	19.6%	10.3%	
Other	14	10	
17.7%	19.6%	10.3%	
White	37	26	
46.8%	51.0%	69.2%	
Age Group	18-20	1	0
	1.3%	0.0%	2.6%
	21-25	0	0
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	26-30	0	0
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	31-35	0	0
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
36-40	0	0	
0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
41 +	0	0	
0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Under 18	78	51	
98.7%	100.0%	97.4%	

JUVENILE DRUG COURT TRENDLINE




DUI Court

DUI Court programs utilize the drug treatment court model with impaired drivers. A DUI Court is a distinct court docket dedicated to changing the behavior of the alcohol/drug dependent offenders arrested for Driving Under the Influence (DUI). The goal of DUI Court is to protect public safety by using the drug court model to address the root cause of impaired driving, alcohol, and other substance abuse.

Compliance with treatment and other court-mandated terms is verified by frequent alcohol/drug testing, close community supervision, and interaction with the Judge in non-adversarial court review hearings. DUI Court often enhances close monitoring of offenders using home and field visits, ignition interlock and alcohol detection devices.

There is currently one DUI Court operating in Scottsbluff County in Gering, and has served 12, 14, and 13 offenders in the past three fiscal years. Due to the low number of offenders served by DUI Court, demographic details have been omitted.

DUI COURT TRENDLINE



YOUNG ADULT DRUG COURT

Young Adult Drug Court

The Douglas County Young Adult Drug Court (YADC) is a judicially supervised program that provides a sentencing alternative for individuals between the ages of 16-22 who are charged with a non-violent felony. A non-violent offense includes all theft and non-trafficking drug offenses. Program participation is based on selective assessment and the rehabilitative services are administered by multidisciplinary agencies.

Potential candidates for YADC are identified by their Defense Attorney who requests the County Attorney to review the case for possible screening by the team. If the County Attorney believes that the individual is a potential candidate, the Defense Attorney is notified and is asked to have the offender contact the YADC Coordinator for an interview. A Level of Service Inventory (LSI) interview is conducted and scored. A suitability report is then submitted by the YADC Coordinator at the County Attorney's office.

If the potential candidate is approved for YADC, the first requirement for entrance is that the offender must appear and enter a plea of guilty to their charge(s). The Judge then places the offender in the program which includes the following key components:

Phase I: Stabilization - 60 to 180 days; includes day reporting classes such as GED, Commitment for Change, HIV Education, Victim Impact, Parenting, Pre-Treatment, Recovery, Reactive Behavior, Domestic Violence, and Job Readiness and Money Skills for Life. Chemical dependency evaluations, mental health screenings, and counseling can also begin in this phase.


Phase II: Transition - 120 to 240 days; may involve participation in self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous, furthering of education, employment, electronic monitoring, transitional living, mentoring, victim offender mediation, and use of outside agencies such as three-quarter or halfway houses.

Phase III: Probation - 12 to 24 months; begins with the felony conviction withdrawn and reduced to a class I misdemeanor. Upon completion of Phase III, a graduation ceremony is held and the individual is awarded a certificate of completion along with an order signed by the Judge satisfactorily releasing them from probation.

YOUNG ADULT DRUG COURT DEMOGRAPHICS

		2011	2012	2013
Sex	Female	4 15.4%	4 14.3%	3 13.6%
	Male	22 84.6%	24 85.7%	19 86.4%
Race	American Indian Or Alaska Native	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	Black	7 26.9%	7 25.0%	6 27.3%
	Hispanic	1 3.8%	1 3.6%	0 0.0%
	Other	1 3.8%	1 3.6%	0 0.0%
	White	17 65.4%	19 67.9%	16 72.7%
Age Group	18-20	19 73.1%	22 78.6%	16 72.7%
	21-25	6 23.1%	6 21.4%	5 22.7%
	26-30	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	31-35	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	36-40	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	41 +	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
	Under 18	1 3.8%	0 0.0%	1 4.5%

YOUNG ADULT DRUG COURT TRENDLINE




SECTION III: PAROLE

Parole in Nebraska was established in 1893 with the Governor holding sole authority to release an individual onto parole. The Nebraska Board of Parole was created by a constitutional amendment in 1968, and is found in the State Constitution in Article IV Section 13. The Parole Board is made up of 5 people who meet daily to review inmate cases to determine offender readiness to be released into society on parole. Adult Parole Administration, which was created by the Legislature in 1969, manages the parolees once the board has determined they are eligible for parole. Since its creation, Parole Officers have played a significant role in assisting offender transition back into the community while maintaining community safety.

Parole is a method of prison release whereby inmates are released into the community under supervision before having completed their entire sentence. Supervision takes place by Parole Officers, who oversee parolee activity while assisting with the individual's transition back into the community. A Parole Officer will monitor the parolee's travel, residence, employment, associates, financial obligations, drug and/or alcohol use, and compliance with laws and special conditions of parole. Parolees are responsible for the costs of their own housing, food, and medical expenses.

The goal of the Parole Officer is to assist each parolee in achieving a successful discharge from parole supervision and to become a responsible member of society. Parole administration has a number of programs intended to carry out their goals.



PAROLE DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	383 14.8%	434 15.3%	340 15.0%
	Male	2,205 85.2%	2,395 84.7%	1,932 85.0%
	Total	2,588 100.0%	2,829 100.0%	2,272 100.0%
Age Group	18-20	55 2.1%	42 1.5%	30 1.3%
	21-25	466 18.0%	503 17.8%	370 16.3%
	26-30	512 19.8%	566 20.0%	421 18.5%
	31-35	433 16.7%	461 16.3%	400 17.6%
	36-40	321 12.4%	381 13.5%	300 13.2%
	41 +	798 30.8%	874 30.9%	751 33.1%
	Under 18	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
UNK (age)	3 0.1%	2 0.1%	0 0.0%	
Total	2,588 100.0%	2,829 100.0%	2,272 100.0%	
Race	American Indian Or Alaska 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	2,588 100.0%	2,829 100.0%	2,272 100.0%
Education	8th or Less	172 6.6%	179 6.3%	141 6.2%
	9th - 11th	888 34.3%	989 35.0%	776 34.2%
	12th or GED	890 34.4%	957 33.8%	795 35.0%
	College or Above	36 1.4%	31 1.1%	33 1.5%
	UNK (education)	421 16.3%	474 16.8%	373 16.4%
Vocational/Some College	181 7.0%	199 7.0%	154 6.8%	
Total	2,588 100.0%	2,829 100.0%	2,272 100.0%	
Marital	Married	550 21.3%	579 20.5%	438 19.3%
	Separated/Divorced/..	474 18.3%	532 18.8%	423 18.6%
	Single	1,510 58.3%	1,649 58.3%	1,319 58.1%
	UNK (marital)	54 2.1%	69 2.4%	92 4.0%
Total	2,588 100.0%	2,829 100.0%	2,272 100.0%	

PAROLE PROGRAMS & SERVICES

Re-entry Officer Assistance

Every offender with a parole hearing scheduled will meet with a re-entry officer before their parole hearing. First meetings are usually done in a re-entry class that includes all offenders from the facility who have hearings scheduled within the next three months. At this meeting, the re-entry officer will explain what the offender can expect on the day of their hearing and the general conditions of parole. The Re-entry Officer will answer offender questions and begin to work with the offender on a parole plan which will consist of residential, employment, and programming needs. The Re-entry Officer will communicate with facility staff and the offender to determine if the offender has, or has applied for, documents such as a birth certificate, driver's license, and social security card. The offender may have had an opportunity to work on obtaining these documents while incarcerated. Offenders may also have been able to apply for Social Security Income or Social Security Disability immediately prior to a parole hearing date. While a person cannot collect income from these sources while incarcerated, they can apply to have them resume upon their release.

The Re-entry Officer will visit with each parole candidate regarding their proposed residence and employment plan in an effort to assist the parole candidate in determining the most stable option. The Re-entry Officer will then submit the proposed plan to field staff via an Adult Placement Worksheet (APW). The APW includes information obtained from facility staff in a variety of areas, such as substance abuse, mental health, medical, educational, and medication needs. The Re-entry Officer will also receive information on the current offense, criminal history, and detainers from other jurisdictions. The assigned Field Officer will conduct a placement investigation into the proposed program to determine the viability and stability of the program, and will either approve or deny the residence and employment. If the residence is denied, the process will begin again. While the investigation is being completed, the Re-entry Officer completes a Simple Screening Instrument (SSI) and a Specialized Substance Abuse Services (SSAS) screening with those offenders who are serving felony drug or Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) offenses. When the screening instrument indicates appropriateness, a Level of Service/Case Management (LSCMI) assessment will be administered and sent to SSAS staff through Probation.

In 2013, Parole completed 2,065 adult placement worksheets, 1,714 placement investigations, and 997 LSCMI's.

Cognitive Thinking classes

Almost all Parole Officers have been trained in Thinking for a Change (T4C), an integrated, cognitive behavioral change program for offenders which includes cognitive restructuring, social skills development, and development of problem solving skills. Parole Officers in the Lincoln and Omaha offices conduct classes on a regular basis. T4C classes are taught by Parole and are available to both parolees and probationers as needed. Last year 761 offenders were served by this program.

Cognitive Workbooks

In addition to cognitive thinking classes, each Parole Officer addresses thinking errors and cognitive thinking issues with the parolee as they occur. Parole Officers are urged to assign workbooks before a violation occurs. When a violation does occur, it may result in an offender being required to submit a 'thinking report', or to complete a cognitive workbook. Workbooks are assigned by Parole Officers to parolees who have demonstrated a need, through discussions with their Parole Officers or by violating their conditions of Parole. Work books are paid for through the Parole Cash Fund. Workbooks require the parolee to have a significant support person work through the lessons with the parolee, and the support person reports to the Parole Officer regarding the progress of the parolee. The costs of the books are \$20 each, and in 2013, 178 parolees were assigned workbooks, for an annual cost that year of \$3,560.

Drug Testing

Parolees are tested for drug usage both randomly and for cause. A parolee may also be targeted for testing if they have a history of drug or alcohol use. NDCS uses its own lab, which also runs a confirmation test for each test with a positive result. In 2013, 1,732 initial urine tests were run, with an additional 346 confirmation tests. The annual cost of these tests in 2013 was \$12,314.

DRUG TESTING DEMOGRAPHIC DATA WAS REQUESTED, BUT WAS NOT PROVIDED BY PAROLE.

PAROLE PROGRAMS & SERVICES CONT.

Transitional Housing

There are a large number of transitional living facilities in both Lincoln and Omaha, and additional facilities exist statewide in Columbus, Grand Island, Hastings, Norfolk, & Scottsbluff. Outside of these communities there are few options available. Parole maintains a list of transitional houses and updates it regularly as they become aware of new living facilities that are available.

Some of the residences are sober living facilities; some have substance abuse assistance available as well.

These facilities provide shelter for those with a history of substance abuse who need a stable residence to parole to, or those individuals who are paroling from a Nebraska Department of Correction Services (NDCS) residential substance abuse program with a recommendation to go to a sober living facility.

The State does not oversee or regulate this housing in any way. All transitional housing is privately owned and receives no funding from the NDCS or from Parole. Parolees are responsible for paying the costs of living in a transitional housing facility.

Polygraphs

Polygraphs have been available for Parole to use in assessing sex offenders and have been used in determining if changes to supervision might be appropriate. Currently, polygraphs are administered by the Nebraska State Patrol (NSP) polygraphists who have been trained in administering these tests to sex offenders. Due to difficulties in coordinating these tests with NSP, Parole has decided to terminate this program going forward.

In 2013, nine polygraph tests were administered to six individuals at an annual cost of \$4,066.57. The cost per test varies a small amount, and is based upon the amount of time the NSP polygraphist uses to research the case, drive to the polygraph site, administer the test, and finally submit the results to Parole.

Vocational Rehabilitation Services

Vocational Rehabilitation Services (VRS) are available on site in the Lincoln Parole Office, and help to facilitate cooperation between agencies. A computer lab has been recently created for offenders seeking employment. The cost to the State to run these services annually is \$73,710.36. There were 43 individuals referred from Parole to utilize these services, and 190 from the Lincoln Community Corrections Center.

Mental Health Services

NDCS has Mental Health Staff available in both the Lincoln and Omaha parole offices to provide anger management and sex offender groups to parolees and inmates. Mental Health Staff is also available to assist Parole Officers in the management of parolee crisis intervention as needed. Individual counseling is not currently available. In 2013, 86 offenders utilized mental health services through this program, and the cost per offender is \$4,569 annually, for a total cost of \$180,667.

General Education Diploma Classes

General Education Diploma (GED) classes are offered on-site at the Lincoln Parole Office and instructors are NDCS employees. Parolees, probationers, and re-entry furlough program participants are eligible for this program. These classes are individual study and offenders may enter at any time, working at their own pace. In 2013, there were 329 offenders who utilized this class, and the cost per offender was \$228.71. Annually, the total cost of the GED program was \$75,245.

Other community resources

Paroling offenders often need a variety of services and programs to aid their success. Parole maintains a comprehensive summary of resources including housing, medical, mental health, substance abuse services, medication assistance, financial assistance, clothing, furniture, and transportation. The summary can be located on the NDCS website under Adult Parole. These resources include volunteer organizations, and businesses that provide other services that the parolee may need at no (or minimal) cost. The substance abuse program providers listed will all accept vouchers. Providers of other services may require the parolee to pay for services. The listings in the Community Resource Summary are reviewed annually to ensure they are still available and the information contained within is current. New resources are added as they are discovered.

In addition, Parole collaborates with many community agencies including law enforcement, program providers, assistance agencies, employers, victim programs, crime reduction programs, and other government agencies. Some of these programs provide services and volunteer opportunities, while others provide food, clothing, or medical care for parolees. Parole, along with the Community Corrections Centers in Lincoln and Omaha, sponsor Community Advisory Committees to share information with others interested in collaborating.

SECTION IV: WORK RELEASE & WORK DETAIL PROGRAMS

In October of 1967, the enactment of LB569 by the Nebraska Legislature established the Work Release program. This program allowed a select group of inmates to be employed in the community and be housed in correctional facilities during non-working hours. A community residential program was established in 1971 in both Lincoln and Omaha.

Community inmates participate in the initial step that provides for a graduated release through a systematic decrease in supervision and a corresponding increase in responsibility on the part of the inmate. Inmates nearing release on parole or discharge from sentence are eligible through the classification system to be promoted to community custody status. Inmates on Community A are assigned to a detail within the facility or on a park or roads crew or other work assignment in the community. Community A inmates are furnished work clothes, room and board, and a daily wage. Community B inmates participate on the work and/or educational release programs. Inmates on work release are employed in the community, receive competitive wages, and pay applicable taxes. Inmates on educational release attend local vocational, technical, business, or community colleges and universities. Community B inmates are responsible for their own clothing and personal items, and pay room and board costs of \$12 dollars per day.


Work Release Demographics

		2011		2012		2013	
		CCL	CCO	CCL	CCO	CCL	CCO
Sex	Female	97	58	156	63	109	37
	Male	692	435	649	360	437	298
Race	American Indian Or Al..	28	12	26	12	20	6
	Asian or Pacific Islan..	9	3	6	2	2	1
	Black	179	178	174	140	112	96
	Hispanic	65	22	57	23	42	23
	Other	5	2	10	1	5	0
	White	503	276	532	245	365	209
			63.8%	56.0%	66.1%	57.9%	66.8%
Age Group	18-20	4	9	7	2	5	4
	21-25	131	81	131	61	69	46
	26-30	160	88	146	82	99	53
	31-35	124	86	125	67	90	69
	36-40	111	66	124	55	95	41
	41 +	259	163	272	156	188	122
			32.8%	33.1%	33.8%	36.9%	34.4%
	Under 18	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%


Work Detail Demographics

		2011		2012		2013	
		CCL	CCO	CCL	CCO	CCL	CCO
Sex	Female	222	43	270	55	198	37
	Male	1,049	322	983	298	791	291
Race	American Indian Or Al..	53	8	38	10	40	6
	Asian or Pacific Islan..	13	2	9	2	7	3
	Black	274	142	264	132	215	111
	Hispanic	113	20	97	15	72	20
	Other	8	0	16	0	11	3
	White	810	193	829	194	644	185
			63.7%	52.9%	66.2%	55.0%	65.1%
Age Group	18-20	17	12	18	4	13	1
	21-25	237	53	213	54	135	48
	26-30	231	64	222	66	169	55
	31-35	178	61	189	56	167	52
	36-40	159	38	178	34	135	43
	41 +	449	137	433	139	370	129
			35.3%	37.5%	34.6%	39.4%	37.4%
	Under 18	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Work Release Trendline



Work Detail Trendline



Type
■ CCL
■ CCO

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CENTERS


Inmates nearing the end of their prison sentence or pending parole hearing are selected for placement at the Community Correction Centers.

Community Corrections Center - Lincoln

The Community Corrections Center - Lincoln began construction of a new facility in the fall of 1991. This facility opened in 1993, and has four housing units, three for men and one for women, and can currently house 88 women and 312 men, classified at a Community A or B custody level. The Lincoln facility has been accredited by the American Correctional Association since 1981. Available programs include work detail, work release, educational release, furloughs, community activity passes, Adult Basic Education (ABE) and GED classes, substance abuse programming, family counseling, and mental health counseling.

Community Corrections Center - Omaha

The Community Corrections Center-Omaha houses 156 male and 24 female inmates who are also classified at a Community A or B custody level. Available programs include Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), Narcotics Anonymous (NA), substance abuse counseling, community based intensive outpatient program, relapse prevention group, aftercare group, GED classes, referrals to community based counseling programs, and Christian fellowship...



CCL & CCO DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011		2012		2013		
	CCL	CCO	CCL	CCO	CCL	CCO	
Sex	Female	235 16.9%	73 11.4%	277 20.5%	87 14.5%	246 20.0%	62 11.5%
	Male	1,159 83.1%	570 88.6%	1,077 79.5%	514 85.5%	985 80.0%	478 88.5%
	Total	1,394 100.0%	643 100.0%	1,354 100.0%	601 100.0%	1,231 100.0%	540 100.0%
Age Group	18-20	17 1.2%	17 2.6%	18 1.3%	4 0.7%	17 1.4%	4 0.7%
	21-25	248 17.8%	105 16.3%	227 16.8%	85 14.1%	157 12.8%	76 14.1%
	26-30	257 18.4%	113 17.6%	245 18.1%	112 18.6%	217 17.6%	86 15.9%
	31-35	199 14.3%	109 17.0%	202 14.9%	97 16.1%	209 17.0%	96 17.8%
	36-40	178 12.8%	75 11.7%	192 14.2%	67 11.1%	172 14.0%	66 12.2%
	41 +	495 35.5%	224 34.8%	470 34.7%	236 39.3%	459 37.3%	212 39.3%
	Total	1,394 100.0%	643 100.0%	1,354 100.0%	601 100.0%	1,231 100.0%	540 100.0%
Race	American Indian Or Ala..	55 3.9%	17 2.6%	42 3.1%	20 3.3%	50 4.1%	9 1.7%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	15 1.1%	3 0.5%	10 0.7%	3 0.5%	8 0.6%	3 0.6%
	Black	298 21.4%	240 37.3%	289 21.3%	207 34.4%	259 21.0%	169 31.3%
	Hispanic	121 8.7%	34 5.3%	104 7.7%	30 5.0%	93 7.6%	33 6.1%
	Other	9 0.6%	2 0.3%	17 1.3%	1 0.2%	13 1.1%	3 0.6%
	White	896 64.3%	347 54.0%	892 65.9%	340 56.6%	808 65.6%	323 59.8%
	Total	1,394 100.0%	643 100.0%	1,354 100.0%	601 100.0%	1,231 100.0%	540 100.0%
Education	8th or Less	75 5.4%	35 5.4%	63 4.7%	32 5.3%	51 4.1%	23 4.3%
	9th - 11th	471 33.8%	224 34.8%	431 31.8%	219 36.4%	391 31.8%	187 34.6%
	12th or GED	462 33.1%	229 35.6%	449 33.2%	200 33.3%	424 34.4%	205 38.0%
	College or Above	20 1.4%	8 1.2%	21 1.6%	9 1.5%	19 1.5%	12 2.2%
	UNK (education)	253 18.1%	86 13.4%	295 21.8%	94 15.6%	254 20.6%	67 12.4%
	Vocational/ Some College	113 8.1%	61 9.5%	95 7.0%	47 7.8%	92 7.5%	46 8.5%
	Total	1,394 100.0%	643 100.0%	1,354 100.0%	601 100.0%	1,231 100.0%	540 100.0%
Marital	Married	323 23.2%	136 21.2%	296 21.9%	147 24.5%	265 21.5%	121 22.4%
	Separated/Di..	291 20.9%	111 17.3%	273 20.2%	105 17.5%	255 20.7%	100 18.5%
	Single	745 53.4%	382 59.4%	734 54.2%	334 55.6%	644 52.3%	299 55.4%
	UNK (marital)	35 2.5%	14 2.2%	51 3.8%	15 2.5%	67 5.4%	20 3.7%
	Total	1,394 100.0%	643 100.0%	1,354 100.0%	601 100.0%	1,231 100.0%	540 100.0%

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Education Services

NDCS became a self-operating school district in January 2008, offering educational services to meet individual inmate's needs. The programs include a high school accredited through the Nebraska Department of Education, Adult Basic and Secondary Education (ABE/ASE), including literacy education and General Equivalency Diploma testing to earn a Nebraska High School Diploma, English as a Second Language (ESL), life skills courses, parenting courses, pre-vocational and vocational programming, and correspondence study. Courses are presented in individualized or group format depending upon the need of the inmate student and course content. Inmates are encouraged to pursue educational release when they reach Community Corrections status. Teachers and the principal are all certified through the State of Nebraska; 47% of the teachers hold a master's or higher degree.

Additional Academic Services

Upon initial admission to adult facilities, all inmates provide personal data regarding their education and complete the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) or the BEST Plus test for ESL students. For inmates who have graduated from high school, or have a GED, the verification process begins in each facility. Based on the TABE results, students are placed in coursework that meets their needs. The juveniles admitted to the Nebraska Correctional Youth Facility (NCYF), are placed in either the high school program or ABE/ASE program based upon their age, length of sentence, evaluation of their high school transcripts, and TABE test scores.

At all facilities, if a student has a diploma but does not score well on the TABE, that student may be placed in literacy programming or, if college is a goal, in courses to better prepare the student for college and college entrance testing. The ABE/ASE program offers coursework in reading, science, social studies, writing (language), and math. Special Education professionals assist students with special learning needs.


Educational Release

The Educational Release Program allows inmates the opportunity to participate in education not available within the confines of the secure institutions. Eligible inmates may enroll in community colleges, technical schools, and four year colleges and universities. Inmates must pay for this education while also paying expenses related to living at Community Corrections where they are housed.

EDUCATION SERVICES DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011		2012		2013		
	CCL	CCO	CCL	CCO	CCL	CCO	
Sex	Female	66 20.5%	18 12.1%	93 27.4%	24 16.1%	83 27.9%	19 12.0%
	Male	256 79.5%	131 87.9%	247 72.6%	125 83.9%	214 72.1%	139 88.0%
Race	American Indian Or Alaska Native	23 7.1%	4 2.7%	15 4.4%	5 3.4%	17 5.7%	2 1.3%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	0 0.0%	1 0.7%	4 1.2%	1 0.7%	3 1.0%	3 1.9%
	Black	83 25.8%	66 44.3%	88 25.9%	65 43.6%	74 24.9%	64 40.5%
	Hispanic	55 17.1%	15 10.1%	49 14.4%	10 6.7%	42 14.1%	16 10.1%
	Other	2 0.6%	0 0.0%	8 2.4%	1 0.7%	6 2.0%	0 0.0%
	White	159 49.4%	63 42.3%	176 51.8%	67 45.0%	155 52.2%	73 46.2%
Age Group	18-20	7 2.2%	12 8.1%	7 2.1%	4 2.7%	6 2.0%	1 0.6%
	21-25	81 25.2%	35 23.5%	80 23.5%	31 20.8%	58 19.5%	37 23.4%
	26-30	70 21.7%	28 18.8%	74 21.8%	35 23.5%	68 22.9%	30 19.0%
	31-35	48 14.9%	22 14.8%	54 15.9%	22 14.8%	61 20.5%	20 12.7%
	36-40	31 9.6%	8 5.4%	43 12.6%	9 6.0%	39 13.1%	14 8.9%
	41 +	85 26.4%	44 29.5%	82 24.1%	48 32.2%	65 21.9%	56 35.4%
	Under 18	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

EDUCATION SERVICES TRENDLINE



Correspondence Study

Inmates who have verified diplomas may participate in correspondence study with accredited post-secondary facilities. Inmates are responsible for enrolling and paying all fees for such study. Education staff monitors progress and proctor tests.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS

Re-Entry Furlough Program

The Reentry Furlough Program (RFP) is a very structured program that may include restitution, drug and alcohol testing, community based treatment opportunities, itineraries, electronic monitoring and may include any other condition necessary for successful participation in the program. Adult Parole Administration and staff from the Community Corrections Centers work very closely with local law enforcement to supervise these offenders.

This is not parole or a release from official custody. These offenders enjoy no liberty interest and can be immediately transferred to an appropriate institution if they violate program rules.

This program is designed to allow offenders who have been program compliant, demonstrate stable institutional behavior, and been deemed low risk through evaluation, to serve a portion of their sentence at an approved residence in the community, prior to their parole or release date.

The Legislature has been studying the legality of RFP through the Department of Correctional Services Special Investigative Committee that was formed through LR464(2014). The Committee feels the RFP was developed outside of the process required by administrative procedures act, and is not in compliance with the law. The Committee has recommended that this program be abandoned, and if it has any merit at all, should be re-established through the legislative process. The Community Corrections Division fully expects the Legislature to take appropriate action with regards to RFP, and our next annual report will reflect any changes to this program, and other programs, as the Legislature convenes in January of 2015.

Prevocational and Vocational Programming

The Pro-Start Food Service program will be offered in several facilities. Food service personnel who are certified vocational instructors will teach these programs. Upon completion of each year of the two year program, inmates will receive national certification for that year of training.

The Cabling Program is taught by a staff member trained in this venue. The program is available at the Community Correctional Center - Lincoln for inmates who have a diploma and meet criteria for this program. Students receive industry certified training and then practice those skills doing jobs for the State.

Life Skills & Parenting

Life Skills courses included Relationships, How to Find and Keep a Job, Introduction to Computers, Keyboarding, Money Smart, and other related topics. These courses are taught by the education staff. Education staff and volunteers teach the Inside Out Dads Curriculum for the men. Parenting courses for the women are taught by trained parenting professionals.

The Parenting Program at the Nebraska Department of Corrections aspires to teach the inmates within the facilities guidelines to good parenting through classes, and experiences provided to them with their children. The goal is to return inmate parents back to their communities with the knowledge and motivation to appropriately care for their children, to reduce their own recidivism, and reduce the number of children exposed to parental incarceration.

SECTION V: COMMUNITY SUPERVISION


The following section provides a combined view of the community supervision offender population utilizing information from the previous sections. The community supervision offender group combines fiscal year population served counts for Probation (adult & juvenile), Problem Solving Courts and Parole. This section contains information on the supervision programs shared by the above listed agencies when providing services for the offender population. A combined demographic breakout is included to the right.

During the FY13/14, about 1 in 67 residents above the age of 16 in the State of Nebraska participated in some form of community supervision, compared to 1 in 61 in FY12/13, and 1 in 57 in FY11/12. Adult Probation is down 17.3%, overall community supervision has dropped 14.0% comparing 2011 to 2013 fiscal years.

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011		2012		2013	
Adult Probation	17,115	68.1%	15,555	66.1%	14,157	65.4%
Juvenile Probation	4,772	19.0%	4,505	19.1%	4,489	20.7%
Parole	2,588	10.3%	2,829	12.0%	2,272	10.5%
Problem Solving Courts	672	2.7%	658	2.8%	721	3.3%
Grand Total	25,147	100.0%	23,547	100.0%	21,639	100.0%

PROBATION BY TYPE



Type

- Adult Probation
- Juvenile Probation
- Parole
- Problem Solving Courts


COMMUNITY SUPERVISION DEMOGRAPHICS

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	7,546 30.01%	7,030 29.86%	6,571 30.37%
	Male	17,601 69.99%	16,517 70.14%	15,068 69.63%
	Total	25,147 100.00%	23,547 100.00%	21,639 100.00%
Age Group	18-20	2,569 10.22%	2,226 9.45%	1,993 9.21%
	21-25	4,834 19.22%	4,407 18.72%	3,981 18.40%
	26-30	3,504 13.93%	3,277 13.92%	2,828 13.07%
	31-35	2,453 9.75%	2,464 10.46%	2,237 10.34%
	36-40	1,934 7.69%	1,808 7.68%	1,651 7.63%
	41 +	4,678 18.60%	4,565 19.39%	4,220 19.50%
	Under 18	4,852 19.29%	4,557 19.35%	4,530 20.93%
UNK (age)	323 1.28%	243 1.03%	199 0.92%	
Total	25,147 100.00%	23,547 100.00%	21,639 100.00%	
Race	American Indian Or Alaska 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	25,147 100.00%	23,547 100.00%	21,639 100.00%
Education	8th or Less	1,415 5.63%	1,368 5.81%	1,383 6.39%
	9th - 11th	5,985 23.80%	5,698 24.20%	5,465 25.26%
	12th or GED	10,281 40.88%	9,803 41.63%	8,847 40.88%
	College or Above	2,011 8.00%	1,816 7.71%	1,716 7.93%
	UNK (education)	696 2.77%	673 2.86%	555 2.56%
	Vocational/Some College	4,759 18.92%	4,189 17.79%	3,673 16.97%
Total	25,147 100.00%	23,547 100.00%	21,639 100.00%	
Marital	Married	4,050 16.11%	3,742 15.89%	3,328 15.38%
	Separated/Divorced/..	3,325 13.22%	3,247 13.79%	2,844 13.14%
	Single	17,095 67.98%	15,877 67.43%	14,598 67.46%
	UNK (marital)	677 2.69%	681 2.89%	869 4.02%
Total	25,147 100.00%	23,547 100.00%	21,639 100.00%	

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION SERIOUS OFFENDER POPULATION

As noted in the previous page, the community supervision population served has dropped significantly during the past three fiscal years, mainly due to the decrease in misdemeanor probation utilization as seen below.

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION BY OFFENSE TYPE




Offense Type
■ MISDEMEANOR (Less Serious)
■ FELONY & PAROLE (More Serious)
■ OTHER (Serious Level Unknown)

To better understand the community supervision offender population the following pages have further broken out the population into cohorts based upon the seriousness of the offense committed.

The more serious offender population cohort are those who are on parole, felony adult/juvenile probation, and felony problem solving court offenders. The less serious offender population cohort is the 'misdemeanor' group which consists of juveniles and adults from both probation and problem solving courts whose most serious offense is a misdemeanor.

In the above line graph you can see the amount of more serious offenders (blue) under community supervision increased in 2012, but then decreased in 2013. Overall counts remain steady when comparing all three years.


COMMUNITY SUPERVISION MORE SERIOUS OFFENDER POPULATION



The percentage of offenders that make up the serious designation has increased from 28.87% in 2011, to 32.52% in 2013. This can mainly be attributed to the decrease in the misdemeanor offender population, not necessarily an overall increase in the serious offender population.

During the FY13/14, about 1 in 206 residents above the age of 16 in the State of Nebraska participated in some form of community supervision relating to a serious offense. Compared to 1 in 190 in FY12/13, and 1 in 197 in FY11/12. Details regarding community supervision of offense types are included on the following three pages.


COMMUNITY SUPERVISION MORE SERIOUS OFFENDER POPULATION



Program Type
■ Adult Probation
■ Parole
■ Juvenile Probation
■ Problem Solving Courts

OFFENSE BREAKOUT (PROBATION & PSC)


ADULT PROBATION BY OFFENSE TYPE



ADULT PROBATION BY CRIME CATEGORY

Crime Category	2011			2012			2013		
	FEL	MSD	Other	FEL	MSD	Other	FEL	MSD	Other
Assaultive Act	321	1,079	1	330	978	0	347	974	0
Burglary	301	0	0	280	0	0	284	0	0
Compliance	74	325	0	79	333	0	93	339	0
Dangerous Drugs	1,287	186	10	1,323	157	13	1,403	129	11
Family Offense	59	238	0	73	238	0	86	232	0
Homicide	22	13	0	20	18	0	19	21	0
Kidnapping	11	2	0	13	3	0	12	2	0
Property & Fiscal	802	749	0	784	686	0	778	623	0
Robbery	49	0	0	50	0	0	44	0	0
Sex Offense	267	42	4	284	37	4	274	38	3
Traffic Offense	263	9,611	7	275	8,314	14	285	7,033	20
Unknown	92	996	197	92	900	127	86	794	100
Weapon Offense	81	23	3	86	43	1	84	41	2
Grand Total	3,629	13,264	222	3,689	11,707	159	3,795	10,226	136


JUVENILE PROBATION BY OFFENSE TYPE



JUVENILE PROBATION BY CRIME CATEGORY

Crime Category	2011			2012			2013		
	FEL	MSD	Other	FEL	MSD	Other	FEL	MSD	Other
Assaultive Act	53	530	0	37	454	0	50	527	0
Burglary	132	0	0	125	0	0	98	0	0
Compliance	8	168	0	9	136	0	10	115	0
Dangerous Drugs	102	472	1	137	428	1	109	477	0
Family Offense	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	0
Homicide	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	5	0
Kidnapping	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
Property & Fiscal	82	844	0	75	850	0	74	713	0
Robbery	8	0	0	10	0	0	14	0	0
Sex Offense	27	33	0	27	38	1	54	59	1
Traffic Offense	4	269	2	6	254	3	4	198	1
Unknown	60	939	999	58	916	907	40	764	1,149
Weapon Offense	13	17	3	8	17	3	6	15	1
Grand Total	493	3,274	1,005	494	3,096	915	460	2,877	1,152

PROBLEM SOLVING COURTS BY OFFENSE TYPE




PROBLEM SOLVING COURTS BY CRIME CATEGORY

Crime Category	2011			2012			2013		
	FEL	MSD	Other	FEL	MSD	Other	FEL	MSD	Other
Assaultive Act	0	5	2	0	4	2	0	2	0
Burglary	35	0	2	37	0	0	33	0	0
Compliance	25	15	36	29	19	16	18	13	5
Dangerous Drugs	447	11	17	453	10	9	418	9	8
Family Offense	1	0	3	1	0	6	1	0	4
Homicide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kidnapping	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Property & Fiscal	40	12	4	41	6	2	33	3	2
Robbery	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Sex Offense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Traffic Offense	3	8	0	5	9	0	2	8	0
Unknown	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	2	156
Weapon Offense	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	553	53	66	570	50	38	509	37	175

Offense Type
■ FEL ■ MSD ■ Other

OFFENSE BREAKOUT (PAROLE, CCO, & CCL)


PAROLE POPULATION SERVED TRENDLINE



PAROLE POPULATION SERVED BY CRIME CATEGORY

Crime Category	2011		2012		2013	
Assaultive Act	283	10.9%	323	11.4%	229	10.1%
Burglary	291	11.2%	307	10.9%	233	10.3%
Compliance	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dangerous Drugs	628	24.3%	702	24.8%	614	27.0%
Family Offense	10	0.4%	12	0.4%	11	0.5%
Homicide	47	1.8%	45	1.6%	39	1.7%
Kidnapping	14	0.5%	21	0.7%	10	0.4%
Property & Fiscal	462	17.9%	547	19.3%	449	19.8%
Robbery	184	7.1%	181	6.4%	125	5.5%
Sex Offense	112	4.3%	119	4.2%	89	3.9%
Traffic Offense	360	13.9%	378	13.4%	314	13.8%
Unknown	93	3.6%	100	3.5%	75	3.3%
Weapon Offense	104	4.0%	94	3.3%	84	3.7%
Grand Total	2,588	100.0%	2,829	100.0%	2,272	100.0%


CCL POPULATION SERVED TRENDLINE



CCL POPULATION SERVED BY CRIME CATEGORY

Crime Category	2011		2012		2013	
Assaultive Act	189	13.6%	147	10.9%	135	11.0%
Burglary	151	10.8%	117	8.6%	114	9.3%
Compliance	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dangerous Drugs	360	25.8%	377	27.8%	344	27.9%
Family Offense	5	0.4%	7	0.5%	5	0.4%
Homicide	39	2.8%	33	2.4%	33	2.7%
Kidnapping	8	0.6%	5	0.4%	3	0.2%
Property & Fiscal	236	16.9%	258	19.1%	202	16.4%
Robbery	78	5.6%	85	6.3%	67	5.4%
Sex Offense	55	3.9%	87	6.4%	70	5.7%
Traffic Offense	181	13.0%	148	10.9%	152	12.3%
Unknown	34	2.4%	34	2.5%	33	2.7%
Weapon Offense	58	4.2%	56	4.1%	73	5.9%
Grand Total	1,394	100.0%	1,354	100.0%	1,231	100.0%

CCO POPULATION SERVED TRENDLINE




CCO POPULATION SERVED BY CRIME CATEGORY


Crime Category	2011		2012		2013	
Assaultive Act	65	10.1%	62	10.3%	52	9.6%
Burglary	67	10.4%	51	8.5%	49	9.1%
Compliance	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Dangerous Drugs	110	17.1%	113	18.8%	102	18.9%
Family Offense	3	0.5%	4	0.7%	3	0.6%
Homicide	11	1.7%	13	2.2%	7	1.3%
Kidnapping	3	0.5%	4	0.7%	3	0.6%
Property & Fiscal	127	19.8%	113	18.8%	125	23.1%
Robbery	52	8.1%	37	6.2%	31	5.7%
Sex Offense	41	6.4%	40	6.7%	21	3.9%
Traffic Offense	111	17.3%	116	19.3%	107	19.8%
Unknown	19	3.0%	18	3.0%	13	2.4%
Weapon Offense	34	5.3%	30	5.0%	27	5.0%
Grand Total	643	100.0%	601	100.0%	540	100.0%

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION BY OFFENSE TYPE

COMMUNITY SUPERVISION (LESS SERIOUS OFFENDER) BY CRIME CATEGORY



COMMUNITY SUPERVISION (MORE SERIOUS OFFENDER) BY CRIME CATEGORY



SHARED RESOURCES: REPORTING CENTERS

There are eight Reporting Centers in Nebraska. They are run by Probation, and Parolees may attend classes or access other services. Reporting Centers provide pre-treatment, employment, educational and life skills classes. Other options include cognitive groups to assist offenders in behavior change, create a location for daily offender contact, random monitoring of daily itineraries, job interviews, counseling attendance, community services, GED and ABE, job referrals, and vocational services. Eligibility criteria for parolees are based on class space availability. Most parolees are able to begin classes within a short time of their referral.


Within the Reporting Centers, specially trained Probation Officers use cross-system case management and cross-system collaboration between the Judicial system and treatment providers. Each of the Reporting Centers are responsible for having a core set of classes, although due to the availability of resources, non-core contracted services vary among Reporting Centers.

Reporting Centers provide the following: Pre-treatment, employment and educational/life skills classes; cognitive groups to assist clients in behavior change, including daily offender contact; random monitoring of daily itineraries; job interviews, counseling attendance, community service, GED and ABE, job referrals, and vocational services. Reporting Centers also offer services that are unique to the Judicial districts where they are located. During FY13/14, there were collectively over 143 different services within eight Reporting Centers. These services include classes or programs covering parenting, anger management, financial management, relapse prevention, victim impact classes, domestic violence classes, women's groups, and Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, drug testing, substance abuse services, and aftercare/relapse prevention counseling. Other services such as drug testing and ancillary assistance (transportation, leisure activities, clothing closets, or computer labs) are also available.

The target populations for the Reporting Centers are offenders under community supervision, in need of rehabilitative services, and include probationers, parolees, and problem-solving court participants. Services are tailored to meet the needs of the district and local population. Reporting Centers assist in engaging offenders in rehabilitative services while simultaneously providing enhanced supervision. Reporting Centers are funded through a combination of general fund, cash fund, and county dollars.

Reporting Centers have become integral to the success of the Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision (SSAS) program's work to reduce recidivism. In 2006, the Community Corrections Council approved a set of standards for the Reporting Centers, and by September of that same year, the first reporting center staff were hired, and seven Reporting Centers were opened serving the Judicial district and County Court's higher risk offenders in the following counties: Buffalo, Dakota, Dawson, Douglas, Lancaster, Otoe, and Sarpy. In 2012, a Reporting Center was opened in Gering, for a total of eight.

Reporting Center Counties



SHARED RESOURCES: SPECIALIZED SUBSTANCE ABUSE SUPERVISION

Established in 2006 in response to prison overcrowding, Specialized Substance Abuse Supervision (SSAS) targets high-risk substance abusing offenders. SSAS is administered by Probation, and is a sentencing alternative that combines intensive supervision with substance abuse treatment as a means of crime control. It is intended to address the treatment and supervision needs of offenders with chronic drug problems who pose a high risk to recidivate. Highly trained Probation Officers work with offenders who are also identified as having anti-social, pro-criminal tendencies. The target population for the SSAS program is felony drug offenders with substance abuse problems. Probation uses risk assessment tools to identify appropriate candidates.

Goals of the SSAS program are:

- 1) Lower levels of recidivism and relapse;
- 2) Improve education and enhance employability; and
- 3) Facilitate reintegration into the community.

Each offender's needs are individually assessed so the treatment, including length of time spent in treatment, may be customized. This flexibility creates the most efficient and effective means to assist the offender to recover, maintain sobriety, and become a productive, law abiding member of the community.

Core components of the SSAS program are:

- 1) Access to substance abuse treatment;
- 2) Participation in cognitive behavioral programming;
- 3) Use of Reporting Centers to address other risk factors; and
- 4) Quality case management and intensive supervision.


SSAS is funded with general fund dollars, and there are currently seven SSAS sites located throughout the state. The sites serve offenders in Buffalo, Dawson, Dodge, Douglas, Lancaster, Otoe, and Sarpy counties.

SSAS DEMOGRAPHIC DATA WAS REQUESTED, BUT WAS NOT PROVIDED BY PAROLE.


SSAS Demographics (Probation Only)

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	148 26.5%	125 25.9%	132 28.0%
	Male	410 73.5%	357 74.1%	340 72.0%
Race	American Indian Or Alaska Native	50 8.5%	14 2.9%	14 3.0%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	7 1.2%	6 1.2%	5 1.1%
	Black	92 15.6%	73 15.1%	58 12.3%
	Hispanic	48 8.2%	43 8.9%	33 7.0%
	Other	51 8.7%	44 9.1%	34 7.2%
	White	340 57.8%	302 62.7%	328 69.5%
Age Group	18-20	33 5.9%	33 6.9%	26 5.5%
	21-25	124 22.3%	92 19.2%	84 17.8%
	26-30	118 21.3%	94 19.6%	82 17.4%
	31-35	104 18.7%	92 19.2%	107 22.7%
	36-40	54 9.7%	53 11.1%	51 10.8%
	41 +	122 22.0%	115 24.0%	122 25.8%
	Under 18	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

SSAS Population Served Trendline (Probation Only)



SSAS Drug Testing (Probation Only)



SHARED RESOURCES: FEE FOR SERVICE VOUCHER PROGRAM

Fee for Service Voucher Program - Adult Probation

Many offenders under supervision do not have the financial ability to pay for their own rehabilitative programs. The Fee for Service Voucher Program (Voucher) was created to reduce the financial barriers of specifically identified offenders receiving treatment through a financial assistance program. Vouchers are not intended to supplant other means of financial assistance, but instead are a resource available to Parole and Probation Officers when a need exists. Whenever possible, offenders are expected to contribute toward the financial obligations associated with evaluation and treatment. Services provided by the Voucher Program include:

- 1) Substance abuse evaluations, completed by a registered provider that is licensed by the State of Nebraska to assess and treat substance abuse problems;
- 2) Outpatient Treatment, including individual and/or group therapy to treat substance-use disorders causing disruption in the offender's life;
- 3) Intensive outpatient treatment consisting of group and individual counseling for offenders with substance abuse disorders or chemical dependence; and
- 4) Short-term residential treatment that is clinically managed high intensity treatment in a staff secure location. Non-medical residential treatment is also available for offenders with a primary chemical dependency, entrenched dependency pattern of usage, or an inability to remain drug free outside of 24 hour care.

This program is used statewide, and is intended specifically for felony drug offenders, parole offenders, felony offenders under sanction or violation status, offenders with a Class I Misdemeanor drug offense, offenders with a 3rd offense of DUI, Felony DUI, and Problem-solving Court offenders. In order to be determined eligible for this program, a potential offender must meet the sliding scale fee requirements. This program is funded by the State of Nebraska through a combination of general funds and cash funds.

Fee for Service Voucher Payments (Adult)

Level of Care		
Short-Term Residential	\$2,359,943.00	56.92%
Outpatient Counseling	\$842,795.00	20.33%
Intensive Outpatient	\$746,727.00	18.01%
Assessment and Evaluation	\$196,745.00	4.75%
Grand Total	\$4,146,210.00	100.00%

Fee for Service Voucher Program - Juveniles

The Voucher Program was extended to Juveniles on probation to reduce the financial barriers to services, treatment, or placement. As with the adult Voucher Program, these serve as a resource when a financial need exists.

To promote parental responsibility and provide for the most equitable use and availability of public money, the court may assess the cost of placement or detention in whole or in part to the parent(s) of the juvenile. Probation will consider parental funds, private or public insurance, entitlements, grants, and other sources of funds, prior to the authorization of state appropriated monies. Services provided to juveniles through the Voucher Program include substance abuse services, other treatment services, non-treatment services, out-of-home placements, and detention placements.

Fee for Service Voucher Payments (Juvenile)

Level of Care		
Out of Home	\$8,155,599.00	40.83%
Non-Treatment	\$6,390,113.00	31.99%
Other Treatment	\$3,757,111.00	18.81%
Substance Abuse	\$1,486,726.00	7.44%
Assessment and Evaluation	\$183,410.00	0.92%
Grand Total	\$19,972,959.00	100.00%

Fee for Service Voucher Program - Parole

Parole also utilizes the Voucher Program. All data is maintained by Probation.

The Crime Commission requested a separate breakout regarding how payments are distributed and number of parolees qualifying for voucher assistance, but this information was not provided.

Fee for Service Voucher Payments (Adult Parole)

Level of Care		
Short-Term Residential	\$0.00	
Outpatient Counseling	\$0.00	
Intensive Outpatient	\$0.00	
Assessment and Evaluation	\$0.00	
Grand Total	\$0.00	

ELECTRONIC MONITORING

Electronic Monitoring

Electronic Monitoring (EM) is a general term referring to forms of surveillance which monitor the location, movement, and specific behavior of offenders under 24 hour community supervision. EM is most effective when used with offenders who are at highest risk of reoffending and in need of a stabilization period. EM is used by both Probation and Parole for offenders determined to need this higher level of supervision.

The average cost of EM per client served each year is \$1,880.65, and is paid for by general fund appropriations for this program.

Parole and Probation utilize several types of EM. Utilizing technology available through Satellite Tracking of People, VeriTracks electronic monitoring system is the platform through which the monitoring takes place. Active global positioning is 'real time' tracking of an offender. Passive electronic monitoring programs allow an officer to see where an offender has been previously. House arrest is available for curfews and tells the Parole Officer when the parolee arrives or leaves home, and gives the Parole Officer an alert in the event that a parolee is not home by curfew. The information is transmitted via the ankle bracelet worn by the parolee.

Active global positioning is the most often used form of EM by Parole. The service provider supplies Parole with daily reports and notifications of violations. Parole requires immediate notification when an EM unit is tampered with or when the offender enters an exclusion zone where they are not permitted to be.

EM is used as a supervision tool for offenders on community supervision, and all lifetime sex offenders. Parolees with a history of sexual offenses are specifically placed on EM. Additional candidates for EM are any parolee with ties to gang activity, a previous parole violation, or an offender's victim who has requested the parolee be placed on EM. EM is often used as a graduated sanction, allowing the offender to remain in the community while allowing increased supervision. It also may be used as an incentive with increased free time, to encourage offender compliance.


Parolees are responsible for paying for their own EM while the NDCS pays the cost of lifetime sex offenders and RFP offenders. NDCS does cover the cost of EM for parolees who are 90 days in arrears on their bill.

Parole is responsible for the supervision of sex offenders on lifetime supervision. Those offenders who are designated lifetime supervision sex offenders meet a very specific criteria as was adopted into law by the Nebraska Legislature, and became effective in 2006. These offenders are monitored very closely by the Parole Administration Sex Offender Unit, which consists of a supervisor in Lincoln, and several Parole Officers located throughout the state.

EM Demographics (Parole Only)

	2011	2012	2013	
Sex	Female	10 4.1%	41 10.3%	54 9.4%
	Male	234 95.9%	359 89.8%	519 90.6%
Race	American Indian Or Al..	10 4.1%	15 3.8%	22 3.8%
	Asian or Pacific Islan..	3 1.2%	3 0.8%	4 0.7%
	Black	53 21.7%	104 26.0%	169 29.5%
	Hispanic	17 7.0%	30 7.5%	60 10.5%
	Other	2 0.8%	3 0.8%	2 0.3%
	White	159 65.2%	245 61.3%	316 55.1%
Age Group	18-20	7 2.9%	11 2.8%	13 2.3%
	21-25	50 20.5%	101 25.3%	148 25.8%
	26-30	69 28.3%	73 18.3%	114 19.9%
	31-35	35 14.3%	72 18.0%	96 16.8%
	36-40	31 12.7%	49 12.3%	73 12.7%
	41 +	52 21.3%	94 23.5%	129 22.5%
	Under 18	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%

ELECTRONIC MONITORING DEMOGRAPHIC DATA WAS REQUESTED, BUT WAS NOT PROVIDED BY PROBATION.



CONTINUOUS ALCOHOL MONITORING

Continuous Alcohol Monitoring

The goal of the Continuous Alcohol Monitoring (CAM) program is to enable the courts, Parole Board, and Probation to introduce the various applications of CAM technology in context with the supervision strategies of offenders with a substance abuse problem and on community supervision. The objective is to provide a meaningful period of abstinence that would promote behavioral change. Ideally, the technology would be ordered in conjunction with a substance abuse evaluation and/or some form of treatment. CAM offers 24 hour continuous monitoring of alcohol intake through the use of an ankle bracelet.


Any adult offender, as determined by the courts, Parole Board, or Problem Solving Courts that requires abstinence from alcohol as a condition of supervision is eligible for this program, and it is available statewide. Offenders who are engaged in a chemical dependency treatment program and have demonstrated an inability to refrain from the use of alcohol while under supervision are targeted for this program.

In addition, the CAM offender population is made up of offenders with a history of alcohol abuse, alcohol violations while on parole, or numerous DUI offenses. CAM is also used for RFP offenders. Offenders are eligible for financial assistance for up to 120 days of CAM. Additional costs of this program are paid by NDCS for the RFP offenders.

CAM is administered through the use of an electronic monitoring ankle bracelet. Although the device can determine alcohol use quickly, the company usually does not provide the information to agency staff for 24 to 36 hours.

The unit can detect if the offender is tampering with the device and will report this information to the supervising officer as well. CAM units have a house arrest component which allows the supervising officer to monitor curfew.

CAM USAGE BY FISCAL YEAR



Type	2011	2012	2013
Probation	985	1,041	1,167
Parole	171	280	298
Total	1,156	1,321	1,465

CAM Demographics

	2011		2012		2013		
	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation	Parole	Probation	
Sex	Female	18 10.5%	0	34 12.1%	0	30 10.1%	0
	Male	153 89.5%	0	246 87.9%	0	268 89.9%	0
Race	American Indian Or Al..	4 2.3%	0	24 8.6%	0	25 8.4%	0
	Asian or Pacific Islan..	1 0.6%	0	1 0.4%	0	2 0.7%	0
	Black	36 21.1%	0	61 21.8%	0	48 16.1%	0
	Hispanic	19 11.1%	0	23 8.2%	0	26 8.7%	0
	Other	2 1.2%	0	4 1.4%	0	3 1.0%	0
	White	109 63.7%	0	167 59.6%	0	194 65.1%	0
Age Group	18-20	0 0.0%	0	2 0.7%	0	2 0.7%	0
	21-25	27 15.8%	0	38 13.7%	0	33 11.1%	0
	26-30	27 15.8%	0	41 14.8%	0	45 15.1%	0
	31-35	34 19.9%	0	48 17.3%	0	55 18.5%	0
	36-40	24 14.0%	0	44 15.9%	0	47 15.8%	0
	41 +	59 34.5%	0	104 37.5%	0	116 38.9%	0
	Under 18	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0	0 0.0%	0

CONTINUOUS ALCOHOL MONITORING DEMOGRAPHIC DATA WAS REQUESTED, BUT WAS NOT PROVIDED BY PROBATION.