



Senate

General Assembly

File No. 189

February Session, 2000

Substitute Senate Bill No. 569

Senate, March 22, 2000

The Committee on Judiciary reported through SEN. WILLIAMS of the 29th Dist., Chairperson of the Committee on the part of the Senate, that the substitute bill ought to pass.

An Act Requiring The Evaluation Of The Costs And Benefits Of Programs Serving Juvenile Offenders.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

1 (NEW) (a) The Connecticut Policy and Economic Council shall
2 evaluate the costs and benefits of programs serving juvenile offenders,
3 whether offered by private providers or state or municipal agencies, to
4 determine the cost-effectiveness of such programs in reducing
5 recidivism.

6 (b) There is established an advisory board to be composed of the
7 Commissioner of Children and Families, the Commissioner of
8 Correction and the Chief Court Administrator, or their designees, and
9 the chairpersons and ranking members of the joint standing committee
10 of the General Assembly on judiciary. The advisory board shall assist
11 the council in obtaining from private providers and state or municipal
12 agencies information necessary for the council to perform its
13 evaluation.

14 (c) Notwithstanding any provision of the general statutes
15 concerning the confidentiality of records and information, the council
16 shall have access to, including the right to inspect and copy, any
17 records of private providers offering programs serving juvenile
18 offenders pursuant to a contract with a state agency or the Judicial
19 Department and records of state or municipal agencies as necessary to
20 carry out its responsibilities as provided in this act. Such records shall
21 not be further disclosed by the council.

22 (d) The council shall identify the types of programs that are effective
23 and not effective in reducing criminal offending in a cost-beneficial
24 way. The council shall use uniform data collection and a common
25 methodological approach to compare programs serving juvenile
26 offenders. The evaluation shall include, but not be limited to, a
27 determination of the extent to which each program:

28 (1) Targets diverted and adjudicated juvenile offenders;

29 (2) Includes assessment methods to determine services, programs,
30 and intervention strategies most likely to change behaviors and norms
31 of juvenile offenders;

32 (3) Provides maximum structured supervision in the community
33 using natural surveillance and community guardians such as
34 employers, relatives, teachers, clergy and community mentors to the
35 greatest extent possible;

36 (4) Promotes good work ethic values and educational skills and
37 competencies necessary for the juvenile offender to function effectively
38 and positively in the community;

39 (5) Maximizes the efficient delivery of treatment services aimed at
40 reducing risk factors associated with the commission of juvenile
41 offenses;

42 (6) Maximizes the reintegration of the juvenile offender into the

43 community upon release from confinement;

44 (7) Maximizes the juvenile offender's opportunities to make full
45 restitution to the victims and amends to the community;

46 (8) Supports and encourages increased court discretion in imposing
47 community-based intervention strategies;

48 (9) Is compatible with research that shows which prevention and
49 early intervention strategies work with juvenile offenders;

50 (10) Is outcome-based in that it describes what outcomes will be
51 achieved or what outcomes have already been achieved;

52 (11) Includes an evaluation component; and

53 (12) Recognizes the diversity of local needs.

54 (e) Not later than January 1, 2001, the council shall submit a
55 preliminary report on its activities to the joint standing committee of
56 the General Assembly on judiciary.

JUD Committee Vote: Yea 39 Nay 0 JFS

The following fiscal impact statement and bill analysis are prepared for the benefit of members of the General Assembly, solely for the purpose of information, summarization, and explanation, and do not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either House thereof for any purpose:

OFA Fiscal Note

State Impact: Minimal Cost

Affected Agencies: Department of Children and Families,
Department of Correction, Judicial
Department, Legislative Management

Municipal Impact: None

Explanation

State Impact:

The bill would result in a minimal cost to the agencies participating on the advisory board to the Connecticut Policy and Economic Council's evaluation activities. This cost relates to administrative staff time and miscellaneous expenses and can be absorbed within the anticipated budgetary resources of the agencies involved.

OLR Bill Analysis

sSB 569

AN ACT REQUIRING THE EVALUATION OF THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PROGRAMS SERVING JUVENILE OFFENDERS.**SUMMARY:**

This bill requires the Connecticut Policy and Economic Council (CPEC) to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of state programs serving juvenile offenders. The council must determine if programs offered by state or municipal agencies or private providers are cost-effective in reducing recidivism. It must submit a preliminary report on its activities to the Judiciary Committee by January 1, 2001.

It creates an advisory board to help CPEC obtain from program providers information it needs to perform its evaluation. The board is composed of the commissioners of the departments of Children and Families and Correction and the chief court administrator, or their designees, and the chairmen and ranking members of the Judiciary Committee.

The bill gives CPEC access to otherwise confidential records and information held by public agencies and private providers operating under contract with state agencies or the Judicial Department that it needs to conduct the evaluation. This access includes the right to make copies. CPEC may not disclose these records.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 2000

CPEC EVALUATION

The evaluation must determine the extent to which each program evaluated:

1. targets juveniles who are diverted from the juvenile justice system and those adjudicated as delinquent;

2. provides maximum structured supervision in the community using natural surveillance and “community guardians” like teachers and mentors to the greatest extent possible;
3. promotes work ethics and educational skills and competencies that enable offenders to function effectively in the community;
4. maximizes the delivery of treatment services to reduce risk factors, the reintegration of offenders into the community after confinement, and offenders’ opportunities to make full restitution to victims and amends to the community;
5. supports and encourages increased court discretion in imposing community-based intervention strategies;
6. is compatible with research identifying effective prevention and early intervention strategies;
7. recognizes the diversity of local needs;
8. is based on outcomes to be achieved or that have been achieved; and
9. includes methods to assess strategies most likely to change offenders’ behavior and norms and an evaluation component.

CPEC must use a uniform data collection and methodology to compare programs.

BACKGROUND

CPEC

CPEC is a nonprofit, nonpartisan public research organization supported by businesses, professional firms, municipalities, and civic organizations. It conducts research and analysis of local and state tax and spending policies, economic competitiveness, education, and transportation.

COMMITTEE ACTION

Judiciary Committee

Joint Favorable Substitute

Yea 39 Nay 0