

Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee




Proposed Strategic Goals Action Recommendations For Discussion and Adoption

Pursuant to Public Act 15-183

January 2016

I. BACKGROUND

In July 2015, pursuant to Public Act 15-183 the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee (JJPOC) adopted the following strategic goals to be met within the next three fiscal years (by June 30, 2018):

-  Increase the rate of youth diverted from the juvenile justice system by 20%
-  Decrease the rate of youth incarcerated by 30%; and
-  Decrease the juvenile recidivism rate by 10%.

Workgroups for each goal (diversion, incarceration and recidivism) were established as well as a cross agency data sharing workgroup (formerly the data interoperability) to address the overarching goal of improving state agency data reliability, collection and sharing.

Workgroup members and co-chairs were appointed by Representative Walker and Secretary Barnes, Co-chairs of the JJPOC, and included a range of key stakeholders and sectors (Attachment A contains a list of the co-chairs and the workgroup members). Workgroups were charged with developing strategies and actions to achieve the three-year strategic goals. The workgroups met at least monthly from September 2015 through January 2016, and were supported by staff and consultants from the University of New Haven Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI).

II. A SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVE

As the workgroup discussions evolved, it became clear there was an emerging consensus on the characteristics of a reformed juvenile justice system. The characteristics are:

- a. Rehabilitative responses while maintaining public safety;
- b. Early identification and intervention to reduce involvement with the juvenile justice system;
- c. Programs and services individualized/customized to youth needs, behaviors and risk;
- d. Families and youth are at the center of planning and decision-making;
- e. Reduce disproportionate minority contact;
- f. Data driven planning and decision making; and
- g. Utilization of evidence-based practices for all programming.

Although each workgroup worked independently, increasing the network and availability of community-based alternatives emerged as the primary system change strategy to achieve the all three target goals across all workgroups. It also became apparent there was an inherent inter-relationship between the three goals. For example, increasing and improving diversion programs and options became integral to the discussions about decreasing the rate of youth incarcerated and were noted all along the continuum in terms of discretionary decision making.

Once the workgroups began to look at currently available data they became acutely aware of the overlap between juvenile justice and behavioral health both at the client and systems levels. There is an emerging consensus that the juvenile justice system should not remain the default behavioral health service system for youth with behavioral health needs.

III. ACTION RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACHIEVE GOALS

The workgroups acknowledge that in order to achieve the strategic goals, actions were needed at three levels: policy, program and practice. The proposed recommendations are presented by the strategic goals and articulate actions at the three levels (Attachment B contains a summary of all the recommendations).

The following are some of the major system change recommendations that emerged from the workgroups:

- Limiting the grounds for detention to: public safety , assure court appearance, and hold for another jurisdiction;
- Closing the Connecticut Juvenile Training School (CJTS) and Pueblo as expeditiously as possible, no later than July 2018, in accordance with a plan jointly developed by DCF and the JJPOC;
- Eliminating truancy and defiance of school rules as status offenses in order to divert youth from the juvenile justice system;
- Adopting a nationally recognized recidivism framework;
- Establishing a permanent JJPOC juvenile justice data group to link data maintained by Executive Branch agencies and the Judicial Branch.

The specific recommendations for achieving each of the target goals are delineated on pages 4-15 of this report.

Goal: Decrease Rate of Youth Incarceration by 30 %

Background: As a strategy to reduce disproportionate minority contact and disparate treatment in the juvenile justice system, Public Act 11-154 requires police in Connecticut to obtain a court order to bring any juvenile to a secure detention center. Currently, a judge may only sign a court order for detention if there is probable cause that the child is responsible for the act(s) alleged in the police report; there is no less restrictive alternative available; and that one or more of the following circumstances (“grounds for detention”) are applicable: 1) strong probability the child will run away; 2) strong probability the child commit other offenses ; 3) child’s continued residence in the home poses a risk to the child or the community; 4) need to hold the child for another jurisdiction; 5) need to hold the child to assure court appearance t; or 6) violation of one or more of conditions of a suspended detention order.

Pre-trial juvenile detention is sometimes used as a default service system when behavioral health treatment is not readily available to manage problematic behaviors (e.g., self-harm, reactive aggression, running away, human trafficking). Approximately 80% of youth in detention have a diagnosable behavioral health problem, including significant trauma, and approximately 40%-50% of youth have special education needs, for which only about 20% are identified. Detaining youth for behaviors resulting from unmet needs is not only unjust, but also exacerbates existing conditions by putting youth at greater risk of self-harm, mixing youth with negative peers, and disconnecting students from school, family and the community. The research literature does not provide evidence that detaining youth leads to less delinquency, but in fact, indicates that detention is correlated with future offending, increased behavioral health issues, weakened family and community ties, poor educational outcomes and worse employment prospects.

Incarceration Recommendation #1	
Target of Change	Pre-trial Detention
Problem	Youth are being detained for reasons other than public safety or to assure court appearance. The number of times in detention increases a youth’s likelihood of commitment.
Recommendation Summary	Reduce use of detention by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limiting the grounds for detention from six to three (public safety , assure court appearance, and hold for another jurisdiction); 2. Develop and implement a validated Detention Risk Screening Instrument to determine which youth are at risk to offend or not appear for court; 3. Instituting policy consistent with C.G.S. §46b-133(f) to allow the detention deputy director to release a youth under certain judicially sanctioned circumstances; 4. Reducing the number of days between detention hearings from 15 to 7; 5. Holding initial detention hearings at the “home” court; 6. Holding a Case Review Team meeting prior to seeking a violation of any court order; and 7. Diverting youth from detention to community-based alternatives for services to address behavioral health, domestic violence, and running away (e.g., assessment centers, intensive care coordination, respite beds, other services).

<p>Potential Impact</p>	<p>The recommendations will advance the JJPOC goal of a 30% reduction in the rate of youth confined in pre-trial status by prohibiting the use of punitive or preventive detention (e.g., to teach a lesson/punishment, due to youth safety concerns, due to parental refusal to take the youth home, or to prevent running away.) Analysis of calendar year 2014 detention admissions indicate that approximately 52% of detention admissions (about 1,100 youth) were for one of these reasons. The use of a detention risk screening tool will support the use of detention only for youth at highest risk for failure to appear or to offend. Eliminating or reducing the number of times a youth is admitted to detention may reduce the likelihood of commitment as an adjudicated delinquent to the Department of Children and Families (DCF.) In addition, for youth who are detained, the average length of stay in detention may be reduced.</p>
<p>Rationale</p>	<p>Academic research consistently shows that admission to detention is correlated with more negative case outcomes such as recidivism and commitment as an adjudicated delinquent. Research also shows that the use of detention is detrimental to positive youth development and pro-social behavior and is ineffective as a punishment. Juvenile justice best practices supported by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the MacArthur Foundation Models for Change initiative promote research-supported interventions and developmentally-appropriate responses to delinquent behavior. The recommendations are consistent with promoting public safety, national research, best practices and OJJDP’s vision of <i>“a nation where our children are healthy, educated, and free from violence. If they come into contact with the juvenile justice system, the contact should be rare, fair, and beneficial to them.”</i></p>
<p>Incarceration Recommendation #1 Detail</p>	
<p>Policy/Legislative Action</p>	<p>Changes to C.G.S. §46b-121(b)(1) would be necessary to remove “punish the child” from the authority of the Superior Court, which has implications for the entire Juvenile Matters chapter and its language related to criminal acts; to §46b-121(h) to make it “the intent of the General Assembly that the juvenile justice system provide individualized supervision, care, accountability and treatment in a <u>developmentally-appropriate</u> manner.....”; to §46b-133(c) and (e) to limit the grounds for detention; and to §46b-140a(c) to allow detention on a violation only if the underlying violation is for a new criminal offense.</p>
<p>Program Actions</p>	<p>Funding for behavioral health assessment centers is needed and also recommended as part of the Children’s Behavioral Health Plan. A review of current resources and program utilization may generate a redistribution of funding for alternative services.</p>

Practice Change Actions	A process to redirect youth to alternatives in lieu of detention will need to be developed. Agency policy will need to be revised and created to implement the recommendations.
Implementation Implications	If the needed resources are not readily available to state and local law enforcement and the Juvenile Court, youth with significant behavioral health problems or who are experiencing extreme family dysfunction or who are running away will be in danger of self-harm, family violence and/or exploitation. It is well documented that limited access to community-based behavioral health services in Connecticut often results in local hospital emergency departments being overwhelmed with children and youth in crisis. Due to a lack of resources, children and youth instead unnecessarily stay in emergency departments for days awaiting access to care.

Incarceration Recommendation #2	
Target of Change	Connecticut Juvenile Training School (CJTS) and Pueblo
Problem	Some youth are being placed and maintained at CJTS/Pueblo due to a lack of alternative settings and programs.
Recommendation	Close CJTS/Pueblo as expeditiously as possible, no later than July 2018, in accordance with a plan jointly developed by DCF and the JJPOC through an inclusive process that incorporates input from national experts and local stakeholders. The plan shall promote public safety, youth rehabilitation, elimination of racial and ethnic disparity, and ensure the optimal use of public resources. The plan shall include community-based secure and non-secure congregate care settings, supervision and programming based on national best practices.
Potential Impact	The recommendation will advance the JJPOC goal of a 30% reduction in incarceration by further reducing the number of young people in secure confinement.
Rationale	There is a growing national consensus that larger training schools should be closed. Best practices identified through the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation and others suggest some youth currently served in secure confinement can be served with intensive community-based programs.
Implementation Implications	The closure of CJTS/Pueblo will require the simultaneous implementation of community based alternatives in order to achieve the timeline proposed by the Governor. Given that over 90% of the CJTS/Pueblo budget is dedicated to staffing costs, a fiscal plan for funding the community alternatives is needed. C.G.S. §46b-140 (j) and (k) will need to be amended to remove reference to CTJS once the closure is complete.

Incarceration Recommendation #3:	
Target of Change	Manson Youth Institution
Problem	As of December 2015, eighty-four (84) youth under the age of 18, are inmates at the Manson Youth Institution.
Recommendation	Reconstitute the incarceration workgroup to review statutes, conditions and outcomes for youth incarcerated in adult facilities. By April 1, 2016, issue recommendations to the JJPOC regarding possible statutory changes, enhancements to community supervision, and improvements to housing and programming for young offenders while ensuring public safety.
Rationale	National academic literature suggests poor youth outcomes and questionable positive impact on public safety associated with the incarceration of minors in adult facilities. Many other states are examining and implementing strategies to reduce the number of youth incarcerated in adult facilities.

Goal: Increase Rate of Diversion by 20 %

Background: Three major sectors are key contributors to increasing diversion – law enforcement, schools and the community-at-large. C.G.S §10-19m establishes Youth Service Bureaus (YSB) as the coordinating unit of community-based services to provide comprehensive delivery of prevention, intervention, treatment and follow-up services for delinquent and pre-delinquent youth. As such YSBs, in partnership with Local Interagency Service Teams (LIST) and the regional systems of care collaboratives can facilitate the development of a community-owned system of diversion and build the capacity of law enforcement, schools and community providers to work collaboratively within a common restorative practices framework.

Juvenile Review Boards (JRBs) were developed by the YSB system as a strategy to divert low risk youth from juvenile court. As a part of the Juvenile Diversion Certificate program through Georgetown University’s Center for Juvenile Justice Reform, the multi-agency Connecticut team will complete a Capstone Project aimed at enhancing the JRB system and establishing restorative justice practices. Three main components for the project include creating and implementing a manual of standard policies and protocols; identifying and implementing a universal screening tool for utilization with JRB referrals; and infusing restorative practices into the JRB diversion system.

Target of Change	Community and Schools
Problem	Multiple efforts and programs are currently operating in communities however; there is not systemic multi-sector capacity to address both the criminogenic and behavioral health needs of youth.
Recommendation Summary	<p>Increase diversion by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amending C.G.S. §46b-120(5)(D) to remove truancy and defiance of school rules as family with service needs (FWSN) offenses from the jurisdiction of the Superior Court – Juvenile Matters only upon such time as the JJPOC confirms that both community and school based diversion services are sufficiently available and accessible, in every jurisdiction, to address the needs of these children and families. 2. Implementing a comprehensive community based diversion system that appropriately diverts youth who commit crimes, excluding serious juvenile offenses, from involvement with the juvenile justice system. The building of a comprehensive diversion system will be accomplished through targeted law enforcement training, expanded Juvenile Review Board capacity and Police/School/Community MOAs, and improved access to needed community services.
Potential Impact	The recommendation will advance the JJPOC goal of a 20% increase in diversion by recognizing the non-delinquent nature of truancy and defiance of school rules and shifting the responsibility for addressing behavioral issues and the needs of low risk/high need youth from the juvenile court to the community. Analyses of calendar year 2014 data indicate that 25% (3,861) of referrals to Juvenile Court are FWSN cases (approximately 70% are truancy).
Rationale	National research indicates that exposing young people to the justice system can actually increase their likelihood of future offending rather than deter it. It is well documented in the Sociology, Psychology and Juvenile Delinquency academic

	<p>literature that there is a “labeling effect” for individuals. Whether positive or negative, individuals will self-identify with the label that is used to describe or classify them, such a justice involved or juvenile offender. Justice-involved youth overwhelmingly have histories of untreated trauma, victimization, physical and behavioral health needs, and educational difficulties. Research also indicates that community-based interventions are more effective at addressing the developmental and behavioral health needs of youth and produce positive long-term outcomes for youth and society.</p>
<p>Diversion Recommendation Detail</p>	
<p>Policy/Legislative Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change C.G.S. §46b-120(5)(D) to remove truancy and defiance of school rules as family with service needs (FWSN) offenses thereby removing them from the jurisdiction of the Superior Court – Juvenile Matters. • Change C.G.S. § 10-198a to amend the policies and procedures concerning truants. • Revise P.A. 15-168 which requires Memorandums of Agreement between Police and Boards of Education to more strongly support a graduated response model for student discipline. • Change C.G.S. §7-294h for police training to include: use of graduated sanctions, restorative justice practices, adolescent development and risk-assessment and screening tools.
<p>Program Actions</p>	<p>Funding for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juvenile Review Boards to serve more youth and for more communities to have access to JRB services; • Expand access to in-home and community-based services such as MST, MDFT, TF-CBT; • Expansion of YSB prevention, intervention and treatment services; • Sustaining and embedding the School Based Diversion Initiative (SBDI) into CSDE; • Enhancing school based truancy alternatives; • Community-wide restorative justice practices and appropriate graduated response training; • Completing the planned expansion of EMPS. <p>A review of current services and utilization may generate redistribution or repurposing of existing resources.</p>
<p>Practice Change Actions</p>	<p>The following practice changes will be required by law enforcement, schools and community providers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train and utilize restorative practices and appropriate graduated sanctions; • Identify and utilize evidence-based truancy and discipline alternatives; • Enter into collaborative Memorandums of Agreements (MOA) for diversion services; • Formalize consistent JRB protocols and procedures; • Conduct program evaluations and utilize outcome data to inform service planning and delivery.

<p>Implementation Implications</p>	<p>The juvenile justice system will continue to be the default for the behavioral health needs of challenging youth if the needed community based resources are not readily available. Moreover, the criminogenic and behavioral health issues being exhibited by youth may escalate into more serious arrests, mental health issues and increased recidivism. Removing truancy and defiant of school rules status offenses from the Juvenile Court has program implications for the Child, Youth, and Family Support Centers (CYFSC). In FY 14/15, 79% of all referrals were for FWSNs/status offenders. Of those, 75% were for truancy and/or defiant of school rules.</p>
---	--

Goal: Decrease Recidivism Rate by 10%

Background: Public Act 14-217 required the Institute of Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) at Central Connecticut State University to evaluate the effectiveness of DCF juvenile parole services. The IMRP defined the primary measure of success to be the rate of recidivism among youth supervised on parole, which had not been tracked previously for this population. The study is expected to be completed in early 2016 as it was delayed due to reasons beyond the control of the IMRP. It should be noted the Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division has long tracked the rate of recidivism (re-arrest and conviction) among juveniles sentenced to probation supervision. The recidivism rate and trend data have been presented by CSSD to the JJPOC and the recidivism work group. It is acknowledged that a comprehensive understanding of the rates and patterns of re-offending by juvenile offenders is critical to achieve the JJPOC's targeted goal of reducing the rate of recidivism. A complete understanding of the complex issue of reoffending is necessary to improve the policies and practices of the system and to make appropriate and responsible funding decisions. Additionally, it will be necessary to understand the recidivism trends and patterns among young adult offenders and how youth progress from the juvenile justice to adult criminal justice system in Connecticut given the Governor's proposal to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction to 21.

National research indicates that the path to recidivism reduction is paved primarily by the adoption and adherence to a broad and empirically supported theoretical framework that can guide system improvement and ultimately lead to better outcomes for the juvenile justice population through practice and performance benchmarking. Connecticut is well-positioned to capitalize on this research. The Judicial Branch has already created a framework that mirrors what national experts are promoting and Results First is currently developing juvenile justice program inventories and subsequent cost benefit analyses per PA 15-5, Sec. 486, which will allow CT to align the provision of evidence-based, research- based and promising programs and practices for purposes of efficiently reducing recidivism rates amongst client populations.

Recidivism Recommendation #1:	
Problem	The current juvenile justice system does not operate within a common, evidence-based, data driven framework for the management, supervision, treatment and rehabilitation of young offenders.
Recommendation	<p>Build on national research by adopting and adhering to an empirically supported recidivism framework for CT's juvenile justice system that includes; validated risk and need assessment; treatment matching based on risk/need; high quality service delivery through the development of common cross-agency measurements; and program and practice monitoring and collective accountability by JBCSSD and DCF. Core components include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sufficient contract and quality assurance capacity within DCF and Judicial. 2. Aligned contract monitoring and quality assurance practice. 3. Shared training for providers and contract staff 4. Annual inventory of emerging, best and evidence-based practices. 5. Annual reports to the JJPOC on any differential outcomes by race and gender as well as service access and gaps.

<p>Potential Impact</p>	<p>The Connecticut adult and juvenile probation systems have been following the frameworks for recidivism reduction since 2007. Their results are impressive and illustrate that the approach is effective. Since 2007, the percentage of juvenile probationers rearrested within 24 months from the start of probation has dropped by nine (9) percentage points (66% to 57%). This represents a reduction of nearly 14%. Similarly, the percentage of adult probationers rearrested within 24 months of a sentence to probation has dropped over seven (7) percentage points (47% to 39.54%), a reduction of over 15%.</p> <p>Consistent recidivism reduction practices within the private public sectors will further contribute to the decrease in the identified rates of recidivism among young offenders. Moreover, the use of programs which have been certified as effective by the Results First Project will further advance the state toward achieving the 10% recidivism reduction goal.</p>
<p>Implementation Implications</p>	<p>A common framework to address recidivism will ensure that the juvenile justice system approaches recidivism reduction in a comprehensive manner. The framework will allow agencies to evaluate the impact of programming on the overall juvenile justice population and for specific cohorts. Failure to adopt a universal framework will hinder efforts to reduce recidivism and improve overall outcomes for youth and public safety.</p>

<p>Recidivism Recommendation #2:</p>	
<p>Problem</p>	<p>Arrests in secure and congregate care facilities often times stem from youth behavior problems that escalate unnecessarily due to a lack of de-escalation policies and practices, and a culture of punitive rather than rehabilitative responses from staff. Children and youth are often times arrested for the very problems that brought them to the facility. Arrests of children and youth run away or AWOL from facilities can be another source of recidivism.</p>
<p>Recommendation</p>	<p>DCF and the Judicial Branch should develop, monitor and provide staff training on policies and practices that promotes de-escalation and diversion efforts as a precursor to police involvement when problem behaviors occur. The cross-agency core components of a restorative justice model include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collect and report baseline data on the number and rates of arrests in facilities stratified, as warranted, by risk, race, and gender. 2. Track and monitor successful and unsuccessful de-escalation efforts. 3. Contract and licensing language should include directives for policy compliance or noncompliance around expectations for police involvement. 4. Develop and implement a comprehensive, cross-agency pre- and in-service staff training curriculum. 5. Annual reports to the JJPOC on public and private sector staff training in crisis management, de-escalation techniques, and restorative justice.
<p>Potential Impact</p>	<p>If secure and congregate care settings establish and maintain a positive, prosocial culture wherein clients are supported in their attempts at behavioral change arrests will be minimized.</p>

Implementation Implications	Efforts to create restorative justice models and diversion programs in congregate and secure care facilities will assist with ongoing efforts to ensure that the program culture facilitates rehabilitation and does not focus on compliance and corrections. Implementing training and piloting diversion efforts within programs are low cost activities that could have a significant impact on outcomes. Data collection presents some challenges. DCF indicates that updates and revisions would need to be made to their existing data systems, and would minimally require Programmer and Consultant time. Additionally, DCF does not have adequate resources to build the new LINK Data Collection System.
------------------------------------	--

Recidivism Recommendation #3:	
Problem	No central repository of recidivism related data exists for juvenile matters. Data is not required to be reported regularly so system-level work is compromised.
Recommendation	Appoint a neutral single state agency (e.g., OPM) to annually track, analyze and report on recidivism of all youth.
Potential Impact	National research indicates that key to recidivism reduction is the adoption and adherence to an empirically supported theoretical framework that guides system improvement through practice and performance benchmarking. If DCF and Judicial were reporting data in a consistent fashion to a single source, the data could be stratified, as warranted, by risk, race, gender, etc. and strategies could be customized to reduce the rates of recidivism for each group.
Implementation Implications	A central repository is necessary to ensure that recidivism data is collected and reported in a consistent and cohesive manner. Implementation of this recommendation should result in little or no fiscal impact. Agencies are already collecting data on recidivism. The only gap appeared to be arrests in contracted services. A requirement that the providers report arrests of children in their custody could be written into their agreements at little or no additional cost. If OPM, through the Criminal Justice Policy and Planning Division is designated, additional staff resources would be needed and C.G.S 4-68m would need to be amended to include DCF and CSDE.

Goal: Develop Systemic Strategies to Institutionalize Cross-Agency Data Sharing

Background: Over the past 14 months, there have been numerous presentations from state agency administrators, academic researchers and consultants that have raised the issue of the data reliability and the problems in data sharing between state agencies and state agencies and researchers and consultants. This is a longstanding problem that is not unique to the juvenile justice system and child service agencies; it cross all state agency lines. There have been several JJPOC projects and research being conducted by other entities and academic institutions that have been delayed and/or hindered by the lack of cross-agency data sharing and less than reliable state agency data.

Governor Malloy recognized the need for data-driven public policy and budgetary decisions. In an effort to improve cross-agency data sharing, the governor proposed and the General Assembly enacted Public Act 15-142 which directs the Secretary of OPM to develop a program to access, link, analyze, and share data maintained by executive branch agencies and respond to research requests. Priority will be given to data requests which seek to measure outcomes for state funded programs or that may facilitate the development of policies that promote the effective, efficient and best use of state resources. The Secretary is required to establish policies and procedures to review and respond to data queries that ensure legal compliance, protects the privacy and confidentiality of protected data, and is based on sound research design principles. The law sets forth the procedure for data sharing between executive branch agencies including execution of memorandum of agreements with each executive branch agency to govern data-sharing and protect the privacy and confidentiality of data shared between and among executive branch agency or agencies and the Office of Policy and Management.

Cross Agency Data Sharing Recommendation #1	
Problem	There is no existing interagency group charged with responding to requests for descriptive or evaluative data on the juvenile justice system. As the JJPOC moves into implementation and ongoing monitoring/oversight, such a group will be needed to assist the committee.
Recommendation	<p>Establish a permanent JJPOC juvenile justice data sharing group to assist the committee in the implementation and ongoing monitoring and oversight of the adopted 2016 recommendations. Specifically, the data sharing group’s charge will include the development of a mechanism to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access relevant data on juvenile justice populations; • Link these data maintained by Executive Branch agencies and the Judicial Branch for the purposes of facilitating the sharing and analysis of data; and • Establish uniform provisions for protecting confidential information and enforcing state and federal confidentiality protections. <p>The membership of the group will include representatives of the Department of Children and Families, State Department of Education, Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, Office and Policy and Management, Department of Labor, Department of Correction, Department of Social Services and the Judicial Branch.</p>
Potential Impact	More timely, relevant, and comprehensive data to support data-driven policy making.

Cross Agency Data Sharing Recommendation #2	
Problem	Significant confidentiality concerns, specifically when there is law enforcement involvement, have frustrated prior attempts to address this need. Currently, for example, DCF social workers cannot share client specific data with probation officers in Judicial to inform case management of an individual youth. Defense Counsel has legitimate concerns about how shared data could be used against their clients in the juvenile justice system.
Recommendation	Convene a work group to develop specific recommendations for the JJPOC on the use of limited releases for <i>client specific data</i> sharing across systems for the sole purpose of improving case management by February 2017. The workgroup should be comprised of representatives from the Office of the Public Defender, Office of Chief State’s Attorney, Department of Children and Families, State Department of Education, Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, Office and Policy and Management, and the Judicial Branch.
Potential Impact	More seamless and comprehensive information to identify gaps in service and ensure continuity of care for children and families involved in the juvenile justice system.

Cross Agency Data Sharing Recommendation #3	
Problem	The format and content of Memoranda of Agreement involving Executive Branch agencies, the Judicial Branch, and outside entities is inconsistent. The significant time and resources needed to develop and execute these memoranda often impede progress on important juvenile justice projects.
Recommendation	In order to expedite projects that require cross-agency/branch data, there should be developed a standard template for data-sharing MOUs between Executive Branch agencies, the Judicial Branch, and, when necessary, researchers outside of state government. Where possible, confidentiality agreements, requirements for data-user background checks, and citation of relevant state and federal statutes should be standardized.
Potential Impact	Streamlining of the process will enable timely cross-system data for improving service delivery and evaluating system outcomes.

IV. NEXT STEPS FOR THE JJPOC

- a. **Implementation Plans** – implementation plans will need to be developed for the recommendations adopted by the JJPOC. It is suggested that the JJPOC appoint an implementation planning group comprised of representatives from the existing workgroups to develop an integrated implementation plan to be reviewed and endorsed by the workgroups and subsequently approved by the JJPOC.
- b. **Defining Performance Measures and Indicators**– as part of the implementation plan development process, performance measures need be defined that align with the Results Based Accountability (RBA) report being presented to the JJPOC in February.
- c. **Accountability** – the JJPOC will need to develop a process and timeline for monitoring the progress and outcomes of the adopted recommendations to achieve the target goals.
- d. **Develop a Comprehensive Plan to Reduce Recidivism** – The OJJDP grant received by OPM provides the opportunity to develop a community supervision and re-entry plan to improve the state’s capacity to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for youth returning to their communities from out-of-home placements. The findings from the recidivism study and the re-entry recommendation from the recidivism workgroup (ensure adequate educational, social, familial and other supports as children return to their home communities) will serve as a foundation for the development of this plan.
- e. **Develop a Plan for Young Offenders Ages 21-25** – In accordance with the request from Governor Malloy to the JJPOC to begin a conversation on how the State of CT treats young offenders, the JJPOC will develop a phased plan to raise the age for eligibility for the juvenile justice up to age 21 to include the impact of such changes on the justice system and the private services delivery system; and a plan for addressing how young adults under the age of 25 can be more effectively handled in the adult system in order to insure lower recidivism rates and elimination of barriers that impede success.

ATTACHMENT A: WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP

Diversion Workgroup	
Erica Bromley	Connecticut Youth Services Association (CYSA)
Chief Dean Esserman	New Haven Police Department
Representative Robyn Porter	Connecticut General Assembly
Francis Carino	Office of the Chief State's Attorney
Leon Smith	Center for Children's Advocacy
Abby Anderson	The Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance (CTJJA)
Valerie LaMotte	Office of Policy and Management (OPM)
Linda Dixon	Department of Children and Families (DCF)
Steven Smith	Department of Children and Families (DCF)
Kevin Cranford	Department of Children and Families (DCF)
Bianca Rey	Connecticut Voices for Children
Jeffrey Vanderploeg	School-Based Diversion Initiative (SBDI)
Ron Onofrio	University of New Haven Police Department
Joel Rosenberg	AHM Youth & Family Services
Scott Newgass	State Department of Education (CSDE)
Daisy Ortiz	Court Support Services Division (CSSD)
Sean Grant	Manchester Police Department
Officer Caleb Lopez	South Windsor Police & SRO Association
Amy Evison	Community Health Resources (CHR)
Sara Jefferies	Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI)
Kitty Tyrol	Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI)
Danielle Cooper	Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI)

Incarceration Workgroup	
Judge Bernadette Conway	Connecticut Judicial Branch
Senator Gary Winfield	Connecticut General Assembly
Bob Francis	Regional Youth Adult Social Action Partnership (RYASAP)
Martha Stone	Center for Children's Advocacy (CCA)
Sarah Eagan	Office of Child's Advocate (OCA)
Cathy Foley Geib	Court Support Services Division (CSSD)
Fernando Muniz	Department of Children and Families (DCF)
Karl Alston	Court Support Services Division (CSSD)
John Alves	Department of Corrections (DOC)
Abby Anderson	Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance (CJJA)
Scott Semple/Cheryl Cepelak	Department of Corrections (DOC)
Deb Fuller	Court Support Services Division (CSSD)
Marion Malafronte	Office of the Chief State's Attorney
James Connolly	Office of Chief Public Defender
Sergio Rodriguez	CT State Department of Education (CSDE)
Jeanne Milstein	Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI)

ATTACHMENT A: WORKGROUP MEMBERSHIP (continued)

Recidivism Workgroup	
Christine Rapillo	Office of Chief Public Defender
Hector Glynn	Village for Children and Families
Steve Smith	Department of Children and Families (DCF)
John Frassinelli	State Department of Education (DOC)
Maureen Price Borland	Community Partners in Action (CPA)
Scott Wilderman	Career Resources
Geoff Scales	Hartford Probation
Julie Revaz	Court Support Services Division (CSSD)
Melanie Rossacci	Department of Children and Families (DCF)
Chris Lyddy	UConn Health Center
Martha Stone	Center for Children’s Advocacy (CCA)
Jeanne Milstein	Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI)
Renee LaMark Muir	Institute of Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP)/Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI)

Cross Agency Data Sharing Workgroup	
Brian Hill	Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division (JBCSSD)
Jamie Mills	Office of Policy and Management (OPM)
Mickey Kramer	Office of Child Advocate
Miguel de Figueroa	University of Connecticut (UConn)
Ajit Gopalakrishnan	State Department of Education (CSDE)
Barbara J. Claire	Department of Children and Families (DCF)
Patrick Hynes	Department of Corrections (DOC)
Bryan Sperry	Court Support Services Division (CSSD)
Andy Condon	Department of Labor (DOL)
Noel Miano	Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS)
Dominic Falcone	Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS)
Peter Kochol	Court Support Services Division (CSSD)
Dr. Kendell Coker	Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI)
Brandon Knieriem	Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI)
Renee LaMark Muir	Institute of Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP)/Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI)

Standing Members of all Workgroups:

Representative Toni Walker and Secretary Ben Barnes	JJPOC Co-chairs
Representative Robyn Porter and Senator Gary Winfield	Connecticut General Assembly
William Carbone	Tow Youth Justice Institute
Andrew Clark, John Noonan and Mary Janicki	Results First

ATTACHMENT B: RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

Incarceration #1	Reduce use of detention by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Limiting the grounds for detention to: public safety , assure court appearance, and hold for another jurisdiction; 2. Implementing a validated Detention Risk Screening Instrument; 3. Instituting policy to allow the detention deputy director to release a youth under certain judicially sanctioned circumstances; 4. Reducing the number of days between detention hearings from 15 to 7; 5. Holding initial detention hearings at the “home” court; 6. Holding a Case Review Team meeting prior to seeking a violation of any court order; 7. Diverting youth from detention to community-based alternatives.
Incarceration #2	Closing the Connecticut Juvenile Training School (CJTS) and Pueblo as expeditiously as possible, no later than July 2018, in accordance with a plan jointly developed by DCF and the JJPOC that promotes public safety, youth rehabilitation, elimination of racial and ethnic disparity, and ensures the optimal use of public resources.
Incarceration #3	Reconstitute the incarceration workgroup to review the conditions and outcomes for youth incarcerated in adult facilities and submit recommendations to the JJPOC by April 2016.
Diversion #1	Increase diversion by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amending C.G.S. §46b-120(5)(D) to remove truancy and defiance of school rules as family with service needs (FWSN) offenses from the jurisdiction of the Superior Court – Juvenile Matters only upon such time that both community and school based diversion services are sufficiently available and accessible, in every jurisdiction, to address the needs of these children and families. 2. Implementing a comprehensive community based diversion system that appropriately diverts youth who commit crimes, excluding serious juvenile offenses, from involvement with the juvenile justice system.
Recidivism #1	Adopt and adhere to an empirically supported recidivism framework for CT’s juvenile justice system that includes; validated risk and need assessment; treatment matching based on risk/need; and common program and practice quality measurements.
Recidivism #2	Implement and monitor a cross-agency restorative justice model and provide staff training on policies and practices that promotes diversion as a precursor to police involvement.
Recidivism #3	Appoint a neutral single state agency (e.g., OPM) to annually track, analyze and report on recidivism of all youth.
Data Sharing #1	Establish a permanent JJPOC juvenile justice data sharing group to assist the committee in the implementation and ongoing monitoring and oversight of the 2016 recommendations.
Data Sharing #2	Convene a work group to develop recommendations on the use of limited releases for <i>client specific data</i> sharing across systems for the sole purpose of improving case management to the JJPOC by February 2017.
Data Sharing #3	Develop a standard template for data-sharing MOUs between Executive Branch agencies, the Judicial Branch, and, when necessary, researchers outside of state government.