

Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee

Report per Public Act 14-217, Section 79

Submitted: January 15, 2015

University of New Haven

Henry C. Lee College of Criminal Justice and Forensic Science

Tow Youth Justice Institute

Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Progress Report January 1, 2015

Introduction

On January 1, 2015, the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee (JJPOC) is statutorily required to issue a report to the Connecticut General Assembly committees having cognizance over juvenile justice matters. The report must detail the status of five broad policy and procedural areas within the state's juvenile justice system: (1) any proposed statutory changes to the juvenile justice system; (2) the definition and analysis of recidivism among juvenile offenders; (3) short- and long-term goals for the JJPOC; (4) impact of Raise the Age legislation; and (5) the effectiveness of educational services provided to juvenile offenders. This report serves to meet that requirement and is organized based on the five broad areas. This report also provides a summary of Public Act 14-217, Section 79.

The report was prepared by the Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI) at the University of New Haven (UNH), which provides professional and administrative support to the JJPOC.

Legislative History

Statutory Mission of JJPOC

The JJPOC shall evaluate policies related to the juvenile justice system and the expansion of juvenile jurisdiction to include persons 16 and 17 years of age (Raise the Age legislation.)

The Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee was created in 2014 by a bill signed by Governor Dannel Malloy on May 28, 2014: PA 14-217, Section 79, An Act Implementing Provisions of the State Budget for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2015. The JJPOC was established to evaluate policies and procedures related to the juvenile justice system and the expansion of juvenile jurisdiction to include persons 16 and 17 years of age (commonly referred to as the Raise the Age legislation.) A summary of Public Act 14-217, Sec. 79 is provided in Appendix A.1.

The statute provided funding to the University of New Haven for professional and administrative staffing support to the JJPOC. The staffing is provided through the Tow Youth Justice Institute at UNH.

JJPOC Membership

The JJPOC is co-chaired by Representative Toni Walker and Office of Policy and Management Secretary Ben Barnes. The JJPOC is comprised of legislators, administrators from the Judicial Branch and state juvenile justice and child service and advocate agencies, representatives from local law enforcement and youth and parent advocates. All members serve on the JJPOC without compensation and there are no statutory term limits.

To date, there remain three vacancies on the JJPOC. The TYJI suggests that efforts be made to encourage the appointing authorities to complete the membership assignments. A list of current JJPOC members is provided in Appendix B.

Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee


Progress Report January 1, 2015

TYJI Staffing

The Tow Youth Justice Institute consists of both full-time and part-time professional staff, undergraduate and graduate interns, and PhD students. The TYJI also contracts with several professional research consultants to meet the JJPOC's comprehensive mandate.

Progress to Date

The following graphic shows the five policy and procedure areas set out in Public Act 14-217, Sec. 79. The TYJI organized and conducted its work based on these broad categories.



The following sections highlight the work completed and in progress in each area as well as any findings or identified issues. No recommendations in any policy or procedure area are included in this report. The TYJI has found that the ongoing and planned research projects must be completed before submitting a comprehensive and cohesive set of recommendations for the JJPOC to consider. However, the status report for each policy and procedure area should give a sense of the scope of work being done and coordinated by the TYJI.

To initiate the work of the JJPOC, the TYJI structured a work plan and coordinated and/or completed the following:

- Requested that all state agencies represented on the JJPOC designate a single point of contact for the purposes of communication, coordination and data needs. All agencies have complied and network of contacts and working relationships have been established.
- Coordinated presentations to the JJPOC by the Judicial Branch, Department of Children and Families (DCF). The Results First Initiative at the Institute of Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) at Central Connecticut State University (CCSU,) and the Department of Correction (DOC). These presentations have provided detailed information about the state juvenile justice system that can be used to make informed policy and budgetary decisions.

Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Progress Report January 1, 2015

- Scheduled presentations by the State Department of Education and the Office of the Child Advocate will be held at the January 2015 JJPOC meeting.
- Reviewed relevant academic and national and state-based research. A detailed summary of the research is provided in Appendix C of this report.
- Established four work groups each with a specific charge that reflect broad policy and procedural areas set out in legislation: recidivism, goals and objectives, education, and law enforcement. Details of the progress of each work group are summarized in the next section.
- Initiated research on the impact of the Raise the Age legislation. Public Act 14-217, Sec. 79 requires analysis of four areas be conducted. The TYJI has completed findings on two of the statutory requirements; the change in the average age of arrest among juvenile offenders and the types of arrest charges. These two areas are discussed later in this report. Research projects on the remaining two areas are in progress: the types of services available and provided to juvenile offenders and identified service outcomes and gaps in services.

Status Reports from JJPOC Workgroup

The TYJI established and oversees the Goals Workgroup, Recidivism Workgroup, Education Workgroup and Law Enforcement Workgroup. Membership for each workgroup is comprised of JJPOC members, TYJI staff and contracted consultants and professionals from the juvenile justice system, advocacy groups and the public. The workgroups were established and tasked with specific charges based directly on the statute while the Law Enforcement Workgroup was administratively established to explore the impact of the Raise the Age legislation on local law enforcement. All of the workgroups met twice in 2014 and are expected to continue their mission into 2015. A summary of the work completed to date by each group will be set out below. Appendix D provides a listing of the members on each workgroup.

Proposed Statute Changes

It should be noted that recommending statutory changes relating to the juvenile justice system is one of the tasks of the JJPOC. This area is being approached through the charge of each of the four workgroups by integrating a review of legislative needs into their charge. Recommendations are forthcoming as the efforts of each workgroup continue.

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Goals Workgroup

Goals Workgroup: Identified Systemic Goals

Goal 1: Diversion – To increase the diversion of youth from the juvenile justice system and for court-involved youth at all points in the juvenile justice system in order to reduce the systemic impact of stigma and to reduce recidivism.

Goal 2: Education – To increase the educational achievement of youth in the juvenile justice system by addressing their unique needs in order to improve opportunities for successful transition to adulthood and reduce recidivism.

Goals 3: Treatment – To improve access to appropriate and quality treatment, intervention and support services, including mental health and substance abuse treatment, for youth in the juvenile justice system in order to enhance wellbeing, improve family dynamics and reduce recidivism.

Goals 4: Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) – To reduce disproportionate minority contact at all phases of the juvenile justice system in order to ensure fairness and quality in juvenile justice process, treatment programs and services and community response.

Goal 5: Data – To increase the timely and efficient collection, sharing and analysis of data among all public and private agencies involved in and with the juvenile justice system in order to ensure effective service delivery to juveniles and their families to improve policy and practice.

PA 14-217, Sec.79(f)(3) mandates the JJPOC and state juvenile justice agencies meet short-term goals within six months, medium-term goals within 12 months and long-term goals within 18 months. The short-, medium- and long-term goals were to be developed after considering the existing relevant research related to the juvenile justice system and any state strategic plan. After review of the academic, national and state research and strategic plans, the Goals Workgroup identified five strategic goals listed in the text box.


Recidivism Work Group

PA 14-217, Sec.79(f)(2) required the JJPOC recommend a standard definition of recidivism to be used by state juvenile justice and child service agencies and make recommendations to reduce the rate of recidivism for children and youth involved with the juvenile justice system. PA 14-217, Sec. 79 also required the Institute of Municipal

and Regional Policy (IMRP) at CCSU conduct a study of the rate of recidivism among adjudicated juvenile offenders committed to DCF and placed on parole. The IMRP is required to report its finding to the General Assembly on July 1, 2015. For the purposes of its study, the IMRP is working cooperatively with the JJPOC and TYJI to develop an accepted definition of recidivism.

The Recidivism Workgroup also recognized that the measures of recidivism are equally as important as the definition. The workgroup adopted the fundamental measures of recidivism that have been adopted by the state’s adult criminal justice system and national academic and system researchers. The definition and measures of recidivism are set forth in the table below. After the Judicial Branch and DCF presented on their data systems, the Recidivism Workgroup concluded that data sharing is possible and necessary to conduct a comprehensive and accurate analysis of recidivism. The Judicial Branch is assisting DCF to improve its data collection and database systems. DCF reported it is also working with Georgetown University to update its databases.

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**



The Recidivism Workgroup is working cooperatively with the IMRP in conducting the study of the rate of recidivism among juvenile parolees (parole is defined in the study scope). The workgroup will use the IMRP analysis to formulate necessary recommendations.

Education Workgroup

PA 14-217, Sec.79(f)(5) mandates the JJPOC identify the strengths that support and barriers that impede the educational needs of children and youth in the juvenile justice system and make specific recommendations for reforms. To that end, the Education Workgroup identified prevention and re-entry as areas to be further explored in more detail. Members will focus on the Education Goal to suggest objectives together with measures of effectiveness, legislative ideas, and cost implications for providing education to this population.


Law Enforcement Workgroup

As previously stated, this work group was administratively created without a specific statutory charge because the JJPOC recognized the critical role of law enforcement in juvenile justice. The workgroup is currently reviewing the impact of the Raise the Age legislation on state and local law enforcement agencies. The workgroup is collating perspectives and opinions from police on the strengths, gaps, challenges, and issues in dealing with juvenile offenders. In addition, the workgroup plans to address opportunities to increase diversion from the system and the intersection of mental health and education services for juvenile offenders and will develop recommendations for training police and impacting law enforcement policies and practices. Finally, the workgroup is focusing on identifying ways to expand collaborative partnerships between law enforcement, juvenile justice and child welfare and education agencies and the community.

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Impact of Raise the Age Legislation

As previously stated, the Tow Youth Justice Institute completed two components of the assessment of the impact of the Raise the Age legislation on the juvenile justice system and is currently working on the final two components of the assessment. The graphic summarizes the four areas to be assessed to determine the impact of the Raise the Age (RTA) legislation.





Based on the data received from state juvenile justice and adult criminal justice agencies, the TYJI completed studies on the average age of children and youth before and after the Raise the Age legislation and the types of delinquent acts or criminal offenses that children and youth have been charged with since enactment of the Raise the Age legislation. Change in the average age of children and youth before and after Raise the Age (RtA).

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Average Age. There were a total of 142,654 cases (dockets in the dataset) from January 2006 through early December 2014. In January 2010, the Raise the Age legislation was introduced and placed 16-year-olds under the jurisdiction of the juvenile justice system. In July 2012, 17-year-olds were added to the juvenile justice system. There were 823 cases in which the specific ages of the juvenile offenders were not available. Of this 823, 273 (0.2%) were under age 8 and 550 (0.4%) were 18 and over. Thus, the average age calculations were based on a remaining sample of 141,831 cases.


From 2006 to 2014, there was a 1.15 year increase in average age of arrest.

In 2006, the average age of arrest was 14.07 years and in 2014 the average of arrest was 15.22 years.



The data shows that the average age increased only slightly more than one year between 2006 and present.


Types of Charges. The data were analyzed to determine the types criminal offenses youth were charged with since the Raise the Age legislation were phased in during 2010 and 2012. This analysis was based on the full sample of 142,654.




In 2006, the most frequent categories were family offenses (34% of arrests), public-peace (20% of arrests), assault (11% of arrests), and larceny (9% of arrests). These four offenses made up 74% of all arrests. The other category includes all other crimes charges against juvenile offenders, but none of the crimes in this category accounted for a percentage larger than the four listed here.

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

The findings were very similar in 2014. The most frequent categories again were family offenses (25% of arrests), public-peace (17% of arrests), assault (13% of arrests), and larceny (10% of arrests). These four offenses made up 65% of all arrests. Overall, these same four offenses were the most frequent offenses and in the same order among the under age 16 cohort and for the 16-and 17-year-old cohort. The data reveals that the same four types of offenses make up approximately three-fourths of all offenses for youth in the system both before and after the Raise the Age legislation.



The data also revealed a substantial decline in arrests over time. Based on the full sample of 142,654, there were a total of 20,115 arrests in 2006 in comparison to 15,411 in 2013 (23% reduction in arrests). Between January 2014 and early December 2014, there were a total of 13,713 arrests (32% reduction in arrests). When specifically analyzing this decline among the under 16 cohort, there were a total of 18,455 arrests in 2006 in comparison to 7,996 in 2013 (57% reduction in arrests) and 6,817 in 2014 (63% reduction in arrests). Furthermore, in 2006, the under 16 cohort made up 91% of youth arrests and the 16-and 17-year-old cohort made up 8% of arrests. In 2013, the under 16 cohort made up 51% of youth arrests and 16-and 17-year-old cohort made up 48%. In 2014, the under-16 cohort made up 49% of youth arrests and 16-and 17-year-old cohort made up 50%. The overall percentage of arrests of the under 16 cohort has dropped from 91% of the total for the period between 2006 and 2009 to approximately 60% of the total for the period since the Raise the Age legislation began in 2010 and through almost all of 2014.



Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Progress Report January 1, 2015

Next Steps

The Tow Youth Justice Institute will submit a second progress report to the Juvenile Justice Policy In July, 2015 providing assessment, examination, and plans that will address the following policy and procedural areas and issues. These are not listed in any particular order of importance. All are interrelated and most are dependent on others.

- 1 • The quality and accessibility of diversionary programs available to children and youth, including Juvenile Review Boards, and services for a child or youth who is a member of a Family with Service Needs (FWSN)
- 2 • System of community-based services for children and youth who are under the supervision, care or custody of DCF or CSSD of the Judicial Department
- 3 • Congregate care settings operated privately or by the state and have housed children and youth involved in the juvenile justice system in the past 12 months
- 4 • Collaborative school-based efforts and other processes between state and local schools agencies/boards, DCF, CSSD of the Judicial Branch, DMHAS and other agencies to reduce the number of children and youth who enter juvenile justice system as FWSN or convicted delinquent
- 5 • Practices and procedures that result in disproportionate minority contact within the juvenile justice system
- 6 • A plan to provide that all state or private juvenile justice facilities and programs provide results-based accountability
- 7 • Number of children and youth who after being under the supervision of DCF are convicted as delinquent (recidivism)
- 8 • The overlap between juvenile justice system and mental health care system for children and youth

The TYJI is committed to conducting all research into each policy or procedural area in a deliberate way. Based on an initial review of these projects, there is a variety of methodologies to be used and some projects may have to be completed prior to others as the analyses may build upon the other. Other studies will require longitudinal analyses while others will simply take multiple years to complete (e.g., assessment of all state and private community-based programs.) It should also be noted that during this process, any significant reforms to the juvenile justice system or changes to policies and procedures may most likely result in measureable changes in the data analysis so that this will have to be considered in conducted these research project over time. However, the TYJI is committed to providing the JJPOC with the most accurate, current and analytical sound data analysis, findings and recommendation with which to consider when developing and implementing reforms to the state juvenile justice system.

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Appendix

Appendix A.1 Public Act 14-217, Section 79

Appendix A.2 Summary of Public Act 14-217, Section 79

Appendix B JJPOC Membership

Appendix C Summary of Research

Appendix D Work Group Membership

House Bill No. 5597

health system, and (C) the extent to which the facility fee or any increase in total fees charged or billed by a hospital or health system is associated with improving service to and outcomes for insurance plan enrollees; and

(3) The feasibility of removing reimbursements, beginning not later than July 1, 2015, for such fees the Comptroller has determined to be inappropriate or unreasonable.

(d) Not later than October 1, 2015, the Comptroller shall submit a report, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the Governor, the General Assembly and the Health Care Cost Containment Committee of the results of the analysis and determinations under subsections (b) and (c) of this section, and the impact of limiting facility fees or total fees or both on such insurance plans and enrollees of such plans.

(e) The Comptroller may consult with the Health Care Cost Containment Committee to implement the provisions of this section.

Sec. 78. (Effective from passage) Not later than November 1, 2014, the Commissioner of Social Services shall conduct an analysis of the cost of providing services under the Connecticut home-care program for the elderly, established pursuant to section 17b-342 of the general statutes, and the pilot program to provide home care services to persons with disabilities, established pursuant to section 17b-617 of the general statutes, which shall include a determination of the rates necessary to reimburse providers for such costs. On or before January 1, 2015, the commissioner shall submit a report, in accordance with the provisions of section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations and human services summarizing such analysis.

Sec. 79. (Effective from passage) (a) There is established a Juvenile

House Bill No. 5597

Justice Policy and Oversight Committee. The committee shall evaluate policies related to the juvenile justice system and the expansion of juvenile jurisdiction to include persons sixteen and seventeen years of age.

(b) The committee shall consist of the following members:

(1) Two members of the General Assembly, one of whom shall be appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives, and one of whom shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate;

(2) The chairpersons and ranking members of the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the judiciary, children, human services and appropriations, or their designees;

(3) The Chief Court Administrator, or the Chief Court Administrator's designee;

(4) A judge of the superior court for juvenile matters, appointed by the Chief Justice;

(5) The executive director of the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Department, or the executive director's designee;

(6) The executive director of the Superior Court Operations Division, or the executive director's designee;

(7) The Chief Public Defender, or the Chief Public Defender's designee;

(8) The Chief State's Attorney, or the Chief State's Attorney's designee;

(9) The Commissioner of Children and Families, or the commissioner's designee;

House Bill No. 5597

(10) The Commissioner of Correction, or the commissioner's designee;

(11) The Commissioner of Education, or the commissioner's designee;

(12) The Commissioner of Mental Health and Addiction Services, or the commissioner's designee;

(13) The president of the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association, or the president's designee;

(14) Two child or youth advocates, one of whom shall be appointed by one chairperson of the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee, and one of whom shall be appointed by the other chairperson of the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee;

(15) Two parents or parent advocates, at least one of whom is the parent of a child who has been involved with the juvenile justice system, one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(16) The Child Advocate, or the Child Advocate's designee; and

(17) The Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, or the secretary's designee.

(c) All appointments to the committee shall be made not later than thirty days after the effective date of this section. Any vacancy shall be filled by the appointing authority.

(d) The Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, or the secretary's designee, and a member of the General Assembly selected jointly by the speaker of the House of Representatives and the president pro tempore of the Senate from among the members serving

House Bill No. 5597

pursuant to subdivision (1) or (2) of subsection (b) of this section shall be cochairpersons of the committee. Such cochairpersons shall schedule the first meeting of the committee, which shall be held not later than sixty days after the effective date of this section.

(e) Members of the committee shall serve without compensation, except for necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

(f) Not later than January 1, 2015, the committee shall report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations, the judiciary, human services and children, and the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, regarding the following:

(1) Any statutory changes concerning the juvenile justice system that the committee recommends to (A) improve public safety, (B) promote the best interests of children and youths who are under the supervision, care or custody of the Commissioner of Children and Families or the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Department; (C) improve transparency and accountability with respect to state-funded services for children and youths in the juvenile justice system with an emphasis on goals identified by the committee for community-based programs and facility-based interventions; and (D) promote the efficient sharing of information between the Department of Children and Families and the Judicial Department to ensure the regular collection and reporting of recidivism data and promote public welfare and public safety outcomes related to the juvenile justice system;

(2) A definition of "recidivism" that the committee recommends to be used by state agencies with responsibilities with respect to the juvenile justice system, and recommendations to reduce recidivism for

House Bill No. 5597

children and youths in the juvenile justice system;

(3) Short-term goals to be met within six months, medium-term goals to be met within twelve months and long-term goals to be met within eighteen months, for the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee and state agencies with responsibilities with respect to the juvenile justice system to meet, after considering existing relevant reports related to the juvenile justice system and any related state strategic plan;

(4) The impact of legislation that expanded the jurisdiction of the juvenile court to include persons sixteen and seventeen years of age, as measured by the following:

(A) Any change in the average age of children and youths involved in the juvenile justice system;

(B) The types of services used by designated age groups and the outcomes of those services;

(C) The types of delinquent acts or criminal offenses that children and youths have been charged with since the enactment and implementation of such legislation; and

(D) The gaps in services identified by the committee with respect to children and youths involved in the juvenile justice system, including, but not limited to, children and youths who have attained the age of eighteen after being involved in the juvenile justice system, and recommendations to address such gaps in services; and

(5) Strengths and barriers identified by the committee that support or impede the educational needs of children and youths in the juvenile justice system, with specific recommendations for reforms.

(g) Not later than July 1, 2015, the committee shall report, in

House Bill No. 5597

accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations, the judiciary, human services and children, and the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, regarding the following:

(1) The quality and accessibility of diversionary programs available to children and youths in this state, including juvenile review boards and services for a child or youth who is a member of a family with service needs;

(2) An assessment of the system of community-based services for children and youths who are under the supervision, care or custody of the Commissioner of Children and Families or the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Department;

(3) An assessment of the congregate care settings that are operated privately or by the state and have housed children and youths involved in the juvenile justice system in the past twelve months;

(4) An examination of how the state Department of Education and local boards of education, the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Department, and other appropriate agencies can work collaboratively through school-based efforts and other processes to reduce the number of children and youths who enter the juvenile justice system as a result of being a member of a family with service needs or convicted as delinquent;

(5) An examination of practices and procedures that result in disproportionate minority contact, as defined in section 4-68y of the general statutes, within the juvenile justice system;

(6) A plan to provide that all facilities and programs that are part of the juvenile justice system and are operated privately or by the state

House Bill No. 5597

provide results-based accountability;

(7) An assessment of the number of children and youths who, after being under the supervision of the Department of Children and Families, are convicted as delinquent; and

(8) An assessment of the overlap between the juvenile justice system and the mental health care system for children.

(h) The committee shall complete its duties under subsections (f) and (g) of this section after consultation with one or more organizations that focus on relevant issues regarding children and youths, such as the University of New Haven and any of the university's institutes. The committee shall work in collaboration with any results first initiative implemented pursuant to section 2-111 of the general statutes or any public or special act.

(i) The committee shall establish a timeframe for review and reporting regarding the responsibilities outlined in subdivision (5) of subsection (f) of this section, and subdivisions (1) to (7), inclusive, of subsection (g) of this section. Each report submitted by the committee shall include specific recommendations to improve outcomes and a timeline by which specific tasks or outcomes must be achieved.

G) Not later than July 1, 2015, and quarterly thereafter until January 1, 2017, the committee shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to appropriations, the judiciary, human services and children, and the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, regarding progress made to achieve goals and measures identified by the committee pursuant to this section.

Sec. 80. (*Effective July 1, 2014*) The sum of \$330,000 appropriated to the Department of Correction's Other Expenses account for fiscal year

House Bill No. 5597

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Appendix A.2: Summary of Public Act 14-217 Regarding JJPOC

Section	Description
§79(a)	Establish Juvenile Justice Policy & Oversight Committee (JJPOC) to evaluate juvenile justice policies & the impact of Raise the Age law
§79(b)	List JJPOC membership & appointing authorities
§79(c)	Establish appointing date & that vacancies shall be filled
§79(d)	JJPOC co-chairpersons are Office of Policy & Management Secretary & a legislator selected jointly by house & senate leadership. Require first JJPOC meeting be held within 60 days
§70(e)	JJPOC not compensated except for expenses
§79(f)(1) thru (5)	JJPOC issue report by January 1, 2015 addressing: (1) proposed statutory changes to juvenile justice system; (2) definition & measurement of recidivism; (3) JJPOC short-, medium- & long-term goals; (4) impact of Raise the Age legislation; (5) strengths & barriers to providing educational services to juvenile offenders
§79(g)(1) thru (8)	JJPOC issue report by July 1, 2015 addressing: (1) quality & accessibility of diversionary programs including Juvenile Review Boards (JRB) & Family With Service Needs (FWSN); (2) assessment of community-based services for adjudicated juvenile offenders on probation or committed to DCF; (3) assessment of state & private congregate care facilities; (4) collaboration of school-based programs between State Department of Education (SDE), local boards of education, DCF, DMHAS, CSSD & other agencies to provide to reduce number of FWSNs entering juvenile justice system; (5) examine disproportionate minority contact within juvenile justice system; (6) develop a plan to provide result-based state & private juvenile justice programs; (7) assess recidivism among juvenile offenders committed to DCF; & (8) assess overlap between juvenile justice & mental health systems
§79(h)	JJPOC consult with organizations including the University of New Haven (UNH) and state universities that focus on children's issues and with the state's Results First Initiative
§79(i)	JJPOC set timeframe to complete the review of the strengths & barriers to providing educational services to juvenile offenders (§79(f)(5))and for completing all the research, review & analysis required for the July 1, 2015 report (§79(g) (1)-(7))
§79(j)	Beginning with July 1, 2015 report, JJPOC issue quarterly reports until January 2017

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Appendix B: JJPOC Member List

Appointing Authority	Serving Member
House Speaker - <i>Rep. Sharkey</i>	VACANCY
Senate Present Pro Temp Leader - <i>Sen. Williams</i>	Sen. Gary Holder-Winfield
Chair of Judiciary - <i>Sen. Coleman</i>	Sen. Eric Coleman
Chair of Judiciary - <i>Rep. Fox</i>	Abby Anderson
RM of Judiciary - <i>Sen. Kissel</i>	Sen. John Kissel
RM of Judiciary - <i>Rep. Rebimbas</i>	VACANCY
Chair of Children - <i>Sen. Bartolomeo</i>	Sen. Dante Bartolomeo
Chair of Children - <i>Rep. Urban</i>	Erica Bromley
RM of Children - <i>Sen. Linares</i>	Lisa Wexler
RM of Children - <i>Rep. Betts</i>	Rep. Whit Betts
Chair of Human Services - <i>Sen. Slossberg</i>	Sen. Gayle Slossberg
Chair of Human Services - <i>Rep. Abercrombie</i>	Hector Glynn
RM of Human Services - <i>Sen. Markley</i>	Pam Salamone
RM of Human Services - <i>Rep. Wood</i>	Martha Stone
Chair of Appropriations - <i>Sen. Bye</i>	Sen. Beth Bye
Chair of Appropriations - <i>Rep. Toni Walker*</i>	Rep. Toni Walker
RM of Appropriations - <i>Sen. Kane</i>	Sen. Rob Kane
RM of Appropriations - <i>Rep. Miner</i>	Rep. Craig Miner
Chief Court Administrator - <i>Judge Carroll</i>	Judge Patrick Carroll
Superior Court for Juvenile Matters - <i>Chief Justice Rogers</i>	Judge Bernadette Conway
CSSD Executive Director - <i>Steve Grant</i>	Stephen Grant
Superior Court Operations Division Executive Director - <i>Joseph D'Alesio</i>	Joseph D'Alesio
Chief Public Defender - <i>Christine Rapillo</i>	Christine Rapillo
Chief State's Attorney - <i>Francis Carino</i>	Francis Carino
DCF Commissioner - <i>Joette Katz</i>	Dr. Linda Dixon
DOC Commissioner - <i>James Dzurenda</i>	Warden John Alves
SDE Commissioner - <i>Stefan Pryor</i>	John Frassinelli
DMHAS Commissioner - <i>Patricia Rehmer</i>	Loel Meckel
CT Police Chiefs Association President - <i>Chief Joseph Dooley</i>	Chief Eric Osanitsch
Child or Youth Advocate appointed by Chairpersons of JJPOC - <i>Walker</i>	Derrick Gordon
Child or Youth Advocate appointed by Chairpersons of JJPOC - <i>Barnes</i>	Kary Strickland
Parent or Parent Advocate appointed by Senate Minority Leader - <i>Sen. McKinney</i>	VACANCY
Parent or Parent Advocate appointed by House Minority Leader - <i>Rep. Cafero</i>	Mark Zeck, Esq.
Child Advocate - <i>Sarah Eagan</i>	Sarah Eagan
Secretary of OPM - <i>Secretary Ben Barnes*</i>	Secretary Ben Barnes

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Appendix C: Summary of Research

The Tow Youth Justice Institute reviewed more than 70 relevant reports and strategic plans on juvenile justice submitted by agencies and organizations including the Judicial Branch, Department of Children and Families, Connecticut Youth Services Association and the Department of Correction.

The TYJI examined the reports and plans using 8 factors set out in Public Act 14-217 to serve as a guidepost. The 8 factors are:

1. Improving Public Safety
2. Promoting Best Interests of Children
3. Improve Transparency and Accountability
4. Promote Efficient Information Sharing
5. Recidivism
6. Short, Medium, Long Term Goals
7. Impact of Raise the Age Legislation
8. Educational Barriers.

Three major themes emerged from the review of the literature: treatment; diversion; and data. These three themes are discussed below and recommendations for next steps are included.

Treatment

A. Treatment: Mental Health/Substance Abuse

- There are high rates of mental health needs among youth in the system including those with conduct disorder, substance abuse, trauma, and other co-occurring disorders.
- There is a high percentage of youth with learning disorders.
- Due to Raise the Age legislation, there was an increase of 16 and 17 years olds in the juvenile system; research shows increased likelihood of substance abuse at this age.
- There is a need for comprehensive assessment for identifying youth with substance abuse treatment needs.

B. Treatment: Matching

- It is not uncommon for youth to be matched to services that are available rather than services that match their needs.
- It is evident that offenders typically receive available services rather than what they needed.
- There is a need to offer diverse services including those for youth with children; i.e. programs training youth to be more effective parents.
- Over-representation in the juvenile justice system is coincidentally occasioned by underrepresentation in the treatment system.
- Community-specific stigma association with mental illness adds to challenges in both assessment and treatment
- Explore ways to overcome barriers caused by stigmas to better connect youth with services.

Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015

- In order to reduce likelihood of reoffending, youth must be better matched to treatment that addresses their specific behavioral or mental health needs; otherwise, they remain at higher risk for reoffending and the lack of a positive outcome may be misinterpreted as an untreatable problem rather than as a result of poor matching.

C. Treatment: Family Engagement

- Reports revealed the importance of engaging families as a part of continuity of services; a critical aspect to providing a stable environment for transitioning youth and reducing risk of reoffending.
- Some families do not become involved in treatment because they do not know how.
- Because there is an overrepresentation of minorities in the system, it is important that services and their providers are culturally competent.
- Because youth are coming from diverse family backgrounds, there is also a need to include a broader definition of “family” that could include faith-based communities and local businesses.
- Because of the large Hispanic population, there is a need for a diversity of services to include linguistically diverse providers that will not only engage youth but also their families; educating them as to how to understand and navigate the system of services to help youth and their families.
- Sensitivity and understanding as to the needs of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning (LGBTQ) youth and their families and communities when providing services is essential.
- Mindfulness and inclusion of family in a broad sense promotes sustainability of treatment and the well being of youth in the system beyond treatment programs and facilities.

D. Treatment: Evidence-Based Practices and Accountability

- With a common definition of recidivism, there will be an ability to evaluate programs on a common basis to determine what works to reduce recidivism rates.
- There is a need for monitor these practices for fidelity.
- Reports emphasize that positive outcomes be measured outside of unitary concept of recidivism to include measures of the general well being of youth.

School-based Diversion

- Schools in suburbs using School Based Diversion practices refer significantly more white youth but significantly fewer minorities are referred (Connecticut SBDI Evaluation Report, pp. 11).
- School based diversion schools indicate in-school arrests dropped 50%-59% per school, in-school suspensions decreased by 9%, and out of school suspensions decreased by 8% (CT Comprehensive approach to Reducing School-Based Arrests pp. 11).
- Minority youth may be labeled with behavioral problems rather than mental health disorders.
- Implementation of Restorative Justice Practices in schools warrants further examination
- Increase the number of school districts that have access to information on mental health services, (for example, Emergency Mobile Psychiatric Services), in the respective communities of their students so as to address the needs of all urban, suburban, and rural youth.

Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015

Data-sharing

- Reports revealed the potential benefits of sharing data including more accurate tracking of youth across systems and the ability to connect services to outcomes.
- The need for unique identifiers to track youth across all agencies is apparent and electronic records could be extremely helpful to this end.
- There is a clear need to develop a system that is efficient in terms of information being shared in a timely manner to promote continuity of care. For example, the release of school records prior to a youth's discharge would support transition of youth back into the school system more effectively. This kind of educational advocacy could be integrated into case management.
- Future discussions must include issues of confidentiality and the impact of privacy laws that interfere with the ability of agencies to communicate with each other around effective treatment and continuity of care for youth. Exploring a way to promote this without breaching confidentiality needs within the system is essential.

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Appendix D: Work Group Member List

Goals

Representatives	Agency
Hector Glynn	Village for Children and Families
Francis J. Carino	Office of the Chief State's Attorney
Bob Francis	RYASAP
Mallory LaPierre	CTJJA
Dan Rezende	CJR
Jacquese Patterson	FAVOR
Lisa Wexler	Westport Probate Court
Martha Stone	Center for Children's Advocacy
Ellen Shemitz	CT Voices for Children
Mickey Kramer	Office of the Child Advocate
Christine Rapillo	Office of the Chief Public Defender
Steven Smith	DCF
Steve Grant	CSSD
Brian Hill	CSSD
Deb Fuller	CSSD
Cynthia Cunningham	CSSD
Erica Bromley	CYSA
Merit Lajoie	OVA
Andrew Clark	CCSU
Renee LaMark Muir	CCSU
Shari Shapiro	Kids in Crisis
Stephen Ment	Judicial

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Recidivism

Representatives	Agency
Francis J. Carino	Office of the Chief State's Attorney
Hector Glynn	Village for Children and Families
Abby Anderson	CTJJA
Doreen Thompson	CPA
Linda Dixon	DCF
Brian Hill	CSSD
Peter Kochol	CSSD
Mickey Kramer	Office of the Child Advocate
Christine Rapillo	Office of the Chief Public Defender
Deb Fulller	CSSD
Erica Bromley	CYSA
Merit Lajoie	OVA
Andrew Clark	CSSU
Renee LaMark Muir	CCSU
Pam Salamone	(Sen. Markley)
Jeanne Milstein	UNH-TYJI
Jim Isenberg	UNH-TYJI
Kitty Tyrol	UNH-TYJI

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Law Enforcement

Representatives	Agency
Dean Esserman	Chief, New Haven Police Dept.
Francis J. Carino	Office of the Chief State's Attorney
Lara Herscovitch	CTJJA
Steven Smith	DCF
Christine Rappillo	Office of the Chief Public Defender
Renee Cimino	Office of the Chief Public Defender
Judge Bernadette Conway	Judicial
Julia O'Leary	Judicial
Cynthia Cunningham	Judicial
Deb Fuller	Judicial
Christine Whidden	DOC
Merit Lajoie	OVA
Andrew Clark	CCSU
Renee LaMark Muir	CCSU
Joseph Gaudett	Chief, Bridgeport Police Dept.
Louise Pyers	NAMI
Dora Schriro	Commissioner of the Dept of Emergency Services and Public Protection
Leon Smith	Center for Children's Advocacy
Thomas Flaherty	Chief, POST
Sean Grant	Manchester Police Dept
Steven Marans	Yale Child Study Center
Ann Smith	AFCAMP
Eric Osanitsch	Windsor Locks Police Dept.
Jim Rovella	Chief, Hartford Police Dept.
Brian Foley	Dep Chief, Hartford Police Dept.
Neil Dryfe	Cheshire Police Dept.
Derrick Gordon	Yale
Valerie LaMotte	OPM
Stephen Ment	Judicial
Christene Mertes	Hartford Police Dept
Ron Onofrio	North Branford Police Dept.
William Carbone	UNH - TYJI
David Lambert	UNH - TYJI
Jeanne Milstein	UNH - TYJI
Jim Isenberg	UNH - TYJI
Kitty Tyrol	UNH - TYJI
Dan Davies	UNH - TYJI - Intern
Chloe Williams	UNH - TYJI - Intern
Diane Serapina	Tow Foundation
Mickey Kramer	OCA
Sarah Eagan	OCA

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee
Progress Report January 1, 2015**

Education

Representatives	Agency
Hector Glynn	Village for Children and Families
Agata Raszczyk-Lawska	CLS (CT Legal Services)
Edie Joseph	CT Voices for Children
Ellen Shemitz	CT Voices for Children
Marisa Halm	Center for Children's Advocacy
Stephen Tracy	DCF
Sarah Eagan	Office of the Child Advocate
Christine Rapillo	Office of the Chief Public Defender
Terri Drew	Stamford Youth Services Bureau
Judge Bernadette Conway	Judicial
Cathy Foley-Geib	Judicial
Patricia Nunez	Judicial
Tasha Hunt	Judicial
Jaquita Monroe	Judicial
Deb Fuller	Judicial
Leigh C. Higgins	CFGNH
Kary Strickland	
Kim Holley	DOC
Jason Bartlett	New Haven Youth Services Bureau
Judge Thomas Brunnock	Waterbury Probate District
Andrew Clark	CCSU
Renee LaMark Muir	CCSU
Shari Shapiro	Kids In Crisis
Michael Ferguson	Kids in Crisis
Robert Rader	CABE (CT Association of Boards of Education)
Patrice McCarthy	CABE
Josephine Hawke, PhD	FAVOR
Nachi Bhatt	DCF
Howard Haberman	DCF
Cyd Oppenhiemer	CT Voices for Children
Peter Rockholz	School & College Placement Services, LLC
Scott Newgrass	Bureau of Health/Nutrition, Family Services and Adult Education
Bill Scalise	CT Association of Alternative Schools and Programs (CAASP)
Bob Rath	OPP (Our Piece of the Pie)
John Frassinelli	State Dept of Education (SDE)
Joseph Cirasuolo	CT Association of Public School Superintendents (CAPSS)
Mark Benigni	Meriden Public Schools - Superintendent
Malcolm Welfare	New Haven Board of Education
Gemma Joseph Lumpkin	New Haven Board of Education
Valerie LaMotte	OPM
Derrick Gordon	Yale
Kitty Tyrol	UNH - TYJI
Jeanne Milstein	UNH - TYJI
DiJonee Talley	UNH - TYJI
Amanda Bozak	UNH - TYJI