

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee**

**Report per Public Act 14-217, Section 79**

Submitted: July 16, 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  
Status Report July 1, 2015**

**Introduction**

In accordance with Public Act 14-217, the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee (JJPOC) issues this report, dated July 1, 2015, on the status of its work in identifying and implementing reforms and initiatives to improve the juvenile justice system. This report is submitted to the Connecticut General Assembly committees having cognizance over juvenile justice matters. This is the second status report issued by the committee; the first was released on January 1, 2015. The reports are produced for the JJPOC by the University of New Haven Tow Youth Justice Institute (TYJI), which provides administrative and research support to the committee.

This report is formatted based on the goals established by the JJPOC. A summary of the short-, medium- and long-term goals will be provided. This report is organized into the following sections: overview of legislative mandate, strategic plan, and other projects.

# Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015

## Overview of JJPOC Legislative Mandate

The JJPOC is statutorily required to complete the following:

- Sec. 79 F1 • Assessment of community-based services for children and youth under supervision, care or custody of the Department of Children and Families (DCF) or the Court Support Services Division (CCSD)
- Sec. 79 G1 • Evaluation of the quality and accessibility of diversionary programs including juvenile review boards and family with service needs (FWSN) services
- Sec. 79 G2 • 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
- Sec. 79 G3 • Assessment of the congregate care settings housing children and youth involved in the juvenile justice system that are operated or funded by the state
- Sec. 79 G4 • Examination of how the state agencies such as the Department of Education (SDE), Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services (DMHAS), DCF and CSSD, local boards of education and other appropriate agencies collaborate on school-based programs and processes to reduce the number of children and youth entering the juvenile justice system as a FWSN or adjudicated delinquent
- Sec. 79 G5 • Examination of practices and procedures that result in disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system
- Sec. 79 G6 • Establish a plan to implement Results Based Accountability in all facilities and programs that are part of the juvenile justice system
- Sec. 79 G7 • Assessment of the number of youth who were under the supervision of DCF who are subsequently convicted as delinquent
- Sec. 79 G8 • Assessment of the overlap between the juvenile justice and mental health care system for children

## Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015

### New Legislation

PA 15-183, "An Act Concerning the Juvenile Justice System," was passed by the General Assembly and signed by Governor Dannel Malloy, effective October 1, 2015. The new legislation impacts the membership, responsibilities and mandate of the JJPOC.

The membership of the JJPOC is expanded by four new members: the Commissioners (or their designees) of the Departments of Labor, Social Services and Public Health and adds a Chief of Police of a municipality with a population in excess of one hundred thousand to be appointed by the President of the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association.

The original responsibilities of the JJPOC, which are set out above, have been expanded to include the following:

Implement a Strategic Plan with short-term, medium-term and long-term goals

Report to General Assembly and Office of Policy and Management on progress to implement a strategic plan on January 1, 2016

Make recommendations to improve:

- mental health and substance abuse treatment programs and services
- training on the juvenile justice system for state agencies and municipal police departments
- diversion
- vocational education opportunities
- reducing the use of restraints, seclusion and room confinement in juvenile justice facilities and using evidence-based positive behavioral support strategies and other evidence-based or research-informed strategies as alternatives

## Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015

### Implementation Plan

Development of an implementation plan was an important and necessary first step for the JJPOC in meeting its broad statutory mandate. Each statutory requirement has been prioritized and detailed with actionable steps. The JJPOC focused much of its efforts during the past six months on developing the strategic planning process. The JJPOC has established short-, medium- and long-term goals and identified and prioritized the research, evaluation and analytical projects to be undertaken. The ongoing and planned projects will provide the necessary information and analysis from which reforms and initiatives will be developed. The implementation plan will provide a blueprint for the committee to meet its comprehensive statutory mandate to improve the juvenile justice system and other related systems serving children and youth involved in the juvenile justice system such as education, mental health and addiction, labor and social services.

The strategic planning initiative was conducted through several processes. First, JJPOC workgroups developed recommendations for the scope of research projects with initial reform recommendations. Second, the TYJI consolidated the workgroup recommendations and proposed short-, medium- and long-term goals. Finally, the JJPOC, during its monthly committee meetings, reviewed and considered the recommendations, goals and supporting data on certain key measures to set the final goals with specific numerical targets.

### Short Term Goals

The short-term goals include completing most research projects, most by mid-2016. A brief summary of each project is provided.

#### **Juvenile Parole Recidivism**

Public Act 14-217 required the Institute of Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP,) at Central Connecticut State University (CCSU,) to assess the effectiveness of juvenile parole services administered by the DCF including a cost-benefit analysis based on the model developed by the Pew-MacArthur Foundation. The primary measure of effectiveness used by the IMRP is the rate of recidivism. Public Act 14-217 also required the JJPOC establish a common definition and measures to track recidivism rates among the juvenile offender population. To avoid duplication of efforts and to reduce costs associated with completing the research, the JJPOC and IMRP have collaborated on this project.

## **Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015**

Recidivism is defined as a new crime committed by a youth under 18 who had a previously been adjudicated delinquent. Three measures of recidivism are being used: (1) re-arrest of a new crime; (2) re-adjudication of delinquency or reconviction of crimes; and (3) sentencing. Using the three measures, the analysis will determine: the extent to which youth involved with the juvenile justice were re-arrested for new crimes, re-adjudicated delinquent (convicted), and recommitted to DCF or other sanction; how recidivism rates differ among categories of juvenile offenders; whether recidivism is related to a juvenile offender's criminal history, demographics, program participation or other factors; and the impact the "Raise the Age" law has on the rate of recidivism among juvenile offenders, now including sixteen and seventeen year olds.

The IMRP final report was due on June 30, 2015. However, additional time is needed to secure the necessary data resolving DCF confidentiality concerns. This study is expected to be complete in September 2015. The IMRP is also working with the Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division and Executive Branch State Department of Education (SDE) and the Department of Labor (DOL) to obtain juvenile parolee population data on court disposition, education and employment, which would provide for a comprehensive analysis of the factors impacting recidivism.

### **Secure Facilities: A Study of Youth in Confinement**

The JJPOC is required to assess congregate care settings for juvenile offenders and the Phase 1 of state-run facilities project completion anticipated by January 2016. Phase 2 assessment of state-funded congregate care settings will begin in February 2016.

Congregate care settings have been distinguished as state-run facilities and state-funded centers. The first phase of this project will focus on state-run secure confinement facilities including juvenile detention centers, operated by CSSD, the Connecticut Juvenile Training School (CJTS) for boys and the Solnit Pueblo Unit for girls operated by DCF, as well as the Manson Youth Institution for males and York Correctional Institution for females operated by DOC for youth transferred to the adult criminal justice system.

This study is focused on the conditions of confinement in CCSD, DCF and DOC secure facilities including the code of conduct and use of graduated sanctions including seclusion and mechanical and physical restraints; and the educational, vocational, recreational, social and mental health programs available for youth at each facility. The study will also examine: the discharge planning process; staff selection, training and retention; and any alternatives to juvenile secure facilities in Connecticut based on population projections and cost-benefit analyses and savings.

## **Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015**

### **Impact of Raise the Age**

JJPOC was tasked with determining the impact of the Raise the Age legislation that transferred the jurisdiction of 16- and 17-year-olds from the adult criminal justice system to the juvenile justice system. The impact is measured by: (1) average age of juvenile offenders; (2) types of criminal offenses charged among juvenile offenders; (3) types of services used by juvenile offenders by age groups and service outcomes; and (4) gaps in services for juvenile offenders including 18-year-olds still under juvenile justice jurisdiction. TYJI completed and reported on the first two measures in the January 1, 2015 JJPOC Progress Report. TYJI is in the process of completing the final two measures focusing on types of services and service outcomes and gaps in services. However, as stated above, additional time is needed to resolve DCF confidentiality concerns around certain data that is necessary for this study.

### **Educational Needs of Students in the Juvenile Justice System**

The JJPOC has directed the TYJI to begin a project to identify the strengths that support and barriers that impede the educational needs of children and youth in the juvenile justice system. The Center for Children's Advocacy will continue to examine the following factors pertaining to children and youth involved in the juvenile justice system include, but not be limited to:

- Ways state agencies and local boards of education collaborate through school-based efforts and other processes;
- Rates of suspensions, expulsions and other school discipline;
- Quality and academic credit provided through education services provided in residential and community-based juvenile justice programs,
- Rates of truancy, chronic absenteeism, and school-based arrests;
- Disproportionate minority contact by regions, districts, and schools; and
- Transition of youth involved with the juvenile justice system from secure facilities and residential programs to schools, re-entry services or to home upon discharge.

The project will provide findings and recommendations to include, but not be limited to reducing suspensions and expulsions, truancy, chronic absenteeism, and school-based arrests, improving education services provided while students are in the juvenile justice system and as they transition from facilities to the community, serving the English Language Learner population and expanding the Raise the Grade initiative. A preliminary report is expected in early Fall 2015.

## Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015

### Results Based Accountability

Public Act 14-217 required public and private juvenile justice agencies to use Results Based Accountability (RBA) process. Since 2005, the Appropriations Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly has been using Results-Based Accountability (RBA), which is a data-driven evaluation tool, to strengthen the legislative budgeting process. It is a disciplined way of thinking and taking action that can be used to improve quality of life in communities, cities, counties, states, and the nation, as well as to improve the performance of programs. RBA is a simple, plain language approach to measurement that puts the focus on the ends and works backward to the means. RBA enables policymakers, funders, and program administrators to identify how well they are doing in achieving a particular quality of life result and where they might need to make changes. If the projected performance is not attainable, the RBA methodology helps stakeholders identify what changes will be needed to “turn the curve,” that is, move the trend line in a positive direction.

TYJI is collaborating with the Charter Oak Group, LLC (COG) to develop a plan for implementing RBA. COG had previously developed an RBA model for the Raise the Age implementation and building upon that model, TYJI and COG convened an advisory group to develop the standardized markers and indicators for evaluating the juvenile justice system, like recidivism. The basic goal is to determine whether children and youth involved in the juvenile justice system are better off after discharge.

The advisory group is reviewing a draft of the plan. COG is conducting a survey of state agencies and service providers to gauge the extent to which RBA is utilized. Once the survey results are compiled and the draft plan revised, a final RBA plan will be submitted to the JJPOC in September 2015.

### Overlap Between Juvenile Justice and Mental Health Services

The Child Health and Development Institute, in collaboration with the TYJI, is assessing the overlap between the juvenile justice system and the mental health care system for children. The project will analyze various data and use qualitative information gathered from the interviews and focus groups along with a literature review to craft a set of specific recommendations for improving systems and practices for meeting the needs of youth. The report will be completed in the summer of 2015 and presented to the JJPOC in the Fall 2015.



## Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015

### Medium Term Goals

The JJPOC medium term goals are based on the five focus areas that were identified throughout the JJPOC monthly meetings. There was a consistent consensus among the committee membership that the focus areas were in need of reform. The focus areas are: diversion, incarceration, recidivism, data interoperability and disproportionate minority contact (DMC)

Based on these focus areas, the TYJI recommended to the JJPOC adoption of the following goals to be met within the next three years (by 2018):

- Increase diversion of children and youth from juvenile court by 20 percent;
- Decrease the number of children and youth confined (incarcerated) in state-run facilities by 20 percent; and
- Decrease the rate of recidivism among juvenile offenders by 10 percent.

The goals were set based on the information presented and reviewed during the JJPOC monthly meetings and a report on the trends of several key measures. The measures are: referrals to the juvenile court; referrals to Juvenile Review Boards (JRBs); admissions to juvenile detention centers, CJTS, Pueblo Unit, Manson Youth Institution and York Correctional Institution; and the rate of re-arrest among juveniles on probation and inmates under 18 discharged from DOC facilities. TYJI acknowledges that there are many systematic and other reasons why children and youth are diverted from the juvenile justice system and that these key measures may not be fully comprehensive. However, the measures selected are specific indicators related to each goal. The following is a summary of the trends of the key measures.

The TYJI proposed several initiatives within each goal area that may achieve the numerical targets. A brief overview of the proposed initiatives is also presented below.

#### Increase Diversion

The measures used to determine the rate in which children and youth are diverted from the juvenile justice system relied upon data that reflects the rate of juvenile court referrals and referrals to Juvenile Review Boards (JRBs). Over the past 10 fiscal years, the trend in the number of children and youth referred as delinquent to the juvenile court decreased – 26 percent from Fiscal Year 04/05 to Fiscal Year 13/14. The anticipated increase in juvenile court referrals due to the implementation of Raise the Age legislation did not occur. So while there were incremental increases in the actual numbers during the implementation years, the over trend shows a consistent decline.

## Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015

There are 76 JRBs statewide of which three operate in the three largest urban areas (Bridgeport, Hartford and New Haven.) From Fiscal Year 08/09 to Fiscal Year 12/13, there was a 31 percent increase in JRB referrals, which are a diversion from juvenile court referral. The upward trend in referrals was driven by the three urban JRBs, which show a 48 percent increase during that same period.

The TYJI proposed the following initiatives to achieve the targeted **20 percent increase in diversion**:

- Open Child, Youth and Family Service Centers (CYFSC) to accept referrals from Juvenile Review Boards
- Standardize JRB protocols and reporting
- Urban JRBs focus on minority populations to reduce DMC
- Conduct a comprehensive assessment of JRBs
- Expand the School Based Diversion Initiative (SBDI)
- Expand memorandum of agreement (MOA) protocols between local schools and police; coordinated by the Office of Policy and Management

### Reduce Incarceration

Over the past 10 years, the rate of confinement in juvenile detention centers and CJTS/Pueblo Unit has not significantly decreased. The trend has, for the most part, remained consistent. Between 2006 and 2014, the trend rate of confinement in juvenile detention centers has decreased by 19 percent and admissions to CJTS/Pueblo Unit have increased two percent. Only the admission of children and youth under 18 to DOC facilities has shown a steady and significant decrease. Between 2007 and 2010, the rate of admissions to DOC was steadily declining and beginning in 2010 with the implementation of Raise the Age the decline continued. Admissions to DOC dropped 81 percent from 2007 to 2014. The dramatic decrease can be attributed to several factors including a decrease in crime, state efforts to reduce reliance on incarceration especially for young offenders, budgetary constraints that shifted the focus from incarceration to more community-based supervision programs and other initiatives to reduce the prison population and implementation of the Raise the Age legislation.

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee  
Status Report July 1, 2015**

To achieve the targeted **20 percent reduction in incarceration** rates, the following initiatives were proposed:

- Decrease technical violations for youth on probation and/or parole
- Improve assessment and client-program matching and
- Address the gaps in services, particularly in mental health and substance abuse programs

### **Reduce Recidivism**

Recidivism is a key indicator of the effectiveness of the juvenile justice system. CSSD tracks the rate of recidivism among adjudicated juveniles under probation supervision and OPM tracks the rate among persons sentenced to prison, including children and youth under 18 under the jurisdiction of the adult criminal justice system. Efforts are underway to implement the CSSD system cross-agency. It should be noted, as previously discussed, IMRP and TYJI are collaborating on an analysis of recidivism rates among this population.

CSSD reported a 9 percent decrease in the rate of new arrests among juvenile probationers within 24 months of their probation start dates. OPM reported 73 percent of inmates under the age of 18 were re-arrested within three years of discharge from prison. Young inmates in the adult system had a higher rate of recidivism than the general inmate population.

The following initiatives were proposed to **reduce recidivism by 10 percent**:

- Validate the risk assessment tools used by juvenile justice agencies  
Train DCF in the Risk, Needs and Responsivity protocols
- Adopt evidence-based programming
- Address gaps in program availability
- Ensure quality assurance in programming and practices and
- Conduct ongoing evaluation and research

## Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015

### Reduce Disproportionate Minority Contact

The trend report showed that children and youth of color were disproportionately represented in all measures used to set the medium-term goals. Therefore, reducing disproportionate minority contact (DMC) has been identified as another medium-term goal. While there is not a target number to reduce DMC, the JJPOC has prioritized it as a focus in achieving the increase in diversion and reductions in incarceration and recidivism rates.

The TYJI is beginning to define the framework for tracking and reporting on disproportionate minority contact throughout the juvenile justice system. The institute will work with national and state DMC experts to design the data collection processes and identify the indicators to be tracked. The TYJI expects to begin regular reporting to the JJPOC in late Fall 2015.

### Improve Data Interoperability

To meet the requirements of its statutory mandate, the JJPOC will rely on accurate data analyses on the policies, procedures and populations of the juvenile justice system. Currently, there are several issues that impede the collecting, merging, sharing and analysis of data across agencies. Most of the issues revolve around confidentiality of data, but research and policy exemptions exist and protocols should be developed to address those issues. Another area is technical capabilities, which vary across state agencies with some being very sophisticated while others are not. The JJPOC has excellent working relationships with several academic institutions that can improve data capabilities.

### New JJPOC Work Groups

Based on the medium-term strategic goals, the JJPOC has restructured and refocused its work groups. The new work groups will focus on: (1) Diversion, (2) Incarceration, (3) Recidivism, and (4) Data Interoperability. Membership of the work groups will consist of JJPOC members and state agencies, advocates, private providers, academic members and experts in the fields.

## Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015

### Long Term Goals

The JJPOC, through recommendations from the work groups, identified specific tasks to be completed to meet its broad statutory mandate. As previously discussed in this report, some tasks are underway and a few have been completed. There are still, however, many projects to begin to develop the information and analyses needed to formulate innovations and reforms to the juvenile justice system.

The following are the research projects that were recommended by workgroups to the JJPOC. The projects will be prioritized and a schedule for initiating and completing the studies will be produced. The TYJI will take the lead to conduct and/or contract with researchers to complete each project.

- A comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of Juvenile Review Boards to: (1) examine the practices of all JRBs to determine whether there should be statewide standardization or allowances for geographical differences; (2) determine if there is, and should be, consistent data collection and data sharing among JRBs; (3) establish common performance measures for effectiveness and evaluate each JRBs; (4) conduct a cost-benefit analysis based on the Connecticut Results First model; and (5) make findings and recommendations on whether the JRB model should be expanded to other communities in Connecticut.
- A review of Family With Service Needs (FWSNs), Children and Youth Family Service Centers (CYFSCs) and other school-based diversion initiatives to examine policies, protocols and processes for “beyond control” and status offending youth and provide a descriptive data analysis of the client population. The study will attempt to develop a statewide, interagency continuum of diversionary programs including FWSN and CYFSC.
- A study of the availability, accessibility and effectiveness of state-funded, community-based substance abuse treatment programs and services for children and youth involved with the state juvenile justice system to include: (1) a descriptive analysis of the children and youth referred to and participating in substance abuse programs and services; (2) examination of CSSD, DCF, DOC and DMHAS contracting processes; (3) an inventory of all state-funded substance abuse services and programs and client eligibility requirements; (4) state agencies’ client referral processes; (5) analysis of program and service availability by type and client population and short- and long-term coverage; and (6) analysis of disproportionate minority access and completion rates. The study will also review evidence-based practices and alternative models for providing congregate care and out patient substance abuse services to juvenile offenders.

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee  
Status Report July 1, 2015**

- A review of client needs assessment and program matching in juvenile offender programs to: (1) inventory and categorize the state-administered and state-funded congregate care and out-patient programs and services, and programs, available to children and youth involved with the juvenile justice system and identify client eligibility requirements for each; (2) describe the needs assessment and treatment planning instruments and processes used by DCF, DOC for youth under 18 years, CSSD, juvenile court and DMHAS for young adults transitioning from juvenile programs and, if necessary, evaluate such instruments for validity; (3) evaluation of the agencies' and providers' abilities to match programs and services to youth in the juvenile justice system based on risk and needs; (4) determine residential and out-patient capacity and conduct a client population projection over the next 10 fiscal years; and (5) academic literature and academic research review of unintended consequences of inappropriate matching of youth to treatment, programs and services.
  
- A study of children and youth involved in domestic violence incidences to: (1) identify the types of offenses and frequency of incidences; (2) identify the charges filed and case outcomes including issuances of protective orders, restraining orders and criminal protective orders; (3) track the recidivism rates among juveniles convicted of domestic violence including violations of protective orders, restraining orders and criminal protective orders; (4) provide descriptive analysis of juvenile involved in domestic violence; (5) calculate the costs of juvenile-involved domestic violence; and (6) describe diversionary programs, educational programs and treatment programs and services for this population. The study would examine best practices for handling juveniles involved in domestic violence and alternative and/or pilot programs having success in reducing incidences and recidivism other states.
  
- An examination of the need for and availability and efficacy of gender-specific residential and out patient services for girls involved with the juvenile justice system.

**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee  
Status Report July 1, 2015**

- A study of additional educational issues school suspensions and expulsions and school-based arrests focusing on: (1) school climate data and School Strategic Profiles; (2) access to educational options for youth statutorily excluded for educational entitlement; and (3) examine best practices and models for reducing suspensions and expulsions. This study will also establish a common definition of “school-based arrest” and collect and examine data on the frequency and types of school-based arrests on public school grounds.
  
- A review of the need for and use of educational surrogates, guardians and specialists for children and youth involved with the juvenile justice system and focus on: (1) definition of education surrogate, guardian, advocate and specialist/consultant and the role, scope of authority and training of each including overlap and/or gaps in their services; (2) process for assigning or accessing each including defining when and why a student would need an educational surrogate, guardian, advocate and/or specialist/consultant; (3) funding for each; (4) identify performance measures to determine effectiveness and efficiency of each including case disposition measures; (5) measure socioeconomic and educational needs of students versus system capacity to provide educational surrogate, guardian, advocate and specialist/consultant system; (6) cost-benefit analysis based on Results First Initiative model; and (7) review academic literature and research in other states or models for educational surrogates, guardians, advocates and specialists/consultants. The study would provide findings and recommendations to improve this service and process.
  
- A comprehensive review of Medicaid reimbursements and private insurance payments for juvenile mental health services for youth involved with the juvenile justice system. The study proposal includes a work group comprised of representatives from the Office of the Health Care Advocate, the Department of Social Services, Office of the Comptroller, Department of Children and Families and economists, actuaries and insurance professionals. The areas of analysis will include, but not be limited to: (1) the rate of Medicaid reimbursements and private insurance payments for juvenile offenders; (2) Medicaid and private insurance coverage for mental health services for youth involved in the juvenile justice system; and (3) the use of DCF-discretionary, flexible funds and voluntary services for youth involved in the juvenile justice system. At the conclusion of the study, the working group will make recommendations to: (1) increase Medicaid reimbursement to Connecticut; (2) determine if private insurance companies are cost-shifting to the public sector; and (3) increase access to DCF-voluntary services by juvenile justice-involved youth.

## Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee Status Report July 1, 2015

One of the most crucial long-term goals is to initiate a process to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of all state-funded, community-based residential and out patient programs and services for children and youth involved with the juvenile justice system. This project will evaluate all categories and types of program and services from diversionary services to secure residential treatment programs. Program effectiveness will be determined based specific evidence-based performance measures, which may be unique to a program or cut across all programs and services (e.g., recidivism.) Embedded in each program effectiveness evaluation is an assessment of disproportionate minority access to programs and services and client completion rates. This is a multi-year effort as not all programs and services will be reviewed at the same time. The TYJI in consultation with the JJPOC will prioritize all programs and services to be evaluated. Priority will be given based on the JJPOC strategic goals and other research provided by JJPOC projects. Additionally, the availability of staff and other resources will be the primary determinate for the number of evaluations conducted during a single year.

### Other Projects

#### Restorative Justice Forum

On April 29, 2015, the Tow Youth Justice Institute held its first Restorative Justice Practices Forum at the University of New Haven. The Tow Foundation provided additional support to bring in the keynote speaker, The Honorable Andrew Becroft, from New Zealand, together with Christina Rurawhe-Gush, Family Group Conferencing Coordinator of the Maori community. The Honorable Bernadette Conway, Juvenile Court Matters, Connecticut Judicial Branch, moderated the discussion focused on use of restorative justice and family group counseling (FGC) for the highest risk juvenile cases, which constitute about 20% of juvenile matters in New Zealand. New Zealand is a model for the world with a successful history of restorative justice practices since the mid-1980s. The forum also included a presentation on restorative justice practices by Professor Donna Decker Morris, JD, University of New Haven Legal Studies, and a panel discussion on restorative justice efforts in Connecticut. The panel consisted of Jeff Vanderploeg, PhD, Child Health and Development Institute/School Based Diversion Initiative (SBDI), Kyisha Velazquez, New Haven Reparation Review Board, Gemma Joseph Lumpkin, New Haven Public Schools, Liz Murphy of RYASAP and Community Mediation, and Antonia Thompson, JD, Stamford Youth Service Bureau Restorative Justice Project. While the forum focused on increasing awareness and knowledge of restorative justice practices, TYJI closed with a call to action for our state to continue restorative justice efforts with particular emphasis in youth justice.



**Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee  
Status Report July 1, 2015**

Two sessions (morning and afternoon) were held to accommodate the nearly 80 invited guests, which included several JJPOC members, DCF and Judicial Branch administrators and staff, community providers, advocates, educators, law enforcement officials and the UNH community. A follow up session is planned for the Fall 2015.

**OJJDP Grant Proposal: Community Supervision/Re-entry**

In June 2015, the Office of Policy of Management (OPM) submitted a grant application to the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) for a \$100,000 planning grant under the “Second Chance Act Smart on Juvenile Justice: Community Supervision.” The purpose of the grant is to support state and local efforts to improve their capacity to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for youth returning to their communities after out-of-home detention or placement. There is a particular emphasis on strengthening continuity of care through the reentry process and reducing recidivism and disproportionate minority contact. Connecticut partners on the grant application include OPM, Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division, Department of Children and Families, State Department of Education (SDE), Department of Correction (DOC), and the JJPOC as well as non-profit service providers, advocates and families and youth. If awarded, grantees will then compete for \$650,000 for implementation of the strategies over a five-year period.