



Making connections. Informing solutions.

**Cross Agency Data Sharing / RED Workgroup Meeting**

**September 15, 2025**

**9:30AM-11:00AM**

**Web Based Meeting- Zoom**

1. CCA local RED work update
2. Ken Barone: Update re: equity dashboard work
3. Diversion Policy Tracking Discussion
4. Georgetown Crossover Youth Project Update

**THIS MEETING DID NOT CONTAIN A PRESENTATION**

**JJPOC Cross Agency Data Sharing Workgroup**

**September 15<sup>th</sup>, 2025**

**9:30 AM – 11:00 AM**

**Web Based Meeting- Zoom**

**Attendance**

Aaron Bean  
Brian Hill  
Derrick Gordon  
Eliza Halsey  
Erica Bromley  
Jabarey Wells  
Jessica England  
Joanne Santiago  
Katie Bare  
Katie Breslin

Kelly Orts  
Martha Stone  
Mary Lansing  
Maurice Reaves  
Michele Massores  
Mike Carone  
Nieka Thompson  
Rachel Leventhal-Weiner  
Sharmese Walcott

**TYJI Staff**

Andrew Zhebrak  
Brittany LaMarr  
Erika Nowakowski  
Paul Klee

**Meeting Objectives:**

During the March 17, 2025, Cross Agency Data Sharing Workgroup meeting, CCA provided updates on local Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RED) work. Following this, there was an update on the equity dashboard. Next, the group discussed ongoing developments for the passage of the Statewide Uniform Diversion Policy. The meeting concluded with an update of the Georgetown Crossover Youth Project.

**Meeting Summary:**

**RED Update**

For the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of the year, Black youth continue to be arrested at higher rates than White or Hispanic youth. There was a decrease from 78% to 66% in Bridgeport, though Black youth only make up 26.7% of the student population. In Hartford, there was an increase from 59% to 61%, and Black youth make up for 28% of the student population in Hartford. In New Haven, there was a reduction from 79% to 71%, with Black Youth making up 31% of the student population. In Waterbury, there was an increase from 48% to 52%, and they only make up 20% of the student population. There were spikes in arrests in Waterbury and Hartford, partially stemming from a fight that occurred at Kennedy High School, with approximately 30 students who were arrested. Despite this, there are some positive trends worth noting, such the significant decreases in arrests for youth 12 and under, going from 25 in Q3/Q4 of 2024 to only 8 in Q2 of 2025. There was also a noted decrease in auto theft arrests in New Haven. One of the next focus areas for RED's work is in addressing the increases in Out of School Suspensions (OSS) in New Haven and Waterbury, which outpace the rate of In School Suspensions (ISS). This will be addressed by studying schools with lower suspension rates and adopting potential methods they are using for reduced levels of discipline. Another highlight of the group's work is early

implementation of a diversion policy in Bridgeport, bringing together Connecticut's Court Support Services (CSSD) of the Judicial Branch, local police departments and catalysts in taking an approach addressing this issue. In Waterbury, they developed a sub-committee analyzing crossover youth for service gaps, and evaluating what strategies are best for this population. In New Haven, RED reached an agreement to ensure that all juvenile summonses are reviewed for their diversion eligibility.

Another component of RED includes analyzing service gaps. First the group identified a lack of services available for the 12–15-year-olds, most serve 16–18-year-olds. Additionally, the group highlighted service gaps occurring in YDTs, which should be addressed through the implementation of the youth diversion policy through restorative justice programming. Currently, there are issues with the availability of gender-specific services, mediation, credible messengers, and FLEX funds.

Q: There was a question raised regarding at what age do youth lack access to services?

A: Services across the board in JRBs are lacking regardless of age, but especially for youth under 16.

Q: There was a raised question regarding whether it would be beneficial to include the juvenile service specialist from The Boys and Girls Club into the RED meetings

A: They will be invited to future meetings

Q: Do RED groups collect and report on services that would have been recommended, but funding wasn't available?

A: The reporting is anecdotal, they track referral, what services they refer youth to after panels. Service providers are only capable of recommending what's available, so it's difficult to identify how many youths would have been referred to an alternate non-existing program.

Q: Where is DCF at in getting recently approved funding back into community through YDTs and JRBs?

A: The 35 communities that were not priorly covered by the YSB system are now covered, without leveraging any existing community-based services. Two of the funding lines are strictly limited to direct services, but there are others pertaining to addressing family needs.

Q: Once the Diversion First Plan passes, it will likely demonstrate that there aren't enough services in the community to implement correctly. How do we address this issue?

A: It's potentially worth investing in tracking the data for YDT services across rural, suburban, and urban areas, on what they recommended, and if the youth could not access those services due to insufficient funding and resource access. There are on-going conversations with YSBs to

standardize data collection practices to capture some of these gaps. At this point it may be beneficial to survey YDTs and JRBs for what services gaps their individual locations are experiencing.

Q: How are available services identified and cataloged at each individual YSB so that young people from under resourced municipalities can access additional services or a larger array of services from a neighboring municipality.

A: This current process doesn't exist through CYSA.

Q: Should we start a case study write-up documenting concrete instances of failures in service delivery, to be able to present this information more effectively?

A: This is something the group is now considering and facilitating.

### **Equity Dashboard Update**

There are two phases of work for the equity dashboard, the first will focus on evaluating all of the data this is coming into the equity dashboard, with a goal of tracking racial and ethnic disparities on the community level, and then drilling down and understanding the factors which contribute to these disparities. The Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy (IMRP) crafted a proposal like their earlier work in tracking police department disparities. One way that they are considering expanding the scope of their work is by looking at data through enhanced data mapping currently available on the dashboard and improving data visualization tools. This would involve tracking current patterns and disparities in juvenile crime, in how it varies over time depending on geographic location.

The data should capture the town of residence for the youth, where the legal violation occurs, where they are arrested. In addition, the Equity Dashboard will leverage existing data to analyze juvenile justice involvement and system involvement by age, municipality, and court district. Currently the dashboard does not disaggregate delinquent referrals, detention, or disposition by age cohorts. By bringing this data to light, we may know where young people are being stopped, criminalized, and how it relates to future referrals. The next step of the work would be to implement the intervention, which would be outlined for the JJPOC and other aligned groups to address any of the identified disparities.

Q: Will offense severity be measured, and if so how will it be presented?

A: Yes, there will be an identification of existing data, though they have not decided on the presentation method.

Q: What did you mean by available data? Is this regarding data underlying the public-facing dashboard, or would it include data from data providers, such as CSSD?

A: We're currently discussing data available in the dashboard, the dashboard was the first phase of the project, but now that we are in the second phase in attempting to enhance the existing data, and in using more rigorous statistical analysis to understand existing disparities. There will be conversations from other providers than CSSD to access additional data.

Q: What is the timeline for this project?

A: Approximately a year, with a goal to complete writing a report with recommendations by the end of June

Q: How do we balance privacy and confidentiality for people involved in the juvenile justice system, while extracting as much data as possible?

A: We have a statutory responsibility to ensure privacy and confidentiality, since the records are sealed, we don't share individual record-level data outside the branch. If we were to release that data, it would require a court order prior to sharing those records.

### **Diversion First Policy**

Per Public Act 25-168, the Diversion Workgroup collaborated with the Connecticut Police Officer Standards and Training (POST) Council to design a statewide uniform diversion policy. The statute outlined who would participate in those conversations and what the policy looks, what is remaining determining how police departments would be able to track whether a young person has been diverted for a first- or second-time eligible offense, or any offense which a juvenile court would retain jurisdiction. The policy currently establishes that police departments shall prioritize diversion for first- and second-time offenses for all lower-level misdemeanor offenses.

POST Council will begin reviewing the proposed policy to determine if there are any necessary changes, as they are required to complete this by a specific deadline. There are concerns from law enforcement officials in being able to confirm that the youth has not been diverted before in a municipality they have no jurisdiction over. The Diversion Workgroup is attempting an existing software system that may perform that function, thus alleviating this issue.

Q: There was a question regarding whether or not there is a software system in place for police or the court to look up prior charges young people have incurred and if it could be used for tracking if a youth has already been diverted?

A: This is the MAJEB system – which allows law enforcement officials to determine whether they arrested a youth or adult has an active or pending case within a 90 day period, but it doesn't pertain to diversion. This is a question for CSSD, and if the software can be extended into other uses.

Q: With MAJEB – Diversion Information is not currently by this system. Would it be possible for police departments currently collecting diversionary data to send them to another statewide system, such as the CIS, which aggregates arrest data currently? While it currently does not include juvenile arrests and referrals, it may be a preferable alternative to the MAJEB system.

A: We are open to considering this software system and will meet to have these conversations.

Q: There is a comment asking if law enforcement officials are over-concerned with youth reoffending and that their focus on youth failing to get through diversion is unwarranted

A: In earlier conversations with law enforcement, they had concerns with youth undergoing diversion and reoffending and assessing that they aren't making the same mistake by rediverting a young person who's been previously diverted. The workgroup is interested in ensuring that youth are assigned to the service most helpful for their needs, and if a youth could not successfully complete the diversionary process, it is fair to direct them out of that.

### **Crossover Youth Project Update**

This project came about to test a data matching strategy, with 15 agencies agreeing to share the necessary data. It focused on work completed a decade ago to identify crossover youth populations that engaged with both DCF and CSSD. The goal of this project is to test the data matching strategy and update existing research from a decade ago.

There are set ethical, political, and regulatory risks in data sharing. The benefit of privacy-enhancing technology is that a lot of these risks are around the privacy of individuals represented in administrative datasets. The PETs enable you to not have to share private information, and still across the datasets. The technology discussed today was created using secure hash encoding. This would take the first name, last name, date of birth, and convert it into a linking key that can enable analysis across all systems. It would go from de-identification to a framework of usable data.

The benefit of testing this technology is it offers a comparison for the standard data matching process, as currently data sharing and matching services are completed through external research. With this, it would be possible to implement a consistent routine data sharing using PETs between JBCSSD and DCF.

Q: Once a data-key is assigned, does it track that individual across various data sets and across agencies, or does it change every time someone asks a new question?

A: The hash linking code should be the same, but there's not currently a plan to have that same hashing code assigned to other agency datasets for persistent linking. We could still establish a

question that's matched on a routine basis, which is something we already do, eliminating the need for a real time connection. Within one data source, you have the ability to choose what project an individual could be observable in.

Q: RED Meetings collect data on crossover youth, but people were not capturing the full list of DCF involvement, only containing it to group homes and committed to DCF. The RED committees then broadened it and extended it to any kind of protective supervision. How broad are the definitions this project is using?

A: This depends on the utilization of the project, this is less about crossover youth and more about matching people across systems, to be able to support the identification of crossover youth, whatever that definition may be.

**Next Meeting: November 17, 2025**