



THIS MEETING DID CONTAIN A PRESENTATION – UPDATES AND DISCUSSION

JJPOC Diversion Workgroup

November 4, 2022

11:00-12:30

Virtual Meeting – ZOOM

Summary

- Dillinger Data gave a Landscape presentation on data they collected regarding Connecticut YSB and JRBs
 - This report discusses:
 - The context for the analysis
 - How data was collected
 - In-depth analysis regarding the JRB and YSB data
 - Recommendations based on the data
 - The recommendations have also been disseminated to DCF and CYSA to be implemented
 - This analysis was done because the Youth Initiative Taskforce gave recommendation to collect more data and the JJPOC approved that recommendation
 - Found that it was hard to measure the effect of YSB/JRBs, so this data was designed to identify barriers that YSBs and JRBs were facing
 - Since much data is not online, this analysis focused more on if the programs were functioning in accordance with State laws and mandates
 - 94% of JRBs and 96% of YSBs in the state participated
 - Wanted to differentiate the situations of different YSBs- look at budgeting, types of core staff, types of youth, the city
 - Each question were scored from 1-3 (each section was the averaged for an overall score)
 - 1: Room for Growth and Support
 - 2: Striving for Success
 - 3: Maximizing Impact
 - 7 benchmarks for YSBs were identified
 - ACU function
 - Equity and Inclusion
 - Data Collection and Use
 - Standards and Guidelines
 - Training and Staffing
 - Community Hub
 - Identify, Match and Access Services
 - 7 benchmarks for JRBs were identified
 - Restorative Justice
 - Equity and Diversity
 - Individual Plans
 - Standards and Guidelines
 - Training and Staffing



- Data Driven
 - Youth and Family Involvement
- The analysis attempted to identify what a typical YSB and JRB looks like
 - A lot of variation
- Were able to identify shifts and trends in data for the overall state
- Based on tiering JRBs excel in Youth and Family Involvement but could improve Training and staff, all other categories were in the middle of these two
 - Barrier in Staffing and Training is constrained resources (money, time, and people)
 - Discussed looking into offering online, on-demand training
- Based on tiering YSBs do best in ACU Functions but could improve in Data Collection and Use (scored lower than JSBs overall)
- Discussion regarding major drivers for success (looked at top 20% of YSBs and JRBs then compared the two)
 - YSBs with more community partners, more successful
 - JRBs with more resources in community and those who followed protocols are more successful
- Overall feedback was that the survey was educational because it gave YSBs and JRBs an idea of what data to collect
- Each YSB and JRB was given report with their data, state data, and recommendations
- Discussed computerizing YSB and JRB data as well as next step of shorter analysis to see improvements
- Discussion regarding the relationships between schools and YSBs
- Discussion regarding Alternatives to Arrest Subgroup Recommendations
 - Final bill from the initial report did not pass last session, therefore an addendum is being added for this year
 - Giving implementation date of January 1, 2023
 - Most of the offenses listed are already being diverted, it is just occurring post-arrest (discussed again later in meeting regarding idea that diversion will not overwhelm YSBs)
 - Discussion regarding the offense being diverted only the first two times, otherwise it would completely decriminalize the act (decriminalization was recommended at one point)
 - If diversion is unsuccessful, the case is referred to the individual that made the original referral
 - Serving agency will know but law enforcement won't need to share data
 - A referral form was created which will create consistency
 - Updates regarding planning to train “feeder systems” (schools, law enforcement, etc.) on diversion programming
 - Reminder that this was created because some offenses were being referred to court more in some communities than in others, goal to create consistency
- Discussion regarding the recommendations of the Raise the Age Subgroup



- Discussion regarding what age to raise it to (plan is to raise it to 12 then hopefully 14 later)
 - Data highly supports moving age to 12, but 14 less supported by data
 - There are other bills being raised that may support moving the age to 12-14
- Recommendation to do implementation report on year into implementation (July 1, 2024)
- The addendum draft will be available the 18th, then edits will be made, and the final draft will go to the JJPOC at the December 2nd meeting
 - Brief discussion about recommendations from:
 - Incarceration work group: commissary
 - Community expertise work group: membership