



**Raising the Lower Age Limit Subgroup
Diversion Work Group
November 5th, 2020
10AM-11:30AM
Zoom Conference Call**

Meeting Summary

1. Review of Additional Data by CSSD

- CSSD presented data on cases for the under 12 delinquent court referrals that involved or were likely to have involved a victim. These charges were examined by Juvenile Probation and the Business Intelligence Department. Charges that might be involved with a victim were flagged if that court referral was based on the Judicial Branch Case Management Information System. Court referrals often involve multiple charges for different statutes, and each statute may or may not involve a victim.
- Overall victim rate is about the same, even though the number of cases does begin to decrease. Just over half of all delinquent court referrals are involved with actual victims. Felony referrals involved a potential/actual victim about 75% of the time, while misdemeanors involved a victim 48% of the time. The top 30 charges including (assault, threatening, larceny, burglary, sexual assault, etc.), with maybe involving a victim includes breach of peace, disorderly conduct, criminal mischief 3rd degree, cruelty to animals). no victims involved are crime including carrying a dangerous weapon, possess a weapon on school grounds,) The chart provided breaks down if there is an identified victim (yes, no, or maybe), the name of the charge, with the number of years from 2015-2019. The limitations to this data were explained in detailed. There are challenges to finding specific information because of the increase of dismissal of cases with youth under 12.
- CSSD is trying to follow at a small number of cases and review their dispositions (judicially handled/non judicially handled) using the information with juvenile probation supervisors with community-based arrests. They will look through some data points and narratives, focusing on particular demographics from probation guidance. CSSD will provide a time frame for review and results.
- There was discussion on family violence incidents and themes of charges. Many of these individuals who have committed risk or harm to another may be victims within their situation. We are moving these children from a punitive situation because they need services, but there can be the accountability with community providers. As we are looking to move from a judicial model to a community model, we need to know what

supports are in place regardless of the label that is given. No matter the victim/perpetrator, there needs to be assessment if they can have access to these resources to the needs of the child.

- The discussion on victim services focused on providing the “victim” with information if an arrest was not going to be made. It was suggested that a card explaining that the offender is under the age of 12 and the Connecticut law has changed could be provided to police officers and other offices to provide to victims. There should be a phone number of a YSB and how the case is handled. There was further discussion on victim compensation and other services available. Victims of crime want to know that something is being done. Providing victims with some information is vital to keeping faith that their government is taking their victimization seriously.
 - i. We need to make sure a restorative justice model is included in the system response we put together. Most of these cases are low levels of restitution, making sure there was some accommodation for these victims in these circumstances. If you look at a restorative model, it is set up for victim/perpetrator or community in a way the court is not set up to do. These children are not just perpetrators but also victims of trauma and a disturbing society. They need mental health and other services. This would be an outgrowth of an investment into restorative practices throughout communities, schools.
- There was further discussion on trauma screening, risk assessment, DCF involvement, childhood victimization, and special disabilities. Specific supports with assessment and home visiting frameworks may reduce other occurrences of abuse and neglect. Ways to approach the evaluation with a two-generational lens and build the interventions useful in CT. An existing system already serves kids ages 7-11 who are successfully diverted and never get referred to court. While there may be concerns about the quality/access to this service array, we suggest that we need to look at this.

2. Discussion on Meeting Materials

- Flowchart Visual
 - i. We had talked about using a community-based diversion system, YSB, as a coordinating hub, and we took the visual from the community-based diversion system specific for the age group for more information and specifics. This is the first draft and not completed.
 - ii. At the top are similar to potential referrals (schools, police, parents, DCF, CBO's, court) and similar to the system with mobile crisis and the hubs by making sure we aren't interpreting the process of the schools with the mobile crisis. Referral to YSB once the mobile crisis is notified. The JRB is inside the YSB because most

JRB is under their YSB, and not always necessary to go directly to a JRB, similar to truancy and other behaviors. Importance of screening and currently, the YSB uses the Ohio Scales Screening tools, and those are done with three versions, youth, worker, and child version; encourages to do the youth/parent intake process. Use of a trauma screener, ecological screens, gather the info to determine others' basic needs that need to be addressed—the flow from the hub to potential services as examples that are not inclusive. Community-based interventions include mental health and specialty programming, including problem sexual behavior, arson/fire setting program, and intensive family support.

- iii. Feedback was provided by the subgroup members regarding the role of pediatrics, additional victim services, accountability, and education.
- iv. It was also suggested that a one-pager be developed on services available to the under 12 population in CT.

3. Other:

- i. Subgroup members were encouraged to volunteer to draft specific content for this plan.
- ii. The timeline for this implementation was discussed:
 - 1. December 11th is the deadline for the diversion workgroup
 - 2. December 18th is the deadline for the executive committee
 - 3. January 7th is when the 2021 JJPOC recommendations package will be sent to the entire JJPOC for review
 - 4. January 21st is when the JJPOC will review and vote on the recommendations

4. Next Steps

- Case Management
- Accountability
- Training & Education
- Measuring Outcomes

CHECKLIST	
<input type="checkbox"/>	RED Lens
<input type="checkbox"/>	Integrating Community Voice
<input type="checkbox"/>	Strategic Plan

Next Meeting- November 19, 2020 at 10AM