

**THIS MEETING CONTAINS A PRESENTATION**  
**GENDER RESPONSIVENESS WORKGROUP**  
**MAY 23<sup>RD</sup>, 2024**  
**2:00 – 3:00 PM**  
**Web-Based Meeting – Zoom**

**Attendance**

|                   |                  |                     |
|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| TAMMY SNEED       | ERICA BROMLEY    | CHYANN HIGGS        |
| JILLIAN GILCHREST | TRINA SEXTON     | CHRISTINE KENDALL   |
| MARTHA STONE      | BETH HAMILTON    | KIM SELVAGGI        |
| SUKHMANI SINGH    | SHERON GREEN     | ALICIA LIND-WINDHAM |
| SARAH EAGAN       | ERIN WILLIAMSON  | EULACIA GARCIA      |
| SUNINDIYA BHALLA  | SHARMESE WALCOTT |                     |

**TYJI Staff**

BRITTANY LAMARR  
PAUL KLEE

Meeting Objectives:

- Provide legislative updates
- Level-setting conversation of the history of gender responsiveness
- Defining the target population and goals of this workgroup

Meeting Summary:

- **Legislative Updates:**
  - Recommendations passed: Charged with creating a landscape analysis, a gaps and needs assessment, streamline submission of human trafficking data collection
- **History of Gender Responsive Work in Connecticut – Kim Selvaggi**
  - *Summary of Juvenile Justice Reforms in Girls' Services in CT from 1999-2012*
  - Timeline on page 12 of Georgetown Report
  - 1999-2002 – Judicial Branch applied for and received a grant from OJJDP and BJA
    - \$150k awarded with the intent to build one program for pregnant girls
      - Soon realized there was a bigger problem across the entire system in juvenile justice
    - Required a multi-agency advisory board that was connected to partners in Cook County, IL doing similar work in system reform
    - Focused on educating people, themselves, and piloted a girl's probation program
    - Education Advocacy Era: produced study of girls in 2002 in partnership with UConn discussing the overlap between girls in the Child Welfare system and girls in the JJ system

- Legislation kicked off in 2002 with the Office of the Child Advocate tasking the lead in combination with other experts
  - 2004 addressed the FWSN population
  - 2005 report by DCF consultant, interviewed the system's most challenging girls and proposed a service model
  - 2007 discussed eliminating detaining FWSN population
- 2002-2006 Internal System Reforms
  - CSSD changed definition and contract language
  - Established single sex programs, provided training and technical assistance to providers and selves, defined girls specific challenges, and the impact of trauma
  - Intensive work with girls' detention, developed a new paradigm for behavior management, training at state facilities, internal policy changes for requirements that matches girls' needs, and measured improvements including a reduction in incidents
- 2005-2011 New Program Models
  - Kicked off when CSSD, DCF, and providers designed guidelines for girls' services in CT defining what it meant to be a quality provider for girls
  - The Girls Probation Model grew to 17 dedicated probation officers in the State
  - Developed the Center for Assessment, Respite, and Enrichment (CARE Program) to reduce the number of girls in detention with funding from CCSD and DCF
  - Emergence of evidence-based practices and Home-Based interventions across the system
  - DCF Girls' Parole Model and DCF's Girls' Network practice established
- Lesson Highlights
  - Need a funding source to directly support initiatives
  - Research and education must continue in a collaborative way
  - Policy and legislative changes, such as the Raise the Age Act that followed many of these initiatives
  - Training for all staff across all the entire system
  - Measuring outcomes and revising as needed while holding accountability
  - Services for boys improved alongside implementation of girls' services
- Open Discussion
  - One member asked what happened the funding
    - The presented responded that when Judicial stopped servicing the work, the funding stopped as well
  - The same member asked why the connection to probation went away

- The presenter answered that the girls probation model still stands, while the other services no longer exists because CSSD no longer serve that population
  - Another member answered that the gender-responsive model is still present in all 11 courts and has been continuously worked on since
- Another member asked whether there were other documented outcomes
  - The presenter discussed that other system changes were happening simultaneously, making it difficult to identify specific improvements
  - The presenter is willing to dig for other outcomes and improvements
  - One member responded that she may have data from in Niantic where girls' incidents, attendance, and recidivism rates were down
- Another member asked about the difference between the DCF Girls' Network and the Girls' probation
  - The presented said they are different from each other, where CSSD had part of the judicial program and DCF had the deep end of the system due to the bifurcated system, but there was some collaboration
- A member questions the availability of services in present day to serve this population again
  - A member responded with yes, but more justified services are needed, as well as a more flexible system with more training
- A member discussed referring to the past to prepare for the future and seeing more girls diverted from judicially run gender response case management to behavioral health care coordination
- Another member discussed the need to remember considering the girls that are diverted at the front end, where there is a trend in referrals being made for fighting across the state
- A member recommends that the workgroup puts together a resource matrix questionnaire (not interviewing, just simple questionnaire) asking girls specific to CT what they need when they are at the deep end of the system and within our state, what are 4 or 5 things that girls name needing immediately that can be the interruption to the pathway/pipeline
  - These can become the action anchors for the workgroup, rooted in young people's experiences
- Christine Kendall provides an update for a similar workplan already in place
  - A set of interviews with working group members are almost complete
  - Looking to present the findings and opportunities or challenges of the group in June

- Felt that a better map of services available to girls is needed
- Using a Google Survey form only sent out to people that provide relevant services
- Looking to talk directly with girls using a round of focus groups to better understand their needs
  - Create a system map from the girls' perspectives (which way are they navigating the system, where are they getting stuck)
- Once interviews with girls are complete, will be working on full landscape assessment to everyone in July and getting a report put together by the end of the fall
  - A literature review is also in process
- A member provided a suggestion for the survey: in addition to mapping out the service providers, look into eligibility criteria and roles to receive the services and look into the providers' main referral services
- **Workgroup Project Plan**
  - Workgroup legislative charges will be shared out
    - Staff researcher Paul Klee is working on a system to standardize the submission of municipal police data on trafficking
    - Charged with defining what is meant by gender responsiveness
    - Reviewing existing working practices among agencies and community providers, falling under the scope of ROCA's work
    - Review data broken down by race, ethnicity, gender, age, location, and level of system involvement
      - Outlines type of offense/judicial handling only
      - Asked group if interested in girls in STAR homes who aren't judicially involved
      - Need to prioritize data requests, what data is group hoping to receive
    - Review programs and practices that are developed with the input of sexual abuse and trafficking survivors
    - Review service and treatment setting options that specifically address the needs of children with intellectual or other developmental disabilities
    - Supports for youth who identify as trans or gender non-conforming
    - Review specialized treatment foster care for girls who have experienced sexual abuse and/or domestic minor sex trafficking including children with intellectual and other developmental disabilities
    - Recommendations for improvements
- **Update on Municipal Trafficking Data Collection**
  - Brainstorm and have a conversation regarding what data needs to be collected
    - Target 10 to 18-year-old age range

- Break up the data by who is where and if there is a pathway from RTCs to justice involvement
- Need to define whether it is just girls, just under 18, including transgender/non-conforming? What level does the group want to focus on?
- Girls and youth who identify as non-binary or transgender under the age of 18 and involved in JJ or DCF systems
  - Placement is defined broadly as including out-of-home placements, CSSD, DCF, young people diverted
  - Including those on waitlists
- **Closing Remarks**
  - Next month's meeting will prioritize the discussion on the collection of data

**Next Meeting: June 27, 2024**