



## JJPOC RED Workgroup MEETING

MAY 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2024

9:00 am- 10:30 am

Web-Based Meeting – Zoom

**THIS MEETING DOES NOT CONTAIN A PRESENTATION- DISCUSSIONS AND UPDATES**

### Attendance

Kim Traverso	Chris Dutcher	Erica Bromley	Martha Stone	<b>TYJI Staff</b>
Derrick Gordon	Steve Smith	Ashad Hajela		Brittany LaMarr
Gus Marks- Hamilton	Indre Fishman	Joanne Santiago		Paul Klee
Joshua Berneggar	Hector Glynn	Kathryn Dube		Shelby Henderson

### Meeting Summary

#### 1. **CCA'S Updates on Local RED Workgroup Meeting**

- There had been 4 local RED Meetings since this group last met
- Local RED Workgroups are in Hartford, Bridgeport, New Haven, Waterbury, and Hamden
- Topics Discussed included,
  - 13 students aged 12 or under were arrested in Danbury in the last quarter
    1. This has been addressed by the Workgroup in conjunction with CSSD and the Department of Education.
    2. The arrests were also a topic of discussion at the LIST meeting
      - 1) The Youth Service Bureau had been trying to get into the main offending schools, but they were having issues with scheduling
        - i. The Connecticut State Department of Education had gotten in contact with the Special Education Division, who oversees school discipline, and they were seemingly unaware of the arrests.



1. This was concerning because state policy stated that as soon as a student was arrested, the schools were supposed to immediately call the superintendent
  - ii. The Connecticut State Department of Education said they would work on getting into contact with the principals of the aforementioned schools.
3. At the time of this meeting, there was no information regarding the nature of the arrests.
  - 1) There was speculation that this could have been because the most recent superintendent of Danbury had resigned in February, so at this time there was an interim superintendent. Another possible reason cited was Danbury's recent breach in PowerSchool data.
  - 2) While the Department of Education understood that Danbury was going through a lot of changes at this time, they felt that it did not excuse their abnormal school-based arrest rates.
  - 3) The workgroup noted that the schools in question had declined to implement School Based Diversion Initiatives prior to this report.
4. It was determined that with the exception of Danbury, other jurisdictions have just about eliminated the practice school-based arrests for students under 12 years old.
- The local RED workgroups also had been working to identify the gaps in student services. This included:
  1. Chronic Absenteeism in High School Students,
    - 1) specifically, in the
      - i. 9<sup>th</sup> Grade repeaters in Hartford
      - ii. Alternative School Students in Waterbury
    - 2) LEAP had not been showing signs of success in decreasing truancy and absenteeism rates so far.
  2. Vocational and Summer Programming
    - 1) The committee noted that in some instances, Students must be disenrolled in school to get into vocational programs
    - 2) There was also concern over an excess demand for summer programming as well as the longevity of enrollment in summer programming
  3. Substance Abuse Inpatient
- At this time the workgroup asked additional questions regarding this update, including,
  - Were there any academic enrichment activities offered over the summer in the RED cities?



1. The workgroup was not confident that academic enrichment activities were being offered to every student in RED cities.
  - 1) Such programs had a very competitive enrollment process
2. There was also concern that if these programs didn't have an interactive supervision component, the students will drop out soon after the program had begun.
  - 1) This concern was supported by the fact that completion numbers for academic enrichment activities last year were very low
  - 2) Dropouts had been linked to student issues with
    - i. Transportation
    - ii. Not receiving stipend payments quickly enough
- The group asked if there was a plan to overcome those structural barriers
  1. The work group was told that the funding was available, but no one had any ideas to amend the programs.
- The workgroup asserted that they would like to ask The Department of Children and Families as well as DEMUS for a presentation on available services for substance abuse inpatients
- The group also expressed an interest in hearing what the LEAP program actually did during their home visits.

## **2. Updates Regarding The Center for Children's Learning Policy**

- Effective on April 15, the CCLP would no longer be contracting with the JJPOC
- No reason was given, the Tow Youth Justice Institute Staff have been working to get in contact with them with little to no success.
- There were some Deliverables as well as a progress report on those deliverables, but nothing was complete. The deliverables included:
  - A User Guide for the Equity Dashboard
  - A Policy Dashboard which would include:
    1. What the JJPOC has done
    2. What policy the JJPOC has gone over
    3. Status of JJPOC recommendations
- The hope was that by the end of the fiscal year, there would be an update on those projects.

## **3. Update on RED Collaboration with Diversion Work Group**

- The RED workgroup had compiled a list of the diversion policies in all 50 states and presented them to the leadership of the Diversion Workgroup
- The workgroups were looking at gathering data from CT as far as what is going on with diversion issues in the state, specifically looking at different needs-assessment tools
- The group was informed that there was a very tight tie line as far as deliverables go for this collaboration.



- No decisions had been made at the time of this meeting
  - It was suggested that this project could be rolled out in two phases because of the time constraint.
  - Conversations still needed to happen including,
    1. Who should oversee Youth Service Bureaus and Juvenile Review Boards?
    2. Should Youth Service Bureaus be mandated for every region? Just those accepting state funding?
    3. What standards must be met in every Youth Service Bureau and Juvenile Review Board?
    4. What does diversion mean?
- 4. Potential JJPOC Reporting System Proposed by TYJI
  - The Tow Youth Justice Institute has been brainstorming ways to better illustrate the purpose of the JJPOC to the public. This idea comes after feedback regarding the current reporting systems.
  - Their idea was to create a timeline to work in conjunction with the Equity Dashboard and the Cross Agency Data Sharing Workgroup, etc. to spotlight important information and data from all areas of the JJPOC.
    - The intent was to connect dots across all of the JJPOC workgroups to get a fuller picture of the JJPOC as a whole, as well as to compare different municipalities' juvenile justice data and policies.
  - The committee asked that the timeline also focus on outcomes in the community and that it is specific enough to lead to actionable items.
  - The committee asked how communities will be selected for this timeline.
    - Concern was raised about pinpointing certain communities to speculate about their data without any background knowledge, as well as making sure that the actionable items recommended based on the data are doable for these communities given their, in some cases limited, resources.
      1. This concern was rebutted with the fact that people are already making assumptions based on the equity dashboard, and a timeline would allow for the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee to connect the dots instead of just leaving the public to form their own opinions.
    - There was also concern about the data on the timeline inadvertently painting a negative picture
      1. The workgroup was reminded that anything published on behalf of the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee would be vetted through multiple people and would be discussed thoroughly before it was released.



# University of New Haven

---

HENRY C. LEE COLLEGE OF  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND FORENSIC SCIENCES



- It was suggested that a part of this timeline project should be local outreach to train the municipalities in how to use the data to better inform their decisions, as well as give the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee context for community data.

**Next Meeting: July 17th, 9:00 am-10:30 am**