



The Connecticut Success Story: Raising the Age of Juvenile Court Jurisdiction

Overview

Connecticut locks up more children in adult prisons than any other state in the nation. Approximately 425 youth are held in adult prisons in Connecticut each year.¹ This is mainly because Connecticut is one of only three states that tries all 16 and 17 year-olds as adults – even those youth accused of minor and nonviolent offenses.² Deprived of the rehabilitative focus of the juvenile system, Connecticut’s court-involved youth have been denied appropriate services, given limited educational and employment opportunities, and exit the adult system stigmatized with criminal convictions. However, this is all about to change. Thanks to the work of the “Raise the Age CT” campaign coordinated by the Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance (CTJJA), and the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee (JJPIC), a legislatively-mandated committee comprised of key stakeholders, legislation to raise the age of juvenile court jurisdiction in the state was approved in June 2007. The combined efforts of legislators – in particular legislative champions, Senators Toni Walker and Toni Harp, state agencies, law enforcement officials, judicial officers, advocacy and grassroots organizations, parents and family members, led the Connecticut state legislature to unanimously pass Public Act 07-4’ returning 16 and 17 year-olds to juvenile court jurisdiction.³ Signed into law by Governor Jodi Rell, the expansion will be effective January 1, 2010. To guarantee proper planning and implementation of the law, a new committee, the Juvenile Justice Policy and Operations Coordinating Council (JJPOCC), has already begun helping Connecticut focus its resources on effective prevention programs and ensuring the systems and services are in place to rehabilitate youth who come into contact with the system.

Connecticut’s success is one example of how state legislatures across the country are reconsidering laws allowing youth to be prosecuted in the adult criminal justice system. This policy brief outlines the critical features of the successful campaign to raise the age of jurisdiction in Connecticut. The state’s inclusive and solution-oriented approach serves as an excellent template for other state legislatures seeking to enact widespread changes to their juvenile and criminal justice systems.

Treating Youth As Adults Was Not Working in Connecticut

Nearly 8,000 youth in Connecticut enter the adult court system each year, the vast majority for non-violent crimes (96% of the 16 and 17 year-old youth arrested were charged with non-violent crimes).⁴ Despite the low-level offenses, 16- and 17-year-olds in Connecticut were being adjudicated as adults, branding them as criminals for life. The law was also having a devastating impact on youth of color. Although African-Americans represent only 13% of the youth population, over 82% of youth held in adult corrections were youth of color.⁵

Connecticut’s punitive approach toward youth attracted much criticism from prosecutors and advocates alike because it did not reduce crime, nor did it function to rehabilitate youth. Former US Attorney and current Connecticut State Senator Edward

April 2009

By Neelum Arya,
Ian Augarten, and
Yaamini Rao*

Meyer noted that “[t]reating young offenders like adult criminals is not tough on crime...placing children in adult prisons increases the likelihood that they will re-offend and escalate into violence.”⁶ Part of the problem is that the adult prison system in Connecticut, like most adult systems across the country, is not equipped to help youthful offenders become contributing members of society upon reentry. William Carbone, director of court support services for the state judicial branch, admitted, “Our services for 16- and 17-year-olds are minimal. [When] you're faced with someone who has committed a crime and been convicted, if you don't have programs appropriate for that age group, you're going to see more of them incarcerated.”⁷ The lack of educational, vocational, and other services for 16- and 17-year-olds means that many youth in Connecticut were more likely to commit new crimes.

Connecticut’s experience is backed up by national research that finds treating youth as adults are more likely to re-offend. According to the Task Force on Community Preventive Services supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, youth who are transferred to the adult criminal system are 34% more likely than youth retained in the juvenile court system to be re-arrested for violent or other crime.⁸

Advocates for Change

According to Abby Anderson, Executive Director of the Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance (CTJJA), there were efforts to look at raising the age for years, but the policy proposal was able to move forward only after the CTJJA formed the “Raise the Age CT” campaign in 2005 and there were strong legislative champions in leadership positions. The CTJJA, an organization representing the leading children’s rights organizations in the state, decided that focusing efforts on a campaign to raise the age of jurisdiction could also result in a more efficient and cost effective juvenile justice system as well.

In 2005, the tragic suicide of 17-year-old David Burgos brought new urgency to the issue and helped the “Raise the Age CT” campaign spur the General Assembly to action. Burgos, who was suffering from untreated mental health conditions, was incarcerated in an adult facility on a probation violation when he took his life.⁹ As James McGaughey, Executive Director of the Office of Protection and Advocacy said, “This individual was not convicted of a crime. You have to wonder if there were alternatives available instead of sending him to jail. That’s of greater concern to me...How does a kid this age wind up there, particularly someone with a history of mental illness.”¹⁰ This stark reminder of the harmful effects of trying youth in the adult criminal justice system renewed interest in changing Connecticut’s law. Gary Kleblatt, a Department of Children and Families spokesman, said, “Undoubtedly this is a real tragedy and it gives us all an ...occasion to think about how to better help vulnerable young people.” And state Child Advocate Jeanne Milstein said, “I’m very concerned about this issue. There is an increase in the number of children ending up in the adult criminal justice system. The adult criminal system is becoming another layer of the children’s mental health safety net.”¹¹

Focusing on the target population of youth in the adult system provided CTJJA with a unique opportunity to achieve change. Youth in the adult system are not really “owned” by any agency – the traditional juvenile justice agencies don’t pay much attention to these youth since they are not within their jurisdiction, and their numbers are so small relative to the overall adult population that adult criminal justice agencies have no incentive or directive to address their specific needs. In Connecticut, the 16-

and 17 year-olds account for about 10% of all adult criminal cases. Raising the age of jurisdiction would require that multiple agencies work together (e.g., mental health, education, human services) in new and effective ways to appropriately address the needs of these youth, to ensure get them back on track and reduce the likelihood they will reoffend.

Throughout 2006 and 2007, CTJJA and other campaign partners organized events (e.g., legislative breakfasts) across the state to reach out to different communities and legislators to educate them about the how raising the age of jurisdiction was a better public policy to effectively deal with these youth and improve public safety. Legislators and leaders from area school districts, community organizations, state agencies, and family advocates were all able to discuss their shared desire to improve the lives of Connecticut youth.

Overcoming the Opposition

As the “Raise the Age CT” campaign gained momentum, a growing number of policymakers were ready to support the change. However, certain objections are almost inevitable and those objections needed to be addressed head on in order to move forward. CTJJA helped bring the leading experts in the field to speak to legislators during “Educate the Legislature” days about the impact of trying youth as adults on youth, on the criminal justice system and on public safety.

Adolescent Brain Development: In response to claims that youth “know right from wrong,” Dr. Abigail Baird, a leading researcher on adolescent brain development, testified that teenagers’ brains are not fully developed and that adolescents take longer to judge whether an idea is bad or not, and they are slower to respond appropriately. Other studies have shown that children don’t consider the future consequences of their actions, and are greatly influenced by peer pressure. Even the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized the differences between adults and juveniles in their recent decision to overturn the juvenile death penalty. “It’s clear to me that 16- and 17-year-old children simply aren’t far enough along in their maturing processes to be treated as adult offenders who are presumably better able to calculate – and ignore – the potential consequences of anti-social and criminal behavior” said Senator Toni Harp.¹²

Recidivism and Holding Youth Accountable: Dr. Donna Bishop was able to testify about what is nationally known about recidivism rates for youth prosecuted in the adult criminal system. Studies comparing the recidivism rates of youth processed in the juvenile system with those handled in the adult system indicate that youth processed in the adult system are likely to re-offend more quickly and at higher rates making trying youth as adults counterproductive. However, raising the age of jurisdiction does not preclude holding youth accountable. “[Accountability] is an important component of rehabilitation,” Rep. Toni Walker said after the bill was signed. “There are still penalties in place for kids who commit crimes. But we will hold them accountable in a setting that’s designed to improve their behavior rather than exacerbate it. Sending kids to adult prisons is a great way to create adult criminals. Connecticut is now out of that business.”¹³

Costs: A major concern of legislators and agency officials was the strain that would be placed upon the juvenile system’s finances and resources. Estimating the economic

impact of moving juvenile offenders from the adult criminal justice system to the juvenile justice system is incredibly challenging. While advocates acknowledged that providing services to youth in the juvenile justice system can cost more than providing them with a cell in the adult system, they raised questions about the long-term cost of doing nothing. Currently, youth in Connecticut's adult system have access to very few services and very little treatment. This means behaviors are unchanged and underlying causes of criminal behavior are not addressed. As a result, recidivism rates are high. High recidivism means increased harm and the repeated expense of paying for people to go through the system again and again. Instead, advocates made the case for the benefits of investing in services and treatment up front to reduce recidivism and lower long-term costs.

Economist John Roman at the Urban Institute testified that moving 16- and 17-year-olds back to the juvenile system would return about \$3 in benefit for every \$1 in cost, assuming no new juvenile facilities were needed. Even with new construction, Roman estimated the result would be a little less than a \$1 return for every \$1 invested during the years of construction, increasing to a \$3 return for every \$1 invested in following years.¹⁴ Although the short-term cost may be high, the long-term investment pays off.

Intervention and Public Safety: Peter Greenwood, an expert on evidence-based programs, also testified that nearly all "career criminals" begin as juvenile offenders. Improving programs and reforms for juveniles would decrease the numbers who become serious criminals as adults, ultimately having a huge impact on crime rates and individual lives. After surveying the literature of delinquency prevention and intervention programs in the U.S., Greenwood testified that the best return on taxpayers' investments comes from programs that focus primarily on training, empowering, and assisting families and guardians of troubled adolescents.

Legislators Step Up to the Challenge

In response to public concern about the death of David Burgos and with the information from the "Educate the Legislator" days in hand, in 2006 the General Assembly mandated the formation of the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee (JJPIC) (Appendix A) and developed a budget to hire outside contractors to assist with the effort.¹⁵ The JJPIC was charged with submitting a fiscally responsible "plan for the implementation of any changes in the juvenile justice system that would be required in order to extend jurisdiction in delinquency matters and proceedings to include sixteen-year-old and seventeen-year-old children within the Superior Court for Juvenile Matters."¹⁶ The JJPIC was to ensure that solutions be cost-effective and satisfy the needs of youth while fostering community development and safety. The Committee became a way to ensure all stakeholders had a voice in the process, and there was a method to achieving consensus.

With oversight from the Vera Institute, the National Center for State Courts and Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc., provided consultation and research for the workgroups necessary to finalize the proposal. The *Front-End Workgroup* developed recommendations so that current systems and involved parties would be prepared for a change in jurisdictional age. The *Court-Related Issues Workgroup* worked to ensure that court dockets, courthouses, attorneys, and staff were ready for a sizeable increase

in the population. Finally, the *Services Workgroup* sought to ensure that appropriate services would be available to the new population joining the juvenile system.¹⁷

The JJPIC met biweekly over the course of a year, with the early part of the year focused upon hearing the testimony of various practitioners and experts. These meetings helped to educate policymakers and invest stakeholders in the reform process. Presenters included representatives from the major Connecticut state agencies as well as advocates, researchers, and social service practitioners. Law enforcement representatives discussed how the reform could affect arrest and interrogation procedures and victims' rights. The Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services talked about confidentiality issues and the need for more resources to aid youth with substance abuse issues. The State Board of Education discussed their policies to ensure that youth get adequate academic support and counseling. The Department of Children and Families outlined the needs of court involved-youth with concurrent abuse or neglect cases. Presentations also addressed practical concerns such as budgeting, staff, and interdepartmental communication and were able to recommend specific strategies for youth development and rehabilitation.

The "Raise the Age CT" campaign worked to involve interest groups from diverse communities throughout the state, including families of incarcerated youth, and these groups were given an advisory role to the JJPIC. Over the course of the year, each interested party was given a chance to answer the Committee's questions as well as make recommendations for change. Participants aired concerns in the open and worked towards compromise instead of building opposition. "All of those people needed to be at the table and we needed to be able to see eye-to-eye," said Representative Walker. "We all needed to be able to negotiate."¹⁸ Christine Whidden, warden of the Manson Youth Institution echoed this idea saying, "We learned things from being at the same table. I was able to build relationships and share information with people I had not had contact with before."¹⁹

The collaboration between experts, researchers, practitioners, and community members at the JJPIC meetings proved an essential component of the "Raise the Age CT" campaign. At the end of the process, the Vera Institute of Justice, who managed the bi-weekly discussions, synthesized the findings into a final report. According to Abby Anderson, legislators in the General Assembly began to recognize through these sessions that "raising the age would give youth a chance to succeed and improve overall community safety."²⁰

A Strong Plan for Change

On February 12, 2007, the JJPIC submitted its Final Report, listing five key recommendations in the form of the "Implementation Plan."²¹ The recommendations were:

- 1. Pass legislation in the 2007 session to raise the age of juvenile jurisdiction from 16 to 18** after a two-year planning period. Postponing the effective date has allowed state agencies to reorganize, train and hire appropriate staff, implement new policies and procedures, and revamp their current budgets.

2. **Improve court diversion and pre-trial detention practices** by focusing on programs and policies that can divert more youth from secure detention at the time of arrest. The JJPIC recommended enhancing community-based programs and called upon officials to reduce pre-trial detention for youth of all ages.

3. **Establish regional youth courts** to exclusively serve the 16 and 17 year-old population. To plan for the influx of 16- and 17-year-olds to the juvenile court system, the JJPIC worked closely with the National Center for State Courts to develop solutions to minimize construction costs. Youth courts will make use of existing underutilized courthouse facilities and be spread across the state.

4. **Phase in services and supports for 16- and 17-year olds** to ensure services for younger youth are not diluted. The JJPIC believed that prevention, diversion, and intervention services must be developed and tailored to the individual, and provided in the least restrictive manner, all while maintaining safety of the community. To accomplish these goals, the JJPIC recommended expanding the probation workforce and assigning veteran officers to the older adolescents. State agencies will expand and adapt the existing array of juvenile programs while paying particular attention to mental health and substance abuse services. The JJPIC also recommended creating new educational and vocational programs.

5. The final recommendation of the JJPIC was to continue the successful collaborative committee structure used by the JJPIC throughout the implementation process of the law by **establishing a policy and operations coordinating council** to “monitor the implementation of the central components of the implementation plan developed by [JJPIC]... concerning changes required in the juvenile justice system to expand jurisdiction to include persons sixteen and seventeen years of age.”²²

After the JJPIC report came out in February of 2007, legislation was written reflecting the recommendations included in the report. The “Raise the Age CT” campaign worked with Sen. Harp and Rep. Walker to get a second Educate the Legislature Day that March, hosted by the Appropriations, Judicial and Children’s Committees of the Legislature. The group invited national experts to discuss how to serve 16- and 17-year-olds in the juvenile justice system. “In 2006 we had to help legislators understand why treating youth as adults was poor public policy. In 2007 we wanted to help them figure out how to serve those youth in the juvenile system effectively,” said Anderson. Nearly 300 citizens came to the state capitol that day as a visible sign of support for Raise the Age. An e-mail, postcard and phone call campaign also helped to convince legislators that a change in the age of juvenile court jurisdiction was something their constituents favored. No specific bill passed that session, but the language suggested by the JJPIC was included as part of Public Act 07-4, the state’s budget implementing bill. This legislation called for a two-year delay between bill passage and full implementation of the change, so 16- and 17-year olds would be included in the juvenile justice system as of January 1, 2020.

Putting Solutions into Place

Connecticut State Representative Toni Walker and Senator Toni Harp, who led the legislative effort to have the law changed, are co-chairs of the Juvenile Justice Policy and Operations Coordinating Council (JJPOCC) along with Secretary Robert Genario of the Office of Policy and Management. A wide cross section of stakeholders participate

in JJPOCC including police chiefs, children’s advocates, lawyers, judges and representatives from state agencies (see Appendix B).

The JJPOCC met bimonthly beginning in September 2007 to monitor each agency’s progress towards compliance with the mandate of Public Act 07-4²³. The agencies use this forum to discuss their concerns with the plan, such as the impact on local costs and staffing. The JJPOC continues to collaborate with state agencies, community based service providers, parents, and other interest groups in order to make sure each party has a voice as plans are implemented. Even *before* the legislative change takes place, work has already begun. For example, all probation officers working with 16- and 17-year-olds will receive training around supervision practices and interventions targeted at the unique developmental needs of older adolescents and their families.

A radical change such as raising the age of jurisdiction can galvanize a movement. The “Raise the Age CT” Campaign has created a new sense of enthusiasm for the juvenile justice field in Connecticut. The change in age has provided Connecticut with a rare opportunity to offer innovative visions for the future of juvenile justice. Connecticut is incorporating the best ideas from existing juvenile and adult court processes as they plan for the future. Connecticut expects that as a result of changing the age of juvenile court jurisdiction there will be: lower re-arrest rates; fewer youth incarcerated, placed or hospitalized; reduced use of illicit substances; reduced minority representation; more youth completing school; increased engagement in pro-social activities; better family functioning; and improved public safety.

Lessons Learned

The strength of the “Raise the Age CT” campaign and the JJPIC committee lies in their collaborative spirit. State legislative champions took advantage of in-state expertise as well as consultants’ research data to develop cost-effective and practical solutions. These solutions were shared and vetted through constant communication between legislators, state agency officials, advocates, and other interested parties. By encouraging open dialogue and utilizing community support and public education, the “Raise the Age CT” campaign also demonstrated the urgency for reform. Holding the whole process together was strong, determined legislative leadership. Senators Harp and Walker built the coalition for reform while constantly reminding everyone that, “we have to make this change because we have to save the children of this state, and give them opportunities to become a better person.”²⁴

Connecticut’s “Raise the Age” campaign can be replicated in other states by modeling the key elements of working collaboratively with all stakeholders, identifying strong legislative leadership, and executing a public education and advocacy campaign based on solid research. Connecticut has set a powerful example in the field of youth development and criminal justice reform by improving their system to foster the overall rehabilitation and development of youth without compromising public safety. Other state legislatures can look to their template for legislative change.

For more information about the Raise the Age campaign in Connecticut, log onto the campaign website at <http://www.raisetheagect.org>.

Appendix A

The Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee

Connecticut House Bill No. 5846

Public Act No. 06-187 9 of 89

Sec. 16. (*Effective from passage*) There is established a juvenile jurisdiction planning and implementation committee that shall consist of the following members:

- (1) Six members of the General Assembly, one of whom shall be appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate, one of whom shall be appointed by the majority leader of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives and one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;
- (2) the chairpersons and ranking members of the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the judiciary and human services, or their designees;
- (3) the Chief Court Administrator, or the Chief Court Administrator's designee;
- (4) the Commissioner of Children and Families, or the commissioner's designee;
- (5) the Commissioner of Correction, or the commissioner's designee;
- (6) a judge of the superior court assigned to hear juvenile matters, appointed by the Chief Justice;
- (7) the Chief Public Defender, or the Chief Public Defender's designee;
- (8) the Child Advocate, or the Child Advocate's designee;
- (9) the Chief State's Attorney, or the Chief State's Attorney's designee;
- (10) the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, or the secretary's designee; and (11) four members of the advocacy community, two of whom shall be appointed by each of the cochairs of the Juvenile Court Jurisdiction Committee.

The members of the General Assembly appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives and the president pro tempore of the Senate shall serve as the cochairs of the committee. All appointments to the committee shall be made not later than thirty days after the effective date of this section. Any vacancy shall be filled by the appointing authority. The chairpersons of the committee shall schedule the first meeting of the committee to be held not later than sixty days after the effective date of this section. The committee shall plan for the implementation of any changes in the juvenile justice system that would be required in order to extend jurisdiction in delinquency matters and proceedings to include sixteen-year-old and seventeen-year-old children within the Superior Court for Juvenile Matters. On or before February 1, 2007, the committee shall submit a report, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, on the committee's findings, together with any recommendations for appropriate legislation, to the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the judiciary and human services.

Appendix B

The Juvenile Jurisdiction Policy and Operations Coordinating Council

Connecticut Senate Bill No. 1500

June Special Session, Public Act No. 07-4 101 of 147

Sec. 88. (*Effective from passage*) (a) There is established a **Juvenile Jurisdiction Policy and Operations Coordinating Council**. The council shall monitor the implementation of the central components of the implementation plan developed by the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee, as set forth in subsection (f) of this section, and resolve issues identified by the committee, as set forth in subsection (g) of this section, concerning changes required in the juvenile justice system to expand jurisdiction to include persons sixteen and seventeen years of age.

(b) The council shall consist of the following members:

- 1) Two members of the General Assembly, one of whom shall be appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives, and one of whom shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate;
- 2) The chairpersons and ranking members of the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the judiciary, human services and appropriations, or their designees;
- 3) The Chief Court Administrator, or the Chief Court Administrator's designee;
- 4) A judge of the superior court for juvenile matters, appointed by the Chief Justice;
- 5) The executive director of the Court Support Services Division of the judicial branch, or the executive director's designee;
- 6) The executive director of the Superior Court Operations Division, or the executive director's designee;
- 7) The Chief Public Defender, or the Chief Public Defender's designee;
- 8) The Chief State's Attorney, or the Chief State's Attorney's designee;
- 9) The Commissioner of Children and Families, or the commissioner's designee;
- 10) The Commissioner of Correction, or the commissioner's designee;
- 11) The Commissioner of Education, or the commissioner's designee;
- 12) The Commissioner of Mental Health and Addiction Services, or the commissioner's (13) The president of the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association, or the president's designee;
- 13) Two child or youth advocates, one of whom shall be appointed by one chairperson of the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee, and one of whom shall be appointed by the other chairperson of the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee;
- 14) Two parents, each of whom is the parent of a child who has been involved with the juvenile justice system, one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, and one of whom shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate; and
- 15) The Child Advocate, or the Child Advocate's designee.

(c) All appointments to the council shall be made not later than thirty days after the effective date of this section. Any vacancy shall be filled by the appointing authority.

(d) The Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, or the secretary's designee and a member of the General Assembly selected jointly by the speaker of the House of Representatives and the president pro tempore of the Senate shall be co-chairpersons of the council. Such co-chairpersons shall schedule the first meeting of the council, which shall be held not later than sixty days after the effective date of this section.

(e) Members of the council shall serve without compensation, except for necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

(f) Prior to January 1, 2009, the council shall monitor the implementation of the central components of the implementation plan contained in the final report of the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee dated February 8, 2007, including, but not limited to, the development and implementation of a comprehensive system of community-based services and residential services for juveniles.

(g) Prior to January 1, 2009, the council shall study and develop recommendations regarding the issues identified in the final report of the Juvenile Jurisdiction Planning and Implementation Committee to prepare for the introduction of persons sixteen and seventeen years of age into the juvenile justice system and to improve the juvenile justice system. Such issues and study shall include, but need not be limited to, the following:

- (1) The development of diversion programs and the most appropriate programs for such persons;
- (2) The development of comprehensive projections to determine the short-term and long-term placement capacity required to accommodate an expanded juvenile population in the juvenile justice system, including an identification of available pretrial detention facilities, the need for additional pretrial detention facilities and feasible alternatives to detention;
- (3) An analysis of the impact of the expansion of juvenile jurisdiction to persons sixteen and seventeen years of age on state agencies and a determination of which state agencies shall be responsible for providing relevant services to juveniles, including, but not limited to, mental health and substance abuse services, housing, education and employment;
- (4) An examination of the emancipation of minors with respect to the juvenile justice system;
- (5) An examination and modification of offenses categorized as serious juvenile offenses in subdivision (12) of section 46b-120 of the general statutes, as amended by this act;
- (6) A comparison and analysis of procedures used in the juvenile justice system versus the criminal court system to determine the most suitable procedures for juveniles, including, but not limited to, the most suitable procedures for the lawful interrogation of juveniles;
- (7) An examination of school-related issues related to delinquency, including intervention strategies to reduce the number of suspensions, expulsions, truancies and arrests of juveniles;
- (8) An examination of practices and procedures that result in disproportionate minority contact with the juvenile justice system and strategies to reduce disproportionate minority contact with the juvenile justice system; and

- (9) An examination of whether the inclusion of persons sixteen and seventeen years of age in the juvenile justice system requires a revision of provisions of the general statutes that establish a mandatory age for school attendance.

(h) Not later than January 1, 2008, and quarterly thereafter until January 1, 2009, the council shall submit a status report to the Governor and the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the judiciary, human services and appropriations, and the select committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to children, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes, on implementation of the plan components set forth in subsection (f) of this section and resolution of the issues identified in subsection (g) of this section. (i) Not later than January 1, 2009, the council shall submit a final report on the council's recommendations and such implementation and resolution of issues to the Governor and the joint standing committees of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to the judiciary, human services and appropriations, and the select committee of the General Assembly having cognizance of matters relating to children, in accordance with section 11-4a of the general statutes.

References

* Neelum Arya is the Research and Policy Director for the Campaign for Youth Justice. Ian Augarten was a Program Associate for the Campaign for Youth Justice and is currently a law student at American University. Yaamini Rao was a Fellow at the Campaign for Youth Justice and is currently a law student at Georgetown University.

¹ Sabol, W.J., Minton, T.D., Harrison, P.M. (2007). *Prison and Jail Inmates at Midyear 2006*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

² New York and North Carolina are the two other states that prosecute all 16 and 17 year-olds in their adult criminal justice systems. Connecticut's law will change effective January 1, 2010.

³ It is important to note that the law raising the age of jurisdiction did not alter other transfer provisions. Therefore, 16 and 17 year-old offenders who have committed Class A or Class B felonies which are termed "seriously violent" offenses will continue to be automatically transferred to the adult criminal justice system and transferred back to the juvenile justice system based on decisions made by judges and prosecutors. Traffic offenses will also be excluded from juvenile court jurisdiction as well.

⁴ State of Connecticut Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police, Crimes Analysis Unit. (December, 2003). *Crime in Connecticut 2003: Annual report of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program*. Middletown, CT: Author.

⁵ Data request filled by the Connecticut Department of Correction, July 2006.

⁶ Meyer, Edward. *Get Tough on Crime, not Kids*. Article forthcoming.

⁷ Poitras, C. (2007, March 22). Teens In Adult Jails A State Specialty. *The Hartford Courant*, retrieved April 22, 2008 from http://www.hartfordinfo.org/issues/documents/PrisonerRe-entry/htfd_courant_032207.asp

⁸ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2007). *Effects on Violence of Laws and Policies Facilitating the Transfer of Youth from the Juvenile to the Adult Justice System*. MMWR 2007; 56 (no. RR-9). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved March 19, 2008 from <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr5609a1.htm>

⁹ Ryan, L., & Ziedenberg, J. (Eds.). (2007, March). *The Consequences Aren't Minor: The Impact of Trying Youth as Adults and Strategies for Reform*. Washington, DC: Campaign for Youth Justice.

-
- ¹⁰ Poitras, C. (2006, July 25). Teen's Prison Suicide Draws Outrage: As Probes Begin, Advocates Contend Again: Youths Don't Belong In Adult System. *The Hartford Courant*, retrieved April 22, 2008 from http://www.kidscounsel.org/news_july262005.htm
- ¹¹ Ibid
- ¹² Harp Wins Senate Passage of 'Raise the Age' Bill to Improve Juvenile Justice. (2007, May 22). Retrieved April 22, 2008, from <http://www.senatedems.ct.gov/pr/harp-070522.html>
- ¹³ Tuhus, M. (2007, July 19). Age Raised. *New Haven Independent*, retrieved April 22, 2008 from http://newhavenindependent.org/archives/2007/07/raising_the_age.php
- ¹⁴ Roman, John. (2006, February 21). *The Economic Impact of Raising the Age of Juvenile Jurisdiction in Connecticut*. Presented to the Judiciary and Appropriations Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly, Hartford, CT.
- ¹⁵ Connecticut Public Act No. 06-187 (2006) (enacted). Retrieved April 22, 2008 from <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2006/ACT/PA/2006PA-00187-R00HB-05846-PA.htm>
- ¹⁶ Connecticut Juvenile Justice and Planning Implementation Committee. (2007, February 12). *Final Report*. Hartford, CT.
- ¹⁷ Ibid
- ¹⁸ Walker, T. (personal communication, January 28, 2008).
- ¹⁹ Whidden, C. (personal communication, April 3, 2008).
- ²⁰ Anderson, A. (personal communication, March 26, 2008).
- ²¹ Connecticut Juvenile Justice and Planning Implementation Committee. (2007, February 12). *Final Report*. Hartford, CT.
- ²² Juvenile Jurisdiction Policy and Operations Coordinating Council. (2008). Retrieved from <http://www.housedems.ct.gov/jjpoccc/index.asp> on March 20, 2008
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ Walker, T. (personal communication, January 28, 2008).