How to catch lightning in a bottle

The Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance's first 10 years
As Ben Franklin suspected, it’s just a spark, a bit of electricity. But lightning is a mighty force. Even on the darkest night, it can illuminate the world with stark clarity. The top section of the Eiffel Tower needed to be rebuilt after a single strike. As lightning ionizes the air, nitric acid is created, fertilizing everything in its pathway.

The Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance is like lightning – powerful and hard to pin down. The turnaround of Connecticut’s juvenile justice system is a national story and the Alliance’s part in it resoundingly praised. But how exactly did the Alliance – neither a direct service provider nor a lobbying group – make so much change?

It started with a spark. The Alliance illuminated both the problems and possible solutions in juvenile justice by asking good questions. Often, obvious questions are the best kind. Why are we locking these kids up? How can we expect them to reform if we don’t provide services that have been proven to actually work?

Through meticulous data analysis and reference to national research, the Alliance found answers to its own questions. Then they publicized those answers in clear, compelling terms – the difference between engaging in an intellectual exercise and starting a movement.

The conversation changed. People at all levels of the system and in the general public began aspiring to be “smart on crime.” Juvenile justice reform became an accepted path to improved public safety. Unproductive and expensive punitive programs were clearly in no one’s interest.

By fundamentally challenging the system, the Alliance created hope for a better one. Hope is an attractive commodity. Almost immediately the Alliance found like-minded people in private and public life who wanted to improve outcomes for kids. The Alliance provided them with the support they needed to move forward, drawing on the organization’s key skills in community organizing, communications and research.

Of course, an electrical storm isn’t all sweetness and light – it’s a storm. As the only advocacy group in the state focused solely on juvenile justice, the Alliance is the go-to source for policymakers and the media. Just as the Alliance believes in holding kids accountable for their actions, it holds adults accountable through credible and cogent assessments when the system falls short in measures such as fairness and effectiveness.

Finally, the Alliance, like lightning, encourages new growth. That can mean training parents to talk with the press and legislators. It has also meant setting up teams of “sparkplugs” who call and email legislators before critical votes on juvenile justice issues. Today the Alliance is building the capacity of community stakeholders to have a voice in juvenile justice policy so that state directives align with local needs.

The Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance has seen multiple victories in its first ten years and is poised to achieve much more. Lightning, the saying goes, never strikes twice. The saying is wrong.
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Lightning in a bottle
“People had gotten used to the idea that juvenile courts were punishing kids instead of looking at what was best for kids,” remembered Alliance Co-Chair Chris Rapillo.

That was 2001. An independent report had just found that Connecticut’s juvenile justice system was actually increasing delinquency. The Connecticut Policy & Economic Council recounted shocking details in its analysis, including youth having sex and selling drugs in detention centers. The state opened the Connecticut Juvenile Training School, modeled after a supermax prison and constructed under a no-bid contract that would become a symbol of corruption.

Ten years later, Connecticut is a leader in juvenile justice reform. Huge challenges remain, of course, and the Alliance is fighting as passionately as ever for reform. But today we lock up fewer kids than a decade ago. We use evidence-based programming to offer families solutions that work. We have extended the protections and services of the juvenile system to 16-year-olds and will soon do the same for 17-year-olds. “We caught lightning in a bottle,” said Hector Glynn, the Alliance’s executive director from 2005-2007.

The Alliance, founded in 2001, was an important driver of reform, along with the broader advocacy community and many state officials committed to doing better by Connecticut’s most vulnerable children. Our achievements have far outpaced our expectations. Our achievements have not, however, outpaced our aspirations. So the Alliance’s 10th anniversary is a time to reflect as much as to celebrate and to ask a few more good questions: Why were we able to come so far? How can we build upon what we’ve learned to go further still?
I look for what needs to be done. After all, that’s how the universe designs itself.

R. Buckminster Fuller
In 2001, juvenile justice in Connecticut wasn’t working. This was no secret, but the system was something outside of most people’s experience, easily ignored.

Juvenile Court Judge Carmen Lopez asked Robert Francis, executive director of RYASAP, to look into the conditions in Bridgeport’s Juvenile Detention Center. Francis formed the Greater Bridgeport Juvenile Justice Task Force to investigate, but the scope of the inquiry quickly expanded. The study found that 60 percent of the kids in detention in Bridgeport were there for status offenses (running away, truancy, beyond control of parents) or very minor delinquencies. And it showed that a disproportionate number were young people of color. “This was totally unacceptable to us,” said Francis. “They should get help, not punishment.” These kids had committed no crimes. Detaining them was wrong and likely in itself to cause future delinquency.

To fund a researcher to conduct the study, the task force went to The Tow Foundation, a Connecticut-based family philanthropy. “We were funding services for disadvantaged youth and families and asking: How can we do more?” recalled the foundation’s executive director, Emily Tow Jackson. The foundation had begun looking at juvenile justice as a focus area because there was an opportunity to have a significant impact there. The task force’s shocking findings inspired the foundation to make an even greater commitment. “Tow said: If these are the conditions in Bridgeport, they must be the conditions around the state,” Francis recalled. But no statewide organization focused solely on juvenile justice.

Together with The Tow Foundation, Janice Gruendel, then of Connecticut Voices for Children, and Martha Stone, of the Center for Children’s Advocacy, Francis formed the Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance. At first, it was “a virtual group,” with the chairs doing much of the work, recalled Tow’s Diane Sierpina, a steering committee member. In 2004 the first executive director, Fernando Muniz, was hired. Data was his tool of choice to formulate priorities and to drive change. “A lot of people weren’t asking the right questions about the growth of the system, the kinds of kids that were there,” Muniz said.

His reliance on data helped the organization gain credibility. When Muniz resigned to take a senior position at the Department of Children and Families, he was replaced by Hector Glynn. “I already decided I wasn’t going to like him because he wasn’t Fernando,” recalled state Rep. Toni Walker, the primary champion of juvenile justice reform in the legislature. Walker’s father, who was blind, taught her to close her eyes to listen without being distracted by emotion. With her eyes shut, she realized, “his knowledge base was extraordinary and his passion was as strong as Fernando’s.” As a social worker, Glynn was himself adept at listening and could often steer conversations with legislators toward consensus, Walker said. Glynn would amp up the Alliance’s legislative efforts. Notably, the organization’s Raise the Age bill passed in 2007 near the end of his tenure.

Glynn left the Alliance to return to the world of direct service at The Village for Families and Children. Abby Anderson, who had been a staffer since Muniz’s days, took the helm, a transition that made Glynn feel good about his decision. “I knew I was sitting in her seat because she’s the one who has the passion for advocacy,” he said. Anderson protected and expanded upon gains in juvenile justice reform in the face of the financial crisis. She has brought the organization national prominence through a number of avenues, including her co-chair position with the National Juvenile Justice Network.
If opportunity doesn’t knock, build a door.

Milton Berle
The Alliance made the most of every advantage it encountered. Sometimes it even created its own advantages.

Before the Alliance, there was no authoritative provider of information on juvenile justice in Connecticut. The Alliance made itself into the go-to source for research, national information and connection to direct service providers and families. Thus it gained enormous power to steer policy discussions.

“They did the background and they did the evaluation of what was really going on,” said Walker. “The Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance brought the real world to Hartford.”

While the purpose of this work was to promote better policy, the Alliance was scrupulous about the quality of its reports. “The Alliance has a good reputation for giving out accurate information. It’s deliberative in its process and it’s not sort of a knee-jerk advocacy organization,” said Stone. For example, its 2010 “Safe and Sound” report was an extensive review of outcome data that showed Connecticut’s shift toward prevention and diversion accompanied a drop in crime and saved taxpayers money in many areas. The report drew national attention and reinforced efforts within the state to continue down the path of reform.

The Alliance seized the opportunity to build relationships with policymakers who were also eager for change. Walker was a new legislator when she took up the issue of juvenile justice reform, but “Toni got famous pretty quickly as a hard worker,” recalled Glynn. She secured a seat on the Judiciary and Appropriations Committees, eventually becoming co-chair of Appropriations. Sen. Toni Harp, another key ally, was already a co-chair of the powerful committee and scuttled last minute attempts to strike juvenile justice reform from the budget in 2009. Throughout state government, the Alliance found people with the power and passion to change the system and it increased their capacity to do so.
You may have the greatest bunch of individual stars in the world, but if they don’t play together the club won’t be worth a dime.

George Herman Ruth
Official responsibility for Connecticut’s juvenile justice system is shared by the Judicial Branch and the Department of Children and Families. Ten years ago those two entities did not work together. Kids might do without services as each agency maintained the child was “the other side’s” responsibility. What care there was lacked coordination.

In 2002, the state entered into a corrective action plan as part of a settlement of the Emily J. lawsuit, filed by the Center for Children’s Advocacy to address dangerous conditions in juvenile detention centers and the stark inadequacy of mental health services for detained youth. As part of the plan, DCF and the Court Support Services Division of the Judicial Branch had to work together to assess kids in the system and plan appropriate services for them, investing more in those that were evidence-based. By 2004, with strong support from the Alliance, the two agencies began a joint strategic planning process for the entire span of the juvenile justice system. It was facilitated by the Child Welfare League of America and was completed in 2006.

The plan called for the agencies to coordinate efforts to reduce minority overrepresentation, divert more youth from court involvement, provide gender-specific services, increase family involvement and promote local coalitions – all goals championed by the Alliance. “I participated in just about every subcommittee in the development of that plan,” recalled Muniz. Very early in its life, the Alliance had secured a seat at the table and was steering juvenile justice policy in the direction of reform.

This “process” victory had dramatic tangible outcomes. Services improved as planning incorporated the resources and perspectives of both agencies and focused on the needs of the child and family. Policy level decisions were made with both agencies – and often a much broader coalition – at the table, bringing a new level of accountability to juvenile justice. Like many Alliance victories, it was not an Alliance project per se. The organization, as always, worked by being a resource and a catalyst within existing structures. This way of operating makes a non-profit with a staff of three powerful enough to consistently achieve major policy victories.
If you look for the worst in people and expect to find it, you surely will.

Abraham Lincoln
"I’m always seen as the bad guy," Connecticut’s Child Advocate Jeanne Milstein said with a slight smile. Milstein’s mission frequently has her investigating and exposing failures in child welfare. Being one of the first steering committee members of the Alliance also makes her part of a group that often works collaboratively with state agencies and others. "It’s a great inside/outside strategy," said Milstein.

It’s a strategy that was carefully developed. Sierpina recalled a meeting in 2001 where advocates all sat on one side of the table, while state officials sat on the other. The Alliance sought to change that.

“We’re never afraid to hold anyone accountable, even if that means getting into an adversarial position,” said Anderson. “But that’s not where we start from. Collaboration is our first impulse and that’s proven enormously effective.”

“People with bruised egos don’t make good partners,” said Commissioner of Correction Leo Arnone, previously head of DCF’s Bureau of Juvenile Services. “A lot of times advocates demand that officials make changes beyond the scope of their power or control.” But the Alliance did not so much demand as seek to understand and then offer solutions. “There didn’t seem to be a way to get from where you are today to where you think you should be,” remembered Arnone. “The Alliance provided the bridge to get over the gap, and it did that by saying, ‘Let’s work together’ and not threatening the establishment with a lawsuit or some negative consequence.”

“It moved state folks by empowering them to do what they know is right,” said Tow Jackson.

As time went on, the Alliance found state officials increasingly willing to share information, even when it was sensitive. “Why not?” asked CSSD Executive Director William Carbone. “We all have the same goal. We’re all learning how to do better work with these challenging children.”
First, do no harm.
Hippocrates
When minors have sex, chronically skip school or stay out all night, it is alarming to say the least. It is not, however, criminal. While federal guidelines prohibit criminalizing these “status offenders,” Connecticut’s juvenile system was full of them. “My philosophy was that the kids shouldn’t go to court at all, they shouldn’t be in detention at all,” said Francis.

A decade ago, approximately half the children in Connecticut juvenile detention centers were status offenders. Today, none are. Most of these cases are now handled outside of court. Family Support Centers are operating in communities statewide to rapidly connect families to services that address the root causes of these behaviors. Most children who complete programs at the centers do not return to the system.

These changes began in 2005 as the result of a major push by the Center for Children’s Advocacy to decriminalize status offenses and improve services to struggling families. The reforms became law in 2007. They are part of a larger, statewide emphasis on reducing unnecessary contact with the juvenile justice system and making sure those children who do enter the system do not go deeper into it than necessary. It’s well documented that sending children to more restrictive sanctions can actually increase delinquency.

The Alliance was able to translate these massive statutory changes into clear, concise language and explain the broad benefits of the reform. At informal community breakfasts around the state, Alliance presentations helped win buy-in. The Alliance’s continual work tracking the effect of the reforms has already demonstrated that, yet again, solid prevention was a better investment than incarceration.

Another way of looking at this shift is: We’ve decided to make things better, not worse. “You see in the juvenile system a trend where the emphasis is on motivating kids and motivating families,” said Carbone.
Youth cannot know how age thinks and feels. But old men are guilty if they forget what it was to be young.

J.K. Rowling
What I’m hearing now is that our youth aren’t worth tackling a problem that might be hard and cost some money. What I’m hearing is that my son wasn’t worth it. Diana Gonzalez, whose son died in prison, testifying before the General Assembly at the same time Connecticut was taking steps forward, it remained mired in the past on the issue of juvenile jurisdiction. It was one of only three states that prosecuted 16-year-olds as adults, even for the most minor of offenses. Research on the subject showed this to be dangerous folly. Kids tried as adults are more likely to reoffend and to escalate into more serious crime. The taint of an adult record limits educational and professional opportunities. Youth in adult facilities are at high risk of suicide and victimization. Tragically, the Connecticut campaign gained urgency in 2005 after 17-year-old David Burgos killed himself in prison. The boy, who had a history of mental illness, was incarcerated for a parole violation.

Clearly the juvenile system needed to be expanded to age 18, the legal age of adulthood for most matters in the state and the country. But there were so many other issues: continued work to be done for status offenders, the unconscionable over-representation of minority youth in the system, the lack of child and adolescent mental health services, the increasing tendency to use arrest as a discipline tool in schools, among others.

The Raise the Age campaign, as it came to be called, did not make the Alliance choose between issues. “It was a chance to look at everything we did,” said Rapillo.

“Liz Ryan from the Campaign for Youth Justice gave me great advice,” said Anderson. “She said: ‘Don’t think about building the capacity of your organization around a campaign to raise the age. Use your campaign to raise the age as a way to build the capacity of your organization.’ We embraced that way of thinking because to include the 16- and 17-year-olds in the system effectively you have address all the usual juvenile justice reform issues.”
Clarity, clarity, clarity.
William Strunk Jr. and E.B. White
Gov. M. Jodi Rell vaulted Connecticut to the forefront of the juvenile justice reform movement when she signed a bill that removes 16- and 17-year-old offenders from the adult courts and puts them back into the juvenile justice system where they clearly belong.

Raise the Age was, perhaps above all else, an issue that was easy to understand. "It was something that we thought people could connect to in a real way," remembered Muniz. "While the fix was complicated, the issue really wasn't." Clear and strategic communication is one of the Alliance's primary skills and strategies.

"What the Alliance does so well is educate people by having a message that's easy to understand, short, and it's the same message over and over," said Milstein. That skill has paid off in every major Alliance effort to reform the system. The Alliance uses many tools to get its messages across. It hosts "community breakfasts" and forums across the state to make its case to individual communities. When Glynn became executive director, one of his first acts was to hire a communication consultant to craft persuasive op-eds and help him fine-tune messages.

"We stopped marketing to ourselves, and we started marketing to the rest of the state," says Walker. Much of the messaging focuses on broad benefits to all taxpayers, most of whom assume that their own children will never enter the system. For example, the juvenile justice system has higher costs than the adult system up-front, because it provides services that address the root causes of behavior. But the system also delivers lower recidivism, which means reduced crime in the future and less need for spending in adult corrections. Expanding its jurisdiction was in everyone's interest, just as continued improvements to make the system more effective carry widespread benefit.

"My inmates don't cost me a fraction of what my kids did when I was in juvenile," said Arnone, the department of correction commissioner and one-time head of juvenile services. But he added that his department saved $12 million closing a prison last year and more closures are planned. "This whole concept of justice reinvestment I think can be used successfully," he said.
The facts fairly and honestly presented; truth will take care of itself.

William Allen White
Along the way to passage in 2007 (and even after that) Raise the Age faced barriers. The Alliance overcame them through its traditional reliance on data, presented in a compelling way to both the legislature and the media. The reform was threatened by a legislatively commissioned report that claimed it would cost $100 million to implement the change. The estimate presumed that massive building projects for new courthouses and secure facilities would be required, which in fact they were not. Alliance staff worked with Walker to pour over the source material for the estimate “to help me discredit this illusion of $100 million,” she recalled.

The reform was included in the 2007 budget implementer bill for 2010 implementation. In 2008 and 2009, opponents made efforts to roll Raise the Age back, citing the fiscal crisis. The Alliance maintained its policy and grassroots advocacy efforts and, in the end, advocates agreed to a staged implementation. In 2010, 16-year-olds accused of all but the most serious offenses would rejoin the juvenile system. In 2012, the reform would extend to 17-year-olds.

Hard numbers are a great tool in solving problems – and in pointing out the existence of problems. Anecdotal evidence has long suggested an uptick in school-based arrests for minor offenses and the tendency of this harsh consequence to be meted out to children of color or children with special education needs. But objective data was nearly impossible to find. Through community outreach and capacity building, the Alliance has encouraged school districts around the state to track arrests. CSSD is similarly focusing on the source of referrals and demanding that schools stop using arrest for offenses like having a soda in class or violating a dress code. (Those are actual examples.) As more data become available, the Alliance will provide expert analysis and dissemination to build support for reasonable and effective school discipline.

### Raise the Age Impact

**Predicted increase in juvenile court caseload:** 40%

**Actual increase in Year One:** 22%

16-year-olds kept out of Connecticut’s adult court from January 2010 to June 2011: More than 6,000

### Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total juvenile cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan–June 09</td>
<td>7,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan–June 10</td>
<td>8,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan–June 11</td>
<td>8,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSSD
There are no ordinary people.
C.S. Lewis
In most discussions about juvenile justice, people actually affected by the system are conspicuously absent. In Connecticut, that’s no longer the case. The Alliance reaches out to families, often stigmatized for their children’s involvement in the system. In addition to moral support, the Alliance offers practical assistance – producing a video featuring their stories, helping them write op-eds, providing buses to the legislature, including parents in delegations to national meetings.

Family and community presence were strongly felt in the Raise the Age campaign. Anyone could be a key part of the campaign by attending rallies or sending legislators emails and postcards. During public hearings, the organization made sure that the experiences of families received as much weight as the testimony of academicians. At annual Educate the Legislature days, noted national experts presented research supporting Raise the Age. Mothers and youth testified, offering stories of amazing power. Grassroots advocates, including youth and parents, in orange campaign t-shirts flooded the Capitol and visited nay-saying legislators. “We showed them the error of their ways,” recalled Walker.

Parents have gone on to offer testimony on behalf of a broad range of services for children and families. The Alliance’s goal is to empower families to shape the agenda itself, rather than simply offer their perspective on initiatives devised by politicians and advocates. The network created as part of the Raise the Age campaign is now a growing coalition that is tackling the many areas of the juvenile justice system that still cry out for reform. Parents will be an especially powerful voice in the Alliance’s intensive efforts to reduce school-based arrests and racial disparity in the juvenile justice system.

… a fellow inmate committed suicide, and my son witnessed staff dragging the deceased’s body through the common area of his unit. My son has continually been haunted by this image and regularly reflects that ‘minutes go by like hours’ while in custody.

Johnna Paradis
LESSON 10

The reward for work well done is the opportunity to do more.

Jonas Salk
The issue itself is pretty simple: We want fewer kids in the system. We want kids getting better services in the community.

Diane Sierpina
The Tow Foundation

“Having wins has just been critical,” reflected Sierpina, in large part because it confers a credibility that makes more wins possible. That’s a good thing, because there are many remaining battles to be fought. For example, substantial defects remain in juvenile justice, notably racial and educational issues that push kids into the system.

“Whether we want to admit it or not, race is a factor,” said Merva Jackson, a steering committee member and executive director of African Caribbean Parents of Children with Disabilities. “There is enough information out now that shows doing the right thing saves money,” she said. “If we can build on that, it will make our job a lot easier in the next 10 years.” Jackson believes the same strategies that worked in Raise the Age can be used to fight racial disparity.

In fact, the Alliance’s skill in translating data into action-inspiring communication has already helped. The Alliance developed a presentation on race and juvenile justice—based on data produced by the Office of Policy & Management and the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee—that demonstrated how policy changes would reduce inequality. In 2011, one of those changes became law. A court order is now required to send a child to detention, a decision point where clear racial disparity was demonstrated. That victory, however, is only a beginning. Racial disparity persists in every phase of Connecticut’s juvenile justice system.

The Alliance is also taking on many of the educational issues that can steer kids into the system. “Kids in the system are four, five, six, seven, eight grade levels behind,” said Jackson. She added that most children in DCF care have special education needs. Meanwhile, children are more likely to be arrested in school than they were a generation ago.

Local Interagency Services Teams, modeled after the Greater Bridgeport Juvenile Justice Task Force, have been formed in every region of the state to address these and other issues. The Alliance has provided support and technical assistance to all of them to increase their capacity to make change within communities. It has organized forums on school arrests, inspiring local advocates, educators and police officers to foster safe, effective schools where arrests are rare occurrences.

Meanwhile, the same allies who propelled policy forward over the past 10 years occupy positions of the same or greater power. Alliance staffers and steering committee members past and present sit on every major state or local committee involved in juvenile justice practice and policy. Changes under way in the structure of the Department of Children and Families could offer opportunities to improve services for youth and families. As Connecticut struggles with record deficits, reform must be guarded vigilantly. But it is possible that the Alliance’s next 10 years will see even greater gains for children than the first 10. As Stone says, “Let’s go!”
Achievements

Who made the system better: Parents who spoke up? Agency heads who led with their conscience? Crusading legislators? Tireless advocates?

The answer, of course, is: All of them. The Alliance’s role has been to create a climate where good people can do great things and to build the capacity of the smallest groups to have substantial victories. That’s why this is not a list of “The Alliance’s Achievements.” It’s a list of what many, many good people in Connecticut have done in the past 10 years. The Alliance has been proud to stand with them.
Arrests reduced  
Commitments reduced  
Juvenile crime down  
Age of juvenile jurisdiction raised  
Staff speak nationwide on model Raise the Age campaign  
Status offenses decriminalized  
Family Support Centers open statewide  
Zero status offenders in detention  
DCF/Judicial joint strategic plan  
Executive Implementation Team holds state accountable to plan  
Gender-specific programming required by statute  
Agencies required to report on racial disparity and their plans to address it  
Reentry programs for youth leaving custody  
Credits youth earned in custody transfer to schools  
Judicial dismisses minor school-based arrests  
Red tape to register kids returning to schools is cut  
Awareness raised around prevalence of school-based misdemeanor arrests  
Broad stakeholder coalitions to reduce arrests in schools  
Education Working Group coordinates action on juvenile justice/education issues  
Statewide public awareness campaign on race and juvenile justice  
Court order required to detain youth  
Alliance partnership with CPTV  
Local Interagency Services Teams established in 13 communities  
System transparency increases, with considerable data posted online  
Police get free training in youth development and racial disparities  
Conditions improve at Connecticut Juvenile Training School  
Detention conditions improve  
Fewer youth waiting in detention for placement  
Protocols for high-risk youth in custody  
Alternatives to detention promoted  
DCF liaisons in detention centers coordinate care  
Services focus more on families  
Flexible funding allows more responsiveness to kids’ needs  
Annual art show highlights issues, potential of system kids  
Alliance staff, Steering Committee members on every major statewide policy group  
Immediate access to in-patient psychiatric hospitals improved  
Mental health care expanded to include appropriate assessments, evaluations and evidence-based community alternatives  
Scrutiny on arrests in facilities  
Juvenile justice reform becomes a budget priority
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