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- Investigating trends and prevalence of juvenile offenders with disabilities
- Research proposal
- Next Steps
- *Potential Limitations
- Questions
Background and Case Example

- “East Hartford Man Sentenced for Stomping Man to Death Outside of Walgreens”
  - Not guilty by:
    - ...reason of insanity—Hartford Superior Court’s Clerk Office
    - ...reason of mental defect—Hartford Courant
  - (Lakisha Henry) Mom’s Testimony

- First-hand JRB account
  - Boy with autism threatens to kill family and stabs father in hand with kitchen knife

- Importance of ‘person in environment’ and holistic approaches

- Individualism and Punishment for Conflict
  - OUTCOME: Non-problem solving
Trends and Prevalence of Disability Among ‘Offenders’

• Competing Results
  • Overrepresentation of juvenile offenders with intellectual disability in the criminal justice system (Frize et al. 2008; Close, D.W., & Walker, H.M., 2010)
    • 1/3 state prison and ¼ of federal inmates
    • 1+ disabilities
  • National Survey of 12,000 students (Wagner, 2005; Newman et al., 2009)
    • 47% of students with emotional/behavioral disorders –arrested @L 1x w/n 2 years
    • 0% arrested @L 1x w/n 4 years
  • Adolescents with LD 3x greater risk of involvement in offending activities (Matta-Oshima et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2005)
  • Crimes against persons vs. property (Cheely et al., 2012)
  • Washington State Juvenile Court (Van der purt et al. 2014)
    • ID (IQ below 70) juvenile offenders n=102 vs. w/o ID n=526
Research Project

- Examining Connecticut Juvenile Review Boards’ Case Management of Youth with Disabilities
- Juvenile Review Boards
  - What are they? Where can they be found?
  - What is their role?
  - Why are they important? Why focus on this population?
    - Sample—JRBs whose members attend LIST Local Interagency Service Team
Research Project

- Examining Connecticut Juvenile Review Boards’ Case Management of Youth with Disabilities
  - Intake Form—characteristics of population and clients served, JRB process & inclusion of the family
  - Amended version of Striker’s (2001) Counseling Clients with Disabilities Survey, 6-item Likert Scale
- Focus
  - Board members’ perceived knowledge and skills related to disabilities
  - Involvement of youth and families in JRB process
  - (Type of) interventions offered
Limitations

- Time
  - Availability of Board Members
  - “Peak Season”
  - Bi-monthly meetings
- Full board participation unlikely
  - Inconsistencies of member attendance
- Inability to recall majority of cases
  - No database or tracking system
- Potential usefulness of follow-up questions
- Major differences by Board, Town, and Region
Next Steps

• IRB Approval
• Distribution of surveys and intake forms—Month of June, 2017
Questions???