

DRAFT
Juvenile Access Pilot Program Advisory Board
Subcommittee on Evaluation/Assessment of the Pilot Program Meeting
November 23, 2009 Meeting

The meeting was convened at approximately 2:05 p.m.

Present: Sarah Eagan, Judge Keller, Deborah Fuller, Cynthia Cunningham, Christina Ghio, Bryan Morris, Daniela Giordano

1. **Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the 10/13/09 meeting were approved, with the following amendment suggested by Christina Ghio: In the second paragraph on page 3, change the last phrase to “whether their own preparation had changed.”
2. **Review of Revised Draft Survey**

Remaining issues:

- Who would get look-back vs. short-term surveys
- Focus group issues – who, when, details?
- Whether everyone present in the courtroom will be identified
- Method for distribution of surveys

Judge Keller stated that she does not think that judges should fill out the survey because of confidentiality issues. They could be part of a focus group or a look-back survey. Judge Keller added that the staff should fill out a survey after each case, rather than a look-back survey. Sarah Eagan stated that the judges should be the only ones to do the look-back survey.

Discussion of distribution of the survey, the anonymity of responders and ways to ensure getting sincere answers. Judge Keller suggested distributing the questions by e-mail; a discussion of the fact that not everyone has e-mail ensued.

A discussion of whether parents and children should be surveyed ensued. Attorney Eagan pointed out that the criticism with the surveys that were done in other states focused on the fact that they did not get input from parents and children.

Attorney Ghio stated that there needs to be an announcement to let parents know the proceeding is open to the public, but that we don’t want their feedback to be influenced by the judge.

The following distribution options were discussed:

- Judge ask them to fill out the survey
- E-mail distribution
 - How would be returned? Print out? Generic e-mail address?

- Survey monkey
 - Currently being it
 - E-mail distribution to parents/children could be done through attorneys to parents and children who were at a proceeding, but the problem with this option is that many parents are dissatisfied w/ their attorney
 - It could be sent to parents/children at their last known address with a SASE a week after they attend a proceeding, with instructions to go on-line to fill it out
 - Information on the child's reaction could also be collected from the attorney

Attorney Ghio pointed out that if information is obtained only on children who attend a proceeding, we won't get information on enough children. Attorney Eagan said there needs to be questions that get at whether a child/client felt that private information about them was publicly disclosed, and whether they were unhappy about it. Bryan Morris pointed out that there a cut-off age under which you would not ask for a child's feedback, because they would simply be too young to provide input.

There was extensive discussion of whether the Board should make use of the services of Christine Kraus of UConn, who volunteered to review the draft survey. Concern was expressed that it might delay implementation of the survey. It was decided that Attorney Eagan would contact Ms. Kraus to feel out what her timeframe would be.

There was discussion of the obligation of attorneys to inform their child clients that the proceeding will be open, even if they are not going to attend the proceeding, because they have the right to object. A standing order could require attorneys to notify their clients that the proceeding is open.

A discussion of the specific questions on the survey ensued, with suggestion made to amend or eliminate several of the questions. Judge Keller offered to revise the survey in accordance with the discussion.

3. **Schedule Next Meeting:** The subcommittee determined that the next step would be to bring its recommendations to the full Board for their consideration and possible approval. Therefore, no further meeting was scheduled at this time.
4. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:56 p.m.