



AUDIT SUMMARY

Division of Criminal Justice's Prosecutor-Led Diversion Practices for Family Violence Offenders

Performance Audit

www.ctauditors.gov

Calendar Years Ended June 30, 2021, 2022, and 2023

BACKGROUND

Connecticut law defines family violence as an incident between family or household members that results in physical injury or creates imminent fear of physical harm. Domestic violence, a subset of family violence, involves intimate partner abuse with unique emotional and physiological dynamics. Prosecutors have the discretion to utilize prosecutor-led diversion when processing criminal complaints. This approach allows offenders to engage in activities such as community services, counseling sessions, and domestic violence treatment. To ensure consistency and quality, Connecticut has statutory standards for community-based domestic violence treatment interventions. This audit examines the Division of Criminal Justice's practices regarding prosecutor-led referrals to community treatment providers in family violence cases.

ABOUT THE AUDIT

We have audited certain operations of the Division of Criminal Justice's Prosecutor-Led Diversion Practices for Family Violence Offenders. The scope of our audit included, but was not necessarily limited to, the calendar years ended December 31, 2021, 2022, and 2023. The objectives of our audit were to:

1. Examine the Division of Criminal Justice's practices regarding prosecutor-led community provider referrals in domestic violence cases, and;
2. Evaluate whether administrative controls sufficiently ensure such practices comply with statutory requirements and best practices.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

[Link to full report](#)

 **6** **Total Findings**

Our audit identified internal control deficiencies; instances of noncompliance with laws, regulations, or policies; and a need for improvement in practices and procedures that warrant management's attention.

NOTEWORTHY FINDINGS



Findings



Recommendations

1

Our audit revealed that the Division of Criminal Justice (DCJ) did not comply with statutory requirements involving treatment for certain family violence offenders and did not meet prosecutorial standards for recording related data into its eProsecutor case management system.

DCJ should develop internal controls and updates to eProsecutor to: (a) Document and monitor compliance with Section 54-56o of the General Statutes; and (b) Ensure compliance with prosecutorial standards requiring the recording of certain information in eProsecutor.

2

Our audit found significant deficiencies in DCJ's eProsecutor case management system that affected the reliability and completeness of case data.

DCJ should: (a) Establish comprehensive data validation protocols to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data in eProsecutor; (b) Implement standardized terminology and required data fields to enhance consistency and eliminate subjective interpretation in case data; and (c) Ensure all prosecutors consistently follow the established system standards.

3

Although the Family Domestic Violence Criminal Justice Response and Enhancement Advisory Council approves applications for community domestic violence treatment providers, it does not appear to have statutory authority to do so.

The Family Domestic Violence Criminal Justice Response and Enhancement Advisory Council should advocate for legislation to grant the council or an appropriate state agency the authority to review and approve community domestic violence treatment providers.

4

The domestic violence treatment provider approval process and oversight assumed and performed by the Family Domestic Violence Criminal Justice Response and Enhancement Advisory Council lacked written policies and procedures, consistent vetting of providers, quality assurance measures, and a reapproval process.

The Family Domestic Violence Criminal Justice Response and Enhancement Advisory Council should advocate for legislation to establish a specific approval process and oversight mechanisms for community domestic violence treatment providers.

5

Our audit revealed that DCJ lacked consistent documentation practices for tracking the compliance of family violence offender treatment programs.

DCJ should: (a) Develop and implement a protocol for monitoring and documenting treatment completion for providers not contracted by the Judicial Branch; and (b) Standardize the requirement for providers to submit completion reports and ensure prosecutors record them in eProsecutor. In cases in which the courts dispose of cases before the completion of treatment, DCJ should ensure eProsecutor includes a status report indicating compliance to date with treatment requirements.

6

Our audit highlighted that there appears to be insufficient availability of and prosecutor knowledge about approved treatment programs for domestic violence offenders.

DCJ should: (a) Consider assessing practices to ensure prosecutors recommend and offenders receive appropriate family violence treatment, to the extent practical; (b) Ensure that prosecutors are sufficiently informed about the availability and appropriateness of different types of treatment providers; and (c) Collaborate with community stakeholders, including the Domestic Violence Criminal Justice Response and Enhancement Advisory Council to assess treatment provider gaps and further develop a wider network of approved domestic violence treatment providers.