Public Attitudes and Juvenile
Justice Policy Reform in
Connecticut: A Survey on
TUTEJTH
FUTEConnecticut: A Survey on
Truancy and Status Offenses

University of New Haven

Danielle T. Cooper Ph.D., CPP

Presentation to Truancy Subgroup of the Diversion Workgroup 7/27/2021





"School-to-Prison Pipeline"





"School-to-Prison Pipeline"

- Over 7 million students missed 15 or more days from schools in 2015-16 school year. That's about 1 in 6 students (Department of Education, 2019).
- There are 87,900 petitioned status offense cases handled by U.S. juvenile courts and 61% are for truancy in 2017 (OJJDP, 2019).



What Is Truancy?

- A legal term
- Defined by each state
- A status offense in most states
- Designated numbers of unexcused absence from school over a month or a year

In Connecticut, a truant means someone who,

- between the ages of 5 to 18
- is enrolled in a public or private school
- has 4 unexcused absences from school in one month or 10 in a school year



Consequences of Missing School

1. Possible Short-term Adverse Outcomes

- Poor school performance (Hunt & Hopko, 2009)
- School dropout (Henry et al., 2012)
- Early justice system involvement (Bennett et al., 2017; Vaughn et al., 2013)

2. Possible Long-term Adverse Outcomes

- Enhance the chances that negative outcomes will extend into adulthood
- Being unemployed, in less stable relationships, and engaging in crime as adults (Flaherty et al., 2012; Nolan et al., 2013; Henry, 2007; Meyer & Goldman, 2015)



Decriminalization of Truancy and Other Status Offenses in Connecticut

- In 2016, CT eliminated truancy and defiance of school rules referrals from court interventions (effective on August 15, 2017; Public Act 16-147).
- In 2018 and 2019, called for the removal of all other status offenses from the juvenile court jurisdiction (effective on July 1, 2020; Public Act 17-2 & PA 19-187).



Administrative Advocacy Efforts

- Include public voices after the laws were put in place
- Better inform the relevant parties around policy implementations

Comprehend Connecticut adult residents' awareness and recommendations on the legislation of status offense and truancy preventions.

Research Questions



- 1. What are the experiences of parents and non-parents in CT have with truancy?
- 2. How are parents and non-parents in CT informed about school attendance polices and the changes in status offense policies?
- 3. What are believed and recommended interventions for truancy by parents and non-parents in CT?
- 4. What are the recommended parties in preventing truancy?

T YOUTH JUSTICE INSTITUTE University of New Haven

Methodology

Survey Research: Online questionnaire via Qualtrics.

Sampling Frame: Adults in Connecticut from the top four cities that had the highest numbers of truant cases reported in 2016-17: Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, and Waterbury.

Sample:

- A convenience sample (n=796) from the Qualtrics panel
- Included 56.7% parents and 43.3% non-parents
- Included 30.8% males and 68.5% females

Demographics



	Sample	Parents	Non-parents	Sig.
Average age	38.2	43.7	30.9	* * *
Female	68.5%	67.9%	68.9%	
Non-Hispanic White	58.9%	57.6%	60.7%	
Undergrad degree	40.3%	39.6%	41.2%	
Never married	50.1%	27.2%	80.8%	* * *
Average # of children		2.4		
Engage with minors daily	43.2%	59.6%	22%	* * *



Experience with Truancy

	Parents	Non-parents	Sig.
Self-engagement in truancy	10.2%	11.8%	
Child-engagement in truancy	9.8%		
Know someone has engaged in truancy	55.1%	64.2%	*



Self-reported Knowledge about Polices

	Parents	Non-parents	Sig.
Read 2018-19 school policies	35.6%	14.7%	* * *
Read 2018-19 student handbook	38%	15.9%	* * *
Familiarity with school policies	Slightly & Not at all (45.8%)	Slightly & Not at all (64.4%)	* * *
Familiarity with SO policies	Slightly & Not at all (60.2%)	Slightly & Not at all (74.8%)	* * *



Tested Knowledge about Polices

	Parents	Non-parents	Sig.
Know school days per year	24.2%	21.5%	
Know school hours per day	31.8%	18.0%	* * *
Truancy: Know unexcused absences per month	18.0%	12.8%	*
Truancy: Know unexcused absences per year	10.0%	7.8%	
Truancy: Know decriminalization	22.4%	22.3%	
Defying school rules: Know decriminalization	50.0%	61.6%	* *

"What are ...?"



		Parents	Non-parents	Sig.
	School	79.8%	75.7%	
Current	Community	29.6%	28.0%	
interventions	Court	50.2%	43.1%	*
for truancy	Out of home placement	17.8%	17.1%	
	Detention/Incarceration	19.1%	21.7%	
	School	83.3%	78.0%	
Recommended	Community	45.8%	42.5%	
interventions for truancy	Court	39.1%	37.9%	
	Out of home placement	14.2%	15.9%	
	Detention/Incarceration	18.2%	22.3%	



"Who is responsible for truancy prevention?"

	Parents	Non-parents	Sig.
Parents or guardians	99.1%	98.3%	
Teachers	50.9%	47.4%	
School administrators	56.0%	50.6%	
School resource officers	48.9%	35.0%	* * *
Community members	29.6%	27.2%	
Other youth/peers	30.9%	33.5%	

Key Findings



- 1. Among people who are influenced the most, they were poorly informed about school polices and status-offense-related policies in CT.
- 2. Parents have higher intent of learning policies that related to youth. While parents are not more knowledgeable than non-parents in these polices, except in micro level knowledge.
- 3. Nearly half of participants still think the court interventions are possible in addressing truancy
- 4. Almost all participants agree that parents and guardians are responsible in preventing truancy
- 5. More community-based approaches are recommended to prevent truancy.



Administrative Advocacy - Next Step

- Make sure parents are well educated about school and legislative policies, as well as the importance of the policies
- Make policies to be easy accessible and understandable
- Improve data measurements and collection for better policy reform and evaluation needs
- Ensure research-based best practices for reducing truancy



Thank you and Questions?



Dr. Danielle T. Cooper

DCooper@newhaven.edu

University of New Haven

Henry C. Lee College of Criminal Justice & Forensic Sciences Tow Youth Justice Institute