

Connecticut Juvenile Justice Policy Oversight Committee

Population and System Metrics Report

Compiled by:

The Charter Oak Group, LLC

Submitted to:

JJPOC Data Committee

June 2017

Introduction and Overview

This report is intended to provide the CT JJPOC with a periodic picture of the juvenile justice system using an array of population and system level indicators and performance measures. These are consistent with the Results-Based Accountability Implementation Plan adopted by the JJPOC in March of 2016. Many of the indicators and measures contained in this report were recommended in the implementation plan.

The JJPOC data committee has since reviewed the implementation plan and refined the indicators and measures to be systematically and periodically reported. The data committee also cross walked these metrics with the three goals of the JJPOC related to diversion, recidivism and incarceration:

Diversion	Incarceration	Recidivism
Youth Justice Involvement Rate	# of juveniles in detention by geography	Outcomes of children arrested
Referrals to Court by Court Location	# of juveniles committed delinquent	Recidivism rate by type, and new arrest, adjudicated/convicted
School Based Arrests	# of juveniles committed delinquent and admitted to CJTS/Pueblo	
Cross-Goal Indicators and Measures <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 4 Year HS Graduation Rate• Youth School Attendance Rate• School Disciplinary Rate• Youth Wellness Index		
Data Development Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Refine wellness index• At risk of homelessness• Cross over youth• Graduation, attendance and disciplinary rates for those justice-involved• Disaggregate indicators by gender and race		

The table on the prior lists several “data development agenda” items that will require more work before they can be included in this report. There are also other kinds of data that might be appropriate for this report that need to be collected from the different partner agencies. Some of this information, such as outcomes for participants that receive different services, may also require additional data analysis and development.

The system is not without the capacity to do some of this development work. In fact, some of the work is already being done in current studies or initiatives either under the auspices of JJPOC or at individual agencies. However, as is often the case, integrating this information from these disparate sources, or aggregating this information across agencies or programs can be difficult. In the next year, the JJPOC data committee will assess the resources we have available to work on these data development tasks, and prioritize them in terms of value and feasibility.

Table of Contents


INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW	2
JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE METRIC DASHBOARD	5
DISPOSITIONAL FLOW CHART, PROGRAM YEAR 2015	6
TOTAL UNIQUE CLIENTS SERVED IN CALENDAR YEAR.....	7
YOUTH JUSTICE INVOLVEMENT RATE	8
JUVENILE REVIEW BOARD SERVICE RATES	9
12 MONTH RECIDIVISM FOR ALL CHILDREN REFERRED TO COURT	10
12 MONTH RECIDIVISM RATE FOR CLIENTS STARTING SUPERVISION	12
JUVENILE DETENTIONS BY COURT LOCATION	13
STATUS OF CHILDREN COMMITTED DELINQUENT	14
OUTCOMES OF CHILDREN ARRESTED IN CONNECTICUT	16
YOUTH 4 YEAR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RATE.....	17
YOUTH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE RATE	18
SCHOOL BASED COURT REFERRALS.....	19
SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY RATES.....	21
YOUTH HEALTH/WEALTH INDEX	22
APPENDIX A: DIVERSION DATA.....	24
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	28

Juvenile Justice System Performance Metric Dashboard

Juvenile Justice System----- Population or System Performance Metric Dashboard	Most Recent Available Year	One Year Prior	Five Year Trend	Is Trend Positive or Negative?
	2016	2015		
Total Unique Clients Served	10567	12004		Positive
Youth Justice Involvement Rate	2.67%	3.06%		Positive
12 Month Recidivism Rate For All Those Referred To Court				
New Arrests	44.01%	42.95%		Negative
Adjudication/Conviction	19.01%	18.91%		Mixed
Juvenile Detentions	1080	1261		Positive
Committed Delinquent to CJTS	140	207		Positive
Committed Delinquent to Congregate Care	164	224		Positive
Committed Delinquent to Detention/Corrections	148	146		Mixed
Committed Delinquent to Parole	215	288		Mixed
12 Month Recidivism Rate For All Those Under Supervision	46.60%	42.83%		Mixed
Outcomes for Children Referred to Court				
Convicted (Probation)	1358	1716		N/A
Convicted (Discharged)	749	780		N/A
Convicted (DCF Commitment)	257	317		N/A
Transfer to Adult Court	180	192		N/A
Non Judicial Supervision	2207	2445		N/A
Not Guilty or Dismissed	5115	5692		
CT Four Year Graduation Rate	2015-2016	2015-2014		
Statewide	87.40%	85.50%		Positive
Eligible For Free Lunch	74.40%	73.10%		Positive
CT Chronic Absenteeism Rate	2015-2016	2015-2014		
Statewide	9.60%	10.60%		Positive
Eligible for Free Lunch	17.70%	19.90%		Positive
School Suspensions	2015-2016	2015-2014		
in school	56866	56638		Positive
out of school	34415	37701		Positive
School-Based Court Referrals	1630	1624		Negative
	2015	2013		
Health Index	19.27	20.57		Mixed
mental/behavioral risks	14.55	16		Mixed
safety	11.78	13.71		Positive
nutrition	23.3	25.4		Negative
fitness	25.83	25.75		Negative
substance abuse	18.1	21		Positive

Dispositional Flow Chart, Program Year 2015

The following diagram shows the disposition of children referred to court prior to their 18th birthday. As the diagram shows, there were 10150 case dispositions in juvenile court in 2015, 62.3% of which were handled judicially.




More information on juvenile court referrals and dispositions can be found on the Office of Policy and Management website here:

<http://www.ct.gov/opm/cwp/view.asp?a=2974&Q=471654>

Total Unique Clients Served in Calendar Year

The following chart shows the total number of children served (unduplicated, not cases) from 2006 to 2016.




Unique Clients Served Per Calendar Year												
Total number of unique clients either referred to court or supervised by probation during the calendar year. Youth can be represented in more than one sub-category in the same year.												
Category	Figure	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Unique Clients	Clients	16,863	15,697	13,051	11,659	13,324	13,017	12,649	13,300	12,845	12,004	10,567
Delinquent	Clients	12,706	11,838	10,172	8,763	10,761	10,362	9,923	10,489	9,773	8,711	7,874
FWSN	Clients	5,360	4,759	3,263	2,844	3,173	3,394	3,600	3,982	4,172	4,389	3,602
YIC	Clients	1,491	1,420	1,070	1,291	671	516	368	7			

- Please note "FWSN" stands for "Families with Service Needs" and "YIC" stands for "Youth in Crisis"

Source: Connecticut Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division

Youth Justice Involvement Rate

The following chart shows the percent of children 10-17 in CT that were referred to court, 2009 to 2016.



	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
# of justice involved youth	11,659	13,324	13,017	12,649	13,300	12,845	12,004	10,657
# youth 10-17	387,888	397,134	398,287	389,371	387,205	380,758	392,181	396,103
Percent 10-17 justice involved	3.01%	3.36%	3.27%	3.25%	3.43%	3.37%	3.06%	2.69%


Source: Connecticut Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division

Please note that this includes all juveniles that were referred to court in each year, as well as those juveniles that had continued court involvement (supervised by probation or committed from the prior year).

A dynamic that is not captured by this measure is the relationship between court referral and diversion. Any individual referred to a diversion program after court referral would be counted in the above numbers. However, if diversion occurred **in place** of court referral, these diversions are not counted in the above number. Additionally, discretion at the point of police contact that results in no official diversion referral (e.g. juvenile review board) is not counted. See the chart on the next page for an estimate of referrals to juvenile review boards across the state.


Juvenile Review Board Service Rates

A Juvenile Review Board (JRB) is a community-based diversion process for youth that may otherwise be referred to the Juvenile Court for minor violations of the law. Although there is no specific enabling statute establishing a JRB, the Youth Service Bureau (YSB) JRB model has been in existence for 50 years in Connecticut. The closest statutory basis for the YSB JRB model is found in Connecticut General Statutes §10-19m that establishes a YSB as *“multipurpose youth service bureau for the purposes of evaluation, planning, coordination and implementation of services, including prevention and intervention programs for delinquent, pre-delinquent, pregnant, parenting and troubled youths referred to such bureau by schools, police, juvenile courts, adult courts, local youth-serving agencies, parents and self-referrals.”* That statute goes on to say that the YSB *“shall be the coordinating unit of community-based services to provide comprehensive delivery of prevention, intervention, treatment and follow-up services”* and it provides that the YSB deliver the following services: (1) *Individual and group counseling*; (2) *parent training and family therapy*; (3) *work placement and employment counseling*; (4) *alternative and special educational opportunities*; (5) *recreational and youth enrichment programs*; (6) *outreach programs to insure participation and planning by the entire community for the development of regional and community-based youth services*; (7) *preventive programs, including youth pregnancy, youth suicide, violence, alcohol and drug prevention*; and (8) *programs that develop positive youth involvement.*” These are all services provided by the JRB to comply with the clear legislative mandate to ***“meet the needs of youths by the diversion of troubled youths from the justice system as well as by the provision of opportunities for all youths to function as responsible members of their communities.”***



Source: CT State Department of Education, Youth Service Bureau Program

The following chart shows activity by Juvenile Review Boards funded by the CT Department of Children and Families. This activity is not represented in the chart on the previous page. This activity takes place primarily in the Hartford and New Haven areas.




Source: Connecticut Department of Children and Families

The chart above shows the activity of the Juvenile Review Board sites fully funded by the CT Department of Children and Families. This activity is separate from the activity reflected in the chart on the prior page and the information contained in Appendix A.

12 Month Recidivism For All Children Referred To Court

The following chart shows the 12 month recidivism rate for all children referred to court. The solid line is the new arrest rate, while the dashed line is the re-adjudication/conviction rate.



Recidivism of All Clients Referred - New Arrest												
The percentage of all youth referred who incur new charges in the standard exposure periods (3/6/12/24 months) following referral. Violations of probation are excluded from calculation; new status offenses are included only for FWSN youth.												
YearID		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Three Months	Clients	17,745	17,759	14,593	12,859	14,407	14,234	13,457	14,525	13,885	13,142	11,822
	Rate	16.70%	21.50%	20.70%	20.20%	19.20%	17.90%	18.10%	18.30%	17.80%	19.07%	21.37%
Six Months	Clients		17,891	15,051	13,241	13,964	14,448	13,084	14,622	14,047	13,360	12,041
	Rate		32.50%	32.40%	30.90%	29.30%	28.00%	27.40%	28.60%	28.30%	29.15%	31.14%
12 Months	Clients		18,649	16,996	14,046	12,588	15,224	13,646	13,861	14,506	13,759	12,647
	Rate		46.80%	45.80%	44.70%	44.00%	41.80%	41.10%	42.00%	42.30%	42.95%	44.01%
24 Months	Clients			18,649	16,996	14,046	12,588	15,224	13,646	13,861	13,948	13,761
	Rate			60.20%	59.50%	58.80%	58.20%	55.10%	55.00%	55.30%	56.64%	55.44%

Recidivism of All Clients Referred - Adjudication/Conviction												
The percentage of all youth referred who incur new a new adjudication or conviction in the standard exposure periods (3/6/12/24 months) following referral. Violations of probation are excluded from calculation; new status offense adjudications are included only for FWSN												
YearID		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Three Months	Clients	17,745	17,759	14,593	12,859	14,407	14,234	13,457	14,525	13,885	13,142	11,822
	Rate	2.50%	3.50%	3.20%	2.80%	2.40%	2.40%	2.60%	2.70%	2.70%	2.82%	3.45%
Six Months	Clients		17,891	15,051	13,241	13,964	14,448	13,084	14,622	14,047	13,360	12,041
	Rate		11.20%	10.50%	9.60%	8.30%	8.30%	7.80%	8.20%	7.60%	8.02%	8.70%
12 Months	Clients		18,649	16,996	14,046	12,588	15,224	13,646	13,861	14,506	13,759	12,647
	Rate		24.60%	23.30%	21.90%	20.30%	19.00%	18.90%	19.60%	18.60%	18.91%	19.01%
24 Months	Clients			18,649	16,996	14,046	12,588	15,224	13,646	13,861	13,948	13,761
	Rate			38.30%	36.40%	34.50%	33.80%	32.00%	32.20%	32.10%	31.75%	30.46%


Source: Connecticut Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division

New Arrests—the percentage of all youth who incur new charges in the 24 months following referral. Violations of probation are excluded from the calculation; new status offenses are included only for FWSN youth.

Adjudication/Conviction—the percentage of all youth referred who incur a new adjudication or conviction in the 24 months following referral. Violations of probation are excluded from calculation; new status offense adjudications are included only for FWSN youth.

12 Month Recidivism Rate For Clients Starting Supervision

The following is the 12-month Recidivism rate for children starting supervision. This is the percentage of youth who incur new charges in the first 12 months following the start of supervision. The rate for all starting supervision and the delinquent rate are very similar, and has increased in the last two years following several years of slow decline.



Source: Connecticut Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division

12 Month Recidivism Rate on Clients Starting Supervision											
The percentage of youth who incur new charges in the first 12 months following the start of supervision. Violations of probation are excluded from the calculation: new status offenses are included only for FWSN youth.											
Year ID		2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
All Supervision Starts	Clients	4067	3767	2610	2049	2592	2176	2001	2248	1719	1369
	Rate	50.5%	51.3%	49.3%	47.3%	45.3%	44.6%	44.0%	43.1%	42.8%	46.6%
Delinquent	Clients	2764	2687	2507	1993	2517	2112	1931	2182	1779	1367
	Rate	49.8%	50.5%	49.6%	47.6%	45.3%	44.8%	44.2%	42.6%	42.8%	46.6%
FWSN	Clients	1264	1056	79	31	58	49	50	66		
	Rate	52.2%	53.5%	44.3%	45.2%	50.0%	38.8%	52.0%	62.1%		
YIC	Clients	39	24	24	25	17	15	20			
	Rate	41.0%	50.0%	37.5%	28.0%	23.5%	26.7%				

Please note that the number and rate for FWSN in 2015 and 2016 have been excluded due to small cell size.

- Please note “FWSN” stands for “Families with Service Needs” and “YIC” stands for “Youth in Crisis”


Juvenile Detentions By Court Location

Court Location	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Bridgeport	207	176	139	134	130	173	187	270	231	163	127
Danbury	26	20	21	23	19	39	21	31	33	39	35
Hartford	576	565	442	396	386	442	315	332	284	200	200
Middletown	73	48	55	50	35	55	49	57	69	62	43
New Britain	139	121	98	96	93	144	146	160	118	82	87
New Haven	507	364	364	279	296	286	242	305	300	243	181
Norwalk	21	24	26	29	38						
Rockville	73	58	41	45	57	64	59	74	44	44	39
Stamford	64	42	34	34	41	63	41	80	92	59	68
Torrington	56	47	45	23	28	54	50	52	45	41	27
Waterbury	188	234	179	149	178	239	268	260	258	239	190
Waterford	75	58	41	33	45	58	47	54	53	55	60
Willimantic	31	37	26	23	26	30	21	35	30	34	23
Total:	2,036	1,794	1,511	1,314	1,372	1,647	1,446	1,710	1,557	1,261	1,080

Source: https://www.jud.ct.gov/statistics/juvdet/Juv_Det_yearly.pdf

The tables above show the number of juvenile detentions by court location. Additional data on detention admissions, including disaggregation by age, race/ethnicity, and reason for detention can be found here: https://www.jud.ct.gov/statistics/juvdet/Juv_Det_yearly.pdf

Status of Children Committed Delinquent




The above chart shows the status of children committed delinquent. Overall, the number of children committed delinquent has been decreasing. However, the number of children committed delinquent and admitted to detention/correction has increased over time.

The follow table further details the commitments by source.

Committed delinquent and admitted to CJTS/Pueblo,	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
from court	93	79	114	131	95	61	43
from congregate care	34	44	39	40	27	17	15
from parole	40	56	72	72	50	36	14
escapees	5	8	5	6	11	3	1
From Correction/Detention	12	9	5	16	24	23	24
Total	184	196	235	265	207	140	97
Committed delinquent and admitted to congregate care							
from court	97	91	85	67	41	48	50
from CJTS/Pueblo	83	76	55	58	42	44	28
from parole/community	13	10	12	15	58	23	18
from congregate care	77	52	71	53	83	37	40
From AWOL	2	6	5	1		1	
From Detention/Correction	3	9	3	8		11	28
Total	275	244	231	202	224	164	164
Committed delinquent and admitted to Detention/Correction							
from court	0	0	0	0	1	0	9
from CJTS/Pueblo	15	12	17	11	16	12	4
from parole/community	10	13	15	44	63	70	68
From detention/Correction	4	7	11	29	53	44	45
from congregate care	6	9	6	5	8	19	19
from AWOL	2	1	0	3	5	3	4
Total	37	42	49	92	146	148	149
Committed delinquent and admitted to Parole (community)							
from court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
from CJTS/Pueblo	78	122	127	176	198	121	65
from congregate care	113	181	125	83	66	65	63
From Detention/Correction	5	7	2	13	24	29	33
From AWOL							4
Total	196	310	254	272	288	215	165


Outcomes of Children Arrested in Connecticut

The following chart shows outcomes of children arrested in CT, 2009 to 2015. About half of the juveniles arrested are found not guilty or their case is dismissed. The number of juveniles who are under non-judicial supervision increased from 2009 to 2011, and has remained fairly consistence since. The number of juveniles who were convicted and placed on probation has slowly and steadily declined since 2009, as has the number of juveniles committed delinquent.




Source: Connecticut Office of Policy and Management

Youth 4 Year High School Graduation Rate



Source: CT Department of Education via Edsight.ct.gov


The four-year high school graduation rate has steadily increased over the last four years, and is at 87.4% statewide for the 2015-2016 school year. Large city rates, with the exception of Stamford, are uniformly lower.



Source: CT Department of Education via CTdata.org


The graduation rates for those eligible for free lunch meals is somewhat lower than the overall rate for Connecticut. The same rates for large cities are substantially lower, with all but Stamford having rates under 75% for the 2015-2016 school year.

Youth School Attendance Rate



Source: CT State Department of Education, via Edsight.ct.gov

The percentage of youth with chronic absenteeism (20 or more days absent in the school year) has been decreasing, both in CT overall and in the large cities. The rate is over 15% in all large cities other than Stamford.




Source: CT Department of Education via CTdata.org


When chronic absenteeism is examined for those eligible for free meals, it is substantially higher in CT overall as well as in the large cities.

School Based Court Referrals

School court referrals, as reported in the charts below, means that when the court referral was made the box for “school related” was checked.




The number of school based court referrals, both total referrals and unique clients, has been steadily increasing.



Source: Connecticut Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division


The above chart shows the number of court referrals and unique clients with that were school related for select large cities. The numbers have been increasing in Hartford and Waterbury, while there has been some variability in the trend in Bridgeport, New Haven, and Stamford.



Source: CT State Department of Education, YSB Program

The chart above shows the number of JRB Participants in YSB Programs, for whom the reason for referral “school based arrest,” broken out by race category. Important to note, but not shown on the chart, is that 36.5% of the participants were of Hispanic/Latino origin.

School Disciplinary Rates



Source: CT State Department of Education via Edsight.ct.gov


The number of out of school and in school suspensions have decreased steadily statewide from 2011-2012 to 2015-2016, as has the number of expulsions. The table below shows there is considerable variation in the trends for each of the large cities.

District	Sanction Type	Year	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16
Bridgeport School District	In-School Suspension		5688	5329	4214	4536	5085
	Out-of-School Suspension		5158	4181	4783	3937	3393
	Expulsion		45	51	54	44	76
	Bus Suspension		56	59	45	19	16
Hartford School District	In-School Suspension		3850	3945	3968	3774	3965
	Out-of-School Suspension		5603	5793	5861	4883	3531
	Expulsion		74	105	92	104	82
	Bus Suspension		55	122	59	78	84
New Haven School District	In-School Suspension		720	700	735	762	623
	Out-of-School Suspension		3198	1974	1958	2822	2640
	Expulsion		71	86	58	40	30
	Bus Suspension		0	*	*	78	78
Stamford School District	In-School Suspension		263	206	170	66	293
	Out-of-School Suspension		550	410	504	531	606
	Expulsion		49	39	34	23	29
	Bus Suspension		0	0	*	*	10
Waterbury School District	In-School Suspension		7272	6955	7709	6577	6193
	Out-of-School Suspension		6332	6148	5994	5854	6557
	Expulsion		7	27	27	*	*
	Bus Suspension		107	68	66	116	131

Youth Health/Wellness Index

The youth wellness index is derived from the Connecticut Youth Risk Behavior Survey, which is administered to high school students across CT every two years. The intent of the index is to represent the overall wellness of high school aged youth in CT, and to provide further information about wellness on five dimensions of wellness.

For purposes of this index, five dimensions were identified: Mental Health, Fitness, Nutrition, Safety, and Substance Abuse. Please note that many of the questions on the survey included affirmative responses to negative behaviors or circumstances. To be consistent, all responses were standardized so they were all negative (a higher score is worse) *Also, this is a straight, mechanical aggregation of the responses to these questions, and does not represent any statistical exploration of the relationship between the questions, the dimensions, and the overall index (e.g, dimension reduction (factor analysis), or scale optimization).*



For purposes of this index, the lower the number the better. There has been slight improvement on the safety, mental health, and substance abuse dimensions, while the nutrition and fitness dimensions are worsening, leaving mixed results for the overall index.

	2011	2013	2015
Wellness Risk Factor	Percent	Percent	Percent
Carried a weapon on school property	6.60	6.60	6.20
Were threatened or injured with a weapon on school property	6.80	7.10	6.70
Were in a physical fight	25.10	22.40	18.40
Did not go to school because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to or from school	5.30	6.80	6.90
Were electronically bullied	16.30	17.50	13.90
Were bullied on school property	21.60	21.90	18.60
Felt sad or hopeless	24.40	27.20	26.60
Seriously considered attempting suicide	14.60	14.50	13.40
Attempted suicide	6.70	8.10	7.90
Currently smoked cigarettes	15.9	13.5	10.3
Currently drank alcohol	42	37	30
Currently used marijuana	24.1	26	20.4
Did not eat fruit or drink 100% fruit juices	4.4	4.7	6.3
Did not eat vegetables	4	6	7
Did not eat breakfast		12.6	13.4
Did not eat breakfast on all 7 days		66.3	62.6
Did not participate in at least 60 minutes of physical activity on at least 1 day	11.5	14.1	14.3
Were not physically active at least 60 minutes per day on 5 or more days	51	53	55
Played video or computer games or used a computer 3 or more hours per day	30.5	36.7	37.8
Watched 3 or more hours per day of television	27	24	22
Had obesity	12.5	12.3	12.3
Were overweight	14	14	14
Average Across Questions	18.96	20.57	19.27

Source: Connecticut Youth Risk Behavior Survey, Center For Disease Control

Appendix A: Diversion Data

The data in the tables starting on the next page show the number of diversion cases in each jurisdiction. The first column indicates the organizations that made their YSB or JRB reports or both. The non-YSB organizations are noted, in part, to explain the absence of a YSB report. Some YSBs do not have YSB reports because they have been given an extension related to their use of a reporting software (Kidtrax) that is facing significant changes.

The second column shows the YSB reports made. The third column indicates the submission of JRB data. The fourth column indicates the number of JRB cases during the program year July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016.

Special notes:

- A number in red, indicates incomplete reporting
- An “na” indicates the organization does not provide that report
- A “0” indicates the organization should provide that report but has not

Town	Town	SRD	Number of Cases
1. AHM (Andover, Hebron, Marlborough)	0	1	38
2. Ansonia	1	1	22
3. Ashford	1		
4. Avon	1	1	33
5. Branford	1	0	
6. Bridgeport	1	1	281
7. Bristol	1	1	45
8. Cheshire	1	1	12
9. Clinton	1	1	4
10. Colchester	1	1	10
11. Coventry	1	1	9
12. Darien	1		
13. Derby	1	1	27
14. Durham/Middlefield	1	1	12
15. East Haddam	1	1	8
16. East Hartford (Kidtrax)	0	1	155
17. Ellington	1	0	
18. Fairfield	1	1	13
19. Farmington	1	1	26
20. Glastonbury	1	0	
21. Griswold	1	1	8
22. Groton	1	1	16
23. Guilford	1	1	15
24. Haddam/Killingworth	1	1	8
25. Hamden	1	1	31
26. Hartford	1	1	77
27. Lyme/Old Lyme	0	1	11
28. Madison	1	1	11
29. Manchester	1	1	78

30. Mansfield	1		
31. Meriden	1	1	122
32. Middletown (Kidtrax)	0	1	25
33. Milford	1		
34. Montville	1	1	12
35. Naugatuck	1	1	87
36. New Britain	0	1	107
37. New Canaan	1		
38. New London	1	1	33
39. New Haven (nonYSB)	na	1	159
40. New Milford	1	0	
41. Newington	1	0	
42. Newtown	1	1	19
43. North Haven	0	1	6
44. Norwalk	1	1	148
45. Norwich	1	1	56
46. Orange	1	0	
47. Plainfield	0	1	35
48. Portland	1	1	6
49. Rocky Hill	1	1	10
50. Shelton	1	1	13
51. Simsbury	1	0	
52. Southington	1	1	20
53. South Windsor	0	1	3
54. Stafford	1	0	
55. Stamford (nonYSB)	na	1	55
56. Stratford	1	1	33
57. Tolland	1	1	10

58. Torrington	1	1	12
59. TTYB	1	1	8
60. Vernon (Kidtrax?)	0	1	25
61. Wallingford	1		
62. Waterbury	1	1	108
63. West Hartford	1	(not ysb run)	
64. West Haven	1		
65. Westbrook	1	1	1
66. Westport	1	(report with Norwalk)	
67. Wethersfield	1	1	13
68. Wilton	1		
69. Winchester	1	0	
70. Windham	1	1	43
71. Windsor	1	1	73
72. Windsor Locks	1	1	10
73. Woodbridge	1	0	
74. TEEG (nonYSB)	na	1	36
Totals	58	54	2238

Acknowledgements

This report was compiled by Ron Schack, Ph.D., of The Charter Oak Group, LLC. Agency staff that assisted Dr. Schack include Brian Hill, Brian Sperry, and Peter Kukol at the State of CT Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division; Anne McInyre-Lahner, Linda Dixon and Steve Smith from the CT Department of Children and Families and Ajit Gopalakrishnan from the CT State Department of Education. Barry Goff of the Charter Oak Group, LLC also assisted in the compilation of the report.

The report was developed and reviewed by the CT JJPOC data committee, chaired by Natalie Wagner from the CT Office of Policy and Management and Brian Hill from the CT Judicial Branch.

Other members include:

Erica Bromley
William Carbone
Barbara Claire
Kendall Coker
Andrew Condon
Danielle Cooper
Miguel De Figueroa
Dominic Falcone
Ajit Gopalakrishnan
Patrick Hynes
Mikey Kramer
Peter Kukol
Mary Lansing
Michele Massores
Noel Miano
Erika Nowakowski
Christine Rapillo
Lauren Ruth
Susan Smith
Brian Sperry