



KEY FINDINGS IN THE
COMMISSION'S REPORT ON
AN I/DD DIVERSIONARY
PROGRAM IN CT

APRIL 2026

REPORT GUIDELINES

- PA 23-137 §15 outlines that the Sentencing Commission “shall study the experience of persons with an intellectual disability or other developmental disabilities, including, but not limited to, autism spectrum disorder, who are involved in the criminal justice system. Such study shall include, but need not be limited to, (1) rates of incarceration of such persons compared to the overall population of such persons in the state, (2) the advisability of behavioral assessments of such persons before sentencing and costs of such assessments, and (3) best practices of other states concerning such persons. . . The report shall include the commission's recommendations for sentencing considerations for such persons.”

(2023).

REPORT STRUCTURE

- Introduction + 7 main sections
 - Section I: Methodology
 - Section II: I/DD Defined
 - Section III: Prevalence I/DD Data
 - Section IV: Screening Tools and Assessments
 - Section V: Best Practices in Other States
 - Section VI: Conclusion
 - Section VII: Recommendations

METHODS USED – DOCUMENTS

- Review of scholarly work
- Prevalence statistics and state administrative data from agencies and councils who serve I/DD populations
- More than 10 reports published by state agencies and councils on the numbers and needs of individuals in Connecticut with I/DD
- Training materials used to educate others about I/DD;
- Review of scholarly work, statutes and articles of 21 I/DD related diversionary programs outside of Connecticut among 16 states (BEST PRACTICES)

METHODS USED – INTERVIEWS

- Twenty interviews with
 - Expert professionals in the field of I/DD;
 - Educators;
 - Social workers;
 - Prosecutors;
 - Criminal defense attorneys who practice in state and federal court;
 - Probate attorneys and judges;
 - Individuals with I/DD lived experience in the community;
 - Incarcerated individuals with I/DD lived experience; and
 - Parents and caregivers of individuals with I/DD lived experience;

METHODS USED – INTERVIEWS

- Eight state agency meetings
 - Department of Developmental Services;
 - Council on Developmental Disabilities;
 - Department of Social Services;
 - Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services;
 - Department of Children and Families;
 - Court Support Services Division;
 - Office of the Chief Public Defender; and
 - Office of Policy and Management.

FINDINGS

OVERVIEW

- 18 total findings
- Recommendations – presented by MH Subcommittee

FINDINGS – PREVALENCE DATA

- FINDING #1: CT collects limited data on its I/DD population
 - What is collected: DDS (if ID + IQ 69 or below); DSS (if waiver eligible); DOC (relies on DDS data limited 68 I/DD + 43 ASD in Sept 2025)
 - What is not collected: ID data over IQ of 69; DD individuals who do not have ASD or are not waiver eligible; CSSD; DCJ; OCPD; police departments; courts



DRCT

FINDINGS – PREVALENCE DATA

- FINDING #2: CJS agencies lack adequate training on I/DD (identification, sensitivity)

FINDINGS – PREVALENCE DATA

- FINDING #3: CJS agencies communicate about I/DD individuals on a very limited basis
 - CJS agencies know about I/DD individuals from DDS and DSS

FINDINGS – PREVALENCE DATA

- FINDING #4: There is no standardized practice for collecting data on crimes charged for individuals with I/DD



DRCT

FINDINGS – CHANGES TO I/DD DEFINITIONS/CRITERIA

- FINDING #5: State definition of ID does not account for individuals with IQs above 69 who might be in the CJS

FINDINGS – CHANGES TO I/DD DEFINITIONS/CRITERIA

- FINDING #6: There is no statutory definition for DD.

FINDINGS – CHANGES TO I/DD DEFINITIONS/CRITERIA

- **FINDING #7:** Due to a lack of appropriate diversionary options for defendants, some defendants are court-ordered to WFH, a facility ill-equipped to address their needs

FINDINGS – I/DD PROGRAM COMPONENTS SUPPORTED BY OTHER STATES

- **FINDING #8:** States with I/DD diversionary programs often combine them with existing MH programs, but recognize the need to create individualized support plans with their programs.

FINDINGS – I/DD PROGRAM COMPONENTS SUPPORTED BY OTHER STATES

- FINDING #9: States with I/DD diversionary programs often designate a single agency or non-profit to administer their I/DD diversionary programs

FINDINGS – I/DD PROGRAM COMPONENTS SUPPORTED BY OTHER STATES

- FINDING #10: There are different effective screening tools for ID and ASD that can be either self-administered or with the assistance by non-clinicians
 - HASI/LDSQ
 - CATI

FINDINGS – I/DD PROGRAM COMPONENTS SUPPORTED BY OTHER STATES

- FINDING #11: Most states with I/DD diversionary programs do not automatically exclude an individual because of criminal history or crimes charged

FINDINGS – I/DD PROGRAM COMPONENTS SUPPORTED BY OTHER STATES

- **FINDING #12:** Other states have recognized that clinical evaluations and developing individualized support plans take longer in I/DD diversionary programs than in comparable mental health programs.

FINDINGS – I/DD PROGRAM COMPONENTS SUPPORTED BY OTHER STATES

- FINDING #13 and 14: Other state diversionary programs note that individuals with I/DD are more successful when attainable goals/milestones are set, incentives given

FINDINGS – I/DD PROGRAM COMPONENTS SUPPORTED BY OTHER STATES

- FINDING #15: Other state diversionary programs recognize that individuals with I/DD have lifelong disabilities requiring support after program completion.

FINDINGS – MEASURING PROGRAM SUCCESS IN OTHER STATES

- **FINDING #16:** Other state I/DD diversionary programs establish a review process to measure the success of their programs (e.g. board/council comprised of professionals).

FINDINGS – ADDITION RESEARCH NEEDED

- FINDING #17: More information needed to understand how other states administer their programs include effective data collection and costs



DRCT

FINDINGS – ADDITION RESEARCH NEEDED

- FINDING #18: We only know general national data and through interviews about the types of crimes committed by individuals with I/DD – no CT data
 - E.g., data of the crimes with which individuals with I/DD are charged, how other states administer/evaluate similar programs for this population



DRCT