

NATIONAL HOME EDUCATION LEGAL DEFENSE, LLC

Founder: Attorney Deborah G. Stevenson
P.O. Box 704
Southbury, CT 06488
(860) 354-3590
Email: stevenson@dgstevensonlaw.com

August 18, 2025

STATEMENT TO THE MEDIA AND TO THE PUBLIC THAT STATISTICS OF THE STATE'S CHILD ADVOCATE ARE FATALLY FLAWED.

The Child Advocate has put out certain purported "statistics" in a feeble attempt to convince legislators that homeschoolers, and private schoolers, should be regulated. She claims that her figures show that the number of reports to DCF about homeschoolers shows the "need" for such regulation. The Child Advocate's report, however, not only is deceptive, but it is also fatally flawed, such that any of her so-called "conclusions" are totally invalid.

Here's why in a nutshell.

The Child Advocate is not a statistician.

The Child Advocate's figures are inaccurate and misleading.

The Child Advocate did not conduct a scientifically accurate comparison.

The Child Advocate did not establish a control group of non-homeschooled public schoolers.

The Child Advocate did not isolate a single variable.

The Child Advocate did not conduct a legitimate objective comparison.

The Child Advocate took a random sample of a particular subset of homeschoolers between the ages of 7 and 11 without any explanation for that subset.

The Child Advocate did not identify which, or how many, of the sample homeschool reports to DCF were substantiated or for what reason the families were reported to DCF.

The Child Advocate made no comparative figures for reports made of any similar subset of public schooled students.

The Child Advocate has not provided access to any of the raw data or records of the reports to DCF for anyone to verify.

In short, the Child Advocate's report is merely a subjective descriptive document containing random figures of no statistical value, such that her conclusions are illegitimate, fatally flawed, must be retracted, and are of no value to be used as a basis for any rational conclusions.

The State's Child Advocate needs to immediately **RETRACT** her misleading May 5, 2025 Report recommending regulation of homeschooling because it is flawed beyond belief such that no one can rely on its conclusions or recommendations, particularly not legislators.

We went to several scientists and statisticians for analysis of the figures used by the Child Advocate for a professional opinion, and that opinion resulted in the above findings and more.

NHELD and CHN contacted three different, highly qualified PhD. level statisticians and scientists, from three entirely separate universities, and asked them to review the validity of the OCA's report. Separately, all three concluded the same thing: **The OCA's report is not a statistical analysis, at all. It is merely a descriptive report from which no valid inferences or conclusions can be made.**

Our statisticians indicate that to design a sound scientific analysis to identify the effect of homeschooling on DCF involvement, **one would select two sample populations - one homeschooled and one not, and within those populations one would compare the incidence and severity of DCF reports of neglect or abuse.** Instead of doing that, however, without explanation, the OCA merely took a random sampling of homeschoolers, did not establish any control group of non-homeschooled public schoolers, did not isolate a single variable, and did not conduct a legitimate comparison.

The result is that the **OCA's report, statistically speaking, is meaningless, and cannot be used as a basis to support any conclusions or recommendations.**

What the OCA did is not analysis. **It is merely a subjective descriptive document containing cherry picked numerical samples and random case studies.**

A true statistical analysis also contains no case samples. It also **makes no inferences without a control group considering valid co-variants and objective results, so that any inferences and conclusions may be validly supported.**

That didn't happen with the OCA's report. In fact, many things are missing from her report.

For example:

No hypothesis was tested.

No control group.

No variables isolated.

No comparison was made between DCF reports about homeschoolers versus public schoolers.

No information of when the reports to DCF about homeschoolers were made.

No information about the nature of the reports made - whether about emotional neglect, physical neglect, etc., thus, no comparison of apples to apples.

No information about why the OCA selected a subset of children.

No information about the rates of reporting in other states or when they were made.

No access to DCF records are available to check the validity of the OCA's figures.

This was not a statistical analysis from which a legitimate inference, conclusion, or recommendation can be validly made. It was merely a descriptive report.

Furthermore, **a true statistical analysis does not contain any case studies. The only reason that the OCA included case studies thus was to appeal to the emotion of legislators.** Yes, the case studies reveal horrific abuse and neglect, but **none of them contained any evidence that the children involved were being homeschooled.** In fact, they show the opposite - that each family, in each case, had been reported to DCF MULTIPLE times while ENROLLED in the public schools, long BEFORE any child was kept from attending. In addition, inexplicably, DCF, knowing of these reports, simply closed those cases once the child failed to return to the school, **instead of more aggressively acting to prevent the neglect or abuse by keeping the case open and following through on prosecution. As a result, lives were lost by the ineptitude or ignorance of the State agencies.**

Either the OCA was acting **intentionally** to skew the results in the direction she wanted, or, she was **negligently inept or ignorant** as to how to conduct a valid statistical analysis, **or both.**

Either way, one thing is glaringly certain: the OCA's report is **wholly invalid and the OCA's conclusions and recommendations are grossly incorrect, invalid, and insupportable.**

No legislator can rely on that report, in any manner, as a basis for “regulation” of homeschoolers.

Instead, legislators should **reprimand the OCA for publishing a deceptive report, and demand a retraction and a corrective statement from the OCA**

More importantly, the **legislators should demand an investigation into the practices of the OCA and DCF as to why cases of abuse and neglect known to be occurring at times for years while children were enrolled in the public school were summarily CLOSED simply because the children were no longer attending the public school. It is outrageous that no one is investigating that abuse and neglect by a State agency, and, instead the OCA and the legislature are turning a blind eye on that to deflect the public’s attention away from the State agencies’ culpability only to focus it wrongly on homeschoolers.**

Do not be duped. Show the Child Advocate’s “report” to any of your own credentialed statistician and you are bound to obtain the same conclusion.

When will a full retraction be made?