

# Chapter Four

## HEALTH

LATE OR NO PRENATAL CARE

LOW BIRTHWEIGHT

INFANT MORTALITY (BIRTH TO ONE YEAR)

TEEN BIRTHS (AGES 15-17)

HUSKY A AND B (BIRTH TO 19) -

CHILD ENROLLMENT





### Late or No Prenatal Care

Prenatal care is an important part of delivering healthy babies. Mothers who seek health care early in their pregnancies are more likely to reduce risk factors associated with pregnancy and to identify fetal health problems early on. According to Connecticut data compiled by the Connecticut Department of Public Health, in 2006, non-Hispanic black/African American (25.4 percent) and Hispanic (24.9 percent) women were three times more likely to receive late or no prenatal care compared to non-Hispanic white women (8.6 percent).<sup>1</sup>

Late or No Prenatal Care									
Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006		Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006	
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%
<b>Fairfield Co.</b>	<b>1,396</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>1,482</b>	<b>12.5%</b>					
Bethel	12	6.2%	25	11.9%	Norwalk	199	15.4%	160	12.2%
Bridgeport	469	20.7%	525	21.1%	Redding	3	*	2	*
Brookfield	17	9.6%	19	11.6%	Ridgefield	20	7.8%	18	7.7%
Danbury	193	19.0%	233	19.6%	Shelton	20	4.8%	19	4.8%
Darien	8	2.6%	6	2.1%	Sherman	1	*	4	*
Easton	1	*	2	*	Stamford	279	15.5%	278	14.9%
Fairfield	30	4.7%	24	3.5%	Stratford	52	10.0%	60	9.9%
Greenwich	27	3.9%	35	5.2%	Trumbull	11	2.8%	12	3.4%
Monroe	9	4.5%	6	3.6%	Weston	4	*	4	*
New Canaan	5	2.6%	9	4.7%	Westport	6	2.4%	10	4.3%
New Fairfield	10	6.1%	5	3.9%	Wilton	6	3.7%	9	5.1%
Newtown	14	5.1%	17	7.1%					
<b>Hartford Co.</b>	<b>1,908</b>	<b>18.4%</b>	<b>2,025</b>	<b>19.4%</b>					
Avon	16	9.2%	18	11.7%	Manchester	102	14.4%	122	16.4%
Berlin	19	10.9%	17	10.4%	Marlborough	5	7.0%	4	*
Bloomfield	36	20.5%	21	11.4%	New Britain	241	23.1%	249	22.9%
Bristol	83	11.5%	77	10.6%	Newington	39	15.3%	27	9.8%
Burlington	6	5.6%	7	7.2%	Plainville	27	15.3%	18	10.2%
Canton	7	6.3%	6	5.9%	Rocky Hill	15	8.0%	25	12.8%
East Granby	5	8.8%	2	*	Simsbury	20	9.3%	29	15.2%
East Hartford	145	22.7%	182	26.0%	Southington	45	9.6%	32	7.6%
East Windsor	13	12.6%	13	12.4%	South Windsor	24	11.6%	28	12.6%
Enfield	66	14.2%	46	10.3%	Suffield	9	7.6%	9	7.8%
Farmington	22	9.4%	27	13.1%	West Hartford	88	11.9%	77	12.0%
Glastonbury	23	6.7%	25	7.7%	Wethersfield	34	12.7%	38	15.3%
Granby	9	9.1%	7	7.1%	Windsor	47	16.5%	52	16.2%
Hartford	746	35.6%	846	37.8%	Windsor Locks	14	14.0%	21	18.8%
Hartland	2	*	0						
<b>Litchfield Co.</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>7.8%</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>8.7%</b>					
Barkhamsted	3	*	2	*	Norfolk	0		1	*
Bethlehem	2	*	3	*	North Canaan	2	*	1	*
Bridgewater	2	*	0		Plymouth	6	5.3%	10	7.4%
Canaan	1	*	3	*	Roxbury	2	*	6	27.3%
Colebrook	1	*	1	*	Salisbury	4	*	2	*
Cornwall	1	*	0		Sharon	1	*	1	*
Goshen	5	26.3%	2	*	Thomaston	3	*	5	7.0%
Harwinton	3	*	4	*	Torrington	40	9.2%	54	13.1%
Kent	6	22.2%	2	*	Warren	1	*	0	
Litchfield	7	9.9%	3	*	Washington	0		1	*
Morris	3	*	0		Watertown	10	4.7%	15	7.0%
New Hartford	2	*	9	13.4%	Winchester	13	11.9%	8	6.7%
New Milford	24	6.6%	22	6.8%	Woodbury	7	7.7%	7	8.0%
<b>Middlesex Co.</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>9.7%</b>					
Chester	3	*	5	15.6%	East Hampton	14	10.1%	10	5.9%
Clinton	7	4.9%	13	9.2%	Essex	5	6.4%	3	*
Cromwell	8	5.6%	18	13.7%	Haddam	2	*	7	7.6%
Deep River	7	11.5%	3	*	Killingworth	3	*	2	*
Durham	4	*	3	*	Middlefield	4	*	2	*
East Haddam	9	8.6%	10	11.1%	Middletown	59	10.7%	66	12.2%

## Late or No Prenatal Care

Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006		Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006	
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%
<b>Middlesex Co. contd.</b>									
Old Saybrook	4	*	6	7.9%	Westbrook	9	13.4%	2	*
Portland	7	6.6%	12	14.5%					
<b>New Haven Co.</b>									
	<b>1,121</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>1,409</b>	<b>13.8%</b>					
Ansonia	26	10.4%	22	8.7%	New Haven	374	19.6%	501	23.5%
Beacon Falls	2	*	4	*	North Branford	7	6.2%	8	5.8%
Bethany	0		4	*	North Haven	6	2.8%	10	5.0%
Branford	14	6.1%	12	5.0%	Orange	7	5.5%	6	5.5%
Cheshire	6	2.2%	12	5.2%	Oxford	9	6.3%	3	*
Derby	6	3.7%	16	9.1%	Prospect	7	6.7%	6	7.6%
East Haven	16	5.3%	38	11.9%	Seymour	10	5.5%	10	6.1%
Guilford	5	2.7%	10	5.6%	Southbury	7	4.5%	11	7.9%
Hamden	49	8.0%	67	10.1%	Wallingford	32	7.4%	43	10.1%
Madison	5	3.4%	10	7.8%	Waterbury	242	14.9%	255	15.4%
Meriden	113	14.4%	157	17.8%	West Haven	97	14.1%	130	17.1%
Middlebury	7	10.0%	4	*	Wolcott	8	5.3%	10	8.2%
Milford	38	7.0%	39	7.8%	Woodbridge	2	*	3	*
Naugatuck	26	6.6%	18	4.6%					
<b>New London Co.</b>									
	<b>322</b>	<b>10.2%</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>10.0%</b>					
Bozrah	4	*	1	*	New London	50	12.8%	48	13.0%
Colchester	19	9.1%	8	4.7%	North Stonington	7	13.5%	5	10.6%
East Lyme	4	*	7	5.2%	Norwich	86	16.5%	99	17.6%
Franklin	3	*	2	*	Old Lyme	1	*	5	10.9%
Griswold	24	16.3%	10	7.1%	Preston	2	*	4	*
Groton	56	8.6%	52	8.0%	Salem	3	*	4	*
Lebanon	4	*	4	*	Sprague	2	*	3	*
Ledyard	15	8.5%	15	8.8%	Stonington	10	7.4%	7	5.6%
Lisbon	3	*	3	*	Voluntown	4	*	4	*
Lyme	3	*	1	*	Waterford	9	5.5%	10	6.2%
Montville	13	6.5%	12	7.3%					
<b>Tolland Co.</b>									
	<b>118</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>11.2%</b>					
Andover	3	*	3	*	Somers	6	8.5%	9	13.6%
Bolton	4	*	5	14.3%	Stafford	10	8.5%	13	9.0%
Columbia	4	*	9	18.8%	Tolland	12	7.4%	23	14.5%
Coventry	6	5.5%	9	6.9%	Union	0		1	*
Ellington	8	5.4%	12	7.9%	Vernon	44	12.1%	47	13.6%
Hebron	4	*	7	6.4%	Willington	2	*	2	*
Mansfield	15	14.7%	15	14.0%					
<b>Windham Co.</b>									
	<b>143</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>12.1%</b>					
Ashford	4	*	5	10.4%	Pomfret	4	*	2	*
Brooklyn	3	*	6	7.9%	Putnam	15	15.2%	10	9.2%
Canterbury	3	*	5	11.1%	Scotland	1	*	1	*
Chaplin	1	*	0		Sterling	3	*	2	*
Eastford	0		4	*	Thompson	13	14.3%	8	8.5%
Hampton	1	*	2	*	Windham	51	15.5%	64	19.1%
Killingly	24	10.7%	20	9.0%	Woodstock	4	*	5	9.8%
Plainfield	16	8.2%	25	12.8%					
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>									
	<b>5,302</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>5,858</b>	<b>14.0%</b>					



In Connecticut the data demonstrate women living in urban cities and the outlying communities are more at risk for late or no prenatal care. The availability of routine prenatal care can play a part in reducing maternal death rates and miscarriages as well as birth defects. Connecticut is making progress toward the goal of continuous coverage for mothers and newborns under the HUSKY program and is helping ensure that women achieve early entry into prenatal care.

*Elaine Zimmerman*  
Executive Director  
Connecticut Commission on Children

### Endnotes

1 Moran, J. (2008). *Addressing Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Low Birthweight for Connecticut*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut Department of Public Health.

**Key** \* Percentages for towns in which fewer than five incidents occurred during the reported time period are not calculated because of the unreliability of small numbers.  
SFY State Fiscal Year



## Low Birthweight

Across Connecticut, the number of low-birthweight births increased between SFY 2004 and SFY 2006. Increases occurred throughout Fairfield, Hartford, New London, and Tolland Counties and in several large and moderate-size cities such as Bridgeport, Danbury, Groton, Hartford, New Britain, and Norwalk. The most notable declines were found in the cities of New Haven, New London, and Windham.

The increase in low birthweight in many towns and cities is cause for concern. The national target for low birthweight is 5 percent.<sup>1</sup> Connecticut's low birthweight is 8.1%.

Newborns weighing less than 5 pounds, 8 ounces are considered low birthweight. Low birthweight is primarily caused by premature or multiple births. The negative outcomes resulting from low birthweight are large and costly to both the child and society. They can include any or a mix of learning disabilities, poor educational outcomes, behavioral problems, hearing and vision impairments, cognitive deficiencies, and developmental disabilities.

## Low Birthweight

Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006		Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006	
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%
<b>Fairfield Co.</b>	<b>795</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>907</b>	<b>7.7%</b>					
Bethel	9	4.6%	14	6.7%	Norwalk	88	6.8%	93	7.1%
Bridgeport	199	8.6%	253	10.2%	Redding	5	5.9%	0	
Brookfield	7	3.9%	12	7.3%	Ridgefield	13	5.1%	18	7.7%
Danbury	69	6.8%	78	6.6%	Shelton	31	7.3%	26	6.5%
Darien	18	5.9%	25	8.6%	Sherman	1	*	6	18.2%
Easton	3	*	3	*	Stamford	147	8.1%	133	7.1%
Fairfield	39	6.2%	49	7.2%	Stratford	40	7.6%	61	10.0%
Greenwich	38	5.5%	39	5.8%	Trumbull	32	8.1%	31	8.7%
Monroe	14	6.9%	14	8.4%	Weston	2	*	10	11.8%
New Canaan	4	*	6	3.2%	Westport	8	3.2%	9	3.9%
New Fairfield	8	4.9%	5	3.9%	Wilton	10	6.2%	11	6.3%
Newtown	10	3.6%	11	4.6%					
<b>Hartford Co.</b>	<b>919</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>958</b>	<b>9.2%</b>					
Avon	8	4.5%	9	5.8%	Manchester	60	8.4%	59	8.0%
Berlin	16	9.1%	14	8.5%	Marlborough	8	11.3%	4	*
Bloomfield	28	15.6%	21	11.4%	New Britain	100	9.5%	107	9.8%
Bristol	46	6.3%	55	7.6%	Newington	19	7.3%	26	9.5%
Burlington	4	*	5	5.2%	Plainville	12	6.8%	13	7.4%
Canton	8	7.1%	6	5.9%	Rocky Hill	18	9.6%	21	10.8%
East Granby	4	*	1	*	Simsbury	14	6.5%	7	3.7%
East Hartford	81	12.5%	76	10.8%	Southington	36	7.7%	25	5.9%
East Windsor	8	7.5%	6	5.7%	South Windsor	13	6.3%	13	5.9%
Enfield	28	5.9%	38	8.5%	Suffield	12	10.1%	5	4.3%
Farmington	14	6.0%	16	7.8%	West Hartford	50	6.7%	46	7.2%
Glastonbury	27	7.8%	21	6.4%	Wethersfield	24	8.9%	24	9.6%
Granby	6	5.9%	2	*	Windsor	25	8.6%	35	10.9%
Hartford	242	11.3%	294	13.1%	Windsor Locks	6	6.0%	9	8.0%
Hartland	2	*	0						
<b>Litchfield Co.</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>6.9%</b>					
Barkhamsted	2	*	3	*	Norfolk	1	*	1	*
Bethlehem	1	*	2	*	North Canaan	3	*	1	*
Bridgewater	2	*	0	*	Plymouth	9	8.0%	9	6.6%
Canaan	3	*	4	*	Roxbury	0		3	*
Colebrook	3	*	0		Salisbury	2	*	2	*
Cornwall	0		1	*	Sharon	0		1	*
Goshen	5	26.3%	1	*	Thomaston	7	8.6%	8	11.3%
Harwinton	2	*	5	9.4%	Torrington	38	8.7%	26	6.3%
Kent	2	*	1	*	Warren	0		1	*
Litchfield	3	*	1	*	Washington	0		3	*
Morris	0		0		Watertown	20	9.4%	11	5.1%
New Hartford	4	*	1	*	Winchester	11	10.0%	16	13.3%
New Milford	21	5.8%	20	6.2%	Woodbury	3	*	6	6.8%
<b>Middlesex Co.</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>6.7%</b>					
Chester	4	*	1	*	East Hampton	8	5.7%	23	13.6%
Clinton	9	6.3%	15	10.6%	Essex	2	*	2	*
Cromwell	15	10.2%	5	3.8%	Haddam	4	*	5	5.4%
Deep River	2	*	6	10.0%	Killingworth	0		3	*
Durham	8	9.4%	4	*	Middlefield	4	*	1	*
East Haddam	9	8.6%	5	5.6%	Middletown	43	7.8%	29	5.4%

## Low Birthweight

Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006		Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006	
	#	%	#	%		#	%	#	%
<b>Middlesex Co. contd.</b>									
Old Saybrook	7	7.5%	3	*	Westbrook	6	9.0%	6	10.7%
Portland	9	8.3%	5	6.0%					
<b>New Haven Co.</b>									
	<b>886</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>874</b>	<b>8.5%</b>					
Ansonia	24	9.4%	14	5.6%	New Haven	221	11.2%	205	9.6%
Beacon Falls	6	8.6%	2	*	North Branford	12	10.5%	9	6.5%
Bethany	2	*	0		North Haven	12	5.6%	19	9.5%
Branford	18	7.7%	14	5.8%	Orange	9	7.0%	8	7.3%
Cheshire	9	3.3%	15	6.5%	Oxford	14	9.8%	6	4.5%
Derby	9	5.4%	15	8.6%	Prospect	7	6.7%	4	*
East Haven	24	7.7%	26	8.2%	Seymour	7	3.8%	11	6.7%
Guilford	7	3.7%	16	9.0%	Southbury	8	5.2%	11	7.9%
Hamden	51	8.2%	55	8.3%	Wallingford	34	7.7%	28	6.6%
Madison	10	6.5%	6	4.7%	Waterbury	160	9.8%	180	10.8%
Meriden	66	8.3%	73	8.3%	West Haven	76	10.7%	60	7.9%
Middlebury	8	11.4%	3	*	Wolcott	11	7.3%	6	4.9%
Milford	45	8.2%	37	7.4%	Woodbridge	4	*	9	15.3%
Naugatuck	32	8.1%	42	10.6%					
<b>New London Co.</b>									
	<b>198</b>	<b>6.2%</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>6.9%</b>					
Bozrah	1	*	1	*	New London	42	10.7%	27	7.3%
Colchester	15	7.2%	10	5.9%	North Stonington	2	*	1	*
East Lyme	3	*	14	10.4%	Norwich	42	8.0%	44	7.8%
Franklin	1	*	1	*	Old Lyme	2	*	1	*
Griswold	9	6.1%	8	5.7%	Preston	2	*	2	*
Groton	29	4.4%	53	8.2%	Salem	0		1	*
Lebanon	4	*	5	7.7%	Sprague	1	*	1	*
Ledyard	8	4.5%	13	7.6%	Stonington	12	8.7%	8	6.4%
Lisbon	2	*	3	*	Voluntown	3	*	0	
Lyme	3	*	0		Waterford	9	5.4%	8	4.9%
Montville	8	4.0%	9	5.5%					
<b>Tolland Co.</b>									
	<b>92</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>7.6%</b>					
Andover	2	*	7	21.2%	Somers	8	11.0%	2	*
Bolton	2	*	1	*	Stafford	11	9.2%	9	6.2%
Columbia	3	*	6	12.5%	Tolland	10	6.1%	20	12.6%
Coventry	6	5.4%	5	3.8%	Union	0		0	
Ellington	9	6.0%	6	4.0%	Vernon	20	5.6%	26	7.5%
Hebron	3	*	8	7.3%	Willington	4	*	2	*
Mansfield	14	13.3%	13	12.1%					
<b>Windham Co.</b>									
	<b>110</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>7.2%</b>					
Ashford	3	*	3	*	Pomfret	4	*	3	*
Brooklyn	7	11.3%	6	7.9%	Putnam	11	10.9%	6	5.5%
Canterbury	2	*	2	*	Scotland	0		0	
Chaplin	0		0		Sterling	2	*	7	18.4%
Eastford	1	*	1	*	Thompson	11	11.6%	7	7.4%
Hampton	1	*	1	*	Windham	37	11.0%	22	6.6%
Killingly	19	8.4%	23	10.4%	Woodstock	2	*	1	*
Plainfield	10	5.1%	13	6.6%					
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>									
	<b>3,078</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>3,389</b>	<b>8.1%</b>					

Factors causing low birthweight include: (1) maternal medical issues such as hypertension, periodontal infection, nutritional inadequacy, and teen or advanced age at childbearing; (2) socioeconomic factors such as poverty and low educational attainment; (3) family history; and (4) lifestyle. These causes can be complicated by a lack of health care or access to health care during pregnancy or before pregnancy. Women of child-bearing age need to be in good health, receiving routine and necessary health care, to support pregnancy and delivery.

In Connecticut, low birthweight also illustrates racial disparity. In 2006, 7 percent of white newborns were low birthweight compared to 12.7 percent of black newborns, and 8.8 percent of Hispanic newborns. This disparity needs reckoning on the community and policy levels.<sup>2</sup>

*Elaine Zimmerman*  
Executive Director  
Connecticut Commission on Children

### Endnotes

- 1 Moran, J. (2008). *Addressing Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Low Birthweight for Connecticut*. Hartford, CT: Connecticut Department of Public Health.
- 2 Ibid.

**Key** SFY State Fiscal Year



## Infant Mortality

Overall, there was a small decrease in the number of infant deaths in the two three-year periods between SFY 2002 and SFY 2006. The largest decrease took place in Fairfield County which moved from 173 infant fatalities to 149 per 1,000 live births. Five towns account for this shift: Danbury (44 to 15); Darien (40 to 1); Norwalk (30 to 12); Shelton (8 to 1); and Stamford (17 to 13). The greatest decline outside of Fairfield County occurred in Waterbury (48 to 35).

Increases were seen in Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven, with New Haven reporting the largest increase (69 to 81). Increases also occurred in Bloomfield (6 to 12), Bristol (10 to 16), Enfield (8 to 16), Groton (8 to 16), and Norwich (8 to 11). Note that two three-year periods does not provide enough information to determine long-term trends in infant mortality.

## Infant Mortality (Birth to One Year)

Locality	2002-2004		2004-2006		Locality	2002-2004		2004-2006	
	Total Deaths	Rate/1,000	Total Deaths	Rate/1,000		Total Deaths	Rate/1,000	Total Deaths	Rate/1,000
<b>Fairfield Co.</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>4.2</b>					
Bethel	4	*	4	*	Norwalk	30	7.7	12	3.0
Bridgeport	59	8.6	61	8.5	Redding	0		0	
Brookfield	1	*	1	*	Ridgefield	2	*	1	*
Danbury	44	13.2	15	4.4	Shelton	8	6.5	1	*
Darien	40	42.2	1	*	Sherman	2	*	2	*
Easton	0		1	*	Stamford	17	3.1	13	2.4
Fairfield	13	6.3	11	5.5	Stratford	12	7.1	13	7.7
Greenwich	2	*	3	*	Trumbull	3	*	5	4.5
Monroe	2	*	0		Weston	0		0	
New Canaan	1	*	1	*	Westport	2	*	2	*
New Fairfield	3	*	2	*	Wilton	0		0	
Newtown	1	*	0						
<b>Hartford Co.</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>7.0</b>					
Avon	5	10.0	2	*	Manchester	21	10.0	20	9.2
Berlin	3	*	3	*	Marlborough	0		1	*
Bloomfield	6	11.3	12	22.6	New Britain	24	8.0	26	8.1
Bristol	10	4.6	16	7.1	Newington	2	*	2	*
Burlington	1	*	0		Plainville	0		2	*
Canton	0		0		Rocky Hill	1	*	2	*
East Granby	0		1	*	Simsbury	2	*	0	
East Hartford	18	9.1	19	9.2	Southington	3	*	6	5.7
East Windsor	4	*	2	*	South Windsor	6	4.3	4	*
Enfield	8	5.8	16	11.6	Suffield	0		4	*
Farmington	5	7.4	1	*	West Hartford	10	4.7	6	2.9
Glastonbury	6	5.6	3	*	Wethersfield	3	*	3	*
Granby	0		0		Windsor	4	*	3	*
Hartford	57	8.8	66	10.1	Windsor Locks	0		0	
Hartland	0		0						
<b>Litchfield Co.</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3.6</b>					
Barkhamsted	0		0		Norfolk	0		0	
Bethlehem	0		0		North Canaan	0		0	
Bridgewater	0		0		Plymouth	2	*	2	*
Canaan	0		0		Roxbury	0		0	
Colebrook	0		0		Salisbury	1	*	0	
Cornwall	0		0		Sharon	0		0	
Goshen	0		0		Thomaston	2	*	0	
Harwinton	0		1	*	Torrington	6	5.0	2	*
Kent	0		0		Warren	0		0	
Litchfield	0		0		Washington	0		0	
Morris	0		0		Watertown	4	*	4	*
New Hartford	0		1	*	Winchester	1	*	3	*
New Milford	5	4.9	7	6.7	Woodbury	0		0	
<b>Middlesex Co.</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3.5</b>					
Chester	0		0		East Hampton	3	*	1	*
Clinton	2	*	2	*	Essex	1	*	2	*
Cromwell	3	*	3	*	Haddam	2	*	1	*
Deep River	0		0		Killingworth	0		1	*
Durham	0		0		Middlefield	0		0	
East Haddam	5	15.0	0		Middletown	12	7.1	7	4.3

## Infant Mortality (Birth to One Year)

Locality	2002-2004		2004-2006		Locality	2002-2004		2004-2006	
	Total Deaths	Rate/1,000	Total Deaths	Rate/1,000		Total Deaths	Rate/1,000	Total Deaths	Rate/1,000
<b>Middlesex Co. contd.</b>									
Old Saybrook	0		0		Westbrook	1	*	0	
Portland	0		1	*					
<b>New Haven Co.</b>									
Ansonia	5	6.4	6	8.1	New Haven	69	11.7	81	13.1
Beacon Falls	2	*	2	*	North Branford	1	*	0	
Bethany	0		0		North Haven	3	*	1	*
Branford	0		2		Orange	2	*	0	
Cheshire	1	*	2	*	Oxford	4	*	1	*
Derby	1	*	1	*	Prospect	0		2	*
East Haven	5	5.4	5	5.3	Seymour	4	*	2	*
Guilford	0		0		Southbury	2	*	1	*
Hamden	10	7.3	8	4.1	Wallingford	8	5.7	5	3.7
Madison	1	*	3	*	Waterbury	48	9.8	35	7.1
Meriden	18	7.3	17	6.8	West Haven	13	6.2	20	9.1
Middlebury	1	*	0		Wolcott	2	*	0	
Milford	6	3.6	9	5.6	Woodbridge	3	*	3	*
Naugatuck	4	*	7	5.9					
<b>New London Co.</b>									
Bozrah	0		1	*	New London	12	10.7	9	8.0
Colchester	5	8.2	0		North Stonington	0		0	
East Lyme	2	*	1	*	Norwich	8	5.1	11	7.0
Franklin	0		0		Old Lyme	1	*	0	
Griswold	0		1	*	Preston	4	*	0	
Groton	8	4.0	16	8.1	Salem	1	*	1	*
Lebanon	1	*	1	*	Sprague	1	*	1	*
Ledyard	5	9.0	3	*	Stonington	2	*	0	
Lisbon	1	*	1	*	Voluntown	1	*	0	
Lyme	0		0		Waterford	6	11.2	3	*
Montville	2	*	2	*					
<b>Tolland Co.</b>									
Andover	1	*	0		Somers	2	*	0	
Bolton	0		0		Stafford	2	*	4	*
Columbia	1	*	2	*	Tolland	3	*	2	*
Coventry	0		0		Union	1	*	0	
Ellington	4	*	0		Vernon	4	*	6	5.5
Hebron	0		0		Willington	0		1	*
Mansfield	3	*	3	*					
<b>Windham Co.</b>									
Ashford	0		0		Pomfret	0		0	
Brooklyn	2	*	3	*	Putnam	2	*	1	*
Canterbury	0		0		Scotland	0		1	*
Chaplin	0		0		Sterling	1	*	1	*
Eastford	0		2	*	Thompson	2	*	1	*
Hampton	0		1	*	Windham	5	4.9	7	7.1
Killingly	2	*	5	7.5	Woodstock	0		1	*
Plainfield	4	*	5	9.0					
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>	<b>734</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>5.7</b>					

According to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, infant mortality rates are a key indicator of general population health and are greatly affected by maternal education as well as race and ethnicity. In 2006, infant deaths among Connecticut children born to the most educated mothers—those with a BA or higher (3.9 deaths per 1,000 live births) was almost half that of the state rate overall (5.9 deaths per 1,000 live births). The infant mortality rate among children born to mothers with a high school diploma or less was 8.1 per 1,000 live births compared to 5.7 deaths per 1,000 births for children of mothers with some college education.<sup>1</sup>

As in other child health indicators, racial and ethnic disparities can be seen in Connecticut's infant mortality rates. Between 2000 and 2002, infant mortality among babies born to black mothers was three times the rate of babies born to white mothers and more than twice the rate of babies born to Hispanic mothers.<sup>2</sup>

*Judith Carroll*

Director, Connecticut Kids Count Project  
Connecticut Association for Human Services

### Endnotes

- 1 Commission to Build a Healthier America. (2008). *Unrealized Health Potential: A Snapshot of Connecticut*. Princeton, NJ: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.
- 2 Ibid.

## Teen Births

In general, the rate of teen births has declined nationally and in Connecticut over the past 15 years.

Births to teens, ages 15 through 17, stayed relatively consistent statewide when comparing SFY 2004 and SFY 2006 data. Some fluctuations occurred at the town level, but only two towns showed large changes. In West Hartford, teen births declined from 21 to 7 but in Torrington, the number rose from 4 to 17. The data show that some of our larger cities (Hartford and New London) appear to have experienced slight decreases in births to teens.

In 2006, Connecticut's rate of births to teens increased for the first time in a decade.<sup>1</sup> While some are concerned that this increase may be the sign of a trend reversal, it is too soon to tell for certain.

Health care professionals are increasingly concerned about the racial and ethnic disparities that play out in the state's teen birth rate. In Connecticut, black and Latina women are four and seven times more likely, respectively, to give birth as teens than white women.<sup>2</sup>

Against this backdrop, some cities are taking their teen birth rate seriously. Hartford, with its long-term *Breaking the Cycle* campaign, and New London are approaching the issue holistically. These cities are engaging community partners, health providers, parents, schools and faith

## Teen Births (Ages 15-17)

Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006		Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006	
	Teen Births	Rate/1,000	Teen Births	Rate/1,000		Teen Births	Rate/1,000	Teen Births	Rate/1,000
<b>Fairfield Co.</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>12.6</b>					
Bethel	3	*	1	*	Norwalk	20	16.9	23	19.1
Bridgeport	107	36.4	116	39.8	Redding	0		0	
Brookfield	1	*	1	*	Ridgefield	0		1	*
Danbury	18	14.4	13	10.3	Shelton	4	*	4	*
Darien	0		0		Sherman	0		0	
Easton	0		0		Stamford	31	17.2	28	15.6
Fairfield	1	*	2	*	Stratford	14	15.5	7	8.0
Greenwich	2	*	2	*	Trumbull	1	*	0	
Monroe	0		2	*	Weston	0		0	
New Canaan	0		2	*	Westport	0		0	
New Fairfield	2	*	2	*	Wilton	0		0	
Newtown	0		1	*					
<b>Hartford Co.</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>16.5</b>					
Avon	1	*	0		Manchester	13	13.0	12	11.9
Berlin	1	*	0		Marlborough	0		0	
Bloomfield	2	*	5	14.0	New Britain	57	44.1	65	50.5
Bristol	17	14.7	15	13.2	Newington	1	*	0	
Burlington	0		0		Plainville	0		0	
Canton	0		0		Rocky Hill	1	*	2	*
East Granby	0		0		Simsbury	0		0	
East Hartford	17	18.1	21	22.9	Southington	2	*	0	
East Windsor	2	*	0		South Windsor	2	*	0	
Enfield	9	10.4	5	5.9	Suffield	0		0	
Farmington	1	*	0		West Hartford	21	18.0	7	6.1
Glastonbury	0		1	*	Wethersfield	1	*	1	*
Granby	0		0		Windsor	3	*	5	8.2
Hartford	147	51.1	141	49.7	Windsor Locks	2	*	2	*
Hartland	0		0						
<b>Litchfield Co.</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6.6</b>					
Barkhamsted	1	*	0		Norfolk	0		0	
Bethlehem	0		0		North Canaan	0		0	
Bridgewater	0		0		Plymouth	1	*	3	*
Canaan	1	*	0		Roxbury	0		0	
Colebrook	0		1	*	Salisbury	1	*	0	
Cornwall	0		0		Sharon	0		0	
Goshen	0		0		Thomaston	0		0	
Harwinton	1	*	0		Torrington	4	*	17	26.2
Kent	0		0		Warren	0		0	
Litchfield	1	*	0		Washington	0		0	
Morris	0		0		Watertown	2	*	1	*
New Hartford	0		0		Winchester	3	*	1	*
New Milford	3	*	2	*	Woodbury	0		0	
<b>Middlesex Co.</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6.9</b>					
Chester	0		1	*	East Hampton	1	*	0	
Clinton	2	*	1	*	Essex	0		0	
Cromwell	0		1	*	Haddam	1	*	1	*
Deep River	0		1	*	Killingworth	0		0	
Durham	0		0		Middlefield	0		0	
East Haddam	0		1	*	Middletown	9	12.7	14	19.3

## Teen Births (Ages 15-17)

Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006		Locality	SFY 2004		SFY 2006	
	Teen Births	Rate/1,000	Teen Births	Rate/1,000		Teen Births	Rate/1,000	Teen Births	Rate/1,000
<b>Middlesex Co. contd.</b>									
Old Saybrook	2	*	0		Westbrook	0		0	
Portland	0		0						
<b>New Haven Co.</b>									
Ansonia	9	26.5	3	*	New Haven	91	38.3	98	41.9
Beacon Falls	2	*	0		North Branford	0		0	
Bethany	0		0		North Haven	1	*	0	
Branford	0		2	*	Orange	0		0	
Cheshire	1	*	1	*	Oxford	0		0	
Derby	2	*	3	*	Prospect	2	*	0	
East Haven	4	*	5	10.0	Seymour	1	*	1	*
Guilford	1	*	1	*	Southbury	0		0	
Hamden	8	8.1	11	10.9	Wallingford	9	11.2	7	8.6
Madison	0		1	*	Waterbury	80	38.8	88	42.1
Meriden	31	27.6	33	29.3	West Haven	11	12.2	15	16.3
Middlebury	1	*	0		Wolcott	0		4	*
Milford	4	*	4	*	Woodbridge	0		0	
Naugatuck	5	7.1	4	*					
<b>New London Co.</b>									
Bozrah	1	*	0		New London	22	49.1	19	44.0
Colchester	0		0		North Stonington	0		1	*
East Lyme	0		2	*	Norwich	15	20.4	16	21.6
Franklin	0		0		Old Lyme	0		0	
Griswold	4	*	1	*	Preston	2	*	0	
Groton	14	23.0	11	18.3	Salem	1	*	1	*
Lebanon	1	*	1	*	Sprague	0		0	
Ledyard	1	*	1	*	Stonington	0		0	
Lisbon	1	*	1	*	Voluntown	1	*	1	*
Lyme	0		0		Waterford	1	*	4	*
Montville	3	*	3	*					
<b>Tolland Co.</b>									
Andover	0		0		Somers	0		0	
Bolton	0		0		Stafford	3	*	0	
Columbia	1	*	1	*	Tolland	0		0	
Coventry	1	*	0		Union	0		0	
Ellington	0		0		Vernon	6	12.0	3	*
Hebron	0		0		Willington	0		1	*
Mansfield	3	*	1	*					
<b>Windham Co.</b>									
Ashford	0		1	*	Pomfret	0		0	
Brooklyn	0		2	*	Putnam	1	*	1	*
Canterbury	0		2	*	Scotland	0		0	
Chaplin	1	*	0		Sterling	2	*	0	
Eastford	0		0		Thompson	5	23.5	0	
Hampton	0		0		Windham	14	35.5	13	31.8
Killingly	9	26.1	8	22.5	Woodstock	1	*	0	
Plainfield	3	*	4	*					
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>	<b>917</b>	<b>13.8</b>	<b>912</b>	<b>13.7</b>					

communities in working together to find solutions: offering better sex education; making contraceptives available in school-based clinics; and providing the “social contraceptives” that help teens think past the “here and now” to a future beyond parenting as a young adult.

In 2008, 83 percent of Connecticut voters said that with mounting pressure on teens, sex education, which includes abstinence and birth control information, cannot be put off.<sup>3</sup>

*Susan Lloyd Yolen*

Vice President

Public Affairs & Communication

Planned Parenthood of Connecticut

### Endnotes

- 1 Connecticut Planned Parenthood. (n.d.). Internal planning document. Analysis of data obtained from the Connecticut Department of Public Health and the U.S. Census Bureau.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Lake Research Partners. (2008). Original statewide opinion survey of 400 registered likely voters in Connecticut conducted on behalf of Planned Parenthood of Connecticut between February 11 and February 17, 2008.

### Key

\* Percentages for towns in which fewer than five incidents occurred are not calculated because of the unreliability of small numbers

SFY State Fiscal Year

## HUSKY Program A and B

In Connecticut, free or low-cost health insurance is available for nearly all children who need it. The Healthcare for UninsUred Kids and Youth (HUSKY) Program is the state's major policy tool for ensuring access to care for children and their families. HUSKY A is a Medicaid managed care program; HUSKY B is Connecticut's separate State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) managed care program.

HUSKY A provides free coverage for children, parents, and relative caregivers in families with income less than 185 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) (under \$39,220 for a family of four in 2008). Pregnant women are eligible for HUSKY A if family income is less than 250 percent FPL (under \$35,000 for a family of two).<sup>1</sup> Uninsured children under 19 in families with income between 185 percent and 300 percent FPL (\$39,220 to \$63,600 for a family of four in 2008) are eligible for HUSKY B, which requires sliding-scale cost-sharing.

Since intensive outreach began in 1998, the HUSKY Program has experienced steady enrollment growth. Currently, about 345,000 children and adults depend on this coverage for access to the care they need.<sup>2</sup> HUSKY A is by far the larger program, with over 222,000 children and nearly 107,000 adults enrolled. There are nearly 15,000 children enrolled in HUSKY B, down from nearly 17,000 just over a year ago.

In recent years, legislative and administrative policy changes have had measurable effects on enrollment trends, despite changing support among policymakers for a number of program

## HUSKY A and B (Birth to 19) - Child Enrollment

Locality	Jan 1, 2004 Total A & B	Jan 1, 2006 Total A & B	Jan 1, 2008 Total A & B	Locality	Jan 1, 2004 Total A & B	Jan 1, 2006 Total A & B	Jan 1, 2008 Total A & B
<b>Fairfield Co.</b>	<b>47,520</b>	<b>47,888</b>	<b>49,411</b>				
Bethel	575	643	713	Norwalk	4,724	4,796	4,989
Bridgeport	22,077	21,552	21,469	Redding	79	98	85
Brookfield	308	316	338	Ridgefield	198	165	181
Danbury	4,854	5,195	5,979	Shelton	1,197	1,162	1,197
Darien	102	109	107	Sherman	109	111	103
Easton	63	68	59	Stamford	6,551	6,692	7,169
Fairfield	878	900	937	Stratford	2,644	2,789	2,792
Greenwich	847	1,004	1,036	Trumbull	608	637	618
Monroe	368	340	378	Weston	45	33	44
New Canaan	104	113	82	Westport	214	200	204
New Fairfield	370	371	369	Wilton	92	75	76
Newtown	513	519	486				
<b>Hartford Co.</b>	<b>64,831</b>	<b>65,451</b>	<b>66,289</b>				
Avon	182	211	190	Manchester	4,004	4,153	4,409
Berlin	461	425	433	Marlborough	135	141	119
Bloomfield	1,255	1,223	1,191	New Britain	10,039	10,285	10,649
Bristol	4,027	4,211	4,421	Newington	918	1,008	1,028
Burlington	180	155	144	Plainville	752	868	878
Canton	197	198	196	Rocky Hill	342	366	430
East Granby	138	136	118	Simsbury	330	351	361
East Hartford	5,163	5,432	5,757	Southington	1,218	1,358	1,373
East Windsor	632	654	620	South Windsor	497	579	610
Enfield	2,065	2,139	2,192	Suffield	245	261	287
Farmington	456	524	541	West Hartford	1,940	2,059	2,033
Glastonbury	590	620	663	Wethersfield	744	771	781
Granby	197	169	187	Windsor	1,440	1,422	1,440
Hartford	26,049	25,025	24,522	Windsor Locks	566	622	646
Hartland	69	85	70				
<b>Litchfield Co.</b>	<b>9,048</b>	<b>9,356</b>	<b>9,235</b>				
Barkhamsted	149	149	143	Norfolk	87	67	81
Bethlehem	126	131	115	North Canaan	163	201	200
Bridgewater	34	37	26	Plymouth	768	685	676
Canaan	112	104	105	Roxbury	45	41	28
Colebrook	13	20	16	Salisbury	160	147	117
Cornwall	82	70	75	Sharon	110	125	115
Goshen	86	94	96	Thomaston	330	369	343
Harwinton	132	159	169	Torrington	2,630	2,885	2,949
Kent	112	119	121	Warren	31	29	38
Litchfield	379	391	375	Washington	151	155	135
Morris	97	100	88	Watertown	756	768	799
New Hartford	161	163	153	Winchester	998	970	973
New Milford	1,068	1,112	1,063	Woodbury	268	265	236
<b>Middlesex Co.</b>	<b>6,749</b>	<b>6,584</b>	<b>6,438</b>				
Chester	122	100	88	East Hampton	383	395	407
Clinton	500	463	451	Essex	163	169	170
Cromwell	431	472	455	Haddam	194	188	188
Deep River	328	293	223	Killingworth	107	114	121
Durham	189	189	125	Middlefield	83	87	99
East Haddam	305	294	233	Middletown	3,119	2,956	2,994

## HUSKY A and B (Birth to 19) - Child Enrollment

Locality	Jan 1, 2004 Total A & B	Jan 1, 2006 Total A & B	Jan 1, 2008 Total A & B	Locality	Jan 1, 2004 Total A & B	Jan 1, 2006 Total A & B	Jan 1, 2008 Total A & B
<b>Middlesex Co. contd.</b>							
Old Saybrook	347	318	352	Westbrook	256	193	225
Portland	321	353	307				
<b>New Haven Co.</b>							
Ansonia	1,815	1,969	1,953	New Haven	20,055	19,742	19,146
Beacon Falls	179	200	216	North Branford	405	419	394
Bethany	99	85	97	North Haven	574	631	667
Branford	948	946	911	Orange	203	200	227
Cheshire	411	447	462	Oxford	318	331	286
Derby	934	1,000	1,022	Prospect	276	248	258
East Haven	1,650	1,813	1,919	Seymour	700	708	750
Guilford	446	433	458	Southbury	279	254	274
Hamden	2,718	2,929	2,898	Wallingford	1,435	1,504	1,597
Madison	246	286	257	Waterbury	16,492	17,076	17,847
Meriden	6,721	6,706	6,880	West Haven	4,976	5,143	5,256
Middlebury	107	120	144	Wolcott	606	636	599
Milford	1,911	1,888	1,828	Woodbridge	109	106	109
Naugatuck	2,146	2,101	2,260				
<b>New London Co.</b>							
Bozrah	83	109	107	New London	3,440	3,397	3,470
Colchester	669	645	651	North Stonington	244	252	211
East Lyme	503	486	486	Norwich	3,778	3,742	4,171
Franklin	59	53	47	Old Lyme	166	168	150
Griswold	732	782	735	Preston	175	165	156
Groton	1,724	1,875	1,750	Salem	110	122	117
Lebanon	287	306	338	Sprague	203	232	262
Ledyard	550	571	551	Stonington	866	860	881
Lisbon	163	158	186	Voluntown	103	100	131
Lyme	27	42	31	Waterford	679	730	708
Montville	784	833	833				
<b>Tolland Co.</b>							
Andover	104	96	116	Somers	192	227	213
Bolton	107	125	103	Stafford	592	626	554
Columbia	137	175	150	Tolland	270	278	318
Coventry	478	460	452	Union	15	15	15
Ellington	343	332	385	Vernon	1,811	1,809	1,931
Hebron	238	250	215	Willington	173	195	190
Mansfield	475	465	475				
<b>Windham Co.</b>							
Ashford	284	274	234	Pomfret	149	166	152
Brooklyn	268	240	413	Putnam	796	782	844
Canterbury	245	223	270	Scotland	68	68	78
Chaplin	110	127	125	Sterling	193	200	216
Eastford	43	43	55	Thompson	411	421	405
Hampton	123	99	114	Windham	3,191	3,361	3,371
Killingly	1,727	1,735	1,391	Woodstock	261	258	237
Plainfield	1,177	1,268	1,240				
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>							
	224,345	227,154	230,343				

aspects.<sup>3</sup> The increase in parent enrollment since income eligibility levels were raised July 1, 2007 has been significant.

Net enrollment increases obscure the underlying “churning” common to Medicaid programs. In the 24-month period between January 2006 and December 2007, HUSKY Program net enrollment increased by 11,355 children and adults.<sup>4</sup> In that same two-year period, however, there were over 141,000 children and adults who were newly enrolled in the HUSKY Program. These two figures are evidence that while outreach has been successful, there is a serious, long-standing problem with retention.

Mary Alice Lee, Ph.D.  
Senior Policy Fellow  
Connecticut Voices for Children

### Endnotes

- 1 For the purpose of eligibility determination, a pregnant woman is counted as two persons.
- 2 Affiliated Computer Services, (ACS) Inc. (November 1, 2008.) Retrieved on November 14, 2008.
- 3 Connecticut Voices for Children. (2006). *Covering Connecticut's Children: How Policy Changes Affect HUSKY Program Enrollment*. New Haven, CT. Available at [www.ctkidslink.org](http://www.ctkidslink.org)
- 4 Connecticut Voices for Children. (2008). *Trends in New Enrollment in the HUSKY Program: 2006-2007*. New Haven, CT.