

CPPC Results-Based Accountability Model
Revised May 21, 2008

I. Quality of Life Result. The foundation of the CPPC RBA model is the statement of the quality of life result we want for all of Connecticut's children:

No Connecticut Child Lives in Poverty

Population Level

II. Population Indicators. Progress in achieving this result is assessed using the following headline indicators that apply to the entire population of children in Connecticut:

- % of all children at or above 50%/100%/200% of federal poverty level
- Number of families at various family income levels, shown as quintiles, reported together with % of children who have parents who are employed
- % families with children homeless
- % families with children hungry
- % mothers without HS degree

In telling the story behind the baselines for the headline indicators, the following secondary indicators are also important:

- % teen parents
- % of children not reading at grade level: achievement gap
- % low birth weight babies
- % children with health insurance
- % families receiving TFA
- % two-parent families, including those where both parents work
- % children raised by family members other than parents
- Children's ratings of their self-esteem, hope, resiliency

III. Service Delivery System Strategic Areas. Connecticut state agencies, constituted as a service delivery system, function in a coordinated manner in the following strategic areas:

Service Delivery
System and
Program Level

- Family Income and Earnings Potential
- Education
- Safety Net
- Family Structure and Support

IV. State Partner Agencies. The following state agencies are critical partners in the service delivery system because their programs make a significant contribution to one or more of the system strategies.

- Children’s Trust Fund
- Commission on Children
- CSSD
- DCF
- DDS
- DECD
- DHE
- DMHAS
- DOC
- DOL
- DOT
- DPH
- DSS
- OPM
- OWC
- SDE

V. System Measures. Progress in building the service delivery system and in serving the customers of the partner agencies is measured through the following headline system measures:

- Percent of system programs using outcome measures
- Percent of system development milestones achieved on time
- Percent of system programs maximizing federal resources
- Percent of system program participants using services from multiple programs
- Percent of system program participants and exiters in education or training programs

In telling the story behind the baselines for the headline system measures, the following secondary system measures are also important:

- Percent of budget of service delivery system program expenditures that are poverty-prevention related
- Percent of service delivery system programs sharing data on common clients

VI. Common Program Measures. Performance of individual programs is assessed through the following common performance measures for each strategic area.

1. Family Income and Earnings Potential

- % of eligible program participants receiving federal EITC

- % of program exiters at or above 50%/100%/200% of poverty
- % of program exiters entering employment
- % of employed program exiters retaining employment at 6 months
- Average earnings of employed program exiters
- Average weekly wage of program exiters
- % of working poor program exiters in continuing education or achieving higher degree

2. Education

- Early Childhood
 - % of children ready for K
 - % of children attending preschool with NAEYC accreditation
 - % of children reading at grade level on CMT's
- % graduating from HS
- % HS graduates attending post-secondary education or training programs
- % of schools with positive environments (expectations, diversity of staff, lack of bias)
- % of poor students in public colleges and universities who require remediation
- % of poor remediated students who graduate from state colleges and universities

3. Safety Net (Includes Food Stamps, WIC, TFA, housing subsidies, child care, child developmental screening, SSI, preschool and school nutrition)

- Penetration rate (percent of eligible population with need served)
- Number on waiting list
- % of program participants receiving comprehensive case management and referral
- Average duration in program
- % program participants in education or training programs while in program or at exit
- % unemployed program participants entering employment

4. Family Structure and Support

- Percent of children involved with DCF
- Percent of teenage program participants avoiding pregnancy (first pregnancy, subsequent pregnancy)
- Percent of program participant fathers paying child support
- Percent of program participant fathers participating in arrearage forgiveness program in education or training

VII. Data Development Agenda. There are additional population indicators, system measures, and common program measures that would be extremely useful for measuring progress but that cannot currently be reported. The following indicators and measures are

part of the data development agenda and will be used as headline or secondary indicators or measures when they can be reported.

Indicators

- Alternate measure of poverty
- % of families experiencing difficulties meeting basic needs
- % of children with father in their lives (but not in the home)
- % of families chronically poor
- Distribution of assets per family

System Measures

Priority Measures

- Percent of system customers at 50%/100%/200% of poverty one year after initial participation
- Percent of poor families served by system programs (penetration rate)
- Percent of duplicated services
- Staff turnover rates
- Percent of programs with qualified staff

Secondary Measures

- Percent of programs using appropriate common outcome measures
- Number of documented inter-program collaborations based on evidence-based, recognized, best practices by strategic area
- Percent of communities that have a community-wide poverty planning entity

Common Program Measures

1. Family Income and Earnings Potential

- % of working poor program exiters receiving work supports (childcare, housing, healthcare)

2. Education

- Early Childhood
 - penetration rate for extended day and extended year program

3. Safety Net

- % of program exiters at 50%/100%/200% of poverty one year after program exit
- % of program participants receiving services from another system program, e.g., SSI
- % program participants in stable housing 1 year after exit

4. Family Structure and Support

- Index of self-esteem, resiliency, and hope for middle school and HS student program participants
- Percent program participant fathers involved in the lives of their children
- Percent of program participant fathers participating in arrearage forgiveness program at 50%/100%/200% of poverty 1 year after exit

VIII. Information and Research Agenda. The agenda for further information and research emerges from at least two steps in the RBA process: developing the story behind the baselines and in determining what works to turn the curve. This agenda will grow as the measures are implemented and the strategies are more fully articulated.

1. For what reasons do eligible families not participate in safety net, education, or employment and training programs? To what extent do families deliberately decide to forego these benefits and to what extent do they lack information or face barriers to participation?