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Objectives

- Understand the basic concepts and language of Results-Based Accountability™ (RBA)
- Learn how and where RBA is being used in Connecticut for public accountability, strategic planning, public and philanthropic funding, contracting, and program improvement
- Learn how to use indicators to design strategies that improve the quality of life for all children and families in the communities served by an agency
- Learn how performance measures can enhance program quality and service delivery for an agency
Two Key Principles for Achieving Measurable Community Results

- Start with ends and work backwards to means
- Use data-driven, transparent decision making
Results Accountability Is Made Up Of Two Parts:

**Population** Accountability about the well-being of **WHOLE POPULATIONS**

For Communities – Cities – Counties – States - Nations

**Performance** Accountability about the well-being of **CLIENT POPULATIONS**

For Programs – Agencies – and Service Systems
Results and Performance Accountability

COMMON LANGUAGE
COMMON SENSE
COMMON GROUND
The Language Trap

Too many terms. Too few definitions. Too little discipline.

**Modifiers**
- Measurable
- Urgent
- Priority
- Targeted
- Incremental
  - Systemic

**Core**
- Qualitative
- Programmatic
- Performance
- Strategic

**Outcome**

**Benchmark**

**Result**

**Indicator**

**Goal**

**Objective**

**Target**

**Measure**
Definitions

RESULT
A condition of well-being for children, adults, families or communities.
Children born healthy, Children succeeding in school, Safe communities, Clean Environment, Prosperous Economy

INDICATOR
A measure which helps quantify the achievement of a result.
Rate of low-birthweight babies, Rate of high school graduation, crime rate, air quality index, unemployment rate

PERFORMANCE MEASURE
A measure of how well a program, agency or service system is working.
Three types:
1. How much did we do?
2. How well did we do it?
3. Is anyone better off? = Customer Outcomes
From Ends to Means...
From Talk to Action

RESULT

INDICATOR

PERFORMANCE MEASURE

Customer outcome = Ends
Service delivery = Means
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS IT A RESULT, INDICATOR, OR PERFORMANCE MEASURE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESULT</strong> 1. Safe Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATOR</strong> 2. Crime Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERF. MEASURE</strong> 3. Average Police Dept response time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESULT</strong> 4. A community without graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATOR</strong> 5. % of surveyed buildings without graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESULT</strong> 6. People have living wage jobs and income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATOR</strong> 7. % of people with living wage jobs and income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERF. MEASURE</strong> 8. % of participants in job training program who get living wage jobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Connecticut Glossary of RBA Terms

- The Appropriations Committee standardized the terms we use in Connecticut
- Terms in Connecticut glossary are consistent with Friedman’s RBA approach
- Everyone in Connecticut—executive branch, legislative branch, and now communities— is using a common language and speaking with a common understanding
POPULATION ACCOUNTABILITY

For Whole Populations in a Geographic Area
Results

Population
+ Geographic Area
+ Condition of Well Being
= Result
Connecticut Early Childhood Result Statements

- Ready By Five, Fine By Nine

- Goal 1: All Children Healthy and Ready For School Success at Entry To Kindergarten

- Goal 2: All Children Healthy and Achieving School Success By Age 9

- All Infants and Very Young Children Achieve Optimal Health and Development In Safe, Nurturing Families and Environments
Other CT Result Statements

- Connecticut children of all races and income levels are ready for school by age five and are successful learners by age nine
- Families and individuals live in stable, affordable housing
- All Connecticut residents have optimal mental health
- All children and youth in Connecticut become resilient, empowered, productive and engaged citizens
- All Capital Region adults are self-sufficient
- Connecticut children grow up safe, healthy, and ready to lead successful lives
Results Developed by Governor’s Non-Profit Health and Human Services Cabinet

- All Connecticut residents live in safe families and communities
- All Connecticut residents are economically secure
- All Connecticut residents are developmentally, physically, and mentally healthy across the life span
- All Connecticut residents who are elderly (65+) or have disabilities live engaged lives in supportive environments of their choosing
- All Connecticut residents succeed in education and are prepared for careers, citizenship, and life
- All children grow up in a stable environment, safe, healthy, & ready to succeed (from CT Children’s Report Card)
Community Outcomes for Christchurch, NZ

- A Safe City
- A City of Inclusive and Diverse Communities
- A City of People who Value and Protect the Natural Environment
- A Well-Governed City
- A Prosperous City
- A Healthy City
- A City for Recreation, Fun and Creativity
- A City of Lifelong Learning
- An Attractive and Well-Designed City
Criteria for Choosing Indicators as Primary vs. Secondary Measures

- Communication Power: Does the indicator communicate to a broad range of audiences?

- Proxy Power: Does the indicator say something of central importance about the result? Does the indicator bring along the data HERD?

- Data Power: Quality data available on a timely basis.
Communication Power

● Does the indicator communicate to a broad range of audiences?
  – Public square test: If you briefly describe the indicator and give your fellow citizens the data (e.g., less than 60% of third graders are reading at grade level), they would understand the indicator and its importance to the result.
  – Elevator test: If you are in the elevator with a legislator and have that short ride to make the point, the indicator will quickly highlight an important issue associated with the result.

● Communication power means that the data must be clear to diverse audiences.
Does the indicator say something of central importance about the result or is it peripheral?

Does this measure capture an important aspect of the plain English statement of well-being? What pieces of data really get at the heart of the matter?

Indicators run in herds. If one indicator is going in the right direction, often others are as well. You do not need a dozen indicators telling you the same thing.
Do we have quality data on a timely basis? We need data which is reliable and consistent. And we need timely data collected at regular intervals so we can see progress - or the lack thereof - on a regular basis.

Problems with data availability, quality or timeliness can be addressed as part of the data development agenda.
# Choosing Indicators Worksheet

**Outcome or Result:** Safe Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Indicators</th>
<th>Communication Power</th>
<th>Proxy Power</th>
<th>Data Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1</td>
<td>H M L</td>
<td>H M L</td>
<td>H M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 3</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Development Agenda**
Three Part Indicator List for Each Result

Part 1: Primary Indicators
- 2 or 3 or 4 “Headline” Indicators
- What this result “means” to the community
- Meets the Public Square Test

Part 2: Secondary Indicators
- Everything else that’s any good (Nothing is wasted.)
- Used later in the story behind the baseline

Part 3: Data Development Agenda
- New data
- Data in need of repair (quality, timeliness etc.)
The Matter of Baselines

Baselines have two parts: history and forecast
Caution

- Data are not the same as reality. Think of a leaking roof. No water in the bucket under the leak does not prove that the roof does not leak. In fact, the ceiling may be about to come down.

- Data are a proxy for the condition of well-being we want. Our goal is not no water in the bucket; it is a fixed roof and a dry house.

- The better the proxy, the closer to reality we get. Having more than one indicator increases the chance that we have actually captured reality.

- The rating of headline indicators is not the last word. You must look at the identified indicators and see if, as a whole, they encompass the important dimensions of the result statement.
The 7 Population Accountability Questions

1. What are the quality of life conditions we want for the children, adults and families who live in our community?

2. What would these conditions look like if we could see them?

3. How can we measure these conditions?

4. How are we doing on the most important of these measures?

5. Who are the partners that have a role to play in doing better?

6. What works to do better, including no-cost and low-cost ideas?

7. What do we propose to do?
Country

New Zealand

City

Portsmouth, UK

Neighborhood

Kruidenbuurt
Tilburg,
Netherlands
Pregnant Women and Young Children Thrive

Heartening Indicators:

- Early Prenatal Care (care starting at the first trimester)
- Low Birthweight Infants
- Smoking During Pregnancy
- Breastfeeding Among Healthy Babies Infants: Vermont, FY 1996-97
- Asthma Hospitalization, Average Rates per 1000 Vermont Residents, 1982-98

Troublesome Indicators:

- Percent Children (ages 0-5) with Elevated Lead Levels
- Number of Premature Infants
- Number of Low Birthweight Infants
- Number of Smoking Mothers
- Number of Breastfeeding Mothers

The Story Behind the Curve

In all three areas of improving indicators, success can be attributed to a system-wide approach to address prenatal care, lead levels, and breastfeeding. Community leaders, home visitors, medical care providers, and state agencies all working together have made the difference.

Vermont is a national leader in early childhood prevention supports.

Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued outreach through Healthy Babies with more than 7,400 pregnant women invited to receive home visits.</td>
<td>Work with Department of Health (DOH) to develop one common Parent Information Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successfully obtained 3 year grant from the Common Wealth Fund and the National Association of State Health Policy which in partnership with Medicaid will look at other ways to engage new families that have been difficult to engage.</td>
<td>Work through community tobacco grants to assure families have access to smoking cessation help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrate particular focus on families who are difficult to engage.</td>
<td>Develop a common parent information booklet to be used by all providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support progress interventions that work to improve outcomes.</td>
<td>Focusing on ways all providers can support pregnant women and their families access smoking cessation resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Babies State Team focused on three objectives and provided specific training for home visits to take action to address infant mortality, immunization rates, and smoking cessation.</td>
<td>Establish Breast-Feeding Work Group to address ways to reach out to the public and especially employers on benefits to breast-feeding and ways to support breast-feeding women in our communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support establishment of a Statewide Breast-Feeding Work Group to increase awareness of benefits of breast feeding and assist employers in supporting families as the mother returns to work.</td>
<td>Work with DOH to develop a Statewide Breastfeeding Work Group to enhance public education and develop a helpline for breast-feeding women, their families, and general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider other national models including Healthy Steps.</td>
<td>Participate when possible with state-level trainings to increase care and promote awareness of the Brazelton approach to working with families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are not exposed to environmental toxins.</td>
<td>Continue to increase knowledge of parents and health care providers on the risk of asthma for children, especially those factors they can prevent or eliminate in all children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Children's Environmental Health Task Force.</td>
<td>Identify resources to invite Dr. Michael Shore to speak at community meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H192, the Healthy Schools Air Quality Act.</td>
<td>Work with DOH to develop a Smoke-Free Homes Smoke-Free Public places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and caregivers have the knowledge, skills, and resources to provide positive child development.</td>
<td>Work with parents, health care providers and child care providers to assure children have safe drinking water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of Parent and Community Leadership Trainings.</td>
<td>Increase awareness of issues related to minutes in water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Social and Rehabilitation Consumer Advisory boards.</td>
<td>Increase testing of private wells.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with parents, health care providers and child care providers to assure children have safe drinking water.</td>
<td>Increase awareness of how to disinfect private water sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness of proper preparation of formula or juice with water.</td>
<td>Increase awareness of proper preparation of formula or juice with water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Accountability
For Programs, Agencies and Service Systems
Population Versus Performance Accountability

Population Accountability

- About the well being of entire populations, like young people growing up safe in Waterbury
- Not about any program or service system

Performance Accountability

- About the well being of client populations only
- Applies to programs, agencies, or service systems
Population Versus Performance Accountability

- At the population level, we ask first what quality of life we want and then what strategies (collections of activities or services) we want to buy to achieve our quality of life result.

- At the performance level, once we have decided to buy a particular program or service, we want to know how well it is being implemented and whether anyone is better off.
Children grow up safe and healthy

END

MEANS

Comprehensive Strategy/Partners

1. Doing the right things?

2. Doing those things right?

Indicator

Agency/Program Performance Measures

Interagency System

Interagency Service System Performance Measures

Results Leadership Group

Program A

Children grow up safe and healthy

Indicator

Agency/Program Performance Measures

Interagency System

Interagency Service System Performance Measures

Results Leadership Group

1. Doing the right things?

2. Doing those things right?

Program A

Children grow up safe and healthy

Indicator

Agency/Program Performance Measures

Interagency System

Interagency Service System Performance Measures

Results Leadership Group

1. Doing the right things?

2. Doing those things right?

Program A
# Program Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Effort</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much service did we deliver?</td>
<td>How well did we deliver it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Effect</td>
<td>How much change/effect did we produce?</td>
<td>What quality of change/effect did we produce?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much did we do?

How well did we do it?

Is anyone better off?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did we do?</td>
<td>How well did we do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is anyone better off?</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education

How much did we do? How well did we do it? Is anyone better off?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much did we do?</td>
<td>How well did we do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>Student-teacher ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of high school</td>
<td>Percent of high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduates</td>
<td>graduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effort

Effect

Number of students

Student-teacher ratio

Number of high school graduates

Percent of high school graduates
### Health Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much did we do?</td>
<td>Number of patients treated</td>
<td>How well did we do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is anyone better off?</td>
<td>Incidence of preventable disease (in the practice)</td>
<td>Rate of preventable disease (in the practice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drug/Alcohol Treatment Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much did we do?</th>
<th>How well did we do it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of persons treated</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unit cost of treatment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is anyone better off?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of clients off alcohol/drugs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percent of clients off alcohol/drugs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-at exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-12 months post-exit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Quadrant?

- % participants who got jobs L
- staff turnover rate R
- # participants who got jobs L
- % of children reading at grade level L
- cost per unit of service R
- # applications processed U
- % patients who fully recover R
What Quadrant?

- % of customers satisfied with outcome of service (from survey)    LR
- % of customers satisfied with service quality (from survey)    UR
- % of applications processed within 2 working days    UR
- # on waiting list    UL, UR
- % of teachers with certification    UR, LR
All Data Have Two Incarnations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lay Definition</th>
<th>Technical Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS Graduation Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% enrolled Sept 30 who graduate June 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% enrolled 9th grade who graduate in 12th grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Separating The Wheat From The Chaff

Types Of Measures Found in Each Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much did we do?</th>
<th>How well did we do it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| # Clients/customers served | % Common measures  
  e.g. client staff ratio, workload ratio, staff turnover rate, staff morale, % staff fully trained, % clients seen in their own language, worker safety, unit cost |
| # Activities (by type of activity) | % Activity-specific measures  
  e.g. % timely, % clients completing activity, % correct and complete, % meeting standard |

| Is anyone better off? | % Skills / Knowledge  
  (e.g. parenting skills) |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| # Point in Time vs. Point to Point Improvement | % Attitude / Opinion  
  (e.g. toward drugs) |
| # | % Behavior  
  (e.g. school attendance) |
| # | % Circumstance  
  (e.g. working, in stable housing) |
Selecting Headline Performance Measures

How much did we do?
# Clients/customers served
# Activities
  (by type of activity)
Selecting Headline Performance Measures

How well did we do it?

% Common measures
  e.g. workload ratio, staff turnover rate, % staff fully trained, unit cost

% Activity-specific measures
  e.g. % timely intakes, % accreditation standards met
Selecting Headline Performance Measures

- How much did we do?
- How well did we do it?

Is anyone better off?

- #/% Skills / Knowledge (e.g. cognitive, social, physical)
- #/% Attitude (e.g. toward language, parenting)
- #/% Behavior (e.g. reading to child at home)
- #/% Circumstances (e.g. child care, transportation)
Choosing Headline Measures and the Data Development Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much did we do?</td>
<td>How well did we do it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 1</td>
<td>% Measure 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 2</td>
<td>% Measure 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 3</td>
<td>% Measure 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 4</td>
<td>% Measure 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 5</td>
<td>% Measure 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 6</td>
<td>% Measure 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 7</td>
<td>% Measure 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is anyone better off?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 15</td>
<td>% Measure 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 16</td>
<td>% Measure 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 17</td>
<td>% Measure 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 18</td>
<td>% Measure 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 19</td>
<td>% Measure 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 20</td>
<td>% Measure 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Measure 21</td>
<td>% Measure 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#1 Headline
#2 Headline
#3 Headline
#1 DDA
#2 DDA
#3 DDA
Not All Performance Measures Are Created Equal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>How much did we do?</td>
<td>How well did we do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect</td>
<td>Is anyone better off?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Matter of Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much did we do?</td>
<td>How well did we do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Accountability
For Programs, Agencies and Service Systems

1. Who are our customers?

2. How can we measure if our customers are better off? LR

3. How can we measure if we are delivering service well? UR

4. How are we doing on the most important of these measures?

5. Who are the partners with a role to play in doing better?

6. What works, what could work, to do better?

7. What do we propose to do?
2012 Program Report Card: Residential Work Release – Department of Correction

Quality of Life Result: All Connecticut working age residents have jobs that provide financial self-sufficiency.

Contribution to the Result: Placing offenders in halfway houses allows us to supervise them in a controlled setting, while halfway house staff and other agencies provide job readiness, job finding, and job retention services. Job readiness includes acquiring identification, securing clothing, and preparing for interviews. Job finding entails matching the offender to existing job openings that fit his or her needs. Job retention includes coaching the offender when they encounter challenges or when they are discouraged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Expenditures</th>
<th>State Funding</th>
<th>Federal Funding</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual FY 11</td>
<td>$19,142,673.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,142,673.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated FY 12</td>
<td>$19,142,673.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,142,673.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partners: Connection, CT Renaissance, Neon, Percepton, Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, Department of Social Services, Department of Labor, Board of Pardons and Paroles, University of Hartford, University of Connecticut, local city and town governments, local colleges and universities, business community, other non-profit agencies, and other state agencies. In addition, the work release halfway houses help offenders access services from DOC contracted non-residential services and many services that are not under contract. These include behavioral health, employment, and housing related services.

How Much Did We Do?
Number placed in work-release halfway houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placed</td>
<td>2834</td>
<td>2721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story behind the baseline:
There was a 4% reduction in the number of individuals placed in work-release (113). This small decline is explained by a small increase in the length of stay (FY10: 144 days and FY11: 146 days) and a 1% reduction in utilization (FY10 97% and FY11 96%). We think this reflects normal fluctuation and not a true trend.

How Well Did We Do It?
Percentage of successful completions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY10 Completion</th>
<th>FY11 Completion</th>
<th>FY10 Successful</th>
<th>FY11 Successful</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>1306</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story behind the baseline:
Successful completion rates in 2010 ranged from 66% to 94% within the halfway house programs with a variance of 38%. In 2011, the completion rates ranged from 66% to 93% within the halfway house programs with a variance of 25%. This reflects a more consistent and improved outcome. However, the FY11 variance suggests we have room for improvement. Although we have analyzed some data to determine possible factors, thus far we do not have a definitive answer. One possibility relates to differential rates of resources that halfway houses have.

Trend: ▲

How Well Did We Do It?
Average agency employment rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Served</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2151</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story behind the baseline:
This is a new data element we have added for FY11. “Served” refers to the numbers who had completed orientation and who were not in a training or treatment program.

In 2011, there was a range from 18% to 100% within the halfway house programs with a variance of 82%. This large variance may reflect a data problem or a lack of consistency in practice. Other possible explanations for this variance may include different unemployment rates for different geographical areas, presence of an employment specialist on staff, and the number and variety of employers to which agencies can regularly refer clients.

Trend: N/A
2012 Program Report Card: Residential Work Release – Department of Correction

Quality of Life Result: All Connecticut working age residents have jobs that provide financial self-sufficiency.

Is Anyone Better Off? Percentage with stable housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Successful Completion</th>
<th>Housed</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is Anyone Better Off? Average bank account balance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>$928.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story behind the baseline:
This data element was first available in FY11. In 2011, stable housing ranged from 83% to 100% within the halfway house programs with a variance of 17%. The denominator in this measure is those clients who successfully discharged from the program. Unsuccessful outcomes were those who were discharged to a shelter with no case management or discharged with no housing.

The high proportion of successful outcomes reflects the success that our non-profit partners, DOC Parole and Community Service staff, and other state agencies have in placing offenders in appropriate housing.

Proposed Actions to Turn the Curve:
Service variability should be informed by and improved by a process evaluation currently underway. Two years ago a Program Fidelity Model for halfway houses was created based on a research review, which included an audit tool. This model includes a number of low-cost or no-cost approaches that have been shown to improve outcomes. Examples include assisting offenders to engage in pro-social activities, utilizing motivational interviewing, and utilizing CBT principles. This process became de-registered due to facility population pressures, as well as financial constraints. Since then, the Department of Correction contracted with the University of Hartford and Connection, Inc., to undertake a process evaluation designed to identify implementation challenges that we have encountered and corrective actions that can be taken.

We are in the process of adding an audit team that will be in place by February 1, 2012. The audit team will be responsible for quality assuring the Program Fidelity Model. We fully expect improvements in completion rates, employment rates, and savings rates.

In mid December the DOC made “seed money” available for agencies to hire an Employment Specialist. We estimate that if successful, income generated by increased employment income will cover the future cost of the individual salary beyond the year the seed money will be available.

We need to collect data that better addresses “financial self-sufficiency.” On January 1, 2012 we will begin to collect information on the number of hours worked and hourly wages. In addition, we will collect information on the proportion of individuals with “financial self-sufficiency plans.” We expect to have the first quarterly report available May 1, 2012.

Data Development Agenda:
Regarding employment rates we recently resent information to providers regarding how employment figures should be calculated. We have reason to believe part of the variance is due to inconsistency in data calculation. Following the communication to providers, the Parole and Community Services will conduct an audit.
Program Report Card: Recycling in Connecticut, CT DEP

Quality of Life Result: All Connecticut residents live in a “clean and wholesome” environment in which natural resources are conserved and protected.

Contribution to Result: Waste minimization and prevention programs (source reduction, materials reuse, recycling, composting) optimize the percentage of solid wastes diverted from disposal, thereby minimizing the volume of waste burned or disposed. This saves energy, prevents greenhouse gases, conserves natural resources, saves landfill space, reduces pollutants and toxicity, and lowers the potential for degradation of air and water. Less waste means less waste problems and a better environment.

Partners: Municipalities, CRRA, regional resources recovery and solid waste authorities, DEC, CPW, CT General Assembly, regional solid waste and recycling operating committees, academic institutions, environmental advocacy groups, property tax reform advocates.

Performance Measure 1: STATEWIDE RECYCLING RATE
CT Recycling Rate

Story behind the baseline: Mandatory recycling was put into place in 1989 to decrease the amount of waste disposed. CGS 22a-220(f) set a 40% recycling goal for the year 2000. While total tons have risen, the percent of Municipal Solid Waste ("MSW") recycled has stalled at 25% due to an overall increase in waste generation and disposal. This trend could require public expenditures for additional disposal capacity. Locating, permitting, and building new RRFs and landfills is a costly and time-consuming process. If all municipalities reached 40% recycling, the cost savings would be about $35 million dollars statewide in avoided disposal fees.

Proposed actions to turn the curve: Ensure partners’ actions conform to state solid waste management plan: Focus on municipal compliance; support legislation to improve recycling of certain wastes; target enforcement in key sectors; improve collectors’ registrations and ensure collectors act on their enforcement role.

Performance Measure 2: PER CAPITA DISPOSAL RATE

Story behind the baseline: Data in chart includes residential and commercial waste. DEP estimates each CT person annually accounts for 900 lbs residential MSW. US EPA estimates that 500 pounds residential MSW per person annually is a sustainable disposal rate. The general lack of an economic signal at the individual level on the costs of disposal results in a failure to properly value recycling. Statewide education is limited due to the variety of collection services and recycling practices resulting from municipal, rather than regional, control of solid waste management.

Proposed actions to turn the curve: DEP will improve data reporting and post data on website to aid municipalities in measuring their progress toward the goal. Recognize exemplary municipal recycling rates. Encourage collectors and municipalities to use unit-based pricing for solid waste disposal to change how residents value recycling. Encourage partners to act regionally.

Performance Measure 3: CLOSING THE GAP IN INFRASTRUCTURE PERMITTED CAPACITY

Recycling Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste type</th>
<th>Permitted facilities (#)</th>
<th>Capacity meeting current need (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottles, cans, paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Waste</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>varying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>marginal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story behind the baseline: Current infrastructure has sufficient capacity to process current tonnages of commodity recyclables. Infrastructure is lacking for processing certain significant sectors such as electronics, food waste, other organics, and soil and for marketing and using processed recyclables. CT food waste is 13% of all waste disposed or 331,468 tons annually. There is one permitted food waste recycler in CT.

Proposed actions to turn the curve: Prioritize permit applications that close the capacity gap in specific sectors. Revise regulations to clarify reuse of soils and construction materials. Focus on permitting of collectors, processors, and waste streams with lagging recycling rates. Encourage partners to invest in making home composting units widely available. Ensure partners assist in development of industries, technologies, and commercial enterprises within the state that are based upon recycling, reuse, treatment, or processing of solid waste. Ensure partners encourage private investment in local recycled materials industries and marketing as part of green jobs promotion.
The Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station Program Report Card: Crop Quality and Food Safety

*Quality of Life Result:* All Connecticut residents have access to safe products and safe, locally-grown, high-quality food.

*Contribution to Result:* By conducting research on new crops for our farmers and testing for pesticides and other contaminants, we provide new locally grown crops for our farmers and farmers' markets, help preserve farmland, and reduce exposure to unwanted chemicals in our food. Results are disseminated to state residents and the scientific community through publications and talks.


**Performance Measure 1:** Reduce exposure of CT residents to food and other products containing pesticides or other unwanted chemicals.

**Story behind the baseline:** With increased commerce from foreign countries and with our domestic, large-scale food processing, there is greater potential for product contamination. Sometimes foods and other products contained unwanted chemicals, such as pesticide residues. For example, pomegranate juice contained benomyl and was recalled. Other discoveries include detection of lead paint in toys (2 recalls), sanitizers in CT milk (analyzed within 4 hours of receiving samples), melamine in dog food and water rolls (2 recalls), and ethylene glycol in toothpaste and fruit punch. Our tests resulted in 3 national recalls in 2008. These regulatory actions ensure consumer access to safe foods and other products.

**Proposed actions to turn the curve:** Pesticide extraction and analyses generally take about 4 days. New methods will be developed to detect lower amounts of pesticides more efficiently and to more quickly remove unsafe foods and other products from commerce. Further staff reductions or program cuts will greatly impede work output.

**Performance Measure 2:** Develop new crops for CT farmers that offer fresh and nutritional food for CT residents.

**Number of new crops and cultivars evaluated.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Crops Evaluated</th>
<th># Cultivars Evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Story behind the baseline:* There is increased public interest in growing new specialty crops with little or no pesticides. Cultivars (varieties) of fruits and vegetables and different cultural methods have been field-tested. Recently, different crops, such as Chinese cabbage, were high yielding and could be grown in CT with little or no pesticides. Yields averaged about 17.5 tons/acre. At a retail price of about $0.95 per pound, there is a potential crop value of about $38,400 per acre. Farmers are including this crop in their farm operations; 24 CT farmers are growing 9 specialty crops with low-cost cultural methods. At fruit growers’ requests, beach plums were evaluated at our farms for CT production. With an expected value of $52,270 per acre, two of CT’s largest commercial orchards now include beach plums, which are in consumer demand and can be made into a premium jelly.

**Proposed actions to turn the curve:** New information on crop programs will be transferred to farmers at grower meetings. A brochure was mailed to 500 farmers on the new crops program, but additional lectures will be given to describe new study results.

**Performance Measure 3:** Improve soil quality and minimize the use of fertilizers on lawns and nursery stock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Soil Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Story behind the baseline:* Fertilizers are used extensively by homeowners, landscapers, golf course managers, and farmers. In many cases, these chemicals are applied without knowledge of soil quality. This practice can lead to polluted surface and groundwater, thereby encouraging rapid growth of algae and invasive aquatic plants. People who own or rent lake-front properties are concerned about reduced water quality. A benefit of testing soil samples is less fertilizer leaching into surface and ground water and less detrimental effects to Long Island Sound. Around 4-5% of soils tested do not need additional fertilizer, thus saving those homeowners $11,700 in fertilizer costs.

**Proposed actions to turn the curve:** Information will be included in soil-test reports to advise state residents on the proper use of fertilizers to prevent environmental contamination. Field studies have been designed to determine minimal amounts of fertilizers needed to reduce costs for proper Christmas tree growth in farms. Results will be transferred to growers at public meetings.
Report Cards for the Connecticut General Assembly

Quality of Life Result: All Connecticut students have a successful transition to adulthood, assume a contributing role in a world-class workforce, and become productive members of their community and society at large.

Contribution to Result: Interdistrict Magnet Schools (IMSs) are one of the public school choice options that are raising the educational attainment level of participating students throughout the state through high-quality, racially/economically integrated education. These schools directly provide educational choices that contribute to a more highly educated workforce and reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation. IMSs maximize the opportunity for each student to achieve his or her highest potential by offering challenging, relevant, and rigorous curriculum and instruction. In addition, these programs provide a creative and flexible environment that values each student's unique abilities, talents, interests, and learning styles. Greater student learning and engagement in school lead directly to a more prosperous adulthood with greater contributions to the economy and society.

Partners: Institutions of higher education, business and industry, theme-specific associations/groups, educational researchers and parents.

Performance Measure 1: Number and percentage of IMSs meeting statutory racial isolation target of at least 20% white students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Number of IMSs Each Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>N = 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>N = 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10**</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>N = 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story behind the baseline: The percentage of IMSs meeting the standard (at least 20% white) is continually growing, currently at 67%, up from 65% two years earlier. However, approximately 40% of the schools meeting the standard are only marginally above it, thus risking falling below the standard with only a slight shift in white student enrollment from year to year. Enhanced marketing, better recruitment strategies, and the influence of specific requirements resulting from the State decision (requiring Hartford-area IMSs to meet a specific student diversity standard) help explain the two-year improvement in this measure. The number of IMSs increased from 54 to 61 between 2007-08 and 2009-10.

Proposed actions to turn the curve: The Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) will build upon existing enrollment management plans (EMP) in assisting IMSs that are below or marginally above the threshold with expanding and improving their enrollment strategies. An EMP is a school-level mechanism designed to ensure sufficient enrollment, equitable access, and that student systems to support success and retention are in place. Recruitment strategies may include greater interaction between IMS administrators and potential feeder school children and families, action videos, and other methods beyond program literature.

Performance Measure 2: Percentage of Hartford, New Haven and Waterbury resident students at or above proficiency in reading in both IMS and the city public schools (non-magnets).

# of Students Tested in Reading (2009 CMT/ CAPT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Magnet</th>
<th>Non-magnet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2216</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>5443</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>7697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These data reflect students in tested grades only. These three cities are chosen as they are the only urban areas with at least three IMSs serving significant numbers of city students from which to base valid comparisons.

Story behind the baseline: Resident students of urban centers who attend IMSs outperform students in the city public schools in reading. The distinction between magnet and non-magnet schools is nearly identical for mathematics. To control for differences in the baseline of students when they enter IMSs, an analysis of student academic growth between 2008 and 2009 yielded nearly identical results — IMS students grew at a greater rate than non-IMS students, and New Haven's IMS student growth lagged behind that of Hartford and Waterbury.

Beyond the reading data shown, a recent UCONN study of Hartford-area IMSs found a statistically significant positive impact of the IMS program on mathematics and reading achievement of urban middle and high school students. It is unclear if the difference in IMS student performance across cities is related to the number or percentage of city resident students attending IMSs.
How Population and Performance Accountability FIT TOGETHER
THE LINKAGE Between POPULATION and PERFORMANCE

### POPULATION ACCOUNTABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Area</th>
<th>POPULATION RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Births</td>
<td>Rate of low birth-weight babies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Families</td>
<td>Rate of child abuse and neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children Succeeding in School</td>
<td>Percent graduating from high school on time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Welfare Program</th>
<th>CUSTOMER OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Foster Children Served</td>
<td>% with Multiple Placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Repeat Abuse/Neglect</td>
<td>% Repeat Abuse/Neglect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alignment of measures**

**Contribution relationship**

**Appropriate responsibility**
Innovation
The Power of RBA Thinking: Turning the Curve
Turn-the-Curve Thinking™: Talk to Action

Result or Program:

Data
Baseline

Story behind the baseline
Partners (*with a role to play in turning the curve*)

What Works

Strategy (w/ Budget)

How are we doing?

Why?

Help?

Options?

Propose to do?

Results Leadership Group
How are we doing?

Turn-the-Curve Thinking™: Talk to Action

Result or Program:__________

Data Baseline

[Graph showing a decreasing trend]
Turn-the-Curve Thinking™: Talk to Action

Result or Program: __________

Data Baseline

Why?

Story behind the baseline

Research Agenda
The Story Behind the Baseline

- Root Causes (ask “Why?” five times)
- Positive and negative
- Prioritize – which are the most important to address to “turn the curve” of the baseline?
- Research agenda?
Force Field Analysis

Factors Restricting?

Factors Contributing?
Turn-the-Curve Thinking™: Talk to Action

Result or Program: ____________

Data
Baseline

Story behind the baseline

Help? Partners (with a role to play in turning the curve)

Research Agenda
Partners

- Who are partners who may have a role to play in turning the curve?

- Does the story behind the curve suggest any new partners?
Turn-the-Curve Thinking™: Talk to Action

Result or Program: _____________

Data Baseline

Story behind the baseline

Partners *(with a role to play in turning the curve)*

Options?

What Works

Research Agenda
What Works

- Options for actions to “turn the curve”?
- Research-based?
- Low-cost/no-cost?
- Off-the-wall ideas?
- Research agenda?
Turn-the-Curve Thinking™: Talk to Action

Result or Program: _______________

Data Baseline

Story behind the baseline ➞ Research Agenda

Partners (with a role to play in turning the curve)

What Works ➞ Research Agenda

Propose to do?

Criteria: Leverage; Feasible; Specific; Values

Strategy
Action Plan

- Leverage: will turn the curve of the baseline?
- Feasible (a.k.a. “reach”)?
- Specific: who, what, when, where, how?
- Consistent with values?
Turn the Curve Exercise
Turn the Curve Exercise: Population Well-Being

5 min: Starting Points
- timekeeper and reporter
- two hats (yours plus partner’s)

5 min: Baseline
- forecast: Where is the trend line going?
- turn the curve: Is forecast OK or not OK?

30 min: Story behind the baseline
- causes/forces at work
- information & research agenda part 1 - causes

25 min: What works? (What would it take?)
- what could work to do better
- each partner’s contribution
- no-cost / low-cost ideas
- information & research agenda part 2 – what works

10 min: Report: Convert notes to one page

Two pointers to action
ONE PAGE Turn the Curve Report

Result: _______________

Indicator
Baseline

Story behind the Baseline
______________
______________ (List as many as needed)

Partners
______________
______________ (List as many as needed)

Three Best Ideas – What Works
1. ________________
2. ________________
3. ———No-cost / low-cost
4. ———Off the Wall

Sharp Edges
How RBA Is Being Used in Connecticut

- Connecticut legislature
- State agencies
- Communities
- Non-profits
- Funders
- Connecticut RBA Practitioners Network
“If you do what you always did...

you will get

what you always got.”

Kenneth W. Jenkins
President, Yonkers NY NAACP
Never Be Afraid To Try Something New.

Remember...

A lone amateur built the Ark.

A large group of professionals built the Titanic.

— Dave Barry
Thank You

Bennett Pudlin
bpudlin@charteroakgroup.com
(860) 324-3555

Ron Schack
rschack@charteroakgroup.com
(860) 478-7847

www.charteroakgroup.com