

PRI RESULTS-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT

Interim Report Highlights

Why is the Program Review Committee (PRI) conducting this study?

- Legislation enacted during 2009 (P.A. 09-166) requires PRI to undertake a pilot project that assesses selected human services programs using the Results Based Accountability (RBA) approach currently in use by the Connecticut General Assembly's Appropriations Committee.
- The committee must report findings in January 2010 about:
 - How the programs are performing based on RBA principles: 1) How *much* are we doing; 2) How *well* are we doing it; and 3) Is anyone *better off*; and
 - Whether the pilot project process should be continued or modified.

What are the purposes of this Interim Report?

- Provide an overview of progress
- Familiarize PRI members, as well as other legislators, with RBA

What is in this report? How does it reflect what has been done to date?

- **Overview** of the selected program area for review:
Department of Children and Families Family Preservation and Support programs
- **RBA Framework**, which shows in a chart the relationships among the population-level and program aspects of the RBA review process. The population aspects are:
 - **A statement about the quality of life results** to which the selected programs contribute: *"Connecticut children grow up safe, healthy, and ready to lead successful lives."*
 - **Five key indicators** to measure progress toward the results statement, explained in the Indicator Charts
 - Main state strategies, state agency and community partners, and the roles of DCF
- **Program Performance Profiles** document background information, performance measures, and preliminary data that have been collected for each focus program. To make the study manageable, four specific DCF Family Preservation and Support programs – *Intensive Family Preservation, Intensive In-Home Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Services (IICAPS), Parent Aide, and Supportive Housing for Families* – as well as one tool used widely by DCF, *Flexible Funding*, were chosen for the program performance assessment efforts.

What has been learned, so far?

- Data availability is uneven across programs, with no programs consistently collecting information about whether clients were better off over the longer-term (beyond program exit). PRI staff's past experience in gathering data from a variety of state agencies suggests this problem is not unique to DCF. Lack of data impedes the ability to draw conclusions about program performance because data collection and analysis is the foundation of an RBA evaluation.
- PRI staff plan to further examine a few areas for the final report: area office variation in program delivery; DCF central office oversight differences among programs; and contracting methods.

What will be additional, key components of the Final Report?

- Report Cards for the results statement and each of the focus programs, one or two pages each (with the longer, completed Program Performance Profiles as supplementary documents)
- Data Development Agenda, including further research areas
- What has and has not worked with the RBA evaluation approach
- What should happen next for RBA studies within the Program Review Committee