Program Report Card: Youth Service Bureaus (State Department of Education)

Quality of Life Result: All children and youth in Connecticut will become resilient, empowered, productive and engaged citizens.

Contribution to the Result: The YSBs provide direct services designed to provide supports and build assets for youth, including special populations such as justice involved youth, youth with mental health needs, other youth at risk, and youth needing services to enhance their education and career advancement.

Total Program Funding: $28,449,488  State Funding:$7,107,474 ({$3,508,623, CSDE + $3,598,851, Other State Funds})  Federal Funding: $258,450  Other Funding: $21,083,564

Partners: Superior Court for Juvenile Matters, Department of Labor, CSSD, Department of Social Services, law enforcement, Department of Children and Families, parents, local non-profits, faith-based organizations, public schools, regional action councils.

Performance Measure 1: The number and type of services provided to children, youth and their families.

Story behind the baseline: In the last five years, the YSBs have increased their services in many areas. Most notable is a doubling of the number served in after-school programs and a 134 percent increase in the number served in positive youth development programs. A total of 40,483 individuals were served last year. As evident from the chart, these individuals often received multiple services, with many receiving services as part of diversion from the juvenile justice system. The actual mix of services offered depends largely on the needs of the individual communities.

Proposed actions to turn the curve: Part of the current efforts of the YSBs is not to continuously increase the number served but to have a clearer sense of the needs of each community and more effectively meet those needs. To that end the YSBs are using data to increase their understanding of the reason for participant referrals and shifting resources to services that are most needed.

Performance Measure 2: Participant satisfaction with the quality of program services.

Story behind the baseline: As part of a pilot survey, participants were asked the degree to which they agreed that the program showed each of seven qualities. The survey was administered to assess programs delivered during summer 2010. Over 600 Connecticut youth completed surveys. The responses were coded from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree. As evident from the graph, average student ratings ranged from 4.27 to 4.52, indicating strong agreement regarding the quality of services.

Proposed actions to turn the curve: These data are part of a pilot for implementing new measures. Along with these items regarding program quality, YSBs will begin to report youth engagement as measured by attendance in YSB programs, a widely respected, objective measure of program quality. All of the YSBs will report attendance for their structured, intensive programs beginning in FY2011.

Performance Measure 3: Participant satisfaction with program outcomes.

1 The majority of the other funds are from municipal sources, private grants, and in-kind contributions.
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**Quality of Life Result:** All children and youth in Connecticut will become resilient, empowered, productive and engaged citizens.

**Story behind the baseline:** Participants were asked the degree to which they agreed that they had achieved each of five different outcomes during program participation. The responses were coded from 1=Strongly disagree to 5=Strongly agree. As evident from the scores, participants agreed more strongly with the achievement of some outcomes than of others. Like the program quality measures reported under Measure 2, there is reasonably strong agreement regarding the outcomes overall, with a range of scores from 4.05 to 4.42.

**Proposed actions to turn the curve:** Additional survey data will continue to be analyzed during the pilot period. The outcomes for different types of programs will have to be identified and tested for reliability and validity. All surveys will be implemented in FY2011 and will provide the YSBs with detailed information on specific better off measures being delivered by different program types.

**Performance Measure 4: Participant overall satisfaction with the program**

**Story behind the baseline:** In the same survey used for program quality, a three-item index measures participants’ overall satisfaction with the program. The overall satisfaction scores range from 4.0 to 4.7, the possible range is 1 to 5. The average score of 4.4 indicates that there is a large degree of satisfaction among all program participants evaluating programs for the pilot.

**Proposed actions to turn the curve:** The survey provides a broad measure of satisfaction with the YSB program. As it is applied to more programs it can be used to analyze which program qualities and outcomes are the drivers of overall satisfaction. This will tell YSBs what aspects of how they run these programs are most important to focus on for improvement.

**Performance Measure 5: Rate of school attendance**

**Story behind the baseline:** School attendance is one of the objective measures being piloted this year with the cooperation of the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE). The chart shows that attendance rates range from around 75% to nearly 100% for the individual program groups reporting for the pilot. When fully implemented, attendance data will tell YSBs whether program participants are better off as a result of participation in a particular YSB program (attendance is major indicator of school success).

**Proposed actions to turn the curve:** Together with the other measures being developed in the pilot, full implementation will begin to provide more information for the YSBs to use in driving program improvement. In the future, the YSBs will be able to determine whether their more intensive programs are able to increase participants’ school attendance and other school outcomes. The various measures being piloted this year are going to provide a full array of measures to identify for program directors, stakeholders and funders, how much is being done, how well it is being done, and whether anyone is better off as a result.

---

1 The numbers designating different school districts are arbitrary and not related to the statewide district numbering system.