



State of Maryland Executive Department

Martin O'Malley
Governor

Anthony Brown
Lieutenant Governor

Rosemary King Johnston
Executive Director

January 4, 2011

The Honorable Martin O'Malley
100 State Circle
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1925

Re: At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs
MSAR # 5886 SB882/ Ch. 445, Sec. 3, 2006

Dear Governor O'Malley:

The Governor's Office for Children (GOC) is required by Senate Bill 882 (2006 Session) to report to the General Assembly by December 31st of each year on the "implementation and effectiveness of at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs." (SB 882 Ch. 445, Sec. 3, 2006). The GOC is submitting a compilation of applicable sections of the FY2010 Community Partnership Agreement (CPA) Annual Report that summarizes each program's effectiveness as reported by the Local Management Board (LMB) of the respective jurisdiction.

The General Assembly has defined an "at-risk youth prevention and diversion program" as "services provided to school-aged youth and their families to prevent or divert youth from entering the juvenile justice system and to help make them ready for adulthood by age 21" (Maryland Annotated Code, Human Services (HS) Article, §8-601). The General Assembly has set forth a framework for the development of such programs through LMBs that coordinate, monitor, and support prevention and diversion programs through specific requirements detailed in Md. HS Art., §8-603. The statute further requires that LMBs provide fiscal and program reports to GOC about these programs and that the LMBs apply to GOC for funding for such programs (Md. HS Art., §§8-603, 604). For FY2010, funding for at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs is \$10,180,338.

Each year, the LMBs work with GOC staff to develop performance measures which are used by GOC and the LMBs to monitor program effectiveness. Data on each program's success in meeting its defined targets is included in the LMB's annual report of performance measures which is submitted to GOC in September of each year

Attached please find the following:

301 West Preston Street, 15th Floor · Baltimore, Maryland 21201
410-767-4160 · Fax 410-333-5248 · www.goc.state.md.us

- Attachment 1: A list of the FY2010 funded at- risk youth prevention and diversion programs and funding amounts approved by the Children's Cabinet.
- Attachment 2: Annual Report Overview.
- Attachment 3: Appendix A Compilation of FY2010 CPA Annual Reports that summarizes each program's effectiveness as reported by the Local Management Board of the respective jurisdiction.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (410) 767-4092 if you have questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,



Rosemary King Johnston
Executive Director

Cc: David Treasure, DBM
Cheri Gerard, DBM
Kristy Michel, DBM
Steve McCulloch, DLS
Sarah Albert, DLS (five copies)

Annual Report Summary

Overview:

In 2007, local jurisdictions were provided an opportunity through each Local Management Board (LMB) to develop a Community Partnership Agreement (CPA) for FY2008-FY2010 that included at-risk youth prevention and diversion programs. In accordance with the requirements of SB882 (2006) (now codified in Maryland Human Services Code, Annotated, Title 8, Subtitle 6), each LMB convened a prevention planning entity to ensure that services provided would be designed to:

- Protect children from harm (and providing logical consequences for children when they harm society);
- Prevent a range of negative outcomes, from drug abuse to gang involvement;
- Promote positive outcomes, such as academic success; and
- Ensure that children are both fully prepared and fully participating in their community in positive ways.

In FY2010, more than 117 At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs at multiple sites were funded for \$10,180,338. Each LMB was required to submit a semi-annual program report and an annual program report, including performance measures for each program. Information from the annual report submitted by each LMB was compiled for each program that was funded and is included in this report as Attachment 3.

Alignment of State Plans:

The importance of At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs is described in three key documents guiding the work of the Children's Cabinet: the *Ready By 21™ - 5 Year Action Agenda*, that discusses how to prepare young people to be ready for work, school and life by the age of 21; *Maryland's Three Year Children's Plan*, which outlines how the Children's Cabinet will work with stakeholders to improve child well-being in Maryland; and *The Maryland Child and Family Services Interagency Strategic Plan*, which outlines a coordinated interagency effort to develop a stronger child-serving system. Out-of-school-time programs (*e.g.*, afterschool programs), evidence-based programs, prevention programming and support services for children are promoted within each of these State agendas/plans.

Highlights:

Although overarching evaluative conclusions cannot be definitively made for the At-Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs, the improvement in the results and indicators measured annually and documented in *Maryland's Results for Child Well-Being* can be attributed, at least in part, to the collaborative efforts implemented by LMBs in their communities.

Conclusion:

Statewide data supports that:

Annual Report Summary

- Children who receive services show improvement in overall functioning as measured by various assessments and/or a decrease in negative behaviors and outcomes; and
- Children who are engaged in programs are less likely to re-offend during service interventions.

Every child diverted from the juvenile services system or who rejects negative behaviors (*e.g.*, drug use, pregnancy, gang involvement, dropping out of school) represents a fiscal savings to the State, as well as a more socially responsible, productive young adult who can contribute to the overall success of our State for many years to come.

**FY2010 Community Partnership Agreement
At Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

| Jurisdiction | Program/Project Name | Funding Amount |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Allegany | Juvenile Review Board | 64,683 |
| | Police and Law Enforcement Activity with Youth (PLAY) | 11,170 |
| | After School | 56,599 |
| | Safe School Support | 45,319 |
| | Community Service for Suspended or Expelled Youth | 40,000 |
| | Pregnancy and Substance Abuse Risk | 16,000 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$233,771 |
| Anne Arundel | Youth Services Bureaus* | 181,307 |
| | After School at Mills-Parole | 35,585 |
| | After School - Star Academy | 95,898 |
| | After School - Gems & Jewels | 43,775 |
| | Youth Empowerment Services (YES)* | 110,000 |
| | Teen Court | 50,671 |
| | Brooklyn Park Teen Club | 20,000 |
| | Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA) | 20,097 |
| | Keep a Clear Mind (KACM) | 30,531 |
| Jurisdiction Total | \$587,864 | |
| Baltimore City | Expanded School Mental Health | 182,000 |
| | After School Innovation Fund | 187,289 |
| | After School - Youth Places* | 669,559 |
| | MOED Pre-Adjudication Coordination Transition (PACT) Evening Reporting Center | 22,523 |
| | Choice Program - Intensive Advocacy | 281,675 |
| | Choice Jobs | 140,837 |
| | Youth Services Bureaus* | 408,937 |
| | Baltimore Rising | 68,250 |
| Jurisdiction Total | \$1,961,070 | |
| Baltimore County | Out of School Time - Libraries* | 132,071 |
| | Therapeutic After School Program | 71,334 |
| | Youth Services Bureaus* | 306,180 |
| | Functional Family Therapy (FFT) | 360,000 |
| Jurisdiction Total | \$869,585 | |
| Calvert | Early Intervention - Saturday Schools | 65,267 |
| | Youth Services Bureaus | 25,893 |
| Jurisdiction Total | \$91,160 | |

**FY2010 Community Partnership Agreement
At Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

| Jurisdiction | Program/Project Name | Funding Amount |
|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| Caroline | Laurel Grove and Lifelong Learning Centers After School* | 132,888 |
| | School Based Mental Health | 27,683 |
| | Addictions Counselor in School | 28,708 |
| | Child and Family Behavioral Support | 68,039 |
| | Teen Court | 56,654 |
| | Crisis and Planned Respite | 22,725 |
| | Caroline Mentoring | 36,552 |
| | School/Community Program for Sexual Risk Reduction Among Teens | 63,619 |
| | Nurturing Parenting | 44,255 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$481,123 |
| Carroll | Youth Services Bureaus / Brief Strategic Family Therapy (BSFT) | 101,558 |
| | Adventure Diversion Program | 50,000 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$151,558 |
| Cecil | After School* | 54,018 |
| | Life Skills | 37,119 |
| | Bridges | 200,000 |
| | Youth Outreach Program | 24,588 |
| | Detour | 25,762 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$341,487 |
| Charles | After School Youth Development* | 55,007 |
| | Summer Youth Achievement Program | 15,992 |
| | Youth Services Bureaus | 140,974 |
| | Functional Family Therapy (FFT) | 21,781 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$233,754 |
| Dorchester | Teen Pregnancy Prevention Project | 50,000 |
| | After School* | 120,355 |
| | Youth Services Bureaus | 66,181 |
| | School Based Behavioral Health Services | 82,200 |
| | Strategic Prevention Framework Substance Abuse Prevention | 22,000 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$340,736 |
| Frederick | Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) | 79,999 |
| | Strengthening Families | 22,362 |
| | After School Program* | 133,547 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$235,908 |
| Garrett | Healthy Communities/Healthy Youth | 35,000 |
| | Partners Afterschool @ Accident | 45,000 |
| | School Community Centers Program | 20,000 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$100,000 |

**FY2010 Community Partnership Agreement
At Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs**

| Jurisdiction | Program/Project Name | Funding Amount |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Harford | After School* | 50,840 |
| | CINS Prevention | 90,981 |
| | CINS Diversion | 90,980 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$232,801 |
| Howard | The Drop In | 17,400 |
| | Howard Co Library Teen time | 17,500 |
| | Students Taking Action Reap Success (STARS) | 18,500 |
| | Patuxent Valley Middle After School | 28,000 |
| | Club LEAP* | 13,000 |
| | Harpers Choice After School | 36,000 |
| | BEAR TRAX | 18,000 |
| | ALPA Achievers | 10,450 |
| | HC Learning Lab* | 22,500 |
| | YMCA @ Owen Brown | 21,230 |
| | Education and Career Empowerment Center | 24,000 |
| | Community Homes After School | 59,012 |
| Jurisdiction Total | \$285,592 | |
| Kent | School Based Mental Health | 52,373 |
| | Therapeutic Mentoring | 114,521 |
| | Addictions Counselor in School | 70,300 |
| | Adult Education, Vocational Development Services, Family Support Services | 39,748 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$276,942 |
| Montgomery | After School* | 420,018 |
| | Youth Services Bureaus* | 113,511 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$533,529 |
| Prince George's | Early Intervention and Prevention Services to School Aged Youth* | 395,377 |
| | Youth Services Bureaus* | 403,785 |
| | Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) | 197,000 |
| | Functional Family Therapy (FFT) | 150,000 |
| | Kinship Care | 214,500 |
| | Truancy Prevention | 167,000 |
| | Gang Prevention Initiative | 87,500 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$1,615,162 |
| Queen Anne's | CASASStart | 46,116 |
| | Character Counts | 13,035 |
| | After School | 46,618 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$105,769 |

FY2010 Community Partnership Agreement At Risk Youth Prevention and Diversion Programs

| Jurisdiction | Program/Project Name | Funding Amount |
|---------------------------|--|---------------------|
| St. Mary's | After School | 59,295 |
| | Youth Services Bureaus / Truancy Prevention Project | 120,836 |
| | CASASStart | 79,311 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$259,442 |
| Somerset | STARS for Families | 5,874 |
| | Crisfield Youth Center Targeted Outreach Program | 60,000 |
| | Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA) | 27,671 |
| | Voyage to Excellence After School Program | 57,933 |
| | Community Based After School | 22,337 |
| | Voyage to Excellence Summer School Program | 12,874 |
| Jurisdiction Total | \$186,689 | |
| Talbot | After School* | 48,319 |
| | Voluntary Family Services | 42,000 |
| | Blue Ribbon Commission | 20,000 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$110,319 |
| Washington | After School | 75,612 |
| | Juvenile Delinquency Prevention & Diversion | 135,395 |
| | Teen Pregnancy Prevention | 97,284 |
| | HCC Teen Parent Program | 41,297 |
| | Substance Abuse Prevention | 68,828 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$418,416 |
| Wicomico | New Day Youth Development | 85,500 |
| | Out-of-School Initiative | 69,278 |
| | Elementary Truancy Prevention | 167,000 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$321,778 |
| Worcester | SAGES | 82,825 |
| | Family Asset Building Initiative | 45,934 |
| | Pocomoke Middle/High & Snow Hill Middle/High After School Academies* | 5,130 |
| | Pocomoke Elementary & Buckingham Elementary After School Academies* | 11,849 |
| | Just for Girls, Just for Girls 2, Just for Guys 1* | 60,145 |
| | Jurisdiction Total | \$205,883 |
| Total Statewide | | \$10,180,338 |

*Information provided in aggregate for multiple sites.

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: After School Programming

Program Summary: Teachers will provide after school program activities at Mountain Ridge High School.

Target Population: Middle and High School Students at Mountain Ridge High School

FY10 Funding: \$56,599

| Performance Measure | FY05 Actual | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of youth enrolled. ▪ Number of youth who attend 30 days or more. ▪ Number of family members who attend at least one family event. | 121 | 60 | 93 | 164 | 156 | 80 | 150 |
| | 45 | 40 | 41 | 49 | 29 | 15 | 31 |
| | 296 | 180 | 267 | 43 | 7 | 15 | 10 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants that attend 30 days or more. ▪ Percentage of participants who attend 30 days or more whose family member also participates in family activity. | 37% | 40% | 44% | 30% | 19% (n=29) 47% | 40% | 21% (n=31) |
| | NA | NA | 63% | 34% | (n=13.6) | 50% | 32% (n=10) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who attend 30 days or more who improve in the following grades by changing one letter grade, or more, between the first and third nine-week period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Math ○ English ○ Science ○ Social Studies ▪ Percentage of participants who achieve satisfactory school attendance as defined by less than 8 days of absence during the school year. | 8% | 10% | 24% | 20% | 18% (n=5.2) | 20% | 16% (n=5) |
| | 24% | 10% | 41% | 35% | 16% (n=4.6) | 20% | 29% (n=9) |
| | 16% | 10% | 32% | 21% | 19% (n=5.5) | 20% | 10% (n=3) |
| | 16% | 10% | 27% | 18% | 14% (n=4) | 20% | 32% (n=10) |
| | NA | NA | 56% | 33% | 74% (n=115) | 75% | 94% (n=141) |

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Community Service Program for Suspended/Expelled Youth

Program Summary: The Community Service for Suspended/Expelled Youth will provide supervised community service opportunities for suspended or expelled youth from Allegany Public Schools. Participating youth will be referred by the administration of their school to the coordinator of the CSP program that will provide various community service opportunities to the youth. Youth will also be given opportunities to do the academic work missed while they are suspended from school. Participating youth will be supervised by the CSP coordinator and assign, supervise, and monitor the activity of the participant. Eligibility of youth served will be determined by school administration, the pupil personnel worker, and input from the parent. All interventions used will be focused on the support of the students' return to the classroom.

Target Population: Suspended or expelled youth in grades 6th to 12th from the local school system.

FY10 Funding: \$40,000

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of participants Number of Community Services Opportunities Number of Community Service Opportunities available Number of Community Service Opportunities used | NA | 80 | 53 | 65 | 90 | 68 |
| | NA | 10 | 33 | 39 | NA | NA |
| | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 39 |
| | NA | NA | NA | NA | 15 | 9 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participating youth who complete academic work that is missed due to their suspension. | NA | NA | 90% | 96% (n=62.4) | 70% | 87% (n=59) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participating families who give positive scores on client satisfaction survey | NA | 75% | 100% | 100% (n=65) | 75% | 100% (n=68) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participating youth who are not suspended after program completion. | NA | 75% | 81% | 86% (n=60) | 75% | 91% (n=62) |

*Data not collected

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County Inc.

Program Name: Juvenile Review Board

Program Summary: The Juvenile Review Board consists of volunteers who are professionals and local community members. The purpose of the Board is to offer meaningful alternatives to the Criminal Justice System through intervention strategies that are responsible and community-based. The Board designs alternatives that promote responsible behavior by offenders and help solve problems that may be at the root of delinquent behavior and take into consideration the needs of the victim. The JRB process is offered to all non-alcohol or drug related first-time misdemeanor juvenile offenders.

Target Population: First-time juvenile misdemeanor juvenile offenders

FY10 Funding: \$64,683

| Performance Measure | FY05 Actual | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of cases processed through the Juvenile Review Board. Number of cases processed informally. Number of cases that enter the Juvenile Services System. Number of total referrals | 106 | 96 | 39 | 35 | 17 | 40 | 22 |
| | 58 | 49 | 65 | 74 | 72 | 80 | 40 |
| | 34 | 23 | 24 | 39 | 29 | 20 | 10 |
| | 201 | 170 | 139 | 138 | 122 | 130 | 70 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants who successfully complete the program. | Data Not Collected | Data Not Collected | 76% (n=79) | 67% (n=73) | 93% (n=83) | 78% | 89% (n=55) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of cases that are diverted from the Juvenile Services system. | 100% (n=164) | 75% (n=107) | 83% (N=86.5) | 74% (n=81) | 73% (n=65) | 85% | 90% (n=56) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants who do not re-offend during the first 6 months of program completion. | Data Not Collected | Data Not Collected | 87% (n=91) | 85% (n=93) | 85% (n=76) | 87% | 94% (n=58) |

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Police and Law Enforcement Activities with Youth (P.L.A.Y)

Program Summary: A county-wide prevention program, which began in April 2005 that allows for youth to engage in recreational and mentoring activities with law enforcement officials from the Cumberland City Police Department, Frostburg City Police Department, and the Allegany County Sheriff’s Office.

Target Population: Youth ages 9 to 13 with misdemeanor charges through the Department of Juvenile Services or the Juvenile Review Board, including Children in Need of Supervision (CINS), youth involved with school resource officers, or youth at-risk of committing juvenile crime.

FY10 Funding: \$11,170

| Performance Measure | FY05 Actual | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth served | 21 | 48 | 34 | 16 | 51 | 15 | 45 |
| ▪ Number of group/skills building activities | N/A | N/A | 31 | 28 | 18 | 18 | 26 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who engage in more than one activity. | N/A | N/A | 94% (n=32) | 81% (n=13) | 100% (n=51) | 62.5% | 100% (n=45) |
| ▪ Percentage of youth whose parent/guardian(s) participate. | | | N/A | 44% (n=7) | 61% (n=31) | 50% | 36% (n=16) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of program participants who have subsequent law-enforcement involvement while participating in the program. | N/A | N/A | 20% (n=7) | 19% (n=3) | 6% (n=3) | 10% | 9% (n=4) |

*N/A = Data not collected

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Safe School Support

Program Summary: The Safe School Support program provides school resource officer support at the Eckhart School and non-city schools to deter school violence.

Target Population: Students at the Eckhart School and non-city schools.

FY10 Funding: \$45,319

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of days the School Resource Officer serves the Safe School Support Program. | 100 | 224 | 179 | 180 | 180** | 175 |
| ▪ Number of incidents (non-violent) investigated at non-city schools. | Data Not Collected | Data Not Collected | 65 | 34 | 60 | 25 |
| ▪ Number of incidents (non-violent) investigated at the Eckhart School. | | | 47 | 126 | 40 | 327 |
| ▪ Number of violent incidents investigated at non-city schools. | | | 79 | 12 | 30 | 19 |
| ▪ Number of violent incidents investigated at the Eckhart School. | | | 61 | 69 | 20 | 40 |
| ▪ Number of youth mentored by school resource office. | | | 152 | 385 | 40 | 150 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of Eckhart School students who have not had a violent | Data Not | Data Not | 80% (n=) | 80.5% | 80% | 82.5% |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| incident. | Collected | Collected | | (n=71) | | (n=122) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth who have been mentored who do not have a violent incident. | Data Not Collected | Data Not Collected | 71% (n=) | 86% (n=331) | 80% | 86% (n=129) |
| ▪ Percentage of days covered by the school resource officer that there were no violent incidents at the Eckhart School. | Data Not Collected | Data Not Collected | 79% (N=141) | 76% (N=137) | 80% | 73% (n=128) |

*Data not collected for FY06 and FY07. These are new performance measures in FY08.

**The targeted number of days that the School Resource Officer works in the program has decreased for FY09 and FY10 as there are only 180 days in the academic calendar for which an officer may be present at the school.

LMB: Local Management Board of Allegany County, Inc.

Program Name: Pregnancy and Substance Abuse Risks: A Public Awareness Campaign

Program Summary: A pregnancy and substance abuse risks public awareness campaign to increase knowledge of the risks associated with substance abuse during pregnancy, the resources that are available to pregnant, substance abusing women, and how to specifically address problems that pregnant substance abusing women face.

Target Population: General population, students, and professionals across disciplines, who serve pregnant, substance-abusing women

FY10 Funding: \$16,000

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of organizations to which brochures are distributed. | 16 | 43 | 20 | 20+ |
| ▪ Number of professionals trained. | 334 | 7 | 40 | 159 |
| ▪ Number of organizations to which Speakers Bureau information was distributed | ** | 43 | *** | *** |
| ▪ Number of informational sessions held by the Speakers Bureau | ** | 7 | *** | *** |
| ▪ Number of people who attend the information sessions | ** | 68 | *** | *** |
| ▪ Number of Media Campaigns (FY10) | | | 2 | 2 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of training participants who rate the training as “good” or “excellent”. | 100% (n=334) | 100% | 80% | 94% (n=150) |
| ▪ Percentage of Allegany County Obstetricians who have trained the staff to implement the Nine Zero Project (Nine months, zero alcohol), which provides educational materials to all pregnant women increasing awareness of alcohol abuse during pregnancy *** | ** | 100% | *** | *** |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of training participants who demonstrate increased knowledge of the specific problems that pregnant, substance abusing women face in accessing and participating in treatment, and the dangers to the fetus of substance abuse during pregnancy, as measured by pre and post tests provided. | 96% (n=320) | 100% | 80% | 99% (n=157) |
| ▪ Percentage of participants attending a Speakers’ Bureau information session who demonstrate increased knowledge of the specific problems pregnant, substance abusing women face in accessing and participating in treatment, and the dangers to | ** | 100% | *** | *** |

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| the fetus from substance abuse during pregnancy, as measured by a self report survey. | | | | |

*Data not collected. This is a new program for FY08.

**New performance measure for FY09.

***Reflects modifications in performance measures for FY09.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Annapolis Youth Service Bureau (AYSB)

Program Summary: The AYSB offers individual, family, and group counseling services, crisis and suicide prevention and intervention services, substance abuse and mental health assessment and referral services, and positive youth development programming.

Target Population: Youth at a higher risk for juvenile delinquency, which often is the result of poverty, family violence, poor academic performance, lack of job/vocational training.

FY10 Funding: \$90,325.73

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: | 57 | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | | 76 | 120 | 114 | 116 |
| ▪ Family* | | 68 | 100 | 95 | N/A |
| ▪ Group* | | 4 | 20 | 19 | 8 |
| Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: | 157 | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | | 161 | 100 | 95 | 86 |
| ▪ Family* | | 43 | 80 | 76 | 49 |
| ▪ Group* | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. | 27 | 41 | | | 54+/- |
| ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4th session. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=124) |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | 90% | 92% | 90% | 90% | 93% (N=96) |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=4) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | 90% | 94.4% | 90% | 90% | 93% (N=98) |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | ** | 92.1% | 90% | 90% | 97% (N=98) |

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

**The AYSB uses the "Formal Counseling Outcomes Measures" assessment tool. This assessment is completed for each formal counseling client, but data associated with overall improvements in functioning has not been compiled and reported.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Pascal Youth and Family Services, Inc. (RAPYFS)

Program Summary: RAPYFS offers individual, family, and group counseling services, crisis and suicide prevention and intervention services, substance abuse and mental health assessment and referral services, and positive youth development programming.

Target Population: Youth at a higher risk for juvenile delinquency, which often is the result of poverty, family violence, poor academic performance, lack of job/vocational training.

FY10 Funding: \$90,981.27

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: | 195 | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | | 108 | 159 | 114 | 196 |
| ▪ Family* | | 139 | 101 | 95 | 90 |
| ▪ Group* | | 60 | 400 | 19 | 421 |
| Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: | 178 | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | | 51 | 121 | 95 | 223 |
| ▪ Family* | | 151 | 57 | 76 | 52 |
| ▪ Group* | | 6 | 81 | 0 | 8 |
| # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. | 97 | 99 | 42 | | 64 |
| ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 143 | 42 | 6 | 76 | 25 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4th session. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=196) |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 92% (N=180) |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 87% (N=15) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | 90% | 90% | 90% | 90% | 95% (N=160) |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | ** | 90% | 90% | 90% | 88% (N=160) |

*These totals may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

**RAPYFS uses the "Treatment Goals Assessment Form." This assessment is completed for each formal counseling client, but data associated with overall improvements in functioning has not been compiled and reported.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: YWCA STAR Academy After School Program

Program Summary: An after school program offered three days a week that provides homework help and academic tutoring, training in the Second Step Anti-Violence Curriculum, daily group discussions, daily recreation and arts and crafts activities, and field trips.

Target Population: Middle school-aged students (grades 6-8) who are at risk for either school failure or suspension/expulsion due to poor academic performance and behavior problems. This program is offered at Annapolis and Chesapeake Bay Middle Schools.

FY10 Funding: \$95,898

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students enrolled | 101 | 116 | 77 | 50 | 76 |
| ▪ Number of sessions offered | 92 | 100 | 100 | 92 | 77 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by a 90% program attendance rate. | 100% | 77% (N=89) | 81% (N=63) | 80% (N=40) | 89% (N=68) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level | 100% | 100% | 80% | 80% | 100% (N=68) |
| ▪ Percentage of students absent from school less than 20 days during the academic year. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=68) |
| ▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program. | 100% | 98% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=68) |

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: After School Program at Mills-Parole

Program Summary: An after school program offered four days a week that provides academic enrichment and learning activities focused on improving English language acquisition and skills. The program also offers homework assistance, tutoring, recreation and cultural activities, healthy choices programming, community service, and field trips. This program is offered at Mills-Parole Elementary School.

Target Population: Elementary school-aged Latino/Spanish-speaking students attending Mills-Parole Elementary School (grades K-5) who are at-risk for poor academic performance due to limited English proficiency or suspension/expulsion due to behavior problems.

FY10 Funding: \$35,585

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|----------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students enrolled | 58 | 70* | 40 | 20 | 25 |
| ▪ Number of sessions offered | 92 | 121 | 115 | 92 | 118 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed program as measured by 90% program attendance. | 100% (n=58) | 100% | 80% (N=32) | 80% (N=32) | 84% (N=42) |
| Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=25) |
| ▪ Percentage of students absent less than 20 days during the academic year. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=25) |
| ▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=25) |
| ▪ Percentage of students who moved from non-English Levels to demonstrating higher levels of English while enrolled using adopted | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=25) |

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| assessment | | | | | |

*Program has funding from other sources which enables the program to serve more students.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Gems and Jewels Mentoring Institute

Program Summary: An after school program offered three days a week that aims to deter juvenile delinquency by providing Personal Accountability Training to include Group Dynamics/Discussions, Conflict Resolution, Cultural Diversity Training, Healthy Choices through the Fit for Life Program, Substance Abuse Education and Refusal, violence prevention through the Second Step Anti-Violence Curriculum, tutoring, opportunities for community service, recreational activities, fine arts training, and mentoring. This program is offered at Bates Middle School.

Target Population: Middle school-aged students (grades 6-8) who are at-risk for academic failure, suspension/expulsion due to poor academic performance and behavior problems, or juvenile delinquency.

FY10 Funding: \$43,775

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students enrolled | 47 | 34 | 56 | 20 | 23 |
| ▪ Number of sessions offered | 92 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 93 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by 90% program attendance. | 89% (n=42) | 24%* (n=8) | 80% (n=20) | 80% | 87% (20) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level. | 100% | 100% | 80% | 80% | 100% (23) |
| ▪ Percentage of students absent less than 20 days during the academic year. | 100% | 56% | 100% | 100% | 87% (20) |
| ▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 91% (21) |
| ▪ Percentage of students not involved in the DJS system during program period. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (23) |

* Different criteria for “90% program attendance” and “absent” was used.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Brooklyn Park Middle School Teen Club

Program Summary: An after school program offered four days a week to middle school-aged students at-risk for academic failure, suspension/expulsion, or juvenile delinquency. Program activities include teacher-led homework/tutoring sessions, community service projects, social skills development, team building, sign language, karate, drug/alcohol awareness, recreation, arts and crafts, field trips, family events.

Target Population: Middle school-aged students (grades 6-8) who are at risk for either school failure or suspension/expulsion due to poor academic performance and behavior problems. This program is offered at Brooklyn Park Middle School.

FY10 Funding: \$20,000

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students enrolled | 136 | 100 | 100 | 129 |
| ▪ Number of sessions offered | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program as measured by 90% program attendance. | 98% | 80% (n=80) | 80% | 95% (N=123) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students promoted to the next grade level. | 100% | 80% | 80% | 100% (N=100) |
| ▪ Percentage of students absent less than 20 days during the academic year. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 99% (N=128) |
| ▪ Percentage of students who were not expelled or suspended from school due to behavior while enrolled in program | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=129) |

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Keep A Clear Mind (KACM)

Program Summary: KACM is a take-home drug education program for elementary school-aged students and their parents. The take-home materials consist of four lessons that are to be completed by children and their parents together that are designed to help them develop specific skills to refuse and avoid gateway drug use.

Target Population: Fifth grade students who may be at increased risk for ATOD use.

FY10 Funding: \$30,531

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students enrolled | 1,222 | 1,325 | 1,727 | 900 | 1,876 |
| ▪ Number of take home lessons for which materials were furnished | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who successfully completed the program. | 100% (n=1,222) | 100% (n=1,325) | 100% (N=1727) | 80% | 100% (N=1876) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who reported increased knowledge and awareness of ATOD as assessed by a post-test at completion of program. | 100% (n=1,222) | 91% (n=1,095) | 97% (N=1675) | 80% | ** (N=) |

**Number of students who reported increased knowledge and awareness of ATOD data pending report from contracted evaluator by 9/30/10.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA)

Program Summary: CMCA decreases the perception that underage drinking is normative and acceptable behavior. The goal is to decrease the perception that underage drinking is normative and acceptable behavior. CMCA aims to decrease the availability of alcohol to persons under the age of 21 and to increase the enforcement of existing drinking laws and uniform sanctions for violations of underage drinking laws.

Target Population: All Anne Arundel County residents under the age of 21.

FY10 Funding: \$20,097

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of education, awareness, or outreach events held ▪ Number of people who attended education, awareness and/or outreach events ▪ Number of retail alcohol establishments monitored by AACo Police Department for selling alcohol to underage youth ▪ Number of monthly meetings facilitated by Community Mobilization organizer | 19 5,606 160 12 | 14 5,430 120 12 | 10 3,000 80 12 | 32 4,479 N/A+ 12 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number and percentage of retail alcohol establishments that are not found to be in violation for selling alcohol to underage youth after receiving a warning. ▪ Number of CMCA Core Strategy Team members attending monthly CMCA meetings. ▪ Number of new community partners participating on the Core Strategy Team during current fiscal year. | 83% (n=27) 10 3 | 18% (n=22) 10 5 | 75% 10 5 | 88% (N=14) 13 3 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number and percentage of event participants who self-reported an increased knowledge and awareness of ATOD after attending an event as measured by exit survey. | 91% (n=1123) | 75*** (N=295) | 80% | 98%*** (N=213) |

** The policy of the AA Co. Police Department does not involve a warning. Consequently, the measure now reflects the number of violations.

*** It was not possible to complete surveys for all events. After Prom events were not conducive to surveys due to the late hours that the events were concluded. Exit surveys were also not possible at the Drug-Free Speaker presentations due to the limited time allotted by the school for the event.

+This initiative was not funded by the Children’s Cabinet during FY10.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Youth Empowerment Services (YES)

Program Summary: YES is a 16 week after-school diversion program which operates in two separate locations in Anne Arundel County. Each of the two locations was identified by DJS data as being high-risk areas. YES incorporates a research based prevention curriculum which focuses on school performance, drug involvement, and behavioral and emotional distress. Each location maintains a Site Coordinator, prevention educator and volunteers.

Target Population: Status and 1st time non-violent offender males between the ages 12-18.

FY10 Funding: \$110,000

| Performance Measures | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of participants served. ▪ Number of hours a week students will be facilitated in participating in a research based prevention curriculum ▪ Number of locations served. | 125 10 2 | 65 5 2 | 64 8 2 | 60 5 2 | 48 5 2 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who successfully completed 16-week curriculum. ▪ Percentage of participants who self-disclose or exhibit characteristics of drug involvement who were referred to the appropriate substance abuse treatment services ▪ Percentage of staff trained to teach the curriculum. | 35% *** 50% | 65% 100% 50% | 85% 100%* 100% | 75% 100% 100% | 65% (N=31) 100% 100% |

| Performance Measures | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | N=8 | | (N=8) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who demonstrated an increase in the following as indicated by a comparison of report card data for the marking periods before and after program participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. School attendance: b. Grades (overall GPA) c. School behavior** ▪ Percentage of participants promoted to the next grade level | 53%* | | | | |
| | | 79% | 81% | 75% | 75% (N=24) |
| | | 61% | 94% | 75% | 75% (N=24) |
| | | 53% | 88% | 75% | 80% (N=25) |
| | 92% | 85% | 94% | 100% | 100% (N=31) |

*Participant report cards were not reviewed for these measures and reported in the aggregate in FY06 and FY07.

**School behavior is included in the report card data.

***Data not collected.

LMB: Anne Arundel County

Program Name: Teen Court (TC)

Program Summary: Teen Court is an alternative justice system for 1st time non-violent offenders. TC offers teenage offenders a chance to learn from their mistakes in lieu of obtaining a criminal record with DJS. This juvenile based justice system places strong emphasis on accountability, positive peer influence, youth empowerment and involvement.

Target Population: 1st time, non-violent offenders between the ages of 10-17.

FY10 Funding: \$50,671

| Performance Measures | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of participants diverted from Juvenile Services. ▪ Number of Teen Court Sessions. | 97 20 | 103 20 | 140 20 | 100 20 | 116 15 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who successfully completed sanctions within the time period allowed. ▪ Number of community services hours completed. | 72% 3,138 | 90% 3,684 | 94% 4,788 | 90% 2,500 | 96% (N=111) 4,158 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who did not recidivate within 12 months of successfully completing the program. | 98% | 92% | 99% | 90% | 96% (N=111) |

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Expanded School Mental Health (ESMH)

Program Summary: ESMH is a comprehensive and integrated model of prevention and direct mental health treatment services. Prevention services can include participation in school-wide strategies and activities to promote positive learning environments, consultation and training with school staff, and group activities with students, families, and staff on a variety of topics and issues. Direct mental health treatment services can include, but aren't limited to, individual counseling, and group and family therapy. ESMH services (using a 0.5 FTE model) will be in 7 schools.

Target Population: Students enrolled in general education programs, their family members as well as teachers and school personnel.

FY10 Funding: \$182,000

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of staff/teacher consultations per school per year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Target for 1.0 FTE clinician ○ Target for 0.5 FTE clinician • # of group prevention activities/group sessions per school per year² <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Target for 1.0 FTE clinician ○ Target for 0.5 FTE clinician • # of students engaged in treatment services per school at a given time³ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Target for 1.0 FTE clinician ○ Target for 0.5 FTE clinician | ~256 ~97 | *** ~52 | *** 60 | *** 1,109 (total) | | |
| | ~82 ~66 | *** ~64 | *** 30 | *** 307 (total) | | |
| | ~18 ~13 | | *** 10 | *** 40 (total) | | |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of participating schools who maintain the services of 1.0 FTE ESMH clinician. | 100% | 75% | 100% | 100% (N=7) | | |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| For students seen in treatment at least 4 times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % who attended school at least 90% of school days after beginning services • % of who had no official long term suspensions after beginning mental health services • % of students who were referred to child study teams • % of students who were promoted to next grade | Data being analyzed by BCPS | ~50% ~77% Not yet avail. Not yet avail. | 80% 75% 10% 80% | EBMHP 90.4% /N =232 100% / N=257 N/A | HH 89%/N=160 95%/N=171 N/A | LR 93%/N=30 N=31 N/A |

¹Funding will support the prevention component of an ESMH program; mental health providers must access reimbursement through the Public Mental Health System to support the treatment services component of an ESMH program.

²These activities include small student group prevention activities; classroom wide prevention activities; school-wide prevention activities/assemblies; and, parent/family focused group prevention activities.

³These activities include screening/assessment/evaluation/treatment planning; treatment services; crisis response; family contacts; and, teacher consultations, clinical documentation, and reimbursement activities (billing for service). Numbers reflect average # of students seen per month.

*Data not available. This is a new program for FY08.

***Performance measure no longer applicable in FY09 & FY10 – all funded sites are 0.5 FTE.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: After School Programs – Youth Places

Program Summary: Community-based after school programs that serve youth who need safe, nurturing environments after school in which they can receive additional academic skills development, as well as learn new skills and discover new talents in areas of arts and athletics.

Target Population: Baltimore City youth ages 7 - 18

FY10 Funding: \$669,559 + \$134,209 City of Baltimore

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual** | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual** | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|---------------|--------------------|-------------|---|
| • # of youth served | 927 | 995 | 770 | 958 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| • % of programs that meet Standards for Baltimore After School Opportunities. | 95% | 100% | 90% | - 75% met target ADA (9 of 12) - 100% met standards for Safe Environment N=12 - 57% (4 of 7 programs assessed) met new standard threshold for youth engagement ² |
| • % network meetings attended. | 90% | 92.2% | 80% | 52% Attendance Rate ³ 7 of 9 (78%) organizations attended at least 3 meetings |
| • % average daily attendance (ADA) in after school program ¹ | 87% | 90.8% | 90% | 116% (N=862/743) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| • % of students' school attendance | | | | |
| ○ Elementary | 94% | 96.3% ⁴ | 94% | BCPS data not yet available |
| ○ Middle School | 90% | 95.5% ⁵ | 90% | |
| • # and % of youth reporting increased sense of possibilities for future, as measured by the After School Survey | 560 / 80% | **/93.3% | 616/80% | 86.4% (338/391) |
| • # and % of youth reporting connection to caring adults, as measured by the After School Survey | 560 / 80% | **/92.0% | 616/80% | 85.7% (349/407) |
| • # and % of youth reporting increased feelings of safety, as measured by the After School Survey | 560 / 80% | **/93.3% | 616/80% | 85.6% (338/395) |
| • # and % of youth reporting increased positive peer relationships, as measured by the After School Survey | 560 / 80% | **/72.2% | 616/80% | 62.5% (255/408) |
| • # and % of youth reporting improved academic skills, as measured by the After School Survey | 560 / 80% | **/89.2% | 616/80% | 88.2% (351/398) |
| • # and % of youth reporting improved non-academic skills, as measured by the After School Survey | 560 / 80% | **/94.3% | 616/80% | 81.1% (334/412) |

N/A = data not collected.

¹ Average daily attendance (ADA) % is calculated by dividing the average number of children and youth who attend the program each day, by the total number of children and youth the program has been contracted to serve each day.

² The Family League has adopted a new quality observation instrument, which was used to assess 7 program sites in the Spring, 2010. This new instrument will be utilized for all programs for FY11.

³ There were 7 Network meetings held. The funded nine organizations attended a total of 33 times. 52% attendance rate is based on 33 out of a possible 63.

⁴ This data is the average attendance rate for a sample of 1,383 elementary school aged youth taken from the Family League's entire after school population, it is not disaggregated to include only Children's Cabinet- funded programs.

⁵ This data is the average attendance rate for a sample of 719 middle school aged youth taken from the Family League's entire after school population, it is not disaggregated to include only Children's Cabinet- funded programs.

Program Name: MOED Pre-Adjudication Coordination Transition (PACT) Evening Reporting Center (ERC)

Program Summary: The vendor shall provide services at the Westside Youth Opportunity (YO) Center, located at 1510 W. Lafayette Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21217 to DJS males, ages 14 to 18, on electronic monitoring. Services shall include intensive case management, educational/vocational support, transportation, crisis intervention, dinner meals, recreational activities, and step down/transition plan.

Target Population: Baltimore City, DJS youth, ages 14-18

FY10 Funding: \$22,523 + \$148,811 OSI Funding

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| How Much We Do: | | | | |
| • # of youth referred | 142 | 142 | 120 | 155 |
| • # of youth served | 138 | 142 | 120 | 153 |
| How Well Did We Do: | | | | |
| • % of youth present for their court date | 100% | 131/94% | 85% | 96% / N=146 |
| • % of youth that will have a comprehensive, community-based, individualized service plan at the time of their court date | 100% | 142/100% | 100% | 100% / N=153 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| • # and % of youth not re-arrested before their court date | 133/96% | 140/98.5% | 102 / 85% | 92% / N=140 |

* - Data not collected in previous years.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Youth Service Bureaus (YSBs)

Program Summary: Provide a combination of individual, family and group counseling; referral and information services; case management; crisis intervention; informal counseling; and in accordance to particular community needs: tutoring, alternate leisure activities, employment assistance, community education, training and information relating to youth suicide prevention, and other specialized services.

Target Population: Pre-delinquent and at risk youth in East Baltimore (21205, 21213, 21224 and 21231) Northeast Baltimore (21212, 21218, and 21239) and Northwest Baltimore (21215, 21217 and 21207).

FY10 Funding: \$408,937 + \$79,552 (Baltimore Police Department)

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual EBYSB | FY10 Actual NWYSB |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual EBYSB | FY10 Actual NWYSB |
|--|------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual* ▪ Family* ▪ Group* | 417 62 534 | 564 86 293 | 405 105 335 | 151 85 ----- | 204 ----- 204 |
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual* ▪ Family* ▪ Group* | 143 45 6 | 60 30 0 | 125 85 40 | 67 ----- ----- | ----- 28 609 |
| ➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 347 20 | 493 12 | 335 25 | 151 11 | 204 4 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. | 78% | 82% | 75% | 80% (N=121) | 100% (N=204) |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | 66% | 74% | 70% | 83% (N=125) | 88% (N=180) |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | 92% | 86% | 80% | 100% (N=3) | 100% (N=6) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ➤ # and % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | 499 / 93% | 550 of 564/ 97% | 331/77% | 99% (N=125) | 100% (N=204) |
| ➤ # and % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | 437 / 82% | 310 of 341/ 83% | 291/72% | 78% (N=118) | 84% (N=119) |
| ➤ # and % of youth with improved school attendance pre- and post program participation | 333 / 62% | 71% (based on incomplete data) | 266/66% | 75% (N=95) | 65% (N=76) |
| ➤ # and % of children with reduced suspensions pre and post program participation | 351 / 66% | 79% (based on incomplete data) | 215/53% | 76% (N=96) | 68% (N=76) |

*FY08 is the first year to collect these exact measures, therefore there is no data available for FY06 or FY07.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Choice Program - Intensive Advocacy

Program Summary: Community-based, family-centered, comprehensive case management approach to delinquency and drop-out prevention.

Target Population: Baltimore City, DJS youth, ages 8 – 18.

FY10 Funding: \$281,675

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| How Much We Do: | | | | |
| • # of youth served | 172 | 171 | 65 | 96 |
| How Well Did We Do: | | | | |
| • % of youth who complete the program | 50% | 74% | 75% | 73% (51 of 70 completions) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| • % of youth who do not re-offend during service intervention | 83 / 96.5% | 137/97% | 65% | 88% (62 of 70 completions) |
| • % of youth who reside in the community at the time of program completion | 64 / 74% | 113/80% | 75% | 76% (53 of 70 completions) |

* This data was not collected in FY07.

Program Name: Choice Program - Choice Jobs

Program Summary: Community-based vocational services. The Choice Jobs Program provides a full array of services including; job assessment, preparedness, acquisition and retention.

Target Population: Baltimore City youth

FY10 Funding: \$140,837

| Performance Measure | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--|---|
| How Much We Do: | | |
| • # of youth served | 75 distinct /25 enhanced* 25 FFF/25 BRIDGE /30 Job Club/20 NFTE | Total - 121 FFF – 33 BRIDGE - 34 Jobs Club – 38 NFTE – 16 |
| How Well Did We Do: | | |
| • % of youth completing one work rotation (FFF) | 65% | 100% / 15 of 15 |
| • % of youth completing two work rotations (FFF) | 75% | 33% / 5 of 15 |
| • % of youth completing 3 units (BRIDGE, Job Club, NFTE) | 65% | No Data |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | |
| • % of youth completing program who demonstrate increased vocational knowledge (pre & post tests) | 65% | 100% / N=72 |
| • % of youth completing program who demonstrate increased vocational skills (i.e. business plans, resumes, completed applications, etc) | 65% | 100% / N=16 |

*Enhanced youth have received services through Intensive Advocacy or other Choice Jobs Programs

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: Baltimore Rising

Program Summary: The Young Women in Action Program (YWIA) is a system-wide approach to mentor young ladies in Baltimore City middle schools who are at risk for skipping school, dropping out of school, teen pregnancy, suspensions, expulsions, and getting into trouble with the law. The program focuses on development of various life skills, such as resisting peer pressure, conflict resolution, safe dating, problem-solving, and other issues that young girls face on a daily basis. (Modified Performance Table approved by GOC 5/18/09)

FY10 Funding: \$68,250

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| How Much We Do: | | | | |
| • # of youth served | 178 | 175 | 160 | 235 |
| How Well Did We Do: | | | | |
| • % of students who report on YWIA survey that they are happy to participate in the program (answer “very true or “sort of true”)* | 99% | 90% | 90% | 72% (N=130) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| • # and % of participants who increase their school attendance. | 109/61% | 114/65% | 104/65% | Data being analyzed by BCPS |
| • # and % of participants who increase their academic performance | 53/30% | 58/33% | 53/33% | |
| • # and % of participants with decreased school suspensions* | Data* unavailable | 44/25% | 40/25% | |

*N/A = Data not collected in previous years.

** School attendance, academic performance and suspension data are collected by the Baltimore City Public Schools’ Division of Research, Evaluation, Assessment and Accountability at the end of the academic year and compared to data from the previous year for the cohort of program participants.

LMB: Baltimore City

Program Name: After School Programming – Innovation Fund

Program Summary: Programs will provide creative, innovative out of school time programming that results in positive outcomes for Baltimore City children and youth

Target Population: Baltimore City youth, ages 6-18; some youth may have chronic absenteeism/truancy; be homeless; have physical, developmental, or emotional disabilities; or, not have English as their primary language.

FY10 Funding: \$187,289 + \$37,728 City of Baltimore

| Performance Measure | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of programs funded ▪ # of children and youth served in after school programs and summer learning activities. <u>Details:</u> Full Gospel Fellowship After School Program – 60 youth (30 summer; 30 school year) Civic Works BOOST @ REACH – 100 youth Living Classrooms Foundation CARE Program – 60 youth | 3 220 | 3 220 |
| How Well We Do It: | | |

| Performance Measure | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % average daily attendance (ADA) of youth <u>in after school programs</u>⁶ | 90% (elementary / middle school) 75% (high school) | 91.6% (elementary / middle) N=110/120 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % programs that meet Baltimore Standards for After School | 90% | 77% (high school) N=77/100 |

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: Lighthouse, Inc. (Youth Services Bureau)

Program Summary: Provides individual and family counseling services for citizens residing within a specific geographical catchment area.

Target Population: Youth at risk of entering the juvenile justice system.

FY10 Funding: \$97,196

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual* Family* Group* Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual* Family* Group* # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 54 54 0 83 0 0 137 0 | 78 78 0 100 0 0 178 0 | 80 (total cases) 56 80 21 120 103 1 160 1 | 104 (total cases) 62 89 28 0 41 1 140 2 | 60 60 5 60 5 5 120 2 | 121 (total cases) 62 115 33 62 25 3 98 5 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4th session. % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | 100% 61% 100% | 100% 68% 100% | 100% 75% 100% | 100% 80% 100% | 100% 60% 100% | 100% (N=121) 77% (N=49/64) 100% (N= 6) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit | Data not | Data not | 100% | 98% | 100% | 99% |

⁶ Average daily attendance (ADA) % is calculated by dividing the average number of children and youth who attend the program each day, by the total number of children and youth the program has been contracted to serve each day.

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | collected | collected | | | | (N=166/167) |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or equivalent assessment. | 82% | 92% | 93% | 92% | 60% | 88% (N=44/50) |

*These totals may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: First Step, Inc. (Youth Services Bureau)

Program Summary: Provides individual and family counseling services for citizens residing within a specific geographical catchment area.

Target Population: Youth at risk of entering the juvenile justice system.

FY10Funding: \$90,635

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: | | | 57 (total cases) | 66 (total cases) | | 89 (total cases) |
| ▪ Individual* | 49 | 59 | 57 | 66 | 60 | 89 |
| ▪ Family* | 49 | 59 | 57 | 66 | 60 | 82 |
| ▪ Group* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | 8 | 18 | 20 | 31 | 12 | 22 |
| ▪ Family* | 0 | 0 | 7 | 16 | 5 | 20 |
| ▪ Group* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| ➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments | 57 | 77 | 77 | 97 | 72 | 89 |
| ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made | 0** | 0** | 0** | 0** | 0 | 9 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=89) |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan | 60% | 72% | 70% | 75% | 60% | 80% (N=20/25) |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=8) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling | Data not collected | Data not collected | 90% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=114/114) |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or equivalent assessment | CAFAS not implemented | CAFAS not implemented | 83% | 86% | 60%*** | 85% (N=21/25) |

*These totals may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

**First Step screened out individuals with substance abuse issues and refers them into another program specifically suited to that need.

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: Dundalk Youth Service Center (Youth Services Bureau)

Program Summary: Provides individual and family counseling services for citizens residing within a specific geographical catchment area.

Target Population: Youth at risk of entering the juvenile justice system.

FY10 Funding: \$118,349

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: | | | 71(total cases) | 94 (total cases) | | 104 (total cases) |
| ▪ Individual* | 40 | 56 | 71 | 94 | 60 | 104 |
| ▪ Family* | 40 | 56 | 71 | 94 | 60 | 104 |
| ▪ Group* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 |
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | 14 | 56 | 49 | 47 | 50 | 53 |
| ▪ Family* | 0 | 0 | 49 | 47 | 5 | 53 |
| ▪ Group* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| ➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments | 54 | 112 | 99 | 141 | 110 | 157 |
| ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 98% | 100% | 100% (N=104) |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | 60% | 51% | 85% | 89% | 60% | 93% (N=74/80) |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=5) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | Data not collected | Data not collected | 100% | 96% | 100% | 100% (N=204/204) |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or equivalent assessment. | CAFAS not implemented until FY07 | 73% | 91% | 91% | 60%** | 91% (N=51/56) |

*These counts may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: Functional Family Therapy

Program Summary: An empirically grounded, well-documented and highly successful family intervention for at-risk and juvenile justice involved youth.

Target Population: Pre-delinquent and delinquent youth aged 10-17

FY10 Funding: \$360,000

| Performance Measures | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|

| Performance Measures | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth/families served | 31 | 89 | 105* | 76 |
| ▪ Number of youth/family slots available annually | N/A** | 105 | 105 | 105 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth/families who complete the intervention and are discharged from program by mutual agreement. | 0 | 65% | 75% | 81% (N=59) |
| ▪ Percentage of therapists that attend all mandatory trainings. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| ▪ Percentage of therapists whose adherence scores fall within the accepted parameters of FFT LLC to be considered “adherent” | 100% | 75% | 100% | 90% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who report a reduction in the level of family conflict post therapy, indicated by a score of 3 or higher on the Client Outcome Measure (COM-P) | N/A | 100% (N=28) | 90% | 95.5% (N=35) |
| ▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who report improvement in their child’s behavior as measured by the Youth Outcome Questionnaire (Y-OQ 2.01) pre to post. | N/A | 70% (N=23) | 80% | 91.5% (N=35) |

* Based on caseload capacity of 8-10 per therapist and 3-5 for the supervisor (4 therapists x 8 = 32, plus 3 for the supervisor = 35, and 4 months average service).

** FFT Program began operation in mid-year of FY08.

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: Therapeutic After School Program

Program Summary: After school programs at the Battle Monument and Ridge Ruxton Special Education Centers. Baltimore County Department of Recreation & Parks is the vendor.

Target Population: Students with special needs

FY10 Funding: \$71,334

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth served per site: | | | | | | |
| ○ Ridge Ruxton | 26 | 26 | 23 | 25 | 20 | 24 |
| ○ Battle Monument | 23 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 20 | 30 |
| ○ Maiden Choice | 16 | 22 | 21 | 20 | N/A ² | N/A ² |
| ▪ Number of hours of supervised activities provided per site. | | | | | | |
| ○ Ridge Ruxton | 4290 | 4104 | 3700 | 3422 | 3600 | 2394 ³ |
| ○ Battle Monument | 4182 | 4206 | 3872 | 4108 | 3680 | 3250 ³ |
| ○ Maiden Choice | 2566 | 3440 | 2874 | 3560 | N/A ² | N/A ² |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Average monthly attendance rate per site: | | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ridge Ruxton ○ Battle Monument ○ Maiden Choice | 95% | 90% | 94% | 74% | 80% | 77% ⁴ |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Battle Monument | 95% | 90% | 85.7% | 90% | 80% | (N=69) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maiden Choice | 55% | 75% | 79.1% | 77% | N/A ² | 100% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of time that each site achieves daily youth-to-staff ratios equal to or less than five to one (5:1): | | | | | | (N=89) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ridge Ruxton | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 90% | N/A ² |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Battle Monument | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 90% | 100% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maiden Choice | 100% | 97% | 100% | 100% | N/A ² | (N=69) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of staff retained during the program year, per site: | | | | | | (N=89) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ridge Ruxton | 89% | 90% | 100% | 89% | 90% | N/A ² |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Battle Monument | 91% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 90% | 90% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maiden Choice | 78% | 100% | 100% | 100% | N/A ² | (N=10) |
| | | | | | | 100% |
| | | | | | | (N=10) |
| | | | | | | N/A ² |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of youth showing improvement in socialization and interactions with peers, as measured by comparison of baseline and year-end assessments OR maintaining a score of 3 or higher (scale 0-5) on the youth assessment. | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ridge Ruxton | ¹ | 45% | 84% | 91% | 50% | 88% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Battle Monument | | 50% | 60% | 86% | 50% | (N=18) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maiden Choice | | 33% | 62.5% | 94% | N/A ² | 71% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of youth showing improvement in behavior and cooperation with adults, as measured by a comparison of baseline and year-end assessments, OR maintaining a score of 3 or higher (scale 0-5) on the youth assessment. | | | | | | (N=24) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ridge Ruxton | ¹ | 59% | 92% | 100% | 50% | N/A ² |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Battle Monument | | 32% | 60% | 100% | 50% | 94% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maiden Choice | | 40% | 81.3% | 100% | N/A ² | (N=18) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of youth showing increased participation in activities, as measured by a comparison of baseline and year-end assessments, OR maintain a score of 3 or higher (scale 0-5) on the youth assessment. | | | | | | 83% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ridge Ruxton | ¹ | 50% | 76% | 100% | 50% | N/A ² |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Battle Monument | | 42% | 70% | 100% | 50% | 94% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maiden Choice | | 27% | 87.5% | 100% | N/A ² | (N=18) |
| | | | | | | 88% |
| | | | | | | (N=24) |
| | | | | | | N/A ² |

¹Data not available. New assessment piloted in FY06 for administration in FY07.

² Maiden Choice program site discontinued in FY10.

³ Number of hours of supervised activities at each site were decreased due to budget cuts imposed on the Children’s Cabinet Interagency Fund.

⁴Service provider offered the following reasons for program not meeting performance measures: budget reductions resulted in cutting transportation funding which directly effects program attendance, many students are medically fragile and therefore sick more frequently and for a greater duration, thus absent from school and program, and some students have behavior issues at home and are not sent to school.

LMB: Baltimore County

Program Name: Out-of-School Time Programs

Program Summary: A variety of flexible out-of-school time youth development activities and programs offered at Baltimore County Public Library (BCPL) branches.

Target Population: Youth ages 11-17

FY10 Funding: \$132,071

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of distinct youth served | 898 | 3296 | 800 | 2437 |
| ▪ Number of youth that attended all programs (count of youth that attended each day of each program at each branch) | 2512 | 5866 | 2500 | 4888 |
| ▪ Number of program days (count of each day that each program occurred at each branch). | 389 | | 400 | 538 |
| ▪ Number of distinct programs offered | 69 | | 80 | 42 ² |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth who report overall satisfaction with the programs, indicated by an average score of 4 or higher (scale 1-5) on the satisfaction survey. | 81.3% | 80% | 80% | 94% (N=576) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth attending Education/Career programs who report feeling more prepared to get a job and/or go to college as a result of their participation in the program as measured after program participation using the participant satisfaction survey. | N/A | 93% | 90% | 77% ³ (N=310) |
| ▪ Percentage of youth attending participatory Entertainment programs that report increased confidence in trying new things as a result of their participation in the program as measured after program participation using the participant satisfaction survey. | N/A | 81% | 80% | 81% (N=272) |
| ▪ Percentage of youth attending any Education/Career or Community programs that report thinking more about future plans as a result of their participation in the program as measured after program participation using the participant satisfaction survey. | N/A | 54% | 75% | 75% (N=164) |

² Number of distinct programs offered did not meet the target because of the reduction of the FY10 budget by more than \$100,000.

³ Percentage of youth attending Education/Career programs who report feeling more prepared to get a job and/or go to college as a result of their participation in the program did not meet the target because of the number of middle school age participants, who are not preparing to get a job or attend college yet at this point. These participants may not feel more prepared to get a job or go to college until that option is closer to their grasp, and they may not even know what types of things will make them more prepared for a job or college. Also due to the budget reduction, we were not able to offer more extensive programs in this area.

LMB: Calvert County

Program Name: Saturday Schools for Middle School

The customers served within this program are limited to 35 students in each of six middle schools. The six, seventh and eighth grade students that will participate in the program must be below proficient on their MSA in the 6th grade. The program goals include: increase the percentage of children who are at least ‘proficient’ in math and reading through MSA scores measured in the 8th grade; decrease the rate of ISS and OSS, increase attendance.

Target Population: Those children who are “at risk” for academic failure, specifically children who did not score at least proficient on Maryland School Assessments (MSA) for reading & Math when entering Middle School (6th Grade).

FY10 Funding: \$65,267

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY 10 Actual |
|---|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students attending Saturday School | 664 | 554 | 829 | 600 | 534 |
| ▪ Number of in-school suspensions for students attending Saturday School | 355 | 384 | 90 | 284 | 333 |
| ▪ Number of out-of-school suspensions for students attending Saturday School | 129 | 318 | 41 | 104 | 182 |
| ▪ Number of students who meet at-risk criteria | 153 | 236 | 215 | 163 | 313 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of surveys returned reflecting satisfaction with the program students, teachers and parents | 98% | 97% | 99% | 98% | N=42 97.4% |
| ▪ Percentage of students that meet at-risk criteria | 23% | 43% | 26% | 25% | N=41 93% |
| ▪ Percentage of students attending three or more sessions per year | 30% | 33% | 15% | 25% | N=16 36% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage reduction of in-school suspensions | 72% | 8% increase | 76% | 10% | N=272 |
| ▪ Percentage reduction of out-of-school suspensions | 74% | 189% increase | 87% | 10% | 51% increase |
| ▪ Rate of 8 th grade students scoring within the non-proficient range of the MSA will decrease | N/A | 9% math* 11% reading* | 21% | 5% | N=1340 251% increase N=43 8% |

* The increase in targeted at risk students in FY08 caused a dramatic increase in in-school and out of school suspensions there by throwing off our % in those areas. We hope to see that stabilize in FY09.

N/A – Data not collected for prior years.* Numbers are different due to going back to the schools and requesting the final numbers for 2006 and 2007. Usually we have to have quarterly reports in before complete statistics are done.

LMB: Calvert County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureaus

Program Summary: TCYSB serves Calvert County in partnership with the Local Access Mechanism and the local DJS to coordinate a Youth Interventionist position. This position performs the core duties of a TCYSB adolescent youth counselor as well as takes on duties as a “system navigator” while stationed part-time at Calvert’s designated “Single Point of Access” agency – the Calvert Local Access Mechanism. This position also conducts outreach and continues to serve those adolescents most at risk of re-arrest, school drop-out and other risky behavior.

Target Population: Children in Need of Supervision (CINS) and their families

FY10 Funding: \$25,893 GOC allocation + \$26,359 County = \$52,252

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual** | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|---------------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: | | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | 30 | 27 | 29 | 28 | 40 |
| ▪ Family* | 13 | 36 | 49 | 28 | 24 |
| ▪ Group* | 29 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 36 |
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: | | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | 32 | 23 | 41 | 33 | 40 |
| ▪ Family* | 9 | 347 | 97 | 19 | 14 |
| ▪ Group* | 49 | 261 | 88 | 9 | 233 |
| ➤ Total# of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. | | | | | |
| ▪ Total# of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 0 0 | 60 0 | 27 1 | 14 4 | 14 4 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. | | 100% | 100% | 50% | N=83 83% |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | | 0% | 100% | 20% | N=68 68% |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | | 100% | 100% | 10% | N=100 100% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | 100% | 100% | 90% | 70% | N=82 82% |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | N/A | Unknown, will revisit | N/A | 70% | N=90 90% |

*These totals may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

** Data for the shaded areas is not available.

^The assessment tool used for formal cases is the Personality Inventory for Youth; however, the LMB does not have the resources to analyze the data. The Youth Services Bureau will be utilizing the BECK Youth Inventories (Second Edition), published by PsychCorp, NCS Pearson, Inc. The cost of the inventories and the analyst will be covered by the Bureau. The Youth Services Bureau currently utilizes this tool in 31 schools in Charles County and has a mechanism in place for training and evaluation.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Lifelong Learning Centers (LLC) – After School Program

Program Summary: Engage students & parents in after school activities that develop academic, social and life skills that benefit the students, their families and the community.

Target Population: Students from Lockerman Middle (LMS) and Col. Richardson Middle Schools (CRMS)

FY10 Funding: \$119,421

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| # of middle school students served: | 200 | 231 | 258 | 296 | 150 | 358 |
| ▪ Lockerman Middle School | NA | 147 | 164 | 209 | 75 | 201 |
| ▪ Col Richardson Middle School | NA | 84 | 94 | 95 | 75 | 157 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| % students who attend 30 days or more: | 56% | | | 46% | | |
| ▪ Lockerman Middle School | NA | 35% | 38% | 39% | 53% | 100/50% |
| ▪ Col Richardson Middle School | NA | 37% | 38% | 61% | 53% | 108/69% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| % Difference in LLC students' attendance rate compared to general school population. | Not part of the contract | 95.4% general 94% after school | 95.88% general 96% LLC 95.63% general 97.5 LLC | No relevant change at either school | 1% better 1% better | LMS matched general (94%) attendance CRM 2% better (94/96%) |
| % of students whose SSRS* scores increase from pre-test to post-test. | 33% LMS 66% CRMS | 32% LMS 39% CMS | No relevant change at either school | Reading 100% Math 69% | 25% 25% | SSRS data not analyzed at this date Reading 100% Math 83% |
| % of students attending 30 days or more that achieve a 20% overall improvement in their grades as measured against the prior marking period to program entry | | | Reading 54% Math 14% | Reading 50% Math 100% | 50% | Reading 50% Math 18% |
| ▪ Lockerman Middle School | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | Reading 15% | | 50% | |
| ▪ Col Richardson Middle School | | | Math 17% | | | |

*Social Skills Rating System (SSRS) - This survey has been found to not accurately measure improvements other measures will be used FY11.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: School-Based Mental Health Program

Program Summary: Provide in-school therapeutic services including billable individual, group and family sessions using the Cognitive Behavior Therapy Model and non-billable services such as working with school personnel.

Target Population: Students at Lockerman Middle School

FY10 Funding: \$27,683

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of students served | 58 | 59 | 67 | 66 | 50 | 63 |
| ▪ # of non-billable points of service | 1,749 | 1435* | 1,141 | 1,045 | 1,750 | 1,377 |
| ▪ # of billable points of service | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 1,271 | 1,461 | 1,200 | 1,779 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| # and % of students that attend six behavioral health sessions (six is based on five years of youth strategies and | 46/79% | 55/93% | 45/67% | 25/41% | 38/75% | 28/47% |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| MST recommendations). | | | | | | |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| % of students attending six sessions that demonstrate improved function across home, school, and personal domains on the GAF** Assessment | 87% | 50% | 96% | 90% | 70% | 98%*** |

** GAF is the Global Assessment of Functioning pre and post measure given at intake, every six month after that and at discharge.

***Includes students who are maintaining their improved GAF scores

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Caroline Mentoring Project (CMP)

Program Summary: CMP matches mentors with mentees to foster positive relationship for young people with caring adults.

Target Population: Elementary and middle school students who have been identified as at-risk by a teacher, guidance counselor, parents, case worker or other interested persons.

FY10 Funding: \$36,852

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|--|-------------|-------------|---|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of mentor relationships (youth & mentor) | 20 | 23 | 19 | 26 | 25 | 21 |
| ▪ # of mentor trainings | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| ▪ # of group activities | 4 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 6 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of mentors who spend at least 8 hours per month mentoring their mentee. | 100% | 80% | 95% | 100% | 90% | (18)95% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of mentees who show improvement in overall GPA (from first marking period to last for the school year). | 80% | 60% | 50% improved 25% same 25% declined | 82% | 80% | <i>Waiting on independent evaluator</i> |
| ▪ % of mentees who see value in the relationship and want to continue as measured by Mentee – Caroline Mentoring Project Evaluation Survey. | 88% | 100% | 95% | 100% | 90% | <i>21/100%</i> |

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Laurel Grove After School Conversational English Program

Program Summary: Laurel Grove provides evening conversational English classes for parents and a Federalsburg Evening Enrichment Camp for their children in a community-based setting.

Target Population: Haitian/Creole families (parents and their children 5 to 14 years old) living in the Laurel Grove community.

FY10 Funding: \$13,467

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ # of adults participating | 35 | 22 | 19 | 30 | 11 |
| ▪ # of students participating | 19 | 17 | 20 | 20 | 23 |
| ▪ # evening sessions* | 18 morning* 17 evening | 71 | 61 | 75 | 65 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ # and % of adults attending 30 days or more | 4/11% | 0/0% | 7/73% | 15/50% | 5/50% |
| ▪ # and % of students attending 30 days or more | 4/21% | 6/30% | 17/77% | 10/50% | 20/87% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ % of adults (30days or more) that show improvement on the BEST PLUS pre/post test ** | 3 adults advanced from basic to intermediate *** | Post-test not administered by Mid-Shore Education (change in state agency) | 64% | 60% | 5/45% |
| ▪ % of students (attending 30 days or more) with improved scores on the SSRS pre/post test *** | New in FY08 | | No statistically relevant change | 25% | Data not statistically relevant |

*Morning sessions were discontinued in FY08 due to lack of participation.

**Pre/Post Assessment used in FY07 was a locally designed assessment. Best Plus to be incorporated in FY08.

*** Social Skills Rating System (SSRS) Survey.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Addictions Counselor in School

Program Summary: The Addictions Counselor provides individual and group therapy in two schools and the Caroline Counseling Center using the Stages of Change treatment model and a shorter intervention program, Teen-Intervene. Informational support is also offered as a prevention measure.

Target Population: Teens age 12-17 in need of alcohol, tobacco and other drug abuse prevention, intervention or treatment.

FY10 Funding: \$28,708

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of children referred to the program | 103 | 85 | 142 | 165 | 100 | 60 |
| ▪ Number of children (total unduplicated) receiving services | 93 | 77 | 123 | 144 | 90 | 107 |
| ○ Individual therapy* | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 123 | 144 | 90 | 105 |
| ○ Group therapy* | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 123 | 144 | 80 | 16 |
| ▪ Number of prevention presentations | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # and % of participants attending at least 6 therapy sessions (based on youth strategies 5-year experience). | 56/60.2% | 70/90.9% | 123/100% | 144/100% | 54/60% | 61/57% |
| ▪ # and % of participants taking GAF*** pre and post test. | 67/72% | 77/100% | 123/100% | 144/100% | 68/75% | 105/100% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants <u>not</u> receiving a drug-related school suspension while in treatment ▪ # of referrals to DJS for drug use while in treatment ▪ % of participants demonstrating an increase on GAF between intake and discharge. | 92/99% | 70/90.9% | 90% | 99% | 90% | 61/100% |
| | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 1 |
| | 37/55.2% | 33/42% | 60% | 19% | 60% | 57/62% |

*These totals reflect duplication of children who receive both services during the course of the year. **GAF Global Assessment of Functioning

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Child and Family Behavioral Support Program (CFBSP)

Program Summary: CFBSP provides families and educators with behavioral consultation that will enhance their capacity to manage or change problem behaviors.

Target Population: Children (ages 3-15) who exhibit challenging behaviors that disrupt their daily functioning in the home and/or school environment.

FY10 Funding: \$68,039

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # Children referred to the program ▪ # Children participating in the program | New in FY08 13 | New in FY08 12 | 34 19 | 15 14 | 16 14 | 15 14 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % Children assessed pre-test with CAFAS or PECFAS ▪ % Children assessed post-test with CAFAS or PECFAS ▪ % of children successfully discharged ▪ % of Caregiver Satisfaction Surveys** that rate behavior at home as (3.7) or higher ▪ % of Caregivers Satisfaction Surveys** that rate behavior at school as (3.7) or higher | 60%* 53%* | 100% 83% | 100% 31% | 100% 100% | 80% 60% | (14) 100% (14) 100% |
| | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 100% | 100% | 90% | (14) 100% |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 90% | (14) 100% |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 50% | 90% | None returned |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % Reduction in children's targeted behaviors during course of treatment ▪ % of children with improved scores on the CAFAS/PECFAS between intake and discharge. | 73.8% | 48%*** | 81.4% | 87.2% | 75% | 8/78% |
| | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 100% | 100% | 75% | 12/58% |

*New CFBSP coordinator required to complete assessment training, so percentages were down slightly.

** Questions on 4-point scale with 4 being the most favorable.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: School/Community Program for Sexual Risk Reduction Among Teens

Program Summary: An evidence-based program that is a comprehensive multi-faceted approach to public health education encompassing five principles; responsible decision making, effective communication, values clarification, enhanced self-esteem and improved understanding of reproductive science/sexual risk prevention. These principles are emphasized through three strategies, 1) Public Awareness, 2) Community Workshops, and 3) Teacher/School Workshops.

Target Population: Caroline County youth ages 10 to 19.

FY10 Funding: \$63,619

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual*** | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of public awareness venues | | | 7 | 7 | 3 | 7 |
| ▪ # of community workshops* | | | 45 | 122 | 10 | 55 |
| ▪ # of professional workshops | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| ▪ # of student workshops ** | | | 0 | 0 | 40 | 89 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of community members attending workshops | | | 547 | 2421 | 150 | 484 |
| ▪ # of professionals attending workshops | | | 43 | 33 | 25 | 24 |
| ▪ # of students attending workshops ** | | | 0 | 0 | 500 | 1850 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of students with improved scores on the knowledge and attitude survey (from classrooms provided with reproductive health education) | | | 78% | 93% | 50% | (1610) 87% |
| SECONDARY MEASURE | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of teen-age births (17 and below) | 15 (2005) | | 13 (2006) | 17 | 13 | N/A |

*Community workshops included student workshops/classroom sessions in FY08 & FY09.

**The peer education component of the program was eliminated for FY 10 because there was no interest by students to participate. The vendor tried numerous ways to get this component operational and met with no success. The student workshop or class presentation was added to capture the work being done in the schools.

***New program for FY08.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Planned and Crisis Respite Program

Program Summary: The Respite Program provides overnight respite for families in a crisis or with an acute situation that necessitates a “cooling down” period or breathing room for the caregiver to prevent out-of-home placement or disruption of a foster placement. This program is open to agency referrals and self referrals. Respite services are provided by specially trained foster parents.

Target Population: Families and foster care families that would benefit from respite services.

FY10 Funding: \$22,725

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| # of respite overnights | 275 | 290 | 315 | 351 | 315 | 314 |
| ▪ Crisis Overnights | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 58 | 46 | 105 | 60 |
| ▪ Planned Overnights | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 257 | 305 | 210 | 254 |
| # of children served (unduplicated) | 46 | 41 | 34 | 47 | 55 | 52 |
| ▪ # served in crisis respite* | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 16 | 11 | 35 | 17 |
| ▪ # served in planned respite* | New in FY08 | New in FY08 | 18 | 36 | 20 | 35 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of caregivers satisfied with the service (N= # of surveys completed). | 91% | 91.27% (11) | 97% | 100%(4) | 91% | 96.5% (4) |
| ▪ % of social workers satisfied (N= # of surveys completed). | New in FY08 | 91.2% (9) | 95%(10) | 94.8%(10) | 90%(N) | 92% (9) |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| ▪ % of respite providers satisfied (N= # of surveys completed). | New in FY08 | 86.38% (18) | 89%(22) | 88.3%(15) | 90%(N) | 87%(14) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of children that remained in their homes or existing foster care placement for 12 months after the first respite overnight. | 43/93.5%* * | 38/92.7% | 88% | 89.36% (4 children entered foster care; 1 child in detention) | 82% | 97% (2 children entered foster care) |

*These totals may reflect duplication of children who received both services during the year.

**Numbers and percentage reflect children still in homes at the end of the fiscal year and represent on sibling group of three children.

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Nurturing Parenting Programs (NPP)

Program Summary: NPP is an evidence-based parenting program that teaches age-specific parenting skills and also addresses the need to nurture oneself.

Target Population: Parents or caregivers for children from birth to 11 years old.

FY10 Funding: \$44,255

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| # of people trained in NPP (for all ages) | 14 | 16 | 20 | 0 |
| # of sessions | | | | |
| ▪ Birth – 5 | 1/20wks | 2/20wks | 2/20wks | 2/20 wks |
| ▪ Ages 5- 11 | 1/12wks | 3/12wks | 2/12wks | 2/12 wks |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| # adult attendees and % completing the program | | | | |
| ▪ Birth – 5 | 15/65% | 34/77.6% | 24/80% | 21/65% |
| ▪ Ages 5- 11 | 5/87% | 22/81.1% | 24/80% | 15/80% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| % of attendees demonstrating an improved score from first to last session on Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory (AAPI) measuring parenting and child-rearing attitudes | | | | |
| ▪ Birth – 5 | 100% | 58% | 80% | 36/81% |
| ▪ Ages 5- 11 | 100% | 81.25% | 80% | 39/86% |

LMB: Caroline Human Services Council, Inc.

Program Name: Teen Court

Program Summary: Offers youthful offenders an opportunity to accept accountability for their minor crimes without incurring a criminal record. The program is run by teens for teens. Teen volunteers act as jury, counsel, and bailiff and administer consequences to respondents coming before the court.

Target Population: First and second time offenders who are 11-17 years old.

FY10 Funding: \$56,654

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # 1 st & 2 nd time offenders diverted from the juvenile justice system (including tobacco & alcohol citations) | 98 | 94 | 93 | 100 | 100 | 109 |
| ▪ # court sessions | 21 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 19 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # and % of participants who complete their Teen Court consequences by the deadline. | 75/77% | 84/75% | 93/100% | 85/85% | 75/75% | 109/97% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of Teen Court respondents who do not re-offend 12 months after completing the program. | 74%* | 89.4% * | 88% | 88.4% | 75% | 98/90% |

*Calculated at the end of the FY, not 12 months out.

LMB: Carroll County

Program Name: Brief Strategic Family Therapy (BSFT)

Program Summary: BSFT is an evidence based (SAMHSA & OJJDP) treatment model of family-based intervention aimed at preventing and treating child and adolescent behavior problems. The goal is to improve child behavior by improving family interaction.

Target Population: Carroll County youth ages 6-18 exhibiting acting out, problematic or CINS-like behavior and their families.

FY10 Funding: \$101,558 YSB and \$22, 948 other = Total \$124,506

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|----------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of families that receive Brief Strategic Family Therapy | 46 | 67 | 52 | 60 | 62 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who are satisfied with BSFT as indicated on exit survey | N/A | 75% | 94% (N=39) | 75% | 94% (N=90) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth reporting increase in social/cognitive skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ at midpoint ○ at termination of BSFT | 86% 86% | 75% 75% | NA NA | NA NA | NA NA |
| ▪ Percentage of youth reporting increase in family interacting/bonding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ at midpoint ○ at termination of BSFT | 82% 82% | 75% 75% | NA NA | NA NA | NA NA |
| ▪ Percentage of parents/guardians who report that BSFT has helped to increase their parental skills <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ at mid point ○ at termination of BSFT | Not available N/A | 75% 75% | NA NA | NA NA | NA NA |
| New tool for FY09 - McMaster Assessment Tool* | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of families that demonstrate healthy effective verbal | | | 55% | 75% | 52% |

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| communication of information within the family when measured pre and post treatment. | | | (N=25) | | (N=44) |
| ▪ Percentage of families that demonstrate healthy approaches to resolve problems to a level that maintains effective family functioning when measured pre and post treatment. | | | 80% (N=37) | 75% | 57% (N=44) |
| ➤ Percentage of families that demonstrate healthy appropriate roles by which family members fulfill family functions when measured pre and post treatment. | | | 64% (N=29) | 75% | 57% (N=44) |

LMB: Carroll County

Program Name: Adventure Diversion Program

Program Summary: Adventure Diversion Program (ADP) is a mandatory supervised evening reporting center that provides experiential learning, conflict resolution and pro-social skill development, blended with outdoor recreation activities.

Target Population: Carroll County Department of Juvenile Services-involved youth that are at imminent risk of being removed from the community based on violations of probation or increased high risk behaviors.

FY10 Funding: \$50,000 + \$50,000 Other = \$100,000

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth that participated in the Adventure Diversion Program | 30 | 34 | 24 | 30 | 27 |
| ▪ Number of evening reporting sessions completed | 118 | 150 | 158 | 125 | 153 |
| ▪ Number of venturing activities conducted | 47 | 115 | 137 | 95 | 117 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth who are satisfied with the Adventure Diversion Program as indicated on the exit survey | 89% | 93% | 94% | 75% | 90% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth who did not have a subsequent violation of criminal and/or a court order while participating in ADP | 87% | 80% | 86% | 75% | 70.4% (N=27) |
| ▪ Percentage of youth not placed out of home at 6-months post service* | N/A | N/A | N/A | 75% | 80% |
| ▪ Percentage of youth not placed out of home at 12-months post service* | N/A | N/A | 50% | 75% | 81.8% |
| ▪ Percentage of youth who showed improvements in both pro-social and conflict resolution skills as measured by the pre/post assessment | 100% | 100% | 90% | 75% | 82% |

*This data not reported prior to FY09. This initiative was first funded by the Children's Cabinet Interagency Fund in FY10.

LMB: Carroll County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureau

Program Summary: Provide outpatient mental health and behavioral health services

Target Population: Carroll County youth and families

FY10 Funding: \$101,588 YSB funding directed to BSFT

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: | 711 | 668 | 718 | 623 | 803 |
| ▪ Individual* | 137 | 144 | 150 | 116 | 191 |
| ▪ Family* | 553 | 499 | 522 | 489 | 563 |
| ▪ Group* | 21 | 25 | 46 | 18 | 49 |
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: | 220 | 240 | 146 | 238 | 130 |
| ▪ Individual* | 144 | 148 | 138 | 186 | 180 |
| ▪ Family* | 71 | 92 | 8 | 49 | 50 |
| ▪ Group* | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| ➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. | | | | | |
| ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 814 | 680 | 764 | 674 | 805 |
| | 66 | 134 | 197 | 160 | 153 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. | 100% | 100% | 100% (N=718) | 100% | 100% (N=803) |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | 57% | 55% | 62% (N=194) | 55% | 64% (N=139/214) |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | 61% | 65% | 65% (N=28) | 65% | 65% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | N/A | 75% | 75% (N=46) | 75% | 85% (N=12/80) |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | NA |

LMB: Cecil Partnerships for Children, Youth & Families, Inc.

Program Name: Detour

Program Summary: A prevention and intervention program that serves youth ages 7–16 in the juvenile justice system and on probation or at-risk of out-of-home placement. Detour also targets youth that exhibit CINS type behaviors as defined by the DJS or the school system. The program supports improved school attendance, academic success and individual goal setting and achievement.

Target Population: Youth ages 7-16 who are involved with DJS, or who are exhibiting risky-type behaviors and may be in danger of dropping out of school.

FY10 Funding: \$25,762 GOC + \$10,175 United Way = \$35,937

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth in active services. | 35 | 36 | 19 | 20 | 35 |
| ▪ Number of youth who are linked to Detour from other services | 30 | 30 | 32 | 32 | N/A* |
| ▪ Number of youth who transitioned into after-care services | 40 | 9 | 40 | 40 | 36 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth who received referrals for additional services | | Not measured | 55% | 50% | 7% (N=5)** |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ % of participants who did not have a subsequent arrest after intake | | 95% | 94% | 90% | 100% (N=71) |
| ▪ % of participants who had no subsequent school suspensions after intake | | 67% | 71% | 70% | 77% (N=55) |
| ▪ % of participants who had no truancy violations after intake | | Not measured | 92% | 70% | 100% (N=71) |

*Linked clients are now included in the other two categories.

**Classes such as anger management and drug and alcohol abuse prevention, which were previously considered referrals, are now offered within the program.

LMB: Cecil Partnerships for Children, Youth and Families

Program Name: Bridges Program

Program Summary: Client management program that focuses on initially identifying client's needs and developing short and long term goals enabling the client to achieve self sufficiency in a core set of functional areas: GED or high school diploma, employment, housing, access to mental health or health services, transportation, crime/substance abuse-free, and social skill development/recreation.

Target Population: Cecil County youth ages 16–21 who have dropped out of high school.

FY10 Funding: \$200,000

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth served | 150 | 181 | 130 74new/56 aftercare | 170 79 new/ 91 aftercare | 150 | 172 69 new/103 aftercare |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who complete vocational training | 35% | 43% | 62% | 59% | 50% | 19% (N=13)† |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who enroll in GED classes | 58% | 58% | 69% | 61% | 80% | 54% (N=37) † |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who complete Job Ready and computer literacy training | * | * | 62% | 25% | 50% | 16% (N=11) † |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ▪ Percentage of clients who obtain GED | 50% | 13% | 52% | 23% | 50% | 8% (N=14) |
| ▪ Percentage of clients who obtain full or part-time employment | 50% | 75% | 80% | 33% | 60% | 5% (N=43) |
| ▪ Percentage of clients who increase GED/ABE test level while working towards GED | * | * | 90% | 15% | 70% | 5% (N=9) |
| ▪ Percentage of clients who complete all goals listed on their ISP | * | 22% | 22% | 18% | 25% | 8% (N=14) |

* These are new performance measures for FY08.

†These results were measured for active clients only, not aftercare, because they most often occur within a short time period of enrolling in the program.

LMB: Cecil Partnerships for Children, Youth and Families

Program Name: Youth Outreach Program

Program Summary: Youth outreach program run by the local police department for ages 13-21 in the Perryville area during non-school hours (evenings, weekends, etc) to provide positive interactions with law enforcement and reduce the number of kids vulnerable to gang activity as well as divert arrestees from DJS system.

Target Population: Children who are in danger of or engaging in risky behaviors and/or vulnerable to gang activity.

FY10 Funding: \$24,588

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of First Time Offenders participating in DJS diversion component | 11 | 22 | 10 | 7 |
| ▪ Number of individual counseling sessions provided for youth in DJS diversion component | 150* | 329* | 30 | 41 |
| ▪ Number of group counseling sessions provided in DJS diversion component | 22* | 38* | 15 | 1 |
| ▪ Number of At Risk Youth participating in Outreach component | 28* | 50* | 25 | 3 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participating youth whose parent(s) or guardian(s) participated in no fewer than 50% of parent involvement activities. | 70% | 10% | 30% | 7% (N=9) |
| ▪ Percentage of activities and sessions in a month that have at least 60% of enrolled youth in attendance | 50% | ** | 20% | ** |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ % of Diversion Program participants with no DJS intake/referral 6 months after program's end. | 99% | 86% | 50% | N/A |
| ▪ % of Outreach component program participants with no DJS intake/referral 6 months after program's end | 91% | 98% | 50% | N/A |
| ▪ % of Diversion Program participants who improve skills, attitudes and assets as measured by the ARISE Life Skills assessment pre and post tests. | 60% | 90% | 60% | N/A |

* Numbers for FY08 and FY09 are considerably larger than FY 10 because CPCYF provided funding for only 3 months during FY10**The size of the program prevents all of the children from going on field trips.

LMB: Cecil Partnerships for Children, Youth and Families

Program Name: After School Programs

Program Summary: Comprehensive after-school programs offering at least two and half hours of socialization, recreational, and academic/educational activities for youth

Target Population: School age youth within targeted school or community

FY10 Funding: \$54,018

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth served | 125 | 130 | 135 | 110 | 150 | 274 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Staff to Student Ratio: | 1:15 | 1:6 | 1:15 | 1:15 | 1:15 | 1:11 |
| ▪ Percentage of Students who attend program at least 50% of the time | * | * | 80% | 39% | 80% | 45% (N=124) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who increase pro-social attitudes (anger management, group participation/teamwork, resist peer pressure, ask for help/advice when have a problem) as measured by self and staff pre and post-tests, which will be administered at the beginning and the end of the school year. | No Data Available | 65% | 85% | 56% | 85% | 75% (N=73 out of 97) |
| ▪ Percentage of student participants who improved English, Math or Reading score. | 26% | 57%** | 35% | 55% | 35% | 49% (N=30) |

*This is a new performance measure for FY08.

**This number based on 45 students for whom we have full year data.

LMB: Cecil Partnerships for Children, Youth and Families

Program Name: Life Skills

Program Summary: LST is an early intervention program that combats the underlying causes of substance abuse. The program consists of three major components: drug resistance, personal self management, and general social skills.

Target Population: Youth aged 5-21 in the community.

FY10 Funding: \$37,119

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth served | 146 | 158 | 150 | 93 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who complete Life Skills Training | 90% | 58% | 80% | 75% (N=70) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants who demonstrate an increased knowledge in drug resistance as measured by ARISE Life Skills Pre and Post tests | 95% | 56% | 75% | 100% (N=70)† |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants who demonstrate improved personal skills as measured by ARISE Life Skills Pre and Post tests | 75% | 56% | 75% | 100% (N=70)† |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants who demonstrate improved social skills as measured by ARISE Life Skills Pre and Post tests | 50% | 56% | 75% | 100% (N=70)† |

† Percentage based on the 70 students who completed the program.

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: After School Youth Development

Program Summary: An after school program that offers homework assistance, a nutritious snack, a social skill development (including empathy, problem solving, anger management, and conflict resolution) through the Connect with Kids curriculum for 5 months at an interval of two times per week.

Target Population: Latchkey students in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades who have low test scores, a discipline referral, and/or low school attendance rates attending General Smallwood and Benjamin Stoddert middle schools in Charles County.

FY10 Funding: \$55,007

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of Children in After school program | 276 | 296 | 300 | 190 | 237 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of modules completed for the Connect with Kids curriculum (2 schools) | 72 | 48 | 23 | 22 | 27 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of sessions offered during the academic year | 136 | 81 | 108 | 64 | 64 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of participants who attend 75% or more of the scheduled sessions | 82% | 83% | 52% | 85% | 36% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of participants who complete the Connect with Kids program curriculum? | * | 79% | 19% | 60% | (N=86) 14% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student to Teacher Ratio | 14 to 1 | 10 to1 | 10 to 1 | 10 to1 | (N=34) 10 to 1 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth who improved life skills/view points of presented modules as measured by the curriculum pre & post survey | * | 63% | 63% | 75% | 62% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth who improved their GPA by .25 or more between the 1st & 4th marking periods | * | 41% | 38% | 50% | 26% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth who have an improved positive attitude toward school and teachers as measured by the pre and post survey during the initial and final marking periods. | * | 74% | 54% | 60% | (N=59) 61% |

*This data was not collected in prior years due to some changes under the Performance Measures

**This information will be compiled at the end of the year where the grades, curriculum completion and Pre and Post surveys can be compared.

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: Summer Youth Achievement Program (a component of the After-School Youth Development Program)

Program Summary: At-risk middle school students that are in jeopardy of academic failure, becoming involved with the legal system and show a “lack of commitment to school.”

Target Population: Youth enrolled in Summer School Program have been identified by teachers, administrators, guidance counselors, and/or local community leaders as “At-risk” for academic failure and/or are involved with juvenile services systems.

FY10 Funding: \$15,992

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth enrolled in program | 82 | 53 | 53 | 45 | 70 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Students to Staff Ratio | 4 to 1 | 5 to 1 | 4 to 1 | 7 to 1 | 5 to 1 |
| ▪ % of participants who attend 75% or more of the scheduled sessions | * | 75% | 89% | 85% | 91% (N=64) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ % of youth who report improvement in their view of authority figures (Police, Principals, Vice Principals, etc.) as measured by the Pre and Post test | 17% | ** | 70% | 20% | 28% (N=20) |
| ▪ % of students who feel connected to their school as measured by the Pre & Post survey | 6% | ** | 53% | 9% | 38% (N=27) |
| ▪ % of students not referred to juvenile services while in the program. | * | 94% | 100% | 90% | 100% (N=70) |

*Prior to FY07 data (including pre and post-test results) was not required in prior summer sessions.

**The staff of the summer program did not complete a pre/post survey during this fiscal year. It has since become a program requirement.

LMB: Charles County Human Services Partnership

Program Name: Youth Services Bureaus

Program Summary: A single point of access for pre-delinquent and adjudicated youth up to age 18 and their families in Charles County. The program is designed to direct youth to one single point of access for information and referral, care coordination and youth development services.

Target Population: Pre-delinquent and adjudicated youth.

FY10 Funding: \$140,974

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual * ▪ Family* ▪ Group* ▪ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by a subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual* ▪ Family* ▪ Group* ▪ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 263 | 780 | 506 | 300 | 359 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual * ▪ Family* ▪ Group* | 135 | 380 | 120 | 151 | 141 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Family* ▪ Group* | | 227 | 271 | 50* | 164 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Group* | | 173 | 115 | 99 | 54 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by a subtype: | 164 | 742 | 565 | 175 | 387 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual* | | 527 | 94 | 115 | 110 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Family* | | 78 | 222 | 23* | 82 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Group* | | 137 | 249 | 37 | 195 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 1 | 18 | 137 | 3 | 87 |
| | 1 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 4 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4th session. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 98.5% (N=139) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | ** | 90% | 69% | 50% | 78% (N=110) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | 100% | 100% | 93.75% | 100% | 92.5%+ (N=6) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | ** | 80% | 82% | 75% | 85% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by pre & post assessment 25% improvement (PIY). | ** | 30% (NCFAS) 50% (PIY) | 12% | 60% | 7% |

*Family numbers are based upon the family component utilized within the individual treatment plan.

**Data previously collected was separated by individual (child & adult) and unduplicated youth/children and adults and does not provide numbers for family and groups.

***This data is reported at the end of each fiscal year in an effort to see a clearer picture of the targeted performances.

+This percentage is reported as an average over the course of FY11.

LMB: Charles County

Program Name: Family Functional Therapy (FFT)

Program Summary: FFT was selected as a best practice model for implementation due to its provision of an umbrella theory of conceptualizing youth and family behaviors and interventions in the community.

Target Population: Youth ages 11–18.

FY10 Funding: \$21,781

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|-------|----------------|
| ▪ Number of youth enrolled in program | 18* | 7 | 7 | 5 | 10** |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of attendees who complete counseling successfully | 72% | 80% | 100% | 82.5% | 57%** (N=4) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth participants who are not placed outside the home during program duration. | 83% | 100% | 100% | 87% | 100% (N=7) |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who report improved family functioning as measured by the Client Outcome Measure Report (COM) administered at the completion of the program. | 72%* | 75% | 100% | 85% | 75% (N=2) |

*The decrease in youth for FY07 was due to the previous year counts including youth that were funded under other programs/grants and not Children's Cabinet funding alone.

**Reflects three families involved with Child Protective Services that didn't follow through.

LMB: Dorchester County Local Management Board

Program Name: Strategic Prevention Framework - Substance Abuse Prevention

Program Summary: The five steps that comprise SAMHSA's Strategic Prevention Framework enable communities to build the infrastructure necessary for effective and sustainable prevention.

Target Population: Teens, Parents, General Community

FY10 Funding: \$22,000

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ # of active teen participants in committee-sponsored activities. | 50 | 2001 | 200 | 2200 |
| ▪ # of active adult participants in committee-sponsored activities. | 75 | 75 | 275 | 200 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ % of teens that participate in more than one event | 50 | 365 | 75 (37%) | 15% n=336 |
| ▪ % of adults that participate in more than one event | 50 | 30 | 75(37%) | 117 (58%) |
| ▪ % of participants who believe that coalition can make a difference in the community's current level of substance abuse among youth as measured by exit surveys at committee-sponsored activities. | 50 | Survey could not be completed | 75 | 80% n=160 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| % of participants who report a positive change in attitude concerning committee-sponsored activity topic on exit survey: ✓ Drinking and driving ✓ Other topics as added by committee | 60% | 75% | 80% | 80% n=160 |

LMB: Dorchester County Local Management Board

Program Name: School Based Behavioral Health Services

Program Summary: Case Management, individual session, group sessions, referral linkages, family liaison, parent support groups, home visits and social skill building to strengthen individual, school and family functioning.

Target Population: Elementary School Students

FY10 Funding: \$82,200

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| Total # of children served (unduplicated count) | 67 | 56 | 100 | 101 | 100 | 105 |
| # of individual sessions | | | 1000 | 738 | 1000 | 602 |
| ▪ # children receiving individual session | 2066 | 949 | 50 | 41 | 50 | 120 |
| # of group sessions | | | 20 | 365 | 20 | 582 |
| ▪ # children participating in group session | | | 50 | 64 | 50 | 63 |
| # of parent support group sessions | | | 16 | 5 | 16 | 4 |
| ▪ # of parents attending session | | | 20 | 28 | 20 | 23 |
| # of home visits | | | 50 | 21 | 50 | 22 |
| ▪ # of parents receiving home visit | | | 65 | 18 | 65 | 24 |
| # of referrals to community-based services | | | 200 | 33 | 200 | 23 |
| ▪ # of children receiving referrals to community-based services | | | 100 | 33 | 100 | 24 |
| # of family events | | | | | 4 | 4 |
| ▪ % of families attending | | | | | 60% | 95% N=100 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of parents who report overall satisfaction or higher on case closure satisfaction survey | 100% | 100% | 75% | 100% | 85% | 100% N=75 |
| ▪ % of referring teachers who report overall satisfaction or higher on case closure satisfaction survey | Not collected | Not collected | 80% | 87% | 85% | 92% N=69 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| % of program participants who demonstrate a gain in teacher rating of classroom behavior from referral to: | 65% | 65% | | | | |
| ▪ Mid-year | | | 50% | 28% | 65% | 32% N=34 |
| ▪ End of school year | | | 60% | 31% | 70% | 46% N=48 |
| % of program participants who show an overall improvement in social skills rating scale between referral (pre) and case closure (post). | | | 60% | 37% | 70% | 38% N=74 |

LMB: Dorchester County Local Management Board

Program Name: After School Program

Program Summary: Recreational, educational, and service-oriented activities are held two days per week for two hours per day at two middle schools

Target Population: Middle School Students

FY10 Funding: \$120,355

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| # of middle school students served: | 350 | 357 | 330 | 427 | 390 | 424 |
| ▪ Teen ambassadors Program | | | 145 | 19 | 20 | 15 |
| ▪ Quest | | | 185 | 38 | 300 | 295 |
| ▪ TREK | | 26 | 28 | 293 | 50 | 95 |
| ▪ NDAIGA | | 26 | 28 | 60 | 20 | 19 |
| | | | | 17 | | |
| # of participants (unduplicated) by activity: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Teen Ambassadors | | | | 19 | 20 | 15 |
| ▪ Quest | | | | 38 | 300 | 295 |
| ▪ TREK | | | | 293 | 50 | 95 |
| ▪ NDAIGA | | | | 60 | 20 | 19 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of students who participate in no fewer than 80% of all sessions | Unknown | Unknown | 70% | 75% | 75% | 86% N=365 |
| ▪ % of students who meet no fewer than 80 % of their individual goals as determined at program entry. | Not collected | Not collected | 75% | 74% | 75% | 82% N=348 |
| ▪ Staff to student ratio | 1:10 | 1:10 | 1:10 | 1:12 | 1:10 | 1:13 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of participating students who meet satisfactory school attendance standards of 94% | Not collected | 85% | 75% | 91% | 80% | 91% N=386 |
| ▪ % of participating students with no DJS referral during program period | Not collected | Not collected | 75% | 85% | 80% | 98% N=416 |

LMB: Dorchester

Program Name: Youth Services Bureaus

FY10 Funding: \$66,181

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | 74 | 59 | 60 | 72 | 60 | 60 |
| ▪ Family* | 101 | 61 | 75 | 0 | 75 | 0 |
| ▪ Group* | 1 | | 1 | 0 | 20 | 59 |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual* ▪ Family* ▪ Group* | 79 Total | 37 Total | 40 55 1 | 89 0 0 | 40 55 1 | 27 0 81 |
| ➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 7 Unknown | 6 Unknown | 5 2 | 0 0 | 5 2 | 0 0 |
| ➤ # of Gang Prevention Groups | | | | ** | 6 | 14 |
| ➤ # of participants in Gang Prevention Groups | | | | ** | 50 | 102 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. | Unknown | Unknown | 85% | 100% | 90% | 99% n=118 |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | | | 85% | 91% | 90% | 92.7% n=72 |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | | | 50% | 100% | 65% | 100% n=2 |
| ➤ % of staff trained in mediation | | | | ** | 100% | 0% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | Unknown | Unknown | 75 % | 98% | 85% | 86% n=102 |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | | | 80% | 80% | 85% | 67% n=80 |

LMB: Dorchester County

Program Name: Teen Pregnancy Prevention Project

Program Summary: A best practice/evidence-based program that is a comprehensive multi-faceted approach to addressing teen pregnancy in Dorchester County. Components of the program are case management and support services, referral linkages, child care, life skills training, parenting classes and job readiness.

Target Population: Dorchester County youth ages 10 to 17.

FY10 Funding: \$50,000

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual* | FY07 Actual* | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of pregnant teens being served ▪ # support services provided ▪ # referral linkages ▪ # parenting classes offered | | | Program didn't begin. Only program planning. | 20 195 18 37 | 25 100 50 3 | 24 815 109 98 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of pregnant teens participating in the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Life skills training ○ Parenting classes ○ Job Readiness classes | | | | 28 24 26 | 25 25 25 | 70 70 70 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| % of participants with an individualized service plan who complete 80% of their goals by target date. | | | | 64% | 75% | 77% n=31 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| # of pregnant teens participants who remain in school at least one year after birth of baby. | | | | Not Available. | 18 | 13 (100%) |
| SECONDARY MEASURE | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of teen-age births (17 and below) | 2005/23 Births 2006/29 Births | | | | 15 | 13 girls gave birth. |

LMB: Frederick County

Program Name: Strengthening Families Program

Program Summary: The Strengthening Families Program is a parenting and family skills training program that consists of 7 weekly skill-building sessions and 4 booster sessions. Parents and children work separately in training sessions and then participate together in a joint session, practicing the skills they learned earlier. Children's training sessions concentrate on setting goals, dealing with stress and emotions, communication skills, responsible behavior and how to deal with peer pressure. Topics in the parental section include setting rules, nurturing, monitoring compliance and applying appropriate discipline.

Target Population: Youth at-risk for substance abuse and other negative outcomes and families.

FY10 Funding: \$22,362

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total # of sessions delivered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Parenting sessions ○ Youth sessions delivered ▪ # of parents served ▪ # of youth served | 14 14 9 13 | 23 23 41 33 | 21 21 30 30 | 21 21 18 22 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of families participating in at least 6 of 7 core sessions ▪ % of families indicating satisfaction with program | 100% 100% | 89% 100% | 75% 85% | 80% (N=12) 97% (N=29/30 Parent/Youth |

| | | | | Surveys Returned) |
|--|------|------|-----|-------------------|
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| % of parents indicating (on curriculum-based pre and post-test measures) that participating in SFP helped improve their: | | | | |
| ▪ Parenting communication style | 67% | 89% | 85% | 100% (N=14) |
| ▪ Parental support and nurturing | 83% | 89% | 85% | 100% (N=14) |
| % of youth indicating (on curriculum-based pre and post-test measures) that participating in SFP helped improve their: | | | | |
| ▪ Relationship with parents | 67% | 88% | 75% | 94% (N=16) |
| ▪ Peer pressure skills | 67% | 88% | 75% | 65% (N=11) |
| % of youth who experienced no school suspensions during program period | 100% | 100% | 90% | 88% (N=15) |

LMB: Frederick County

Program Name: Frederick County Afterschool Programs

Program Summary: After school programs are provided to middle school students to promote positive youth development while minimizing unsupervised time. The program seeks to improve participant well-being by engaging youth in meaningful programs that assist them in becoming healthy young adults. Comprehensive programming is designed to improve social, academic and legal outcomes.

Target Population: Youth attending the five most high-risk middle schools in Frederick County. At least 50% of youth attending after school programs must be referred by an outside referral source such as DJS, CASS, school guidance counselor or psychologist.

FY10 Funding: \$133,547 (+ County match of \$94,779)

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual * | FY07 Actual * | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of youth receiving after school programming | 154 | 201 | 164 | 182 | 150 | 159 |
| ▪ # of hours of programming per week offered to youth at risk through the after school program (5 sites total) | * | * | 87.5 | 87.5 | 87.5 | 87.5 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of youth participating in the after school program who are referred by child serving professionals or educators for at-risk behaviors | * | * | 58% | 68% | 50% | 50% (N=80) |
| ▪ % of middle school principals indicating satisfaction with the quality of their after school program | * | * | 100% | 100% (N=3/5) | 85% | 100% (N = 5) |
| ▪ % of parents indicating satisfaction with the quality of their child's after school program | * | * | 100% | 100% (N=40) | 85% | 97% (N=36/37 surveys returned) |

| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
|---|-----|------|------|------|-----|-----------------|
| ▪ % of youth participating in after school programs who do not experience an out of school suspension during program period | * | * | 96% | 90% | 88% | 88% (N=140) |
| ▪ % of youth participating in after school programs who do not experience a school expulsion during program period | * | * | 100% | 100% | 97% | 99% (N=158) |
| ▪ % of youth participating in after school programs who do not experience a DJS referral during program period | 99% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 100% (N=159) |

*This data was not collected in FY06 or FY07. These are new performance measures for FY08.

LMB: Frederick County

Program Name: Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)

Program Summary: Intensive family and community based treatment program for youth with complex clinical, social and/or educational issues who are at imminent risk of out-of-home placement.

Target Population: Youth at-risk of out-of-home placement.

FY10 Funding: \$79,999

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of target youth served | 15 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 20 | 20 |
| ▪ # families served | * | * | 22 | 22 | 20 | 20 |
| ▪ Total # of youth served (including siblings) | * | * | 24 | 46 | 24 | 44 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| % of families indicating (on MST Therapist Adherence Measure) agreement that: | | | | | | |
| ▪ The MST therapist made good use of family's strengths | * | * | 100% | 88% | 85% | 95% (N=19) |
| ▪ Family got much accomplished during therapy sessions | * | * | 100% | 93% | 85% | 95% (N=19) |
| ▪ The MST therapist did whatever it took to help family with tough situation | * | * | 100% | 93% | 85% | 95% (N=19) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of families who accomplish no less than 75% of goals identified in their treatment plan. | * | 79% | 85% | 81% | 80% | 60% (N=9) |
| ▪ % of youth who do not experience out-of-home placement during treatment. | * | 84% | 90% | 88% | 70% | 93% (N=14) |
| ▪ % of youth engaged in school, training, or work at time of case closure. | * | 95% | 90% | 81% | 85% | 87% (N=13) |

*This data was not collected in FY06 or FY07. These are new performance measures for FY08.

LMB: Garrett County Partnership for Children and Families, Inc.

Program Name: Healthy Communities/Healthy Youth (HC/HY)

Program Summary: The HC/HY strategy is a model prevention program that utilizes a community-focused asset development approach to promote the healthy development of youth. The developmental asset framework is integrated into activities by local community and youth groups and into the quarterly *“Play Hard. Live Clean.”* ATOD-free youth events. Public awareness is promoted through various media strategies. The *Guiding Good Choices* substance abuse prevention curriculum is offered to parents of youth ages 9-14.

Target Population: Children, youth, and families residing in Garrett County.

FY10 Funding: \$35,000

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of asset development trainings ▪ # of ‘youth hours’ and ‘adult hours’ (actual) for HC/HY asset trainings facilitated by the HD ▪ # of HC/HY media activities ▪ # of PHLC activities (ATOD-free focus) and # of youth participants | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 ▪ 172 youth; 121 adult ▪ 54 ▪ 4 activities; 878+ attended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 19 ▪ 300 youth; 175 adult ▪ 54 ▪ 4 activities; 888+ attended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 89 ▪ 107.8 youth; 104.3 adult ▪ 56 ▪ 4 activities ▪ 1,566 youth attended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 45 ▪ 59 youth; 80.5 adult ▪ 48 ▪ 4 PH/LC activities; 1073 youth attended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 10 ▪ 200 youth; 200 adult ▪ 30 ▪ 4 activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 5 ▪ 12.25 youth; 43.5 adult ▪ 48 ▪ 4 PH/LC activities; 260 attended |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of parents attending the Guiding Good Choices workshops who attend 75% of the time ▪ % of GGC parents ‘satisfied’ with the workshop per the GGC Workshop Leader’s Rating | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 60% (3/5) ▪ 75% (3/4) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 50% (4/8) ▪ 100% (4/4) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (5/5) ▪ 100% (5/5) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Program discontinued</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Program discontinued</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Program discontinued</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of Community Resource Survey respondents indicating <i>“Recreation for Families”</i> is ‘somewhat’ or ‘very much’ a Strength, annually ▪ % of Community Resource Survey respondents indicating <i>“Recreation for Youth”</i> is ‘somewhat’ or ‘very much’ a Strength, annually | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>N/A – New for FY 2010</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>N/A – New for FY 2010</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>N/A – New for FY 2010</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 23.9% (n=348) ▪ 22.4% (n=344) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 30% ▪ 30% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 51.1% (97/190) ▪ 38.2% (71/186) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of parents attending the GGC workshops who show pre/post improvement on assessment survey ▪ % of 9th graders reporting that they have at least 75% of the 40 Developmental Assets, annually | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 75% (3/4) ▪ <i>Survey not administered until FY 2007</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 75% (3/4) ▪ 37.5%, NHS/SHS (126/336) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% (5/5) ▪ 50.2%, SHS (118/235) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Program discontinued</i> ▪ 36.4%, NHS (43/118) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Program discontinued</i> ▪ 40% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Program discontinued</i> ▪ 39.3%, SHS (136/346) |
| Secondary Indicators (potentially impacted by the intervention) | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitor Juvenile Non-Violent Arrest Rate (3-year average, ages 15-17) ▪ Monitor High School Drop-Out Rate (3-year average) ▪ Monitor Teen Pregnancy Rate (3-year average, ages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,938 (‘05-‘07) ▪ 2.58% (‘04-‘06) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1,908 (‘06-‘08) ▪ 2.34% (‘05-‘07) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TBD ▪ 2.21% (‘06-‘08) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TBD ▪ 2.22% (‘07-‘09) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monitor ▪ Monitor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TBD ▪ <i>Pending updating of GOC data</i> |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---|--|--|--|------------------------|-------------|
| 15-19) ▪ Monitor High School Program Completion (3-year average) | ▪ 23.5 ('04-'06) ▪ 45.6% ('04-'06 UMD) | ▪ 30.6 ('05-'07) ▪ 45.9% ('05-'07, UMD) | ▪ 31.2 ('06-'08) ▪ 49.0% ('06-'08, UMD) | ▪ 31.5 ('07-'09) ▪ 51.9% ('07-'09, UMD) | ▪ Monitor ▪ Monitor | <i>sets</i> |

LMB: Garrett County Partnership for Children and Families, Inc.

Strategy Name: Partners After School @ Accident

Strategy Summary: Partners After School @ Accident operates five days a week, 2½ hours a day, during the school year. Activities include homework help, tutoring, enrichment activities, computer time, recreation, arts/crafts, community service, and field trips. The model substance abuse prevention program *LifeSkills™* Training is offered provided for eight weeks during the SY.

Target Population: Students in grades 3-6 that reside in the Accident Elementary School attendance areas.

FY10 Funding: \$36,102

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of students served by PAS @ Accident, per SY | ▪ 51 | ▪ 41 | ▪ 43 | ▪ 42 | ▪ 38 | ▪ 33 |
| ▪ # of students served 30 or more days, per SY | ▪ 37 | ▪ 40 | ▪ 37 | ▪ 30 | ▪ 35 | ▪ 26 |
| ▪ # of parent/other adult volunteer hours, per SY | ▪ 537.5 | ▪ 212.5 | ▪ 286 | ▪ 247.5 | ▪ 250 | ▪ 146 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % parents satisfied with PAS @ Accident, per SY | ▪ 86% (12/14) | ▪ 83% (38/46) | ▪ 95% (38/40) | ▪ 81% (13/16) | ▪ 80% | ▪ 100% (37/37) |
| ▪ % of PAS students attending 8+ days who attend at least 75% of the days they are scheduled, per SY | ▪ 77% (37/48) | ▪ 80% (32/40) | ▪ 62% (23/37) | ▪ 77% (30/39) | ▪ 75% | ▪ 100% (20/20) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-5 with a grade of "B-" or better in a) Reading/English and b) Math/Algebra | a) 93% (26/28) b) 93% (26/28) | a) 85% (29/34) b) 97% (33/34) | a) 78% (28/36) b) 89% (32/36) | a) 85% (22/26) b) 81% (21/26) | a) 70% b) 70% | a) 86% (24/28) b) 86% (24/28) |
| ▪ % of students served 30+ days in grades 3-5 who score at or above proficient in a) Reading and b) Math on the MSA | a) 86% (30/35) b) 91% (32/35) | a) 97% (34/35) b) 82% (31/35) | a) 100% (28/28) b) 96% (26/28) | a) 89% (24/27) b) 74% (20/27) | a) 75% b) 65% | a) TBD b) TBD |
| ▪ % of students attending at least 75% of LST sessions who demonstrate a) 'adequate life skills' and b) 'positive life choices' per LST post-test | a) 92% (22/24) b) 96% (23/24) | a) 100% (26/26) b) 92% (24/26) | a) 100% (27/27) b) 100% (26/26) | a) 85% (11/13) b) TBD | a) 75% b) 75% | a) TBD b) TBD |

LMB: Garrett County Partnership for Children and Families, Inc.

Strategy Name: School Community Centers Program

Strategy Summary: The School Community Centers Program provides a variety of supervised scheduled (or drop-in) activities for Pre-K through 12th Grade students at many of the 15 public schools in the county. Activities include skill building, recreation, and tutoring assistance.

Target Population: School aged youth that reside in the service area of the school-based or community-based program.

FY10 Funding: \$18,000

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of schools with an SCCP site, annually ▪ # of students served by SCCP programs, annually (may be a duplicated count) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 14 ▪ 871 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 10 ▪ 496 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 13 ▪ 606 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 14 ▪ 543 <i>(duplicate count)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 12 ▪ 500 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 15 ▪ 499 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of SCCP participants attending at least 50% of <u>scheduled</u> activities, each SY cohort | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ TBD | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 15% (17/114) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 36% (82/226) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 33% (65/197) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 40% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 12 % (16/139) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of SCCP tutorial participants who pass the classes for which they are being tutored (grade of C- or better on their year-end report card), each SY cohort | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>N/A – New for FY 2008</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>N/A – New for FY 2008</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 81% (104/128) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 88% (130/140) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 75% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 81% (121/150) |

LMB: Harford County Local Management Board

Program Name: After School Programs

Program Summary: After school programs provide structured activities for low-income children in the areas of: homework assistance, service-learning projects, and delinquency/substance abuse prevention presentations

Target Population: Elementary school age children at 3 elementary schools.

FY10 Funding: \$50,840

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| Number of program days per site: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deerfield Elementary ▪ Magnolia Elementary ▪ Bakerfield Elementary* | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 84 78 N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 69 60 N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 69 69 N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 71 71 75 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45 45 45 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60 58 N/A |
| Total number of participants per site: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deerfield Elementary ▪ Magnolia Elementary ▪ Bakerfield Elementary* | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40 40 N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40 50 N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 47 53 N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 47 47 40 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 40 40 40 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 45 46 N/A |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |
| Attendance rate per site: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deerfield Elementary ▪ Magnolia Elementary ▪ Bakerfield Elementary* | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 77% 90% N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 84% 89% N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 82% 87% N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 85% 91% 84% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 65% 65% 65% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 87% 83% N/A |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| Percentage of students who show an increase of at least one letter grade: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Math | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 32% |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | | | (25/109*) | | (29/91) |
| ▪ English | N/A | N/A | 24% | 26% (28/109*) | 60% | 24% (22/91) |
| Percentage of students absent less than 20 days of school: | | | | | | |
| • Deerfield Elementary | 96.5% | 84% | 96% | 96% (45/47) | 82% | 53% (24/45) |
| • Magnolia Elementary | 100% | 84% | 79% | 96% (45/47) | 82% | 78% (36/46) |
| • Bakerfield Elementary* | N/A | N/A | N/A | 98% (39/40) | 82% | N/A |

*Total is out of 109 as 25 students attended the program for only 1 quarter.

**The measure of increased academic grades will not be available until the annual report. No grades are given for the first quarter of the school year.

***Number reflects 7/1/08-10/31/08 as only the first quarter report has been due to date. Deerfield number to be available at the annual report as the program started after the first quarter report was due.

LMB: Harford County Local Management Board

Program Name: CINS Diversion Program

Program Summary: Program seeks to divert children from the juvenile justice system who are considered Children In Need of Supervision

Target Population: All potential middle and high school age youth in Harford County identified as committing status offenses.

FY10 Funding: \$90,980

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Youth served with Level I Services. | 32 | 35 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| ▪ Youth served with Level II Services. | 26 | 32 | 39 | 35 | 27 | 30 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ From the returned surveys, percent of families receiving Level II services who were satisfied or higher (%/N) | 100% (12) | 100% (25) | 100% (N=18) | 95% (21/22) | 60% | 92% (11/12) |
| ▪ Percentage of youth completing Level II services (# completed services/# admitted into program) | 84% | 89% | 98% (39/41) | 83% (35/42) | 90% | 96% (23/24) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of Level II clients diverted from formal DJS involvement | 96% (25/26) | 90%* (28/31) | 97% (38/39) | 97% (34/35) | 75% | 96% (22/23) |
| ▪ % of Level II clients, for whom running away has been a problem, who showed a decrease in incidence of running away behavior during service delivery (N=number improved/number with a history of running away). | 100% (15/15) | 89% (8/9) | 88% (21/24) | 97% (34/35) | 88% | 100% (N=3) |
| ▪ % of Level II clients who maintained or improved school attendance during service delivery | 79% (15/19) | 89% (17/19) | 87% (34/39) | 97% (34/35) | 50% | 100% (N=23) |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|----------------|
| ▪ % of Level II clients completing the program who maintained or improved their GPA during service delivery as compared to the previous marking period** | 54% (7/13) | 29%* (9/31) | 38% (15/39) | 91% (32/35) | 50% | 100% (N=23) |
|--|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|----------------|

*32 Level II families were discharged during FY07. The sample size is reduced by one due to incomplete outcome information.

**Maintained is defined as academic grades not getting any worse, improved is defined as an increase in academic grades.

LMB: Harford County Local Management Board

Program Name: CINS Prevention Program

Program Summary: Focused on the prevention/reduction of youth violence and delinquent behavior at home and in the community

Target Population: All potential elementary age youth in the Route 40 area, identified as in need of intervention by school-based personnel

FY10 Funding: \$90,981

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of youth served | | | 47 | 74 | 45 | 73 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth completing services (# completed services/# admitted into program) | | | 87% (27/31) | 79% (45/57) | 80% | 77% (36/47) |
| ▪ Percent of families who indicate they are satisfied or better with the program (N=number of returned surveys) | | | 100% (N=17) | 100% (N=18) | 80% | 94% (16/17) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of participants, for who violent incidences have been a problem, that demonstrate a decrease in violent incidences in the home and the school based on parent and teacher surveys administered at the close of service | | | 100% (21/21) | 60% (24/40) | 85% | 81% (17/21) |
| ▪ % of children who maintained or improved school attendance during service delivery as it compared to the previous marking period* | | | 93% (25/27) | 96% (43/45) | 85% | 100% (N=36) |
| ▪ % of families who report an improved relationship with the school, based on parent survey at the close of service | | | 88% (15/17) | 83% (15/18) | 85% | 81% (13/16)** |
| ▪ % of youth who demonstrate increased functioning in two or more domains of the CANS as administered at the start, middle and close of service | | | 100% (27/27) | 100% (45/45) | 90% | 97% (35/36) |

*Maintained is defined as attendance not getting any worse, improved is defined as an increased number of days in attendance at school.

**Note that one family was provided with the staff version of the satisfaction survey, and therefore did not have this question to respond to.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: The Drop-In

Program Summary: The program operates on a drop-in basis year-round and offers educational and recreational programs and activities.

Programs focus on problem solving, leadership skills and life skills. Youth are given opportunities to participate in the development of programming at the Center.

Target Population: Youth ages 9-17 living in Howard County (in particular the Oakland Mills Community).

FY10 Funding: \$17,400

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth served. | 146 | 150 | 60 | 68 |
| ▪ Number of hours of community service completed by participating youth per quarter. | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth attending two or more times per week. (N=total number of youth served) | 75% | 75% | 75% | 100% (N=68) |
| ▪ Percentage of youth participants satisfied with programs and activities. (N=Total number of youth served) | 60% | 65% | 75% | 96% (N=65) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth reporting improved leadership and problem solving skills as determined by survey results (given in October and May). (N=Total number of youth served) | 55% | 88% | 70% | 98% (N=66) |

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Howard County Library Teen Time

Program Summary: A program at the East Columbia Library that provides a safe structured environment for at-risk children where they receive academic enrichment and character building activities after school.

Target Population: Middle school students from the Cradlerock School.

FY10 Funding: \$17,500

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth served. | 60 | 62 | 62 | 50 | 47 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Staff/client ratio. | 1:10 | 1:10 | 1:5 | 1:10 | 1:5 |
| ▪ Percentage of students that attend the program three days or more per week. (N=Total number of youth served) | 85% | 85% | 60% | 90% | 78%* (N=37) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of student participants not involved in library incidents. (N=Total number of youth served) | 80% | 95% | 99% | 95% | 100% (N=47) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of parental/significant adult involvement (based on attendance at workshops, events). (N=Total number of youth served) | 60% | 50% | 79% | 60% | 83% (N=39) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students that report an improvement in their relationships with peers and teachers (based on surveys given in October and May). (N=Total number of youth served) | n/a | 55% | 77% | 60% | 68% (N=32) |

*This program serves a community with a particularly high rate of single parent households. As a result many of the youth that participate in this program have added responsibility for younger siblings that impacts their attendance. In addition, the target was set very high as compared to last year's 60% attendance rate. An increase of 18% to 78% is actually a significant accomplishment and we are pleased with that result.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Students Taking Action Reap Success (STARS) at Bollman Bridge Elementary School

Program Summary: After school program with academic intervention, enrichment and recreational opportunities. Intensive academic support is provided to a targeted group of 3-5th graders that are identified by school staff as most at risk of academic failure.

Target Population: 3rd -5th graders at Bollman Bridge Elementary.

FY10 Funding: \$18,500

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of youth served. | 36 | 42 | 36 | 33 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of "at-risk" youth served with targeted support (at-risk youth are identified by school staff as requiring significant intervention to prevent academic failure). | 36 | 35 | 36 | 33 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students attending the after school program at least two times per week. (N=Total number of youth served) | 90% | 99% | 95% | 96% (N=32) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of student participants who show improvement in Language Arts grades from 1st to 3rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served) | 70% | 68% | 60% | 51% (N=17) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of student participants who show improvement in Math grades from 1st to 3rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served) | 80% | 78% | 70% | 72% (N=24) |

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Patuxent Valley Middle

Program Summary: An after school program located in the Savage Community that provides supervised academic, recreational, cultural, social and health activities and encourages parental involvement. There is an intensive academic focus available to those students identified as at-risk of academic failure by school staff.

Target Population: Students in grades 6-8 from Patuxent Valley Middle School.

FY10 Funding: \$28,000

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of youth served. | 200 | 287 | 176 | 200 | 236 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of “at-risk” youth served with targeted support (at-risk youth are identified by school staff as requiring significant intervention to prevent academic failure). | 45 | 40 | 60 | 30 | 44 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of student participants receiving academic support. (N=Total number of youth served) | 63% | 75% | 75% | 75% | 100% (N=236) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of targeted student participants who show improvement in Language Arts grades from 1st to 3rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served) | n/a | 80% | 72% | 75% | 36% (N=85) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of targeted student participants who show improvement in Math grades from 1st to 3rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served) | n/a | 70% | 85% | 70% | 45% (N=106) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of student participants receiving office referrals in the 1st- 4th quarter. (N=Total number of youth served) | 5% | 7% | 10% | 4% | 5% (N=12) |

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Club LEAP (Learning English After School Program)

Program Summary: Supports academic success of K-8 ESOL students by focusing on improving students’ English proficiency.

Target Population: Students in grades K-8 who are performing below grade level as a result of limited English proficiency in one of 12 participating sites.

FY10 Funding: \$13,000

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much Do We Do: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students served. | 69 | 75 | 50 | 49 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of volunteers. | 38 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of Club LEAP parents attending at least one Parent Night. (N=Number of students) | 50% | 70% | 65% | 65% (N=32) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of volunteers actively meeting with youth for one school year (Oct.-May). (N=Number of volunteers) | 90% | 100% | 95% | 90% (N=36) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of student participants demonstrating increased English proficiency (based on pre- and post-tests). (N=Total number of youth served) | 55% | 57% | 50% | 50% (N=24) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students showing progression toward grade level performance standards (as determined by reading assessments/running records given monthly or as needed). (N=Total number of youth served) | 60% | 76% | 60% | 67% (N=33) |

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Harper's Choice After School Program

Program Summary: Operating as an extension of the school day, this unique partnership between the schools, Howard Co. Recreation and Parks and the Howard Co. Police Department, students are provided a safe environment in which to improve their academic skills as well as building important social skills.

Target Population: Students in grades 4-8 from the neighboring Harpers Choice Elementary and Middle schools.

FY10 Funding: \$36,000

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students served. | 60 | 75 | 80 | 60 | 81 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students receiving intensive academic support. | 30 | 30 | 36 | 25 | 18 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students attending the after school program three times per week or more. (N=Total number of youth served) | 50% | 90% | 95% | 90% | 97% (N=59) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of student participants who show improvement in Language Arts grades from 1st to 3rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served) | 50% | 59% | 56% | 60% | 37% (N=30) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of student participants who show improvement in Math grades from 1st to 3rd quarter. (N=Total number of youth served) | 50% | 50% | 85% | 55% | 29% (N=23) |

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Bear Trax Police - Youth Programs

Program Summary: Bear Trax Camp outreach program is designed to enhance relationships between police and youth in the Howard County Community.

Target Population: At-risk students in need of positive mentoring.

FY10 Funding: \$18,000

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth served. | 150 | 75 | 21 | 60 | 30 |
| ▪ Number of youth served with school suspension history. | 55 | 35 | 0 | 30 | 0* |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participants needing mentoring who have had a rewarding experience (as measured by youth surveys). (N=Total number of youth served) | 83% | 75% | 100% | 75% | 100% (N=30) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of improvement in school suspensions by participants (as measured by an after-action report by administrators). (N=Total number of youth served) | 36% | 30% | n/a | 50% | n/a |

*Referrals are being made by teachers who are identifying youth prior to a suspension incident. We are tracking the number of students that have referrals to the office for disruptive, inappropriate behaviors. As a result of funding cuts and new program managers within the police department, this program went through some restructuring during FY10. Performance measures will be modified for FY11 as a result of these changes.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Alpha Achievers

Program Summary: This program fosters a positive learning environment to support African American males to attain and maintain a 3.0 GPA. This funding will support the daily running of the program as well as provide enhancement to the program by supporting a conference of all participating Alpha Achievers for a day of team building activities, workshops and leadership training.

Target Population: African American males in grades 9-12.

FY10 Funding: \$10,450

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students served. | 255 | 310 | 200 | 270 |
| ▪ Number of participating students registered for conference. | 65 | 77 | 70 | 72 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participating students that were mentored by an Alpha Achiever in 8 th grade. (N=Total number of youth served) | 60% | 25% | 70% | 75% (N=202) |
| ▪ Percentage of Alpha Achievers attending the conference. (N=Total number of youth served) | 25% | 25% | 25% | 27% (N=72) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participating students maintaining a GPA of 3.0 or better. (N=Total number of youth served) | 90% | 95% | 95% | 100% (N=270) |

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participating students reporting increased knowledge and skills as a result of attending the conference. (N=Number of youth attending conference) | 85% | 91% | 85% | n/a** |

**The conference attendees gave very positive feedback about the conference in general; however, due to a miscommunication the survey was not distributed to youth that participated in the event. Anecdotal information is available and supports the positive impact of attendance at the conference. Every effort is being made to contact youth that attended the conference for follow-up but at this time we do not have a sufficient number of responses to report on this data point.

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: HC Learning Laboratory

Program Summary: Year-long intervention program that addresses the immediate, long-term and systemic needs of kindergarteners who are identified as approaching or developing school readiness at school entry.

Target Population: Identified kindergarteners (and their families) attending Deep Run, Phelps Luck or Swansfield Elementary schools.

FY10 Funding: \$22,500

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students served | 76 | 75 | 70 | 60 families |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of "Learning Parties" sessions held. | | 8 | 6 | 4 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of parents attending the full series of "Learning Party" sessions. (N=Number of families served) | 100% | 96% | 100% | 80% (N=48) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students showing an increase in at least four of the seven domains on the MMSR as administered at the beginning of the school year and in May. (N=Total number of youth served) | 75% | | 80% | 80% (N=48) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participating parents reporting increased knowledge and skills as a result of attending the parental skill building sessions. (N=Number of parents attending sessions) | 85% | 100% | 85% | 100% (N=60) |

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: YMCA at Owen Brown

Program Summary: Year-round out of school care for children in low to moderate income families (before and after care during the school year and full day in summer). Includes enrichment activities to improve social competency and increase resiliency factors. (Based on the Developmental Assets model)

Target Population: K-5 children attending school with 5 miles of the child care center.

FY10 Funding: \$21,230

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students served. | 29 | 36 | 25 | 32 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students' families receiving financial assistance from the YMCA for child care. (N=Total number of youth served) | 40% | 53% | 40% | 40% (N=13) |
| ▪ Percentage of students attending program daily. (N=Total number of youth served) | 90% | 100% | 90% | 100% (N=32) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students showing increased school attendance. (N=Total number of youth served) | 75% | 80% | 75% | 42% (N=13) |
| ▪ Percentage of parents reporting an increase in the number of developmental assets exhibited by their child (based on surveys given in October and May). (N=Total number of youth served) | 75% | 80% | 75% | 70% (N=22) |

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Education and Career Empowerment Center (ECEC)

Program Summary: The ECEC empowers youth to increase healthy behaviors and avoid negative behaviors through positive modeling of asset building behaviors, individual and group guidance sessions, leadership training and positive daily interactions.

Target Population: Students grades 9-12 in the Oakland Mills Community*

FY10 Funding: \$24,000

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students served per quarter. | 26 | 25 | 24 | 30 | 29 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Staff/client ratio. | 1:10 | 1:10 | 1:5 | 1:10 | 1:2 |
| ▪ Percentage of students that attend program three or more days. (N=Total number of youth served) | n/a | 100% | 100% | 85% | 93% (N=27) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who show an improvement in both Reading and Math grades between 1 st and 3 rd quarters. (N=Total number of youth served) | 85% | 86% | 90% | 80% | 80% (N=23) |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who can identify a positive adult role model (as measured by youth surveys). (N=Total number of youth served). | 80% | 75% | 100% | 80% | 100% (N=29) |

LMB: Howard County

Program Name: Community Homes After School Enrichment Program

Program Summary: An after school program at three of the Community Homes complexes where students will have the opportunity to receive academic support in addition to learning and experiencing cultural and social awareness.

Target Population: 4th, 5th and 6th graders residing in the Community Homes complexes.

FY10 Funding: \$59,012

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students served. | 115 | 113 | 111 | 95 | 114 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students needing academic support in Math and Reading skills. (N=Total number of youth served) | 57% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 82% (N=93) |
| ▪ Percentage of students who attend daily. (N=Total number of youth served) | 90% | 89% | 92% | 90% | 91% (N=104) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students improving grades in both Reading and Math between 1 st and 3 rd quarters. (N=Total number of youth served) | 50% | 80% | 88% | 80% | 83% (N=95) |
| ▪ Percentage of participants at all sites who can identify a positive adult role model (as measured by youth surveys). (N=Total number of youth served) | n/a | 80% | 80% | 80% | 89% (N=101) |

LMB: Local Management Board for Children’s and Family Services of Kent County

Program Name: Addictions Counselor in School

Program Summary: The Addictions Counselor provides individual and group therapy in four schools and the Kent County Behavioral Health (Addictions) program using the Stages of Change treatment model and a shorter intervention program, Teen-Intervene. Informational support is also offered as a prevention measure.

Target Population: Adolescents age 11-17 in need of alcohol, tobacco and other drug abuse prevention, intervention or treatment.

FY10 Funding: \$70,300

| Performance Measure | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | |
| ▪ Number of children referred to the program | 63 | 100 | 83 |
| ▪ Number of children (total unduplicated) receiving services | 33 | 90 | 56 |
| ○ # receiving individual therapy** | 63 | 90 | 56 |
| ○ # receiving group therapy** | 6 | 80 | 19 |
| ▪ Number of prevention presentations | 10 | 10 | 50 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | |
| ▪ # and % of participants attending at least 6 therapy sessions. | 54.5% (18/33) | 54/60% | 27% (n=15/56) |
| ▪ # and % of participants taking GAF*** pre and post test. | 64% (21/33) | 68/75% | 94% (n=34/36) |

| Performance Measure | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | |
| ▪ % of participants <u>not</u> receiving a drug-related school suspension while in treatment | 97% (32/33) | 90% | 100% |
| ▪ # of referrals to DJS for drug use while in treatment | 0 | 15 | 0 |
| ▪ % of participants demonstrating an increase on GAF between intake and discharge. | 38% (8/21) | 60% | 61% (n=14/23) |

**These totals may reflect duplication of children who receive both services during the course of the year.

***GAF is the Global Assessment of Functioning pre and post measure

LMB: Kent County

Program Name: School Based Mental Health

Program Summary: Based on a partnership among Mid-Shore Mental Health systems, Kent County Public Schools, the LMB, and a mental health service provider, this strategy will provide school based mental health services to students with an identified mental health diagnosis. Funds are used to cover non-billable counselor time (travel, phone conversations, meetings).

Target Population: Public school students in grades K-12 with a mental health diagnosis.

FY10 Funding: \$52,373

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of new referrals (individual students)* | 55 | 97 | 68 | 103 | 70 | 85 |
| ▪ # of individual students (unduplicated) receiving counseling | 239 | 264 | 181 | 214 | 200 | 248 |
| ○ # of students participating in group sessions (a group is 3 or more students) | N/A | N/A | 16 | 21 | 10 | 32 |
| ▪ # of families receiving counseling | 66 | 70 | 181 | 115 | 55 | 195 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of students who return for 3 or more sessions | N/A | 70% | 87% | 71% (134/188) | 75% | 89% (n=220/248) |
| ▪ % of participating students who achieve at least 60% of treatment goals during academic year | N/A | N/A | 66% | 70% (177/253) | 50% | 54% (n=135/248) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of program participants with an attendance rate equal to or greater than rate for all students at home school | N/A | N/A | Not Done | 52% (105/201) | 50% | 49% (n=118/241) |
| ▪ % of program participants with # of suspensions equal to or less than average number of suspensions per student by school | N/A | N/A | Not Done | 60% (121/201) | 50% | 76% (n=183/241) |

N/A= This data was not collected in prior years.

*The number of referrals is lower than the number of students receiving counseling services because client numbers are carried forward from one year to the next; the students are not re-counted as new referrals at the beginning of the year.

The following indicators will only be reported once, at the end of the academic year: % of participating students who achieve at least 60% of treatment goals during academic year; program participants with attendance rates & suspension rates compared to school averages.

LMB: Kent County

Program Name: Therapeutic Mentoring

Program Summary: The Therapeutic Mentoring program provides one-on-one assistance in the classroom to increase the student’s focus, on-task behavior, completion of assignments and will assist with behavioral interventions. Support includes the development of written plans for age-appropriate behavioral interventions that address students’ rehabilitation needs and also take into account students’ home and community environment. Due to the success of this program, it has expanded to provide services to three distinct groups: middle school and transition age students (“Therapeutic Mentoring 1” or “TM1”); students in the Intensive Behavior and Alternative Learning Classroom (ALC), which is a separate facility in Kent County (“Therapeutic Mentoring 2” or “TM2”); and students who return from the ALC to the Kent County High School (“Therapeutic Mentoring 3,” or “TM3.”) The TM1 program also includes small group sessions on anger management, conflict resolution, & life skills. These small group sessions are not a part of TM2 (other resources provide supports in these areas at the ALC). TM3 is a new program in FY10; the small group sessions described above will be incorporated if possible.

Target Population: KCPS students, last quarter of 4th grade through 12th grade, identified as “at risk” by school personnel (difficulty maintaining positive relationships with teachers, peers and parents; numerous disciplinary referrals; lacking social and communication skills; difficulty working in a cooperative group setting; withdrawn or indifferent). At the high school level, participation is limited to students transitioning back to the high school from the ALC, and students in the 9th grade who were participating in Therapeutic Mentoring in the 8th grade (first quarter of 9th grade only).

FY10 Funding: \$114,521 (\$86,317 to TM1; \$10,122 to TM2; \$18,082 to TM3)

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students participating, Therapeutic Mentoring 1 (TM1) | 39 | 37 | 41 | 39 | 34 | 29 |
| ▪ Number of students participating at the Alternative Learning Classroom (ALC), Therapeutic Mentoring 2 (TM2) | | | | 5 | 24 | 15 |
| ▪ Number of students participating who are returning from the ALC to the high school, Therapeutic Mentoring 3 (TM3) | | | | | 12 | 8 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of students participating for at least 6 months who achieve at least 1 goal (2-4 goals usually set). (TM1) | N/A | 35% | 77% | 89% (25/28) | 50% | 75% (n=18/24) |
| ▪ % of participants successfully discharged (decreased need or no longer needs service). (TM1) | N/A | 55% | 64% | 83% (15/18) | 50% | 66% (n=19/29) |
| ▪ % of ALC students who receive new services to which they are referred at home school upon completion of ALC program, as reported by home school guidance counselor ten days after return to home school. (TM2) | | | | N/A | 25% | 62.5% (n=5/8) |
| ▪ % of students participating for at least 6 months who achieve at least 1 goal (2-4 goals usually set). (TM3) | | | | | 50% | No one in program 6 mo. |
| ▪ % of participants successfully discharged (decreased need or no longer needs service). (TM3) | | | | | 50% | 0% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants with stabilized (the same) or reduced (lower) absenteeism, period immediately preceding program participation compared to most recent period (or at discharge, if applicable). (TM1) | 62% | 60% | 66% | 58% (22/38) | 60% | 69% (n=20/29) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of students with stabilized (the same) or reduced (lower) disciplinary referrals, period immediately preceding program participation compared to most recent period (or at discharge, if applicable). (TM1) | 69% | 69% | 77% | 87% (34/39) | 70% | 90% (n=26/29) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of students with improved (higher) or stabilized (the same) GPA, period immediately preceding program participation compared to most recent period (or at discharge, if applicable). (TM1) | 85% | 85% | 83% | 82% (31/38) | 85% | 86% (n=25/29) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of ALC students indicating that TM improved their ability to work in school (in the ALC program) as measured by post survey administered to student, last day in ALC program. (TM2) | | | | N/A | 25% | 25% (n=2/8) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of principals of ALC students indicating that TM services improved the ALC student's ability to work in school as measured by post survey mailed 10 days after ALC student returns to home school. (TM2) | | | | N/A | 25% | N/A |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of teachers of ALC students (one teacher per student, selected by principal) indicating that TM services improved the ALC student's ability to work in school as measured by post survey mailed 10 days after ALC student returns to home school. (TM2) | | | | N/A | 25% | N/A |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants with stabilized (the same) or reduced (lower) absenteeism, period immediately preceding program participation compared to most recent period (or at discharge, if applicable). (TM3) | | | | | 50% | 57% (n=4/7) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of students with stabilized (the same) or reduced (lower) disciplinary referrals, period immediately preceding program participation compared to most recent period (or at discharge, if applicable). (TM3) | | | | | 60% | 100% (n=7/7) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of students with improved (higher) or stabilized (the same) GPA, period immediately preceding program participation compared to most recent period (or at discharge, if applicable). (TM3) | | | | | 75% | 57% (n=4/7) |

**The Therapeutic Mentoring 2 program (TM2) at the Intensive Behavior and Alternative Learning Center (ALC) did not begin until Q4, 2009. The Therapeutic Mentoring 3 program (TM3) to provide support to students returning from the ALC to the high school is new in 2010. Data not collected in previous years.

LMB: Kent County

Program Name: Adult Education; Vocational Development Services; Family Support Services.

Program Summary: This program provides continuing education and/or vocational development services to individuals who do not have a high school diploma and require child care support. The Adult Ed. component supports parents in building academic skills and obtaining a GED. Vocational Services includes resumé development, mock interviews,

filling out job applications, and job hunting. Family Support Services provides evidence-based parenting classes to participating parents, and Ages & Stages Questionnaire assessments for children age 4 and under.

Target Population: Families at risk of poverty. Head of household over the age of 16 (not in school, no high school diploma).

FY10 Funding: \$39,748

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of <u>new</u> individuals enrolled in Adult Ed. | 13 | 9 | 31 | 41 | 10 | 52 |
| ▪ # of participants Adult Ed. Total | 31 | 13 | 36 | 48 | 25 | 62 |
| ▪ # of <u>new</u> individuals enrolled, Vocational Services | 21 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 29 |
| ▪ # of participants Vocational Services | 22 | 14 | 16 | 13 | 20 | 29 |
| ▪ # of evidence-based parent courses offered | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| ▪ # of participants, evidence-based parent courses | N/A | 30 | 16 | 26 | 20 | 32 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Retention Rate, Adult Ed. (1 minus the % of participants who leave program without obtaining GED). | N/A | 20% | 35% | 33% (1/3) | 20% | 35% (n=8/23) |
| ▪ % of participants who improve CASAS reading and math scores between 2 most recent test administrations. | 100% | 75% | 57% | 100% (1/4) | 80% | 80% (12/15) |
| ▪ % of Vocational Services participants who do not gain employment, but who continue to participate in this program for at least 3 months. | N/A | 100% | 82% | 50% (5/10) | 20% | 86% (n=12/14) |
| ▪ Percentage of participants completing evidence-based parenting courses | N/A | N/A | 54% | 37% (11/30) | 50% | 75% (n=24/32) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of continuing education participants who improve combined CASAS scores at least 8 points in the year reported. | 75% | 60% | 100% | 100% (4/4) | 60% | 60% (n=9/15) |
| ▪ % of participants who obtain GED in the year reported. | 13% | 23% | 15% | 40% (2/5) | 20% | 66% (n=2/3) |
| ▪ % of vocational participants who obtain employment (1/2 time or full time) in the year reported | 38% | 93% | 27% | 23% (3/13) | 30% | 41% (n=12/29) |
| ▪ % of evidence-based parenting course participants who show improvement in parenting knowledge, as measured by pre/post tests at course completion. | 100% | 75% | 100% | 100% (11/11) | 75% | 100% |

LMB: Montgomery County

Program Name: After School Activities Project

Program Summary: Providing quality after school programming for academic enrichment/extended learning; job skills; leadership development/service learning; recreation, arts and leisure.

Target Population: Middle and high school youth in vulnerable communities usually having gang activity

FY10 Funding: \$420,018

| Performance Measures | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much Do We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of youth served | 1,550 | 1,471 | 1,669 | 1,044 | 1,440 | 1,009 |
| ▪ # of programs | 18 | 18 | 36 | 27 | 20 | 34 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |

| Performance Measures | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of programs with 90% compliance on implementation standards as measured during site visits | 90% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 90% | 100% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of providers in compliance with core standards when developed | 94% | N/A | N/A | N/A | 90% | N/A ⁷ |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of youth and parents satisfied or very satisfied with their program as measured by a survey | 90% | 93% | 96% | 78% program 81% staff | 90% | 78% with program |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of programs with a 75% youth participation rate for an unduplicated number of youth served within each month of service | 80% | 88% | 80% | 53% | 70% | 84% with staff 38% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants in all ASAP programs targeting general education that increased life skills (as measured by an increase in the following: communication, decision-making, goal-setting, peer pressure/resistance skills reported on pre- and post-survey) | N/A | 98% | 84% | 66% 73% 61% | 80% | 71% 75% 68% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants in all ASAP programs targeting general education that maintain or improve school attendance (as measured by first and third marking period) | N/A | 85% | 72% | Not Available | 75% | Not Available ⁸ |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants in all ASAP programs targeting general education that increase pro-social involvement (as measured by increased participation in school clubs, sports, volunteer reported on pre- and post-survey) | N/A | 81% | 92% | 44% | 80% | 45% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants in academic enrichment programs that maintain or improve academic performance in core subjects (as measured by report card grades from first marking period to third marking period) | 80% | 85% | 72% | 49% | 75% | Not Available ⁹ |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants in career/workforce development programs that increase expectations for post-secondary work and learning (as measured by pre- and post-survey) | 80% | 95% | 87% | 85% | 80% | 95% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants with severe emotional or developmental disabilities in these after school programs will increase social skills development, safety skills development, or community skills development | 80% | 100% | 95% | 100% | 80% | 90% |

⁷New statewide standards have been created by the Maryland Out of School Time Network.

⁸ Montgomery County Public School data will not be available until October.

⁹ Montgomery County Public School data will not be available until October.

LMB: Montgomery County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureaus – GUIDE

Program Summary: Youth Service Bureaus are community-based, non residential entities that provide delinquency prevention, youth suicide prevention, drug and alcohol abuse prevention and youth development services to youth and their families. Each YSB provides the following core services for children, youth and families: Formal and Informal Counseling (Individual, family and group¹⁰); Information and Referral Services; Crisis Intervention and Substance Abuse Assessment and Referral

Target Population: Youth ages 5–18 and their families residing and/or attending school in targeted areas of Gaithersburg.

FY10 Funding: \$44,689

| Performance Measures | FY06 Actual* | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype ¹¹ : | 279 | | | | | |
| ▪ Individual | | 39 | 9 | 49 | 10 | 30 |
| ▪ Family | | 49 | 36 | 39 | 30 | 24 |
| ▪ Group – does not provide group counseling | | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype ⁴ : | 212 | | | | | |
| ▪ Individual | | 4 | 4 | 32 | 5 | 13 |
| ▪ Family | | 0 | 25 | 6 | 25 | 10 |
| ▪ Group – does not provide group counseling | | 77 | | | | |
| ➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. | 379 ¹² | 80 | 93 | 70 | 20 | 102 |
| ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | | n/a | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% | 70% | 70% |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | n/a | n/a | 90% | 100% | 70% | 70% |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | n/a | n/a | 100% | 80% | 70% | 70% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | n/a | n/a | 80% | 92% | 70% | 93% |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | n/a | n/a | 72% | 67% | 60% | 60% |

*Subtype data not available.

¹⁰ Not all YSBs provide group counseling.

¹¹ These totals may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

¹² This is a cumulative total of all three YSBs

LMB: Montgomery County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureaus – Rockville¹³

Program Summary: Youth Service Bureaus are community-based, non residential entities that provide delinquency prevention, youth suicide prevention, drug and alcohol abuse prevention and youth development services to youth and their families. Each YSB provides the following core services for children, youth and families: Formal and Informal Counseling (Individual, family and group); Information and Referral Services; Crisis Intervention and Substance Abuse Assessment and Referral.

Target Population: Youth ages 5–18 and their families residing and/or attending school in targeted areas of Rockville.

FY10 Funding: \$32,275

| Performance Measures | FY06 Actual* | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual ▪ Family – does not provide family counseling ▪ Group – does not provide group counseling | 279 | 32 | 32 | 34 | 30 | 36 |
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual ▪ Family – does not provide family counseling ▪ Group – does not provide group counseling | 212 | 25 0 9 | 17 | 89 | 17 | 79 |
| ➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. Does not provide assessment tool. | 379 ¹⁴ | 9 | 20 | 25 | | 19 |
| ➤ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | | n/a | 10 | 21 | | 19 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% | 70% | 100% |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | n/a | n/a | 75% | 97% | 70% | 100% |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% | 70% | 100% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | n/a | n/a | 80% | 96% | 70% | 100% |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | n/a | n/a | 58% | 97% | 60% | 100% |

*Subtype data not available.

¹³ Rockville YSB does not provide family or group counseling.

¹⁴ This represents a cumulative total of all three YSBs

LMB: Montgomery County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureaus – Bethesda YMCA

Program Summary: Youth Service Bureaus are community-based, non residential entities that provide delinquency prevention, youth suicide prevention, drug and alcohol abuse prevention and youth development services to youth and their families. Each YSB provides the following core services for children, youth and families: Formal and Informal Counseling (Individual, family and group); Information and Referral Services; Crisis Intervention and Substance Abuse Assessment and Referral

Program Funding: Youth ages 5 – 18 and their families residing and/or attending school in targeted areas of the Rosemary Hills section of Bethesda.

FY10 Funding: \$36,547

| Performance Measures | FY06 Actual* | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual ▪ Family ▪ Group | 279 | 76 0 0 | 11 36 22 | 26 52 7 | 1 35 20 | 14 34 0 |
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Individual ▪ Family ▪ Group | 212 ¹⁵ | 52 0 86 | 7 24 22 | 9 29 14 | 7 20 20 | 7 15 10 |
| ➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 379 ¹⁶ | 143 n/a | 183 1 | 74 3 | 20 5 | 20 5 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% | 70% | 70% |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | n/a | n/a | 60% | 75% | 70% | 70% |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | n/a | n/a | 100% | 100% | 70% | 70% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | n/a | n/a | n/a | 98% | 70% | 70% |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | n/a | n/a | 81% | 93% | 60% | 80% |

*Subtype data not available.

¹⁵ This is a cumulative total of all three YSBs

¹⁶ This is a cumulative total of all three YSBs

LMB: Prince George’s County

Program Name: Family Functional Therapy (FFT)

Program Summary: Provide intervention services to status offenders and youth at risk of or involved with DJS

Target Population: Youth aged 11–18 and their families.

FY10 Funding: \$150,000

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ Number of youth served by FFT | 32 | 29 | 45 | 11 |
| ▪ Average duration of services (in days) for youth receiving FFT | 54 | 83 | 90 | 146 |
| ▪ Number of service “slots” available | | | 16** | |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ % of families satisfied with services | 100% | 100% | 90% | 100% N=11 |
| ▪ % of cases completing treatment with goals attained | 100% | 66% | 80% | 70% N=7 |
| ▪ % of parents with parenting skills necessary to handle future problems as measured by Client Outcomes Measures (COM) | 100% | 94% | 70% | 88% N=9 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ % of youth not placed OOH during program duration. | 97% | 83% | 90% | 85% N=9 |
| ▪ % of youth attending school or working at discharge. | 84% | 76% | 80% | 91% N=10 |
| ▪ % of youth not experiencing arrest or rearrest during program duration. | 94% | 97% | 70% | 91% N=10 |

LMB: Prince George’s County

Program Name: Youth Services Bureaus

Program Summary: Provides core services of formal counseling, informal counseling, substance abuse assessment and referral, crisis intervention, suicide prevention and information and referral

Target Population: At-risk children and families

FY10 Funding: \$403,785

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: | 352 | | | | 605 |
| ○ Individual* | | 379 | 91 | 100 | 162 |
| ○ Family* | | 297 | 350 | 300 | 358 |
| ○ Group* | | 62 | 58 | 10 | 85 |

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Individual* ○ Family* ○ Group* ▪ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. ▪ # of individual youth for who substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | 659 | 511 241 29 | 295 250 4 | 400 100 5 | 705 317 265 123 536 77 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4th session. ▪ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. ▪ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | 97% | 92% | 95% | 95% | 94% N=568 71% N=429 97% N=586 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. ▪ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | 99% | 98% | 94% | 85% | 100% N=605 92% N=556 |

The total number of informal counseling cases was less than anticipated because the target number was estimated to high.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: Early Intervention and Prevention Services to School Aged Youth

Program Summary: Provides safe, structured and enriching activities for school age youth

Target Population: School-aged children and youth

FY10 Funding: \$395,377

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual* | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of youth served by after school programs ▪ Number of after school sites | 642 15 | 450 9 | 483 9 | 425 9 | 573 8 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of students who attend 90% of the total after school sessions. ▪ Average Daily attendance | 95% | 98% | 76% | 85% | 91% N=521 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual* | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth with C grade or less in Reading or English that show an improved grade in that subject based on report cards comparing the first and third quarters. | 80% | 83% | 32% | 70% | 55% N=315 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth with C grade or less in math that show an improved grade based on report cards comparing the first and third quarters. | 75% | 76% | 58% | 70% | 50% N=287 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth who show both improved emotional and social skills as measured by the Child Development Tracker & Social & Emotional Learning Assessment administered at beginning and end of school year (CAFÉ & Edgewood) | N/A | 98% | 35% | 70% | 92% N=500 |

* In FY08 reduced to four service providers and nine program sites fully funded as a result of an RFP issued. FY07 had 10 service providers at 15 program sites partially funded.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)

Program Summary: Intensive, in-home services

Target Population: Children and youth involved with, or at risk of involvement with DJS

FY10 Funding: \$197,000

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of youth served by MST. | 56 | 59 | 45 | 45 | 47 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average length of duration in days for youth receiving MST services. | 128 | 104 | 112 | 120 | 134 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of service "slots" available | | | | 9.75* | |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of families satisfied with services | 91% | 91.84% | 93% | 85% | 85% N=40 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of cases completing treatment with goals attained | 87% | 80.49% | 88% | 80% | 81% N=38 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of parents with parenting skills necessary to handle future problems measured at termination by self-report | 77% | 75.61% | 78% | 70% | 85% N=40 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth at home at case discharge | 87% | 87.80% | 84% | 85% | 90% N=42 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth attending school or working at discharge | 87% | 80.49% | 80% | 70% | 87% N=41 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth who do not experience arrest or re-arrest while receiving services | 91% | 90.24% | 89% | 60% | 90% N=42 |

**Calculated as 3 therapists x 5 cases = 15 x .65% of funding from the Children's Cabinet Interagency Fund.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: Gang Prevention Initiative

Program Summary: Provide prevention awareness and prevention training and activities utilizing Phoenix Gang Prevention and Intervention model program curriculum

Target Population: Youth aged 8-15 and their families.

FY10 Funding: \$87,500

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual* | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of times the curriculum is implemented in its entirety ▪ Number of communities where trainings held ▪ Number of outreach activities to communities ▪ Number of youth participants in the rounds of curriculum implementation | | | 7 16 48 164 | 25 20 25 2500 | 3 13 50 116** |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants who indicated on survey that they would recommend training to others | | | 100% | 80% | 100% N=116 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants expressing a greater knowledge of gang issues as measured by the Curriculum survey. ▪ % of youth with a greater knowledge of how to avoid gang activity as measured by the Curriculum survey. | | | 47% 80% | 80% 80% | 40% 100% N=46 N=116 |

*New program for FY08 which did not become operational due to contract negotiation delays. Gang Prevention curriculum was purchased and training and technical assistance on the curriculum was conducted. Gang Prevention initiative will be implemented in FY09.

** A request was submitted to GOC to reduce the number of youth to be served from 2500 to 160 as the number was too high and FY10 had a substantial funding reduction.

LMB: Prince George's County

Program Name: Kinship Care

Program Summary: Support relative caregivers of children whose biological parents cannot care for them

Target Population: Families who are taking care of relative children

FY10 Funding: \$214,500

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of families served by program | 111 | 109 | 143 | 100 | 117 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of families with reduced stress upon completion of services based on Consumer Satisfaction Survey. ▪ % of families with increased community support at end of services how based on Consumer Satisfaction Survey. | 98% 95% | 84% 92% | 99% 97% | 90% 90% | 97% 99% N=113 N=116 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| ▪ % of youth receiving kinship care services who are not placed out-of-home while participating in program. | 98% | 100% | 100% | 80% | 95% N=111 |
| ▪ % of families who are not reported for abuse or neglect while involved in program services. | 98% | 99% | 98% | 80% | 96% N=112 |
| ▪ % of youth receiving kinship care services who are not placed out-of-home 6 months after completing the program. | 89% | 100% | 97% | 80% | 100% N=117 |
| ▪ % of families who are not reported for abuse or neglect 6 months after completing the program. | Not collected | 100% | 97% | 80% | 100% N=117 |

LMB: Prince George’s County Commission for Children, Youth and Families

Program Name: Truancy Prevention & Intervention

Program Summary: Improve attendance to schools assigned by providing case management services to elementary school children and their families.

Target Population: Children with intensive behavioral, health, and/or emotional needs that become barriers to learning and prevent regular attendance to school.

FY10 Funding: \$167,000

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual* | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of families served | 40 | 212 | 188 | 140 | 233 |
| ▪ Number of students served | 40 | 225 | 204 | 155 | 260 |
| ▪ Number of trained school personnel | 50 | 100 | 130 | 75 | 0 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| ▪ Staff to family ratio | 1:25 | 1:75 | 1:15 | 1:70 | 1:75 |
| ▪ Percentage of assessments completed within 15 days of referral | 75% | 75% | 100% | 75% | N=217 93% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students served who decrease number of days absent. | 70% | 95 | 49% | 70% | N=149 64% |
| ▪ Percentage of students served who decrease in-school behaviors that result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Office referrals ○ In-school or out-of-school suspensions ○ Expulsions | 50% | 80 | 69% | 50% | N=170 73% |

LMB: Queen Anne’s County

Program Name: After School – “Partnering for Youth”

Program Summary: After school program at four middle schools – 4 days a week for two 13-week sessions.

Target Population: Students at two middle schools in Queen Anne’s County

FY10 Funding: \$46,618

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of middle school youth served | 363 | 484 | 377 | 323 | 150 | 285 |
| ▪ Number of middle school program sites | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who are regular attendees (attending 30 days or more per year). | 63% | 16% | 20% | 20% (N=65) | 25% | 22.5% (N=64) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of participants that self-report positive personal change. | 83.5% | 93.8% | 82.2% (N=310) | 81% (N=261) | 85% | 88% (N=116) |
| ▪ Percentage of full-time program participants who achieved a satisfactory school attendance of 94%. | 95.9% | 80.6% | 69% | 71% (N=229) | 70% | 80% (N=228) |

LMB: Queen Anne's County

Program Name: CASASTART

Program Summary: Case management services at 3 middle schools for youth that coordinates youth/family connection to behavioral, academic, and social resources.

Target Population: Middle school students at-risk of entry into the juvenile justice system

FY10 Funding: \$46,116

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of youth served | 55 | 61 | 28 | 27 | 29 | 25 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of parents updated on participant progress on a monthly basis during the school year. | Not tracked | Not tracked | 93% | 88 (N=24)% | 85% | 92% (N=23) |
| ▪ % of participants who stay enrolled in the program for at least 3 months. | Not tracked | Not tracked | 87% | 96% (N=26) | 75% | 100% (N=25) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ % of participants with less than 8 behavioral referrals in the last six months. | Not tracked | Not tracked | 84% | 96% (N=26) | 75% | 93% (N=23) |
| ▪ % of participants that maintain at least a 90% school attendance. | 97% | 96% | 52% | 73% (N=20) | 60% | 76% (N=19) |
| ▪ % of participants who have no Department of Juvenile Services referrals while enrolled in the program. | Not tracked | Not tracked | 91% | 92% (N=25) | 80% | 84% (N=21) |

LMB: Queen Anne’s County

Program Name: Character Counts!

Program Summary: Character Counts! (CC) is a national character development initiative which utilizes the six pillars of character: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship. Character Counts in Queen Anne’s County includes weekly volunteer character coaching in schools, community capacity building, and social marketing of character development.

Target Population: All Queen Anne’s County citizens including students in the school system.

FY10 Funding: \$13,035

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of volunteer Character Counts coaches | 109 | 104 | 116 | 117 | 100 | 111 |
| ▪ Number of months with bi-weekly press releases, cable coverage and/or participation in a community event | New measure FY08 | New measure FY08 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 12 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of classes with Character Counts coaches for grades 1-6. | 86% | 93% | 88% | 87% (N=102) | 80% | 92% (N=150) |
| ▪ Annual retention rate for CC coaches. | New measure FY08 | New measure FY08 | 97% | 54% (N=63) | 70% | 60% (N=70) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of pillars of character for which respondents report a statistically significant* increase in the practice of the character trait (*greater than might be expected by chance). | Survey not administered | 66% | Survey administered every other year | 67% (N=4) | Survey administered every other year | Survey administered every other year |
| ▪ Percentage of “Businesses of Character” that follow-through on their written Character Counts Plan of Commitment. | New measure FY08 | New measure FY08 | 90% | 85% (N=40) | 80% | 85% (N=39) |

LMB: St. Mary’s County

Program Name: Tri-County Youth Services Bureau

FY10 Funding: \$120,836

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ➤ Total # of formal counseling cases (more than three sessions on a regular basis) by subtype: | 146 ** | 57 ** | 85 | 117 | 100 | 237 |
| ▪ Individual* | 78 Youth | 40 Youth | | | | |
| ▪ Family* | 68 Adults | 17 Adults | 50 | 244 | 60 | 112 |
| ▪ Group* | | | 50 | 35 | 60 | 61 |
| ➤ Total # of informal counseling cases (fewer than three | | | 110 | 157 | 120 | 64 |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| sessions or on an irregular basis) by subtype: | 125 | 108 | | | | |
| ▪ Individual* | | | 25 | 164 | 35 | 169 |
| ▪ Family* | | | 100 | 215 | 110 | 118 |
| ▪ Group* | | | 100 | 139 | 110 | 160 |
| ➤ # of individuals receiving substance abuse assessments. | 2 | 0 | 25 | 19 | 27 | 194 |
| ▪ # of individual youth for whom substance abuse referrals were subsequently made. | | | | | | 55 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases for which service plans with all required elements are developed before the 4 th session. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% N=237 |
| ➤ % of formal counseling cases that terminate services by mutual plan. | N/A | N/A | 40% | 55% | 50% | 47% N=111 |
| ➤ % of staff with substance abuse and referral training able to provide assessment and referral services. | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 75% | 100% N=35 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services who did NOT commit a juvenile offense (DJS intake) during the course of counseling. | 80% | 80% | 80% | 77% | 85% | 77% (N=137) |
| ➤ % of youth receiving formal counseling services showing improvement in overall functioning as measured by CAFAS or an equivalent assessment. | N/A | N/A | 70 | N/A*** | 80% | 74% (N=132) |

*These totals may reflect duplication of count among youth who receive more than one form of counseling during the course of the year.

** Previous data collection did not break down by subtype.

***Recidivism rates at the end of the year.

LMB: St. Mary's County

Program Name: Truancy Prevention

Program Summary: To reduce absenteeism.

Target Population: 6th, 7th, and 8th graders, Spring Ridge Middle School

FY10 Funding: Funded with YSB funds, \$120,836

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students served. | 26 | 45 | 45 | 38 | 45 | 47 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who complete the program. | 88% | 91% | 85% | 84% | 90% | 94% (N=44) |
| ▪ Percentage of participants who show improvement in attendance (indicated by a 50% reduction in the number of days absent between admission to the program and the end of the school year): | 83% | 82% | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Percentage of 8th grade students having 90% attendance rate. ○ Percentage of 7th grade students having 90% attendance rate. ○ Percentage of 6th grade students having 85% attendance rate. | | | 80% | 92% | 85% | 84% (N=17) |
| | | | 50% | 61% | 55% | 50% (N=9) |
| | | | 50% | 25% | 55% | 43% (N=4) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who are not referred for DJS intervention from the date admitted to the program through the end of the school year. ▪ Percentage of students who have a decreased number of referrals during the school year to the principal and/or Behavior Modification Center. | 83% | 82% | 85% | 92% | 87% | 90% (N=42) |
| | 100% | 100% | 40% | 68% | 50% | 80% (N=38) |

LMB: St Mary's County

Program Name: CASASTART

Program Summary: Provide substance abuse and delinquency prevention services

Target Population: At-risk elementary and middle school students

FY10 Funding: \$79,311

| Performance Measure | FY06* Actual | FY07* Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of youth served by the program | 20 | 20 | 30 | 27 | 30 | 54 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who receive at least one incentive each quarter. ▪ Percentage of students who successfully complete the program. | | | 50% | 75% | 60% | 71% (n=38) |
| | | | 80% | 83% | 85% | 80% (n=43) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants that maintain at least 80% school attendance. ▪ % of participants who have no Department of Juvenile Services referrals while enrolled in the program. | | | 75% | 81.4% | 80% | 85.7% (n=46) |
| | | | 75% | 89% | 85% | 92.8% (n=50) |

* Data not available. New measures for FY08.

LMB: St. Mary's County

Program Name: After School

Program Summary: Activities and services which focus on improving attendance and dropout rates

Target Population: Youth who are identified as being habitually truant or at risk of dropping out of school.

FY10 Funding: \$59,295

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| Boys & Girls Club | | | | |
| ▪ Total number of participants | 140 | 168 | 150 | 205 |
| ▪ # of education sessions provided | 150 | 139**** | 150 | 244 |
| St. Mary's County Public Schools | | | | |
| ▪ Total number of participants | 150 | 44 | 70 | 160 |
| ▪ Average count of FUNNIX units completed per elementary student | 60* | ** | 12 | ** |
| ▪ Number of "Reading Together" levels completed per student- | 12 | 100%*** | | 100%*** (N=160) |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| Boys & Girls Club | | | | |
| ▪ % of participants attending at least 90% of the sessions. | 75% | 55%**** | 80% | 42% (N=86) |
| St. Mary's County Public Schools | | | | |
| ▪ % of participants completing the program successfully. | 85% | 90.9% | 85% | 91% (N=146) |
| ▪ % of staff with formal training in youth development. | 85% | 100% | 95% | 100% (N=8) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| Boys & Girls Club | | | | |
| ▪ % of youth with improved attendance compared to last school year. | 50% | 50%**** | 60% | 61% (N=125) |
| St. Mary's County Public Schools | | | | |
| ▪ % of high school students showing improvement in school attendance. | 75% | 75% | 85% | 81% (N=129) |
| ▪ % of high school students who report an increased attachment to school. | 75% | 93.75% | 80% | 94% (N=67) |

*FUNNIX discontinued for FY09 and replaced by Reading Together. The goal is for students to complete one level.

**Data not collected in FY09. New performance measure developed for FY09.

***Reading Together has two levels. The two levels have different numbers of units. All students completed 100% of the units in the level they were assigned.

****The after school program did not begin until 09/30/08 for multiple logistical reasons. Additionally, one of the schools had a number of events needing the same space resulting in either an altered schedule or a closed program. Additionally, percentages were affected by seasonal sports and other extracurricular activities.

*****This percentage is taken from the total number of students who began the program on the first day who would have had the opportunity to participate in the full amount of days offered (8/8/09).

LMB: Somerset County Local Management Board

Program Name: STARS for Families

Program Summary: Alcohol prevention program for 6th and 7th grade students. It targets the postponement of alcohol use until adulthood by increasing protective factors and reducing risk factors through life/social skills training, peer-resistance education, and task-oriented family education sessions to improve family interactions.

Target Population: 6th and 7th grade students

FY10 Funding: \$5,874

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of participants ▪ Number of Key-Facts Postcards (6th Grade) distributed ▪ Number of Take Home Lessons (7th Grade) distributed | 52 0 192 | 70 320 120 | 48 264 60 | 67 288 124 | 60 240 120 | 68 320 120 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of families that stated the program was helpful in establishing family rules about not using alcohol until age 21, as measured by the satisfaction survey. ▪ Percent age of 6th grade youth who stated a desire to participate next year, as measured by the satisfaction survey. ▪ Percentage of students successfully completing program (5 or more postcards – Phase I or returned 3 of 4 lessons – Phase II). | N/A* N/A* 52% | 75% 75% 80% | Not on Survey 96.97% 85.42% | 75% 85% 80% | 75% 85% 80% | 100% (11 of 11) Not Administered 61.4% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of 6th grade participants who report a decrease in last 30 day use on the Youth Alcohol and Drug survey (comparing pre and post tests). ▪ Percentage of 7th grade participants who report a decrease in last 30 day use on the Youth Alcohol and Drug survey (comparing pre and post tests). ▪ Percentage of improvement (increase) among participants reporting parent/guardian telling them it is not OK for them to use alcohol in past 30 days on the Youth Alcohol and Drug survey (comparing pre and post tests). | N/A* N/A* -10% | N/A* N/A* 20% | 0% 6.66% 27.27% | 5% 7% 30% | 5% 7% 30% | 2.5% 0% 13.8% |

*The LMB has changed the data to be collected after FY07. A notation of “N/A” indicates that data was not collected during that fiscal year. Past data was not separated by grade.
Note 1: None of the participants reports any last 30 day use in their pre tests or post tests, resulting in a 0% change.

LMB: Somerset County Local Management Board

Program Name: Crisfield Youth Center Targeted Outreach Program

Program Summary: The Targeted Outreach Program is designed to divert youth from potential and/or further DJS involvement by providing structured programs, supervision, and community support.

Target Population: Youth ages 7 through 17 residing in the Crisfield area of Somerset County.

FY10 Funding: \$60,000

| Performance Measure | FY10 Target* | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total number of youth served ▪ Total number of youth served using graduated sanction approaches (Kids of Honor, 40 Developmental Assets) | 50 25 | 86 86 |
| How Well We Do It: | | |

| Performance Measure | FY10 Target* | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------|---------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of youth who are engaged with an evidence-based program (Kids of Honor, 40 Developmental Assets). | 50% | 100% (N=86) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of youth who are “glad” they participated in the program, as measured by the end of program Satisfaction Survey. | 75% | 97% (N=41 of 43) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of youth who would recommend the program to a friend, as measured by the end of program Satisfaction Survey. | 75% | 94% (N=40 of 43) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants who decreased their total school disciplinary actions in the 3rd and 4th Qtr. of the previous school year as compared to their total school disciplinary actions in the 3rd and 4th Qtr. of the current school year. | 35% | 3% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of youth with prior offenses who have not re-offended during the program period. | 65% | No Prior Offenses |

*This is a new program in fiscal year 2010, so no previous fiscal year data is available.

LMB: Somerset County Local Management Board

Program Name: Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA)

Program Summary: CMCA is a universal prevention strategy aimed at reducing the availability of alcohol to minors by decreasing public support for underage alcohol use, affecting policies and ordinances, and increasing enforcement of current laws.

Target Population: Indirectly targets all youth and young adults under 21.

FY10 Funding: \$27,671

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of alcohol sales compliance checks completed | 0 | 40 | 59 | 69 | 60 | 131 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of CMCA Team Members | 9 | 10 | 12 | 17 | 15 | 15 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of alcohol-related citations issued to youth | 11 | N/A | 11 | 13 | 13 | 19 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average score on Question #18 of the CMCA Team Member Survey | N/A* | 4 | 4.75 | 5.1 | 5 | 5.6 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average score on Question #25 of the CMCA Team Member Survey | N/A* | 4 | 6.75 | 5.6 | 5 | 5.6 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of items implemented based on fidelity to the CMCA model | N/A* | N/A* | 87.5% | 100% | 100% | 87.5% (N=7) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of increased compliance over first round of checks. | N/A* | 10% | 14% | 15% | 15% | 21% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage increase in number of alcohol related citations issued to youth | N/A* | N/A* | 0% | 9% | 9% | 46% |

* The LMB has changed the data that will be collected during FY08-FY10. A notation of “N/A” indicates that data was not collected during that fiscal year.

LMB: Somerset County Local Management Board

Program Name: Voyage to Excellence After School Program

Program Summary: Programs will be held at 7 sites for 3rd-5th grade students who scored “Basic” on the Maryland School Assessment. Participants will be served Monday-Friday for 3 hours. Academic performance will be the focus of the program using 21st Century Learning Center funding. With funding through the CPA, a special education assistant will be hired at each site. Additionally, incentive trips will be provided for those students who have regular attendance and good behavior during the school day.

Target Population: 3rd – 5th grade students who scored “Basic” on the MSA, Special Education and ESOL students.

FY10 Funding: \$57,933

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students enrolled | 55 | 150 | 224 | 192 | 196 | 186 |
| ▪ Number of Special Education Students | 30 | 35 | 34 | 24 | 35 | 37 |
| ▪ Number of ESOL Students | N/A* | N/A* | 26 | 23 | 19 | 27 |
| ▪ Number of Field Trips | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 |
| ▪ Number of Special Education/ESOL Assistants | N/A* | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students completing the program. | N/A* | N/A* | 91.2% | 52.46% | 80% | 84% |
| ▪ Percentage of students attending at least 80% of the program days. | N/A* | N/A* | 61.9% | 50.82% | 80% | 42% (N=78) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who reduce discipline entries from 1 st Qtr to 3 rd Qtr. | N/A* | N/A* | 93% | 16.98% | 70% | 72% |
| ▪ Percentage of Special Education/ESOL students whose grade increases in math from 1 st Qtr report card to 3 rd Qtr report card | N/A* | N/A* | 60% | 47.17% | 70% | 42% |
| ▪ Percent of Special Education/ESOL students whose grade increases in reading from 1 st Qtr report card to 3 rd Qtr report card | N/A* | N/A* | 50% | 52.83% | 70% | 48% |

* The LMB changed the data that will be collected during FY08-FY10. A notation of “N/A” indicates that certain data was not collected during that fiscal year.

LMB: Somerset County Local Management Board

Program Name: Voyage to Excellence Summer School Program**

Program Summary: Using the Voyage to Excellence curriculum, the focus will be on increasing math and reading skills of the participants. Recreational activities will be provided, and one field trip will be planned. The program will be 5 days a week, 4 hours a day, for 5 weeks.

Target Population: 3rd – 5th grade students who scored “Basic” on the MSA.

FY10 Funding: \$12,874

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of students enrolled | N/A* | 158 | 166 | 155 | 170 | 175 |
| ▪ Number of Special Education Students | N/A* | 34 | 31 | 28 | 30 | 19 |
| ▪ Number of ESOL Students | N/A* | 7 | 23 | 34 | 19 | 38 |
| ▪ Number of Special Education/ESOL assistants | N/A* | 6 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| ▪ Number of Field Trips | N/A* | N/A* | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percent of students completing the program | N/A* | N/A* | 81% | 82% | 80% | 86% |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ▪ Percent of students attending at least 80% of the program days | N/A* | 59% | 79% | 95% | 80% | 94% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percent of students with an increase Math score from the final marking period of the ended school year to the first marking period of the new school year. | N/A* | 50.3% | Not Available | 58% | 70% | 41% |
| ▪ Percent of students with an increased Reading score from the final marking period of the ended school year to the first marking period of the new school year. | N/A* | 43.0% | Not Available | 55% | 70% | 63% |

*This is a new program to be funded by the SCLMB in FY08.

**This program occurs in the summer and overlaps fiscal years. CPA funds will be expended during June of each fiscal year, but the program will continue through July – July funds are provided by Somerset County Board of Education. FY07 data is from June and July 2007. FY08 data will be June and July 2008 program data, etc.

LMB: Somerset County Local Management Board

Program Name: Community Based After School Program

Program Summary: The program will serve 50 students, ages 7 through 17, from Monday through Friday. Activities will include homework assistance, tutoring, recreational activities, enrichment activities, leadership classes, and life skills training.

Target Population: Somerset County youth ages 7 through 17.

FY10 Funding: \$22,337

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of participants | 30 | 20 | 16 | 19 | 50 | 75 |
| ▪ Number of staff | 3 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| ▪ Number of programs sessions & events | ** | ** | ** | 80 | 180 | 186 |
| ▪ Number of participants paired with mentors | ** | ** | ** | 2 | N/A* | Note 1 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of staff trained in cultural competency | N/A* | N/A* | 0% | 100% | N/A* | Note 1 |
| ▪ Percentage of students who attend at least 80% of the program days | 68% | 80% | 18.75% | 68.42% | 60% | 98% (N=73) |
| ▪ Percent of youth who were “glad” they participated in the program, as measured by the end of program Satisfaction Survey. | ** | ** | ** | Not Done | 80% | 99% (N=75) |
| ▪ Percent of youth who would recommend the program to a friend, as measured by the end of program Satisfaction Survey. | ** | ** | ** | Not Done | 80% | 98% (N=73) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students with an increase in GPA as compared from the 1 st quarter to the 3 rd quarter | N/A* | N/A* | 28.57% | 20% | 30% | 95% (N=71) |
| ▪ Percentage of students with increased number of developmental assets as shown by pre/post Developmental Assets Survey | N/A* | 50% | 0% | 50% | 50% | 94% (N=70) |
| ▪ Percent of students with an increase in school attendance from marking period before intervention through end of program participation involvement | ** | ** | ** | 50% | 50% | 95% (N=71) |
| ▪ Percent of students with increased family attachment shown by pre/post test | | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| measures on Index of Parental Attitudes | ** | ** | ** | 30% | N/A* | Note 1 |
| ▪ Percent of students with a decrease in disciplinary actions (office referrals, suspension) from marking period before intervention through end of program participation | ** | ** | ** | 20% | N/A* | Note 1 |

The LMB has changed the data that will be collected during FY08-FY10. A notation of “N/A” indicates that certain data was not collected during that fiscal year.

Note 1: The program changed during FY10; resulting in these performance measures not being addressed.

LMB: Talbot County

Program Name: Voluntary Family Services

Program Summary: Intensive support to families in their homes, improve family functions, and prevent out-of-home placements by allowing for a paraprofessional, parent aide to work in collaboration with a professional to provide an interagency approach to meet family needs.

Target Population: Children identified by the IAC and LCC as children at risk of abuse and neglect and families identified as having risk factors that without intervention the children could fall victim to abuse or neglect and would not need to have a prior child protective services (CPS) report to be eligible.

FY10 Funding: \$42,000

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ # of families served | 7 | 15 | 10 | 13 |
| ▪ # of contact hours per family per week: | 5 | 5-intensive 2 to 3-stepdown | 5-intensive 2 to 3-stepdown | 5-intensive 2 to 3-stepdown |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ % of referrals for services vs. actually served | 100% | 100% | 100% | 82% (N=9/11) |
| ▪ % of satisfaction surveys rating the services as satisfactory or better | 100% | 100% | 100% | N/A |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ % of children from families served who are NOT placed out-of-home within 6 months and one year from start of services. | 92.4% | 33 of 34/97% | 95% | 100% (N=22) |
| ▪ % of participants who are not referred to DSS for abuse or neglect within 6 months and one year from start of services. | 100% | 28 of 34/82% | 95% | 95% (N=21/22) |

LMB: Talbot County

Program Name: Blue Ribbon Commission County Plan

Program Summary: The Blue Ribbon Commission, composed of an influential cross section of Talbot County leaders, will create a county plan to address “Talbot County’s growing substance abuse and addictions problem”.

Target Population: All Talbot County residents, especially households with children, across geographical boundaries, and across socio-economic, cultural, and language barriers.

FY10 Funding: \$20,000

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| ▪ # of BRC Status Reports distributed | 0 | 10 | 100 | 20,990 |
| ▪ # of meetings of the BRC Oversight Committee | 1 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| ▪ # of calls made to the “report a party” hotline | 0 | 12 | 12 | 13 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| ▪ % of BRC members who attend 75% of the scheduled BRC Oversight Committee meetings | 100% | 55% | 60% | 58% (N=7/12) |
| ▪ % of youth (6 th -12 th grade) & parents in LMB funded afterschool programs who sign a BRC pledge | 0% | 23% | 50% | 52% (N=25/48) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| ▪ % increase from the previous year of underage drug/alcohol parties dispersed by law enforcement. | NDA | See below* | 10% | See below** |

NDA = Data not available. This is a new program in FY08. Attempts are being made to have this data reported in the FY09 Annual Report.

*There is no formal data collection of the police departments in terms of dispersing underage drinking parties. The LMB sent data surveys to all police departments serving Talbot County. Five (5) of six (6) responded. Only one, the Easton Police Department (EPD), reported that it collects stats on the number of underage drinking reports/ investigations. The EPD reports that in FY 2008 they received 55 reports and issued 175 citations; in FY 09 they received 24 reports and 75 citations. This seems to indicate the possibility that underage drinking activities may be diminishing.

**The LMB sent data surveys to police departments serving Talbot County. These surveys were sent via email and then again via fax to those who did not respond to the email. Four (4) of six (6) responded. Of these, 100 % (N=4) reported they were aware of the TipLine. 100% (N=4) reported they had seen advertising materials about the TipLine displayed in the county. 50% (N=2) reported they had heard radio ads for the TipLine. 50% (N=) reported that the TipLine was making a difference; the other 50% (N=2) reported the impact as undetermined.

LMB: Talbot County

Program Name: YMCA Special Needs After School Program & Camp Lazy Days

Program Summary: Students with special needs are identified through a collaborative process with school staff and the Talbot County Health Department DDA Coordinator. Each participant has specific identified goals based on his/her needs and these participants are integrated with the traditional after school program participants.

Target Population: School-aged children with special needs in Talbot County.

FY10 Funding: \$13,702

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of youth served | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 7 |
| ▪ # of youth served in Camp Lazy Days | NA | NA | 50 | 54 | 50 | 61 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % participants attending at least 75% of their scheduled time | NDA | 89% | 77% | 100% a/s 76% camp | 89% | 57% (N=4/7) |
| ▪ % of parents who report they are satisfied or very satisfied with services (school year) | NDA | NDA | 100% | 100% | 89% | 100% (N=1) |
| ▪ % of parents who report they are satisfied or very | NA | NA | 100% | See below** | 80% | 100% (N=21) |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| satisfied with Camp Lazy Days services | | | | | | |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ # and % of participants who attend school at least 95% of the time | NDA | NDA | 66% | 4 of 8/50% | 67% | 3 of 7/43% |
| ▪ # and % of participants who meet 75% of program targeted school year IEP goals | NDA | NDA | 5 of 6/83% | 7 of 8/88% | 78% | 2 of 3/66% |
| ▪ # and % of participants who meet 75% of program targeted Camp Lazy Days goals* | NA | NA | 45 of 50/90% | 54 of 54/100% | 45 of 50/90% | 56 of 61/92% |

NDA = No data available. This data was not collected in FY06 or FY07.

*Targeted goal is for 90% of the campers who have a moderate to severe physical and/or cognitive disability, to actively participate in the variety of camp activities. "Actively participate" is defined as participating either on his/her own or with facilitator assistance. Alternative programming is provided for those who cannot actively participate.

**This component not funded during this timeframe.

LMB: Talbot County

Program Name: St. Michaels Elementary School Homework Club

Program Summary: The goal of the Homework Club is to help students in risk of school failure to master the necessary student objectives so that they can be promoted to the next grade. The program is staffed by certified teachers and students work independently, in small groups, or with a partner according to their wishes and needs. Students work on homework, long term projects, and practice skills needed for success on MSAs.

Target Population: School-aged children in St. Michaels Elementary School who are in danger of failing a grade due to unacceptable grades, test scores, or work habits.

FY10 Funding: \$5,485

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ # of youth served | 31 | 42 | 39 | 35 | 25 | 39 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ % participants attending at least 75% of their scheduled time | 73% | 79% | 77% | 49% | 85% | 51% (N=20) |
| ▪ % reporting they are satisfied or very satisfied with services: | | | | | | |
| ○ Youth | NDA | 91% | 100% | 100% | 95% | 85% (N=11/13) |
| ○ Parents | | 100% | 100% | 100% | 95% | 100% (N=7) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ # and % of participants who attend school at least 95% of the time | NDA | 22 of 42/52% | 27 of 39/69% | 20 of 35/ 57% | 18/70% | 15 of 37/41% |
| ▪ # and % of participants who maintain or improve reading and/or math grades from the first marking term to the fourth marking term | Data reported differently | 33 of 35/94% | 39 of 39/100% | 29 of 35/83% | 23/95% | 29 of 34/85% |

NDA = No data available. This data was not collected in FY06.

LMB: Talbot County

Program Name: Scotts UMC After School Tutorial Program

Program Summary: This program offers academic enrichment services for elementary and secondary grade level at risk youth in Talbot County. The program offers a safe environment conducive to learning, homework help, one on one tutoring, and character development.

Target Population: School-aged children in Talbot County

FY10 Funding: \$16,647

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY 10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of youth served ▪ # of days of programming per week | 38 4 | 32 4 | 29 4 | 36 4 | 32 4 | 27 4 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % participants attending at least 75% of their scheduled time ▪ % of youth & parents who report they are satisfied or very satisfied with services | 84% NDA | 78% NDA (youth) 95% (parents) | 93% 96% 100% | 94% 100% (youth) 100% (parents) | 29 of 32/90% 95% 95% | 27 of 27/100% 95% (N=19/20) 100% (N=11) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # and % of participants who attend school at least 95% of the time ▪ # and % of participants who maintain or improve reading and/or math grades from the first marking term to the fourth marking term | NDA NDA | 9 of 10/90% 16 of 23/70% | 6 of 7/86% 7 of 9/78% | 26 of 29/89% 26 of 26/100% | 29 of 32/90% 26 of 32/80% | 16 of 22/73% 22 of 22/100% |

LMB: Talbot County

Program Name: Tilghman After School Kids (TASK)

Program Summary: TASK is a comprehensive after school program which includes homework, exercise, and enrichment activities.

Target Population: All elementary school students in the Tilghman area (public school, private school, and home schooled students)

FY10 Funding: \$12,485

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of youth served ▪ # of program/activities offerings (social, recreational, academic, etc.) | 83 35 | 96 35 total 16 session I 19 session II | 85 35 | 90 32 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % participants attending at least 75% of their scheduled time ▪ % of youth & parents who report they are satisfied or very satisfied with services | 90% 100% (youth) 100% (parents) | 89% 95% (youth) 100% (parents) | 76 of 85/90% 100% 100% | 62 of 90/69% 97% (N=63/65) 100% (N=32) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # and % of participants who attend school at least 95% of the time | Unable to obtain data | See below* | 76 of 85/90% | 61 of 64/ 95% |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> # and % of participants who maintain or improve reading and/or math grades from the first marking term to the fourth marking term | Unable to obtain data | See below | 76 of 85/90% | See below |

*Data not available. This is a new program in FY08.

LMB: Washington County Community Partnership for Children & Families

Program Name: Early Intervention and Prevention/After School

Program Summary: After School programs offer safe, nurturing environments that offer supervision and alternative activities to families at no cost during out of school time. They will include strategies to address the availability of the program to participants regardless of school schedules, so that service will be provided on days on which the schools may be closed (i.e., professional days, inclement weather days, etc.). After School Programs targeted to middle and/or high school age youth will address their specific needs and interests, and will make efforts to include them in the program planning

Target Population: Elementary, middle, and high school age children in Washington County are eligible for program participation.

FY10 Funding: \$75,612

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|
| What/How Much Did We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of unduplicated youth served. Number of hours of structured, supervised activities available per youth (calculated as hours per day x number of operational days). | 65 1000 | 139 895 | 79 1585.5 | 76 1614.5 | 90 1300 | 75 1450 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of operational days where attendance meets or exceeds 80% of capacity. | 75% | 75.7% | 72% | 94% N=80 Cascade N=78 Hancock | 85% | 88% N=149 Cascade N=161 Hancock |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of youth enrolled who report an increase in pro-social protective behaviors (as measured by pre and post –program surveys). | 70% | 82% | 86% | 91% | 85% | 94% |

LMB: Washington County Community Partnership for Children & Families

Program Name: Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Diversion Initiative

Program Summary: Case management and diversion services focusing on two core components: diverting juvenile offenders from the Department of Juvenile Services (DJS) and redirecting alleged Children In Need of Supervision (CINS) youth away from DJS to community-based services. In addition to these previously established services, the program will be expanded to include parenting and teen educational and support groups, led by a trained facilitator.

Target Population: Washington County youth who are either: first-time non-violent offenders, first-time violent (specifically 2nd degree assault) offenders, as well as certain second-time misdemeanor offenders and/or alleged CINS youth (CINS defined as youth who exhibit at-risk behaviors that do not constitute a delinquent act such as: truancy, run-away, ungovernable, incorrigible, and/or disobedient). They have not been formally adjudicated by the court system. Parent and teen educational and support group services are targeted to program participants AND the larger community by referral from other community providers or self-referral.

FY10 Funding: \$135,395

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|----------------|------------------|------------------|---|-------------|------------------------------------|
| What/How Much Did We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of youth served by the program, both components (new + ongoing cases). | 426 | 464 | 579 | 493* | 615 | 438 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of eligible referrals diverted to community-based services (diversion component). | 383 | 464 | 224 | 222 | 460 | 110 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of CINS youth linked to community based programming (CINS component). | 43 | 78 | 35 | 43 | 70 | 39 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of educational and/or support groups facilitated (measured in program cycles). | N/A | N/A | 10 | 12 See Comments | 25 | 18 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of youth referred to mental health and/or substance abuse services who are successfully linked (successful linkage is defined as attending 2 or more sessions/meetings where ongoing intervention is indicated). | N/A | 61.5% | 60.9% | 76.1% (data limited to CINS component) | 80% | 75.0% (N = 54, both components) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants who complete 80% or more sessions of a parent/teen education or support group cycle.** | N/A | N/A | 68% | 50.0% (N = 59) | 80% | 73% (N = 119) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of families at closure who report satisfaction with program services (per survey). | 99% (N=155) | 95.4 (N=65) | 95% (N = 40) | 89.8% (N = 53) | 95% | 81.5% (N = 66) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of diverted cases that satisfy all obligations to successfully complete the diversion program. | 80% | 89.1% (N=431) | 94.5% | 92.6% (N = 387) | 85% | 86.5% (N = 262) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of diverted youth who avoid re-offending for one full year from open date. | N/A | 80.4% (N=367) | 85.7% (N=363) | 82.0% (N = 340) | 85% | 81.6% (N = 334) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of CINS youth who avoid adjudication for one full year from open date. | N/A | 90.2% (N=41) | 83.1% (N=59) | 80.0% (N = 40) | 85% | 74.5% (N= 35) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of CINS youth served who show arrested decline or improvement in functioning as measured by the Child and Adolescent Assessment (CAFAS, comparison of initial and discharge measures). | 67% | 86.7% (N=15) | 66.6% (N=15) | 87.5% (N = 7) | 85% | 60.0% (N = 3) |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of parents participating in education or support groups who report improvement in parent-child relationship (comparison of pre- and post-group survey scores). | N/A | N/A | 89% | 100.0% (N =69) | 85% | 70% (N = 85) |

* Number recalculated upon implementation of new Case Management software. Previous records required manual tracking of all cases, some of which may have duplicated within the system.

** Reflects minor wording change to clarify the measure reported. (“Linked” cases are reported under “How Well Did We Do It?” section below.

**The measure “percentage of participants who complete 80% or more sessions of a parent-support group cycle” was revised to reflect attendance in multi-session groups only (parent support groups). Teen education groups (Tobacco Abatement, Drug Education, Alcohol Awareness, and Violence Abatement) meet one time only and do not require sustained attendance over multiple sessions.

LMB: Washington County Community Partnership for Children & Families

Program Name: Teen Pregnancy Prevention Coalition Strategies

Program Summary: The Washington County Teen Pregnancy Prevention Coalition (WCTPPC) has identified two program components within this strategy: 1) Coordination and 2) Prevention Education. Coordination involves hiring a part time, contractual Teen Pregnancy Prevention Coordinator to support the WCTPPC’s objectives to improve the community-wide approach to preventing teen pregnancy. This approach includes increasing awareness, implementing media campaigns, coordinating special events, distributing educational materials, providing technical assistance to youth development organizations, soliciting contributions, and seeking additional grant funding. The Prevention Education component involves targeting youth at critical transition periods in middle and high school with “best practice” methods of teen pregnancy prevention education.

Target Population: Parents, middle/high school youth, youth development organizations, public agencies, faith based community, local government and municipalities, media outlets, business community, and medical professionals

FY10 Funding: \$97,284

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|---|-------------|-------------------------|
| What/How Much Did We Do: | | | | |
| Coordination Component | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of contacts or program participants requesting pregnancy prevention information* | 1011 | 4093 | 900 | 1,652 + 8,149 online |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of partners “committing” to pregnancy prevention efforts in the county** | 75 | 65 | 75 | 131 |
| Prevention Education Component | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of youth who participated in education programs | 2141 | 2224 | 2500 | 2376 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | |
| Coordination Component | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of targeted partners “committing” to pregnancy prevention efforts in the county** | 100% | 97% N=160 | 90% | 99% (N=131) |
| Prevention Education Component | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of youth invited to participate in the teen pregnancy prevention educational programs who actually participate for at least 80% or more of the sessions. | 62% | 59% (9 th grade) (N=958) 75% (6 th grade) N=1266 | 70% | 73% (N=2,376) |

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|---|--|-------------|-------------|
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| Coordination Component <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of randomly surveyed teens who report having a conversation with a parent or another adult about avoiding teen pregnancy. | Not Collected | 69% - parent N=22 62% -other adult N=18 | 75% | 67% |
| Prevention Education Component <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of participating youth surveyed who report new information learned while participating in the program. | 100% - 9th grade 86% - 6th Grade | 94% (9 th) 87.5% (6 th) | 90% | 90% |

* Includes requests for parent tool kits, attendees at special educational events and requests for technical assistance.

** “Committing” is defined as providing funding or in-kind services, materials or staffing, etc.

*** New program in FY08.

LMB: Washington County Community Partnership for Children & Families

Program Name: Substance Abuse Prevention

Program Summary: A social worker or counselor with experience working in the drug and alcohol field will be hired to observe and collect data regarding student behavior, work cooperatively with classroom teachers, assist in maintaining classroom organization and positive learning environments, collaborate with school staff to support behavioral interventions and facilitate the student’s educational goals and facilitate the practice-based substance abuse prevention curriculum at Antietam Academy.

Target Population: The target population is Antietam Academy Middle (Western Heights Middle School (WHMS)) and South Hagerstown High School (SHHS)) students, ages 11-17, at-risk of school dropout, substance abuse, juvenile crime, or recidivism.

FY10 Funding: \$68,828

| Performance Measure | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--|--------------|-------------|--|
| What/How Much Did We Do: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of participants Number of participants completing the practice-based substance abuse prevention curriculum. | 89 28 | 95 74 | 60 45 | 108 82 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants completing the practice-based substance abuse prevention curriculum. | 45% | 78% N=74 | 75% | 76% N = 82 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of participants demonstrating an increased knowledge the effects of substance abuse on the brain and the body following the practice-based substance abuse prevention “Mind Over Matter” curriculum as measured by pre-/post tests. | Program failed to capture this information | 78% N =74 | 75% | 90.5% (SHHS) N = 51 92.0% (WHMS) N = 47 |

*New program in FY08.

LMB: Washington County Community Partnership for Children & Families

Program Name: Hagerstown Community College (HCC) Teen Parent Program

Program Summary: Provides outreach and educational support services to teen parents in order to increase the number of parenting teens completing their GED/External Diploma Program or advancing their education beyond high school through college credit or continuing education classes.

Target Population: Pregnant teens or teen parents who reside in Washington County. Participants must be age 28 or less.

FY10 Funding: \$41,297

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|----------------------------------|
| What/How Much Did We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of teen parents actively served* by the HCC Teen Parent Program. ▪ Number of participants enrolled in college classes. | 70 | 58 | 84 | 78 | 75 | 72 |
| | 45 | 49 | 51 | 43 | 50 | 49 |
| How Well Did We Do It: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of surveyed participants who agree or strongly agree that the program helped them to be successful in college classes. ▪ % of participants enrolled in HCC college classes who earned passing grades each semester (spring, & summer). | Not tracked | Not tracked | 100% | 100% N=8 | 90% | 100% N=7 |
| | Fall 91% Spring 82% Summer 90% | Fall 80.5% Spring 84% Summer 86% | Fall 80% Spring 86% Summer 100% | Fall 86% N=25 Spring 89% N=26 Summer 100% N=14 | 80% | Fall 87% N=33 Spring 92% N=35 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ % of participants eligible to complete a certificate or degree program who actually complete their program. | Not tracked | Not tracked | 92% | 100% N=8 | 80% | 100% N=4 |

*Actively served means the program coordinator has had phone or in person contact with the participant within the fiscal year.

LMB: Wicomico Partnership for Families and Children

Program Name: Out-of-School Initiative

Program Summary: Out of school programs that provide safe places with positive, structured activities for school aged children coordinated through LMB.

Target Population: School age youth

FY10 Funding: \$69,278

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual* | FY07 Actual* | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| Total youth enrolled in After School Programs receiving LMB funding from GOC: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WISE ▪ LIVE ▪ New Program/s** | 42 | 50 | 46 | 75 | | -- |
| | 35 | 32 | 27 | 35 | 50 | -- |
| | | | | | | 235 |
| How Well We Do It? | | | | | | |
| ➤ % of students maintaining attendance at after school program for 90% of school days | | | 65% | 90% | 80% | 80% |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual* | FY07 Actual* | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ WISE ▪ LIVE ▪ New Program/s ** <p>➤ # and % of programs that meet or exceed goal of initiating minimum of 10 Developmental Assets in program structure</p> | | | 2/75% | 2/100% | 1/100 % | 1/50 % |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <p>➤ % of middle school youth in funded program/s who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ increase or maintain school attendance from first to last marking period. ▪ do not have a DJS intake from the beginning to end of school year | | | 88% | 95% | 80% | 80% |
| | | | 100% | 94% | 70% | 0% *** |

*Not all data for FY06 and FY07 is available

**In FY10, two proposals funded – one comprehensive program and one tutoring program – both only partially funded.

***No program focused on middle school age which would pertain to DJS involvement as indicator.

LMB: Wicomico

Program Name: Elementary Truancy Prevention

Program Summary: Truancy prevention through system navigation/service linkage in elementary schools in Wicomico County.

Target Population: Elementary school students and their families at Beaver Run, East Salisbury, Prince Street, Chipman, and Glen Avenue who have 20 days absences/truant or at high risk due to referrals for behavioral challenges to office.

FY10 Funding: \$167,000

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of families served ▪ Number of students served | 38* | 32 | 18 New/ 50 Total | 50 | 11 New/ 46 Total |
| | 36* | 29 | 18 New/ 52 Total | 50 | 13 New/ 46 Total |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of school personnel trained by program staff | 14 | 16 | 30 | 20 | 5 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff to family ratio <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ System Navigation ○ Care Coordination | ** | 1:15 | 1:40 | 1:25 | 1:36 |
| | 1:10 | 1:10 | 1:10 | 1:10 | 1:10 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of assessments completed within 10 days of referral | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of students served who decrease number of days absent measured from academic quarter (marking period) previous to start of service to academic quarter at close of services. | 90% | 94% | 93% | 90% | 92% |

| Performance Measure | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of students served who decrease in-school behaviors that result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Office referrals ○ In-school or out-of-school suspensions ○ Expulsions *** <p>As measured from academic quarter (marking period) previous to start of service to academic quarter at close of services.</p> | 90% | 72% | 69% | 70% | 69% |

*Not a whole year of data. Services and referrals began in February.

**Navigation position was not filled; Care Coordinator provided linkages to services for families not eligible for wraparound.

*** Expulsions are not allowed at elementary school level in Wicomico Public Schools.

LMB: Wicomico

Program Name: New Day Youth Development Initiative

Program Summary: Community-based alternatives to school suspension

Target Population: Middle School Youth

FY10 Funding: \$85,500

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ # of middle school youth who participate at center (unduplicated) ▪ # of hours youth participate in youth development activities by type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Goal Setting ○ Conflict Resolution/Anger Management ○ Leadership/Character Building ○ Arts/Creative Learning Activities ○ Academics | 439* | 337 | 234 | 31 | 150 | 31 |
| | | | 1080 | 488 | 1000 | |
| | | | 148 | | | 728 |
| | | 7 | 82.5 | 195.2 | 150 | 142 |
| | 7 | | 80 | 97.6 | 150 | 154 |
| | | | 66 | 195.2 | 150 | 99 |
| | | | 66 | 0 | 100 | 88 |
| | | | 168 | 97.6 | 400 | 245 |
| How Well We Do It? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants (enrolled) who successfully complete the program following first referral. ▪ % of youth receiving referral to additional services or activities for families ▪ % of participants (N) completing survey at exit of program who rate the program as satisfactory. ▪ % of participants reporting activities were helpful as measured by survey administered at exit of program. | Not tracked | Not tracked | 98.9 % | Not tracked | 70% | 77% |
| | Not tracked | Not tracked | 57.3 % | Not tracked | 60% | 60% |
| | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked | 70% | N=20 89.4% |
| | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked | 70% | 93% |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| ▪ % of youth reporting ND helped them become more interested in school as measured by survey administered at exit of program. | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked | 70% | 70% |
| ▪ % of youth reporting ND will help them to participate more in class as measured by survey administered at exit of program. | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked | Not tracked | 70% | 85% |
| ▪ Percentage of those youth who complete program (N) and do not have repeat referral to program for rest of school year. | 83%** | 70%** | 234/92.4%*** | 30 | 70% | 87% |

*FY06 unduplicated count not available.

**Only percentage of repeat suspension tracked – not measured in same way.

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: SAGES (Strengthening Adolescent Girls through Education and Support)

Program Summary: SAGES is a non-residential, gender specific program for girls who are experiencing difficulty or conflict in school and at home. Direct Impact on 4 domains of wellness: intellect, sexual, emotional, and family and relationships.

Target Population: Worcester County at-risk middle school girls experiencing one or more of the following: academic underachievement, delinquency, substance abuse, truancy, physical/emotional abuse, absentee parents, parental incarceration and social difficulties, acknowledged risk factors for involvement in the juvenile justice system.

FY10 Funding: \$82,825

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of clients (child) enrolled | 17 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 29 |
| ▪ Number of group activities by type: | | | | | | |
| ○ Tutoring | 51 | 51 | 61 | 61 | 68 | 126 |
| ○ Education groups | 67 | 37 | 35 | 53 | 39 | 136 |
| ○ Team meetings | 22 | 13 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 18 |
| ○ Service projects | 40 | 21 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 18 |
| ○ Field Trips | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 20 |
| ▪ Number of counseling sessions: | | | | | | |
| ○ Individual | 483 | 373 | 412 | 546 | 425 | 1036 |
| ○ Family | 161 | 29 | 108 | 120 | 115 | 240 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth completing program | 75% | 87% | 86% | 100% (15) | 86% | 93% (29) |
| ▪ Average Percentage of attendance at each group activity | 78% | 80% | 89% | 94% (14) | 80% | 95% (10) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of youth showing improvement on the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS) | 85% | 92% | 100% | 100% (15) | 93% | 100% (29) |
| ▪ Percentage of youth showing increase in knowledge about sexuality | No Data Collected | No Data Collected | 100% | 100% (15) | 93% | 100% (29) |
| ▪ Percentage of youth reaching their goals as measured by CANS. | No Data Collected | No Data Collected | 92% | 100% (15) | 80% | 100% (29) |

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: Pocomoke Elementary (PES) and Buckingham Elementary (BES) After School Academies

Program Summary: Promote academic success and character development for at-risk students as determined by FARMS (students who qualify for free or reduced lunch), grades kindergarten through third, by providing remedial, enrichment, and recreational activities during after school hours. Academies provide an opportunity for students to engage in enriching activities after the school day.

Target Population: Pocomoke Elementary and Buckingham Elementary School at-risk students

FY10 Funding: PES - \$8,690 BES - \$3,159

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| Total number of students enrolled | | | 326 | 540 | 206 | 121 |
| ▪ PES | 226 | 216 | 198 | 254 | 97 | 90 |
| ▪ BES* | * | * | 128 | 286 | 109 | 31 |
| Number of total academies offered | | | | | | |
| ▪ PES | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 10 | 10 |
| ▪ BES* | * | * | 10 | 12 | 8 | 9 |
| Average Number of weeks per academy | | | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| ▪ PES | 21 | 19 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 12 |
| ▪ BES* | * | * | 28 | 10 | 9 | 24 |
| How Well We Do It:** | | | | | | |
| Percentage of FARMS students participating | | | | | | |
| ▪ PES | No data available | No data avail | 52% | 54% (137) | 44% | 64% (90) |
| ▪ BES* | | 80% | 42% | 58% (166) | 35% | 59% (31) |
| Percentage Rate of attendance: | | | | | | |
| ▪ PES | No data available | No data available | 80% | 83% (211) | 83% | 92% (90) |
| ▪ BES* | | | 94% | 96% (275) | 74% | 95% (31) |
| Student/Staff Ratio | | | | | | |
| ▪ PES | No data available | 15:1 | 20:1 | 20:1 | 20:1 | 20:01 |
| ▪ BES* | | No data available | 12:1 | 16:1 | 15:1 | 15:01 |
| Is Anyone Better Off?*** | | | | | | |
| Percentage of students showing academic improvement | | | | | | |
| ▪ PES | No data avail | 50% | 85% | 85% (216) | 74% | 90% (90) |
| ▪ BES | | No data avail | 64% | 77% (220) | 52% | 60% (31) |
| Number of office referrals as collected in the Character School Wide Information System (SWIS) | | | | | | |
| ▪ PES | 209 | 112 | 118 | 56 | 78 | 56 |
| ▪ BES | No data avail | No data avail | 47 | 75 | 70 | 0 |

* No data is available for BES for FY06 and FY07. This is a new program at BES in FY08.

** Some data for FY06 and FY07 is not available as new performance measures were implemented in FY08.

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: Pocomoke Middle/High (PMS/PHS) and Snow Hill Middle/High (SHMS/SHHS) After School Academies

Program Summary: Enhance life skills for students in grades four-12 by providing opportunities for students to participate in career exploration and development activities.

Target Population: Pocomoke Middle/High after school academy participants and Snow Hill Middle/High after school academy participants

FY10 Funding: \$5,130

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Total number of students enrolled | | | 710 | 418 | 225 | 279 |
| ○ PHS/SHHS | 20 | 117 | 160 | 23 | 17 | 20 |
| ○ PMS* | No data collected | No data collected | 373 | 182 | 104 | 118 |
| ○ SHMS* | 10 | 10 | 177 | 213 | 104 | 151 |
| ▪ Number of total activities | | 10 | 22 | 24 | 9 | 9 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Field Trip Teacher/Student Ratio | 1/10 | 1/10 | 1/9 | 1/6 | 1/10 | 1/8 |
| ▪ Percentage of eligible students who completed Driver's Education | 90% | 90% | 100% | 100% (23) | 78% | 100% (20) |
| ▪ Percentage of eligible students who attended Career Exploration trips to local colleges | 20% | 20% | 21% | 24% (95) | 17% | 30% (6) |
| ▪ Percentage of eligible students who attended Career Exploration trips to businesses | 20% | 20% | 0% | 37% (79) | 17% | 55% (11) |
| ▪ Percentage of eligible students who attended swimming lessons | 15% | 15% | 70% | 20% (80) | 13% | 100% (5) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of students who pass Driver's Education class and obtain Driver's License | 90% | 90% | 83% | 100% (23) | 78% | 100% (2) |
| ▪ Percentage of PHS/SHHS seniors who attended Career Exploration trips to local colleges and expressed an intent to apply to college | 70% | 70% | 28% | 0% (0) | 61% | 100% |
| ▪ Percentage of students increasing skills/knowledge through Career Exploration trips | 90% | 100% | 100% | 100% (79) | 87% | 40% |

* FY2008 PMS and SHMS are new programs.

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: Family Asset Building Initiative (Renamed Parent Resource Center/Parent Education Consortium)

Program Summary: A countywide approach to enhance the quality of established parent education programs, supplementing parent resources providing technical assistance to family program providers. The Assets in Motion Committee (AIM) will utilize the Asset approach to train adult and youth volunteers. Additionally, the AIM will assist in coordinating the activities of the Worcester County Youth Council.

Target Population: Worcester County Families, youth, and parent education providers

FY10 Funding: \$45,934

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Number of parents accessing resources | 397 | 667 | 731 | 658 | 600 | 650 |
| ▪ Number of Website hits | 1400 | 3550 | 27510 | 53189 | 15000 | 20018 |
| ▪ Number of answer line calls received | 388 | 630 | 781 | 729 | 500 | 641 |
| Number of Meetings Facilitated: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Worcester Co. Youth Council | 2 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 |
| ▪ Assets in Motion | 5 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| ▪ Parent Consortium | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Number of Trainings Provided: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Parent Education (subset) | 33 | 42 | 31 | 33 | 30 | 35 |
| ▪ Assets in Motion | 4 | 19 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 18 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of the annual goals met by Assets in Motion Committee | 100% | 75% | 85% | 80% (4) | 80% | 80% (4) |
| ▪ Percentage of participants satisfied with Parent Education Training | 97% | 100% | 99% | 99% (32) | 95% | 99% (267) |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| ▪ Percentage of parent education participants showing pre/post test improvement. | 93% | 96% | 98% | 97% (32) | 90% | 100% (119) |
| ▪ Percentage of AIM training participants who indicated benchmark proficiency in knowledge of assets. | No Data Available | No Data Available | 91% | 92% (642) | 75% | 93%(57) |
| ▪ Percentage of AIM training participants who indicated benchmark proficiency in attitude – intentionality. | 92% | 87% | 99% | 94% (656) | 90% | 95% (58) |

LMB: Worcester County's Initiative to Preserve Families

Program Name: Just for Girls and Just for Girls 2 and Just for Guys 1

Program Summary: Provide after school program which has the following focus: minority and at-risk students, by providing middle school girls with a gender specific, abstinence only, substance abuse prevention, homework assistance, social skills training, peer education, community service and recreation.

Target Population: Berlin Intermediate girls and boys/Pocomoke Middle School girls

FY10 Funding: \$32,097 Berlin \$28,048 Pocomoke

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| What/How Much We Do: | | | | | | |
| ▪ Total number of students enrolled | 50 | 53 | 62 | 68 | 47 | 63 |
| ▪ Number of total activities | 692 | 680 | 1090 | 1094 | 745 | 1020 |
| ▪ Number of hours spent on activities | 475 | 620 | 770 | 850 | 587 | 681.5 |
| How Well We Do It: | | | | | | |

| Performance Measure | FY06 Actual | FY07 Actual | FY08 Actual | FY09 Actual | FY10 Target | FY10 Actual |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ minority ○ FARMS ▪ Attendance ▪ Retention ▪ Client/Staff Ratio | 78% No data | 74% No data | 75% 75% | 78% (53) 74% (50) | 52% 44% | 72% (45) 74% (47) |
| | 78% | 79% | 82% | 83% (56) | 70% | 87% (55) |
| | 81% | 65% | 89% | 80% (54) | 65% | 70% (44) |
| | 11:1 | 10:1 | 7:1 | 8:1 | 10:1 | 8:1 |
| Is Anyone Better Off? | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Percentage of participants who demonstrate a decrease in risk factors associated with substance use ▪ Percentage of participants who demonstrate an increase in knowledge and attitude which support an abstinent lifestyle before marriage (Girls only) ▪ Percentage of participants who demonstrate an increase in social skills | No data available | No data available | 10% | 7% (5) | 9% | 5% (3) |
| | No data available | No data available | 12% | 14.2% (10) | 9% | 42% (12) |
| | No data available | No data available | 2% | 16.71% (11) | 9% | 2% (2) |