



GUERNSEY COUNTY
FAMILY & CHILDREN FIRST COUNCIL

756 Wheeling Ave.
Cambridge, OH 43725
740-432-6815
www.guernseyfcdc.com

Guernsey County

Strategic Action Plan



July 2007

Partnerships
for Success

SAI Strategic Plan

Executive Summary

In 2006 Guernsey County was one of six Ohio counties selected to participate in the Partnerships for Success Initiative (PFS), Planning Year 2007. During the Planning year, counties collect, assess and analyze relevant local data on youth and family service delivery systems; establish strategic priorities; and develop a strategic PFS plan. The planning process requires significant collaboration from stakeholder service providers and businesses to educators and private citizens.

Partnerships for Success is an initiative of the Ohio Family & Children First Cabinet Council and is administered by the Ohio Department of Youth Services. County Family & Children First (FCF) Councils participating in PFS:

- Mobilize communities around issues related to families and children and engage them in action;
- Reduce duplication of effort between and among state and local agencies;
- Make better decisions that lead to better investments on public dollars;
- Evaluate the impact of these investments with an eye toward accountability; and
- Provide for long-term sustainability of effective programs and services.

The Strategic Plan is the culmination of the PFS Planning Year that included:

1. Mobilization of Community;
2. Conducting a community-wide Needs Assessment;
3. Draft coordinating Needs Assessment Priority Report;
4. Conducting a Resource Assessment based on priorities determined from the Needs Assessment;
5. Draft coordinating Resource Assessment Final Report;
6. Establish Strategic Action Identification Workgroup to conduct a Gap Analysis and develop Implementation Recommendations;
7. Draft Strategic Plan

The development of the Partnership for Success Strategic Plan is the penultimate goal of a very extensive, complicated, difficult and rewarding year of work and organization. This cornerstone capped a process that started with the mobilization of current and potential community partners behind the idea of community-wide strategic planning, and ended with a plan that is developed to meet an urgent need within the scope of youth succeeding in school.

The Strategic Action Identification Workgroup investigated the work from the previous Workgroups (Needs & Resource Assessments) and conducted a gap analysis based on those results. Reviewing the results of the Needs Assessment, the Workgroup identified that there was an immediate need to address Truancy at the high school level. Based on the results of the Resource Assessment, none of the forty (40) programs investigated had the reduction of truancy as its prioritized outcome.

Needs Assessment Summary

The PfS Needs Assessment was the first of three phases in the development of a county-wide strategic plan to address data-informed community-selected youth behaviors. The assessment was designed to determine long-term, intermediate-term and short-term outcomes which would lead to identification of a potential strategy to affect all three desired outcomes.

During the Needs Assessment a Workgroup was created (consisting of multiple cross-system community partners), to collect national, state and local data from selected indicators surrounding Ohio's Commitments to Child Well-Being which are designations of potential Long-Term Outcomes associated with the PfS Process. Once those indicators were analyzed and the data collected, the potential outcomes were narrowed from broad to specific. In addition, the Workgroup also identified community values in relation to the potential outcomes. The purpose of assessing community values is to factor in the community's belief system into the prioritization of the outcomes. This can be important step in the process as community values are the backbone of what an individual, family or any other social entity holds important.

Based upon the data collected and community input that was provided, the Workgroup ranked the Long-Term Outcomes in order of needed priority:

Ohio's Commitments to Child Well-Being – Long-Term Outcomes:

- 1. Children and Youth Succeed in School**
2. Youth Choose Healthy Behaviors
3. Youth Successfully Transition into Adulthood
4. Children Are Ready For School
5. Infants and Toddlers Thrive
6. Expectant Parents and Newborns Thrive

There were many factors that went into these rankings and choices. Based on the data gathered and the results of the community valuing efforts, *Children and Youth Succeed in School* was chosen as the Long-Term Outcome. This is a very broad Outcome that can be affected by a variety of means. The Workgroup focused on two areas to meet that Long-Term Outcome: *Increase School Success* and *Reduce Delinquency*.

Targeted Impacts – Intermediate-Term Outcomes:

- 1. Increase School Success**
- 2. Reduce Delinquency**
3. Reduce Violence and Neglect
4. Reduce Behaviors Associated with Mental Illness
5. Reduce Substance Abuse
6. Reduce Teen Pregnancy

The *Increase School Success* Targeted Impact will be measured by: 1) The county-wide Graduation Rate; 2) The numbers of 12th Grade Drop-outs; 3) School District Report Cards. The Workgroup feels that improvements in any of these areas will *Increase School Success*.

The Targeted Impact of *Reduce Delinquency* will be measured by: 1) The number of school-based truancy and delinquent truancy filings; 2) The number of Discipline Occurrences per 100 Students.

In choosing these outcomes, the Workgroup made the determination that a decrease in the identified Risk Factors would increase the likelihood that the Targeted Impacts could be achieved. By decreasing *Academic Failure* and *Lack of Commitment to School* the Workgroup felt each of the indicators around *Increase School Success* could be positively affected. By working to

decrease *Antisocial Behavior*, a similar decrease in delinquent *Truancy* filings and discipline occurrences should be expected.

From that ranking and the data provided, the potential Short-Term Outcomes were ranked in order of needed priority:

Risk Factors, Protective Factors, Assets – Short-Term Outcomes

1. Risk Factor: *Academic Failure*
2. Risk Factor: *Lack of Commitment to School*
3. Risk Factor: *Truancy*
4. Risk Factor: *Antisocial Behavior*

The Workgroup made a conscious effort to look at the RPAs as distinct but related items. When the RPAs were investigated, the approach was to look in two distinct areas: (1) inside the day-to-day academic environment and (2) outside the walls of the academic environment. To fully address the chosen prioritized outcomes, the Workgroup felt that eliminating barriers to education (*Truancy* and *Antisocial Behavior*) was just as important at addressing standard academic success measures inside the classroom (*Academic Failure* and *Lack of Commitment to School*).

Please reference the Guernsey County Needs Assessment Priority Report for the corresponding data used to determine these rankings.

Resource Assessment Summary

The Resource Assessment was the second of three phases in the Planning Year of the PfS process. The goal of the PfS Resource Assessment is to create a realistic profile of current programs, services and activities in the community related to the prioritized outcomes chosen through the Needs Assessment. This profile will ultimately allow the PfS Strategic Action Identification Workgroup to define gaps in services that should be filled with strategies.

A Profiling Community Resources (PCR) Tool was used as a mechanism to collect data on current programming that focused on the prioritized outcomes that resulted for the county-wide Needs Assessment. The PCR Tool contained quantifiable categories that were designed to provide a

variety of reports that would be used to create the gap analysis. These reports included programming location (agency, school), types of services provided (prevention, early intervention, systems of care), age group the program was reaching and the method of evaluation used to determine program effectiveness.

The reports that were generated by this process were guided by the Short-Term Outcomes identified through the Needs Assessment. Those reports included current programs that affected (1) Academic Failure, (2) Lack of Commitment to School, (3) Truancy, (4) Antisocial Behavior, (5) Drop-Out Rate, (6) Increase the Potential to Graduate and (7) Achievement Test Scores. These reports will serve as the foundation of the Gap Analysis which will be performed by the Strategic Action Identification Workgroup (SAI).

Here are some preliminary results that were obtained by the Workgroup:

1. High percentage of programs investigated were Prevention programs (72% on average)
2. High percentage of programs were within the formalized Educational Environment addressing Academic Success (78%)
3. Low percentage of programs used Evidence-based approach as documented by literature (35% on average)
4. Lack of programs solely addressing barriers to education i.e. Truancy, Antisocial Behavior (0 of 40)
5. Low percentage of programs with targeted audiences, i.e., many broad based Prevention programs for all ages (5% on average)

Please reference the Guernsey County Resource Assessment Final Report for the corresponding data used to determine these findings.

The SAI Workgroup made the determination that Truancy could be the key outcome to addressing the academic success of at-risk students. These students are often those that affect the graduation rates, drop-out rates and disciplinary rates of our local school districts. Choosing this as an outcome will not only increase the statistical standings of local school districts, but also provides those at-risk youth with a support system that would allow them to build confidence knowing that they are working within a system that cares about their efforts.

The Workgroup decided to implement wraparound service teams in the two largest county high schools and the largest county middle school. These teams will be modeled after the Council's wraparound services program that provides the Service Coordination mandate by the Ohio Revised Code. These teams will be guided by the Council to address truancy on a case-by-case basis allowing for individualized plans to address the areas of need. These teams will be made up of the student and his/her family, school social worker, guidance counselor, building administration, wraparound team leader and any other party that has a specific interest in the case.

These teams will work collectively to develop a plan of action to correct the issues surrounding the behavior that is causing the truancy. With the proper utilization of this program, the Workgroup hopes that the instances of truancy and the number of delinquent truancy filings will be reduced, as will the number of high school drop-outs and non-graduating students.

Executive Summary 1

Introduction..... 8

Table of Organization..... 14

Needs Assessment Summary 15

Resource Assessment Summary 19

Phase III Strategic Action Identification 22

Identification Process 24

Strategic Logic Model..... 27

PfS Recommendations 28

System of Organization..... 30

Appendix..... 33

Introduction

Partnerships for Success is an initiative of the Ohio Family & Children First Cabinet Council and is administered by the Ohio Department of Youth Services. County Family & Children First (FCF) Councils participating in PfS:

- Mobilize communities around issues related to families and children and engage them in action;
- Reduce duplication of effort between and among state and local agencies;
- Make better decisions that lead to better investments on public dollars;
- Evaluate the impact of these investments with an eye toward accountability; and
- Provide for long-term sustainability of effective programs and services.

Partnerships for Success is a holistic and strategic approach to building a community's capacity to prevent and respond effectively to child and adolescent problem behaviors while promoting positive youth development.


Involving and Engaging the Entire Community: This guiding principle requires that all elements of the community be involved in planning, implementing, and evaluating the PfS Model. Actively engaging individuals from all fields that affect young people is likely to lead to a comprehensive community investment in sustainable solutions to significant community problems involving youth.

Balancing a Holistic Continuum of Approaches: This guiding principle requires that a broad array of services and approaches be available to meet the needs of children and youth in the community. A continuum of services includes primary prevention programs, early intervention programs, and systems of care. These services and approaches should also include programs focused on reducing risks associated with problem behaviors and those focused on building community-wide assets that prepare children and youth to be fully engaged in their communities.

Making Data-Informed Decisions: This guiding principle requires that communities continually review data in order to define priorities and make decisions related to program implementation. Four levels of data informed decisions are involved in PfS. First, data are used to determine the magnitude of problem behaviors in a community and prioritize efforts to respond to them. Second, data are used to identify levels of risk, protection, and assets that exist within the community to help target potentially effective strategies. Third, data are used to determine best practices related to implementation decisions for new programs. Programs with highly feasible approaches based on sound scientific evaluations are preferred. Finally, data are used to continually evaluate the progress of the PfS Initiative within the community.


Continuum of Services

- **Prevention.** This program/activity is designed for all eligible participants and is provided before any major problems are identified.
- **Early Intervention.** This program/activity is designed for participants who have been identified as having problems but before those problems become entrenched.
- **Systems of Care.** This program/activity is designed for participants who have serious and chronic problems.



Adelman, H. S., & Taylor, L. (1999). Mental Health in Schools and System Restructuring. Clinical Psychology Review, 19, 137-163.

Partnerships for Success Model



While the PfS Model is followed in a linear and chronological order, in reality the model revolves around a constant commitment to making data-informed decisions including:

1. Identifying long-term, intermediate-term, and short-term outcomes
2. Determining evidence-based and feasible practices to address the prioritized outcomes
3. Evaluating the progress of PfS in the community


Success of the local PfS Initiative is contingent upon ongoing and sustained mobilization of the community. There are a variety of mobilization activities that should be conducted throughout the PfS Initiative to ensure long-term sustainability of the PfS Strategic Plan.

PfS Planning is comprised of three basic activities:

1. *Needs Assessment* – The goal of the needs assessment is to define both broad targets for change in the community and factors that are most closely associated with the selected targets.
2. *Resource Assessment* – The goal of the resource assessment is to create a realistic profile of current programs, services, and activities in the community related to the outcomes prioritized in the needs assessment.
3. *Strategic Action Identification* – The goal of gap analysis and strategic planning is to produce a gap analysis and a strategic plan that indicates how best to address problem behaviors and promote positive youth development within the community.

In 2006 Guernsey County was one of six Ohio counties selected to participate in the Partnerships for Success Initiative, Planning Year 2007. During the Planning year, counties collect, assess and analyze relevant local data on youth and family service delivery systems; establish strategic priorities; and develop a strategic PfS plan. The planning process requires significant collaboration from stakeholder service providers and businesses to educators and private citizens.

2006-2007 Partnerships for Success Counties



Following the successful completion of PfS Planning, Guernsey County will receive an additional PfS Implementation Grant to be used for the implementation of the Strategic Plan identified during the Planning phase of PfS. There are three possible implementation options resulting from PfS Planning:


- The development of a new program
- The enhancement of an existing program
- A change or enhancement of the local infrastructure supporting youth development programming

PfS Planning Timeline

July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June
Mobilization			Needs Assessment			Resource Assessment			Strategic Action Identification		

Implementation Year Timeline

July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June
Program Logic and Outcome Definition		Implementation and Outcome Evaluation							Outcome Achievement Report		



Family and Children First Leadership:

Director – Chad Hibbs Chairperson – Jean Stevens

PfS Core Team Members:

Chad Hibbs – FCFC/PfS Director

Jean Stevens – FCFC Chairperson

Kelly Lynch – Director of Children Services

Kellie Brown – Superintendent of MR/DD

Vickie Hare – Thompkins Child & Adolescent Services Inc.

Tim Welch – Guernsey County Public Information Officer

Brenda Caldwell – FCFC Family Representative

Troy McCollister – Director of Guernsey County Department of
Jobs & Family Services/CSEA

Needs Assessment Summary

The PfS Needs Assessment was the first of three phases in the development of a county-wide strategic plan to address data-informed community-selected youth behaviors. The assessment was designed to determine long-term, intermediate-term and short-term outcomes which would lead to identification of a potential strategy to affect all three desired outcomes.

During the Needs Assessment a Workgroup was created (consisting of multiple cross-system community partners), to collect national, state and local data from selected indicators surrounding Ohio's Commitments to Child Well-Being which are designations of potential Long-Term Outcomes associated with the PfS Process. Once those indicators were analyzed and the data collected, the potential outcomes were narrowed from broad to specific. In addition, the Workgroup also identified community values in relation to the potential outcomes. The purpose of assessing community values is to factor in the community's belief system into the prioritization of the outcomes. This can be important step in the process as community values are the backbone of what an individual, family or any other social holds important.

Based upon the data collected and community input that was provided, the Workgroup ranked the Long-Term Outcomes in order of needed priority:

Ohio's Commitments to Child Well-Being – Long-Term Outcomes:

- 1. Children and Youth Succeed in School**
2. Youth Choose Healthy Behaviors
3. Youth Successfully Transition into Adulthood
4. Children Are Ready For School
5. Infants and Toddlers Thrive
6. Expectant Parents and Newborns Thrive

There were many factors that went into these rankings and choices. Based on the data gathered and the results of the community valuing efforts, *Children and Youth Succeed in School* was chosen as the Long-Term Outcome. This is a very broad Outcome that can be affected by a variety of means. The Workgroup focused on two areas to meet that Long-Term Outcome: *Increase School Success* and *Reduce Delinquency*.

Targeted Impacts – Intermediate-Term Outcomes:

- 1. Increase School Success**
- 2. Reduce Delinquency**
3. Reduce Violence and Neglect
4. Reduce Behaviors Associated with Mental Illness
5. Reduce Substance Abuse
6. Reduce Teen Pregnancy

The *Increase School Success* Targeted Impact will be measured by: 1) The county-wide Graduation Rate; 2) The numbers of 12th Grade Drop-outs; 3) School District Report Cards. The Workgroup feels that improvements in any of these areas will *Increase School Success*. One telling factor that led to this decision was the most recent three-year graduation rate average for Guernsey County. Data indicated that from the last three school years of record, (2004-2005, 2003-2004, 2002-2003) the average graduation rate was 86%. That means that on average, 14% of Guernsey County students did not graduate from high school.

The Targeted Impact of *Reduce Delinquency* will be measured by: 1) The number of school-based truancy and delinquent truancy filings; 2) The number of Discipline Occurrences per 100 Students. The one leading piece of data that led to this decision was the number of In-School Suspensions due to *Truancy* in Cambridge High School over the past three school years of record:

- 2005-2006: **482**
- 2004-2005: **509**
- 2003-2004: **486**

In choosing these outcomes, the Workgroup made the determination that a decrease in the identified Risk Factors would increase the likelihood that the Targeted Impacts could be achieved. By decreasing *Academic Failure* and *Lack of Commitment to School* the Workgroup felt each of the indicators around *Increase School Success* could be positively affected. By working to decrease *Antisocial Behavior*, a similar decrease in delinquent *Truancy* filings and discipline occurrences should be expected.

From that ranking and the data provided, the potential Short-Term Outcomes were ranked in order of needed priority:

Risk Factors, Protective Factors, Assets – Short-Term Outcomes

5. Risk Factor: *Academic Failure*
6. Risk Factor: *Lack of Commitment to School*
7. Risk Factor: *Truancy*
8. Risk Factor: *Antisocial Behavior*

The Workgroup made a conscious effort to look at the RPAs as distinct but related items. When the RPAs were investigated, the approach was to look in two distinct areas: (1) inside the day-to-day academic environment and (2) outside the walls of the academic environment. To fully address the chosen prioritized outcomes, the Workgroup felt that eliminating barriers to education (*Truancy* and *Antisocial Behavior*) was just as important as addressing standard academic success measures inside the classroom (*Academic Failure* and *Lack of Commitment to School*).

The RPAs that were identified were ranked by using a Logic Chain Model. This allowed the Workgroup to visualize the potential impact (known or unknown) of a selected RPA. By going through this exercise, it allowed the workgroup to solidify their suggestions and feel confident that the selected RPAs will achieve the intended results for the Commitments.

The Needs Assessment Workgroup labored many weeks to collect the presented data to have it analyzed in a timely fashion. Although local data was not found on every indicator, the Workgroup collected the data that was available and analyzed it within its proper contexts. A few judgment calls needed to be made as data was not always presented in the context that the Workgroup would have liked, but a consensus was reached on every decision. The Workgroup made an informed decision based on the data that was collected, and did not speculate about the data that was not available to be reviewed.

Please reference the Guernsey County Needs Assessment Priority Report for the corresponding data used to determine these rankings.

PfS Needs Assessment Workgroup Members

Troy McCollister – Needs Assessment Chair
Chad Hibbs – FCFC/PfS Director
Jean Steven – FCFC Chairperson
Mike Kachilla – Director, Cambridge Area Chamber of Commerce
Chuck Chippi – Principal, Meadowbrook High School
Stephanie Laube – Creative Options Facilitator
Kellie Brown – Assoc. Director, Guernsey County MR/DD
Kelly Lynch – Director, Guernsey County Children Services
Tim Welch – Public Information Officer
Carolyn Wilson – Ohio State University Extension
Linda Mehl – Nursing Supervisor, Cambridge Guernsey County Health Dept
Capt. Bob Sears – Salvation Army
Vickie Hare – TCAS, Inc.
Brenda Caldwell – FCFC Family Representative

****The members would like to thank the following community partners for their support, efforts and information****

Courtney Wetzel
Cambridge City School District
East Guernsey Local School District
Rolling Hills Local School District
Southeastern Med
Jerry Bean, Ph.D.

Resource Assessment Summary

The Resource Assessment was the second of three phases in the Planning Year of the PfS process. The goal of the PfS Resource Assessment is to create a realistic profile of current programs, services and activities in the community related to the prioritized outcomes chosen through the Needs Assessment. This profile will ultimately allow the PfS Strategic Action Identification Workgroup to define gaps in services that should be filled with strategies.

A Profiling Community Resources (PCR) Tool was used as a mechanism to collect data on current programming that focused on the prioritized outcomes that resulted for the county-wide Needs Assessment. The PCR Tool contained quantifiable categories that were designed to provide a variety of reports that would be used to create the gap analysis. These reports included programming location (agency, school), types of services provided (prevention, early intervention, systems of care), age group the program was reaching and the method of evaluation used to determine program effectiveness.

The Resource Assessment Workgroup was cultivated from various community leaders each with their own expertise and insight of current community programming efforts. After the Resource Assessment Workgroup was developed, the following tasks were performed:

1. Develop a PfS Workgroup Charter
2. Create a Resource Database
3. Develop a Plan for Collecting Data
4. Finalize the Profile Community Resources (PCR) Tool
5. Profile Community Resources
6. Analyze Resource Assessment Data
7. Draft PfS Resource Assessment Report

The Results

The reports that were generated by this process were guided by the Short-Term Outcomes identified through the Needs Assessment. Those reports included current programs that affected (1) Academic Failure, (2) Lack of Commitment to School, (3) Truancy, (4) Antisocial Behavior, (5) Drop-Out Rate, (6) Increase the Potential to Graduate and (7) Achievement Test Scores. These reports will serve as the foundation of the Gap Analysis which will be performed by the Strategic Action Identification Workgroup. Here are some preliminary results that were obtained by the Workgroup:

1. High percentage of programs investigated were Prevention programs (72% on average)
2. High percentage of programs were within the formalized Educational Environment addressing Academic Success (78%)
3. Low percentage of programs used Evidence-based approach as documented by literature (35% on average)
4. Lack of programs solely addressing barriers to education i.e. Truancy, Antisocial Behavior (0 of 40)
5. Low percentage of programs with targeted audiences, i.e., many broad based Prevention programs for all ages (5% on average)

There were some issues with the Resource Assessment results that need to be addressed. With multiple programs choosing multiple areas of programming outcomes, it was difficult to achieve solid percentages to represent the findings in the analysis. Members of the Workgroup went back and investigated each program that was submitted and made the determinations for the analysis.

Please reference the Guernsey County Needs Assessment Priority Report for the corresponding data used to determine these rankings.

PfS Resource Assessment Workgroup Members

Kelly Lynch – Resource Assessment Chair

Chad Hibbs – FCFC/PfS Director

Jean Steven – FCFC Chairperson

Kellie Brown – Superintendent, Guernsey County Board of MR/DD

Vickie Hare – Asst. Director, Thompkins Child & Adolescent Services Inc.

Martha Moore-McConnell – Superintendent, Cambridge City Schools

Tim Welch – Guernsey County Public Information Officer

Mike Humphrey – Executive Director, United Way of Guernsey County

Nick Davis – Guernsey County JET Program

Ann Lawrence – Branch Manager, Wesbanco of Cambridge

The members would like to thank Dr. Dennis Embry and the Paxis Institute for the work and detail provided during this process. Dr. Embry’s information and guidance was a significant and valuable resource during this endeavor.

The following agencies and programs contributed information to the Resource Assessment Process:

32° Degree Masons of Cambridge

Cambridge City Schools

Cambridge Kiwanis Club

Cambridge Lioness Club

First Presbyterian Church of Cambridge

Guernsey County 4-H Youth Development

Guernsey County Children Services Board

Guernsey County Community Outreach Education Coordinator

Guernsey County Department of Jobs & Family Services/CSEA

Guernsey County Help Me Grow

Guernsey County JET Program

Guernsey County Juvenile Court

Guernsey County Opportunity Center

Guernsey County SMARTT Program

Guernsey Monroe Noble Tri County Head Start/Early Start

Heart of Ohio Girl Scouts

Phase III: Strategic Action Identification

The Strategic Action Identification (SAI) process is the third of three phases in the Planning Year of the PfS process. The goal of the PfS SAI process is to develop a strategic plan that defines strategies to achieve the prioritized outcomes. This plan will guide the Implementation Phase of Year Two of the PfS Initiative.

The Strategic Action Identification kicked-off with a school and community presentation of the preliminary results of the Needs and Resource Assessments, and an overview of the Family & Children First Council and its participating partners in this PfS Initiative. From that event, a list of interested participants was cultivated to create the Strategic Action Identification Workgroup and the following tasks were completed:

1. Develop a PfS Workgroup Charter
2. Perform Gap Analysis
3. Review Gaps between Community Needs and Resources
4. Research Potential Strategies
5. Identify Strategies that will Impact Prioritized Outcomes
6. Draft PfS Recommendations
7. Draft PfS Strategic Plan

The Gap Analysis portion of the PfS Process was originally due to be completed by the Resource Assessment Workgroup but was moved to this stage. The Leadership of the PfS Initiative felt that with more intimate and planned participation with local school districts at this level, a true Gap Analysis could only take place with their direct involvement. Not that this has lessened the results of the Resource Assessment, but with only one school district participating in that assessment, the Leadership felt that more input was needed before drafting that analysis.

PfS Strategic Action Identification Workgroup Members

Jean Stevens – SAI Chair

Chad Hibbs – FCFC/PfS Director

Kellie Brown – Superintendent, Guernsey County Board of MR/DD

Vickie Hare – Asst. Director, Thompkins Child & Adolescent Services Inc.

Martha Moore-McConnell – Superintendent, Cambridge City Schools

Scott Eldredge – Principal, Cambridge High School

Karen Yanico – Social Worker, Cambridge City Schools

Dennis Dettra – Principal, Meadowbrook High School

Herb Owens – Special Education Coordinator, Rolling Hills School District

Kristen Epperson – Social Worker, Rolling Hills School District

Tim Welch – Guernsey County Public Information Officer

Mike Humphrey – Executive Director, United Way of Guernsey County

The PfS Leadership would like to thank Scott Eldredge and Dennis Dettra for their participation. Each gentleman is starting brand new in their leadership positions this school year (2007-2008), and they began working with this Workgroup during their busy transition time. This work could have not been accomplished without their help and dedication.

The Strategic Planning Identification Process

The Partnerships for Success process paces itself step-by-step to ensure that the integrity of the decisions are solid and data-informed. This section of the report will illustrate this process and explain the decision-making that led to the final ranking. The Workgroup's 7-step process starts with the development of the Workgroup Charter.

Step 1: Development of a Workgroup Charter

Once the workgroup was identified, the members convened to develop a workgroup charter. The charter is designed to outline the responsibilities of the workgroup and to charge this specific group with this activity. This document gave the Workgroup a sense of identity and responsibility.

Step 2 & Step 3: Perform Gap Analysis/Review Gaps

In conducting the Gap Analysis, the Workgroup reviewed the Needs Assessment (NA) Data and the Resource Assessment (RA) results. The NA provided a context and a framework for the analysis with the identification of the Long-Term (*Children and Youth Succeed in School*), Intermediate-Term (*Increase School Success, Reduce Delinquency*) and Short-Term Outcomes (*Reduce Academic Failure, Reduce Lack of Commitment to School, Reduce Truancy, Reduce Antisocial Behavior*).

The results of the RA provided the data that served at the foundation of the Gap Analysis. The preliminary RA results were passed along to the SAI Workgroup and were used as a starting off point for the investigation. Here are some preliminary results that were obtained by the Workgroup:

- 1. High percentage of programs investigated were Prevention programs (72% on average)*
- 2. High percentage of programs were within the formalized Educational Environment addressing Academic Success (78%)*
- 3. Low percentage of programs used Evidence-based approach as documented by literature (35% on average)*
- 4. Lack of programs solely addressing barriers to education i.e., Truancy, Antisocial Behavior (0 of 40)*
- 5. Low percentage of programs with targeted audiences, i.e., many broad based Prevention programs for all ages (5% on average)*

These preliminary results highlighted what would be the core finding of the Gap Analysis; lack of programs solely addressing barriers to education and the low number of programs using Evidence-Based programs. *Increasing School Success* is broad outcome to achieve and it could be achieved in a variety of ways. Using the RA data and findings, the Workgroup felt that reducing barriers to education needed to be addressed with this initiative. With this decision, it narrowed the potential Short-Term Outcomes to two possible choices, *Reduce Truancy* and *Reduce Antisocial Behavior*. Even though all of the potential Short-Term Outcomes could be affected by barriers to education, the Workgroup wanted to investigate the barriers that limited access to the school environment and the latter two of the four were chosen.

The other result that stood out for the Workgroup was the lack of Evidence-Based programming. The Workgroup felt that if the focus of the Strategic Plan would be the elimination of barriers to education, an evidenced-based approach needed to be the end result.

The Workgroup also discussed the type of programming to institute. The RA results indicated that 72% (*on average*) of the programs investigated were Prevention programs. Based on the narrowed list of Short-Term Outcomes, the Workgroup made the decision to focus on the System of Care end of the Continuum of Services spectrum. Once that decision was made, the Workgroup chose *Reduce Truancy* as the final Short-Term Outcome. This decision was based on the idea that *Truancy* could be caused by a variety of barriers, and has been a consistent problem in the county's largest school district.

The area that represented itself to be the most in need were those students who were chronic offenders. These students fall behind academically, can not make up the grades and are unable to advance or drop-out entirely. By focusing on *Truancy*, the Workgroup made the determination that multiple potential Long, Intermediate and Short-Term Outcomes and related RPAs could be positively affected. But, the possible reasons for *Truancy* are numerous and that posed a significant challenge to the SAI Workgroup.

Step 4: Research Potential Strategies

Each member of the Strategic Action Identification Workgroup investigated programs that had a positive affect towards the reduction of *Truancy*. With having a diverse makeup to the Workgroup, many different avenues were explored to find potential program including model school-based programs, juvenile justice model programs and multi-system model programs.


Many of the programs that were researched only had the reduction of *Truancy* as a secondary outcome. The Workgroup felt that to be successful, the chosen Evidenced-Based Program must have the reduction of *Truancy* and its preliminary outcome. Finding no programs that fit this needed criteria, the Workgroup chose to investigate a process that could lead to the desired outcome; the development of a Wraparound Services Program that was designed to deal with *Truancy* and *Truancy*-related barriers to education.

Step 5: Identify Strategies that will Impact Prioritized Outcomes

The Workgroup decided that a multi-system approach to *Truancy* was the only way to reach the chronic offenders. The Prevention and Early Intervention Evidence-Based Programs that were investigated were unable to provide a frame-work that would effectively reach this target audience. The Workgroup decided that a program with its roots in providing Wraparound services would be the best choice to develop a workable strategy.

The rationale of choosing a Wraparound-based system for chronic *Truancy* offenders needed to be investigated and a Logic Model was created. If a youth is receiving wraparound services for multiple issues, highlighted by truant behavior and a positive outcome is achieved, the chance of a reduction in other risk behaviors drop, protective factors are increased, school success increases as does the possibility of graduation. (Please see graphic on the following page.)

PfS Logic Model



Step 6: PfS Recommendations

Once the strategy was chosen, the Workgroup developed a set of recommendations for implementation. With Council programming currently including a Wraparound services model for its Service Coordination efforts, the recommendations would serve as an addition to that program. The SAI drafted recommendations include:

- 1. Create an independent Wraparound service programs in the two largest county high schools and largest middle school;**
- 2. These programs will be modeled after the GCFCFC Wrap-around community program which utilizes the Council's Service Coordination Mechanism;**
- 3. Oversight of these programs will lie with Council leadership and with Multi-Systems Youth Coordinator;**
- 4. Referrals will be made from school systems;**
- 5. Parents/Guardians and/or family mentor will be present at each session.**

The Wraparound theory is the basis for many effective Evidence-Based Programs, and it allows multiple systems to partner together to develop a specific strategy for a specific issue, youth or family. *The National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice* has recognized Wraparound as a “**Best Practice**” for promoting educational success and reducing delinquency. Many highly rated Evidence-Based Programs including the Care Team Model use elements of service coordination and wraparound services as the foundation for its programming.

Often the need for Wraparound programming exists where there are multiple issues that need to be addressed before a specific situation can be improve and a positive outcome achieved. The Workgroup's theory around choosing school-based wraparound teams is to identify what other barriers to education exists within each case that leads to the high number of truancy occurrences and filings. If these barriers are dealt with and positive outcomes are achieved, then an increase in academic success would be an end result.

Recommendation Specifics


The Guernsey County Family & Children First Council's community-based wraparound program (Creative Options) will be used as a guideline on how the SAI recommendations will be established. Creative Options utilizes the Council's Service Coordination Mechanism which provides guidance on meeting the mandates of Council's Service Coordination function as set by the Ohio Revised Code. The school-based teams will not use the mechanism on a case-by-case basis, but will use it as means of conducting the process. The Creative Options process (**Recommendation 2**) will provide the school-based program with a set of procedurals that will be applied to their established function.

Each of these School-Based teams (**Recommendation 1**) will be led by a School Engagement Coordinator (SEC) that will be specifically cross-trained with the methodology from the Care Team Model and with high fidelity wraparound training. This training will allow each SEC to gain knowledge on how to successfully conduct the wraparound process while also adapting that process to work within the school environment.

The SEC will meet periodically with the Council's Director and Multi-System Youth Coordinator (**Recommendation 3**) to determine gaps in services and to align and relate the established functions in all three school buildings. These meetings will be used to discuss case proceedings, problems or common areas of interest. This will enhance strategy fidelity and to maintain common practices in each school building to better provide and report on findings and outcomes for specific cases.

The individual school buildings will be tasked to make referrals to SEC and their teams (**Recommendation 4**). Once a student has reached five (5) absences (excused or unexcused) a referral will be made to the SEC to conduct a formal meeting. This meeting will be used to discover the reason for the absences and to draft a Family Service Plan to correct the behavior. Each team will consist of the SEC, building principal, school social worker, guidance counselor, student, parents/guardians and any other applicable school staff (**Recommendation 5**). This team will work collaboratively to create the Family Service Plan and plan a course of action.

School-Based Wraparound System of Organization



Success Measures

The Workgroup drafted a list of Success Measures that will be used to determine the effectiveness of the strategy as it pertains to the chosen outcomes. Each outcome (Long-Term, Intermediate-Term and Short-Term) has a specific measure and from where that measure will be collected.

Long-Term Outcome: Children and Youth Succeed in School

Success Measure(s): (1) Graduation Rate
(2) School Report Cards

Instrument/Source(s): Ohio Department of Education

Intermediate-Term Outcome: (A) Increase School Success
(B) Reduce Delinquency

Success Measure: (A-1) % Increase in student GPAs
(A-2) Completion of the OGT
(B-1) Delinquent Truancy Filings

Instrument/Source: (A) Ohio Department of Education
(B) Guernsey County Juvenile Court

Short-Term Outcome: Reduce Truancy

Success Measure: (1) Number of truanancies/absences
(2) Number of High School Drop-outs

Instrument/Source: (1) SWIS Program Data – High School
(2) Ohio Department of Education

Evidence-Based Strategy: School-Based Wraparound Services Team

Evidence Source:

The National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice
http://www.edjj.org/focus/prevention/JJ-SE_downloads.htm

Conclusion

The Wraparound strategy that is recommended by the Strategic Action Identification Workgroup is very narrow in scope and is intended to reach a very specific audience. Adding wraparound service teams and addressing the infrastructure and oversight that is required to maintain those teams is a significant challenge.

The current structure of the Council's Wraparound system will change with these additions, but it does provide a solid foundation for creating a school-based system. This infrastructure change will solidify a working relationship between the Council and two county school districts that did not exist prior to this planning process. Even if this was the ultimate goal of this plan, this process would have been considered a great success.

In addition to the creation of a school-based Wraparound model, the Council is looking forward to identifying and eliminating other barriers to education. Even though *Truancy* will be the trigger to organize the teams around specific issues, the hope is that these teams will uncover and eliminate other barriers to education which will lead to a better outcome for the school districts, but most importantly the families and children of Guernsey County.

Appendix

Presenting Strategic Plan Recommendations

Instructions: This worksheet should be completed collectively by the Strategic Action Identification Workgroup. One worksheet should be completed for each preferred strategy.

Long-Term Outcome: Children and Youth Succeed in School

Success Measure(s): (1) Graduation Rate
(2) School Report Cards

Instrument/Source(s): Ohio Department of Education

Intermediate-Term Outcome: (A) Increase School Success
(B) Reduce Delinquency

Success Measure: (A-1) % Increase in student GPAs
(A-2) Completion of the OGT
(B-1) Delinquent Truancy Filings

Instrument/Source: (A) Ohio Department of Education
(B) Guernsey County Juvenile Court

Short-Term Outcome: Reduce Truancy

Success Measure: (1) Number of truanancies/absences
(2) Number of High School Drop-outs

Instrument/Source: (1) SWIS Program Data Collection – High School Data
(2) Ohio Department of Education

Strategy: School-Based Wraparound Services Team

Evidence-Base: X Evidence-based Program
 _____ Promising Program
 _____ Innovative Program

Evidence Source: The National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice
http://www.edjj.org/focus/prevention/JJ-SE_downloads.htm

Preliminary Action Steps to Prepare for Implementation

Action Step	Individual Responsible	Due Date
Identify school(s) to implement school-based wrap-around teams	SAI Workgroup	Completed
Develop Program Logistics surrounding creation of teams	PfS Core Team/Council Leadership	Month 1
Develop Program Logistics surrounding implementation of teams	PfS Implementation Workgroup	Month 1
Develop Program Logistics surrounding guidelines and requirements	PfS Implementation Workgroup	Month 2-3
Identify school-based team leaders	PfS Core Team/Council Leadership	Month 2-3
Schedule Wrap-around training for identified team leaders	PfS Implementation Workgroup	Month 3
Team Leaders Attend wrap-around training	Wrap-Around Training program	Month 3-4
Organize school training for teachers and administration about wrap-around teams and their function	PfS Implementation Workgroup/PfS Core Team	Month 4

