



State of Maryland Executive Department

Larry Hogan
Governor

Boyd K. Rutherford
Lieutenant Governor

Arlene F. Lee
Executive Director

To: Local Management Board Chairs and Points of Contact

From: Kim Malat, Deputy Director

Date: December 11, 2015

Re: Question and Answer Recap #6

-
- 1. Would you please explain the status of the requirement that a portion of Children's Cabinet-funded programs serve the "SB 882 population" regarding delinquency prevention? Are we still required to make sure that the majority of our programs serve that population? Will we be required to include this requirement in the next three or four fiscal years along with all of the other new requirements we have to meet to get State funding? If so, can you please provide us with a reminder of exactly who falls in that identified population? If not, would you please let us know what happened with that requirement?**

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 law does not require the Boards to ensure that a majority of programs fit the definition of at-risk, prevention or diversion or for the programs funded to serve a majority of youth who meet the definition of at-risk youth.

- 2. Tell me if GOC would consider the following situation. An LMB gets some federal funding, private money or any other money (other than State funds) for a program (strategy) to address one of the LMB's prioritized Results and fits well with one of the four Strategic Goals. However, the LMB is not able to get additional funding for another strategy to address another one of the LMB's prioritized Results that does not fall address one of the Strategic Goals. Will GOC consider a trade that would go something like this: Since the LMB was able to find \$100,000 in money outside of the State funds to address one of the Strategic Goals, the State will allow the LMB to use some of its Children's Cabinet funds for another project that is still an LMB priority but doesn't address one of the four Strategic Goals.**

We are sorry, but we are not able to speculate. The question does highlight the fact that there will be many variables that cannot be predicted or anticipated today. As those questions arise, the Office and the Children's Cabinet will work to address them with the Boards.

At this time, we are asking the Boards to prepare for the FY17 Notice of Funding Availability based upon an assessment of needs, the local service array, the local priorities and community input. We are making new resources available in FY17 and FY18 to address Governor Hogan's Strategic Goals and are working with Boards to transition to FY19 when the Children's Cabinet funding will be available to support one or more of the Governor's four Strategic Goals.

3. If a Local Management Board determines not to support one or more of the Governor's four Strategic Goals in FY17 and FY18, will this decision impact that LMB'S ability to apply for funding to address one or more of the Strategic Goals in FY19?

Please also see Recaps #4 and #5.

Beginning with the Notice of Funding Availability to be issued in January 2016, the process for receiving Children's Cabinet will be the same for all programs, regardless of whether they are funded under the base and by new resources. The only difference is that programs to be funded by new resources must also address one or more of the Governor's four Strategic Goals.

From FY17 through FY19 the process for base funding and new funding will require the Board to demonstrate that all proposed programs address a critical need by:

- 1.) county-specific data that shows this is a significant problem in the jurisdiction (high rate of child poverty, high rate of single mothers under 24 living in poverty, high rate of youth homelessness, etc.);
- 2.) an assessment of local resources included in the plan that shows there are no, or insufficient, programs addressing this issue/need, and;
- 3.) the members of the Board ranked the problem among the top issues needing to be addressed, above all other problems identified in the community plan, based upon input from the community and their own assessment of the data.

The application process will also require the Board to quantify the outcomes achieved by the programs to be funded (for existing programs only).

If critical need is not clearly demonstrated (in the needs of the population, the gaps in resources in the jurisdiction and the input from the community, as presented in a community plan) and outcomes are not clearly demonstrated (through performance data), the program will not be funded with Children's Cabinet funds. We believe it is a shared goal that limited resources should be used for critical needs and programs that are demonstrating an impact on those needs.

As to whether decisions by the Board about what to fund in FY17 and FY18 will impact the application for FY19, the answer is no. There are many reasons a Board might not apply for new resources in FY17 and FY18, such as needing to conduct a more thorough assessment or convening stakeholders to engage in a longer planning process. Funding for FY19 will be based upon the same criteria as outlined, the only difference will be that the programs must also address one or more of Governor Hogan's goals.

4. Can we use Earned Reinvestment as bridge money for programs that don't address one or more of the four Strategic Goals?

Yes, if the funding is one time only and a separate funding source has been secured for future funding. If this is the case, the Board would submit a request in writing to use Earned Reinvestment as one-time bridge funding for a specific program that includes documentation of the funding secured to support that program in the future.

Please be aware that a waiver of any Manual requirement may be requested whenever a Local Management Board believes it has a situation that falls outside of the requirements in the Manual and can be justified by unique circumstances.

5. What if the majority of the Disconnected Youth in our jurisdiction are just about to drop out or have not officially dropped out of school?

If youth have stopped attending school but have not officially dropped out they would fall into the definition of Disconnected Youth.

If the number of youth who are not in school and not working is very small, but a significant number of youth are on the verge of dropping out and becoming disconnected, then that jurisdiction can certainly attempt to make the case in their application that this is where they need to focus their attention. At a minimum this should include:

- 1.) data about the population that fits the definition of Disconnected Youth plus data about youth on the verge of dropping out;
- 2.) a definition of "on the verge of dropping out" and how the jurisdiction has ascertained that youth fit this definition; and
- 3.) written support from the local Workforce Investment Board that there are too few Disconnected Youth in the jurisdiction to justify programming by the Workforce Investment Board or the Local Management Board.

Local Management Boards should note that this strategy is not encouraged. However, there is no prohibition against a Board attempting to persuade the grant reviewers that the jurisdiction has a unique set of circumstances that would justify the approach taken in its application, that it is supported by key partners and that the approach will advance Governor Hogan's goals.

6. Can you clarify the example of how home visiting and family support centers can support the Governor's goals?

The examples used most frequently relate to Disconnected Youth and illustrate two different approaches; a bridge program and an integrated program. This is not meant to demonstrate how a home visiting program or family support center could be a part of a Board's proposal. Instead these are examples used to illustrate how a Board might think about bridging two separate programs or developing an integrated program.

Bridge programs: In the example of home visiting programs, it is often the case that programs are primarily working with single mothers under the age of 24 and unemployed who fall into the definition of Disconnected Youth. However, the home visiting programs are focused on healthy early childhood development. A Board might work with the local Workforce Investment Board to develop a bridge program or strategy that supports the connection of the home visiting program with a workforce development program. (Please see materials from the home visiting technical assistance session for additional examples.)

Integrated programs: In the example of a family support center, the Washington County family support center has been highlighted as an integrated approach addressing Disconnected Youth. This is a fully-integrated program that was designed to address both early childhood development and family economic success from its inception. The program has the only onsite high school program, which allows participants to complete their high school education at the family support center and graduate with a diploma, often on time and with their high school class. It also houses GED classes, workforce development and other programs, providing a range of onsite education and employment opportunities along with the services that support healthy early childhood development.

The important distinction is that an integrated program has everything onsite, the participant does not go to different places for any part of the program to assist them with their education, employment and early childhood needs. A bridge program creates a smooth, supported, facilitated transition between two separate programs, where the participant is provided assistance in accessing both programs.

As part of the assessment of existing programs in their jurisdictions Boards are encouraged to consider how to establish bridge approaches or to integrate strategies in a single location. The new resources in FY17 and FY18 will be limited and identifying opportunities that enhance or expand existing programs are strongly encouraged.

7. Is there a preference or will there be a funding priority related to the number of Governor's priorities that an LMB prioritizes?

This will be addressed in the Notice of Funding Availability. Please note that Boards should not be conducting their assessment and planning process to fit the Notice of Funding Availability. Instead, the process should be to develop the community plan with prioritized strategies which could then be proposed for Children's Cabinet funding in FY17.

8. Regarding the Results/Indicator data that is on the GOC website or otherwise maintained by GOC; can any of it be delineated by gender, race and/or financial status? If so, which ones, and may, we have that information?

Some indicators on the Office website are already disaggregated by race or ethnicity. For those that do not currently have the data broken down in that manner, it may be available disaggregated from the original source, but it is not collected in all cases. Attached, you will find **Appendix A**, which consists of a list of indicators with links to disaggregated data. We have included all of those that the Office either already collects or whose source data we can link to online.

If an indicator is not included in the list, it doesn't necessarily mean it isn't available. In some cases, we may still be able to help the Boards track down the information, either through a different data source or a proxy measure. There are a few indicators that use unpublished data from the agencies, so a request of this nature will require additional conversations. If you have a question about a specific indicator, please contact Brian Alexander at brian.alexander@maryland.gov.

In the coming months, as the Office continues to implement the Results Scorecard and plans for a corresponding overhaul of Maryland's Results for Child Well-Being report, we will seek to obtain as much granular data as possible for each of the indicators and make it available to the Local Management Boards.

9. For the Disconnected Youth and Incarceration strategic goals, will GOC be adding specific indicators to track progress at the macro-level? In order to build the community plans, we need to know what GOC would like us to track to measure success and/or need in each of those areas.

As noted at the September 10th meeting, a new indicator or two related to workforce development in the Youth Employment Result will be available in the Notice of Funding Availability. This will be the only change or addition to the Results and Indicators in the Manual. However, Boards may also include locally determined Results and Indicators, in addition to the ones used by the State and provided in the Manual.

Regarding how the Boards should measure success or needs in the new goal areas, the process would be the same for all programs for which the Boards propose for Children's Cabinet funding. Based on the assessment of needs that is part of the community planning process, the Boards should prioritize the current Results for their jurisdiction, prioritize the corresponding indicators and then determine the strategic goal to be addressed. Then, using the assessment of the service array and gaps in services as well as community input, the Board will be able to identify the appropriate strategy and the performance measures for each strategy or program.

10. Can GOC please provide technical assistance to help us fit our program into the new goals and receive funding?

The Office is not able to provide assistance designed to secure funding for any particular program. This would give one Board an advantage over the others in the competition for

funding and would violate the policies underlying the State's grant funding and procurement processes.

In addition, Boards should not be conducting their assessment and planning process to fit the parameters of the Notice of Funding Availability. The strategic planning process is a separate analysis of the needs and gaps within a jurisdiction, without regard to the Notice of Funding Availability. At this point in the planning process, the Boards may not be ready to talk about specific programs. Instead, the planning process should be to first develop the community plan to identify needs and prioritized strategies to address those needs, then to determine which of those strategies may be proposed for Children's Cabinet funding in FY17 under the Notice of Funding Availability. This process will allow the Boards to also be prepared to investigate and pursue other funding opportunities from the State, the federal government or foundations.

Should you have questions about data gathering, community needs assessments, or want general information about any of the strategic goal areas, the Office's policy analysts are happy to provide support. To ensure that the competitive grant process is as fair and neutral as possible, however, they will not be able to assist Local Management Boards in any kind of program planning prior to the grant awards.

Once grant award determinations have been made, the Office's policy analysts will be able to provide technical assistance in the implementation of approved programs.

We recognize that the change in funding priority to programs that address the four Strategic Goals may seem daunting. The Office will provide as much support as is appropriate without jeopardizing the integrity of the competitive grant process. If you have questions about any of the above, please reach out to your Board technical assistance contacts (Candy or Tracey) and they will be able to assist you in determining what technical assistance support may be appropriate and available.

Appendix A: Data Availability by Indicator:

- Infant Mortality: Available by ethnicity at the jurisdictional level in [Vital Statistics Annual Report](#)
- Low Birth Weight: Available by ethnicity at the jurisdictional level on the Office website
- Births to Adolescents: Available by ethnicity at the State level in [Vital Statistics Annual Report](#)
- Hospitalizations: Available by ethnicity at the State level on the Office website
- Deaths: Available by ethnicity at the State level on the Office website
- Obesity: Available by ethnicity and gender at the jurisdictional level from [Youth Risk Behavior Survey](#)
- Substance Use: Available by ethnicity and gender at the jurisdictional level from [Youth Risk Behavior Survey](#)
- Kindergarten Assessment: Available by gender, ethnicity, and economic status (FARMS) at the jurisdictional level on the Office website
- Maryland State Assessments: Available by ethnicity and gender at the jurisdictional level from the [Maryland Report Card](#)
- High School Assessments: Available by ethnicity and gender at the jurisdictional level from the [Maryland Report Card](#)
- Alt-MSA: Available by ethnicity and gender at the jurisdictional level from the [Maryland Report Card](#)
- Juvenile Felony Offenses: Some additional information available by ethnicity and gender in Department of Juvenile Services [Data Resource Guide](#)
- Out-of-Home Placements: Available by ethnicity and gender at the State level on the Office website