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Executive Summary: Southern Garrett Co.

In FY 16 the Southern Garrett County Judy Center partnered with and supported schools and programs in the southern portion of the county: Broad Ford Elementary, Creltin Elementary, Yough Glades Elementary, Dennett Road Head Start/Early Head classrooms, Kitzmiller Head Start, Overlook Early Head Start, St. Mark’s Christian Early Learning Center, and three Family Child Cares.

The FY 16 goal was met and exceeded. Fifty one percent (51%) demonstrated readiness for school as measured by the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA). Three of the four Headline Performance Measures were fully met. Numerous and diverse activities were planned and conducted to support achieving the goal. Extensive, varied partnership was a key factor for the action plan implementation.

The collaborative partnership with the Garrett County Public Schools was notable. That partnership expanded the Judy Center’s organization structure (Appendix A), making additional staff available so the many various activities could be carried out. The Judy Center Partnership was able to provide both specific academic support and expand outreach/services to families.

Data are presented in the report to show that all of the Required 12 Program Components were addressed. Engaging numerous partners and accomplishing copious activities were instrumental in assuring the program components were met.

Stakeholder data was obtained via Playgroup surveys and a structured brainstorming/voting process used with the teachers. The Playgroup data was 100% positive about many facets of the Playgroups. Data from the teacher group was used for planning purposes by the Partnership for the FY 17 Action Plan.

The report illustrates the Southern Garrett County Judy Center Partnership continues to use a multi-pronged approach to positively address client needs and make a difference. The data shows that the Judy Center serves as a role model for collaboration and partnering.
The Southern Garrett County Judy Center FY 16 Goal, given below, was MET. There were four Headline Performance Measures (HPMs), with eleven objectives. The four HPMs were clustered into four different focus areas: (1) High Quality Early Care and Education Practices (teacher/classroom focus); (2) Support and outreach to families with children birth to five, (3) Support Social/Emotional Development and Transition, and (4) Support Language and Literacy Development.

Numerous activities for each HPM were planned, executed, and measured. Three of the Headline Performance Measures were MET. Overall 91% of the Objectives (10/11) were MET. Only one Objective in HPM #4 was not MET.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Goal</strong></th>
<th><strong>Data</strong></th>
<th><strong>Goal MET or Not MET</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Fall 2016, the percentage of Southern Garrett County Judy Center (SGCJC) kindergarten children demonstrating readiness for kindergarten will increase to 48% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 42% as measured by the KRA.</td>
<td>The Fall 2016 Kindergarten Readiness Assessment data showed that 51% of the SGJC kindergartners were Demonstrating Readiness for school an increase of 9% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 42%.</td>
<td>The Goal was exceeded. This report will demonstrate that this Goal was exceeded as a result of the intensity of services and outreach strategies employed by the Judy Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headline Performance Measures (HPM)</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Headline Performance Measure MET or Not MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPM #1: High Quality Early Care and Education Practices.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1A.</strong> By June 2016, 75% of SGCJC kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start/Early Head Start, and child care teachers will attend four (4) or more staff development trainings /collaborative events.</td>
<td><strong>1A.</strong> By June 2016, 78% (31/40) of SGCJC kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start/Early Head Start, and child care teachers attend four (4) or more staff development trainings /collaborative events.</td>
<td>The HPM was MET. This report will show the strategies undertaken to ensure the Judy Center staff work collaboratively to align all early childhood programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1B.</strong> By June 2016, 100% of SGCJC Pre-K, Head Start, child care partners will participate in Maryland EXCELS.</td>
<td><strong>1B.</strong> By June 2016, 100% (10/10) of SGCJC Pre-K, Head Start, child care partners participated in Maryland EXCELS.</td>
<td>The HPM was MET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C.</strong> By June 2016, 100% of SGCJC classrooms will maintain or receive MSDE validation/accreditation.</td>
<td><strong>1C.</strong> By June 2016, 100% (24/24) of SGCJC classrooms maintained or received MSDE validation/ accreditation.</td>
<td>The HPM was MET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HPM #2: Provide support and outreach to families with children birth to five (5).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2A.</strong> By June 2016, the number of children attending playgroups will increase by 20% from FY 15.</td>
<td><strong>2A.</strong> By June 2016, the number of children attending playgroups increased 138% from FY 15.</td>
<td>The HPM was MET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2B.</strong> By June 2016, 80% of SGCJC parent/guardian of children that participate in Pathway Planning will complete at least one action step on their plan.</td>
<td><strong>2B.</strong> By June 2016, 88% (138/157) of SGCJC parent/guardian of children that participate in Pathway Planning completed at least one action step on their plan.</td>
<td>The HPM was MET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2C.</strong> By June 2016, SGCJC will assist 100% of families requesting assistance in achieving education and career goals.</td>
<td><strong>2C.</strong> By June 2016, SGCJC assisted 100% (69/69) of families requesting assistance in achieving education and career goals.</td>
<td>The HPM was MET.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### HPM #3: Support Social/Emotional Development and Transition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3A. By Fall 2016, the percentage of SGCJC Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Social Foundations will increase to 54% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 48% as measured by the KRA.</th>
<th>3A. By Fall 2016, the percentage of SGCJC Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Social Foundations increased to 63% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 48% as measured by the KRA.</th>
<th>The HPM was MET.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3B. By June 2016, The percentage of SGCJC pre-k and kindergarten children receiving Behavior management Intervention will be 10% lower than SY 14/15.</td>
<td>3B. By June 2016, The percentage of SGCJC pre-k and kindergarten children receiving Behavior management Intervention was 20% lower than SY 14/15.</td>
<td>The HPM was MET.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C. By August 2016, 50% of SGCJC Head Start and Child Care four (4) year olds will participate in three (3) or more transition activities at their elementary school.</td>
<td>3C. By August 2016, 62% (120/194) of SGCJC Head Start and Child Care four (4) year olds participated in three (3) or more transition activities at their elementary school.</td>
<td>The HPM was MET.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HPM #4: Support Language and Literacy Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4A. By Fall 2016, the percentage of SGCJC kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development will increase to 57% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 51% as measured by the KRA.</th>
<th>4A. By Fall 2016, the percentage of SGCJC kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development decreased to 34% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 51% as measured by the KRA.</th>
<th>The HPM was not MET.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4B. By June 2016, 100% SGCJC children in kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start or child care center receiving academic intervention will meet 75% of their goals.</td>
<td>4B. By June 2016, Fifty SGCJC children in kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start or child care center receiving academic intervention MET at least 75% or more of their goals.</td>
<td>The HPM was MET.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Southern Enrollment by Age and Partner Program for FY 16

The total enrollment for the Southern Garrett County Judy Center Program was **544**. The age and partner program data is shown separately in Table B-1. The total number enrollment shown does not include "double counting" of children who are enrolled in more than one program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th># Enrolled in JC Programs</th>
<th># in &gt; 1 Program</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Birth to three       | 169                       | 133              | 1. Overlook Early Head Start–30
2. Early Head Start Home Based–8
3. Infants and Toddlers–14
4. Early Care System of Care (Healthy Families/Early Care/EHS Home Visiting)–16
5. Annie’s Little Angel Family Child Care–6
6. Little Ones Family Child Care–4
7. St. Mark’s Christian Early Learning Center–3
8. Wrap Around Care–9
9. Others identified by Judy Center who participate in services/activities but are not enrolled in other programs–26 |
| Three year olds      | 122                       | 113              | 1. Dennett Road Head Start Center–54
2. Kitzmiller Head Start–7
3. Early Care System of Care (Healthy Families)–8
4. St. Mark’s Christian Early Learning Center–10
5. Infants & Toddlers–5
6. Annie’s Little Angel Family Child Care–2
7. Little Ones Family Child Care–2
8. Cozy Caterpillar Family Child Care–2
9. Wrap Around Child Care–5
10. Others identified by Judy Center who participate in services/activities but are not enrolled in other programs–27 |
| Four year olds       | 140                       | 134              | 1. Broad Ford PreK–40
2. Yough Glades PreK–38
3. Dennett Road Head Start Center–30
4. Kitzmiller Head Start–9
5. Annie’s Little Angel Family Child Care Center–1
6. Little One’s Family Child Care–4
7. Cozy Caterpillar Family Child Care–1 |
Southern Grant Race and Ethnicity of Children for FY 16

The population of the Southern Judy Center Program mirrors the county demographics. According to 2015 Census Bureau data, 97.4% of the Garrett County was reported as white alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Birth to 3 years</th>
<th>3 years</th>
<th>4 years</th>
<th>5 years</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>544</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Retrieved from: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045216/24023,24
Southern Students Receiving Special Services and FARM Status for FY 16

The total of 331 Southern Judy Center children eligible for Free and Reduced Price Meals (FARM) reflect only the children in programs collecting income eligibility data or participating in the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP). Some of the partner programs do not participate in the CACFP so they do not collect this income data (See Table A-3). Table A-4 gives a further breakdown by age for each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Southern Grant (N-544)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Price Meals (FARM)</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education (IEP/IFSP)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learners (ELL)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-3. Children Receiving Special Services, and FARM Status—Southern Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 to 3</th>
<th>3 year olds</th>
<th>4 year olds</th>
<th>5 year olds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Price Meals (FARM)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education (IEP/IFSP)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment (N) per Age</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A-4. Children by Age, Receiving Special Services, and FARM Status—Southern Grant (N=544)
B. Southern Enrollment History

During its 14 years of operation, the Garrett Co. Judy Center Partnership has experienced noticeable enrollment shifts. Among the most noticeable enrollment change happened in FY15 as the result of the Expansion Grant. That added new partner schools and partner programs and increased enrollment for the total program. The chart below plots the enrollment changes and shows the total FY 16 enrollment program wide; or for both the Northern and Southern Grants. In FY 15 combined enrollment was reported and referred to as “Expansion Grant”.

Enrollment History Prior to FY 16

Initially the Judy Center had partnered with two southern area Garrett County elementary schools: Yough Glades and Dennett Road. The Dennett Road School closed at the end of the 2012 school year.

With school closings and relocation of students, approximately 40% of the Judy Center children were in Yough Glades in FY 13; the remainder were redistricted to other elementary schools in southern Garrett County. In addition to Yough Glades, the Judy Center also provided services to other children residing in the attendance area.

Enrollment increased in FY 14 when the Garrett Co. Judy Center expanded into the northern portion of the county by adding the eligible classrooms in the Friendsville area. In previous reports this was referred to as the “Expansion Grant” data.

Prior to 2010 the enrollment data may have contained duplicated numbers. Beginning in FY 2010 children in two additional Head Start classrooms, located outside of the attendance area, but served children in the Yough Glades attendance area were included in the total enrollment count.

The earlier FY 08 enrollment decline is believed to be due to declines in the Early Care Systems of Care (HFGC and NFP) programs. At that time over 200 families were discharged from those programs due to budget restrictions. Between FY 10 to FY 12 the enrollment had begun an upward trend because of identification and recruitment of children birth to three not being served in other programs.

The enrollment dipped again in 2013. Some possible factors for that decline include the closing of Dennett Road Elementary School, the relocation of students to other elementary schools outside the Judy Center attendance area,
and the declining numbers of children in the county. Adding the Friendsville School, and other Friendsville based programs, yielded a small enrollment increase for FY 14.

**Expansion Grant Changes in FY 15 and Dual Grant Enrollment FY 16**

While enrollment for the Continuation Grant remained stable, the FY 15 Expansion Grant meant an additional enrollment of 434 children. The Expansion Grant added Broad Ford Elementary, Crellin Elementary, Grantsville Elementary, Grantsville Head Start/Early Head Start, and Broad Ford, Crellin and Kitzmiller Head Starts.

In FY 16 enrollment tracking shifted from the terminology of “Continuation Grant” and “Expansion Grant”. Instead enrollment was monitored and reported by Northern Grant and Southern Grant. Of the total 783 total combined enrollments, the Southern Grant in FY 16 enrolled 554 children (71%).

---

**Chart B-1. Total Number of Children Enrolled per Fiscal Year of Operation—Combined Grant Totals**
The Garrett County Public Schools were one of the Maryland counties that opted to assess all, rather than a sample, of the kindergarten children with the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment instrument. For 2016 Garrett County kindergarten children’s scores show them leading the state in readiness. The counties that did sampling, versus assessing the entire population, may have impacted state scores. MSDE data shows 33.8\(^2\) of the Maryland kindergarten children were assessed.

**Fall Composite Scores**

Chart C-1 depicts the 2014-2016 Fall Composite Scores showing the percentages of children demonstrating readiness for the Southern Judy Center Schools by JC0 (no Judy Center Experience) and JC1 (with Judy Center Experience). Percentages for the county and state are included.

The sample size for each population, over the three-year period, is reported via Table C-2 following Chart C-1. The JC0 and JC1 populations represent the entire Kindergarten population for each of the Southern schools.

The trend line for Garrett County aligns with its leading the state in 2016. The trend line for JC1 children shows an upward projection.

---

Table C-2. Fall Sample Sizes for Southern Judy Center Schools, County, and State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JC0</td>
<td>N=104</td>
<td>N=46</td>
<td>N=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC1</td>
<td>N=50</td>
<td>N=124</td>
<td>N=99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett Co</td>
<td>N=269</td>
<td>N=288</td>
<td>N=239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>N=66,281</td>
<td>N=65,070</td>
<td>N=21,359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KRA Scores by Domain

Charts C-3, C-4, and C-5 contain data for JC0, JC1, total for Kindergarten in the JC schools, county, and state. The disparity in sample size makes comparisons, especially to the state, less meaningful. The sampling done in 2016 for the state (*noted with asterisk) may have also impacted the state level data. The bars give a visual snapshot showing the JC1 students generally outperforming the students at the state level, similar to Composite score data shown in preceding chart.
Chart C-3. 2016 KRA Results by Domain Southern Grant

Chart C-4. 2015 KRA Results by Domain Southern Grant
Income differences appear consistent among all the demographic populations shown in Chart C-6. The lower income students, those who qualify for Free or Reduced Prices Meals, show lower percentages of readiness than their peers.
Similar to FARM, or income status, differences between Special Education and Non-Special Education students appear consistent between demographic groups. The percentages of non-Special Education students demonstrating readiness are higher than the corresponding sample of Special Education students. However, differences in sample sizes make comparisons both between and within the sub-groups difficult. Lack of sample size data for some of the groups also confounds comparisons.
Ethnicity, Gender, and ELL Comparisons

For the Southern Judy Center program these subgroups are not significant and thus not reported here.
D: Southern 3rd Grade PARCC Data

Spring Charts D-1 and D-2 show the Spring 2015 and Spring 2016 reading and math scores for JC1, JC0, the county, and state. Level 4, Met Expectations, is shown in lavender. Level 5, Exceeded Expectations, is represented with the turquoise color. Both of those levels are at the right of the stacked bar graphs.

Rounding errors and percentages of less than five accounts for the bar lines either exceeding or not meeting 100%. The asterisk with the JC1 category is a notation that forty-one (41) students that transferred to other schools in the county after kindergarten or were enrolled in Dennett Road Elementary School, which is now closed, are included with this group. The JC0 represents Yough Glade students without Judy Center Experience. The newer schools in the Southern Judy Center Program do not yet have Judy Center students reaching grade 3.

The PARCC has only been administered in Spring 2016 and Spring 2017. When data for multiple years becomes available the longitudinal comparison may be more meaningful and may more clearly illustrate differences—at least at the local levels of similar demographic/geographic samples.

For both Reading and Mathematics, the percentages of JC1 children at Levels 4 and 5 are fairly comparable to their Garrett County peers and higher than the JC0 peer group. The small sample size also limits the robustness of the data.
Chart D-1. PARCC Reading Scores 2015 and 2016

Chart D-2. PARCC Math Scores 2015 and 2016
FY 16 Goal: Southern Grant

By Fall 2016, the percentage of Southern Garrett County Judy Center (SGCJC) kindergarten children demonstrating readiness for kindergarten will increase to 48% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 42% as measured by the KRA.

Goal Measurement Data

The Fall 2016 Kindergarten Readiness Assessment data showed that 51% of the Southern Garrett County Judy Center kindergarten students were Demonstrating Readiness for school. This represents an increase of 9% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 42%.

Goal Status

The Goal was achieved. The goal was exceeded as a result of the intensity, complexity, and diversity of services and outreach strategies employed by the Judy Center Partnership. As shown in the next section of this report, the activities were numerous, diverse, and conducted with a wide variety of partners. Some activities were broad in nature, while others were more specifically focused.

While some of the Judy Center’s partners are family/adult focused, the Judy Center’s more unique ability to engage families with both the children’s activities, as well as with adult education and case management, helps the families to be partners in supporting their children’s school readiness as well.

The expanded collaborative partnership (Organization Chart, Appendix A) with the Garrett County Public Schools, with the school system’s focus on academics, has also helped the Judy Center to outreach and address families as an essential element to turning the curve.
The Southern Garrett County Judy Center had four Headline Performance Measures for FY16. Each of the four Headline Performance Measures (HPMs) is shown below in tables with columns for Objective, Data, and Status. For each HPM, (a) the number of action plan items planned and completed is noted, (b) the partners involved are identified by frequency of involvement, (c) a partner roles overview is given as narrative, and (d) the corresponding components addressed per objective are charted by frequency.

The Action Plan contained numerous activities for each of the HPMs. The specifics of each of the planned activities exceed the scope of this report. A detailed listing of numerous activities can be found in the Mid Year and End of Year Reports submitted to MSDE.

The Action Plan also included a listing of additional activities that do not directly pertain to the HPMs discussed here. Those collaborative activities involve various partners and each address two or more of the Required Program Components.

Implications and Assumptions Regarding the HPMs and Partner Involvement

The data presented in this section, especially the partner information, illustrates some noticeable patterns, trends, and assumptions. Some of those are:

- The Judy Center partners well with many other organizations or programs. That is especially true in terms of the partnership they have developed with the GC Public Schools.
- The Judy Center has numerous partners because of how well they collaborate and partner with others.
- The Judy Center partners apparently recognize the value of the partnership based on the partners continued involvement each year.
- The Judy Center’s extensive numbers of partners are engaged by varying degrees. Some partners have very limited or specific, yet important, involvement.
- The partners provide both tangible support (e.g., swim wear) and intangible support (e.g., trainings and professional expertise).
- The activities planned and conducted by the Judy Center are so numerous and diverse that all of the 12 Required Program Components are repeatedly addressed. The extensive list of partners also facilitates the Judy Center in addressing all of the components.
• The Judy Center is outstanding in addressing the Partnership Leadership Component; they serve as a role model for other partners.

• The Judy Center’s collaborative partnership with Public Schools is evident by the level of Public School involvement in so many of the activities.

• The Judy Center’s more formal collaborative partnering with the Public Schools has enabled the School system to take more of the academic classroom lead. That frees up and allows the Judy Center staff to focus more on their unique mission work: supporting children and families in achieving school readiness, while also continuing to support teachers.

In FY 16, one of the many examples of collaboration was the Mobile Outreach Bus that began in June 2016. That initiative was led and coordinated by the Judy Center.

The Judy Center respects and listens to their partners. For instance, In FY 16 the Judy Center surveyed the teachers using the foot survey method (reported in Section G). Dealing with challenging behaviors was identified by the teachers as a major concern. As a result of that finding, in FY 17 the Judy Center collaborated to provide SEFEL training. The spring joint staff development training focused on working with children that were born drug/alcohol addicted.

**HPM #1: High Quality Early Care and Education Practices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1A.</strong> By June 2016, 75% of SGCJC kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start/Early Head Start, and child care teachers will attend four (4) or more staff development trainings /collaborative events.</td>
<td><strong>1A.</strong> By June 2016, 78% (31/40) of SGCJC kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start/Early Head Start, and child care teachers attend four (4) or more staff development trainings /collaborative events.</td>
<td><strong>MET</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1B.</strong> By June 2016, 100% of SGCJC Pre-K, Head Start, child care partners will participate in Maryland EXCELS.</td>
<td><strong>1B.</strong> By June 2016, 100% (10/10) of SGCJC Pre-K, Head Start, child care partners participated in Maryland EXCELS.</td>
<td><strong>MET</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C.</strong> By June 2016, 100% of SGCJC classrooms will maintain or receive MSDE validation/accreditation.</td>
<td><strong>1C.</strong> By June 2016, 100% (24/24) of SGCJC classrooms maintained or received MSDE validation/accreditation.</td>
<td><strong>MET</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-1. Headline Performance Measure #1—Southern Grant
**Action Plan HPM #1**

The Southern Judy Center had 15 items on the Action Plan to achieve HPM #1. All 15 activities were conducted and completed.

**Partners Supporting HPM #1**

Sixteen different programs and organizations partnered with the Southern Judy Center to successfully address this HPM. Chart F-2 shows the partners and their frequency of participation.

![Chart F-2. Partners Supporting HPM #1—Southern Grant](image)

**Partner Roles HPM #1**

Partners played various roles. Such as, but not limited to: training/technical for accreditation and/or validation; providing classroom supplies & materials; training coordination; sponsoring conference attendance; supporting Race to the Top Initiative; and tracking/data maintenance.

**Components Addressed HPM #1**

Chart C-F 3 shows 67% (8/12) of the 12 Required Program Components were addressed. One component, Judy Center Partnership and Partnership, was addressed by each of the 15 activities performed to achieve HPM #1.
HPM #2: Provide Support and Outreach to Families with Children Birth to Five (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2A.</strong> By June 2016, the number of children attending playgroups will increase by 20% from FY 15.</td>
<td><strong>2A.</strong> By June 2016, the number of children attending playgroups increased 138% from FY 15.</td>
<td><strong>MET</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2B.</strong> By June 2016, 80% of SGCJC parent/guardian of children that participate in Pathway Planning will complete at least one action step on their plan.</td>
<td><strong>2B.</strong> By June 2016, 88% (138/157) of SGCJC parent/guardian of children that participate in Pathway Planning completed at least one action step on their plan.</td>
<td><strong>MET</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2C.</strong> By June 2016, SGCJC will assist 100% of families requesting assistance in achieving education and career goals.</td>
<td><strong>2C.</strong> By June 2016, SGCJC assisted 100% (69/69) of families requesting assistance in achieving education and career goals.</td>
<td><strong>MET</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-4. Headline Performance Measure #2—Southern Grant

**ACTION PLAN HPM #2**
The Action Plan to address the three objectives with HPM #2 had 26 planned activities—an aggressive number. All 26 activities were conducted and all of the objectives were met.

**Partners Supporting HPM #2**

Chart F-5 shows the 17 different partners who supported this HPM and the frequency of their respective involvement with the numerous activities.

**Partner Roles HPM #2**

Partners played various roles. Such as, but not limited to: service coordination/case management; academic and behavior support; plan and conduct playgroups; disseminate literature; coordinate family outings; career and economic development via courses/workshops; field trip funding; support mobile classroom; various outreach services; and expanded parent resource rooms.

**Components Addressed HPM #2**

All of the 12 Required Program Components were addressed, some more than others, via the HPM #2 activities.
HPM #3: Support Social/Emotional Development and Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A.</strong> By Fall 2016, the percentage of SGCJC Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Social Foundations will increase to 54% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 48% as measured by the KRA.</td>
<td><strong>3A.</strong> By Fall 2016, the percentage of SGCJC Judy Center kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Social Foundations increased to 63% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 48% as measured by the KRA.</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3B.</strong> By June 2016, the percentage of SGCJC pre-k and kindergarten children receiving Behavior management Intervention will be 10% lower than SY 14/15.</td>
<td><strong>3B.</strong> By June 2016, The percentage of SGCJC pre-k and kindergarten children receiving Behavior management Intervention was 20% lower than SY 14/15.</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3C.</strong> By August 2016, 50% of SGCJC Head Start and Child Care four (4) year olds will participate in three (3) or more transition activities at their elementary school.</td>
<td><strong>3C.</strong> By August 2016, 62% (120/194) of SGCJC Head Start and Child Care four (4) year olds participated in three (3) or more transition activities at their elementary school.</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-7. Headline Performance Measure #3—Southern Grant
**Action Plan HPM #3**

A total of 12 different activities were planned to address HPM #3. A review of the mid-year and end of year reports submitted to MSDE shows all the planned activities were completed.

**Partners Supporting HPM #3**

Chart F-8 shows the nine partners the Southern Judy Center Program collaborated with to accomplish the three objectives for HPM #3.

![Chart F-8. Partners Supporting HPM #3—Southern Grant](chart)

**Partner Roles HPM #3**

Partners played various roles. Such as, but not limited to: behavioral intervention support using Response to Intervention Framework (RIF); supporting alignment to MD Common Core; providing parent education activities; providing health and nutrition activities; converting data to usable chart formats, coordinating Parent Cafés; supporting Second Step; arranging various transition activities, and providing SEFEL training.

**Components Addressed HPM #3**

Eleven (92%) of the 12 Required Program Components were addressed by the activities conducted to achieve HPM #3. The component, Integration of Early Education Services, is the one most directly aligned with the HPM.
HPM #4: Support Language and Literacy Development

Table F-10 has the two objectives for HPM #4. One of objectives was not met. That is the only unmet objective associated with all four of the HPMs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4A.</strong> By Fall 2016, the percentage of SGCJC kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development will increase to 57% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 51% as measured by the KRA.</td>
<td><strong>4A.</strong> By Fall 2016, the percentage of SGCJC kindergarten children demonstrating readiness in Language and Literacy development decreased to 34% from the Fall 2014 baseline of 51% as measured by the KRA.</td>
<td><strong>NOT MET</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4B.</strong> By June 2016, 100% SGCJC children in kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start or child care center receiving academic intervention will meet 75% of their goals.</td>
<td><strong>4B.</strong> By June 2016, Fifty SGCJC children in kindergarten, pre-k, Head Start or child care center receiving academic intervention MET at least 75% or more of their goals.</td>
<td><strong>MET</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table F-10. Headline Performance Measure #4—Southern Grant
ACTION PLAN HPM #4

The Action Plan for HPM #4 had 11 activities. All eleven activities were accomplished.

PARTNERS SUPPORTING HPM #4

Ten partners collaborated with the Southern Judy Center with HPM #4. Some of the partners, such as the Lion’s Club, only partnered for one specific activity. However their partnering was essential to making that one important activity happen.

![Chart F-11. Partners Supporting HPM #4—Southern Grant](chart)

PARTNER ROLES HPM #4

Partners played various roles. Such as, but not limited to: providing vision and hearing screenings; extra support using Response to Intervention Framework (RIF); reading and library promotions; providing additional language and literacy activities; maintain/promote parent lending library; generating data charts and graphs for individualized curriculum development; and supporting take home materials.

COMPONENTS ADDRESSED HPM #4

Chart F-12 shows 83% (10/12) of the Required Program Components were incorporated into the HPM #4 activities.
Chart F-12. Components Addressed Via HPM #4—Southern Grant
Two different populations were surveyed in FY 16. Parents attending Playgroups had the opportunity to complete a questionnaire. Teachers were actively engaged in data collection using a “foot voting” method.

**Playgroup Survey**

Playgroups, as way to engage and inform parents, are one of the services that the Judy Center program is able to provide for families and the Judy Center partners. Playgroups are planned activities in support of the HPM #2, to provide support and outreach to families with children birth to age five. The Playgroups, held in schools, serve as another important transition activity for the children. The Playgroups also help parents to become familiar and comfortable with their child’s school.

The appeal of the Playgroups was evident for the Southern Garrett County Judy Center. By June 2016, the number of children attending playgroups increased 138% from FY 15.

Children’s books were used an incentives to encourage parents to complete the Playgroup Survey. Surveys were distributed in envelopes marked: “Please complete the enclosed Judy Center Playgroup survey and return to staff to received a free book. Thank you. We appreciate your input!” Parents were instructed to put the completed surveys back in the envelopes. A signature was optional. However, based on the nine (56%, N=16) that provided signatures, two were male names (perhaps fathers) and one indicated being the grandmother.

The survey (see Appendix B for blank survey copy) consisted of 17 ranking statements and open-ended space for comments or suggestions for improvement. The first two questions were focused on staff performance. The last eight questions were “I” statements to be answered from the parent’s perspective. The other questions were focused on the children or the playgroup itself.

All of the completed surveys (N=16) were positive with either Strongly Agree or Agree responses. The options for Disagree and Strongly Disagree were not selected by any of the respondents. The survey did not have a Neutral or Not Applicable option assuming the respondents would have some experience or knowledge regarding the question being asked.
The first two questions about staff—friendly, caring, and making children and parents feel welcomed—had 100% Strongly Agree responses. The remaining 15 questions had a mix of Strongly Agree or Agree responses.

The question with the lowest number of Strongly Agree responses (56%) was #16: “I have become friends with other Playgroup parents.” The next lowest in Strongly Agree responses (63%) was question #11: “I am learning new things about my child’s unique strengths and/or needs.” This last item might possibility be seen as an area where staff can develop new strategies. Or, it may be an area to target more specifically in future surveys. For instance, if examples of some strengths or behavioral characteristics were listed on a survey, would that prompt the parents to more easily recognize the new information they have been gaining as they attend the playgroups.

Eight parents (50%) provided the comments shown in the table below.

| 1. I recommend you to other parents all the time. |
| 2. Love the playgroup. We plan to attend again. The staff is so great to the children. |
| 3. This is a great experience for my child. She loves it and talks about it for days. |
| 4. We love playgroup! [Child’s name] is always so excited about the activities, especially craft time. It is as beneficial for me as for my daughter. |
| 5. I never have to beg children to go to playgroup. They look forward to it. |
| 6. You all are doing a great job! |
| 7. We had a good time! Thank you! |
| 8. They enjoy it. |

Table G-1: Parent Playgroup Survey Comments (N=16)
Teacher Survey

Faced with concerns about teachers developing “survey burnout” from being asked each year to complete a questionnaire, coupled with not getting a 100% response rate, a different method of teacher data collected was used. The Judy Center staff wanted a way to have all teachers participate in the data collection and to have teachers voice their own opinions and concerns. The Judy Center took advantage of a Teacher Training day to have access to the majority of the teachers.

Foot Voting Methodology

An alternative method, that one of the evaluators was familiar with and had previously coined “Foot Voting” was used. This methodology involved using prepared charts, hung in different corners of the meeting room.

Three questions with response options were used. The questions and directions were given via PowerPoint slides (see Appendix C). For each question teachers had to go to the chart of their choice and brainstorm their ideas: what drew them to that chart; what ideas/suggestions did they have for addressing that topic, etc. A facilitator recorded the ideas on the respective charts. The number of teachers per chart was noted to determine which response drew the largest number of teachers. Forty-six teachers participated.

The pros to this method were that each teacher had to “vote with his/her feet” or have some input; all teachers had to move from their seats and be somewhat physically engaged. Since this was done during a training day the teachers did not have to use planning time or use their own free time to complete an electronic survey. The method allowed teachers to have more latitude to express, and in their own words, what they wanted to see happen in FY 17. It also, hopefully, created more ownership and buy-in on the teacher’s part.

Some con’s were: teachers did not necessarily have to speak up during the brainstorming sessions at the charts; the accuracy of how well the brainstormed ideas were captured and if all ideas were captured; and there was some overlap of ideas when the charted data was transcribed.

The graph below shows the frequency results of the “voting” process—or the number of teachers who selected a specific response. The brain storming information from the charts was later transcribed. The qualitative raw data from the transcribed charts showed some overlaps or discrepancies with using just frequency for planning purposes. For example, Behavior Management suggestions showed up in the Behavior Management response option for both questions #1 and #2, but it was also mentioned in the responses for Other
Suggestions and Social Emotional Development response options. As a result of the number and type of comments, SEFEL and other behavior management training was made available. The specificity of some of the comments, such as the name of a preferred presenter, was also data that was used for planning purposes.

Chart G-2: Teacher “Foot Voting” Survey Frequencies (N=46)
H: Southern Recommendations

Given the positive performance of the Judy Center program, as evidenced by the goal achievement and number of objectives met, it is difficult to offer recommendations as requested for this section.

At this stage we recommend that the Judy Center basically “stay the course”. From this year and previous years, there is a history of their planned activities and leadership being what is needed to turn the curve. We recommend the Judy Center continue to use data from partners, and continue to work with their partners, to plan the HPMs and supporting activities.

However, there is one specific recommendation linked to the drop in base line data as noted with HPM #4, Objective 4A. We recommend that the four-year old children, not in PreK, but in Head Start classes with three-year old children, be given more targeted time with the Judy Center academic teacher. If the numbers warrant a separate Head Start class of four-year old children could be another option to consider.

The evaluators’ interaction and work with the staff during the year to develop data collection instruments is perhaps a more meaningful and timely way to make recommendations. As evaluators, we make recommendations in support of the type of data to be collected, how to collect that data, as well as discuss with the program how they plan to use that data.

In FY 17 the teachers could again be surveyed with an electronic questionnaire. In addition to teacher input for training and other support topics, teachers can be queried for both possible changes and for evidence of service delivery.

If the Playgroup parents are to be surveyed again, that survey could be modified to be similar to a parent survey used in a previous evaluation. Previously parents were asked to address changes in their own behavior as a result of Judy Center experience (transfer of learning). Questions about what changes they may have observed in other parents who attend the playgroups may also provide insights about changes that they don’t as easily observe in themselves.
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Appendix B: Playgroup Survey

Garrett County Judy Center Playgroup Survey

Please circle the number by each statement to show your level of agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The Playgroup Staff are friendly and caring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) My child and I feel welcomed at Playgroup.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Playgroups have a happy atmosphere.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) My child enjoys coming to Playgroups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Playgroups meet my expectations. If not, what expectation hasn’t been met?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Playgroup activities are well planned, matching the interests and age of the children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) My child is learning about getting along with other children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) My child learns new things at Playgroup.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Playgroup activities are helping my child to be ready for school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) I am learning more about play activities I can do with my child.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) I am learning new things about my child’s unique strengths and/or needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) I am learning more about what skills and behaviors are appropriate for my child’s age.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) I am pleased with the snacks provided during Playgroups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) I will bring my child to Playgroups again.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) I would recommend Playgroups to other parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) I have become friends with other Playgroup parents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) I have received other information at Playgroups that is useful to me as a parent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give us any comments or suggestions that could improve the Playgroups for you and your child/children?

___________________________________
___________________________________
___________________________________

Your Name (Optional)

If you would like the Judy Center to contact you please provide your phone number here:

___________________________________
Appendix C: Teacher Survey

Cast Your Vote

All teachers here—directly or indirectly—are part of the Judy Center Partnership

Your Vote Counts in the Judy Center Partnership FY 17 Planning Process

Math Lesson: Units of Measurement starting with King Henry I in 1100

Voting with your feet

No special ballots or shoes needed!

The term “foot voting” was coined by Dr. Coddington.

The Voting Process
1. A question will be shown on a slide.
2. There will be 4 options with the question.
3. Each option will also be on a chart.
4. After all options are shown, “vote” using your feet to move to the option you prefer.
5. Please “vote” with your initial, gut-reaction response.
6. Stay at that chart for a group discussion.

After going to your option chart
1. Select a facilitator and a scribe (note taker) to discuss that option.
2. Do quick bullet style notes.
3. Rules of brainstorming—all ideas count—try to capture all of them.
4. You will have 10 minutes or less; please act and think quickly going.
For Example: What is your favorite ice cream flavor?

1. Vanilla
2. Chocolate
3. Boysenberry
4. Peach

Q1. For next year, which area should be the primary focus area for the JCP’s HPM/Objectives?

1. Social/Emotional Development
2. Language and Literacy
3. STEAM
4. Behavior Management

Q2. What area of Professional Development do you want or need next year?

1. Language and Literacy
2. STEAM
3. Behavior Management
4. Other: Your Suggestions Required

Q3. What activity is most beneficial in supporting Transition to K or PreK?

1. Summer Camps
2. Opportunities to Visit School: Tour & Lunch, Reading Groups, Assemblies, Playgroups, etc.
3. Summer Activity Packets
4. Registration/Orientation