2000 Report to the Community on Outcomes and Indicators
Our **Vision** is that Montgomery County is a place where families, children and adults live in safe, supportive neighborhoods, care for and respect one another, value each other, and succeed in school, the workplace and life.

The **Mission** of the Montgomery County Family and Children First Council is to serve as a catalyst to foster interdependent solutions among public and private community partners to achieve the vision for the health and well-being of families, children and adults.
December 2000

Dear Community Member,

Two years ago the Montgomery County Family and Children First Council published *Turning The Curve: Report to the Community on Outcomes and Indicators*. In that report the Council described the Community Outcomes that we collectively are striving to achieve and presented some historical and comparative Indicator data that we can use to measure our progress.

We also pledged to issue reports on a regular basis. This publication, the 2000 *Report to the Community on Outcomes and Indicators*, is our second annual update of *Turning The Curve*. As with last year’s report you will see that some – but not all – of the trends that the Council is tracking are moving in the desired direction.

As we have emphasized in all of our discussions about Outcomes and Indicators, the whole purpose of developing the tools for “results-based accountability” is to focus on improvement. Collecting these data and analyzing these trends are important and necessary first steps, but the ultimate test is what we do in response.

What is the Council doing? Spurred by these data the Council unveiled in last year’s report three Strategic Community Initiatives:

- Promoting School Readiness and Fourth Grade Success;
- Promoting Alternative Learning Opportunities; and
- Preventing Family Violence.

This year the Champions who have been leading the Initiatives report on their efforts. You will see that they have assembled talented and broad-based teams to develop specific recommendations, a number of which have already been set in motion. You will also see that “turning the curve” requires us all to continue to work together in order to achieve our common Outcomes.

Sincerely,

Laurence P. Harkness
President and CEO, The Children’s Medical Center
Chair, Montgomery County Family and Children First Council
# Table of Contents

Introduction .................................................................................................................. 3
Discussion ....................................................................................................................... 4

## Indicators

- Low Birthweight ........................................................................................................... 5
- Air Quality .................................................................................................................... 6
- Years of Potential Life Lost ....................................................................................... 7
- Student Proficiency .................................................................................................... 8
- Public School Attendance ......................................................................................... 12
- Teen Pregnancy .......................................................................................................... 13
- Avoiding Poverty ......................................................................................................... 14
- Domestic Violence Deaths ....................................................................................... 15
- Child Deaths ............................................................................................................... 16
- Violent Crimes ............................................................................................................ 17
- Property Crimes .......................................................................................................... 18
- Unemployment ........................................................................................................... 19
- Per Capita Effective Buying Income ........................................................................ 20

## Strategic Community Initiatives

- Promoting School Readiness and Fourth Grade Success ........................................... 22
- Promoting Alternative Learning Opportunities ......................................................... 24
- Preventing Family Violence ...................................................................................... 26

## Champions’ Reports

- Council Membership ................................................................................................. 28
- Outcomes .................................................................................................................... 29
- Data Sources ............................................................................................................. 29
Introduction

As a community we are interested in improving our overall quality of life. To help measure our progress in this area, the Montgomery County Family and Children First Council has created a “tool kit”. The tools – Outcomes, Indicators, Targets and Milestones – help focus discussion on specific actions and strategies we can take to get better results. For more information about our results-based accountability model please see our previous reports, Turning the Curve (1998) and the 1999 Report to the Community on Outcomes and Indicators.

A brief description of the tools follows:

**Outcomes** are conditions of well-being and are, by their nature, general and descriptive. Many communities across the country have started to use this tool, especially in the last few years. Locally, the Montgomery County Family and Children First Council has articulated six Outcomes (inside of the rear cover for easy reference).

**Indicators** are measurable attributes of the community (as opposed to Outcomes which, by their nature, are non-measurable). In Montgomery County we have chosen to begin with a small number for each Outcome. If these few Indicators are moving in the desired direction, then we feel we are making progress toward achieving that Outcome.

**Targets** represent the numerical goals for the Indicators in the near-term future. The Targets announced in Turning the Curve (1998) were set with the 2003 Report in mind, meaning that most of them are for 2002 data.

**Milestones** provide an approximate way of determining whether progress toward a given Target is sufficiently aggressive during the reporting periods prior to the 2003 Report.

---

**How Is Improvement Measured?**

1. Articulate Outcomes
2. Identify, track and report Indicator data
3. Set Targets
4. Monitor progress along Milestones
A few words about the graphs and charts (pages 5 to 20)

- They are grouped according to the Outcomes.
- All of them show historical or trend data for Montgomery County.
- Some of them also show data for the nation, the state, and/or the ten largest counties in Ohio.

Thus we will always have an analysis of our own progress on each Indicator. We can also compare ourselves whenever possible to the nation, state, and/or other counties.

- On each page we have made brief comments on each Indicator, called attention to the specific data points collected since the last report, and then commented on the short-term trend.
- Targets are represented both in graphs and in county comparative ranking charts.

Further information on each Indicator is available in Turning The Curve.

The Trends

We define a trend as “the direction of the change when comparing the most recent data with the data for the preceding year”. The trend is in the “desired direction” if either the value or the rank (where both are applicable) has changed in the desired direction, or if the value has remained unchanged. Using this definition we observe that eight trends (out of sixteen) are in the desired direction. In last year’s report eleven trends were reported to be in the desired direction.

Of the eleven trends that were identified in last year’s report as being in the desired direction, six remained in the desired direction. Altogether seven trends have been in the desired direction for one, but not both, of the last two years. The remaining three trends have not been in the desired direction in either of the last two years.

A note about the “Positive Living for Special Populations” Outcome

The Council did not originally adopt any Indicators for the Positive Living for Special Populations Outcome. We have now collected and analyzed some baseline data related to this Outcome. This work will soon result in a set of established Indicators.
Background:
The term “low birthweight” is used to describe babies born with a weight less than 2,500 grams, or 5 lbs. 8 oz. Babies with higher birthweights are more likely to begin life with a healthy start and to have mothers who had prenatal care and who did not smoke or drink during pregnancy. Strategies to affect birthweight are focused on education and prevention.

New Data:
The provisional value for Montgomery County for 1999 was 8.7%. The final 1998 value was 7.8%, the same as the provisional value reported in the 1999 Report to the Community on Outcomes and Indicators. The 1999 provisional value for the United States was 7.6%.

Short-term Trends:
The 1999 provisional low birthweight value for Montgomery County is not moving in the desired direction when compared with the 1998 value. The 1999 urban Ohio county values are not yet available for comparison.
Air Quality

Outcome: Healthy People

Indicator: Air Quality

Background:
Air quality is measured by an index that considers various pollutants in different jurisdictions. These pollutants affect the clean air that people need to breathe.

New Data:
The percentage of good air quality days in Montgomery County in 1999 was 71%, or 259 days. The percentage of good air quality days for the state of Ohio in 1998 was 73%, or 266 days.

Short-term Trends:
The value is moving in the desired direction and the comparative ranking among counties is moving in a positive direction. There was an increase in the number of good air days monitored in Montgomery County and in Ohio from 1998 to 1999.

1997
1. Lorain 83%
2. Mahoning 83%
3. Lucas 81%
4. Franklin 78%
5. Summit 78%
6. Montgomery 77%
7. Stark 76%
8. Butler 73%
9. Hamilton 71%
10. Cuyahoga 62%

1998
1. Lorain 81%
2. Lucas 75%
3. Mahoning 75%
4. Summit 71%
5. Montgomery 70%
6. Franklin 67%
7. Stark 66%
8. Hamilton 64%
9. Butler 63%
10. Cuyahoga 57%

TARGET

Montgomery 90%

Among the top 3 counties

Number of Days Measuring "Good" on the Pollution Standard Index as a Percentage of Days Monitored
**Outcome:** Healthy People

**Indicator:** Years of Potential Life Lost

**Background:**
Premature mortality is measured by the Years of Potential Life Lost (YPLL) statistic. The figure is calculated as the sum of the difference between the average age of death for each age group, and age 75 for each death. The method of calculation gives greater computational weight to deaths among younger persons and does not include deaths after 75 years of age. The YPLL statistic reflects the preventability of early deaths through changes in lifestyle, reduction of substance abuse and behavior modification. Smaller values of YPLL are desired.

**New Data:**
The provisional value for 1999 was 81.2. The final value for 1998 was 81.1 for YPLL per 1,000 people under 75 years, which replaces the provisional value of 74, as reported in the 1999 Report to the Community on Outcomes and Indicators. The Montgomery County value for YPLL was higher than Ohio’s value of 75.8 and the United States’ value of 76.9.

**Short-term Trends:**
The value for this Indicator is not moving in the desired direction for Montgomery County. The provisional value for 1999 is slightly higher than the final value for 1998. Data for urban Ohio counties for 1999 are not yet available for comparison.

### 1996
1. Stark 72
2. Summit 74
3. Hamilton 78
4. Lucas 80
5. Montgomery 84
6. Cuyahoga 86
7. Franklin 87
8. Mahoning 96
9. Butler n/a
10. Lorain n/a

### 1997
1. Summit 69.3
2. Lorain 69.5
3. Stark 70.3
4. Hamilton 73.7
5. Lucas 76.6
6. Butler 77.1
7. Franklin 79.6
8. Montgomery 83.5
9. Cuyahoga 85.6
10. Mahoning 90.4

### 1998
1. Lorain 65.6
2. Stark 67.5
3. Lucas 71.1
4. Summit 74.2
5. Hamilton 74.4
6. Butler 77.9
7. Cuyahoga 78.3
8. Franklin 79.3
9. Montgomery 81.1
10. Mahoning 90.7

### TARGET
Montgomery 76.7

Among the top 3 counties

---

**Total Years of Potential Life Lost for Deaths to People under 75 per 1,000 People Under 75**

* 1999 Montgomery County data are provisional.
Outcome: Young People Succeeding

Indicator: Student Proficiency - 4th Grade

Background:
Ohio students are currently required to take fourth, sixth, ninth, and twelfth grade proficiency tests in several academic areas. The Family and Children First Council set targets for the percentage of students passing all portions of each grade’s examination. By convention, data are reported for the year in which a school year ends.

New Data:
The percentage of Montgomery County students who passed all portions of the fourth grade exams was 26.7 in 2000. Montgomery County’s rank among urban Ohio counties remained at ninth in 2000. The percentage of students in the state of Ohio who passed all portions of the exams in 2000 was 31.0.

Short-term Trends:
The value is not moving in the desired direction. The comparative ranking among counties remained the same. Standards for test scores were changed in 1999. Since then the values for all the urban counties and the state of Ohio have followed a downward trend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Butler</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stark</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lorain</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summit</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mahoning</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Franklin</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cuyahoga</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hamilton</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lucas</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Montgomery</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mahoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cuyahoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lorain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Montgomery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lucas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery 34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the top 5 counties

1998
1. Butler 41.4
2. Stark 39.0
3. Lorain 37.4
4. Summit 37.3
5. Mahoning 37.0
6. Franklin 36.8
7. Cuyahoga 36.4
8. Hamilton 34.4
9. Lucas 31.0
10. Montgomery 30.9

2000
1. Butler 34.0
2. Mahoning 33.3
3. Summit 32.9
4. Stark 32.8
5. Franklin 31.2
6. Cuyahoga 31.2
7. Hamilton 28.4
8. Lorain 27.7
9. Montgomery 26.7
10. Lucas 21.2

Note: 1995-1998 percentages can be compared. In 1999, the standard for passing was raised.
**Outcome:** Young People Succeeding

**Indicator:** Student Proficiency - 6th Grade

**Background:**
Ohio students are currently required to take fourth, sixth, ninth, and twelfth grade proficiency tests in several academic areas. The Family and Children First Council set targets for the percentage of students passing all portions of each grade’s examination. By convention, data are reported for the year in which a school year ends.

**New Data:**
In 2000, 29.9% of Montgomery County students passed all portions of the 6th grade proficiency examination. Montgomery County’s comparative rank among urban counties was tenth in 2000. The statewide value for sixth graders was 36.0% in 2000.

**Short-term Trends:**
The value of this Indicator is moving in the desired direction, however, the comparative ranking among counties moved from seventh to tenth. The percentage of Ohio students who passed all portions of the 2000 sixth grade proficiency tests is higher than the percentage of Montgomery County students who passed all portions of the exams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Butler</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stark</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mahoning</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summit</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hamilton</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lorain</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Montgomery</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Franklin</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lucas</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cuyahoga</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000</th>
<th><strong>TARGET</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Butler</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mahoning</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hamilton</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stark</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Summit</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Franklin</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cuyahoga</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lorain</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lucas</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Montgomery</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of 6th Grade Students Passing All Tests**

- Montgomery County
- Ohio
- Target
- Milestones

Among the top 5 counties
Background:
Ohio students are currently required to take fourth, sixth, ninth, and twelfth grade proficiency tests in several academic areas. The Family and Children First Council set targets for the percentage of students passing all portions of each grade’s examination. By convention, data are reported for the year in which a school year ends.

New Data:
Of the Montgomery County students who took the ninth grade proficiency tests in the 2000 school year, 43.1% passed all portions. The statewide value for 2000 was 45.9%.

Target for 2000:
In general the targets announced by the FCFC in Turning the Curve were set with the 2003 Report in mind. However, because it was known that the ninth grade proficiency test was going to be phased out in 2000, we set this Target for the year 2000: that at least 38.3% of students would pass all ninth grade proficiency tests on the first time taken, and that Montgomery County would be one of the top 5 counties in the comparative ranking.

Montgomery County’s ninth graders surpassed the target value (43.1% actual vs. 38.3% target) but did not achieve the target rank (9th actual vs. top 5 target).

The ninth grade proficiency test will be replaced by the High School Graduation Qualifying Examination beginning in 2003. Therefore it is not feasible at this time to set a new target for the 2003 Report.

Note: These data represent 8th grade students taking the 9th grade exam for the first time.

Note: Scores for 2000 represent the last group of students required to pass the 9th grade Proficiency Tests. Any student who graduates after September 15, 2004 will be required to pass the new High School Graduation Qualifying Examinations.
**Outcome:** Young People Succeeding

**Indicator:** Student Proficiency - 12th Grade

**Background:**
Ohio students are currently required to take fourth, sixth, ninth, and twelfth grade proficiency tests in several academic areas. The Family and Children First Council set targets for the percentage of students passing all portions of each grade’s examination. By convention, data are reported for the year in which a school year ends.

**New Data:**
The 2000 value for Montgomery County students who passed all portions of the twelfth grade proficiency exams was 44.6%. The value for Ohio for 2000 was 44.0%.

**Short-term Trends:**
The value and the comparative ranking are moving in the desired direction. Montgomery County’s rank among urban Ohio counties has moved up from fifth to fourth. Montgomery County students passed the twelfth grade proficiency exam at a higher rate than Ohio students.

**Percentage of 12th Grade Students Passing All Tests**

Note: In 1996, the standard for passing was raised from previous years, and in 1998 it was raised again. 1998 data are reported for both the old (1996) standard and the new (1998) standard. Using the old standard, 1996, 1997 and 1998 data can be compared.
Indicator: Public School Attendance

Outcome: Young People Succeeding

Background:
The attendance of all students, Kindergarten through twelfth grade, receiving instruction in a Montgomery County school district is considered for this Indicator.

New Data:
The attendance for Montgomery County schools for the 1998-99 school year was 91.4%. Attendance in Ohio schools for the 1998-99 school year was 93.5%.

Short-term Trends:
The value is not moving in the desired direction and the comparative ranking among counties moved from ninth to tenth place. There has been a slight decrease in the percentage of student attendance in Montgomery County schools from 1997-98 to 1998-99. The attendance for the state of Ohio was higher than Montgomery County. From the 1997-98 school year to the 1998-99 school year, the Ohio attendance rate decreased slightly from 93.6% to 93.5%.

Montgomery County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY97</th>
<th>FY98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stark</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Butler</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mahoning</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lorain</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Summit</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lucas</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Franklin</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hamilton</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Montgomery</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cuyahoga</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY99</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stark</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Butler</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lorain</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summit</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hamilton</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mahoning</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lucas</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Franklin</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cuyahoga</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Montgomery</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FY92-98 data were obtained through ODE Vital Statistics. FY99 data came from ODE Information Management Services as gathered for the District Report Cards using a slightly different formula. (ODE Vital Statistics data are no longer available.)
Outcome: Young People Succeeding
Indicator: Teen Pregnancy

Background:
The teen pregnancy value includes the number of teen births, fetal losses and terminations of pregnancy. The child of a teen mother has a greater risk of being premature and experiencing poverty, child abuse and, if female, premature childbearing.

New Data:
The value for teen pregnancy for Montgomery County in 1998 was 4.7%. The value for the state of Ohio was 4.0% for 1998.

Short-term Trends:
The trends for Montgomery County values and comparative ranking are moving in the desired direction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Montgomery</th>
<th>Hamilton</th>
<th>Lucas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Montgomery County Ohio Target

Among the top 3 counties

Pregnancy Rate for Females Ages 15-17

Teen Pregnancy = (Births + Abortions + Fetal Losses)
Notes: Calculations made by Combined Health District, Office of Epidemiology.
Avoiding Poverty

Indicator: Avoiding Poverty

Background:
Research suggests that Americans who have their first child after they reach the age of 20, finish high school, and get married have only an 8% chance that the child will grow up in poverty. However, those who do not meet these three conditions have a 79% chance that their child will be raised in poverty.

New Data:
The provisional percentage of first births which were to parents who were married, had finished high school and had reached age 20 years in Montgomery County in 1999 was 47.2%. The final value for 1998 was 47.9%, replacing the provisional value reported in the 1999 Report to the Community on Outcomes and Indicators of 44.7%. The values for the state of Ohio for 1997 and 1998 were 50.5% and 50.6%, respectively.

Short-term Trends:
The value for this Indicator is not moving in the desired direction. The 1999 urban Ohio county data are not yet available for comparison.

Percentage of first births where both parents completed high school, parents are married (at any time from conception to birth), and mother is at least 20 years old

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Montgomery County</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Montgomery County 1999 data are provisional.
Note: Calculations made by Combined Health District, Office of Epidemiology. Since the educational status of many of the fathers is unknown, the above percentages may not be accurate.
Outcome: Stable Families

Indicator: Domestic Violence Deaths

Background:
The Family and Children First Council has adopted a target of zero tolerance for domestic violence-related homicides. The number of domestic violence deaths is a solid indicator of the prevalence of domestic violence in a community.

New Data:
The number of domestic violence-related deaths in Montgomery County in 1999 was 15.

Short-term Trends:
The value is not moving in the desired direction. The number of domestic violence deaths in Montgomery County increased from 1998 to 1999.

Deaths Due to Domestic Violence

Note: Data include victims of all ages and genders. Information is not available from other counties.
**Indicator: Child Deaths**

**Background:**
The number of child deaths in Montgomery County due to homicides, suicides, accidents and undetermined causes is counted each year. This Indicator is intended to focus attention on the vulnerability of our children and the effectiveness of our efforts to keep them safe, recognizing that some of these deaths are unavoidable tragedies.

**New Data:**
The number of child deaths in Montgomery County meeting the criteria for this Indicator in 1999 was 25.

**Short-term Trends:**
The value for child deaths is moving in the desired direction. The value for Montgomery County has steadily decreased from 1997 to 1999.

---

**Deaths from Homicides, Accidents, Undetermined Causes and Suicide for Children (0-17)**

Note: Sudden Infant Death Syndrome deaths are included in this graph because a S.I.D.S. death is the death of an infant that remains unexplained after the performance of an adequate postmortem investigation. The Montgomery County Coroner’s Office categorizes S.I.D.S. deaths as “Undetermined Causes”.

**TARGET**

| Montgomery | 20 |

**Montgomery County**
Outcome: Safe and Supportive Neighborhoods

Indicator: Violent Crimes

Background:
Violent crime is measured by the rate per 1,000 people of the number of murders, forcible rapes, robberies and aggravated assaults reported in the Uniform Crime Index published by the FBI.

New Data:
The violent crime rate for Montgomery County was 4.6 in 1998. The 1998 value for Ohio was 3.6 and the U.S. value for 1998 was 5.7.

Short-term Trends:
The value for violent crime is moving in the desired direction. The comparative ranking among counties moved from third to fourth. Montgomery County’s 1998 value was lower than the national rate and higher than Ohio’s rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lorain</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hamilton</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Butler</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montgomery</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stark</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lucas</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Summit</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Franklin</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cuyahoga</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mahoning</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lorain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Montgomery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mahoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cuyahoga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Montgomery County Ohio United States

Note: Violent crimes represented in this graph are Murder, Forcible Rape, Robbery and Aggravated Assault.
Outcome: Safe and Supportive Neighborhoods

Indicator: Property Crimes

Background:
The property crime rate is measured by incidents per 1,000 residents. Property crimes include burglary, larceny and motor vehicle theft and are reported by the Uniform Crime Index published by the FBI.

New Data:
The property crime rate for Montgomery County in 1998 was 52.1. The 1998 United States property crime rate was 40.5 and Ohio’s 1998 rate was 39.7.

Short-term Trends:
The value for Montgomery County remained the same from 1997 to 1998. The comparative county ranking moved from fifth to eighth. The property crime rate for Montgomery County was higher than the United States or the statewide values in 1998.
**Outcome:** Economic Self-Sufficiency

**Indicator:** Unemployment

**Background:**
The unemployment rate is a measure of the percentage of the labor force that is unemployed. The unemployment rate reflects the match between the number of people seeking employment and the number of available jobs. Factors that influence unemployment are transportation, child care and work skills.

**New Data:**
The value for unemployment in Montgomery County in 1999 was 3.8%. Montgomery County’s rank among counties was fourth. The unemployment rate for the state of Ohio for 1999 was 4.3%. The United States unemployment rate was 4.2%.

**Short-term Trends:**
The comparative ranking among counties is moving in the desired direction. In addition, the rate of unemployment for Montgomery County decreased from 1998 to 1999. The values for the national and state unemployment rates were higher than Montgomery County in 1999.

**Unemployment Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Montgomery</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the three counties with the lowest unemployment rates.
Indicator: **Effective Buying Income**

**Per Capita Effective Buying Income**

**Background:**
Per Capita Effective Buying Income represents disposable income after taxes.

**New Data:**
The value for 1999 for Montgomery County was $17,831.00. The value for Ohio was $16,651.00 in 1999. The value for the United States in 1999 was $16,895.00. The value for the Consumer Price Index for 1999 was 166.0 (1982-1984=100).

**Short-term Trends:**
The comparative county ranking is not moving in the desired direction. The comparative ranking among counties has moved from third to fourth place. However, the value has increased from 1998 to 1999 and it has remained higher than the values for Ohio or the U.S. from 1996 through 1999.

**1997**
1. Hamilton 17,716
2. Franklin 17,233
3. Cuyahoga 16,529
4. Montgomery 16,468
5. Summit 16,355
6. Butler 15,682
7. Lucas 15,528
8. Stark 14,761
9. Lorain 14,285
10. Mahoning 13,527

**1998**
1. Hamilton 18,502
2. Franklin 18,170
3. Montgomery 17,277
4. Summit 17,135
5. Cuyahoga 17,064
6. Butler 16,588
7. Lucas 16,198
8. Stark 15,395
9. Lorain 14,951
10. Mahoning 14,150

**1999**
1. Hamilton 19,135
2. Franklin 18,816
3. Cuyahoga 17,888
4. Montgomery 17,831
5. Butler 17,587
6. Lucas 16,673
7. Stark 15,764
8. Lorain 15,578
9. Summit 15,118
10. Mahoning 14,583

**TARGET**
Among the top 3 counties

**Note:** Beginning in 1996 the definition changed to be based on “Money Income” rather than “Personal Income”. 

**Outcome:** Economic Self-Sufficiency
Strategic Community Initiatives

No Indicator moves in isolation from a host of other factors, influences and conditions in our society. Each trend needs to be viewed in that context to be better understood. Therefore, before drawing a conclusion about our community’s progress on any Outcome, much less discussing any needed responses or strategies, it is wise to consider as much data as possible.

For example, the trends for the two Economic Self Sufficiency Indicators reported here have both fluctuated over the last two years; each has moved in the desired direction one year but not the other year. With just this information in mind, someone might conclude that progress on this Outcome has been inconsistent. But considering that both the poverty rate and the public assistance caseload have declined locally over the last several years leads to a more positive conclusion. It also reminds us that Outcomes and Indicators and programs are interrelated. In other words…

- …no single agency or program is responsible by itself for the status or trend of any of the targeted Indicators.

The Council’s response to these data recognizes this interconnectedness. After publishing Turning the Curve, the Council looked at these data and other information and identified a number of issues facing the community. Seeking to have a dramatic impact on these issues, the Council launched three Strategic Community Initiatives in areas determined to be of the highest priority:

- Promoting School Readiness and Fourth Grade Success;
- Promoting Alternative Learning Opportunities; and
- Preventing Family Violence.

Collectively these Initiatives set an action agenda for the Council.

Each Initiative is led by a Champion, a respected community leader who has stepped forward and taken charge at the Council’s request. The Champions have recruited broad-based Teams consisting of Council members and others from the community, and have set a simple – but ambitious - goal: to design, stimulate and promote actions that make a dramatic impact on the community’s Outcomes.

- It is noteworthy that many of the Indicators whose trends have not gone in the desired direction in one or both of the last two years, Public School Attendance, 4th grade, 6th grade, and 9th grade Student Proficiency, and Domestic Violence Deaths, are the subjects of these three Initiatives.

We have asked the Champions to report on the accomplishments of their Teams (pages 22-27). In addition to data on Outcomes and Indicators they have been examining other related data and collecting ideas and recommendations from local and national experts. The ultimate value of this data collection and analysis is to enable the community to make enlightened, well-informed responses. Based on the Champions’ reports, it is anticipated that these Initiatives will have a dramatic impact on the community’s Outcomes.
The School Readiness / School Success / 4th Grade Guarantee Initiative is clearly focused on young children through the 4th grade, with special focus on ensuring that all children are prepared to enter kindergarten and are successful learners in the primary grades. The desired outcome of this Initiative is that young people will succeed. Since August, 1999, the School Readiness / School Success / 4th Grade Guarantee Initiative Team has committed personal and community resources toward achieving the goal that all young people will succeed in school.

The Team began meeting in August, 1999. During the first year, the Team explored the issue of school readiness. One of the first actions was defining what is meant by school readiness. This meant grappling with the two sides of the issue: is the child ready for school and is the school ready for the child? Other than a common age requirement of 5 years old, each of the 16 school districts in Montgomery County assessed kindergarten readiness in its own way and there were no aggregate data to determine the level of school readiness among kindergarten students in Montgomery County. The Team recommended that the FCFC compile aggregate data from each school district on the number of children within their district deemed to be school ready based on the kindergarten screening tool used by that district’s kindergarten. A future goal is to strive for a common kindergarten screening tool used by each district.

As the Team explored school readiness, a common consensus among early childhood and educational professionals emerged. The consensus was that the early years are critical for a child’s optimal social, physical, emotional and cognitive development, and this foundational development is the first step in helping children achieve maximum readiness for school. The importance of this foundation has been underscored by advances in research in infant brain development and the importance of quality childhood experiences in promoting children’s development. Based on these critical early years, the Team recommended to the FCFC that a public information campaign be developed and presented throughout Montgomery County to teach and emphasize the importance of parental action during the early years to maximize child development and therefore increase the child’s readiness for school. The public information campaign, entitled “Easy Steps to Grow Great Kids” began in the fall of 2000 and will run through the summer of 2001. The campaign will feature spokespeople for the Easy Steps, an informational video linking parental action during the early years to school readiness, and public information on ways parents can take action to maximize their child’s development each day. In addition to reaching parents and caretakers of young children, the campaign will educate the citizens of Montgomery County on the value of positive adult role models and the important value of adult interaction with children.

The Team also explored the issue of assessing children for school readiness throughout the first 5 years of life prior to entry into kindergarten with the goal of helping children maximize their development prior to entry into kindergarten. The Team recommended that the FCFC bring two model programs to Montgomery County to offer greater
parent/child education programming focused on school readiness. The Parents as Teachers program (PAT) and the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) were identified as providing a full 5 year spectrum of parent training and child school readiness preparation for parents and children in school districts identified as having the greatest need for early intervention. PAT and HIPPY will be targeted to children and families in several Montgomery County school districts, representing districts with academic need throughout our county.

The Team’s next steps will focus on children in school grades Kindergarten – 4th grade. The Team is listening to local educators, researching successes and exploring ways to promote school success for all these children with particular focus on helping more children achieve success on the 4th grade proficiency test.

Through collaborative information sharing, creative planning and hard work, the Team is committed to supporting and initiating positive programs and campaigns to support school success for all young children and their families. In this way the Initiative will have a major impact on the Young People Succeeding Outcome. Because of the pivotal role that education plays in people’s lives, the effects of this Initiative will also be seen in the community’s other Outcomes.

**Team Roster**

Thomas G. Breitenbach, Champion . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Premier Health Partners  
Shauna Adams, Ed.D . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . University of Dayton  
William H. Bines, MS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Combined Health District  
Pat Buckingham . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . University of Dayton  
Craig Chancellor . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . United Way of the Greater Dayton Area  
Tim Currier . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ADAMHS Board of Montgomery County  
Bro. Raymond L. Fitz, S.M., Ph.D. . . . . . . . . . . . University of Dayton  
Maribeth A. Graham . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . The Iddings Foundations  
Ann Granger . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Buckeye Trails Girl Scout Council  
Laurence P. Harkness . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . The Children’s Medical Center  
Sue Koverman . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Community Volunteer  
Judge Nick Kuntz . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Montgomery County Juvenile Court  
Joseph A. Lambright . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . American Red Cross – Dayton Chapter  
Robert D. Lantz, Ph.D . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Mont. Co. Educational Service Center  
Jerrie L. Bascome McGill, Ph.D . . . . . . . . . . . . . Dayton Public Schools  
Nancy Reder . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Mont. Co. Early Intervention Consortium/Starting Point  
Stephen A. Rice . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Community Volunteer  
Gail S. Rowe . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Dayton Public Schools  
Marilyn E. Thomas . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Miami Valley Child Development Centers  
Liane Wagner . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . FCFC Family Representative  

Staff: Cindy Currell . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Montgomery County Children Services
Too many students in Montgomery County are not succeeding in school or finishing high school. Many of these youth experience repeated school failure, are chronically absent, have to deal with the effects of poverty or personal and family problems, are not challenged, and/or are disruptive.

The twenty members of the Alternative Learning Opportunities Team (A.L.O.T.) believe that we can do more to help all children in Montgomery County experience school success. Since September, 1999, the A.L.O.T. has been meeting regularly to focus on issues which can impact at-risk youth who still are in school: truancy/chronic absenteeism; retention; assessment; and providing youth with challenges, program choice, adult support, and career exploration opportunities.

The first phase of the Team’s work has been in examining the obstacles and challenges related to school success and developing alternative learning opportunities, as well as successful models which have overcome these barriers. In its twelve meetings to date, the A.L.O.T. has had thirteen presentations on model alternative schools, truancy, learning styles, local programs dealing with at-risk youth, after school resources, in-school suspension alternatives, and reports on conferences which presented best practices on alternative education, mentoring, and other issues related to student success.

Direct dialogue with school districts also has provided important input. The A.L.O.T. has had panel discussions about barriers and student needs with the Superintendents and/or Board Presidents of nine school districts. Additional input was received through a panel discussion with representatives of several systems which deal with students and their families (ADAMHS, Children Services, Health, Juvenile Court, and MR/DD). The Team also is supporting collaboration and the use of mentors and incentives.

Chronic attendance problems and truancy are gateway behaviors to dropping out of school and delinquency. The A.L.O.T.‘s Truancy Subcommittee surveyed professionals in schools, social service agencies, juvenile justice, and law enforcement who are dealing with students and their families on a daily basis. The A.L.O.T. found that there is a fundamental difference in truancy in grades K-6 (where the focus is on the parent/other caregiver and prevention) and grades 7-12 (where the focus is on the teen and intervention). Also, the Team found that there may be generational and/or cultural issues affecting regular school attendance.

Attending school every day is so important for a child’s future success in school and in life. That is why the Alternative Learning Opportunities Team is implementing the Assuring School Attendance marketing campaign and video to make students and parents aware of the critical relationship between attendance, school success, and personal success in the 21st century economy. While other communities have developed pieces of a truancy prevention campaign, our community will be the first to produce a comprehensive multi-media truancy prevention public awareness campaign. The campaign will be independently evaluated.
Public awareness of the critical role that the parent/caregiver plays in assuring school attendance is only a first step. The A.L.O.T. also has determined that a lead agency is needed to maintain the community’s focus and momentum on truancy reduction over the long run.

The Team currently is entering the second phase of its work: developing findings and recommendations for action. After all the useful input, the Alternative Learning Team is in the process of creating a workable plan to promote school success for Montgomery County youth and to measure results.

The Alternative Learning Opportunities Initiative will have its greatest impact on the Young People Succeeding Outcome. Since school success touches so many other issues in the lives of students and their families, this Initiative undoubtedly also will impact the community’s other Outcomes.

**Team Roster**

John E. Moore, Champion ........................................ Community Leader
Joseph B. Baldasare ........................................ United Rehabilitation Services
*Samuel C. Brewer ........................................ Trotwood-Madison City Schools
Lt. Col. John Compston ....................................... Dayton Police Department
Dannetta Graves ............................................. Montgomery County Dept. of Job and Family Services
Ann B. Higdon ............................................... Improved Solutions for Urban Systems, Inc.
Jeanine Hufford ............................................. Mathile Family Foundation
Learwinson Jackson ........................................ Trade & Tech Prep Charter School
Clarence W. Jarboe .......................................... Northridge Local School District
Carla L. Lakatos ............................................... Miami Valley Regional Transit Authority
*Ann Levett-Lowe ............................................. Dayton Public Schools
Amy Luttrell .................................................. Goodwill Industries of Dayton
Judge Michael B. Murphy ................................... Montgomery County Juvenile Court
Sandra K. Pierce ............................................. Parker, Carlson & Johnson
Mary D. Pryor, M.D. ......................................... Oakwood Health Commissioner
Catherine Rauch ............................................. Miami Valley Teen Coalition
Margaret Sandberg .......................................... Dayton Public Schools
Frederick C. Smith .......................................... Huffy Foundation
Joseph L. Szoke ............................................. ADAMHS Board of Mont. Co.
Donald Thompson .......................................... Alliance for Education
Donald A. Vermillion ...................................... Sinclair Community College/Univ. of Dayton
Joyce C. Young ............................................. Community Volunteer

Staff: Diane Luteran .......................................... Office of Family and Children First

* Prior participants
Helping to stabilize families is the Outcome driving the Family Violence Initiative. The mission of this Initiative is to eliminate family violence through a coordinated community response.

One way to accomplish this response is to create the ability to track all incidents of violence in every jurisdiction of the county and share information. Currently each law enforcement agency and court district has its own record keeping system. Last year the Domestic Violence Death Review Committee, a subcommittee of the Criminal Justice Council, studied recent deaths from DV in Montgomery County and announced their findings and recommendations. Their top recommendation was to improve the quality and timeliness of information related to DV cases. National statistics tell us that every 9 seconds a woman is beaten by her partner and that 70% of the men who batter their wives also abuse their children. Given these facts and recommendation, it became apparent that a county-wide database to track and monitor domestic violence will not only aid the criminal justice system, but the child welfare system as well. The success of a core DV database would allow the system to build in a component addressing not only the needs of families and children, but the elderly as well.

Last year work began on the project plan of a DV database. Meetings were held with Common Pleas Court prosecutors, judges, Dayton Police personnel, Montgomery County sheriff employees, city and county clerks, pre-sentencing and probation officers along with Victim Advocates. They were asked three questions:

1. What information do you want to go into the DV database?
2. What other agencies need to be a part of the system?
3. What information would each agency need from the system to enhance their response to domestic violence?

These initial meetings resulted in further meetings with prosecutors and judges from the surrounding cities and municipalities. After much work, the group answered questions 1 and 3 with the following:

The DV database should include:
1. Temporary and Civil Protection orders plus outstanding arrest warrants
2. Arrest History
3. Probation or parole status
4. Risk assessment (a person’s risk for violence)
5. Photographic evidence (of all parties involved)

The project plan is currently being developed and is to be completed by the end of the year 2001.

During the work on developing the project plan for the county-wide database, information-gathering visits were undertaken to three Domestic Violence Projects. The Largo, Florida Police Department Domestic Violence Intervention Internet project proved to be very unique. In Largo, local domestic violence advocates, the courts and prosecutors have access to a secured internet website. The project was designed to gather as much evidence as possible at the scene of the incident, to increase the amount of independent evidence available at time of prosecution. This enhanced evidence collection also relieves the victim from the primary burden of prosecution through his or her testimony. Judge Bannister of the Vandalia Municipal Court viewed the Largo program and agreed to allow a pilot project in his court. This project will begin the end of January and will be in full operation by the end of March, 2001.

In addition to the development of a database and the evidence collection system, meetings were held with the Family Violence Initiative Team. This is a group of 32 individuals from all segments of human service agencies and county offices that deal with child, spousal/partner and elder abuse. The group...
discussed what it will take to achieve a coordinated response from the community to eliminate family violence and came up with the following conclusions: eliminating repeat offenders of violence; the “buy in” of the criminal justice system to the existing protocols regarding violence; developing a consistent message about what’s tolerable in this community, and the creation of a Family Violence Coordinating Council. This Team will continue to meet during the year 2001. The major impact of its work will be on the Stable Families Outcome. The Initiative will also touch the community’s other Outcomes because the fundamental role that families play is enhanced when they are free from violence.

“We cannot continue to tolerate family violence, not today, not tomorrow, not ever. We must improve our ability to prevent family violence and to intervene early and effectively if it does occur. I firmly believe we are on the right path to putting together a community wide response which will eliminate family violence.”

Team Roster

Vicki D. Pegg, Champion . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . Montgomery County Commission
Donna Audette .......................... Shelter Services/YWCA
Ken Betz ................................. Montgomery County Coroner’s Office
The Honorable Michael Brigner . . . . . Montgomery County Domestic Relations Court
Denise Martin Cross ........................ Montgomery County Juvenile Court
James Dare ............................... Montgomery County Court of Common Pleas/Probation Dept.
Dr. James H. Davis ........................ Montgomery County Coroner’s Office
Ronald A. Eckerle, Ph.D. ................. Catholic Social Services
Jennifer Ginsburg ........................ Artemis Center
Nancy Grigsby ............................. Artemis Center
Kriss Haren ............................... Womanline of Dayton, Inc.
Lisa Hermans .............................. Ombudsman’s Office / Long Term Care
Charlie Holderman ....................... Montgomery County Adult Protective Services
Kathleen K. Hoyng ........................ Deloitte & Touche
Helen Jones-Kelley ....................... Montgomery County Children Services
Judith A. LaMusga ....................... Montgomery County Board of MR/DD
James Levinson ........................... Montgomery County Prosecutor’s Office
Deidre Logan ............................. City of Dayton Municipal Court Prosecutor
Pat Mayer ................................. Area Agency on Aging
Douglas McGarry ........................ Area Agency on Aging
Linda Mercuri-Fischbach ............... Womanline of Dayton, Inc.
Sharon Minturn ........................... Senior Resource Connection
Idotha Bootsie Neal ..................... City of Dayton Commission
Representative Tom Roberts .......... Ohio House of Representatives
Marilyn Sitaker ........................... Combined Health District
Major Joseph Spitler ..................... Montgomery County Sheriff Department
Dennis Stewart, Ph.D. ................. The Partnership for Youth, Inc.
Joseph Szoke ............................ ADAMHS Board of Montgomery County
Dave Vore ................................ Montgomery County Sheriff
Deb Wenig ................................. League of Women Voters
Gary J. Weston ........................... Legal Aid Society of Dayton

Staff: Ann Johnson ....................... Montgomery County Commission Assistant
Ed McNachtan ............................. Office of Family and Children First
Stephanie Ullery ........................ Montgomery County Children Services
Sharon Young ............................. Montgomery County Children Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laurence P. Harkness</td>
<td>Chair* . . . The Children’s Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Audette</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . YWCA of Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Biddle</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Miami Valley Child Development Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Bines</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Combined Health District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas G. Breitenbach*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Premier Health Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig A. Chancellor*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . United Way of the Greater Dayton Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. Col. John Compston</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Dayton Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Decker</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Ohio Dept. of Youth Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Ferrar</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Parent/Family Service Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bro. Raymond L. Fitz, S.M., Ph.D.*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . The University of Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dannetta Graves</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Mont. Co. Dept. of Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hecht</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Diversion Team/ICAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen K. Hoyng*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Deloitte &amp; Touche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen L. Jones-Kelley</td>
<td>Montgomery County Children Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Keltner</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Parent/Early Intervention Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith A. LaMusga</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Mont. Co. Board of MR/DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert D. Lantz, Ph.D.</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Mont. Co. Educational Service Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaFrancine Lewis</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Parent/Edgemont Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas M. McGary</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Area Agency on Aging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerrie L. Bascome McGill*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Dayton Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John E. Moore*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Community Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael B. Murphy*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Montgomery County Juvenile Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootsie Neal*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Dayton City Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John North</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . United Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicki D. Pegg*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Montgomery County Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary D. Pryor, M.D.</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Oakwood Health Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Reeder</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Mont. Co. Early Intervention Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.C. Smith</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Huffy Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph L. Szoekoe*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . ADAMHS Board of Mont. Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael R. Turner</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Mayor, City of Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland L. Turpin</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Dayton Metropolitan Housing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald A. Vermillion</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Sinclair Community College/Univ. of Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liane Wagner</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donelle West</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce C. Young</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Community Volunteer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Executive Committee members

We note with sadness the passing of Council members Lyn Tracy and Sheriff Gary Haines during the past year. Their contributions and commitment to the children and families of Montgomery County will be greatly missed.
Outcomes

Our Vision for Montgomery County (inside front cover) is captured by these six Outcomes.

Healthy People
Everyone makes choices – for themselves or for those entrusted to their care – which promote better health. Everyone gets the information and support they need to avoid preventable health problems. Both physical and mental wellness are valued. Everyone has access to an adequate level of health care, including prenatal care, from birth through death.

Young People Succeeding
Children are well prepared for learning when they start school and receive support outside of the classroom for their efforts inside the classroom. Intellectual curiosity, skill development and achievement are valued. Young people receive mentoring, guidance and support as they develop the capacity to differentiate between positive and negative risk behaviors. Positive role models are plentiful, and others in the community talk to teenagers with candor and respect about the difficult choices they face. Students finish high school ready to compete successfully in the labor market and/or in continuing education and skills development.

Stable Families
The community respects and supports families, recognizing that family composition in a diverse society is varied. Family members have healthy relationships with each other. Families nurture their members and provide a sense of well-being and safety. Family members work together and feel that they also belong to something larger than themselves.

Positive Living For Special Populations
The elderly, and people of any age who are disabled, are supported (when necessary) with services which allow them to live in the most appropriate, least restrictive environment. With support from the community, everyone has the opportunity to participate in every aspect of community living that he or she desires. People with disabilities live, learn, work, and participate in typical accessible community settings. The community respects and protects their rights and includes them as contributing members.

Safe and Supportive Neighborhoods
People live in safe, affordable housing. They have access to positive educational and cultural experiences. Recreational centers are convenient and provide positive role models, especially for the children. All aspects of the environment – e.g., air, water, soil – are safe and healthy. The community values the unique attributes of each neighborhood, whether rural or urban.

Economic Self-Sufficiency
Residents have access to employment that provides a living wage and benefits. Barriers to employment, including transportation and daycare issues, are minimized. Adequate opportunities for life-long learning help prepare the workforce for the realities of 21st Century jobs. Educational, vocational training, and worker re-training services are readily available to support the needs of residents and employers.

The data in this report come from the following sources:

Center for Disease Control
Demographics U.S.A. – County Edition
Montgomery County Combined Health District,
Office of Epidemiology
Montgomery County Coroner’s Office
Montgomery County Prosecutor’s Office
National Center for Health Statistics
Ohio Bureau of Employment Services
Ohio Department of Education
Ohio Department of Health
U.S. Department of Justice
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency