U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY, AUGUST 21, 2006

+ + + + +

The above-entitled matter convened at 9:00 a.m. in the Barnard Auditorium, 400 Maryland Avenue, Southwest, Washington, D.C., David Long, Chair, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

DAVID LONG	Chair
KIM DUDE	Member
FREDERICK ELLIS	Member
MONTEAN JACKSON	Member
RUSSELL JONES	Member
SHEPPARD KELLAM	Member
TOMMY LEDBETTER	Member
SETH NORMAN	Member
MICHAEL PIMENTEL	Member
DEBORAH PRICE	Member
DENNIS ROMERO	Member
BELINDA SIMS	Member
MARY ANN SOLBERG	Member
HOPE TAFT	Member
HOWELL WECHSLER	Member

NEAL R. GROSS

MEMBER REPRESENTATIVES:

DONNI LeBOEUF Representing J. Robert Flores,

Department of Justice

MEMBERS UNABLE TO ATTEND:

RALPH HINGSON

OFFICE OF SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS:

CATHERINE DAVIS Designated Federal Officer

WILLIAM MODZELESKI

PANELISTS

MIKE HERMANN Executive Director, Office of

School Health, Safety and Learning Support, Tennessee

Department of Education

JOHN BYNOE Associate Commissioner, Center

for Student Support,

Massachusetts Department of

Education

JEFF BARBER Safe and Drug Free Schools

Coordinator, Indiana Department of Education, and President, Network of Safe and Drug Free

Schools Coordinators

MONA JOHNSON Program Supervisor, Washington

State Department of Public

Instruction, and Vice

President, Network of Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinators Coordinator, Safe and Drug Free

Schools, Fairfax County Public

Schools

ELLEN MOREHOUSE Executive Director, Student

Assistance Services Corporation

ARTHUR DEAN Chairman and CEO, Community

Anti-Drug Coalitions of America

NEAL R. GROSS

CLARENCE JONES

PANELISTS (CONT.)

GUS FRIAS Coordinator of School Safety

Programs, Los Angeles County

Department of Education

PETER REUTER Professor, School of Public

Policy, Department of

Criminology, University of

Maryland

ZILI SLOBODA Senior Research Associate,

Institute for Health and Social

Policy, University of Akron

CHRIS RINGWALT Senior Research Scientist,

Chapel Hill Center Pacific Institute for Research and

Evaluation

EDWARD RAY Chief, Department of Safety and

Security, Denver Public Schools

LORRAINE ALLEN Director, Office of Safe

Schools, Florida Department of

Education

JON AKERS Executive Director, Kentucky

Center for School Safety,

Eastern Kentucky University

CYNTHIA L. TIMMONS Director, Children of Promise

Mentors of Hope, University of

Oklahoma Outreach

A G E N D A

OPENING STATEMENT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
INTRODUCTIONS OF PANEL: STATE EDUCATION PERSPECTIVE7
PANELIST PRESENTATIONS9
Mike Herman - Executive Director, Office of School Health
John Bynoe - Associate Commissioner, Center for Student Support
Jeff Barber - Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinator
Mona Johnson - Program Supervisor
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS: COMMITTEE TO PANELISTS68
BREAK95
INTRODUCTIONS OF PANEL II: LOCAL EDUCATION PERSPECTIVES
Clarence Jones - Coordinator, Safe and Drug Free Schools
Ellen Morehouse - Executive Director Student Assistance Services Corporation
General Arthur Dean - Chairman and CEO Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America
Gus Frias - Coordinator of School Safety Programs
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS141
LINCH 172

NEAL R. GROSS

PANELIST PRESENTATIONS175)
Peter Reuter - Professor, School of Public Policy	
Zili Sloboda - Senior Research Associate Institute for Health and Social Policy	
Chris Ringwalt - Senior Research Scientist Chapel Hill Center	
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS211	-
BREAK248	;
INTRODUCTIONS OF PANEL IV: SCHOOL SAFETY AND PREPAREDNESS PERSPECTIVE)
Edward Ray - Chief Department of Safety and Security	
Lorraine Allen - Director Office of Safe Schools	
Jon Akers - Executive Director Kentucy Center for School Safety	
Cynthia Timmons - Director Children of Promise Mentors of Hope	
QUESTIONS & ANSWERS307	,
SUMMARY AND CLOSING REMARKS338	;
ADJOIDN 3/13	ı.

NEAL R. GROSS

PROCEEDINGS

(9:06:39 a.m.)

If we could have everyone find DR. LONG: their seats, we'll go ahead and get started. get started, first of all, I would like to welcome Also, reminder for those everyone. а on the committee, and those that will be on the various groups that will be presenting to us, please make sure that your microphone is on as you speak because this is all being recorded.

I would like to, as we get started, just mention something. I'm going to re-mention it because I've talked to a few of the folks on the Advisory Committee, and also for the folks that are going to have the first panel, and those in the audience. We see this as an extremely important day and a half, and we also - I think of all us realize that when we get to the State Grant Program and what we're going to be talking about here for the next day and a half, that it's extremely important that we understand that we need to have some changes, be thinking about some changes. It isn't status quo, and it will not, and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

cannot be same old-same old, so that's why it's so critically important with that thought in mind that as we listen to the experts, starting with the group of four in front of us right now, that we as a committee be thinking about and hone our questions so that they're very sharp, and that we can get at the information so that we can start to synthesize the information to get some very creative ideas and solutions to present to the secretary. So with that in mind, if we can, we'll go ahead and start with the first panel.

I do want to remind as we do that, that if we have anyone that has any degree of hearing impairment to please let us know, because we have some assistance for those folks. So if you do, would you please indicate that to Catherine, who's sitting right at the end here, and we'll make the appropriate adjustments. None? Okay, thank you.

Before we start with the first panel, the reminder to you about the agenda for the day, the introduction of the panel will start in about one minute. We're going to stay right on time.

NEAL R. GROSS

Introductions are 9 to 9:05, it is now 9:05, and you can see it on the screen behind you for those of you in the audience. We'll start with that introduction. And for those of you on the panel, and we have the information that you sent. We want to hear all of your expertise. We are designed for the first panel to go from 9:10 to 10:10, and then questions and answers 10:10 to 10:40. So if we could ask that the panel members, the individuals' presentations about eight to ten minutes, then we'll hear the information. We've read it, but we want to get to those questions so we can have that interaction so we can really get your thoughts, if that makes sense. So I'll be the person that will be watching, and if it's getting close, what I'll do is stand up and wave my arm, so if we could get your help with that.

First, I want to introduce the individual panel members for our first panel, "The State Education Perspective". First of all, Mike Hermann, and Mike serves as Executive Director of the Office of School Health Safety and Learning Support within the Tennessee Department of Education. His background in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the prevention field began more than 20 years ago when he was hired to help implement the recommendations of then Governor Lamar Alexander's task force on Youth and Alcohol and Drug Abuse. He currently oversees all activities within the State Department related health and safety, as well as after-school and extended learning. I was talking to Mike earlier. Actually, Ι think he runs everything in that department. I think you said you even drive a bus.

Next to Mike is John Bynoe, and John is the Associate Commissioner for the Massachusetts Department of Education. I think the important thing about John is that he's been with the Department for 25 years, and has now risen to the position of Associate Commissioner. And he runs all kinds of programs, we were talking about it earlier. John -Health Safety Drug Free Schools, Career Voc Tech school student secondary education, and support services, so again, someone with a lot of years of experience and depth of expertise.

Next is Jeff Barber, and Jeff is a Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinator for the Indiana

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Department of Education, as well as the President of the National Network of Safe and Drug Free Schools The mission of the National Network for Coordinators. Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities is to act an advocacy group for the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities program, and to enhance communication between federal, state, local and agencies.

And lastly, certainly not least, Mona I was going to introduce you first, I want Johnson. to say that up front. Mona currently serves Program Supervisor for the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction in Olympia, Washington. And Mona manages state and federal grant programs related to prevention and intervention services, Safe and Drug Free Schools Supportive Learning Environment, many years in Student Assistance profession prior to joining OSPI, Mona continues to work as a consultant providing training in the of professional areas wellness.

Thanks to all of you for being here, and we're looking forward to hearing from you. Mike, if

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we could start with you.

MR. HERMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I want to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak with you this morning about the State Grants portions of the Safe and Drug Free Schools program. I consider this to be a very important meeting, and I want to get right to the heart of my remarks. I've tried roughly to follow the outline of the questions that were laid out for the Advisory Council.

Let me start with strengths first. The State Grants program is the only source of funding for alcohol and drug education, and violence prevention that reaches into virtually every school district in Tennessee. Without the State Grants program, the overwhelming majority of our schools simply would not be able to address these two issues in any kind of systematic or ongoing way.

Second, and I think equally important, the State Grants program provides an infrastructure at both the state and local level for school-based policy and practice in these two important areas. When

NEAL R. GROSS

Tennessee began a major methamphetamine initiative last year, this infrastructure enabled us to reach the education community and those that could make things happen quickly and efficiently.

Similarly, last year when our Homeland Security folks wanted to develop an initiative to improve the security and preparedness of our schools, we worked through that same infrastructure. Both of those initiatives have relied very heavily upon the infrastructure that was created.

this infrastructure Last November, was particularly important when a student of our's entered a school and shot three administrators, killing one. The infrastructure that we had in place and the relationships that we had with the U.S. Department of Education enabled us to respond very quickly, and to restore the learning environment. I know that very in Mississippi similar things occurred following Hurricane Katrina, and in Minnesota following the shootings at Red Lake.

The State Grants program is the only universal funding stream that addresses some of our

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

most significant barriers to learning. The ability of students to learn and teachers to teach is directly related to the safety of our schools, and to the health and wellness of our students. This program is as much a school improvement process, as it is an alcohol and drug, and violence prevention program.

In terms of challenges, I think the State Grants program clearly has its share of challenges, most notorious of which is undoubtedly the difficulty we have in demonstrating effectiveness. Because each local program is different, it's almost impossible to develop a universal set of outcome indicators. most of our local managers are educators, they're not evaluators. The small amount of funding most districts receive is frequently cited as being too little to implement research-proven programs. submit to the committee that there are many effective strategies that actually require very little funding to implement.

The real challenge with small amounts of funding is that the manager at the local level probably doesn't have the time or the training to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

really do the job that we would like to see done. Another challenge, I think, is certainly one of perception. Too often in education and government circles we perceive importance and funding to be one and the same. As a result, at the state and local level, and I'm sure at the federal level, our managers must be very strong if they're going to be heard in the current environment.

I think the overwhelming question is, is the State Grants program effective in promoting safe and drug free schools? In our state, I certainly think so. Our most recent Youth Risk Behavior Survey data indicates consistent and significant declines in almost every category of drug usage. The number of guns in our schools has declined every year for the past seven years.

By using our discretionary funds to cover out-of-pocket expenses, over 1,200 of our schools have implemented research-proven programs like Life Skills, Second Step, and Olweus. Three of our four urban school districts have long-running Student Assistance Programs that have been able to use State Grants funds

NEAL R. GROSS

to leverage strong fiscal support from their communities. In Nashville, every dollar of State Grants funds is matched by a dollar and a half of local funding.

A lot of work has gone into developing the specific indicators that will be a part of the uniform management information system. The adoption of those measures will be invaluable in allowing us to compare apples to apples across districts and states, and to draw attention to the extent of our challenge. However, I'm afraid that they will be of limited value in demonstrating effectiveness.

It would be nice to be able to tie changes in humors indicators to actions taken with Safe and Drug Free Schools funds, but with funding that hovers in the five dollar per student range, I just don't think that's a realistic expectation.

I think a more productive and practical option would be to identify the specific strategies that we know from research and experience are tied to the outcomes that we desire. We can support and document the adoption of research-proven practices,

NEAL R. GROSS

particularly when federal and state resources are directed toward strengthening the knowledge and skills of our local managers.

I think one of the most important items this committee can look at is how to transfer what learned from research and national programs to the local level. So much of what is needed to be done is not dependent upon funding, but rather upon changes in policy and practice. Action is more important than programs. The State Grants program can and should be national the legs of our strategy relative to that strategy should be education, and specific proven activities, not what is popular.

In terms of structure of the State Grants program, I think it's important to continue making funding available to every school district, but I think across the board we need to be more prescriptive about how the program is administered. This would probably mean that some districts, and possibly some states, would choose not to participate. But at the same time, I think we've got to provide a strong

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

network of training so that all schools, including those schools that choose not to pursue funding, can receive assistance. This can be done when federal and state resources are combined. I think it would also require that additional flexibility for states be allowed in the awarding of funds, including the ability of states to set aside a larger portion for statewide initiatives.

Just note about emergency management issues. Our schools have been significantly impacted by events like the terrorist attacks on September the 11th and Hurricane Katrina. Much of the basic planning and response procedures that have been followed were developed as a result of a series of school shootings that began more than 10 years ago. One important change, I think, is that we now realize the role that schools can and must play in the overall community Public information, response process. emergency sheltering, feeding and transportation are tasks that schools are uniquely prepared to provide for community, but in order for that to happen, we have to, once again, be sure that we have this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

infrastructure in place that includes federal, state, and local players.

In closing, let me just say that I think to a large extent many of the questions that will be raised today come down to a question of will. Do we have the will, particularly at the federal and state level, to make this program work? I know that everyone sitting on this panel can provide you with examples of districts that are doing outstanding work with very limited funding. We can hold everyone to those higher standards if we are prepared to provide the necessary leadership. last The several years difficult for the State Grants program, No Child Left Behind, major budget cuts, and an ongoing threat of elimination have been difficult to weather. But despite it all, we still have an experienced and committed cadre of folks out there that are ready to do what needs to be done. They deserve a long-term commitment.

I encourage you to recognize the important role that the State Grants program must play if we're going to be serious in our commitment to safe and drug

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

free schools and communities. Thank you very much for allowing me the opportunity to speak.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Mike. We appreciate that. Again a reminder, as we start down this path, that we'll hear the presentations from each of the panelists, and then we'll open it up for questions, and have a dialogue back and forth with the committee and the panelists. And we set this up as a reminder to have a call go off to remind all of us that we need to shut our cell phones off so that we don't have interruptions, so if you'd please shut off or turn them on vibrate, it would appreciated. And with that, we will move to Mr. John Bynoe. John.

MR. BYNOE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, also, would like to thank the committee for providing me this opportunity to give you my thoughts on the Safe and Drug Free School State Grants program. One of the problems of following Mike is that Mike and I have been joined at the hip for about the 15 years I've been involved with drug free schools. We've been on about 15 panels in those 15 years, so much of what

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Mike has said, I would just say ditto to; but I also would like to give you the Massachusetts spin on many of those things.

In Massachusetts, as my notes indicated, we have set up a system where we have specific liaisons to districts. In Massachusetts, only 280 out of 380 districts actually take the funds; again, because of the amount of money that's available. Usually those districts don't have high, low-income populations, and they get the minimum amount, the per pupil allocation, which in Massachusetts is less than five dollars a I think, also, the fact that we use the Census data and low-income data, I think different states get different amounts, so the per pupil allocation is not even uniform across the country; because I look at my per pupil allocation for this coming year. If you are a district that does not have a Title 1 population, it's three dollars or less a child, so I know even more districts are going to refuse to take the money.

That said, there are strengths of the program. I think one of the major strengths of the program is the issue of objective analysis of data.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Most people think this is new, but this has been in place since drug free schools. There always has been a needs assessment, there always has been measurable goals and objectives, the Principles of SO Effectiveness have always been in place. The only thing new the principle of effectiveness in that people missed is the science-based research-proven effective strategies, so four or five out of the Principles of Effectiveness have always been in place, but they never have really been legislated. But those in place now, districts now do a good data analysis in order to determine what are putting kids at risk of either substance abuse or violence. Ιt also helping them identify other risks factors preventing kids from being successful.

I think as Mike has mentioned, one of the strengths of the program I could say could be, because I don't think a lot of districts recognize that it is truly part of school improvement. A lot of districts in Massachusetts, we're still having conversations about how it fits in school improvement.

One of the concerns I have is that I'm not

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

sure we as a nation understand the importance of prevention, because when I look at the goals for NCOB, safe and healthy school environment always seems to fall off the table. We focus on the academic, the standards, but I never really hear anybody talk about safe and healthy environments, so I think that's a strength that's being missed, an opportunity being missed.

I think a strength in Massachusetts is also the collaborative efforts that is going on between state, local, and community agencies. I now sit on several statewide task forces with the Lieutenant Governor around substance abuse. Anything that goes substance on in terms of abuse, prevention of violence, I'm there in the state, so the Department of Education is a key player at the state level; whereas, before, in years past we may not have been.

Grantees have a larger selection of eligible programs that could be using, but at the same time, I think that list could be expanded. I think science-based is a good idea, but also in terms of funding, it's not realistic for many districts, even though the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

fact that I can have a waiver process, even districts can often meet that waiver process because I'm asking for three to five years worth of evaluation data to prove that the program is effective. So I'm not sure how to make a balance of giving them opportunity of doing home-grown programs, but at the same time, making sure that those programs work without them being sold the program of the month, so to speak, because oftentimes, the district will go to the last vendor heard because this vendor says it will work, but oftentimes we know those programs are just passing through, or someone is trying to make money.

I think what's meeting the elements of the meeting the needs of students and schools today, again, as I said earlier, is community collaboration and community networking. The grant forces districts to coordinate and utilize all these resources fully to address their needs because they are finding that the little bit of money they do get from safe and drug free schools, they now have to figure out how leverage, and how to bring partners in in order to do prevention. Ιt enables them to tap into local

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

resources to provide violence prevention programs and evaluate services to school districts.

Again, the use of research-based programs that are based on local data is another thing that's working. And in terms of us working as a state, the simple meeting the parent program piece, having districts understand the issue of parenting and the participation of parents in programs around prevention.

determine assistant way we program reviews, we have what we call a program called "The Assurance Reviews" on a regular basis in Massachusetts Safe and Drug Free Schools annually has every year. been part of that review. Unfortunately, this year because, again, the loss of resources, Safe and Drug Free Schools reviews will take place, but they'll have to take place in a different way. But what they have done in the past, was able to go out not only to recognize whether or not programs are in compliance, but to understand where program weakness is, and able to write technical assistance around program planning and improvement.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In terms of difficulties in remote areas,
such as our rural setting, is that because these
settings are usually large regional school districts
with a variety of communities, there is usually not
one central community agency, or one central place.
Every one of these may have several little elementary
school, and one regional high school. And they don't
necessarily allocate all their funds in one pot.
Everybody wants to take their little bit of money, so
there is no systemic, or systematic service delivery
system there, and so the programs may not match.
Somebody may be doing Second Step, somebody may be
doing Alert, some may be doing something about
alcohol, maybe something about violence, so there's no
uniform programming going on. And, oftentimes, the
money is so small, I'm more concerned whether or not
programs are being implemented fidelity, or they're
just doing pieces of programs.

They also have a hard time around being able to do evaluation; again, because even if they come in as a unified district, they're trying to evaluate multiple programs with little more money. One of the

NEAL R. GROSS

things that we have done, though, is to work with the Governor program. Our Governor's program and either our Governor's representative and myself, and my Safe and Drug Free School Coordinator are talking on a regular basis, so we make sure that where programs go in the communities, whether large or small, they are coordinated, that Safe and Drug Free Schools governor awards are coordinated with Safe and Drug Free Schools SCA awards, to make sure that the programs are not competing, but working together.

I think one of the things, or mechanisms that could be posed that would help determine if a program is being supportive, and these funds are effective in meeting the programs. I think right now we don't have a requirement on the end-of-the year narrative. We ask for evaluation results, but we don't ask what do those results mean to the districts. I'm not sure if we want to add another requirement given the little bit of money, but I think it would be interesting to have districts really take a hard look at what they think the issues and concerns are, giving their pre and post data.

NEAL R. GROSS

I think emerging facing students in school today that's not addressed, and should be addressed in STA state grants. I have one answer for this giving my statement, but recently, I just, as I was telling people, I took my son to South Carolina, and this actually gave me an awakening. I thought about Massachusetts, I thought about Boston, I thought about my urban centers, I thought about the recent wake of violence and what's going on. And these kids may or I mean, the teen homicide rate may not be in school. in Boston for this summer is off the charts, but these kids are out of school. But at the same time, when I was in South Carolina, as I often do, I watch the local news to see what's going on.

I don't know if anybody heard the report about what's going on in South Carolina this past week, where there was going to be an armed assault at a football game. But the armed assault was going to perpetrated by the Crips, but members of the Crips were also in the — there was four U.S. Marines who were members of the Crips, who were going to participate in this armed assault. So I'm saying that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to say, you know, basically, these are emerging issues that are facing students today in terms of gangs. These gants, the tentacles of the gangs are reaching where we never would expect their reaching. I was actually shocked that there were four U.S. Marines who were now members of the Crips, who were now going to take their training and put it back on the streets. Also, they were alleging that the kids in South Carolina were in these gangs at the third-grade level, second or third grade level.

In Massachusetts, one of the facing issues are the new barbiturates, the opium, the heroin, the meth, OxyContin in my part of the state. This is what's facing kids today. Prescription drugs are facing - these new prescription drugs where they can go into their parent's cabinet. They no longer have to go on the street, they go in their parent's cabinet, or their grandparent's cabinet, somebody with a bad back of recent surgery, and get OxyContin, chew it and they're high, and they're hooked. This became more prevalent as kids I know, kids that my children knew were in high school who have been addicted.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

think kids are facing more and more issues. like Mike says it's going down, but those are kids who are in school, or it's kids who are in school that day, because the kids who are high probably weren't in school, so they're probably not responding. be seeing a decrease in violence, we may decrease substance abuse on the survey, my reality says that's only a survey. If I go in the streets, I something totally different, working with District Attorneys and my other law enforcement Kids are at greater risk in agencies in the state. terms of new substances than they've ever been before, because these substances are prescription drugs are what's out there.

The plan about keeping schools safe - I think that language is sufficient, but I think we need now to go on about emergency preparedness and crisis management. One of the things that are on the agenda of the world today is the pandemic preparedness. I think what I've been saying in Massachusetts is not pandemic preparedness, it's pandemic preparedness and all hazard planning, because the pandemic is the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

flavor of the month. The truth is, the schools need
to be prepared for anything that comes their way, so I
think we need to change the discussion to all hazard
planning, and use such things as FEMA, in my state
MEMA, to work with schools around crisis planning,
around incident command systems, and how to respond,
and how to be prepared for anything that comes their
way, so that we forget what the flavor of the month
is, but we do real training around crisis management
and planning. But the question, can that really be
funded under Safe and Drug Free Schools, the safety
and crisis management. We say 20 percent, 20 percent
of a little bit is not much, but at the same time, as
Mike says, it doesn't take a lot of resources, it just
takes time. But it also takes time away from
something else, which schools are not willing to give,
which is standardized testing. So, again, this
discussion goes back to how do we make sure that we
understand programs such as Safe and Drug Free School,
education in general as part of school improvement.
It's not something, a set aside, but it's an important
key component.

NEAL R. GROSS

Is the structure of the SDA Grant program a
good structure? Yes, it is. I think it's the only
structure. I think because the schools look to the
state for leadership, as we look to the federal
government for leadership. I think they need someone
to go through that will help them understand what is a
good program, how to find good technical assistance.
Now if we have the resources to provide technical
assistance ourselves; I have just recently put my
whole center, which is much larger than Safe and Drug
Free Schools through the whole training round,
Addressing Barriers to Learning, so that they could
look at issues that get in the way of kids learning,
and so they look at all the programs that I
administer, which as the Chairman of the Center,
includes career, vocational, technical education,
nutrition, feeding, nutrition commodity programs,
academic support, remedial programs, migrant
education, formal education, the list goes on, but how
all these programs are support programs for kids, and
how they all work together, that they're not stand-
alone programs, but they come in and how they work

NEAL R. GROSS

together as a service delivery system. I think that's the same language you need to work with schools about those academic programs, not Safe and Drug Free School programs, but other support programs out there, how they are part of school improvement, and how they're important, because if we don't, No Child Left Behind would just be a dream, and 2014 will be a lie, because children will be left behind.

Is the balance between flexibility accountability contained in the statute working. Well, flexibility is an interesting thing, because schools actually take the flexibility, transfer the money say to Title 5, and then they go ahead and use programs that wouldn't allow them to use it under Title 4, but they flex the money out to Title 5, and Title 5 is school improvement, and so it makes it difficult when that happens. But at the same time, I hold their feet to the fire about meeting the Principles of Effectiveness under Safe and Drug Free Schools, in general, so there is a conflict there.

The tension between Principles of Effectiveness and funds that we spend on research-

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

based effectiveness, I think the reality with that is
research-based effectiveness is a good idea, but I
think we need to go from programs to strategies,
identify those strategies, because again, there's not
enough funding to fully fund programs and implement a
program for fidelity if you're a small district. But
I think helping to educate people about those
strategies within a program that are proven to be
effective, and how to translate those strategies into
many programs, or into some sort of working with
students, the strategy of parent participation, how is
that done well. Parent involvement, what does that
really mean? It means more than the parent coming
into school to hear about their child's grades, it
means about the parent being active in their child's
life, knowing where their child is, taking a little
PSA. It's 10:00, do you know where your child is, and
taking that to heart, and I say why that's important.
So a lot of it can be discussion, and a lot of it
could be strategies.

So with that, I think I'm done, because I'm interested in your questions, because if you have

NEAL R. GROSS

questions, I'm pretty sure I have some answers. Thank you.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, John. We appreciate that, and there is no doubt in my mind that you have those answers. Next we'll turn to Jeff, Jeff Barber from Indiana. Jeff.

MR. BARBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. As was stated prior, I'm certainly pleased to be here, and honored to have the opportunity to speak to you. I think many of things that I'll have to present certainly connect with what you've heard prior. I think that we all see things, both in the areas many of the same of strengths and in areas that could be improved, there are many connections between the states, so I think that commonality of the presentations certainly speaks to the strength of what's being said today.

Just to begin with, one of the things that I think was mentioned before by Mike is that Safe and Drug Free Schools really does offer the opportunity to engage every school district, every school, and every student throughout the country. There's no other

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

opportunity like that, and to me, that has a huge amount of power, and I think that we need to make sure that we use that to its most beneficial effect. And I think if you take the Safe and Drug Free Schools money away, if that wasn't there, where is the slack going to be picked up? And it's not going to be picked up by the states, it's not going to be picked up by the locals. It really is an opportunity, and we need to take advantage of that.

Another strength that I see really is, are the Principles of Effectiveness. They were codified with No Child Left Behind, they were in place prior to that, and I think the codification of them certainly provides strength for the Principles of Effectiveness. The principles really are a sound planning structure for any program, whether you're talking about prevention program, whether you're talking about It really is a process you must school improvement. do in the needs assessment. You must have goals and objectives, or performance measures that make sense and relate back to your needs assessment.

You need to pick program strategies, efforts,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

activities that link back, and you know will have an effect on those performance measures, and then you have to evaluate, and that evaluation really needs to be an opportunity, looked at as an opportunity to strengthen what you're doing, and not just to prove that the program is effective from a funding point of view. I mean, really the point of the evaluation is for the school systems to look at it and say this is working or this it not, or maybe we need to strengthen our evaluation efforts. There are many answers that you can get from an evaluation.

The Principles of Effectiveness also provided me an opportunity at the state level to do training. And I think one of the things that state money is there for is for us to build capacity at the local level. And I'll speak a little bit more on this in connection with the strategic prevention framework, state incentive grant. We are a recipient of that in Indiana, and there's a very tight connection between the two, and I think that's another important point for the committee to look at, is how all these federal programs connect. And I've seen a real — in the last

NEAL R. GROSS

five years, I've seen federal agencies really coming together and coordinating at a much more effective level than was occurring in the past. I think that's occurring at the state level now, and that leadership from the federal level to the state level then can encourage those kinds of connections at the local level, so all of these things are connected. And you take one element out of this, and it's certainly going to have a big effect, and it won't be positive. I can almost guarantee that.

One of the issues with Safe and Drug Free Schools that often is comes uρ the amount allocation per school system. It certainly is very low for some, but what I have seen, I have very few districts - actually, no one in Indiana refuses. We have some who don't follow-through as they need to to receive the funding, but I haven't had anybody, even school systems who receive \$500, say they don't want And they have to fill out an application, they it. have to do all the same things that a school system that receives \$200,000 does. So if schools are willing to do that, school systems are willing to do

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that, to me, that says something. If they're willing to take the \$500, do all the work that comes with it, and implement programs to the best of their ability with that funding, there is a message there, I think, from the school systems.

I think it also provides an opportunity for the schools, even with funding at very low levels, to bring something to the table. They are no longer having a situation we often see where things are being done to them. They are then a partner. They could say look, we can put this money in the pot. We have county you provide from the community level? level organizations that do address issues related to prevention, treatment, and enforcement of drug use, so what this does is it brings the school to the table, say here's our money, you have money, you have resources, how can we work together, as opposed to the people from outside the school setting coming in and saying here's what we want to do. I mean, the school is not really having as much voice, I think, in the matter without something to bring to the table.

Another important point with Safe and Drug

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Schools is it, I think, has provided school systems a new opportunity to be effective in the competitive grant process no matter where the funding comes from. And I really think it has provided a foundation for the national programs to be effective. At the state level, we have a communication system. I use list serve, I have mailings, I have a list of Safe and Drug Free Schools coordinators. I can get information out, so I think that increases the pool of applicants for the national programs or other grant provide opportunities that we certainly the information to the locals on.

it also really does provide think opportunity for the school system to take the built with the foundation that was State program, and build on that through the national grant And I think without that foundation, the program. pool of applicants will certainly decrease, think the quality of those applicants will decrease, also, because you won't have that foundation. you take that away, the system will dry up, Safe and Drug Free Schools if the money was to no longer be

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

available, you really would have to try to rebuild that whole system, the capacity of the schools who offer high quality programs to be able to apply for grant opportunities, and I think that needs to be something to look at. It is a foundation. It is not the answer, the only thing, but it is a foundation and needs to be supported as such.

I just wanted to go over a few things, just to kind of give you an example, and this is just very briefly what Safe and Drug Free Schools offers Indiana is really provided and what from an outcome I'm not a researcher, never claimed to perspective. be, but we certainly look at how we can evaluate the effectiveness of the program. If we had millions of dollars, we certainly would do research to tie the dollar exactly to the outcome, but it would take a great deal of research to do that, and we don't have that kind of funding. But what we do have, we do have a survey that the majority of the school systems in Indiana participate in. They get local data, which is a perfect opportunity for them to learn about what's going on in their schools, in their communities

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

related to drug use, and violent behavior with their students, but that data then is compiled at the state level, and so we can look at data that's directly connected to school systems and tie it back up to the state level. This survey has been conducted since 1991. Every year over 100,000 students are surveyed, and I think it's really an opportunity for us to look at risk and protective factors, as well as drug use rates.

Just a couple of slides on the trends on, I guess, the big three, as I seem to sense those. This is just a look at alcohol use rate since 1991; and although you see some bumps up and down here and there, for the most part you can see that the trend has been going down over time, and continues to do so. And certainly, what I think you see with this data is partly an effect from the Safe and Drug Free Schools money. You can't bring five and a half million dollars into the school systems in Indiana for drug use prevention, for violence prevention, and not see some kind of positive effect.

The next one is cigarette use among Indiana

NEAL R. GROSS

students, and these are all monthly use rates. And as you can see, we had an increase during the mid to late 90s, and we've consistently had a reduction since then, so over time these rates continue to drop, continue to decrease. Finally, we have the monthly use rates for marijuana among Indiana students. And once again, we did have a spike in the early to mid-90s, which has then trended down since then.

The next slide, and one of the questions the question was about rural, is it working in rural
areas? Is it working in suburban and urban areas, and
so I just wanted to touch on a few examples, and I
just pulled these from our files. Every school system
is required to submit their performance measures for
the year with their application. The following year,
they report on the outcomes of those performance
measures, and so these are just a couple of examples
that I have.

This LEA is North Montgomery Community Schools. They have an enrollment of 2,160, and in fiscal year 2005, their allocation amount was \$3,704, and I would show you the difference between that and

NEAL R. GROSS

'06, it's significant. We had decreases because of the decrease at the federal level. Among the LEAs, I basically kind of looked at all of them, and we had anywhere from 9 percent to a 32 percent reduction in allocations, so this amount would be significantly reduced for '06. But as you can see, the percentage of tenth graders reporting alcohol use in the past 30 days, and this is in one year, it decreased from 30.5 percent to 26.7 percent.

Also among tenth graders reporting marijuana use in the past 30 days decreased from 16.5 percent to 9.9 percent. And certainly, there are other efforts going on within the school system, but that \$3,000 had an impact, and you can see that with the data. Not on the slide that you have presented, but I did want to also mention Adams Central Community Schools, they had several looks at their performance measures, and they included annual alcohol use among high school students which declined from 45 percent to 42.5 percent, annual marijuana use among high school students declined from 14 percent to 9.8 percent. Annual cigarette use among high school students declined from 22 percent to 20.1

NEAL R. GROSS

percent. Annual alcohol use among middle school students declined from 19 percent to 14.9 percent. And finally, annual cigarette use among middle school students declined from 7 percent to 5.2 percent.

At the suburban level, our system of how we put -- what level we put schools at is a little bit different, but it relates to the suburban population, as far as numbers of students. We have an LEA, Brownsburg Community Schools, which is near Indianapolis, has an enrollment of 6,726. Their allocation was 17,379, and their 2004 performance measure results, they had daily tobacco use by tenth graders decrease from 15.8 percent to 8.7 percent, daily tobacco use by eleventh graders decreased from 22.7 to 13.5, daily tobacco use among twelfth graders went from 25.1 percent to 15.5 percent. I'm not going to read through all of these because I don't want to take up too much time with this.

We also have Greater Clark County schools, and I put them in here for two reasons. One, they have had great outcomes, but they had an administrator who was working with the Safe and Drug Free Schools

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

program. She was also the Title 1 coordinator, and she did the most magnificent job of connecting safe and drug free schools to academic achievement, and really got her school on board. They implemented a life skills program, and she sold their school system on the fact that they had to do this, because they needed to increase their test scores, their academic achievement. And one of the keys to that was reducing drug use and violent behavior, and they saw dramatic changes.

They also had a huge amount of buy-in from the staff at the school level because of her work, so she was a great leader, unfortunately retired this year, but I'm expecting that what she put in place is not going to just go away. She certainly has had a long-term impact on that school system, but you can see that the rates for this school system for monthly marijuana cigarette use among eighth and tenth graders has decreased significantly, so I think that is a testament to her work, and also was provided -- they were provided the opportunity through the Safe and Drug Free Schools program for that.

NEAL R. GROSS

the urban level, we have Kokomo-Center Township Consolidated Schools with 7,027 students. They have \$48,000 allocation in 2005. Their 2004 performance measure results, you can see they reduced expulsions for possession, use of drugs and alcohol, among sixth through twelfth graders by 10 percent, expulsions for violent behavior for six through twelfth graders was reduced by 58 percent, and then for disruptive behavior suspensions in grades six through seven was reduced by 24 percent. They implemented Student Assistance Programs in Too Good for Drugs, which is a Mendez Foundation program.

Vigo County School Corporation, and this system has certainly seen — well, this county has seen a huge problem with methamphetamine that's been probably at the highest level for all the counties in the state, so they have a big issue that they need to deal with. And they have provided the funding that they use, Safe and Drug Free Schools, they provide the Too Good for Drugs and Project Alert program. They also use it for Student Assistance Programming.

In 2004, with their performance measures,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they saw decreases in monthly cigarette use, out of school suspensions for grades nine through twelve decreased by 5 percent, reductions in monthly alcohol use among twelfth graders, and then students who missed one to two days of school due to school safety concerns decreased by 14 percent, so once again, decreases are improvements in their outcomes across the board.

A couple of things I wanted to mention, mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of Safe and Ι think probably Drug Free Schools. the most important thing is to look at the program from the bottom up, from the LEA level to the federal level, because that's where the program operates, so that's where the evaluation should begin. I think the outcome data should be fed to the state, and then the and this would provide federal level, the best opportunity to assess program effectiveness. With the requirements for Safe and Drug Free Schools plans, the Principles of Effectiveness to be developed based on an assessment of local need, then the measures of effectiveness must be generated at that level.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the system that measures the effectiveness of the program should include process data that ties the implementation of the programs, strategies, and activities using the Principles of Effectiveness. And this really must assess the adherence to all elements of the Principles of Effectiveness.

One of the things that I have experienced, I am actually on the SPFSIG, as they call it, the Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant Advisory Committee at the state level. things that I found through that is the system, as I'm thinking of it here, really is being put in place through the SPFSIG process. And one of the things that they are measuring is the capacity, is capacity to offer high quality programs to assess the problems in the community, to evaluate those problems, is that increasing? And I think that should be part of any any evaluation of Safe and Drug Free program, or It shouldn't just be about reducing drug Schools. use, which is the bottom line piece, but it also should be about developing a program, a structure, an infrastructure really, and assessing that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

infrastructure, because that, to me, is as valuable and more long-lasting of an effect, and so we need to look at that and make sure that we are assessing that.

Some of the emerging issues - I really don't see any emerging issues from the sense that - and I think that John mentioned this, you don't want to end up chasing your tail going for the new flavor of the month, the problem of the month. I think what Safe and Drug Free Schools really offers is that breadth. You could look across the spectrum, and through the systems that have been set up, through the funding partially, but also really more than anything, through the system that has been set up. You have the opportunity to address any problem that may occur, no matter what it is, so I think basically, is flexible is sufficient, the breadth and the program.

The Principles of Effectiveness really by design require districts to monitor their needs, so they should be able to recognize when they have a problem and when they need to maybe make an adjustment in their program, programmatic approach. I think the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

crisis plan with the guidance and the language related to that is sufficient, and that schools really are prepared to address any kind of emergency that comes their way.

The current structure of the Safe and Drug Free Schools program, I really think that one of the strengths is that it provides an opportunity for state level leadership. That leadership comes from the federal level, and is filtered down to the states, and it really provides us the opportunity, and I mentioned some of the trainings that we do. My training, I don't focus on a programmatic training for life skills or this program, or that program. I really focus on this development of capacity, do they have the ability and understanding to evaluate, to do needs assessment, to offer programs and put them in place in a way that is effective, as opposed to just saying here's a program, put this in place and you'll be fine. There's no magic bullet. I think the magic bullet really is that capacity, that understanding. It has a much longer-lasting effect.

I also believe the school systems typically

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

respond more to SEA input than they may from a federal level input. Not always the case, you heard the story of I'm from the state, I'm here to help, and the laughs occur upon saying that. But honestly, I have had no resistance, no sense that people don't want the state to be involved, don't want state leadership. And I think that they really look to the state to provide whatever leadership they may provide, and Safe and Drug Free Schools certainly aives that us opportunity.

think also the closer the supporting are to the end user, they increase effectiveness of that program, whether you're talking about the SEA or the Governor's program. I think it closer, and certainly, federal needs to be leadership is very important, but your ability and resources to effect change at a local level from the federal level is certainly going to be taxed, if not nearly impossible to make a huge impact with that kind of a distance between the two systems.

To continue in the current structure, I think the funding also provides an opportunity for leverage

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

for the SEA to be part of a bigger picture. The Department of Education in Indiana has been brought to the table in many areas. I mentioned the SPFSIG Advisory Committee. We also participate the Governor's Commission for Drug Free Indiana. We have a Meth Free Coalition now in place, and the Department of Education is at the table there. There are many other examples of that basically across the board, whether we're talking about our single state agency, their advisory committees and groups Governor's Commission on Drug Free Indiana.

All of those agencies engage the Department of Education, and I don't think it's wholly because of Safe and Drug Free Schools, but it certainly makes it much more likely that we're going to be at the table because we have resources that we can bring along with that.

I think that also the system allows initiatives and communications related to Safe and Drug Free Schools to flow to the local level. I don't know exactly how effectively even the Safe and Drug Free Schools could communicate directly to LEAs

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

without the SEA being engaged in some way. without the Safe and Drug Free Schools funding, those of us in the position of Safe and Drug Free Schools players, we may still be at the Department, but we may be there in a different capacity, and it may not be that individual or that organization within the Department of Education to pass that information And certainly, there's lot of vital along. а information. You look at the school safety issues have occurred related to the shootings Columbine and other locations, and the initiatives from that. Also, initiatives have come the related to Homeland Security, I think the system that's in place because of Safe and Drug Free Schools has provided an opportunity that would not have been there otherwise.

The Principles of Effectiveness requirements and other authorized activities there certainly is a disconnect between the two. Some of the authorized activities, there are 27 of them, don't have a great deal of research to back them up, so I think that some concerted review of those activities to really look at

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it through the lens of research, and make sure that what's on the list has solid evidence to back it up, solid research to back it up, I think is vitally important.

I believe that using the foundation of the collaboration has been fostered at the federal level would be an opportunity that we could use in this effort, and I know that SAMHSA has their model programs list, which is a great opportunity for school systems to really look at programs that have been assessed and evaluated, but I also think that there be an effort to move toward a look strategies as opposed to what I always call program in a box, because at the state level when you're looking at a list of programs, these are all supported by people that are selling a product. And while those products may be wonderful and great, it's very hard for us at the state level to say here, you have to use this product, because in a sense, we're endorsing that at the state level, and that really puts us in a difficult situation. And I think if you took those programs and really looked at the strategies and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

activities within them, you'd see, and you will see consistency across them. They use role plays. They use various strategies to engage students beyond just some kind of didactic presentation. All of these things are elements of an effective program, so let's take a step back and look at those strategies, the upstream piece, as opposed to the end product, which is oftentimes something that someone is selling for profit.

think that once the review the authorized activities was completed, then we could just look at just having a list of strategies and activities backed by solid research. And then I think from the federal level to the state level, to the local level, we could really provide great training around the strategies. How do you implement them? What strategies work? Which strategies really do address the problems that you have within your local community. So with that, I will close, and thank you very much for the opportunity.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Jeff. We appreciate that. And next we'll move to the State of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Washington, Mona Johnson.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to thank the committee for the opportunity to speak this morning, and I will try to be very brief. I'm looking at time and want to honor that. Behind me you can see my Power Points really quickly, the strengths of the Safe and Drug Free Schools program. My colleagues have reiterated that very well this morning, and I'll say the same thing.

One of the things about this funding stream is the only funding stream available to every LEA. That's critical for the Foundation of Substance Abuse and Violence Prevention. I think part of the power, and Jeff touched on this, and so did my other colleagues, is that it's the SEA administering the presentation or, excuse me, the program to the locals providing a level of leadership, which I think is very important.

Having a point of contact in every district that's specifically identified to deal with substance abuse and violence prevention - those of you in education know how big that world is. And to have a

NEAL R. GROSS

point of contact that we know can be that key person we work with at the District level to address these issues is another strength of this project. And, also, it is the foundational funding stream. I think much of the work that we've done over the time and the span of Safe and Drug Free Schools really has set the structure of the foundation for programs violence prevention and substance abuse prevention that our districts have been able to leverage to get additional resources, either at the state, local, or national level.

We do do a state survey in Washington State.

I didn't really want to share with you the state survey results, because what's most relevant to me in my state is what is the money being spent on related to Safe and Drug Free Schools, and how can we tie what we're doing to Safe and Drug Free Schools in those outcomes, so that's what this slide is to illustrate.

I wanted to share with you in the State of Washington that 74 percent of our total sum of Safe and Drug Free Schools money that comes into our SEA funds our State Student Assistance Program. We call

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it the Student Assistance Prevention and Intervention Services Program. The other 26 percent of the program is used by districts for other authorized activities, and you can see behind you a list of the other authorized activities, which aren't surprising.

We only have one district in our entire state of 296 school districts that has a waiver to do a program outside of the authorized activities, within science-based programming, so we spent a lot of doing training, as Jeff mentioned, building capacity and comprehensive prevention That's the beauty, in our opinion, of the planning. Principles of Effectiveness. It's a beautiful guide to help district build capacity around comprehensive prevention, and it marries, and mirrors, and dovetails really well with the strategic prevention framework and CSAP's work, et cetera.

One of the things I wanted to say, too, about our State Student Assistance Program is, I mentioned that 74 percent of that money is funded by Safe and Drug Free Schools. It is also matched in our state by tobacco settlement funds, and also matched by the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

prevention block grant, the CSAP Prevention block grant. So really for the one dollar spent on Safe and Drug Free Schools, we also have two other dollars from two different funding streams that are being leveraged at the state, and the regional, and the local level to provide our Student Assistance Program. So let me share a little bit about what we mean, and what we're looking at in our State Student Assistance Program in terms of mission.

Essentially, what our goal is, is to provide prevention, intervention, and support services for kids who are struggling with academics, behavioral issues, looking at and those issues cropping up. It can be anything from detention, to You guys know all the behavioral skipping school. issues that happen in schools, so those are the things that are critical indicators that we train staff to be aware of, and those kids become noticed in a school district and become a part of the Student Assistance Program.

Our goals are to, at minimum, across the state, and each of our regional folks have adopted

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

these goals, and even gone further with them - 10 percent reduction each year in alcohol use, tobacco use, and marijuana use. And we also have set for ourselves a goal of 10 percent increase in school bonding, and we collect data on all of these things which I'll mention in a second.

What we are able to document through online documented online data collection system, well as through pre/post tests are the number universal prevention activities that we are providing through our Student Assistance Program. And then more specific, the individual students selected indicated services that are being provided. And this last year in this state, it's just fresh, I'm wrapping my arms around it. We have a meeting in September for our entire state team to go over this and take a look at it, but in the last year, we saw 18,446 kids individually as a part of the indicated selected prevention work that we do in our Student Assistance Program. You can see that's three or more visits that a student has with someone who Assistant Specialist, Student and then we start

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

documenting the services.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'm proud of these Outcomes outcomes, really proud of our state for our hard work in putting together this data collection system and the pre/post testing that we have going on. Reductions in use across the board, which also mirror, by the way, our state survey. All right? But this is, again, really specific to the work that we're doing tied to Safe and Drug Free Schools funds. It's pretty selfexplanatory. I don't think you need me to go through it.

Other outcomes, not just related to use, are outcomes related to behavior. I almost didn't want to show you the slide, as I said, because it's fresh data that I just got for this presentation that we're going to discuss in September, but do you notice anything? There's something glaring that stands out to me in the slide, in this slide. Three percent increase in school skipping, I really didn't want to show that slide. All right? What we did see is changes in all kinds of other behaviors, trouble at school, skipping school, suspended, but we did see an increase in

NEAL R. GROSS

skipping of school. And why I decided to show you this slide, because I wanted our State of Washington to look really good, and this isn't necessarily good why I decided to show this is because what we know about comprehensive prevention planning is, when you do true evaluation, you learn things about programs that you may or may not like. I like the good touchyfeely things that make me feel good so we can keep doing what we're doing, but we also learn some things sometimes that we need to take a look at. And you can bet this is going to be a huge point of discussion at our meeting in September when we get together. What does it tell us about our is this about? program, et cetera? But it's still something to be proud of in terms of changes in behavior.

And then, also, we have changes in protective factors. For us, that's also very important to measure, the connection between risk and protective factors, and you can see some of the things that school bonding increases, guidance, nurturants, all of those things that are critical and important. Again, this data is collected through individual online data

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

collection systems and then pre/post testing with kids into their first sessions with their Student Assistant Specialist, and then at the end of their time in the program.

I also wanted to share with you a little bit about how our LEAs use this, so I'm talking about it the state level, but Ι also wanted understand how our LEAs are using Safe and Drug Free Schools funding. Specifically in the of area leveraging, there's a couple of quick examples. We have a district called South Kitsap School District. 10,400 students and they get approximately, of Safe and Drug Free Schools funds. You can see that they decided to target their money toward the Student Assistance Program, and look at their reductions in use. They went well beyond the 10 percent reduction in use, and did a 22 percent reduction in alcohol, 7.5 in tobacco, and look at the marijuana reduction use in that district specific to the students who are part of the Student Assistance Program, then an increase in school bonding, also.

And then another little teeny, we talked

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about the small sums of money that are available for this program, very small district, Queets Clear Water School District, 40 students in that entire district, a grand sum of \$1,521 of Safe and Drug Free Schools funding, but look at what they were able to do. decided that we're going to target our funding on our best practice. We're going to train our staff in Second Step, and look at the increases in behavior in terms of the kids and their performance, et cetera, so something to be proud of, and some of the different ways that the flexibility within the program allows us within the scope of the Principles Effectiveness and the framework.

One of the things we think that's really critical in Washington State, and I think we would echo this, and we all have said this in our own ways, is the leadership from the state education agency. We really see our job to be the providers of technical assistance to those who need it at the local level. Connecting what we do to the larger mandates of No Child Left Behind, as my colleagues have mentioned, providing professional development, facilitating local

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and state prevention planning, collaboration and coordination. With the variety of funding streams that are out there, again, the leveraging of resources is so very critical, people have to understand the science of prevention and how to do comprehensive planning.

We also feel that our role at the state is to develop a statewide data collection system. That should be our job, to set up statewide data а collection system so we can articulate to people what are we doing with these funds, how are using them, what does it look like? And then, also, to assist and maintain accountability at the state, local, regional level.

You've heard this - one of our biggest challenges is the reductions in funds. It was an interesting task to go back and look at what's happened over the last 10 years in Washington State. Overall, we've had a 37 percent reduction in Safe and Drug Free Schools funds over the last 10 years, which is pretty significant. What is amazing to me is the resilience of our communities, and of our schools.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And with decreased resources and increased accountability, our communities, although they've been stretched, still been able to maintain have programming, and have been able to, to the degree that they can, to address the issues that are specific to kids. They've had to narrow what they focus on and be very clear about that needs assessment and targeting what they're doing, but they're able to do it, and they've really risen to the occasion, in our opinion, in Washington State.

We really need to continue the coordinated effort at the federal level. As my colleague, Jeff, mentioned, the discussion among the different federal agencies has really been supportive to us at the state education agency level, so that we can assist our folks in understanding all of this, and how it fits together. And then, also, we need to tie the larger continue to tie the larger body of what we do to No Child Left Behind, and the supportive learning environment and academic achievement piece.

Our recommendations, increased funding.
We've love to see that. Really, our schools could use

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

more, not less. I know you know that, and I really don't need to say it, but it really is the truth of the matter. If we don't get increased funding, though, we're still going to do the best that we can with what we have.

Maintain an emphasis on the Principles of Effectiveness - I keep mentioning that, but capacity building and understanding the science of prevention is so key to making this work. I hope when I'm not at the Department of Education any more that this program continues because of the capacity that's There are people in place at the local level, and maybe someone - I don't know - who could take my role at the state maybe, or not, but this stuff can continue so it isn't just specific to a person, but the capacity is there, the science is there, the program is there, the strategy is there that's very relevant.

Provide a coordinated effort at the federal level in terms of leadership, guidance, and technical assistance. I think those of us at the state are very open to having dialogues and getting guidance and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

assistance in the way that we need it to help us do our jobs better. And then continue to evaluate the program in the context of No Child Left Behind, really tying what we do in the true sense in the academic environment to student achievement, and assessing and assisting, and reaching out to disenfranchised youth. I think that's our biggest challenge.

I often say to many of the people that I work with in the field, we have our legs in at least two arenas. We have to understand the social service arena and the science, and prevention, and strategic prevention framework, and all of that planning, and then we have to understand the education world, and all of what education is about, and make that link, and tie it together. And I'd like for us to focus on, I think one of the recommendations is that we continue to focus on how to build that bridge stronger as locals, as states, and as a nation. Thank you.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Mona. And thank you, Jeff, thank you, John, thank you, Mike, for all of the information. Now, as we indicated, we'll be turning to a very important part of this segment,

NEAL R. GROSS

1	and that will be where the committee members can ask,
2	so that we can have a dialogue, and draw on your
3	expertise and experience. So the floor is now open
4	for questions of the panelists, so that we can delve
5	into this a little further. Remember as you ask, that
6	you hit the microphone so that it can be recorded.
7	DR. JONES: Yes. First of all, thanks so
8	much or your very exciting and informative
9	presentations. Just had a couple of questions to
10	start out with, in terms of data collection. I think
11	Jeff, both you and Mona, presented data with downward
12	trends. And, I guess, the first question is, are the
13	significance none of the levels of significance
14	were reported in terms of nice decreases in undesired
15	behavior?
16	MS. JOHNSON: I'm not sure I
17	DR. JONES: The question I'm asking is, there
18	were drops in behavior, drug usage and that kind of
19	thing. I was wondering if those drops were
20	significant.
21	MR. BARBER: They certainly were. I mean, if

you look at the data, the reports that we get from the

1	Indiana Prevention Resource Center that does the
2	survey for the state, they don't report things. I
3	mean, if it's not significant, they're not going to
4	put it in their reports, and these were all
5	statistically significant.
6	DR. JONES: Okay. I would just suggest that
7	those significance levels be reported when you present
8	the data, .05 level, .01, et cetera, it's very
9	helpful. Also, in terms of the data, are there
10	breakdowns in terms of race, socio-economic status and
11	gender? I didn't see that there. I'm assuming that
12	those data are there, but it would be very interesting
13	and informative to actually see that breakdown.
14	MS. JOHNSON: In our state survey, we
15	certainly have it broken down in that way, and I also
16	have it broken down specific to our Student Assistance
17	Program. In the interest of time, though, I didn't
18	feel I could get into that level of detail. That's
19	pretty fascinating data to look at, and it certainly
20	tells us a lot about program, and it is available.
21	DR. JONES: Yes, good.

We

BARBER:

also

have

MR.

22

same

the

breakdowns, and anybody - if there's any interest in our state reports, we'd be glad to get those to you, if people want us to look at the data in total, as opposed to a short presentation.

DR. follow-up JONES: Okay. Just one question. John, I thought you made a very good point, that even though they are great reductions undesired behavior, et cetera, I think you made the point that those data simply reflect the kids that are in school versus those that are not. Could you say a little bit about that?

MR. BYNOE: Well, for my state it's the YBS, which is usually grades nine through twelve, so oftentimes, we're moving to work with our Department of Public Health now to do YBS combined with the public health survey, which is six through twelve. But at the same time, it's those kids who are in school on that day and time. Those kids who are truant, those kids who are skipping, those kids who have dropped out are not necessarily included in the survey, and how do you get at those students. Even students who are there, you have the opportunity in my

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

state to opt out of the survey, because of the certain questions that are there. So even though it's a representative and it's a valid sample of students by the students who are in school, I'm concerned about the students who don't go to school on a regular basis, kids who have dropped out, and what's going on with those children. But at the same time, I look at in terms of what's actually going on in the street.

I happen to be a basketball coach and I've been a basketball coach in my community for about 12, And talking in the real world to 15 years now. students, what's going on, working with the District Attorney's office and what they see, listening to what happened - this is not only urban, this is suburban, rural, et cetera, so it's not just one area. my kids went to a suburban school through school You know, OxyContin or heroin was prevalent choice. for some kids, was the choice drug for some kids in their school. I just found this out the other day in a conversation with some other adults about kids that I actually knew who are now addicted to heroin or OxyContin. in the City of Peevey, I mean,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

example, OxyContin is prevalent. A Jeff Judah, think his name is, who was a high school baseball player, who now just was again found OD'd in Lynn on OxyContin. heroin, who has had former superintendent's son was on OxyContin, so these drugs are there, and there's kids who are not in school. And I'm not sure how we get to those children, because we're now in our state, we're talking about drop-out prevention efforts, and re-entry efforts to get kids back in school. How to keep them in school becomes the concern.

One of the things that's happening now also in my state, and I often joke about it, and I mention this to you, the Commissioner made me an Associate Commissioner so that prevention and safety could be on the table at all times, and it's now truly part of our state strategic plan, around safe and healthy schools is a key point in our strategic plan, so that's how we're trying to wrestle it to the ground.

MR. LEDBETTER: The common thing that I've heard each of you say this morning is that there's no commonality between the programs within the states.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It appears to me that each state, at least for the four of you, your programs are somewhat varied from state-to-state. Mike, in your statement you said because each local program is different, it's almost impossible to develop a universal set of outcome indicators. That appears to be a problem, to me. What could be done to change this? Do you have any suggestions, or do any of you have a suggestion?

MR. HERMANN: I think part of what we could do is, you could narrow in the scope of the program. I mean, that's one option. Personally, I would sort of hate to see that happen. I think you can identify indicators that will be universal, but recognize the fact that for this particular program and the focus of what this local district chose to do, this indicator about say the climate of the school may not be a particularly appropriate indicator, and may not be a particularly appropriate measure of effectiveness for that program.

I think the question is being able to have a set of indicators, as opposed to three or four that every program is measured on. Does that make sense?

NEAL R. GROSS

So we give people some flexibility in terms of the indicators that they use, and recognizing the fact that not all districts are going to be focusing on the same issues.

I think to even simplify it even MR. BYNOE: more, if districts are focusing on substance abuse, particularly alcohol, the use of alcohol, and the indicators - and alcohol is only one indicator, talk about bullying or school climate, they may not show good results on bullying or school climate, because that's not what they're addressing with Safe and Drug Free Schools money, they're addressing alcohol. unless you build in a system to say specifically what are you using your Safe and Drug Free Schools money for, and that's the indicator that you're going to be evaluated on, but if you put out a set of indicators, mean, one thought is the Uniform Management Information Reporting System - how can you redesign that system from a warehouse system, which is what it is, just a warehouse of data under the law, because all we do is report it on a school-by-school basis. There's no requirement of analysis or use of that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

data, except we do require districts to use it locally in terms of our school safety and reporting system, which feeds into Humerus, but as a state, we just report on a school-by-school basis. But if you use information somehow work with that as that information, and have schools individually take those pieces of that information to use for their indicators with some quidance, but I don't think a set standard indicators, because as Mike says, if you're talking about those indicators based on Safe and Drug Free Schools funding alone, that funding usually has a small piece of the pie, not the total picture that they're focusing on.

DR. LONG: Okay. Shep, and then Hope.

DR. KELLAM: Yes, I'm impressed. I thought many of the points you guys made were really very, very powerful. One of the points I got was that it takes multiple levels of support to make this thing go at all, and that means that the federal, state, local levels, and at the school building level with the principal and the teacher.

One of the questions that I thought was

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

important that I was surprised, Mona, you didn't raise, and that is, economic analysis, that is, costbenefit analysis. Washington State, Steve Allison and the crowd, have evaluated and shown the level of dollars saved by the very programs that you listed up there, and others, as well, so that's an important dimension that we ought to think about, too.

I was struck by the fact that we're calling on you to somehow be accountable, and all of you have mentioned that that's not what you do for a living, in a sense. I mean, they're not researchers. You're not out there, in fact, trained in sampling, nor should anybody expect you to be. But then the question is, have you tried, or would it not be wise for us to in general, for partnerships to strongly urge, formed between the states, the locals, and the local or otherwise research groups. You know, partnerships which, in fact, allow academic achievement to be part of the model, as well as behavior, but which, in fact, tie-in at least in some local districts with state partnerships, with research groups, and I wondered whether you had any experience with that.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. JOHNSON: I'd like to comment on that.

Yes, we have had experience with that. We're blessed to have the University of Washington --

DR. KELLAM: I recognize Social Bonds and a few other of our friends and relatives.

MS. JOHNSON: And the evaluation that Ι whipped through very quickly up there is generated by an independent evaluator we've been working with since 1994 in our program, so this is an outside person whose expertise is in evaluation, and it's been a wonderful challenge to work together with a large group of practitioners and this researcher to help us develop, number one, an evaluation system that was relevant to what we were doing. And number two, to kind of make it practical so people would complete the evaluation. But I am not a researcher by training, I'm primarily a social work educator by background. However, this job in the last 10, 12-ish years has very much forced me to understand evaluation in a way I never thought I ever would. And sometimes I even scare myself by the questions I ask that are very specific to evaluation and outcomes, based on that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

experience.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I think one of the things kind MR. BARBER: of with your point and the question prior - looking at the fact that the program, any program, if vou're going to do a good quality evaluation, you really have to begin with an evaluation in mind, and that's not, necessarily, the case the way legislation works, so I think that may be part of it. If the legislation maybe was developed based on the concept of what is going to be the outcome, or how are we going to evaluate that, I certainly think that would build a stronger program overall. Sometimes it's kind of like we're evaluating after the horse is already out of the and asking people to come back and tell barn, legislation doesn't things that the provide the opportunity for, and I think there are -- part of it with this, with any system, and being from a local school, you understand that the idea of local control, and I think oftentimes education funding goes out based on this concept of local control. And there needs to be some flexibility, people need to be able If we tell people what to meet their own needs.

NEAL R. GROSS

they're going to do, they'll address a problem that may not be a problem in their community, so there has to be that ability for there to be flexibility or opportunity for differences among the programmatic approaches so they can address their needs. there also has to be the idea of how can we evaluate that in some reasonable fashion. And really, I think the leadership does have to come from the federal level on that. We don't necessarily get the level of funding that we can engage a researcher efforts, even though we would love to do it. basically, I have one and a half me, a half-time person who work on the program at the state level, and so you have to try to find your focus. And we'd love to all do research level evaluation, but we do what we can with the resources that we have.

MR. BYNOE: In the past, particularly at the local level, we work with schools, and Howell, you may -- because I use my CDC evaluator to provide training to local schools around various evaluation models. One simple evaluation model we use, if you can picture the objective analysis, the need, begins an instant

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

evaluation process, because you start the objective analysis of needs, you go with measurables of objectives, you do your evaluation, your outcome impact evaluation, then that takes you right back to objective analysis and need, so it's a very simple model that we've been promoting in the schools over the years in terms of local evaluation.

At the state, in terms of school improvement, we're beginning that. We're beginning that because we are now understanding that even though Massachusetts seems to be a leader around academic achievement with NAPE, our standardized tests, et cetera, senior staff at the department now realizes that even though we're in 85 percent first round, 95 percent after the second round, 5 percent is not going to make it, and the question is why. If you give them all the resources, you give them all the academic training and remedial programs, you still have to drill down and find out why these kids are not being successful, and school districts are going to have to take a hard look at what's going on in the districts, because there are

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

children being left behind, as I said earlier. So that's going to cause them to evaluate their district in terms of school improvement and prevention now is going to be a part of that, the social services part that Mona talked about will not be part of the school improvement. I think that's going to happen through the evaluation process that we're going to begin to develop at the state level to work with schools, especially under-performing schools.

DR. LONG: We have nine minutes left, and the order of questioning, Hope, Fred, Dennis for right now. I just wanted to --

MS. TAFT: I want to thank you all for coming and pointing out very clearly that a little money can go a long way in school districts, and that it's very important to have the state link between the federal government and the local government. I also have two questions. Hopefully, you'll keep your answers brief. But one I want to ask first and get the answers for a second so that you can have a chance to think about it. We've been charged by our chair to think outside the box, to reinvent this program, and I'd like to

know your recommendations for doing that in a way that would allow us to get positive results. And then, Jeff, you mentioned that you thought an evaluation program should start at the bottom at the local level and build up, and I wondered if you had any more thoughts or details on a program developed in that manner that you could share with us?

MR. BARBER: I think the structure really, I mean, it really could build-off, and I actually was reading on the way out here yesterday the strategic prevention framework evaluation design. And, to me, this is, maybe, at least, even though that's a little different program in that it's competitive. It's not having the breadth of coverage that the Safe and Drug Free Schools program has, but one of the things they really do is they provide here are outcome measures at the national level. We want you to measure those at the state and local level, but you also have the opportunity to add to those, and look at other measurements that you want to effect change in. the concept they also look at is measuring a process How are things changing at the local and evaluation.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

at the state level based on this funding being in place. And really, the funding is only a small part of it. It really isn't an issue that brings people together at the state and local level to work toward a common end, so I think that this may be something for the committee to look at, as at least a concept of how an evaluation might work at the local level, and building up through the state to the federal level. So without -- I think the structure is certainly able to be put in place. I don't think there's any question about that.

MS. TAFT: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: May I add a comment here?

MS. TAFT: Yes.

MS. JOHNSON: I have a concern when we say evaluation being developed at the local level. What has worked for us, and this is one state out of 50, is that the local level folks come together with state level folks, and we develop an evaluation system that fits, to the best of our ability, across the board. And I think that that's -- I want to make that point, because it really makes me nervous when we start

talking about local evaluation, because that can be very different. It doesn't mean that -- I mean, the state framework has to be general enough that it encompasses those needs, but then it allows the flexibility for local people to collect the data that's very specific to their area that they need, so I would add that in conjunction to what Jeff shared.

MS. TAFT: So it's really local data that feeds into a system that's larger than just the local.

MS. JOHNSON: Exactly, and it's developed together. And that is a very painful process that we have some first-hand experience with in our state, but it is really powerful when you can pull all those players together and do something like that.

MS. TAFT: Thank you.

MR. BYNOE: In terms of your question about how can this program reinvent itself, well, I have a very simple answer. The program needs to mirror the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools. The Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools is not about Safe and Drug Free Schools community act any more, because you have the Phy. Ed. Program, you have the mental health

NEAL R. GROSS

program, you have the Safe Schools Healthy Child program, so the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools has expanded beyond just violence and substance abuse prevention to the whole child, those issues that get in the way of kids learning, so this program itself, and I jokingly have talked to, I hate to say his name, but David Quinlan, and Bill Modzeleski, actually, the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools, actually going to conferences, health education in terms of what the office is now when you look at the grant programs coming out, so that this program -- so simply, to me, is that Safe and Drug Free Schools and conference Community Act becomes more health education model, because it's part of the conference health education. I think sitting out there alone is what's causing it to be heard.

MS. TAFT: Okay. Any other suggestions?

MR. HERMANN: Along those same lines, I think part of the real challenge in terms of being heard, and in terms of really being able to get to outcomes that we desire, at this point, the program is attached to NCLB. It's one of the titles. There are all sorts

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of issues with, when you get to the state level and local level, with when the program gets squeezed into the consolidated application process. It's very hard to be heard, and it's very easy for priorities to get shifted and manipulated. And it's an issue of having strong leadership, I think, at the state level, strong leadership at the federal level. I think probably the cadre of folks that are working in the National Safe and Drug Free Schools office in the 20 years that I've been involved, I think it's probably the strongest bunch of people that I've ever seen, so clearly, the expertise is here. I think the question becomes, is the leadership engaged, because at the end of the day, really boils think it down to what are the priorities, and is it being pushed from the top.

MS. TAFT: Mona.

MS. JOHNSON: That's a huge question. A couple of things come to mind for me. I think the direction that we're going in, in terms of coming together, I will speak from my experience in the last year or two, between the federal and state, and then the state and local level, to me, is good. The

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

direction, the communication, the guidance, the technical assistance, the support has improved incredibly. I know that that allows me to be able to do what I do better, and more effectively.

I think narrowing, I might regret saying this, but narrowing the scope of what we do, when you look at that list of authorized activities, although they're really wonderful, there is a lot of room for a variety of different things, and it's very difficult to evaluate all of those things, because evaluation looks different for many of those. So narrowing it to a degree that works and is reasonable, not restricting and choking, but narrowing it to a degree that is supportive and helpful. And then I think encouraging outcomes and evaluations to the degree that those work, and accountability. I don't feel that there's anything wrong with that, but allowing states to work with local folks to articulate what they're doing, and I think we need to continue to communicate at the state and local level with federal authorities about what we are doing, that is working, and be more clear about that, and have the opportunity to share and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

articulate our message, so those are the first three things, Hope, that come to mind. That's a very powerful question.

MR. BARBER: I'll be very brief. And once a big question of ponderance, again, it is something that I've certainly thought about. But I think narrowing the scope, I mean, it's really difficult to evaluate something with that wide of a focus, and I think that would be very beneficial and helpful.

Also, I think maybe some requirements around training within the program that support this idea of capacity building. I think, to me, it's more than just putting a program in a classroom, or an effort in really school system. It's helping people understand how to put a system in place that flexible and functional, and has an opportunity to make changes, and to address the issues that are in place in that school system. So, to me, I think there should be more of an effort around that, and more focus on that within the legislation.

MS. TAFT: Okay. Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. LONG: We now have two minutes, which leaves one minute for Fred, and one minute for Dennis.

I'll try to make this quick. MR. ELLIS: of the things I heard from all of you was that the breadth of the program, the Safe and Drug Free Schools is one of its biggest strengths. Some would submit that it's that same breadth that is a real weakness to They've referred to it as being a mile the program. wide and inch deep. One of the examples I think both Mike John referred to in the positive emergency management/crisis management in terms of school systems being recognized as having player resources and bigger in emergency many management issues. So my question, particularly to both you gentlemen, is it appropriate, is it fair, is it right for Safe and Drug Free Schools to be, again, the only agency providing any funding whatsoever to local school systems that I'm aware of for emergency management, crisis management issues. And they are, by definition, limited to planning, not so much in terms of equipment. Should FEMA, DHS, some of the other agencies play more of a role, should Safe and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Drug Free Schools start focusing, again, on some of the core subject matters of what their expertise is, and perhaps some of the other federal agencies step up with the dollars that are needed at the local level?

Quickly, I think other folks do MR. HERMANN: step up and help schools. need FEMA comes immediately to mind, Homeland Security. But I think same time, it's important that we reinvent the wheel. I think it's going to vary from state to state in terms of how involved the Safe and Drug Free Schools program is. In Tennessee, I serve on the state's emergency services coordination body, so it's kind of a logical fit there. But I think in other states, it's probably going to be different.

MR. BYNOE: My answer is yes, those folks need to step up. But at the same time, I'm stepping up with MEMA, my emergency management group, to offer training this year around all hazard planning to local school districts. As I said, the catalyst for that was the whole issue around the pandemic preparedness Avian flu, but we're telling them they need to be prepared for any type of disaster issue, so that's how

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we're going to do it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. ROMERO: Thank you very much. absolutely and enlightened amazed by your presentations from the panel this morning. like to just make an offer to the committee, as the Director for Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, I'd be more than happy to provide the group with an overview of the strategic prevention framework, and how it ultimately is a vehicle for galvanizing both at the state level, as well as in the community level, on a prevention approach to the addictions and issues that plague the communities. So I heard a plug there for me in the presentation, especially from you, Jeff, but I do make that offer.

Secondly, to Jeff, your comment about NREP, and I think it's a very good comment to begin to focus more on the strategies than on the actual programs. And I think, Mona, you would agree with that. And that's something actually that I have been aware of, and we are, just as an FYI, a letter has been sent out to all of the SSAs across the country under my signature making it very clear with the revised NREP

NEAL R. GROSS

what it is, and what it's not to be. It cannot be used as a decision tool for funding, but rather, as a mechanism to help communities identify programs that can be used at different levels.

My question, Jeff, to you, is with regards to the SPFSIG. You mentioned that an area of interest is the capacity building. Can you give me an example of how in your state you are placing a lot of emphasis on that?

MR. BARBER: Well, I'll just touch on it from the standpoint of what we've done through the SEA, and do that very briefly. One of the things that I've really looked at when I first started with Safe and Drug Free Schools in 2000 was the fact that we had the Principles of Effectiveness on the table, that schools are supposed to plan their programs through that, but if you just say here are the Principles οf Effectiveness, go forth and do good work, you're not going to get a very good return on that investment. So my concept was that we need to teach them how to do those, not just tell them they're there. really went out and started very basic levels.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

is what they are, this is why they're important, and
we built on that over time, because people in the
school systems, they could put a curriculum in place
without any problem, but you ask them to plan a
prevention program, and while they have the capacity
to do that with training, they can't just go out and
do it. I mean, it's just not in their professional
background, necessarily. It may be, but not
necessarily, so my idea was that we needed to look at
how can we develop that for those folks that are in
the school system, and so we've done that. We kind of
start out, like I said, basic, doing some regional
trainings around the Principles of Effectiveness, and
kind of move forward in asking people what were the
highest needs. We actually were doing a needs
assessment at the state level to effect changes, but
we looked at one of the big things. Everybody wanted
to know how you do an evaluation, and we actually did
an evaluation, and we actually did an evaluation
training that was based around a logic model. And
from that, we have stepped forward to the next stage,
and we did a training, and then trained those people

NEAL R. GROSS

to be trainers so that they could offer the SAPS training, which is really the foundation of the strategic prevention framework. So we're looking at that, and we want to make sure that they not only have the knowledge of planning, but also what are the basics around good solid prevention, understanding risk and protective factors.

DR. LONG: In closing this segment, this first segment, all of us - I want to thank on behalf of all of us sitting up here at the table, your depth of experience and breadth of expertise. We deeply appreciate you coming here. We are charged with coming up with some, as Hope mentioned, some creative ideas to present to the Secretary. You gave us a I learned - people say I took a great first step. whole page of notes and ideas on things that we can start to synthesize, and it was because of you. And I think the biggest thing, I think perhaps the best stroke and compliment we can pay to a fellow educator is thank you for your passion for our children, came through. Thank you very much. We will take a break and come back at ten of. Let's thank the panel.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 10:48:26 a.m., and went back on the record at 10:58:47 a.m.)

DR. LONG: If the panelists would be so kind as to take the seats, we'll go ahead and get started on time. Okay. We're going to go ahead and get started so that we stay on time, and that's out of respect of all the fine things that the panelists have. If you happen to have not been in the audience when we started this first round, we are doing this to hear your expertise, and then at the end, we will then have a question and answer period back and forth with the committee members, so that we can again draw on your expertise, and to get some ideas.

First of all, to introduce our second panel, and the second panel, "Local Education Perspective", and on my right, for those of you in the back there on your left, Clarence Jones, and Clarence has been the Safe and Drug Free Schools coordinator for Fairfax County Public Schools since 1999, and has been widely recognized for his work in the field. Mr. Jones

NEAL R. GROSS

received the 2006 Distinguished Citizenship Award from the Arlington Fairfax Elks Lodge, and the 2006 Advocate of the Year Award from Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America. He received his BS from George Peabody for Teachers, and his MS from Vanderbilt. Thank you, Clarence, for being here.

Ellen Morehouse - Ellen is the Executive Director of Student Assistant Services, a non-profit substance abuse prevention corporation in Tarrytown, New York. My wife is from about five miles from She's the creator of three national model Tarrytown. alcohol and drug abuse prevention, early intervention programs, the Westchester Student Assistance Program, the Residential Student Assistance Program in schools using coordinated community efforts to strengthen Her undergraduate degree is from Cornell, students. and her Master's Degree is from New York University School of Social Work. Ellen, thanks for being here.

Next is General Arthur Dean, became the Chairman and CEO of Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America in 1998. He has been many awards, with the highest being two awards of the U.S. Army

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Distinguished Service Medal. General Dean has served as a member of many boards, and currently serves as a member of the Defense Science Board Human Resources Task Force, a member of the Board of Advisors for U.S. Army Recruiting Command, and Chairman of Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America Board of Directors. Thank you so much for being here, General.

And lastly, certainly not least, and Gus, we just talked last week on the phone, didn't we? Gus Frias is Coordinator of School Safety Programs for the LA County Office of Education. In this position, he educators develop comprehensive violence to prevention initiatives to make schools safe and secure learning environment. Mr. Frias' work experience includes stints as a management analyst at the LA Police Department, program manager the at Orange County Department of Ed, and academic specialist to the United States Information Agency. Gus, thanks for being here.

And with that, we will get started with the panel. Approximately nine, ten minutes each, and that will allow us plenty of time to go back and forth with

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

those important questions and answers. Clarence, if we could start with you, please.

Thank you very much. I will make MR. JONES: this really brief, because my foot is throbbing, and I will need to take my medicine here very shortly. First of all, good morning. I am pleased to be here today to share my thoughts from the LEA perspective. The role of the LEA under the State Grants portion of the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Community Act is a critical role. In this position, LEAs from across the nation must adhere to the ongoing political changes, as well as provide Safe and Drug Free programs for their schools and communities. Regardless of the size of the school or the community, LEAs from across the country continue to find ways to help make their small part of the world safe and drug free.

As an advisory committee, I encourage you to look beyond numbers, but look into your own hearts and help the United States Department of Education Safe and Drug Free Office find a way to express the wonderful work that hundreds of LEAs and SEAs are doing across this great land of ours.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

You sent out several questions that you wanted us to respond to, and I will respond to those pretty quickly. But first, I want to say this right here. If I ask the question how many of you all could tell me what's written on the walls outside of this room, very few of you probably remember some very key words, so I will remind you of what those words are. "Ensure Equal Access", the way the Safe and Drug Free program is set up now, the mission of the Department of Education states on those walls, "Ensure Equal Access".

The way the program is now is ensure equal access across the board with all the programs from the small ones to the big powerful one. And I'll take a look very carefully at some of the strengths real quickly. Funding from the Safe and Drug Free program has provided at the LEA level the option to use a combination of science-based programs. This is from K through 12th grade, and beyond. Fairfax County Public Schools, we have gone a little bit beyond that. We have found that you cannot solve the programs - well, drugs and violence prevention issues just in the

NEAL R. GROSS

schools. You have to reach out to the communities.

And in Fairfax County Public Schools, we have done that.

The key strength of the State Grant program is it enables schools and communities to organize to combine their effort to expand their prevention Through this channel, schools programs. and communities are able to reach sections of the community where adults without school-age children, which is the largest portion of most communities, we get those people involved in our schools. We get them involved in being leadership roles, and also through mentoring.

Also, both large and small school systems have the ability to provide their students and staff the most up-to-date prevention strategies, the ability to train together, to share resources across schools, communities, and local agencies. And the key here is to leverage these resources to enhance these programs. I'll give you a very good example of that.

In the Commonwealth of Virginia, there is a little city called Petersburg. They receive less than

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

\$5,000 a year on Safe and Drug Free Schools funds. They contacted the State Department, their SEA, and said hey, we have little monies, but we have a really bullying and gang program going on. What can we do? They decided to take their money and buy Too Good for Drugs and Violence kits, and then they contacted other jurisdictions around, like Fairfax. We sent trainers down there, local agencies sent people down there. worked together, and by them working together over these past years, the numbers bullying incidences, those things continue to drop. That is leveraging, reaching out to other people using a small amount of monies.

One main element of the LEA responsibility, you heard several times today, the Principles This book right here contains Effectiveness. Principles of Effectiveness. Ann Atkinson down in Richmond, Virginia, is the author of this book. this book right here, it talks how about the Principles of Effectiveness are set up. Every school system in the Commonwealth of Virginia is given this booklet when they come to a workshop. We sit down, we

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

learn what the Principles of Effectiveness are, how to use them, how to do the evaluation process, and we go on from there. And if you want a copy, I'd be glad to get you one. But in Fairfax County, we have taken it one step further than that right there. We have taken the Principles of Effectiveness and we have -- we took a look at what's going on in Fairfax County. It's one of the richest counties in America, but I can tell you one thing about that county. We have just as many problems when it comes to alcohol and other drugs as any other community in America. We do have gang problems in our county, as well. But from that, we took the Principles of Effectiveness, we did our surveys, we did our -- we took a look at what's happening, and we took a look and decided to change things around a little.

Right now in Fairfax County Public Schools as a LEA, we instituted several years ago Second Step in the elementary school, every elementary school in Fairfax County, over 137 of those. Once they graduated from there, they go to middle schools where they get "Get Real About Violence", which is done

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

through the school day and many after-school programs. From there, they go into high school, where they go to "Too Good for Drugs and Violence." We didn't stop there.

As I mentioned earlier, we get parents involved in this. We have parents program throughout called "Guiding Good Choices". For those who don't know, every last one of those programs are science-based programs, and we use those pretty readily in Fairfax County.

One of the other things you asked is, is the State Grant program working effectively to promote Safe and Drug Free Schools? In Fairfax County, answer is yes. In many jurisdictions across the United States, whether small or big, the answer is In Fairfax County, we continue to prove our ves. programs are working, and right here I have with me, and I'd be glad, as I said, to get a copy of this booklet for you, is a survey that we just took. We do a survey every two years in Fairfax County. I want to give you some of the stats out of this book right here.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

For instance, the past 30-day frequency of use, for eighth grade is 21 percent to this past year, 16 percent; dropped from 36 percent to 29.5 percent. For twelfth grade it's 53 percent, down to 47 percent. For binge drinking, which is a major issue in Fairfax County, for eighth grade dropped from 7.5 percent to 5.3 percent, 10 percent of the tenth graders from 17.3 percent down to 11.3 percent, and in twelfth grade from 31 percent down to 26.1 percent. So yes, it's working. The answer is absolutely yes, it's working.

The effectiveness of these programs can be attributed to the schools and community agencies working together to form school community coalition, to expand the prevention efforts that we have. It is through these coalitions that we engage individuals who normally would stand on the sideline and get those individuals involved. The most difficult part in this system-wide approach is a political issue in getting a survey accomplished. It took us almost nine years to go through the political if, ands, or buts. the last seven years, we've been doing a survey every other year, and those surveys has been showing that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the use of drugs and alcohol are dropping in our county, and we are below the national average right there.

The Virginia Department of Education, I have to give them kudos for a lot because we work very closely with our SEA there. The Department Education right here I hold in my hand, all of the Safe and Drug Free programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia, right here in one booklet. It is required when you submit an application, that that application come in to Richmond, and a peer review committee, as stated by law, will review your application. application must meet the Principles of Effectiveness, must have the ABCD format in order to have your goals and objectives, must have all of these laid out. they do not, it is sent back to those individual school systems, and they must resubmit until they meet that right here.

Once that is accomplished at the end, the application is approved and it's sent out. One of the things that we have at the end of the regular school year, which I have to give back and do here very

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

shortly, is to do our yearly progress report. This report, it's mandated that we have to turn that in. And that progress report is put together to take a look at all the different evaluations, and from that, this booklet right here is devised, so you know what's going on in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

You also asked one of the things about the emerging issues facing students and students today about the Safe and Drug Free Programs, and should they be addressed, and how can they be altered? Let me share something with you.

In Fairfax County, when the gang situation took over, a lot of people quit looking at alcohol and other drugs. In our office, we did not. We continued to look at alcohol and other drugs as it was going on, and by using POE, Principles of Effectiveness, we evaluated everything that we were doing. We worked with our state, and we decided we wanted to change some of the things we had in our original application that was approved, and we wanted to move more into violence prevention. We're still doing a tremendous amount with the other organizations that support us,

NEAL R. GROSS

but now we have alcohol and violence prevention combined together. It's just not a school system. We have community people, parents, legal, medical, you name them, they're on it, and also students are part of this committee to work with us.

One of the other things that you asked about, and I will not go through all of those right here you asked, is there a balance between flexibility and accountability? I have real concern on that part right there because the ability of the LEA to be flexible has allowed the LEA, which is me, to pinpoint the issues within their own communities. continuation of increased funding, and that's what facing, this flexibility has we're given us the opportunity to step back as money decreased and decide hey, we're not going to have enough, so what are the real critical issues that we need to do? Because of flexibility, and that using the Principles of Effectiveness that we have used so much, we are able to take a look at those.

My concern is this - additional core requirements, if you notice, with the decreasing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

funding source would not be advised. As the money keeps dropping down here, the old saying is out there, do more with less. Well, I tell you what - I have 24 years in the United States Military, I've been in wars. Can we do more with less for those guys over there? I think the answer is not. We have a war on the home front right here, and we need to address those issues right there, and we will.

component of the Principles One kev Effectiveness seems to be overlooked many including meaningful and discussions, is input consultation and from parents. is something that is not talked about that much. element alone brings so much accountability to the LEA program, when parents, community, and other agencies are adopting programs that is evaluated and has been proven to make a different in the community, then that is the key. When everyone comes together on the same page, they're talking, that is the key.

You can have all the science-based programs that you want, and we do have a lot in Fairfax County Public Schools, but we get community members involved

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in those programs, so when we say we are making a difference, it's not just the Safe and Drug Free program in itself, because we have coalitions that have come together with many factors to make that worthwhile.

I want to share this with you right here. My grandfather once told me - I had to write this down because sometimes I get teary eyed when I think about my grandfather, such an influence on my life, but I had to write this down. My grandfather once told me that the pendulum swings both ways, so when it swings against the flow that you're headed, have your house in order, for that is when real integrity and honor is The financial pendulum, when it comes to Safe seen. and Drug Free Schools, community and State Grant Program funding has thrown back against the efforts that has helped make this land of ours a better place to live, learn, and play. But what is ironic is the fact that the LEAs across this nation has followed the POE, the Principles of Effectiveness, and have the data to prove that the programs are making a difference, tons of data. This is just

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

nothing compared to what's out there. They have that data, yet their voices are not heard as one in Washington. That is a problem.

As an advisory committee, LEAs from across the country are putting their trust in you to assist the US DOE in finding a way to let the data that we have been collecting for years on how effective our doing, be known to the programs are Washington, can stop wondering if so we continue to help our children stay safe and drug free, regardless of what part of the country we're from, whether low or high.

To close, I would like to use a word a young lady by the name of Ashley Azappana - she's a 2005 graduate from Robinson Secondary School in Fairfax, Virginia. She had the opportunity to testify in front of Congress along with me back in 2005. She said these words, and it's very powerful. "While the President continues to cut back Safe and Drug Free funding, I doubt drug dealers are doing the same." Thank you for giving me this chance to share from an LEA perspective.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Clarence. We appreciate that. Ellen, next. New York perspective.

MS. MOREHOUSE: Well, Ι appreciate the opportunity to present my views, and I'll be speaking primarily from my perspective in a county of about one million people. I also am going to organize my response based on the questions that I was asked. So for the first one, in terms of the strengths of the State Grants Program, I see the strength as providing the flexibility for LEAs and states to respond to local needs, and I'm from a very diverse county, so we have very diverse local needs. It also assures that every LEA is providing substance abuse prevention and has a crisis team. Ιt encourages LEAs to use evidence-based programs and practices, and provides funds for non-public schools.

I'd like to now speak to the whole issue about effectiveness. In New York State, our state government believes that the program is so effective that the New York State legislature and Governor added approximately \$1.3 million, New York State tax dollars, to the New York State budget this year to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

compensate for the federal reduction in funding for the Governor's portion of the Safe and Drug Free Schools. I want to underscore that that money was not from our block, but it was pure local, state tax dollars.

In New York State, the Governor's portion goes to our State Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services, which funds many community-based organizations like mine. Our state has a lot of history of collaboration between community-based substance prevention organizations and local school districts.

As you mentioned, I'm the Executive Director of one of those organizations, and I currently partner with 28 separate local educational school districts in our county. We're providing evidence-based prevention programming currently in 57 secondary schools. I'm also the developer of some model programs. Most of the 28 LEAs use their Safe and Drug Free School funds to match with local school tax dollars to contract with our community-based organization.

You heard from other presenters about

NEAL R. GROSS

leveraging. Let me give you a specific example. of our school districts receives approximately \$13,000 in Safe and Drug Free School, and that's a school district that has approximately 2,600 students. use \$97,000 of their own local tax dollars, not state, not federal, but local tax dollars. And then our Alcoholism state Office of and Substance Services puts in another \$50,000, and that creates \$160,000 worth of prevention programming, but that \$13,000 of Safe and Drug Free Schools money really is the glue that holds this formula together.

depressed economically In school where they don't have the extra local districts, school tax dollars, 100 percent of their substance abuse prevention program is used to match with our dollars for their state tax drug prevention programming, so in a city like Yonkers, which is the fourth largest school district in New York State, if Safe and Drug Free School funding was cut, there would be a direct cut in their substance abuse prevention programming, because they're not able to make up for that reduction.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Without federal Safe and Drug Free School funds, our economically disadvantaged school districts not only would not have the funds to implement evidence-based programs, but the evidence-based programs would become diluted because a full-time person might be reduced to part time, money that would be needed for training and materials would not be available.

I would like to give a local example of the effectiveness of approximately 2,000 Westchester students who would be considered selected or indicated through twelfth grade in seventh received four or more individual or group sessions of our evidence-based program. Is the Power Point up? Ninety-six percent of these secondary Yes. Okay. school students increased their perception of the risk of harm associated with alcohol or other drug use, or maintained their high perception of harm. Ninety-two the students who reported any percent of or other drugs reduced their use, abstinent, or did not increase their low level of use. Ninety-one percent of the students who reported

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

associating with peers involved in delinquent or deviant behavior decreased those associations, and 88 percent maintained or increased their associations with peers not involved in delinquent or deviant behavior. And finally, 94 percent of the students who participated in delinquent behavior decreased their participation in delinquent behavior.

In terms of the difficulties in determining the effectiveness of the program, I see that there are three main difficulties. The first is the lack of funding for evaluation, and a lack of funding for full program implementation with fidelity. The second is the requirement for active parent consent for student participation in surveys in some LEAs. I'm aware of one school district where only 30 percent of the high risk students signed consents to allow for survey participation. And third, most LEAs lack the expertise in evaluating program effectiveness.

Next, are there mechanisms that could be proposed that would help determine if programs supported by Safe and Drug Free School grants programs funds are effective? Yes. What I propose is that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

increased level of funding to with fidelity, but also, public availability survey questions could οf that be selected by LEAs. The federal government many wonderful contributed development of to the national surveys that school districts now have to purchase in order to evaluate their program. like to see some of these questions made available to recipients of Safe and Drug Free School money free, and Ι would like free scoring the questionnaire results.

Next, are there emerging issues facing students in schools today that the grant program does not address, and should? There are additional issues. I think in my county, the number one issue is stress, but I don't think the Safe and Drug Free Schools funding should be addressing that.

The focus on safety - the language currently is sufficient to address the concern for crisis management regarding individual students. The programs cannot and should not address the safety-related issues for natural and large scale disasters.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

That should be FEMA and Homeland Security. My county is the home to the only large nuclear power plant for the New York Metropolitan area. While many of our school districts stock potassium iodide pills, and have all kinds of evacuation plans, we all know that if something happens to that nuclear power plant, that everyone from Hartford, Connecticut to Southern New Jersey will not have a chance to take those pills.

Is the structure of the Safe and Drug Free Schools grants program the most effective mechanism for the use of these funds? The current structure provides for maximum flexibility to address local concerns, as well as statewide priorities. However, the effectiveness could be increased if there was increased funding to pay for required collaboration between the local education agencies, and the single-state alcohol and substance abuse programs.

We are lucky in New York that we have a very large network of community-based providers, as I mentioned, that work very closely with our single-state agency, our state education department, and our local school districts, but some financially strapped

NEAL R. GROSS

school districts don't have the funding to even pay for transportation to our state capitol in Albany.

Additional funding would allow for additional collaboration.

In some states, my colleagues in community-based organizations are required to address certain prevention priorities determined by their single-state substance abuse agency, and are not able to respond to the identified needs of the local education authorities. If there was coordination, I think that problem would not exist.

Another issue of concern is the structure in the way non-public schools and special act public schools receive their funds. Consideration should be given to these schools receiving direct funding from the state education agency based on the number of students enrolled, and not necessarily have their funding coming from the local education authority. I am aware of many non-public and special act public schools that do not have even one student who lives in the public school district where they are located. It is unfair to require LEAs to give their Safe and Drug

NEAL R. GROSS

Free School funds to these schools, just because they're physically located in the same geographic area. In some cases, the vast majority of students do not even live in the same county where the non-public school is located.

In terms of the balance between flexibility and accountability, I think it's working. I think it could be enhanced with additional funding for effective program implementation, administration, evaluation. Additional core requirements without additional funding would dilute the program, reduce effectiveness, and cause local education agencies to forego their funding. LEAs should continue to be allowed to spend their funds on assessed local needs which often can, and do, change.

of the In terms tension between the Principles of Effectiveness, the tension can be resolved by understanding that there isn't research yet on every authorized activity, but local evaluation effectiveness for those activities can justify their existence. Thank you.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Ellen. And

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

next we will turn to General Dean. General.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

GENERAL DEAN: Well, good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to address you. I think the mission that this advisory committee has is a very significant, and a very important one. My slides up? Okay.

Community Anti-Drug Coalition of America came out of a Presidential commission in 1992, and we are a private association representing more than 5,000 community anti-drug coalitions. And we work closely with the LEAs and SEAs as it relates to the substance abuse, the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities program.

My first slide is talking about the implementation of the program. The program, we believe, ensures that even local education agencies, LEAs, and you've heard this already, with minimal funding, have someone responsible for addressing the impact of alcohol, drugs, and violence on the school learning climate. And we think that is critical. program provides effective services, including peer resistance and social skills training, student

NEAL R. GROSS

assistance, parent training, and education about emerging drug trends, and we think it's critical to do that. Next slide.

The Principles of Effectiveness are being implemented, we believe, in their entirety by LEAs regardless of the funding constraints to meet their local identified needs. LEAs are data-driven, and we think that's important, and they use school surveys to determine their community needs and track progress over time, and you just heard an example from Fairfax County. LEAs use these funds to leverage other state funds, local and private funds, and you've also heard that, to enhance the scale and scope of their programs so they're able to deliver the services that are critical at the local level.

We believe that the program works effectively in all settings; that is, rural, urban, and suburban, and we think that's important because the issues are significant in all. We believe, by design, the program is, in fact, data-driven. It links schools and community partners and leverages funds from other sources to address drug and violence prevention, and

NEAL R. GROSS

intervention.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Program funds are being used effectively and can demonstrate measurable results, and I give you one example, but I've provided you several examples in my information written to you. In the State of Wisconsin, the Stevens Point School District has utilized Safe and Drug Free Schools and Community Act funds develop a prevention and intervention to infrastructure for violence, mental health and addiction issues. The district has been able to decrease the number of students reporting past day, 30-day use of marijuana by 5 percent between 2003 and 2005.

LEAs are receiving a small amount of money. They can develop a consortium to pool their resources and to raise additional funds, and we think it's very creative that many local small LEAs are, in fact, coming together. Twenty-four school districts in Ohio received a total of \$751,874 in their funds, but by partnering with outside organizations and individuals, these school districts have leveraged an additional \$686,000, nearly doubling the amount of money that

NEAL R. GROSS

they had received.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In a recent survey or study done in the State of Ohio by Dr. Bonnie Hedrick, determined that LEAs are, in fact, implementing all of the programs of effectiveness. Regardless of the amount of funds they receive, the LEAs surveyed indicated that 86 percent have conducted a needs assessment as the basis of their programming, that 88 percent of them indicated that they had monitored alcohol and other drug use through surveys and disciplinary referrals, 84 percent indicated that they use research-based examples programs, so these represent throughout the country are accomplishing, and we are very proud of their work.

Efforts to determine the effectiveness of the program nationally, we believe, must be built from the LEA level up through the state and federal levels in a uniform manner, capable of connecting inputs, what is actually implemented with the funding to outcomes, including the core data set, so we think that datadriven from the bottom up through states to federal is the way the program should be managed.

NEAL R. GROSS

Yes, the Uniform Management Information Reporting System should be implemented across states collect both input, what is to being implemented, and outcome data from the LEA level in a consistent format with consistent data, and information elements. A uniform system needs to be adopted and developed by all states and LEAs, and We believe collected by the Department of Education. that this system needs to collect and aggregate information about what the program is accomplishing in terms of both implementation of the POE, and how that relates to the core data set.

We believe that currently, as implemented, there are already too many mandates on the program. Therefore, it should not be diluted by any further. No issues and mandates, we believe, would strengthen or would help the program; and, therefore, should not be added.

The other question you asked concerning the program on safety, I chose not to provide a formal response based on the area of interest that we work with the LEAs on. But on your next question, we

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

believe that yes, because every LEA needs funding to provide all of Americas school-aged youth programs and services dealing with drugs, alcohol, and violence. If states did not fund all LEAs within many schools would not their boundaries, funds, and no thought would be given, or at least any real organized thought would be given to preventing the negative impact of alcohol, drugs, and violence in these schools.

The leveraging of scarce resources is why LEAs that seem to have insufficient funds are able to implement effective, comprehensive programs and, in fact, are doing this across the nation. And I think that's a very important point, that you would look at the dollar amounts and assume that they cannot do anything effective with that, but you've heard an example about Petersburg, Virginia. In fact, the leveraging process is what causes these LEAs to be effective.

The Governor set-aside has been very effective in enhancing local efforts to address alcohol, drugs, and violence issues, well

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

dealing with emerging drug trends, as methamphetamine. The Governor set-aside also enables LEAs to leverage additional funds for the program. And you heard from Washington State, but I will use them as an example. Their Governor's program grant \$1.4 million, enabling LEAs was to leverage an additional \$1.7 million in state funds, and nearly \$1.9 million in local matched cash and in kind during the 2004-2005 fiscal year, so you can see that this core money allowed for a lot of leveraging. percent Governor set-aside should be maintained.

The Department of Education, in our view, needs to provide uniform guidance to the states and the LEAs concerning information and data collection to program's ability to it is enhance the show accountable to OMB and Congress. There is а misconception that the States Grants portion of the program is not accountable, and that the funds are not used to implement science-based programs. In fact, states and LEAs have taken the requirements of the POE very seriously, and are implementing best practices and science-based programs, as well as monitoring

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

their progress in reducing youth drug use through student surveys.

The POE will authorize as a complete process to be implemented in their entirety. It is the POE in their entirety that have made LEAs data-driven, and we are concerned that the Department of Education is focusing, and we mean this -- is focusing exclusively on whether or not LEAs are implementing science-based programs, rather than if they are implementing all of the elements of the POE. I hope I didn't confuse you We're concerned that all of the elements of implemented, just are not science-based programs. Okay. Thank you.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, General. And we'll now turn to Gus Frias. Gus, as we indicated, is from the Los Angeles County Office of Ed. Gus.

MR. FRIAS: I'd like to begin by thanking our creator, Chairman Long, and every single one of you for the opportunity to present to you the brief following information.

I start with a quote that reads: "It takes the best in each of us to bring out the best in all of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

us. In a world of change and uncertainty, this includes being the first to think, to see, to hear, and do whatever is wise to ensure the health and safety of our kids. Whoever our rivals are out there, we need to be wiser than them in overcoming whatever challenges they pose to us."

I represent the Los Angeles County Office of Education, a county with over 10 million residents, 80 school districts, 7,300 K-12 schools, and 1.7 million students. The challenges that confront us on a yearly basis, I guess, are documented in the California State Schools Assessment Report, and we average over 4,000 drug and alcohol offenses, 3,000 batteries, over 500 assault with a deadly weapon. We have numerous homicides, and over 15,000 possessions of a weapon. The majority of the weapons in our locale were handguns, and over 8,000 property crimes.

Another big challenge that we have is our tremendous problem with multi-generational street gangs. LA County has approximately over 1,000 street gangs, with 79,668 reported gang members, over 75,000 are males, 3,000 are females. We have over 2,604

NEAL R. GROSS

taggers. These street gangs, again, come in numerous shapes and sizes. We have 217 Crip gangs, 74 Blood gangs, 550 Hispanic gangs, 63 Asian gangs, 24 Pacific Islander, and 63 White gangs.

In the past 20 years, these gangs have been responsible for committing over 10,000 gang-related killings, and over 100,000 serious physical injuries. In 2005, we recorded 553 homicides, 585 attempted homicides, and 4,330 felony assaults. And mind you, attacks on police, we had 168 attacks on police. Matter of fact, this week we had a gang member who just got out of his car and sprayed one of our police cars with an AK-47, shot it over 20 times. And this is something that, again, in many cases is routine.

gangs transforming Our street are international terrorist organizations. LA County cells street gangs are acting as mother cancer replicating across the United States, and throughout Latin America, and other parts of the world. What you have up there are names that are associated with terrorist organizations, the Muslim Brotherhood, Hamas, Al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, but we have

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

our counterparts, counterparts in many aspects, we have similar qualities and are responsible for committing tremendous crime and violence, the Aryan Brotherhood. And mind you, these are gangs of gangs.

Aryan Brotherhood acts as the umbrella for a lot of Nazi low-rider organizations and other white-based gangs.

The Mexican Mafia - the Mexican Mafia is a gang of gangs that has the control of thousands and thousands of southsider street gangs all over Southern California and beyond California, across the states. Mara Salvatrucha is a gang that, again, started in LA, and now it's all over Latin America, and throughout the United States. The Crips, again, they're all over the United States, and beyond the United States. There are Crip chapters in South Africa, for instance. And the Whah Chings, you can find Whah Chings in every single Chinatown throughout the United States, and beyond the United States in China. So along those lines, what I wanted to do, is share with you a twominute clip that Ι selected as part of my presentation. Can you put it up, please?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

(Video presentation.)

MR. FRIAS: As you can see, this is real.
This presentation is about keeping it real, so I
wanted to share that with you because it is real,
folks. Our state prisons right now are run by a lot
of the groups that I just described to you, and they
are indoctrinating so many youngsters into being part
of this, it's becoming very racist, so all the blacks
are on one end, with all their modules. All the
whites on one end, browns on the other end, and Asians
on the other end, and then they are creating
alliances. For instance, the Aryan Brotherhood has
aligned with the Mexican Mafia to take on all the
Crips and Bloods in the California penal system. That
is impacting the state penal system, but it is also
impacting our streets, and it's impacting our schools.
So let me focus on the schools.

To address the challenges in our schools, we have led in developing the following school safety mandates. Our California Constitution Article 1, Section 28(c), basically states that: "All students and staff have the right to attend schools that are

NEAL R. GROSS

safe, secure, and peaceful." Our California Education

Code also mandates that "every single school must

establish comprehensive school safety plans", and

these school safety plans need to be in concurrence

with the Principles of Effectiveness.

California government code also requires that all school safety, routine school crisis response plans must integrate a standardized emergency management system. And now, since we have NIMS, NIMS is also going to be mandated as part of this. We also have a new law called the California School Safety and Violence Prevention Act, which mandates that all the schools need to take preventive steps against hatred, against hate motivated behaviors in the schools.

One that's not listed is another mandate that comes from the state, mandating that all the schools need to be part of a Safe Schools Assessment Report, that documents school crimes that take place on an annual basis. I can tell you that a lot of this all sounds good, but when it comes down to implementing them, a lot of them don't come with sufficient resources to do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

Lessons Learned - we have learned that in the area of school safety, our county Offices of Education need to lead. We are the closest to whatever is going on in the streets and the schools, and our county Offices of Education need to be more active in leading and bringing together the respective multi-agency representatives from law enforcement, community-based organization, faith community, our local elected officials, and others. So, therefore, what we want to recommend based on our lessons learned, is that every single initiative needs to establish some type of Safe coalition that brings together all Schools folks.

Next, we need to be realistic in developing a master plan on school safety, and I've included a copy of our master plan on school safety in your packets. School safety plan that needs to be, again, very real.

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

In California, we mandate that all schools basically go through Safe Schools planning training, and so as part of that, we have School Safety teams composed of educators, parents, students, law

NEAL R. GROSS

enforcement officers, and other community leaders, and we put them through comprehensive training. Again, as part of this training, we address the Principles of Effectiveness. The training for the School Safety teams goes beyond the Safe Schools planning, because then we get into issues. We have a program called TABS, Teaching Alternative Behavior School-wide, that focuses classroom student on management and discipline. Along with that also comes SEMS, Standardized Emergency Management System, and other related types of trainings.

address America's war on county Offices of Education, we have learned that our county Offices of Education must work with our local terrorism early warning groups to share intelligence timely And sharing in and secure manner. intelligence is not easy, ladies and gentlemen, particularly when it comes down to sharing intelligence related to terrorism. In the past, our military did not really share their intelligence with our local law enforcement agencies, and our local law enforcement agencies did not share their intelligence

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

with the schools. Today, we have a system in placed called TEW, and this TEW concept is being replicated across the United States. We believe that we need to be part of the equation, and we need to also share with them whatever intelligence is out there to make sure that we act on it in a timely and secure manner.

Next, we need to identify and replicate effective research-based initiatives, such as those in character education and conflict management. We also need to provide specialized counseling and case management services for selected students and their families.

We've learned that we also need to engage students and their families in leadership development, after-school recreation, and cultural activities. We also need to provide career and employment services for students and their families, design specialized programs to address urgent challenges, such as street gangs. And we need to foster positive relations between students and police officers.

I've got news for you, folks, in many of our schools, our students hate the police. And they in no

NEAL R. GROSS

way are going to cooperate with the police. And they have a word that they use a lot against positive healthy relationships, and that is "snitching". No one wants to be labeled as a snitch. Well, we need to take that on, and we need to change that. In your packets is our Students and the Police guidebook, which is part of a students and police project, that's a collaboration between our office and the LAPD, the LA County Sheriff's Office, as well as the LA County Police Chiefs Association. We believe that, again, we need to foster these relationships in our schools among our kids.

And then we need to, I guess basically again, echo what everybody else has said, and that is, when it comes down to evaluation, we need to truly address it in a comprehensive manner, and attach resources to it, because if we don't, then we will continue to produce evaluations that have a lot of shortcomings.

Along those lines, let me focus briefly on recommendations. Recommendation one, is we recommend highly that you need to modify your funding streams and formulas. The County Office of Education, we get

NEAL R. GROSS

approximately \$83,000 per year from the Safe and Drug Free Schools program. That money, again, is leveraged in numerous ways, but I can tell you that if you really put the County Offices of Education at the center of gravity in terms of local activity, we can make the most out of all the monies that come down the pike.

Focus on helping every student, attending local schools, particularly the walking wounded and the walking dead. And if you don't know who those kids are, those are the kids that oftentimes carry tremendous baggages with them on a daily basis. I often encounter cases of the walking dead of kids who basically throw the finger at the world, and they come into our classes with gang tattoos on their bodies, and now all of a sudden the educator has to address that challenge; a kid who oftentimes has a lot of enemies who want to kill him or her, so these are real cases.

Again, require a master plan of school safety. Direct the County Offices of Education to lead, coordinate, monitor, and evaluate school safety

NEAL R. GROSS

LA County gets a lot of resources from this program, Safe and Drug Free Schools. Resources, instance, to implement the emergency management and crisis response program, resources for the Safe Healthy Students initiative, Schools and but office really is not getting these resources. These monies are going to school districts, and if we have 80 school districts in Los Angeles County, and you give the money to one school district, that school district is going to take care of business for itself. County Offices if you give it to the that we're going to Education, chances are together a diverse group of stakeholders to make sure that we impact more than one school district, so we need to find better ways to accentuate the role for the County Offices of Education.

Again, to address America's war on terror, no ifs, no buts, we need to find better ways to share intelligence. And if DHS is doing anything, we need to collaborate with them. I am often called by different representatives from DHS to address the gang challenges, but I've got news for you, for whatever

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

reason, the U.S. Department of Education really doesn't have a solid comprehensive initiative to address the issue that I just presented through the video.

In California, by legislation, we established the California Gang Risk Intervention Program, allocated \$3 million to address this problem in our respective schools. But even \$3 million was not a lot; nevertheless, it was an effort, and this something that we should try to emulate. The United Education States Department of needs lead. Anything that impacts our schools, we need to make sure that we lead. Law enforcement agencies can play a role in supporting us. DHS can come along and help us in our respective schools, but we at US DOE and in County Offices of Education, we need to lead. Again, direct the counters of education to be the work of the Safe Schools and Healthy Students grants, emergency response, and crisis management grants. And then we need to revive the community services grant program. As you know, that program came and went, but that program was a fantastic program that was addressing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the needs of kids who are suspended or expelled from school. We need to find a way to bring that program, and build on existing lessons learned.

Beyond that, again back to gangs, we need to establish new funding, and really develop a stream of resources that can assist our schools that are having some very difficult challenges.

Lastly, again back to accountability systems, in one of our school districts that got millions from you, the mayor died, the chief of police retired, and the superintendent of schools got himself into a big mess and was fired. The monies were just sitting there. We need to find better ways to make sure that those monies that you allocate to school districts are used for the intended purpose of helping our kids. We believe that County Offices of Education can assist to do that. Thank you.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Gus. And thank you, General; thank you, Ellen; thank you, Clarence. We appreciate that. We now get to the portion that I find extremely interesting. And as I indicated earlier, to draw on your experience and

NEAL R. GROSS

expertise, and from these fine committee members, so we will open that up. And my job will be to monitor time and I'll keep you advised of that so that we stay right on task. Questions from the committee. Hope.

MS. TAFT: Again, I would like to get your ideas on how we could reinvent or change the program, make it new and fresh, based on the charge that our chairman gave us at the beginning of the day. So if each of you would take a few minutes and quickly outline what you would recommend that we do, I would be most grateful.

MR. FRIAS: I'll start if off very briefly. If our political leaders at the federal level are willing to invest billions of dollars to ensure the health and safety of individuals in the Middle East, we need to do the same thing at home. And the monies that are allocated to US DOE at this time for this program, we need to find a way to document our tremendous need, and put it in the context of the war on terror, and get DHS to share its billions. It's got billions and billions, and yet, here we are, to a degree, asking for less than a billion. We should be

NEAL R. GROSS

asking for billions, and then as part of the compromise, settle on billions.

Mrs. Taft, what I would like GENERAL DEAN: to suggest is, first of all, I think that we, at the national level, can do a better job, and it's not to be pejorative or critical, in ensuring that the uniform quidance is provided to states and LEAs as it relates to data collection and the program itself. we took a survey of states and LEAs, I think that it would be -- the great majority would say that they guidance have developed that themselves without national guidance, which prevents the program from having the uniformity that it deserves.

Secondly, we have worked with LEAs and states on evaluation, and we have just recently published a primer that outlines how to do local evaluation built around the strategic prevention framework. And we think that's an area that they can benefit from, and it's not a lack of will, or lack of desire, it's simply providing clarity and helpful information on the evaluation. I think that we are getting a phenomenal amount of help out of this program that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

goes unrecognized, and that's unfortunate. And it could, in fact, be improved, but I'm here to tell you that we get far more out of this program than is put into it in the form of dollar support.

MS. MOREHOUSE: Your questions makes me think of the phrase that "sometimes old is good." And I think of the Polio vaccine and the tetanus vaccine, which have been around forever, and they're terrific and they still work. I think the Safe and Drug Free Schools program, the State Grants portion, is terrific and it works. And you've heard today wonderful examples of it.

The only thing that I would add is just what I'd mentioned before, evaluation. I really think the federal government can provide public domain questions and scoring, so local school districts will not have to use their small amount of money to pay for evaluation. Every survey that I'm aware of that's recognized nationally, was developed through research with federal funding.

When a school district, like you saw, only gets \$1,000, and then they have to pay \$2 per

NEAL R. GROSS

questionnaire, and \$300 per report, that takes money away from programming. I'm not saying there should be a standard questionnaire, but there should be a list of possibly 100 questions taken from various questionnaires, so local education agencies can pick and choose which ones will evaluate most effectively their programs.

One thing I just want to mention with Mr. Frias' comments, not every state has county, local education agencies. So, for example, in New York we don't have county Departments of Education.

DR. LONG: Intermediate agencies, BOCEs. Yes, I think even though he was referring to county offices, from state to state there would be some form of intermediate agency. I think in New York, it would be BOCEs, yes.

MR. JONES: I agree with my peers on the evaluation component is the major one. The real question here really is, how can we get to OMB, how can we let them know what we're doing is effective? If they came to look at Fairfax County's program, they'll go my God, you would score extremely high.

NEAL R. GROSS

But there's hundreds of programs like this, but we need a set of evaluation tools that we can use nationwide that can effectively measure what we're doing, because I'll be very honest, if you thought that you sense frustration in my voice when I was talking, because as an LEA on the front line, we are frustrated because we're busting our tookuses out there, providing the data, working hard, doing the evaluation, doing what we were told to do, turning it in, and then we find out we're going to get cut more because what? We're not doing what we're supposed to do. I've got it right here.

MS. TAFT: Thank you.

DR. LONG: Shep.

DR. KELLAM: Well, in many ways, what you're saying is a very powerful message, and it should bring us together to think about what are we talking about when we talk about evaluation? And we need a common language to understand that. And I'm also assuming that you don't mean that you want the federal government to fund an evaluation on a nationwide basis that tells you a lot about the nation, and nothing

about local communities, and what's working for whom, and where, because that would be a huge disaster. But we have a tendency to do that. We don't do it with the weather report, you don't get a national survey on the weather, you get local reports, but there's a common language. So along that line, I guess what I'm asking is, have you made efforts to team up with local universities, or research groups, and have you had any successes or failures in coming to common cause with research groups so that they understand your mission, and don't use kids as guinea pigs and so forth?

MS. MOREHOUSE: I'll start off by responding. My community-based organization has partnered very successfully with many independent, well-known researchers and research groups, not on Safe and Drug Free School states' portion funds, because the cost for those evaluations when we team up with those 50, 75, 100, 125,000 university researchers are For our Safe and Drug Free School dollars a year. funding, when we use surveys, and I'm not advocating a national survey, but if you use the Communities that Care survey, if you use the Monitoring the Future from

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think it's Western Michigan State University, or the American Drug and Alcohol Survey, and I could go on and on; those surveys have a cost. And when you survey a lot of students, that's a lot of cost. And then there's a cost for writing up the report, and people need to get paid. And that syphons money off from programming. No one does anything for free any more.

DR. KELLAM: Can I follow-up? Yes, so for I don't know how many years, 45 years or so, I've been one of them folks that's been getting research grants from people like Dr. Sims, and others sitting around So the question is, I quess, as much can the table. we restructure science, as it is restructuring Safe and Drug Free Schools. In other words, if there was grant money that would be provided specifically in partnerships with the research funders, private and federal, state, such that there was a premium put on teaming, on developing a partnership which would allow you to do rigorous evaluations of programs, for whom it works, and for whom you need more, how to line up backup services, the universals, and so on.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The new initiatives we're talking about may well, in fact, require fixing science, as well as fixing the program for Safe and Drug Free Schools, getting them closer into intimate common interests.

And I'd like your thoughts about that.

MR. JONES: Let me just answer this here. In Fairfax County, we did several years ago, mentioned, we didn't have a survey for many years, we got together with George Mason University which sits right in our backyard, and we worked with them, and through their efforts working with county agencies, the medical people, the religious, the faith leaders, and parents, and everyone - we all came together at the table and sat down, and we got the Community That Cares survey, and then used that particular survey. And we had to pay a lot for that, but since that happened, we found out a way that we can make it a little cheaper because now our county government actually pays for the survey and the printing of this document that you see here.

Now they pay for that right there. It does cost a little, but not near as much as we would go out

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to other organizations, or vendors and have that to do, so to bring all these people together, that's been in the language for years, to bring all these people together to make a difference. And we are doing that, along with many other school systems, so that is happening.

DR. LONG: I'm sorry.

MR. FRIAS: I'm sorry. Let me add that in your packet, I included a copy of a brand new manual on gang violence prevention and intervention. page 75, you will find a one sheet evaluation form that we require from all of the funded projects. took a while for representatives from the university, from the California Department of Education, from local areas, to come together and agree that this evaluation form was adequate. And when you look at it, it lists X number of program process measures, and program outcome measures. For CDE, based on the limited resources, it felt that this was adequate. What I'm telling you is that we need more than this. This is a nice form that people can fill out, but we need more than this. And the universities, again,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

when they come to the table, they're also limited on the resources available to them, so there's only so much that they can do. The worst case scenario is that they're working alone, and doing it wrong.

A case in point, USC got a \$1 million grant from one of the federal agencies, and after the one year was over, they couldn't come up with some solid findings, because their experimental and control groups in one form or another were contaminated. So when they try to do it alone, believe me, it doesn't work.

DR. LONG: The order, and I apologize, Russell, I missed you - Russell, and then Tommy.

DR. JONES: Yes. One thing that I'm hearing consistently across the panel is the need to work together, and the need to partner, the need to bring parents in, et cetera. And I'm just wondering the extent to which you are practicing what you preach. And what I mean by that is, I've heard a number of very good things that folks are doing, the leveraging of funds, bringing in almost double the amount. I think, Arthur, you mentioned that, and just a number

of very good things. And I'm just wondering to what extent is there sharing of good things that work, the for learned, example, well lessons as as best practices. Because all you guys are doing very good things, but in a situation where there are so many needs - and, Gus, I was really struck by the number of gangs and the enormity of the task there in LA. Again, I'm just wondering the extent to which there's that cross-fertilization in terms of learning from each other.

I'll start. GENERAL DEAN: The answer to your question is absolutely. We work diligently to share best practices with the people at the local level, the state level, as well as our national friends, and we do that in numerous ways. First of have large training seminars around all, we country. We probably have had five different ones this year, ranging from 250 people, to 600 people, to 3,000 in Washington, D.C., so the answer is through training facilities and training seminars, I talked about the one concerning publications. evaluations that we have developed, so I believe that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the national organizations, the state level
organizations, the local level organizations are, in
fact, working with each other, partnering with each
other, involving universities in their data and
evaluation. I think, all candidly, that at the
national level, it is not known the extent of what's
happening out in the states and in local levels. And
I think you all would be totally shocked, and somewhat
blown away to know exactly what is happening out
there, the goodness that's going on out there. Now
can it be improved? Absolutely. So I guess what I'm
suggesting is that you need to somehow, through a
system, have the good work that's going on, and the
data that's being collected, the evaluations that's
going on locally and state filtered up, so you can
have a good understanding of what's really happening,
so that you are not necessarily recommending
modifying, without having all of the good information
that's happening out there. So we are working
together and sharing information. Clarence and I have
been together on a regular basis. Ellen has been to
our trainings, the people that you heard from this

NEAL R. GROSS

morning, also, so it's happening.

DR. JONES: Yes. Just a follow-up question; are there mechanisms in place to track and trace the extent to which folks are following up on the excellent recommendations that are being made, or the trainings that are being carried out? I mean, what's the follow-up from that? I mean, it sounds like very good practices.

GENERAL DEAN: We put together annually for OMB and others, the impact of the Safe and Drug Free Schools, and give them with documented examples and books that are this big, what's happening across the country. So it is being compiled, it's being documented, and it's being shared at the national level.

DR. JONES: And is there feedback given to you based on the collection of all of these good data, of these good things going on, et cetera? You're saying that you compile large books, are there data being given back or feedback given back to you from the --

GENERAL DEAN: The answer is yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

DR. JONES: And is it helpful?

GENERAL DEAN: Yes.

DR. JONES: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. JONES: I was just going to say, from an LEA perspective, we get the opportunity to go out not just in the surrounding counties in Virginia, but as far away as Montgomery County, some parts of Maryland, D.C., and up to Pennsylvania, and other places to talk about how we set up our different programs. of the requirements I have in my office, if one of my specialists is required to go out to a place to do a program, they must return within one year to take a look at that program and see where they are, because we're just not going to go out and do something and We want to make sure that what we say life goes on. did, that we spent out time and money wisely. And as General Dean pointed out, is that a lot of people come together at the national forum, and then we have the opportunity to share a lot of the different programs we have with people all over the nation. And right now, we're trying to figure out a way how to get some of our people out to Kansas, because they're calling,

NEAL R. GROSS

wanting to see how we do some of the things that we do, and that is what it's all about, networking across the country.

MS. MOREHOUSE: I just want to mention, New York State, our state education agency, Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools, and our single state alcohol and drug agency, meet about five times a year with a large number of the community-based prevention providers, so they get to hear local concerns. We also get to hear state ideas, so it's really a two-way mechanism of sharing opinions. Also, many states have statewide prevention conferences that are held annually, and that's another good mechanism.

Unfortunately, there are not as many national prevention conferences. CADCA is really one of the best and one of the few really national places that brings prevention providers together. Even the Department of Education used to have, I think they were yearly Safe and Drug Free Schools conferences. You're down to once every three years, or every two years, I can't remember, but those used to be good places, also.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

The CAPS through CSAP also try to provide prevention. CAPS are the Centers for the Application of Prevention Technology, try to get information out to local providers, as well, so there are some ways to do this. But the lack of funding is a serious issue, and again, I'll just use New York State as an example. If we have a meeting in our state capitol in Albany, that's five hours from the eastern part of Long Island, and five hours from Buffalo, so our colleagues in different parts of the state either can't get there because they don't have the funding for planes, or mileage, or overnight accommodations, so the funding is really hurting travel.

I'm also aware that many, many states in the country will not allow out-of-state travel, so while I'm very lucky, in New York we can send a lot of people to the CADCA conference, I know some of my colleagues can't do that.

MR. FRIAS: Lastly, LA County, with 1,700 K12 schools, we do have our strengths, but believe me,
we have tremendous challenges. By legislation, all
the schools are mandated to have school safety teams.

NEAL R. GROSS

We train those teams, but now we expect them to go back to their respective site and impact the rest of the faculty and others. Well, to follow it up, there are some shortcomings; 1,700 K-12 schools with limited staffing levels, it's going to create some shortcomings, so again, we do have some strengths, but we do have some needs.

MR. LEDBETTER: Ms. Morehouse and General Dean, you both commented about additional funds that were leveraged, or where you got matching money, for lack of better terminology, I'll just call it matching money, where additional funds were appropriated from one place or another. Has anyone looked, or is there any research, or any information that's out there anywhere about how much money has been raised to go along with what has come through from the federal government in these programs nationwide?

MS. MOREHOUSE: I don't have the dollars. I can get that information, but I'll just speak for my own organization. I get approximately \$1 million from our state Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services, and that \$1 million is a combination of

NEAL R. GROSS

federal block grant money and New York State dollars. I that against approximately match million of money I get from the local school districts, the 28 LEAs. Out of that \$2 million, a portion of it, less than 25 percent is Safe and Drug Free School money. The rest is local school tax dollars, so that's just my own example. I can give you more specifics. I don't have those numbers right in front of me.

MR. LEDBETTER: I think it would just be interesting if the Congress were to realize that there were -- what money that the federal government is generating, is just a portion of what may be invested in this project.

MS. MOREHOUSE: Right. In New York, a small portion -- actually, I would like to just take one minute and respond to the other part of what Dr. Jones raised about parents. In many of our school districts with the decrease in Safe and Drug Free School money, that was brought up at a local school board meeting about gee, money has been decreased over the years, that means more local tax money, and parents come out

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and say absolutely, we want the money spent on that program, because they know that it's working.

GENERAL DEAN: taken We have not on national survey to answer the question you just asked. One, we don't have the dollars to do that. don't receive any funds whatsoever from Safe and Drug Free Schools monies, but what we have done is, we've looked in districts where there are significant people in Congress that care about this program, and we can tell them what's happening based on your question in their particular district. So we've done that, and we know in certain states, like Washington state, Ohio, and others that we have very, very close relationships So we have data from representative states, we with. have data from some specific districts where key members of Congress reside, but we have not done it nationally.

My point is that it seems to me that this is something that the Department of Education should do, and that it would then have its total feel for what this program is or is not doing. That was the point I made when I was talking about it earlier, but if you

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	just look at Washington State, it's about one-third,
2	one-third Safe and Drug Free Schools, one-third from
3	the state, and one-third they leverage. That's,
4	obviously, one state, but it is, in fact, happening
5	out there. We can give you specific examples, but not
6	a national example. We can't give you the totality of
7	what's happening across the whole country.
8	MR. LEDBETTER: Okay. One other question;
9	one of the bullets that you had in your presentation
10	was that the Department of Education needs to provide
11	uniform guidance to the states and LEAs concerning
12	information and data collection to enhance the
13	program's ability to show it is accountable to OMB and
14	Congress. That was on page 5, I think.
15	GENERAL DEAN: Right, that's correct.
16	MR. LEDBETTER: Do you have any suggestions
17	to go along with that?
18	GENERAL DEAN: Well, I think the law itself
19	is pretty clear as to what it is that states and LEAs
20	should be doing. The Program of Effectiveness is
21	really quite clear, as well. The piece that I think

that would bring it all together is a national

guidance based on the law, placed on the Program of Effectiveness, that would give then to states and to specific quidance on LEAs some how to about implementing and interpreting the law, so that the data then is rolled up from the local level to states, to national. And to the best of my knowledge, that is not happening at the current time. The law is there, very specific, the Program of Effectiveness is very specific, states individually going are about implementing that, LEAs are individually going about implementing that, but what I think would be very beneficial national quidance is some interpret, how to implement, and how to roll the data back up, and then a national repository of that data so we could, in fact, answer your question.

DR. WECHSLER: Α previous speaker said, "Across the board we need to be more prescriptive and firm about how the program is administered". that direction, goes in can you give some specific advice as to what aspects of the program you think we should be more prescriptive and firm about, and what aspects we shouldn't go there with?

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. FRIAS: Can I start on that? Yes, very
briefly, there are programs out there that do not meet
the Principles of Effectiveness. And yet, they're
getting millions, and millions, and millions. Case in
point, the GREAT Program, Gang Resistance Education
and Training. If Senator Feinstein's bill goes
through, by the way, which it's expected to go
through, it will allocate over \$650 million to address
the challenges of gangs throughout the United States.
We have a press conference with our office next
Wednesday where she's going to announce - I think she
she's got the backup in Capitol Hill to get this
approved. We, the County Office of US DOE, County
Office of Education as educators, we need to find a
way to lead, and let the elected officials know that
if programs do not meet the Principles of
Effectiveness, then they shouldn't be funded. But,
unfortunately, there are some political realities that
get those programs funded, so we need to be a little
more bold on that.

MR. JONES: I just want to say that many of you, if you know Arlene Cundiff, who is the SEA in

NEAL R. GROSS

Virginia, that's all I would need to say, because
Arlene Cundiff runs a tough shop. And the bottom line
is, you have to follow the Principles of
Effectiveness, you have to turn in things a certain
way, you have to respond in a certain time, and if you
don't, that money is going to be sitting there waiting
for you until you do. And that is one of the things
that we have been working on for years, and she's been
wonderful guide, so I think, and maybe with my
military background says hey, if the boss says do it,
you need to do it. And as you pointed out right
there, very clearly that's not happening across the
board. I do know in the Commonwealth of Virginia, it
definitely is happening.

MS. MOREHOUSE: My understanding in New York, that if you don't have an evidence-based program and comply with the Principles of Effectiveness, that you have to redo your application, and you will not get funded until you comply, so I personally don't think you should make it stricter.

DR. SIMS: Gus, I had a question just following up on what you were talking about, and maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

this will give you an opportunity to expand on it, but it was in terms of the school safety teams that you do train, and I was interested in how they come together, and whether or not during the actual time of the training that there are other representatives from other parts of the schools that would be impacted by the overall Safe and Drug Free Schools program at the training? You mentioned later on that when those teams go back to their schools, they're responsible for communicating information to the rest of school personnel, and I was just wondering how does that work, how do you monitor it, and how do you all assess the overall impact, or the overall coordination with the different aspects of the programs, and then outcomes.

Mind you, we're talking state FRIAS: mandates, SO all the schools in California mandated to establish school safety teams. As part of that, we train them. Once we train the teams, they go back to their respective school site, and usually the principal or the assistant principal is the leader of that respective team. There are some major

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

shortcomings in sharing that information with the rest
of the other folks at the school site, all the
teachers, all the counselors, the parents, and others.
Where we come in, basically, is to find a way to
provide direct or indirect support services to these
respective teams in doing that, but I can tell you
that when it comes down to training the whole school,
we run into some tremendous roadblocks, because the
training time for educators is very limited, and
oftentimes it's already taken, so you have to get in
line, even for safety-related issues. We're trying
our best to find a way to, I guess, if we can't do it
by legislation, we have to find a way to collectively
as a team address that tremendous challenge. But that
continues to be a tremendous, I guess, shortcoming,
concerns at some schools, particularly the schools
that are located in the middle of gang-infested areas,
or high risk areas, drugs, gangs, and guns, and all
kinds of other things. Those kids, and just for your
info, we have at the minimum one lock-down a day,
lock-down, and just one gang banger can close down
three schools from a particular area because the law

NEAL R. GROSS

enforcement agencies are chasing a son of a gun with a gun, and the whole school goes into lock-down. Imagine that type of environment impacting the kids. I share this with you because those realities impact what we do, and hopefully, we can use that reality to persuade legislators and others to assist us to address this.

DR. SIMS: Then the other question I had, just in listening to each of the presentations was in terms of the diversity of the different school systems that you all work with, and how is diversity addressed throughout the training and cultural competency, especially when you can have big differences between principals and school student bodies, teachers, and whatnot?

MR. JONES: I can definitely address that. We have one of the most diverse school systems in America in Fairfax County. We have in one elementary school, in particular, we have over 97 different languages that are being spoken in just that one school. One of the things that we're doing is that everything that we have with drug prevention or

NEAL R. GROSS

violence prevention is translated in seven different languages. And we, also, through our office, we hire individuals to go out with our specialists if one of our specialists is not already trained in that language, to provide those in-services for parents, and also community members on whatever topic we're talking about.

Most recently, the Korean population asked us to come out, and over 300 people was there. We had to have a Korean interpreter, so we took all of our drug paraphernalia, all our gang stuff, and we had the most wonderful time. And the Q&A back and forth is what it's all about, and then from that right there, they stay in touch with us, and we constantly stay in touch with them, help providing them information on how they can continue to help their particular areas right there. But it's a whole county thing, not just the school, the whole county is involved in this endeavor right here.

GENERAL DEAN: I would say that speaking of Dennis' strategic prevention framework, there are five major steps, that start with assessment, planning,

NEAL R. GROSS

capacity, evaluation, et cetera. But in the center,
if he presents this plan to you, are two items that
holds all of the major steps together. And the two
items are sustainability, and cultural competency, so
we've been about training at all of our trainings,
whether they're small, large, or whatever, a central
piece that we talk about is cultural competency,
because if you don't get that right, nothing is going
to happen locally at all. So the point is, we're
working with our state friends, and our local friends,
to ensure that they address that, because if they
don't address that, the other five steps will not
work, and will not be held together.
DR. JONES: Just real quick; are people
getting training in cultural competence?
GENERAL DEAN: People are getting training by
trained people who understand cultural competency,
absolutely. Yes.
MS. MOREHOUSE: In my area, as we become more
culturally diverse, this becomes a major challenge,

NEAL R. GROSS

because with Mr. Frias' point, the amount of time for

staff training is minimal, and you have to get in line

behind the new math tests, the new English tests, and the emergency evacuation procedures, and everything else. Most of the school districts in New York are unionized, the number of faculty meetings are set by teacher's contract, number $\circ f$ the the staff development days are set by contract, so there's very little flexibility for training. When a teacher leaves a class or has to be a substitute or a nurse, or a social worker, so I don't feel that it's being dealt with as well as it could be.

One other thing I'll mention; most of the evidence-based programs looked at cultural competency in terms of the results in different populations, so when school districts select evidence-based programs and practices, I think that's one of the issues that they look at, as well. MR. FRIAS: Let me add, that a lot of times federal agencies fund specific CBOs, Community-based Organizations, to address issues related to diversity and tolerance. But when all is said and done, the schools, instead of leading, are following. We need to take change — change it around, and those resources should be coming to our

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

schools. If it involves our kids and our staff, and our purpose is to train them on this type of competence, then we need to find a way to make sure that our county offices, or educational institutions lead.

I've emphasize to to you that in got California, we have the California Student Safety and Violence Prevention Act, that requires that all the schools be proactive in addressing hate motivated behaviors. And guess what, there's no money. forgot to attach money to do this, so who's going to Well, it depends on the respective persons do this? involved to leverage resources and make it happen, but those are tremendous shortcomings that come at us.

DR. LONG: We are right on time. It is now 12:28. As we wrap-up our second panel, and as I sat and watched, and listened, some things really came I'm not going to go through that list, but through. something that really struck me was this; that no matter what the amount of money is, that we get it field called done in this education for these and one of the big reasons is because of children,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

collaboration, and it's that networking. And I was just thinking about the people on this committee sitting around this table, and the panelists that have come up, and I'll give you - and I heard the General talk about the fact that you and Clarence have done a lot - so it's that networking and that collaborative effort, that positive collaborative effort that gets it done for children. And I'll give you one quick example.

We had a situation in a rural area in our county about two weeks ago that some hostilities ended up just prior to this situation, there have been two murders by some teenagers, neighboring towns. Then there was a police shooting, school was going to open and that set up a memorial across the street from the The superintendent was very concerned and school. called me. I picked up the phone, called Bill. said we need to get together with Gus. I'd never met Gus until today, and within the hour, we were on a conference call, and Gus said I'll take care of it. I'll contact the superintendent. I'll be out there. There was no money, there was not even a talk of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

money. It was that relationship went from one person to another person, we're on the phone. This morning when I met Gus for the first time he said, "Dave, I talked with the superintendent. We're going to get it handled." But it reminded me of that collaboration, and you do it so well, so with that, we'll close this panel. And, again, Gus, and General, and Ellen, and Clarence, we thank you so much for being here and sharing.

(Applause.)

DR. LONG: Lunch is now ready. It's 12:30, and lunch will be for the committee members and the presenters, and it will be right down -- you walk right out this door, right through the doorway for about 50 yards, and lunch will be served.

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 12:32:07 p.m. and went back on the record at 1:21:59 p.m.)

DR. LONG: Okay. We're all set to go, if folks, committee members, please come up; and panelists, if you'd please take your seats. Thank you. As we get started, first of all, thanks to the

NEAL R. GROSS

panel members for coming in today and being very
willing to share your expertise and experience for all
of us. As we have with the past two panels, we will
have presentations from each of you. And then as soon
as we are done, it will allow the committee to ask
specific questions so that we can start to synthesize
some information to make a recommendation to the
Secretary. So I'd like to, first of all, introduce
the panelists to you, and starting on my right, Peter
Reuter is a professor at the School of Public Policy,
the Department of Criminology at the University of
Maryland, and Director of the Center on Economics of
Crime and Justice Policy at the university, and also
Senior Economist at Rand. From 1981 through `93, he
was a Senior Economist in the Washington office of the
Rand Corporation. He founded and directed Rand's Drug
Policy Research Center from `89 to `93. Most of his
research has dealt with alternative approaches to
controlling drug problems, both in the United States
and Western Europe. Dr. Reuter received his Ph.D. in
economics from Yale. Peter, thank you so much for
being with us today. And I want to ask - we didn't

NEAL R. GROSS

have an opportunity, is it pronounced Zella or Zila?
Zili, so I'm zero for two. Okay. Zili Sloboda. Now
remember, this is coming from a guy named Dave Long.

(Laughter.)

DR. is currently an LONG: Zili adjunct research professor in the Department of Sociology of the University of Akron, and Senior Research Associate at the Institute for Health and Social Policy of the University of Akron. She was awarded a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation in November of `99 to evaluate a middle and high school substance abuse prevention program being delivered through the drug abuse and resistance education, or as we know it, the DARE network. She was trained as а medical sociologist at New York University, and at Johns School of Hygiene Hopkins University and Public Health. Her research has included a broad range of studies and program evaluation in the area of drug abuse and cancer. Thank you so much for being here.

And Chris Ringwalt is a Senior Research Scientist at the Chapel Hill Center of the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation. He has 16

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

vears of experience in design and development and reporting ideological and evaluation studies relating to public health issues. And he has directed evaluation of the drug abuse resistance again for education, DARE program, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and the National Institute of Justice.

Dr. Ringwalt has served as Chair of the alcohol, tobacco, and other drug section of the American Public Health Association, and as Secretary to the Board of Society of Prevention Research. He has recently stepped down from a five-year term as Director of Pyres Chapel Hill Center. Chris, thank you so much for being here. And if we could start with Peter, we'll go.

DR. REUTER: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the advisory board. I should begin by noting that this is a five-year old study. It's a study done for the Department of Education for this office at the time when the act was out for reauthorization, and I have not continued to work on this specific topic since then, so I will not attempt

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to really update what we did. I think as some of you know, the study has been cited by OMB in part for its - part being a pun here - in justification for some reductions in the program. I think that probably makes some interest, even in its somewhat dated form. It was the result of a grant to the Drug Policy Research Center at the Rand Corporation, and the report, as said, was published in 2001.

The conundrum that we were dealing with is that this is, obviously, an emotionally powerful issue, more so at the time that we were doing the research than it is now when drug use, the drug problem has continued to fall in its prominence amongst social problems in this country.

Congress wants to appear to be responsive, and certainly back then did want to appear to be responsive to the drug problem in all possible ways, but the difficulty was that this was generating what one of our contributors called symbolic pork; that is, it was money that was attractive without its content. It simply was there to be distributed. And the schools accepted the responsibility of providing these

NEAL R. GROSS

programs unenthusiastically. And to make one updated comment, I think that that lack of enthusiasm is probably greater now given the increased pressure on curriculum of other kinds.

The program has been judged in general, and again, I make this comment from sort of the late 90s really as having been unsuccessful. It's not targeted at the need. Too many school districts receive the grants, and the medium grant is too small to make a difference. The schools in general choose relatively they lack guidance, weak projects, they lack incentives, they lack monitoring to force them to do anything else, so the project that we did involved focusing on whether the Act should be re-authorized or reformed in some substantial way. So the project involved, first of all, bringing together people who were involved in delivery of these services in the schools. I should say, this was a project that I did jointly with Michael Timpane who was also at Rand those days. He had expertise in educational policy, I presume he had some expertise about drug policy, and that seemed like a good combination, but neither of us

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

knew much about what was going on in the school room with respect to prevention activities, so we held some focus groups. We commissioned some papers to review specific aspects of the literature, and we held a conference, which at least some people here and а bunch of federal officials present, and researchers talked about what was then a draft report of the project. And what I'd like to do is talk about the current program, the current program as of the late 90s and its problems, evaluate what was then the Clinton administration proposal, and talk about our own views about what might be done.

The schools have lacked guidance, and they've lacked guidance in sort of multiple ways. There's a great diversity of activities supported by this program, and I don't need to tell, I think, this audience just how varied those activities are. At the time, DARE was the dominant curriculum choice. I forget what the percentage was, but it may have been a majority of schools were using DARE, the one program that even at that stage we knew to be an ineffective program. I mean, now Zili is working on something

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that we hope will use that platform to build something effective that you can still call DARE, but at the time, the schools were clearly choosing a program, which for reasons other than its demonstrated largely local political effectiveness. They were factors that governed, not in any pejorative sense, but they were responsive to what parents saw as the preferred program. And the truth was that most of the available curricula simply were unevaluated, and there wasn't much guidance available to the schools, even those that were well-intentioned and wanted to choose the right program.

That's in part because prevention science at that stage was still quite weak. As you may remember, there was a panel of the Department of Education that invited submissions of programs to decide which were proven and effective, and the number that made it to proven and effective was tiny. And if you looked at those that were not specialized, for example, aimed specifically at athletes or something like that, it was truly on the hands, on the fingers of one hand. So it wasn't just that the curricula weren't very

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

strong, but there wasn't a really well -- I mean, it wasn't just that the schools were making bad choices, but there wasn't a lot for them to make an informed -on which basis to make an informed choice. because of our backgrounds, we were mostly focused on drug prevention. violence When you went to prevention, the situation was, if anything, few evaluated programs, worse, very and little understanding of what was likely to make for effective program.

The Safe and Drug Free Schools Act itself as a program was really quite isolated. It had a few educational initiatives links to other the Department of Education, and it was isolated within It had no relationship to the schools themselves. sort of national school reform movement. It sat out on its own, it was stove piped, and it was beginning to collaborate with other health and justice programs, but that was still fairly nascent at that time.

So with that as background, we looked at what was then the dominant proposal on the table, maybe the one from the Clinton administration, which started, I

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thought, with a very realistic assessment. words, an assessment very much like ours, of what the problems were with the program at that time. And it was one that sort of didn't tamper with the allocation across states, and that probably isn't a particularly critical part of the formula to change, but it did try to focus on ensuring that more of the dollars went to schools that were in need, in need and lacking capacity; that is, there's really a good argument for paying attention both to the severity of the problem in the school, and the capacity of the school district finance the stages there, to supplement capacity of the district.

grants. I think it was going to target maybe half as many school districts, and would invite small school districts to form a consortia. And it would involve an explicit evaluation component in grant renewal. You would have to show that you had successfully achieved your goals in getting a renewal. And it would have established a list of approved programs, which costs you something in terms of initiative. On

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the other hand, it sort of gives you a floor or quality, gives you a better chance of a floor or quality than the current system did.

We thought that there was sort of six criteria to use for evaluating proposals, and I think these are fairly self-evident. We should choose programs that demonstrate effectiveness in reducing drug use and violence. They should target the resources of the schools that need those resources. It should be possible to account for how the federal government money got spent. It should be possible to evaluate the consequences of that. It should have low administrative cost, and be compatible with the administrative capacities of the school states, and school districts, and you would like it to be in the business, also, of improving the capacity of the program to deliver effective prevention programs.

Well, on that basis we thought that the Clinton administration proposal did moderately well in terms of accountability and evaluation, and in terms of effectiveness. And I, frankly, can't reconstruct why we thought it was likely to increase

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

effectiveness. I can say why we thought it would fail badly in terms of administrative feasibility, which is that it was still talking about a relatively large number of school districts receiving small grants, but there be elaborate evaluation demanding that an Those two things do not go together. Ιf procedure. you're talking about grants of less than \$30,000, an evaluation of anything more than most pro forma type is simply not doable, and that was really the guts of the Clinton administration program. It didn't, in our eyes, do much to improve program capacity.

So what in 2001 did we think All right. Well, the first question was, should could be done? this program be continued? It's not a question about federal government should be whether the the improving prevention in schools. business of The whether this particular mechanism question is for doing so was the appropriate mechanism. And there's certainly credible arguments against doing that. Ιt does not have well-defined mission. The expansion to violence further complicates an already complicated little evidence that task. There's it has had

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

measurable effects, and it's not obvious.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Now to be quite personal about it, I did not find the argument that the federal government should be in the prevention business, as opposed to many of school curriculum particularly other areas compelling. There are schools which need it, and those schools can benefit from federal intervention, but the notion that there be an essentially universal essentially that's really program, one auite challengeable. An alternative role would be that the federal government be in the R&D, and training, and dissemination, and that it just stick to that, that would be compatible with the Department Education role in many other areas of education.

There are lots of arguments, though, for continuation of it. It is five years ago. It was still popular politically, and popular in the broad public sense, in as much as they knew about it. The program was actually improving, was building better links to other kinds of interventions aimed at health and safety in schools, so there certainly were arguments for continuation.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	We thought that there needed to be, even as
2	compared to the Clinton administration program, more
3	targeting to the needs for to the schools with
4	greatest needs, a shift from give me so much of the
5	money to state formula, to federal discretionary
6	grants. I should note that we are both in Washington,
7	we tend to that, in general; that there be more of an
8	effort to get state and local governments to take this
9	on seriously, as well, and that there should be
10	expansion of the federal capacity for research,
11	training, and national evaluation. Thank you very
12	much.
13	DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Peter. And
14	assuming that that has no semblance to what's coming.
15	DR. SLOBODA: It may, there's no guarantee.
16	DR. LONG: Okay. Again, thank you, Peter,
17	and we'll now move - I want to ask this because I want
18	to make sure that - I didn't get A or B.
19	DR. SLOBODA: Zili.
20	DR. LONG: Zili. Okay.
21	DR. SLOBODA: Zili, like zeal-e.
22	DR. LONG: Got it. Zili.

DR. SLOBODA: But there are variations that Peter, I thought that theme. interesting presentation. Ι have both written comments that I submitted to you in response to each questions, but I'm going the to do slide presentation, sort of summarizing.

I wanted to sort of set a context for where I'm coming from in terms of how I'm responding to the questions, but also wanted to thank you all. I appreciate being here today. I think this is a very important session, and I think it's going to have impact on a lot of what goes on in our schools in the country in terms of prevention in the future. I'm an epidemiologist, so forgive my first context, which is to talk about illicit drug use.

I find that a lot of people sort of know the epidemiology of drug abuse, but there's some nuances that I think have real implications for prevention that many of us sort of overlook. This information comes from the Monitoring the Future study, which is conducted by the University of Michigan annually, looking at drug use in eighth, tenth, and twelfth

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

graders, have looked at the twelfth graders since
1975, and eighth and tenth graders since 1991. And
what I really want to point out here is, in the next
slide which is looking at illicit drug use, but we
could pull tobacco use and alcohol up just as well,
and the bottom line on the graph is information on
eighth graders, middle line is tenth graders, and the
top line is twelfth graders. And what I want to point
out is this huge jump in use between the eighth and
tenth graders. And this morning we saw slides from
Indiana which had information on sixth graders, and it
was also a huge jump in terms of drug use, alcohol
use, and tobacco use between the sixth grade and
eighth grade. And I say this because when we talk
about prevention, I have found that - and even with
the DARE - that the 80 percent of school districts
that delivered DARE were delivering only the
elementary school program, which is good. We need to
have elementary school programs in place, but we also
need to target middle school and high school when kids
are most at risk for drug use. And for some reason,
every time I get an opportunity to make - I try to put

NEAL R. GROSS

this message across, because communities aren't really getting that message.

Law enforcement seems to - when I talk to police chiefs, they seem to understand that better than our educators, so I just wanted to put that forward because it has implications for some of the other things I'm going to say later.

The other thing I wanted to, just as background piece was, know from epidemiologic we studies that not only do drug use patterns change, and we heard this morning very vividly of the change of kids use to more prescription drugs, and more diverse drugs that they have, so not only are these drug use patterns changing, but we also have found that children and adolescents' cultures are changed, and this also has implications for prevention. And what I mean by that, when I started the study that was mentioned this morning funded by Robert Wood Johnson, started out in 1991, and I had a curriculum coordinator who was coordinating the development of a new middle and high school program that was going to be delivered by DARE officers. And one of the people

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on that group said we should have a 2010 program in which she wanted to have more interactive because kids are more involved with video games, et And when we looked at schools, schools didn't in place have the computers at that time to incorporate that into the curriculum. Now we're at 2006, and I make my visits to the schools, noticed more and more of the schools have bags of computers, so a lot of the programs that we have in place need to be updated, and we need to be more flexible in design of our program, recognizing, as I said, the different culture and the drug use patterns.

The third point I want to make is - again, this is just from my experience - I'm finding that school administrators really want to address drug use and alcohol use in their schools. That's what I'm finding from my visits to schools, and I'll talk a little bit more about that. Our study looks at 83 school districts. This involves 83 high schools and 122 middle schools, and they're in six cities. When I travel around visiting the schools, they ask me all the time about prevention, what they can do, where

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

they can go for information. In fact, what's been
interesting, when we started the study, we recruited
schools in 2001. We told the schools that to
participate in the study they had to sign an agreement
that they would agree to be randomized to either
control or treatment condition, and to stay on with
the study for the course of the study. And after we
received the agreement letters, then schools are
randomly assigned to the conditions. And the control
schools in the beginning were not going to offer any
kind of prevention programs. That was part of the
agreement. However, to mess up my study, we're
finding that many of the control schools are actually
delivering a prevention program, and statistics - that
the name programs in the school - when I talked about
name programs, they're Life Skills training, Project
Alert, et cetera, that the delivery of these programs
range was 41 percent in the seventh grade. By the
time kids get to the tenth grade, only 5 percent of
the high schools are delivering a prevention program.
And remember the graph I showed you about where kids
are at risk, but there are lots of prevention related

NEAL R. GROSS

activities, and these pretty much are Rangers Red Ribbon campaigns, assemblies, all kinds of activities to raise awareness about drugs, so there is a real concern. This also said that there's real concern I think in the schools about these problems, and they don't really know how to address it.

Ι looked at the questions that received, two things stood out to me. One is, is the program meeting current student and school needs. the second one, is the program effective; that is, does the funding make a difference in terms of drug I think the existence, the fact that there is the SCRUDs program acknowledges that drug abuse is a problem and needs to be recognized. And I think that one of the turning points in the history of drug abuse research was when NIDA was created in 1974, because it said to the health community and to the nation, that drug abuse is a problem. And I see the creation of this program as making that statement, and I think that's very significant. I think it's significant it makes a statement, and also backs it up with some funding.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I also think that - and this is mentioned over and over this morning - the fact that the program provides elements that support the delivery of prevention program in schools, but also links the schools to the state and federal government. And I see that clearly in my home state of Ohio, where the state government works so closely with the local government and with local schools.

The other thing is, the program is a medium as, again, mentioned this morning, the infrastructure that provides sufficient information to schools on emerging drug problems and innovative educational approaches that meet the changing needs of the kids. Also, I think the Principles of Effectiveness was mentioned quite a bit this morning. I think that that was extremely important for schools. I think it's important for communities, also, in terms of how to plan and strategically plan around the needs of their communities, and it allows flexibility so that community differences can be responded to effectively.

One of the questions had to with the authorized activities and the mandate of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

restrictiveness of the authorized activities. Given what I said in my first set of comments, I think that the authorized activities are restrictive, and they're too limited, they're time limited. Now we have more information about some of those activities, and there are other activities that perhaps need to be added to that list, so I think that needs more flexibility.

I'm a researcher so my primary interest was in the uniform management information and reporting system, and this came up again this morning several I like to sort of not call it an evaluation times. I think evaluations, true evaluations need to I'd like to see the uniform be done differently. management information reporting system to be administrative tool that would feed information both to the local education agencies, as well as to the federal level and to the states, to let you know what's going on. I was talking at lunch with Belinda, and when I was at National Institute on Drug Use, I was the former director of what was then called the Division of Epidemiology Prevention Research, and we had a number of the large data systems in our unit, in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

our division. One of them was looking at how drug abuse treatment was being supported. It was called NDATAS in those days, and what was interesting about that was it had multiple components to it. talking about what kinds of services were beina delivered so you had a description of what was going on in the country. And then there was a point prevalence survey that was done, which gave you an idea of what was going on with the people who were going through the services at one point in time, so everybody who was an active substance abuser who was going through treatment, you had the characteristics of those people, and what their problems were, cetera, but it gave you a good handle on what was going on.

Subsequently to that, we had a discharge form added to it, so we not only had admission data, we all began to look at discharge information, so you had this flow of information, told you what was going on in the country. You could see where some of the gaps were, where additional technical assistance may have been needed. And I think something like that, I think

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it gets more complicated when you talk about prevention, and the complication comes from the variations across communities.

On the other hand, I think that such a system can be developed. I think the system you can build in short, intermediate, and long-term outcomes. And it just needs to be a very good system that is monitored frequently, because one thing that happens, and I've worked with a lot of large data systems, if people don't use the information, it's really worthless, so it has to be a real living thing.

Funding for prevention in the United States is decreasing tremendously now, and now we've - since the late 90s when I think -- I really think one of the turning points was when NIDA put on its first prevention conference in 1997, and out of that, were able to -- NIDA was highlighting a lot of their own research, and showing that prevention I think it's taken time for that message effective. to come across to communities. However, I think the message is there now, and this may not be the right time to begin cutting funding for prevention.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think the states are on board. I'm so impressed with several of the state level people I've been talking to. They're on board, the community is on board, and I think the federal government needs to support that. Thank you very much.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Zili. And next, we'll turn to Chris.

DR. RINGWALT: Good afternoon. Thank you so much for the invitation, Zili, to come. Zili is the person whom I'm holding responsible for my presence here today, and we'll see if that holds true to the end of the day, but I'm delighted to be talking to I'll be addressing the second of the several you. bullets that we were sent relating to is the Safe and Drug Free Schools State Grants programs effectively promoting safe and drug free schools? And I will be presenting data that are as new as Peter's were not exactly old, but getting there. The graphs that I will be sharing with you did not exist a week ago.

You all are familiar with this key Principles of Effectiveness, if any has tripped the field up in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

terms of being a challenge, to me, it's probably this and activities shall be based Programs scientifically-based research that provides evidence that the program to be used will reduce violence and illegal drug use. So I'll be sharing with you some preliminary evidence from the second school-based substance use prevention program study brought to you of NIDA. And specifically, be courtesy I'11 addressing the problems of effective universal substance use prevention curricula.

study methodology entailed drawing representative sample of all public schools include middle school grades. We stratified our school sample by population density, size, and And all together, we sampled some 2,200 poverty. schools that included middle school grades. We then identified the school staff person whom the school said was the lead substance use prevention teacher. WE hoped and expected that this person would be our best informant as to what was going on in his or her And we collected data a little particular school. over a year ago via the web, and then mail, and then

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

phone, and a lot of whining, and wheedling, and nagging, but we did get what I think is an exceptionally good response rate out of our teachers, bless their hearts, of 78 percent. And, in fact, the response rate was so good that when we weighted the data, it didn't look really very different from our unweighted data, so we were pleased with that.

Now we got straight to the findings, first the questions that we asked. We asked our respondents to tell us, and most of them were teachers, some of them were school counselors, social workers or nurses, but most were teachers during the current school year, which of the following substance use prevention curricula are you - and then we asked them in two different questions - using, and using the most for students in your middle or junior high school grades in your school?

Now for using, they could answer multiple responses. We gave them a long list of all of the universal drug prevention curricula that we could find. It went on for about 25 lines or so, using the most, we asked them to pick, of course, just one. And

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

important that you understand this if going to appreciate what's on the following slide, because what we then did was go to the one list of effective prevention programs that most people and most schools turn to, which is the National Registry of Effective Prevention Programs, to find out which of those curricula made the list. It's called simply the "List" out there in the schools. Ιt carries tremendous weight. It has been a source of great pain, and challenge, and anxiety for the people who have been in charge of saying sorry, your curriculum is not on it, and I'll do my best to explain to you why, but you won't like what you hear.

Turning to our first chart, you will see two bars. The light one is any one effective curriculum - and remember, this is the first question. They could answer one, they could answer more than one. And our middle schools of a certain size often had more than one prevention curriculum in their schools. And then we asked them to tell us the effective curriculum they used the most.

Now what do we see here? Well, we see that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

close to 50 percent of our schools with middle school grades have at least one effective curriculum in the That's pretty good news, I think, in terms of the dissemination, the saturation of effective programs into our schools. But when we asked them well, which ones are you using the most, we discover that a fair number of these curricula are simply sitting on the shelf, not being used, or at least not being used the most. And I think that is of concern. As you look at those bars, you will see something closer to 23-24 percent for using effective curriculum the most.

Now in response to the questions that we were asked to address we disaggregated our data by urban, suburban, and rural. And as you will see, the suburban schools were more likely than the urban and rural to say that they had purchased or secured an effective curriculum, but that those differences are more modest when we asked the question well, is this the curriculum you're using the most? So these data suggest to me, at least, that it's not as if the Safe and Drug Free Schools has been more effective say with

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

suburban schools, which you could argue have the money than rural schools, which are less likely to, in getting effective curricula out there. There is work to be done all across the board.

We then asked the question of how long, when did your school first start using the substance use prevention curriculum you were using the most with students in middle or junior high school grades? Our response options were less than a year. You can see for yourself, one to three years, three to five years, and at least five years.

Now when I asked this question, I rather hoped that we would get the answer that you see on the following page, that most of the curricula have been in place for quite a while. Two-thirds of them, approximately, have been in place for at least three years. I think that is good up to a point, because it does show that these curricula are fairly stable. They're not coming and going year by year. But what these data also told me on reflection, I'm reflecting as I speak because these data are so new, is that the push to get effective programs into the school hasn't

NEAL R. GROSS

resulted in a whole slew of them just coming in recently. Most of the ones that are there, have been in for at least a year, and the majority for three or more years. And I don't know why that is. I would have expected to see a larger number of schools saying well, we just got one in, because of the, I believe, persistent emphasis on the part of our states and our districts, to get schools to spend their money wisely, where it is believed that the programs will be most effective.

We then asked our schools, our respondents, how likely is it that the substance use prevention curriculum that you were using the most with students will continue to be used next year, in three years, and in five years? Here's some very good news. Most of the people we talked to expected that their programs will be sticking around, and I was pleased to see that.

Now there was somewhat less optimism that they would be highly likely to be around in five years, as opposed to likely, but I think that just that may have been caution on the part of some of our

NEAL R. GROSS

respondents, so I aggregated those two groups in a single column.

Then we go to the question which I believe is the nub, and I'm going to have to move slowly through this one so you know exactly what you're looking at. You know how economists, present company excluded, have a way of dazzling you with assumptions of one sort or another as they present the results of their cost benefit analyses. I'm going to tell you exactly how we asked this question, and then you can decide for yourself how much credibility you place in the answers that you will get.

We said, "About what proportion of students in middle or junior high school grades in your school will have received the curriculum you are using the most before starting the high school grades"? And we gave them a set of response options from zero to 100 percent, one to six, as you see. Now we categorized schools as having zero percent if they received no substance use prevention curricula whatsoever, or if they received a substance use prevention curriculum not shown to be effective. And we gave that both a

NEAL R. GROSS

Now that's not to say that the programs that are not on the list are not effective, it just means that we don't know that they are. And what we found from our middle schools reports of the proportion of their students who receive evidence-based an curriculum, is that 80 percent of our middle school students have not, and will not, receive a program that is on the list, that is in the effective category by the time they leave middle school. And by the way, you all know how unlikely it is that they will get anything effective in high school. The prevalence of curricula, particularly effective curricula high schools is very low, indeed. So 80 percent got zero, and then a piddling amount got the intermediate categories, but 10 percent, a little over 10 percent said well, almost all of our kids will get this effective curriculum.

Now we also disaggregated in data that I don't have to show you whether these charts looked materially different across urban, and suburban, and rural schools, and they don't. They look pretty much the same, so it is with a reasonable level of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

assurance that I can inform you that we have a long way to go in terms of exposure, or reach as it's sometimes been called, getting our effective programs out to our students in our middle schools.

By way of summary, about half the nation's middle schools report having at least one effective, that is evidence-based prevention curriculum in place, but only a quarter are using it the most. And the differences in by population density use of communities served, that's simply another looking at urban, suburban, or rural these differences are modest. Two-thirds of the schools using effective curricula the most have had them in place for at least three years, and the likelihood that they will stick around in the future seems very But 80 percent of the nation's middle schools high. report that none of their students is exposed to an effective substance use prevention curriculum by the time they leave the middle school grades. And that, to me, was an unpleasant surprise. That tells us that we have work to do.

Now I also wanted to address the issue of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

difficulties in determining the effectiveness of the Safe and Drug Free Schools program. Zili has already referred to the fact that you can't find control schools any more that are pure controls, so it's really difficult when you do a study that you'd like to think it was controlled, to isolate program effects, to attribute program effects when you're lucky enough to find them, to the program under study relative to some other characteristic or attribute of the school that you're in, the intervention school, or the comparison school.

You'll know, of if not, I hope you should, that there's increasing resistance in schools to nonmandated drug use surveys. Schools don't want to do Evaluations are getting harder and them any more. I'm harder, and much more expensive to conduct. conducting some of them right now, and the costs just keep ratcheting up. And there are many other challenges to collecting survey data. Ellen has mentioned education's mandate for active parental consent which makes life difficult, particularly as it is, even if you go to great lengths as we are in our

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

studies to get parents to say yes, it's the ones who say no who probably have the most to hide, or are the most concerned that their kids may divulge something that will make them look bad, or get them in trouble. And there are some new concerns that the questions that we ask kids about their drug use maybe iatrogenic We prevention researchers have been saying in nature. for decades oh, no, that doesn't happen. It can't happen, it won't happen. Well, someone has done a study and published it, which shows maybe it will, maybe it is, maybe we are actually creating the very problem by asking these questions that we are trying to resolve. The jury is not in on this, but we have to be sensitive to the fact that this article is out there, as much as I would like to stick my head in the sand like an ostrich and ignore it.

Other problems are school-based archival data concerning reports of substance use activity unreliable, the reporting norms and practices change, and teacher fidelity to curriculum, and we've heard a number of people talk about fidelity, is very hard to assess. It is increasingly looking like we really

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

can't trust teachers to tell us what they have done, because they don't know what they don't know. And to the extent that they haven't paid attention to the curriculum guide, we can hardly blame them for saying that they haven't followed it very well. So my final slide, and do I have another minute or two? Good. Relates to proposed mechanisms to determine the effectiveness of our programs.

think it is worthwhile Ι to support through one mechanism or another periodic surveys of a nationally representative sample of schools to among other things, the proportion determine, distribution of schools using effective curricula, the extent to which these curricula are being taught to our students, so it's not as if -- what we don't want the schools happen is will yes, sav we're satisfying the mandate of this program, when they're only reaching a very few, a small percentage.

We also need to find out the extent to which content that it thought to be effective is being taught, and also, the extent to which teaching strategies thought to be effective are used. By the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

way, the strategies that we are modeling today we know are ineffective. This notion that our dialogue should be one way, and it won't be as soon as we start asking questions, but that here we are, we're teaching you, you're a class - we have known ever since Nan Tobler told us ten years ago - it doesn't work.

We need to know the extent to which teachers administering evidence-based curricula are fidelity, and there are a number of us who are pushing the feel for, or trying to find out questions that we can ask our teachers that will give reliable and useful information about fidelity. And we need to know progress over time, both relative to earlier surveys, and we did -- our first iteration this survey was back in 1999, and we will do another one in an abbreviated form in another three years, but also to establish goals. And I think we should be considering strongly establishing a goal that our states and our school districts reach X percent of their students with an effective prevention curricula, within a certain amount of time, and then find some way to figure out whether, indeed, that has

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

come to fruition or not.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The only other thing I have to say is that with the revisions and modifications of the National Registry of Effective Prevention Programs, and I could talk at great length about that, but don't have time there's no longer going to be a list, as such. And people like John Carnevale, who is known to some of you, at least, are going around telling programs that aren't on the list to tell schools that there is no more list, there is no more list, so let our program in, please. And, indeed, John is correct to the point registry has transformed itself the something called the decision support system.

Well, when you translate that into English, it turns out to be something like consumers reports, where each program that is reviewed or re-reviewed, and Ellen will tell you that she's in the middle of resubmitting her program for re-review, will be scored along a number of criteria. And the scores will be put out for the public along a continuum, but it won't be an on the list/off the list kind of vehicle, which is easy for anyone to understand; although, it

NEAL R. GROSS

certainly generates a lot of heat, and energy, and
passion, regardless of which side you're on. It'll be
much more difficult for the consumer at the district
or the school to say okay, is this an evidence-based
program or isn't it, and how do I tell, how do I
interpret these criteria, and how do I differentially
weight them? So I'm not sure where the field is
going, but things are in flux, and it's up to you
guys, I believe, to make the kind of recommendations
that will keep us on track and headed in the right
direction. Thank you.
DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Chris, and

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Chris, and thanks to all three of you. And at this time, as we indicated earlier, we'll be opening this up to a dialogue, question and answer, so that we can learn some things as a committee. So we will do that just as I indicated, right now. Any questions from the committee?

MS. PRICE: I have two questions. One is a very short question. Iatrogenic, can you tell me what that means?

DR. RINGWALT: It means creating the problem

NEAL R. GROSS

you're trying to solve.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. PRICE: Okay.

DR. RINGWALT: The best example of an iatrogenic illness is when you go into a hospital healthy and you come out sick.

MS. PRICE: Okay. And your first point on that slide was control schools with no prevention programming, now impossible to find program effects, cannot be isolated from potential competing attributions. Can you expound a little bit on that so we have a clear understanding of what that means?

DR. RINGWALT: When all schools are Sure. doing Red Ribbon weeks, when they have MAD Chapters, when they have assemblies, when there is drug prevention components in regular health classes, when detectors, drug sniffing there metal are doas, whatever it is, when all schools have a certain level of activity, it becomes much harder to disassociate the signal produced by the intervention that you are investigating relative to the background noise, and so as the background noise gets louder, as more schools do more things, the ability to hear the signal above

NEAL R. GROSS

1	that gets harder and harder. It gets fainter and
2	fainter, and the results are that in this depressing
3	profession of ours, is that you it just gets really
4	hard to say with confidence yes, this worked, because
5	you're not comparing something to nothing any more.
6	You're comparing something to something else.
7	MS. PRICE: So, in other words, it's really
8	hard to identify the specific cause of the results of
9	lower drug use, or raising
10	DR. RINGWALT: Yes. And it's even harder to
11	actually find a significant difference between say,
12	drug use and your intervention in control schools for
13	that very reason.
14	MS. PRICE: Okay. Thank you.
15	DR. RINGWALT: Yes.
16	DR. LONG: Russell.
17	DR. JONES: Yes, just a couple of quick
18	questions. Thanks so much for that very informative
19	report. I'm sorry that the results weren't more
20	positive, but that's what
21	DR. RINGWALT: They are what they are, the
22	data speak.

1	DR. JONES: That's research. First of all,
2	how were the data weighted, and then secondly, you
3	talk about the study that was done, suggesting the
4	iatrogenic effects. What is your sense of the how
5	reliable that study is? I've not read that.
6	DR. RINGWALT: Sure, I'll be glad I
7	thought I might get that question, and I thought to
8	myself you better read up on the study. I'd be glad
9	to get you a citation to it, if you give me your
10	business card.
11	DR. JONES: Sure.
12	DR. RINGWALT: And then you can decide for
13	yourself. It looks to my mind as if it's worthy of
14	attention, and that we need to be looking into this
15	with more detail.
16	DR. JONES: Yes. What journal is it in?
17	Okay, no, no.
18	DR. RINGWALT: Back to your first question,
19	how we weight it.
20	DR. JONES: Weight the data, yes.
21	DR. RINGWALT: We told you that the criteria
22	by which we stratified our sample, population density,

school size, and poverty. Those three criteria, so we weighted the data up to be representative of all schools that include middle school grades by population density, school size, and poverty. And as I said, the good news was that our results didn't change much at all. It's when they do start changing that you worry about your sample being unreliable.

DR. LONG: Hope.

MS. TAFT: I want to thank you all for your great presentations. I learned a lot, as I always do, when I listen to the researchers. And I'm hoping that you can enlighten us a little bit on the big question that we are concerned with today, and that is how can we repackage, or how can we reinvent, or how can we do something different that will make this program more attractive to the funders. And I would love to hear your comments on that.

DR. REUTER: Attractive to the funders.

MS. TAFT: I.e., Congress - the big funder in the sky.

DR. REUTER: Yes. I understand. I probably - I'm not sure any of us are the right people to

NEAL R. GROSS

answer that specific formulation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I think as researchers, we're DR. SLOBODA: kind of feeling awkward about that. I think that a couple of things are important. I think first of all, I think the program - Congress should know that this local constituents to be, at least from seem experience, wanting to do something in the schools related to drugs. I think that certainly your study indicates that they're trying to do something. think schools are challenged right now. I know when we were developing the high school portion of the curricula that developing, the curriculum we are people actually had focus groups with high school principals to find out how to include this in the school day, with everything else competing. wonderful because the program became their was program, too, so they were able to assist us and give us guidance in where to place the program.

The point is that it wasn't that they didn't want the program in the schools, they just didn't know where to put it. And I think that along with the fact that the communities are interested in this, I think

NEAL R. GROSS

that the thing I got excited about about this program is the fact that I see this as a way of supporting the federal program supporting the local community, particularly I was pleased to see this group, because it included NIH, includes Justice, includes SAMHSA. The fact that everybody is working on this issue together, that information, to pulls me, information that each of the agencies is developing, and feed that back to the communities, so I think that communities really would like to address this problem they don't have the wherewithal to that They're looking for guidance from the feds. are collaborating across agencies. Those are the kinds of messages I think can get through to Congress.

DR. REUTER: Actually, could I just take a brief go at that? I think the tension is that on the one hand, Congress does like the entitlement aspect of this, the fact that everybody gets something. On the other hand, that makes it very hard for the program to show that it is doing something, and I don't know how you deal with that tension in terms of getting Congress to be more enthusiastic about this program,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

but I do think that's the tension that's there.

MS. In some ways, it's almost TAFT: the five reverse from years ago, when Congress was enthusiastic about it, but the locals didn't have the wherewithal, and were hesitant. And now the locals seem to have more the wherewithal, more knowledge about what works, more enthusiasm for it, more seeing the need of how it relates to higher academic performance, and Congress is cooling on it, so I was just wondering how we could reverse it again.

DR. LONG: Shep, as you start, if we go Shep, Fred, Belinda.

DR. KELLAM: There are times when it's complicated to be a researcher, and I sort of sense a enormous discomfort that the three of you seem to have, although I know at least two out of the three of you, and they're not shy people. One of the problems we've talked about on the part of the policy people is - and this is kind of a comment, I guess - I've tried to elicit some kind of response to this. The policy people this morning local and more broadly, talking about the importance of being able to show

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that something good happens; that is, they wanted to show effectiveness. They were deeply interested, I guess you could say they're a big market for evaluation studies. Listening to the researchers, it says well, nothing much is happening out there, guys, at least that we can tell, and so what that leaves us with is bringing together researchers and program people who need to develop a new paradigm.

I disagree a little bit, Chris, I think it might be useful, a weather report of the nation in what's happening, I do think that terms of but research at the local level that really addresses what and under what circumstances works for whom, is But I don't think we can get there without critical. a new kind of community public education/child welfare institution and researcher collaborations. do randomized field trials requires an enormous partnership, and what we're talking about is something that involves demographic studies, evaluation and third level randomized field trials. modeling, And this has to be done in highly select places with funding, new kinds of institutional kinds of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

support locally, the mid level at the state, and federally, so I think that's the business that we are in. And I just try to make that comment to kind of focus us into a marriage that looks like it could be of mutual self-interest, as my old teacher, Saul Alinski, used to put it.

DR. SLOBODA: I just wanted to comment on It seemed to me that if you were able to that. develop this uniform reporting system, it provides a universe of programs that you can sample periodically, and do some evaluations on a national level, something that was done with the old data system, where they selected programs randomly and went and did a followup study, so I think it can be done. It would be a nice system, I think, giving us information on what's going on in the country in terms of what's being delivered and some of the outcomes. But there are a lot of other issues with research. I quess when research is so close to the -- I definitely think, particularly at the local level, I think communities need to tie up with university-based researchers to do ongoing evaluations. And I feel that when I talk to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

community groups that they don't, and in the past, I mean, I literally got yelled at when I would go and talk to workshops on evaluation, because it was used as a tool, punitive evaluations are considered to be very negative. I don't find that. I still sort of quiver when I go into a workshop, but there's a lot of interest in doing evaluations. But I think that the focus should be on administrative evaluations to see where you tweak a system so it's more responsive to the needs of the kids, rather than necessarily be a punitive thing where you withdraw funding. I think it needs to be in a positive mode.

DR. REUTER: I think this is a field in which evaluation is going to loom very large in the total budget. These extraordinarily are expensive evaluations to do, and if I could put in a plea, they should be much longer, should have much longer term follow-ups than is currently the case. And we are concerned not merely about initiation by age 16, which is often the outcome measure. We want to know about drug use by age 23 or something like that, maybe get That's very expensive research, and it away with 21.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

may be that there has to be an acceptance that if you take the total prevention budget for a while, substantial chunk has to into good quality dО evaluation. Obviously, a researcher's comments, but I'm not an evaluation researcher, so I have slightly clean hands here. But I do think that that, given how hard it is to make a strong case that these programs make a difference to the nation's drug problem, not simply reduce marijuana use in high schools, but make a difference in the nation's drug problems, I think one does need longer term and more expensive evaluations, which are not going to come easily.

I'd like to put in a brief DR. RINGWALT: plea to do that, and particularly in the case of alcohol and alcohol abuse. When you look at drug abuse, rates rise rapidly into the young and early middle twenties, and then they decrease. Alcohol is much more insidious, and is much more flat over the life And extent course. to the that we can demonstrate that we're keeping kids from using alcohol and certainly abusing it, and that we are able to maintain those differences into young adulthood,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

are going to be saving our society a tremendous amount of money and lost productivity over time. And there are economists that are working on this issue even as we speak. But yes, we do need to be following the kids in our studies into high school and young adulthood, if we're going to demonstrate the true effects of what we're up to, to a skeptical audience of funders.

MR. ELLIS: Yes, Ι going was to ask question, basically a follow-on to Dr. comment, because I'm sitting here as a non-researcher, as the lay person, if you will, hearing from the state and local representatives this morning about wonderfully effective they find the programs to be and they quote various statistics, and really make a very case for continuation of programs the cogent current or enhanced form. And then I hear your all information about hey, none of -- well, not none, but many of these programs are not effective, 80 percent of the school systems don't even use the effective ones that are there, so there's kind of a cognitive dissonance going on in my mind. And also, I don't

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

know if you're familiar with the suggested improvements to the State Grants program and reparting of the program, the recommendations that have been made, and some of the things that Safe and Drug Free Schools Office is going to do for in terms of, sharing best practices, instance, and obviously, improving the performance measures, and those kinds of things. So I quess bottom-line question is, what am I missing here? Is it that your all evaluations, and obviously, albeit it your's, Dr. Reuter, was several years ago, but what am I missing here, where your evaluations didn't get the data that we heard this morning, or what's the deal?

DR. SLOBODA: I didn't present this data.

think there's DR. REUTER: Ι general phenomenon of enthusiasm for what you have, and you've And there's general optimism bias that's tweaked it. true of a whole range of human activities. a control it's easy don't have group, yourself. And all of those - I wasn't here this morning, but everybody's reporting basically some very ad hoc evaluation which violates every known principle

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of evaluation, but is a source of great comfort, and genuine inspiration. I mean, I don't want to put this down that everything they're doing is ineffective. It's just that what they're relying on is the measure of effectiveness doesn't have much credibility. And this it's not that I think that the evaluations that have -- I mean, one criticism you can make of the evaluations is that often there are programs -- the interventions are sometimes not very deep, and you sort of, if you look back and say well, could we expect that for a couple of hundred dollars a student, we could make a major difference in a sort of important dimension of behavior, and the answer may be that's pretty optimistic.

Jim Heckman, a very famous economist, keeps pointing out that the first thing you want to start with in an evaluation is how much it cost, and if it costs very little, don't expect much. And prevention is not immune to that, but people act as though it's immune to that. And so I think some of the things that get evaluated are even on their face fairly modest interventions, and not likely to have large

NEAL R. GROSS

effects, so to that extent, perhaps what gets evaluated is not sort of what's really going on out there in the field. That's the best I can do.

DR. LONG: We'll go to -- Dr. Ringwalt, were you going to say something? And then we'll go to Belinda's question.

DR. RINGWALT: What was I going to say? know, when programs are done at the local level, they're backed by champions, they're backed by passion and enthusiasm. All of that, I suspect, makes a difference in a way that I don't know how to measure. By the time we get around to evaluating the program, routine, and sometimes it's being it has become administered by people whose investment in it is very little, and whose understanding of the program and the rationale behind it may be low, and who are not going to be administering it with fidelity, and certainly not with the passion of the original developers. it any wonder why by the time the programs get into our hands in the evaluation field, they fail to show what the developers, and operating under their conditions, under start-up with enthusiastic schools

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

and teachers, that they have found what they know in their hearts to be true.

DR. SIMS: I wanted to follow-up on a point that was raised by the presenters from the first panel, I think it was the state representatives. And at least a couple of them called for wanting to have more choice around using prevention strategies versus prevention programs. And I wanted to get your input on that, especially since with most curricula, you need to be exposed to a certain amount of the program to be able to demonstrate similar effects of the curriculum developer, in addition to the issues around fidelity and things like that.

I'm very cautious about that. DR. RINGWALT: I know how to evaluate programs. I don't know how to evaluate strategies. I can look at programs that work and I can detach from them a set of strategies that they have in common, but then I also look at the programs that have not yet demonstrated effectiveness, and they are using pretty much the same strategies, and often they're adopting the same teaching content, teaching strategies, as well, both content and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

teaching. And I wonder to myself, is a program, is a curriculum really concatenation of various а strategies, or is it something more? And I believe there is synergy operating in our curricula. Ι believe that they have a beginning, and a middle, and an end. I believe that they should be taught with as much fidelity to the original as possible, and that that is what makes the difference, not a collection of strategies, even though you say but all these programs use pretty much the same strategies. Well, they probably do, so do the programs that aren't showing They use the same strategies, too. effectiveness. What makes the difference? It's something else.

DR. SLOBODA: Yes. Being one of the people that put together that first red book that had Principles of Prevention in it, that was -- what we were trying to do with that booklet was to pull out what were the consistent elements across what we were finding were effective prevention programs. I'm also quite torn on this issue, to be honest with you. I believe in strategies, but I think one needs to talk about strategies, or some kind of strategies, or other

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

kind of strategies. I think one of the issues that
was raised, questions was bringing parents in. There
are different elements, there are different steps
involved with effectively bringing parents in. I
don't know if those are strategies. I think we're
hung up on evidence-based, research-based. We're hung
up on terminology. We really have to, as a field, we
really haven't defined terms properly, so I think
sometimes we talk across each other. So I think some
of us feel that there are sort of like how do you do
brain surgery? I mean, you could use Dr. X's
approach, which would be a program, or you can use
some strategies or steps to cut the brain - whatever.
So I think what we're really not there yet in the
field, but I'd like to be there. It seems to me I
would rather be teaching how to do brain surgery, do
prevention that way, than to do you have to learn
Dr. X's methodology. And I think that's basically
where the field is. We're still the field still
hasn't really come up with how do you one can agree
on what fidelity is, sort of, in the field, but how do
you measure - is it content coverage, is it structural

NEAL R. GROSS

1	style, is it the response you get back from the kids?
2	We're sort of not there yet, but I think we're on our
3	way there. I think in the next couple of years we'll
4	probably be able to address that question a lot
5	better.
6	DR. LONG: I'm sorry. I think okay. Yes,
7	you're on, Russ.
8	DR. JONES: Yes. Is it wave or is it
9	particle? How does light we're going to play dice
10	with the universe. Anyway, Chris, I had a question.
11	In terms of the effective strategy, how is that being
12	defined, the most effective strategy? You asked a
13	question to the
14	DR. RINGWALT: The most effective curriculum,
15	or the most effective
16	DR. JONES: Yes, I'm sorry, curriculum.
17	DR. RINGWALT: The most effective curriculum.
18	DR. JONES: I'm hung up on your excellent
19	question.
20	DR. RINGWALT: The very short answer to that
21	question is to go visit the National Registry of
22	Effective Prevention - excuse me - National Registry

1	of Effective Programs and Practices maintained by
2	SAMHSA. There are a number of criteria. The criteria
3	are rated by outside reviewers, of whom I am one, and
4	then there's a score, and that's how it's done. And
5	there are a number of most of the score comprises
6	the quality or the methodology of the study, is it up
7	to snuff on one thing or another. And there's also,
8	does it actually have findings that indicate effects
9	on any particular substance.
10	DR. JONES: Right, I understand that, but my
11	question was in terms of the teachers, when you ask
12	them the question, are they using the effective
13	strategy?
14	DR. RINGWALT: Yes.
15	DR. JONES: How did they define the effective
16	is it
17	DR. RINGWALT: Sorry, how did my respondents
18	define it.
19	DR. JONES: Yes, exactly.
20	DR. RINGWALT: We never asked the question.
21	We gave them a laundry list of curricula.
22	DR. JONES: Right.

1	DR. RINGWALT: And said if you're using this,
2	tell us, curriculum by curriculum. Tell us if you're
3	using it, then we group the curricula as to whether
4	they were effective or not.
5	DR. JONES: And so what was the let me see
6	if I can ask it another way. So the effective
7	strategy
8	DR. RINGWALT: Curriculum.
9	DR. JONES: Curriculum from did that match
10	the effective curriculum on the list?
11	DR. RINGWALT: Yes, what we did is
12	DR. JONES: It did. Okay.
13	DR. RINGWALT: Sorry. We give them a laundry
14	list of curricula, are you using each one? Yes/no,
15	yes/no. Then we looked at what was on the list, and
16	we said you're using an effective curriculum if you're
17	using one of these.
18	DR. JONES: Right.
19	DR. RINGWALT: And that's how we did it.
20	DR. JONES: Right. Exactly. But what we
21	don't know is the fidelity, to the extent to which
22	they were also engaging

	DR. KINGWALI: NO, WE GO HOU KINOW. WE HAVE
2	asked some questions about fidelity, which I have only
3	marginal faith, but we will report that.
4	DR. JONES: Sure. Yes, I was just kind of
5	piggybacking on the question that Shep raised, in
6	terms of a new paradigm, which I agree with. And I'm
7	just wondering the extent to which portions of those
8	effective mechanisms can be engaged in the development
9	of new strategies, or curricula. But that's another
10	issue. But this really does raise the issue of
11	evidence-based versus evidence-informed
12	DR. RINGWALT: Indeed, that's exactly what it
13	is.
14	DR. JONES: Yes.
15	DR. RINGWALT: Evidence-informed means we
16	have a bunch of strategies, put them together like an
17	add-a-bead necklace, and chances are you'll do
18	something that'll be pretty good. Evidence-based
19	curricula means do it this way from soup to nuts the
20	way we tell you, teaching the content we tell you, and
21	that should work, but to the extent that you deviate,
22	it may not.

it may not.

1	DR. JONES: Indeed. You know, I was just
2	wondering - that question was supposed to be real
3	quick, but I was just wondering what your question
4	was, you were going to make a comment, the woman in
5	the yellow, because I thought that was an excellent
6	question that you asked, and I was just wondering if
7	you want to respond to that.
8	PARTICIPANT: I was just stating
9	DR. JONES: Oh, you can't. I'm sorry. You
10	can't answer that question.
11	DR. LONG: Excuse me.
12	DR. JONES: I'm sorry.
13	DR. LONG: I'm at a point privilege here.
14	The reason that we don't do that is that then we go
15	beyond the panelists here, and it becomes a meeting
16	involving the entire public.
17	DR. JONES: So what I guess I would say, I
18	think it's important at some point that the presenters
19	have a better understanding and appreciation of what's
20	being said now in light of their evaluation of some of
21	the good programs that they're using.
22	DR. LONG: Which will be our job to put all

1	that together, yes. Dennis.
2	MR. ROMERO: Thank you, folks. I found your
3	presentation extremely, again, enjoyable and
4	enlightening. Chris, it dawned on me, I do know you.
5	DR. RINGWALT: We sat on a plane next to each
6	other.
7	MR. ROMERO: That's correct. We had a
8	wonderful conversation, and it was your
9	DR. RINGWALT: Accent.
10	MR. ROMERO: Your accent that just gave it
11	away.
12	DR. RINGWALT: Yes.
13	MR. ROMERO: Thank you. I thought he was
14	talking about me.
15	(Laughter.)
16	MR. ROMERO: Two questions, and I don't mean
17	to put you on the spot with the second one, so we'll
18	go with the easy one first. You characterized the
19	NREPP as a consumer's guide or consumer's report
20	version. How would you characterize this version, is
21	it more palatable, does it make more sense, or is
22	still the same soup, just

DR. RINGWALT: Served up in a different bowl.

MR. ROMERO: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

think DR. RINGWALT: Ι it pushes the challenge of interpretation onto the consumer, and it pushes it away from the funding agency that bears the heat from all the people whose programs are not on the And that is a good thing and a bad thing. the extent that the public, the consumer, the end-user of the National Registry has up until now been able simply to figure out whether a program is or is not on That's all one word, "on the list", has the list. made it easy for them. It has also made it very difficult for the people who are doing the reviewing, and very difficult for the people who have had to defend the reviews.

I think it's going to be a challenge, as I believe I said to you on the plane when we talked, to educate the end-user in the school, the lead prevention teacher, whoever he or she is and the school district prevention coordinator, in how to interpret and select among the options given the various criteria by which they are rated. That was

NEAL R. GROSS

the easy question?
MR. ROMERO: I think so. The graph where you
showed the 80 percent of the folks are using non-
listed programs.
DR. RINGWALT: Or nothing.
MR. ROMERO: Or nothing. Were you able to
interpret the effectiveness of those efforts since it
was they were using non-evidence
DR. RINGWALT: No.
MR. ROMERO: They were off the list,
basically.
DR. RINGWALT: If they were not on the list,
they were not right, they were either on the list
or off. This was the old list. Actually, the list as
it currently exists on the website, which is soon, I
suppose, to be updated - so now I can't characterize
the effectiveness. I'm just this is just a fairly
sophisticated exercise in bean counting.
MR. ROMERO: I just wonder if I have seen
programs that are very effective in prevention, that
may not be on the list of - the NREPP list.

DR. RINGWALT: Yes.

1	MR. ROMERO: So they're not - but they are
2	effective, and so how do we measure that?
3	DR. RINGWALT: How do we measure the
4	effectiveness of programs that are not on the list?
5	MR. ROMERO: Yes.
6	DR. RINGWALT: By having them evaluated, and
7	then reviewed, I think.
8	MR. ROMERO: That's such an easy answer.
9	DR. RINGWALT: It is such an easy answer, and
10	it is very superficial. I know that.
11	MR. ROMERO: No.
12	DR. RINGWALT: Evaluations take years and
13	years, and they cost a great deal of money to do
14	right.
15	MR. ROMERO: Absolutely.
16	DR. RINGWALT: And if they're not going to be
17	done right, they won't pass muster by the current
18	criteria that NREPP is using.
19	MR. ROMERO: Thank you.
20	DR. LONG: As we close this portion, I had a
21	question, and it's actually for members of the
22	Department that are sitting at the table. I would

just - as you were talking, Peter, I was listening, and some of the things we've heard this morning from a few of the panels about the need-weighted grant renewal process, accountability, evaluation, improved capacity, effectiveness, so I was seeing and hearing a lot of the things we'd heard from some of the earlier And you had indicated as we're aware, that panels. this was about five years ago, so the question that I would have, what have we done as a Department relative to the things that came up five years ago, or is that -- I mean, leaving politics out of it, of course - but something that crossed my mind listening to you, because I was hearing that from five years ago, and yet we were talking about some of those things this morning, so I was just curious.

MS. PRICE: Well, I'll give a first shot at answering that, and then I'll let Bill follow-up on anything I missed, because he's had the legs with the program, where I've been in the office a little over two years. But when Peter's, the Rand study came out, we became very much aware that there were issues related to the Safe and Drug Free Schools and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Communities Grant Program, and they needed to be addressed. Shortly after that, then OMB reviewed in the PART review, and the program received an ineffective rating, which is the lowest rating.

the PART after Before review, the Rand report, we started looking at questions within the office of what needs to be done to show that programs are effective, and we started looking into areas, what can we do to show that there are positive things about the program. One of the results of that is a grant that we have called the State Data Grant, and it identifies the data, and I'll let Bill give a better it, but it's developed and example of has implemented. As any research project, it's a longterm research project funded through grant dollars. But to help us understand what programs states are implementing, and the second part of that question is, are they being implemented with fidelity.

We are hoping that we will have the first half of that answer in the fall, probably around November, and we'll be able to see what programs states are implementing with their Safe and Drug Free

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Schools State Grants dollars. In the spring, we should be able to get more - in spring/early summer, more of the information about fidelity, are they being implemented with fidelity.

If you will look under your second tab, State Grants Program Background, we gave you a background paper. I think we sent it out a little earlier, but on page 7 of that, if you go over to -- the PART said three things; performance measures used by ED at the time did not reflect program performance, so the program performance measures did not help improve local programming decisions, and the funds are spread too thinly to support quality interventions.

address some of those concerns. There are parts of the legislation that restrict the Department to what we can actually do. We would like to be able to do some things, but we cannot do that. We are -- I mean, the legislation doesn't provide for us to be able to do that, so as much as it seems perfectly logical that we would do that, we can't. But these are the things that we can do, identify performance measures. And

NEAL R. GROSS

I'll just list the categories, the State Data Grants,
getting this information about what programs are out
there being implemented, and are they being
implemented with fidelity, developing a model data
set. We are prohibited from identifying what data
states have to collect. That's one of those
flexibility issues that states get to do, that's part
of the beauty of No Child Left Behind. It's flexible
on many points, and this is one of them, but what we
can do is get a model data set and provide that to
states so they can use that, and it's like the short
menu, maybe they'll add to it, maybe they'll get some
other things, but it helps with that data. Because as
you all know, the data is not comparable from state to
states because of different definitions, which is part
of the No Child Left Behind Act, that states get to
define these things, and we believe that that's an
important thing for states to do, but it makes
comparing that information difficult.

Truancy would be a good example of that, and one state being absent from school may be truancy, in another state it's a much different thing, and so

NEAL R. GROSS

comparing one-to-one. And then providing training to states, and we have really focused on providing training to states. We do technical assistance meetings, we have our state coordinators in twice a year, we do a variety of things. But these are the elements that we have been implementing, and I'll let Bill expand more on it. Do you have anything you want to add to that?

MODZELESKI: Just a couple of things. First of all, let me say, the research that Chris has in the June edition of talked about was Social and three researchers, one from Influence. School, one from the Wharton School, and one from Duke, so Gavin Fitzsimmons from the Falkland School I think was -- and it is an important study, and I think that Howell should take a look at it, also, because they also talked about exercise. They thought that basically if you ask a person a positive question about something like exercise, they'll give you an answer saying yes, we exercise more often than not. And the flip side of that is if you go ask a question about drug uses, that if you ask a negative question,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

you'll get an answer below what you're asking, but you had just the opposite effect, where what they got were people answering higher than they expected, so it is in the June edition of *Social Influence*, I believe.

Just to pick up Peter - Peter and I actually were involved with this back in 1999 on the study, and I think some things have changed for the better, and some things probably haven't changed for the better. I mean, there has been some significant changes in some areas. I just jotted a couple down. There's just as many LEAs receiving dollars today as there was back in 1999. That means about 95 percent.

Peter had a figure on about \$10,000, and that's about cut in half, so that's decreases At the same time the funds have been significantly. decreased, Peter mentioned that the focus expanded back in `99, it expanded in 1994 to violence prevention, and now it's expanded even more to crisis prevention, Avian bird flu, disaster, so forth and so on, so the focus has expanded even more. Sort of the good news was that, you heard this morning, the word "POE", Principles of Effectiveness, and while that was

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

codified in the No Child Left Behind Act, that was actually developed by staff of the Safe and Drug Free Schools in 1999, so just as Peter was beginning to look at this, we began to enforce effectuate the Principles of Effectiveness, that began to kick in, and we believe that that plus the codification in the law had a lot to contribute to developing more, again, research-based, science-based, Chris, call it what you will, at least programs. And Ι think that there has significant increase in the number of programs that have been effective, whether it's on NREPP's list or whatever the case may be.

Just one point of clarification - there still is a list out there. I mean, there is still a lot of confusion. NREPP is not the only thing that schools go to take a look at, and it is the administration. The White House has now the HAY program, Helping America's Youth, which is a list of programs with three levels and schools use that. Schools use the Blue Print Series, schools still use our program, so there's not one, there's multiple lists that are still

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

out there. There's some beauty to that, but there's also some problems because it leads to a lot of confusion about what may or may not happen.

Lastly, is that from where we were in 1999 when Peter took a look at this, and where we are, and Debbie alluded to that, is that there's much more data being collected. And I think the Department has done several things. Lorraine is going to be up next, Lorraine Allen. Her state, Florida, has done quite a bit in the area of not only collecting data, but using data to make decisions, data for decision. We are in of developing а uniform process data Hopefully, it will be adapted by every state, but we don't have the authority to force it down any state's throat, and the other problem here is that you know if you go to change a system, any time you begin to change a system in the state, the one thing they're going to ask you is where is the dollars to change the system, so we have had sign-off by most of the states for a willingness to go to a uniform data set, uniform definitions, and we'll have to see over the course of the next several years as to whether or not they'll

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

accept that change in definitions, and whether they'll put money behind it, and then begin to collect some different data.

DR. REUTER: Could I just very briefly add a point that Deborah made, which is Congress is really the -- was the target for the study that Rand did. Ι mean, this office is hamstrung by legislation, which really I think makes it very difficult to be effective and innovative, and the timing of this report was that there was a re-authorization, this was the chance to make changes, but I think in the end there turned out to be not much interest on the Hill in taking on a major reform, so I think that's why not much has happened. I mean, it was commissioned by the Department of Education. We're probably going to be highly critical of the implementation, but that wasn't the critical issue, it was the legislation that was the problem. Thanks.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much. We are close, just a few minutes over. That was because of all of the very good questions. We will now take a break, and we'll be coming back at 3:10. And as we

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

leave, I want to give you the ultimate compliment - thanks to the doctors. You were excellent.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, the proceedings went off the record at 2:59:20 p.m. and went back on the record at 3:09:39 p.m.)

DR. LONG: Okay. As we come back together, we have four distinguished folks here in front of us that will be our Panel IV on School Safety and Preparedness, their perspective on that. And we'll start over here with introductions of Ed. Ed Ray has been the Chief of Safety and Security Department for Denver public schools since 1995. During his 25-yea career in law enforcement in Colorado, he served as a Deputy Sheriff, patrol officer, detective, sergeant, lieutenant, division commander, and chief of police, retiring in 1993. Chief Ray holds a Bachelor's degree in technical management with minors in criminal justice and economics, and graduate work from Regis University in Denver. Welcome, Ed. Thanks for being here.

Next, Lorraine Allen. Lorraine is the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Director of the Office of Safe Schools for the Florida 2000, of Education. Since her Department responsibilities have included overseeing the Safe and Drug Free School program, School-wide Discipline Initiatives, and School Emergency Management and Antiterrorism Planning activities. And from March 2004 to `06, the Coordinated School Health Program. She has a Master's degree in public administration from Florida State University, as well as a BS in government, and a BA in Spanish. She is originally from the Panama and currently resides in Tallahassee. zone, Welcome, Lorraine.

Next is John Akers. John has served as Executive Director for the Kentucky Center for School Safety since his employment in December of 2000. 35 years experience in public education, has over including 25 years as school-based administrator and Since principal. then, and prior to serving Executive Director of the Kentucky Center for School Safety, served as Kentucky Leadership Academy Coach and Scholastic Auditor for the Kentucky Department of John received the designation as one of Education.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Kentucky's distinguished educators in 1996, and was selected as the 1998 High School Principal of the Year by the Kentucky Department of Education. Thanks, John, for being here.

Cynthia Timmons. Cynthia And has done extensive training and consulting in the area of Safe and Free School Programs, including Drug implementation of violence prevention programs and student assistance programs. Cynthia is the Director for the Children of Promise Mentors of Hope, statewide initiative immobilize to Oklahoma in reaching children who have an incarcerated parent. Children of Promise Mentors of Hope is a partnership between the University of Oklahoma Outreach and Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Oklahoma, and is funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Cynthia received her Bachelor's in education, Master's in guidance and counseling at the University of Oklahoma. Cynthia, nice to have you with us. And with that, we'll go ahead and get started. And, Ed, if we could start with you.

MR. RAY: Thank you, David. Having listened

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

to so many panelists already this morning, I'm not sure exactly where to start, but I'm going to give the famous disclaimer, that I'm a cop. I work in security. I work in security-related issues, so probably many of my comments are going to be geared towards law enforcement and how we protect, rather than how we educate; even though there certainly are some correlations in how do we educate people to protect.

In preparing to come here today, obviously, we were given a series of questions to try to answer and respond to, and my methodology on response, gathering information for my response was to talk with numerous of my counterparts around the country and pose the same questions to them, and then try to compile the myriad of answers that Ι got sensical remarks, and I'm not sure I've done that. But regardless, I'm going to try to focus on what we believe, and I say "we", and I hope I'm not bringing too much of my own personal beliefs in, because my personal beliefs are somewhat strong in some areas, so I'll try to keep those as subjective, or as objective,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

as possible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The first question you asked us to respond to what are the strengths of the State Grants was, Program, and the elements of the States Grants Program that are working and addressing the needs of students in schools today. In my surveys, I found that nearly 100 percent of the folks I talked to felt that the State Grants Program is working effectively, in that the program provides funding, vital funding to school districts to conduct programs that may or may not otherwise be possible, due to the current budgetary constraints, and reductions that are taking place across the country. That's basically in our large inner city urban school districts. Felt that the greatest element to the States Grant Program that is working is the flexibility provided. It allows - I'm going to try to steer away from the research-based programs discussion, but it provides funds for us to use to put programs in effect that we believe are based on best practices, that do have a high degree of efficacy, if nothing else, from the empirical data, and unfortunately, sometimes from the anecdotal,

NEAL R. GROSS

whether they're working on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The programs that we have concerns about are those programs that are not -- don't have the ability research-base, that there has not been any research-base conducted. We've heard a lot of talk this morning about - I think Gus from LA mentioned the great program, DARE programs - those are nice programs to put in, but we don't know. We don't know if they are effective. We really had no opportunity to study I should say we haven't taken the opportunity to study those effectively.

Alcohol counseling, mental health, drug programs certainly are extremely important, and I think there are data, is data that will support that those programs work. The problem we don't know in safety and security in law enforcement is do those programs truly provide a higher degree of safety for the schools, or are they more geared towards the community-base as to helping eradicate the problems of drug and alcohol abuse? We're not sure about that, so we've kind of tried to focus on those things that we believe will truly provide a higher level of safety

NEAL R. GROSS

for our schools that are - I guess basically they are determined by lack of bad things happening to our schools.

One of the other questions was, is the Safe School and Drug Free Grants Program working effectively to promote safe and drug free schools across the country, especially in rural, urban, and suburban settings. The general answer is yes; however, this works better in the urban and suburban areas, the programs do, because of the resources available to those inner city suburban bases.

I'll use Colorado for a second, and every state's got the same issues. We have some school districts in Colorado that have 1,500-2,000 kids in them. They're so rural that even getting an ambulance to a school in the event of something happening is 20 to 30 minutes away. They don't have the resources in some of our - at least in Colorado - rural areas. And in some cases, some of what we consider suburban areas, so are the grants programs truly working in the rural areas? The answer probably is a qualified no, not to the extent they certainly are in the urban and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

inner city, and suburban areas.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A lot of the grant money that we believe we're seeing is based on population and free food, the funds are driven based on that. So if you have an extremely affluent community that has severe, or has very little reduced food, we have some concerns are they getting the appropriate share, or fair share, I for lack of better to quess, terms, implement I don't believe that has been decided upon, programs. but we do know that in the rural and somewhat suburban areas, that many of the safe and security programs that we are able to implement in the inner cities are appropriately implemented in the rural not Obviously, risk factors are believed to communities. I'm not sure I totally agree with that, but certainly, they don't have many of the, numbers-wise, the issues we have in the inner cities and some of the suburban areas. But if we are foolish enough to think that gangs don't exist, drugs don't exist in even the most rural communities, we're badly mistaken to allow ourselves to accept that premise, because it does exist.

NEAL R. GROSS

I tried to list out some mechanisms that could be considered, and I'm not sure that these are kind of a compilation of mechanisms. First and foremost was needed to establish follow-up surveys with attendees of programs. We talked about DARE, talked about GREAT, talked about some of the other awareness programs. To my knowledge, there has been no follow-up down the road, four, five, six years down the road of attendees to see did they learn the lessons of these various programs.

We also know that there are no baseline data programs baselining the occurrence of alcohol and drug directly to crimes occurring on school campuses, and the ability to analyze those incidents appropriately, so we need baseline programs.

We need to establish at the statewide level reporting systems, so that this data, this information can be shared and possibly it will help to do the research to determine whether our programs are effective. This basically applies to school-based incidents. The problem with a lot of incident reporting we do currently at the state level, is it

NEAL R. GROSS

reports only incidents where there is a subsequent disciplinary action taken. Crime analysis, incident analysis, if you will, requires an analysis of those things where we don't know who did it, and frequently data report based only on we know have suspension, or an expulsion, or disciplinary action, that we don't take a very good look at the underlying cause of other incidents that take place on our schools that may or may not be directly related to a wide range of things, not just alcohol and drugs, certainly. Certainly, behavioral issues, but if we don't catch somebody doing it, we tend not to report it in that fashion.

We talked about other emerging issues facing students in schools today that need to be reviewed and addressed. I'm going to go over here to Gus because he stole everything I was going to say today. Yes, there are some tremendous emerging issues, especially in the area of safety and security dealing with the issues that we have to deal with today other than the drug and alcohol issues, certainly major issues, certainly things we have to deal with, some of the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

social and cultural bases, but our lear today is all
the cultural diversity issues that are taking place,
that are causing to every day wake up to another act
of terrorism, another act of a school administrator, a
teacher, a custodian, security officer, bus drivers
that are involved in behavior that is extremely
detrimental to the safety of our children. Every day
you pick up a newspaper, turn on the news, another
story about a behavioral aspect of some of our most
trusted, or should be our most trusted personnel, our
educators, involved in behavior. And it's apparent -
I'm sure it sends chills up most of our spines to
think we send our children to school, and we have our
own professional personnel that are conducting and
involved in behavior. We have to develop, we have to
figure out how we can implement programs to stop those
types of things, certainly terrorism, certainly gang
shootings.

We know that gang shootings infrequently occur on school properties, but we know if a gang shooting takes place in a neighborhood on Saturday night, it's coming to school come Monday morning. We

NEAL R. GROSS

know that. How do we interact with law enforcement?
How do we interact with the prevention? How do we
interact with the intelligence services that Gus so
brilliantly alluded to? We have 20 to 25 percent of
our populations in our buildings every day of the
school day/school year, and yet we seem to be ignoring
they are prime targets for those persons, those groups
who want to make a political or ideological statement
to this country, and that we do very, very, very
little to harden our schools against these types of
attacks, what do we do, how do we prepare our
teachers, our staff, how do we respond; very little.
That's the biggest issue I see emerging, and again,
Gus over here to my left did an outstanding job of
bringing those issues up, so we know the issue that we
had in Bezlin, Russia. I was fortunate enough to be
involved in the study on that, and all the various
things leading up to the Bezlin attack are
frightening, and they are occurring today in our own
country, seeing people who are ideologically immune to
the feelings of hurting our children. So, please, we
need to really consider what we can do on those areas.

NEAL R. GROSS

We all believe that the basic language when it talks about focusing on safety, is adequate. We believe that the recent emergency response or crisis management grants from the Department of Education were critical in helping the schools begin to prepare for how to respond to an emergency, how to prevent an emergency, how to mitigate emergencies, how to deal with the after-effect from all aspects of it, so for the most part we believe the language appears to be adequate in the current documents.

Very difficult to train our staff, however, especially with the No Child Left Behind things that are in place currently. They're geared towards education, they have to be geared towards education, somebody else, and to find time, as a previous panelists said, to find time to train all of our teachers to be security and safety experts, not only it's not -- well, it's plain impossible. We can't do it, so we have to make sure that we have other methods in place, such as the school training, the school safety teams and hope, hope that our principals are responsible enough to roll out those plans to their

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

schools, because that's where the first place, the first—that's where we have to start with school security. The whole thing with national management systems, these are buzz words, not buzz words, operational words, but they're critical in how to establish incident command bases and so on like that. We need to continue training and educating all of our educational staff without putting the burden to them, turning them into experts on those concepts.

I'm going to kind of glaze over this real The question was is the structure of States Grants program through the state and the Governor the most effective mechanism for use of these funds? Yes, we believe currently it is, unless there was a mechanism to award directly to the school districts, but we - no offense to Washington, D.C. folks, but we don't believe that the funds should come directly out of Washington, D.C. We don't believe that to be the effective, maybe the most most and unwieldv possibility, so we kind of would like to see, at a minimum, keep it as it is.

Flexibility, accountability, continue the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

statute working, are they? The short answer is yes. Could state and local flexibility be balanced with additional core requirements? I would encourage LEAs to address specific issues. We believe yes, it could be, it can be balanced.

Can the tension between the Principles of Effectiveness provisions that require that funds be spent on research-based activities and the broad list of authorized activities, many of which lack a strong research-base be resolved? We believe it's important to consider this, that not all programs that work can be research-based. We know for technology, we know that the technology is changing so rapidly that, frankly, if we waited three to four years to get a research-base on any type of program, the technology already left and we've gone to something new, so we need to be a little more flexible in our thinking in thinking outside the box on the technologies, and how do we interact or interface, what we call security technology, and educational technology. Can they be appropriately interfaced? We believe they can be to direct or help us get into truancy issue, safe campus

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

issues, keeping the kids on campus that belong there, and the kids off - not just kids, people off of campuses that don't belong there. We believe all those technologies can be interfaced, but as I've heard so many times this morning, it takes money to do those things, and to sustain those programs, and cause those probably to become institutionalized and funded. With that, I think I'll shut up. Okay. Turn the mic off.

DR. LONG: Thank you, Ed, for the information, and we'll now turn to Lorraine.

MS. ALLEN: Thank you, David. I want to take a little bit different turn if it's all right with you, since we've talked very much about the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, and I want to go right to question 4. How does that sound, talking about school emergency management planning and safety and security, because we've covered quite a bit. But I always like to start out any presentation that we do with this. Really, what we want is for students - we know that our students thrive, and that they do learn in these environments that are safe and drug free, that are

NEAL R. GROSS

well disciplined, strategies that lead students to make healthy life choices, and also that everyone is respected, and the civil rights of all are respected, and so that's one of the things that I like to always start out with, because that's where we look when we're looking at implementing our program.

I also want to show a little bit about Florida, just to show you that we have over 2.6 million students. We're quite large state. In fact, one of our LEAs has 400,000 students in it, so when they were looking this morning at some of them that have less than seven, I said oh, well, Miami-Dade, probably as large as some of the states. We also have 3,441 schools that we deal with, and we try to work with in this program.

My office is the Office of Safe and Healthy Schools, and until recently, we used to be called the Safe and Healthy Schools until about two months ago, and now we are just back to the Office of Safe Schools, and we have school emergency management planning and anti-terrorism activities, school safety and security, Safe and Drug Free Schools programs,

NEAL R. GROSS

school-wide discipline initiatives, and also safety and discipline data collection. So I thought what I would do first is to talk a little bit about what we're doing in the area of school emergency management After 9/11 it expanded to anti-terrorism planning. activities for schools, as well. But as all of you have heard so far today, collaboration is the key, could not do our iob if we because we collaborate with all the other state agencies, local education agencies, and our management folks in our counties, et cetera, couldn't do it alone. And, also, the funding, couldn't do it alone on just the funding that we do receive.

Back after the school shootings back in 2001, the Department decided to look at this issue of emergency management and preparedness planning, and so we received a grant from our Department of Community Affairs, and basically, we received almost \$300,000 to improve emergency planning in our schools. And we were asked to bring together an advisory committee, such as you all have brought together an advisory

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

committee. We also wanted to assess the status of our school plans, and we had a survey that we developed. We wanted to find out well, what are in your plans, are you using your plans, what are your most critical emergencies? Those are the kinds of things that we asked in our survey.

We also wanted to give them some planning guidelines on well, if you're getting ready to do a school emergency management plan, what should you do? And then we created a website, and we've been maintaining it, even though the grant has now ended. And we developed some training, it's our multi-hazards planning training for school, and then we were to evaluate the project. So this is how we got started in the business under the office of Safe Schools, is through this grant with our Department of Community Affairs, where our emergency management division is housed.

Some of the things that have come out of that grant, I just wanted to show you some of our activities, but we have worked with our Attorney General's office and our law enforcement, our

NEAL R. GROSS

emergency management in FASR, which is the Florida Association of School Resource Officers, officers school resource to response terrorism training. As you can see, quite a few partners there, because again, we can't do it alone. And the multihazard planning for Florida schools, which developed through the grant. Then crime prevention through environmental design, which is CPTED, it's target hardening, and we work with our Attorney General's office in offering that training to our school districts.

We also have school safety CD-Roms for site and floor planning training, because Florida requires that all the schools and community colleges provide their plans to law enforcement and emergency personnel, and so this was one way to help our schools get that on a CD, so that if there were an emergency, they could just bring up that CD and find out the layout of the school and the campus, et cetera, and help with the emergency.

We also offered virtual safety conferences around the state on different topics. There were hot

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

topics, and at each of your places I've gone ahead and provided you with three of the sessions that offered, and they were based on the hurricanes, our you know, Florida in 2004 lessons learned. As especially, we were hit by four great hurricanes, and so we went ahead and had regional meetings, and we developed these DVDs from that, and we have shared them with Mississippi last year, our commissioner did, and so I wanted you all to have these, as well. then we started to develop an emergency drill CD-Rom training, too, and we didn't like the product we got, so we're back at the drawing board on that one, but those were some of the things that we did.

We also worked with our school transportation office, because as you know, in emergencies they happen on school buses, and also, you need to use school buses during emergencies, as well, and so we have the electronic bus route so you can tell electronically where the different routes are. Critical situations for school bus operation, and we also have our school emergency management web page.

We also did review some of the school

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

district's emergency plans. We didn't get the kind of response that we wanted, so that's something that we will revisit again. We had some of our regional committees and councils look at those plans, and then we're working with our school transportation area in the school bus student management best practices.

After 2000, there were also some legislation in Florida that passed in dealing with school emergency management planning, and so our school districts are required to have school emergency plans by law, as well as safety and security best practices, which I'll just share with you just what they look like. And then coordination of school safety information.

We also found that there's school safety information that we don't want to have public access to, so we were able to, through legislation, to be able to not have that as part of our Sunshine Law, where you have to report out information, so we're able to keep that non-public information, which is very good in the area of safety.

As I mentioned hurricanes, lessons learned,

NEAL R. GROSS

that's another piece, because we were working on the emergency management plans, and working with school districts after our hurricanes of 2004 and 2005, and we had our sessions. We said well, what are the things that you've learned, and how do schools play such a major part in that? And, of course, schools usually are first responders because you use them for shelters, and what we also found was really critical is that when you start to get the community back to some sense of normalcy, you need the schools to be involved, because when kids start to go back to school, they start to feel they're normal again, and those were some of the things we found were very important.

Also, the fact that disasters changed the What used to be normal, no longer is normal, rules. you have a new set of normalcy. And they found that multi-agency plannings for multi-hazard having response was very, very productive, because you want to be prepared before the emergency occurs, not after. And then backup power systems, because they should functions, have them for the core your

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

processing, for food services, maintenance, central office and schools designated as shelters. One of the things that happened in Santa Rosa County is that people couldn't get paid because the banks, the banks weren't operational, so how do you get paychecks to people? There's just all these different things to think about before the hurricanes, that you have processes in place to deal with them after hurricanes. And, also, that communication was very critical, and you had alluded to they have the whole incident command system, there's a whole bunch of different ways to communicate, but that communication was critical, too. You need planning, of course, on all the phases, not just in the actual response, but in prevention and preparedness, and recovery.

What we're finding in our school districts in the west area of our state, which are Santa Rosa and Escampia, especially, it's a very long-term recovery. We still — it just takes so long to get the community back to where it was, and so that's one of the things that they are still dealing with two years after the hurricanes of 2004. They felt that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

dismissing kids from schools probably saved some lives, and then as I mentioned earlier, that schools are such a critical part of the community, that the sooner you can get the schools operational and the students back, the teachers back and you work with them on their recovery, the better it will be for the community as a whole.

I also just wanted to share with you our website, what it looks like. After 9/11, our focus included anti-terrorism planning for schools, and we, in Florida, and I'm just going to give you a real brief overview of what it looks like in Florida. have a Florida Domestic Security Partnership and a Domestic Security Oversight Board, and what's really critical is that the Department of Education represented on this board, so education is a player. We also have seven regional Domestic Security Task Forces, and as you can see here from the map of Florida where they're located in seven critical areas But what's really nice about them, if of our state. you'll turn to the next slide, is that each one of education schools subcommittee, has an

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

because of that subcommittee, we were really fortunate that when some of the federal dollars from Homeland Security came down for budgeting issues, we were at the table.

Over the last three years, I just wanted to share with you some of the dollars that we have received through Homeland Security that comes through the State of Florida, they're called the Domestic Security State Grants. Target hardening for districts and our schools. As you know, schools, if a terrorist were to attack the school, it gets right to the heart of our country, and what they talked about is okay, how can we look at some of the areas that have most need, those that are by ports, those that are by power plants, those sorts of things, how can we harden those schools, and control access to enhance security of school campuses and transportation are the areas that were looking at. And as you can see here from the list, they talk about single points Quite a few of our schools now have that of entry. single point of entry. Of course, we're Florida, and the old days our schools were with great

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

breezeways, so you could go to our campuses and there
everything is outside. It wasn't that so those -
we're working toward making it so that you do have
that single point of entry. And, of course,
integrating your fencing into the design of your
school campuses to help create that single area, and
to keep others out. Vehicle stand-off barriers,
which, of course, you see all around Washington, D.C.
and very lovely, by the way. You do a nice job with
that. Integrating appropriate locking systems and
restricting access to ventilation system intakes,
because people don't realize that you could also a
terrorist attack by putting something into the
ventilation system. And so we actually, through
CPTED, teach our school administrators and our
security people to go through and look at their campus
and say ooh, this is an area that I need to make sure
that we don't have access to. Those are some of the
things these dollars are for.

Also, we had a group that talked about some of the things that we felt would be really the best of all worlds if we could, and that is having our uniform

NEAL R. GROSS

school resource officers there, that they're actually in uniform as a preventative measure. And in the best of all worlds, they would love to have one school resource officer to 1,500 students, including our elementary schools, consistent with school resources and consultation with law enforcement. And then we talked about security facilities for unattended buses, because some of our school districts actually used to let the school bus drivers take their buses home, and so there wasn't a secured area. I mean, I remember when I first moved to Leon County, you would see the school buses all over the place, so there was no secure area for those buses to go to.

Then we talked about just the physical checks, the critical operations equipment on campus during periods of increased alert, and then, of course, maintaining the safe mail-handling procedures. We also received some funding for training, and we've been really fortunate in that we have several police chiefs of school, and one of them is Jim Kelly with Palm Beach County schools, and he has a Safe Schools Institute. And I think, Bill, you've been fortunate

NEAL R. GROSS

enough to go and visit Jim in his facility, and they provide incredible training, and so we gave them these funds to provide training for all of our school districts that were interested. And as you can see, incident system, national incident the command management system training for district personnel. We had statewide meetings on best practices, exercise development and technical assistance and training, shelter-in-place training, access control, target hardening training, and risk communication, so those are just some of the things that we did.

Also, communication is very critical during emergencies, and we spent dollars on improving our communication system, and purchasing passive repeaters, and that's kind of devices that amplify the bi-directional signals to help responders, application systems to improve, again, signal strength and radios to facilitate communication. Those were just some of the things that we did with regard to communications.

We also received dollars to conduct a study to research the needs for expanded emergency

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

management responders, because I don't know if you know, but in Florida, for example, just in Palm Beach, you have very urban areas, and you have very rural areas, you go into glades, and you have migrant workers, et cetera, so how fast can responders really get there if there's an emergency in the school, so you need to teach your school administrators what to do in those 15, 20, 30 minutes that it takes to be able to respond to an emergency. So we've done a study on that, and we haven't gotten the final results yet. And we also purchased GPS units for all of our school districts, because as you know in hurricanes, sometimes all the street signs are gone, all the landmarks are gone, and so this way they're able to pinpoint where things are with this. That's something else that we have done.

Another thing is, we received additional funds a year ago, another \$1.1 million for more communication, and also, for our K-20 - we're actually K-20, which is that we include post secondary in our Department of Education, and there's funds there for campus warning systems, because campuses are so spread

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

out. How do you warn the students of emergencies, et
cetera, so there has been dollars provided for that,
too. And the most recent legislative session, we were
given \$1.5 million for school safety emergency
preparedness system pilot. And, basically, what that
is, is we're going to be looking at having one large
district, two medium, and four small districts
implement this notification system. And it's going to
be multi-lingual, so that if there is an emergency
occurring that we can via email, phone call, cell
phones, communicate with parents to let them know
what's going on, but there's also another side to it -
you need to tell them about the football game, or the
homecoming parade, you can also do that, and FCAT,
you know, FCAT studying, so you can do that, too,
through this system. And quite a few of our districts
have already put into place these kinds of systems.

Julie Collins is the person that I hired to manage all this for us, and she is my school emergency management planning manager, and I actually hired her away from the Emergency Management Division, and so it's really nice to get someone with that experience

NEAL R. GROSS

and those contacts to come and work in education, because she had so many contacts already made in the field, and at the county level, so that was very, very important to have that, again, that collaboration. So with regard to emergency, I don't see us as a lead agency, but I see us as an agency that needs to be part of that collaborative process in order to make sure that our schools know how to respond, and how to prevent, also, emergencies. That's the piece that I wanted to talk to you a little bit about, emergency planning.

The next I wanted to talk about was school safety, and it gets to some of the data, and I don't know how much more time I have, about two minutes, one minute? Okay. Just briefly, we do collect data on school environmental safety incident report, and we have -- our legislature gives us \$75,350 for safe schools. And we also have best practices for safety and security, and so just briefly, we collect incidents of crime and violence on 22 incidents, and we just added bullying and harassment. You can see those are the incidents right there.

NEAL R. GROSS

We also show based on those 22 incidents of crime and violence what was the resulting disciplinary action, but we also collected based on those who are non-students, too. It's a system that's in effect 365 days per year, 24 hours per day, so we try to collect it on all aspects of school time.

This is just a trend to show you school safety in Florida over times with the Violence Act piece, and we did have a slight increase last year, and that's mostly in battery. We saw an increase in battery in our numbers. And, as I mentioned, we do -our legislature appropriated \$75,350 for safe schools activities. Every district gets \$50,000, the rest is based on two-thirds the Florida crime index, and onethird on weighted FTE. And what we found when we survey the schools, they say that 50 percent of their issues deal with behavior, and 50 percent deal with safety and security, and so these are how they spend these dollars. And I've included some slides there you on some of the activities for emergency preparedness, for school safety equipment and learning environment, and also resources for the

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

student programs. And we really like this quote, "Effective schools invest in systems and strategies that prevent behavior problems, rather than relying on compelling consequences to deter violent behavior."

Okay. And then the best practices for safety and security, and we have 29 of them, and these are the areas that they cover; as you can see, safety planning, discipline, school climate, safety programs, facilities, transportation, and we have best practice indicators, and this is just an example of one.

And as a result, our districts are able to assess their school safety, and to report that at school board meetings, and to make decisions on how to improve their safety, as well. And the last slide, I know how to be safe, because I want all our kids to feel that way. Thank you.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Lorraine. We appreciate that. And next, Jon.

MR. AKERS: I'm afraid I got carpal tunnel syndrome by clicking that so much. She gets off easy, I only have ten slides on mine. Let me, first of all, say to you all, thank you for you giving up your

NEAL R. GROSS

time to come here and to kind of pull all this together, and kind of do all this hard work and sit here and listening to us pontificate here all these many hours of this day, so from Kentucky, we say thank you for all that you're doing for us.

It's hard to be next to the last one. I don't envy you. I don't want to repeat what everybody else has said, but from the educator standpoint, I really believe that what they're saying holds a lot of water. I have troubles with research issues when you can't really measure prevention issues, and that's speaking as a high school principal for 25 years. It's hard to measure our effectiveness until years later down the road, and so I'm just going to kind of say ditto to what our educator folks have been saying here.

I've been invited to come here to give you a different perspective. I think I'm kind of a standalone here, if I'm not mistaken, as far as being a Director of Center for School Safety, and are you going to click for me? It's hard to get good help these days.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

(Laughter.)

2	MR. AKERS: I'm on background right now. I
3	just wanted to tell you that I'm going to come to you
4	from a principal's perspective. I'm going to come to
5	you as a Director of a Center for School Safety. We
6	are independent from our state education agency, so we
7	are stand-alone. Sometimes we're seen as a watchdog
8	agency to be sure that our Department of Education is
9	doing the right things under school safety is
10	concerned. That's a media perception, that's not a
11	real perception. We have a very strong working
12	relationship with the Department of Education in
13	Kentucky. We do not receive monies directly from
14	Title 4s for our program. It's a stand-alone. You
15	want to go the next slide for me here. We are a
16	consortium of three universities, Murray State
17	University, University of Kentucky, and Eastern
18	Kentucky University, which I'm an employee of, and
19	we're the headquarters of the Center for School
20	Safety. We also have as a partner the Kentucky School
21	Boards Association.

Our funding comes from our general assembly,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

which was enacted back in 1998, which was House Bill 330. Our main task is to basically partner and facilitate activities that will enhance school safety, so in a nutshell, that's kind of like what we do.

Now who do we partner with? Well, we partner with our number one partner, obviously, is our Department of Education. In our state, we education cooperatives, which are basically eight regions where all of the superintendents cluster in one of these eight regions to work on common issues and goals together, so we work with those folks. From Bill's shop over here, the RCM grantees that have been awarded grants in our state, we work with those folks to see that whatever we can do to help facilitate what they're doing in pursuing what they have said they were going to do in their grants.

We work with our Homeland Security office.

We had Bill Modzeleski and some of his folks from the

Secret Service come to our state last year to do a

threat assessment workshop, as far as trying to look

at how do we try to identify would-be students who

were going to be violent in our schools.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Just a quick aside, I think they were thinking that we were going to have about 75 police officers and 75 principal-types in there to kind of work with this, and we had to shut down at 500. We had basically a split house of about 250 principals, and 250 police officers that work together on that thing, really, really good session.

We work with our Office of Drug Control Policy, and I go over to Maryann Solsberg, who came over in February, and lit a fire for us over there. She's awfully quiet. I'm really surprised how quiet she is here, because she was just -- she lit my fire. I haven't had a cup of coffee in five months, so she's got me that fired up.

We work with the Department of Mental Health, and I'm not a school psychologist, but when I hear such stats that we have close to 20 percent of our kids that are clinically depressed going to our schools, we've got some problems. We need to get some issues on the front burner here, and we work with our folks with that. And, of course, just like Florida does, and Colorado does, we work with our school

NEAL R. GROSS

resource officers and see what we can do to help them out, as well. Next frame here.

Just kind of give you an idea of what we do as an outside agency looking in here; we formed our own emergency management guide back six years ago, which definitely needs to be tweaked now, but we gave them, and then we were just working with the three phases, Bill, at that time, the preparedness, the response, and recovery. It didn't get into the mitigation issues at that point in time.

We have worked with in our alternative education programs, and I don't know how it exists in your states, as well, but some of our alternative education programs span the continuum, from absolutely wonderful to absolutely uh-oh, where we have some alternative education programs where that's the last stop for some teachers, and the last stop for some administrators, so that's lose-lose when challenging kids come in there. So we have hired, through a program with our Department of Education using these discretionary funds to send trained alternative education specialists to work with those schools that

NEAL R. GROSS

are having troubles, or those programs that are having troubles, and try to assist those programs in an advisory way, not in a supervisory way.

Our hallmark service that we provide in our state is a school safety assessment, which is a climate and culture piece, that is a voluntary piece that superintendents ask us to conduct. And, again, those were through state monies, through the Title 4. My board of directors have picked up on that, and now totally funded, but it was because we had two years of funding through discretionary monies that allowed us to get this program, which we feel is very, very important, up and running, and I think that's the way it's supposed to be. We get the seed money from you guys, and then we take it and run with it in the state level.

A community service work project - boy, did I hate to see those monies dry up. We had some tremendous results on this, where we had kids in lieu of suspensions going to community work service programs. Plus, we put a major counseling component in that - why did you mess up, and how could you avoid

NEAL R. GROSS

these things in the future, and give them some skills on how to avoid those things, and we saw some suspension rates drop as much as 75 to 80 percent. And when we were looking at targeted use, we saw major drops in that, as well. Some school districts had the funds to go ahead and pick it up and run with it. Some smaller districts couldn't do it.

We have been for the last six years working with our State Department of Education. We report all the board and law violations that escalate suspensions, corporal punishment, expulsions The PDS services, and expulsions without services. obviously stands for Persistently Dangerous Schools. Since we are the keepers of the data for the state, we will issue a report card, if you will, to all 1,265 of our schools in our state where they stand as far as movement towards or movement away from our definition of what is being considered as persistently dangerous school. So those are some of the things where we have interacted with our state agency by virtue of Title 4 monies, and so none of this would have gotten off the launching pad hadn't we had those dollars here, is my

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

point.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Some general comments, speaking out of both sides of my mouth now as a principal, and as director, and as a proud father of a son who is a high school principal now, as well, the reign of terror of Akers in principalship still continue in Kentucky. Title 4 monies need to be there. Ten years ago, 15 years ago when I was practicing as a high school principal, I was more concerned about getting those kids to pass that state test. I wasn't really concerned about Osama bin Laden, I wasn't concerned about school shooters, I wasn't concerned about whole lot of these issues. Even though I'm right next to a airport, never thought about an air crash. Two years prior to that, I was at another school where a railroad track, never thought about there was derailment, never thought about the all hazards approach, but we have morphed from, as been mentioned to you here today, from the alcohol, tobacco syndrome issues, all the way through and including an all hazards approach situation.

Now one thing that we're really trying to do

NEAL R. GROSS

in our commonwealth is to look at this teacher/student connectivity piece. When I look at the documents that Bill's shop produced, along with Secret Service, on some of these issues about why kids were involved in these heinous acts, there was a major disconnect between the kids and their school, or the kids and the adults in that school, so we're looking for ways to find ways to enhance that connectivity piece, and that could be through several of these programs that I've got listed there; the Anti-Bullying Program. teachers really knew how they could really interface with that, you would see a major connectivity piece there. The threat assessment program that we talked about earlier, I see a major need to breathe life more into these student assistance teams.

I look at this from basically 200 plus assessments that we have been directly involved with in our schools, basically middle schools and high schools. Staff need the support, they need to have the training there. And, of course, this doesn't come cheap. In Kentucky, people don't want to work for free, so we have to pay these folks when they come in.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

They just don't do it out of the kindness of their hearts.

Some ideas that I have that I want to throw out on the table here - for those states that are and I'll say this with all honesty here - for states that are lucky to have Centers for School Safety, we see a good partnership happening between the local, excuse me, not the local, but the education agency and the state Center for School Safety, not in trying to supplant any kind of existing funds, but to getting creative, and maybe pooling the funds together to see what we can do. You've heard some wonderful stories. Just seemed like regular high school, the custodian going down this time of day with a cart going down there - but anyhow, looking at these initiatives that we could do to consolidate efforts, we heard some testimony today about that, as well; great things can happen when people really don't care who gets the credit, but who want to go out there and see what they can do to help effect change.

I think they need to have a needs assessment. I think they need to see where they need to go, and a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

cooperative attitude. And a couple of other quick things here, too, and this was mentioned, again, that we need to train the trainers, and then we need to have, for lack of a better term, booster sessions, where we can re-up these people again. You know, you've been trained in bullying. You've taken it, now okay, what's happening three years down the road from What do we need to do to re-up this a little bit? Same thing with our emergency management situation with some of the issues that we've seen there.

Talking about emergency management - the training, obviously, is critical. As I go into these schools, I see dusted off copies that haven't been really updated in several years. We are going to try to do something about that, but moreover, now that I've learned a lot more from working with folks up here, there's a significant piece there in this, this exercising these programs, and having functional exercises are certainly desirable, so those are some things we'd like to see kind of come up from, or come down from the federal government to us saying hey, you

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

need to be more engaged with these activities.

And, finally, trying to save you a little bit of time here, I recommend that as you look at where the Center for School Safety are located, and I'll use Ohio, for example, because I collaborate with the folks in Ohio and Indiana, and Mike over here Tennessee, we could have regional meetings, and we could bring our SEA folks down, along with Directors for Centers for School Safety, and get into brainstorming sessions - what's going on that's hot and neat and stuff like that. I'd like to ideas from you guys. Mavbe we steal some something down in Kentucky that you all could use, et So I think that there's a whole gamut of cetera. things that we could do, if we could find some way to coordinate this thing and explore that.

Finally, I'd just like to reiterate the fact that prevention is a very difficult thing to put a measuring stick on. I just know what I've seen in the schools over the years, that these prevention activities have worked in anecdotal ways. Will it fit questionnaires that of the are out

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	Possibly not, but I know that when we have fewer
2	suspensions, we have fewer assaults, when we have
3	fewer crimes in our schools, when we see drug issues
4	dropping off the face as far as the chart is
5	concerned, some good things are happening. Now how
6	people answer crafted questions on surveys sometimes,
7	as was mentioned here before, may not always get to
8	what's going down. Good things are happening with you
9	Title 4 monies. Thank you.
LO	DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Jon.
L1	Cynthia.
L2	MS. TIMMONS: Is my time up?
L3	DR. LONG: No, God bless you.
L4	MS. TIMMONS: Yes, I hope he is.
L5	DR. LONG: This group in front of you has
L6	been here
L7	MS. TIMMONS: Wishful thinking. Go ahead.
L8	DR. LONG: We've been here for 27 hours, and
L9	you can rest assured that we want to hear what you
20	say, and you take as much time as you want.
20	say, and you take as much time as you want. MS. TIMMONS: Oh, did you all hear that, I

DR. LONG: I'm just kidding

MS. TIMMONS: Oh. The clock is on, right?

The bells will ring kind of like the custodian going down, when the bell rings, that means I'm through.

When I work in the prisons, when they come in for count, I have to quit, too, so if we come in for count now you know I'll be quitting.

No, I appreciate the opportunity. Thank you, Chairman, and thank you members that are here to listen and to hear what we have to say, to help you make advised and informed decisions, as well. Do we have all the answers? The answer is probably not. We don't even know the questions yet, so I'm hoping that today what I have to share will kind of summarize many of the things that I've heard people say from the very beginning this morning, and I've been here all day, and glad for that. From the things that Jon said, I thought I think he was looking at some of my slides, because some of those things I will be saying, but very briefly. And I've got my watch here, so I'll try to keep it at 10 minutes.

Okay. The information that I gave you in

NEAL R. GROSS

your packets, and that you've had prior to this has
several slides in it. I'm not going to go over all of
those. I'm going to emphasize the assessment phase,
the needs assessment phase, because I think that's
something that's truly, truly vital and important, so
I'm going to look at 13 steps here very quickly,
because many of them have been talked about, but I'm
going to look at that assessment and the needs
assessment phase. And as I've listened to all of the
panels, one reason that I'm going to do that, and that
I want to keep it to that, is that when we've talked
about evaluation, we've talked about programs that
have worked, I haven't heard too many say that
sometimes they've not been effective. Well, you know
what, sometimes they haven't been effective because
you're not measuring the right thing. You don't know
truly what your problems are in your school, so if
you're measuring Second Step and violence prevention
isn't your number one program, you may not get the
scores that you want, so I am going to emphasize the
needs assessment, and that this is kind of a checklist
of looking at the needs assessment, looking at what

NEAL R. GROSS

you need to do in generalities. I'm not going to look at a specific school district. I'm not going to look at a specific state. I've worked in several, but I'm going to be looking at, in generalities, what do you want to look at in each one of these comprehensive — for a comprehensive prevention program. And look at promising programs and practices, if you will.

And if I get off on the slides, Debbie, will you tell me like you did before. Okay. Am I on number one? All right. Well, first of all, we can't separate focusing on academic achievement from safe and drug free schools. We just can't do it. And I think too often we fragmentize that, and we've looked at our academics, and we've looked at our safe and drug free schools issues as separate issues. It is not. It is the same. We need to look at it together collectively, collaborate, and work together on that, and so that's the first one that I want to look at. We, too, as Safe and Drug Free Schools educators, need to look at that.

Okay. The second one is to involve the family in meaningful ways. Again, that's the

NEAL R. GROSS

Principles of Effectiveness. We need to look at and work with our families. Only when we work with our families are we truly going to make an impact, are we going to make a difference. Are they going to listen to us, only if we're listening to them. I mean, in meaningful ways, not bring the cookies through the door, but I mean truly listen and put them on our advisory boards within the schools, and listen to what they have to say, as well as what the children have to say.

The third one is developing those links to the community. We've got several links with all of our communities, the rural communities we're working one school in Illinois, very, very small rural school, and what they use were the Schools Within The Schools. They use their high school students as mentors for their elementary students, because they didn't have a lot of resources, but a lot of things happened by them doing that, so link to whatever resources you have within your school.

Also, to emphasize the positive relationships amongst students and staff, and I heard Jon talk about

NEAL R. GROSS

that, make sure that your students and your staff have equal and mutual respect for each other. I've seen too many administrators and too many teachers many times not respect their students. The respect goes both ways, and I think that's really important when you're looking at a comprehensive plan for your schools.

Another is to discuss those safety issues openly, make sure that you're talking about them. Just because you talk about them isn't going to make them happen. You need to talk about them and get on the same ground work, get on the same framework, make sure your terminology is the same, and work together there.

Again, I've gone back to the treat the students with equal respect, and it goes along with slide four, and that was that positive relationships between the students and between the staff. There needs to be that positive relationship, respect absolutely the students for the teachers, but also to make sure that you have that positive working relationship with that. Many ways that we've done

NEAL R. GROSS

that in some of the schools that I've looked at as far as student assistance programs, the teachers are mentors with their children, and sometimes silent mentors, especially with their high school students. They don't want to be thought of as needing a mentor, but to be silent mentor with someone, to ask them about how they're doing, to go to their wrestling match, to go to their choir meetings and things like that, is really, really important.

And, again, mentioning student programs, create those ways for students to share Many times they don't feel like they their concerns. have any place that they can go to share those concerns with. Our student support groups, the opportunities for children to meet with and youth to meet with their faculty and staff need to be made readily available for those students. We also, number eight, we need to help those children feel safe in expressing their feelings. How many times do we say, if any of us in this room have said oh, you shouldn't be angry about that; oh, you shouldn't be mad, you shouldn't be sad. Baloney. If they're angry, they're

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

angry. Acknowledge it. Let them know that they can express their anger in appropriate ways. If they express their anger, and they say okay, well if this isn't angry, then maybe I should show them what angry is. Okay? So we need to help them, and share with them ways to express those feelings, and listen to their feelings.

We also need to have a place and system for referring the children who are abused, children who are - their parents are going through divorce. There's children who have parents in prison. We need to let them know it's okay, that they have someone that they can talk to, to come back to. And any of our violence prevention programs, in any of our safe and drug free schools programs, we need to look at that.

We also need to offer those extended day programs. The little girl that I mentor in my program, Children of Promise, both of her parents are in prison, and she's been raised by a grandmother that's trying to work full time, and doesn't get off until 5:00. I don't know what she would do without a

NEAL R. GROSS

full day, without an extended day care that's positive in nature, that allows for some tutoring, that allows for some positive interaction with some adults, extremely important in our Safe and Drug Free Schools programs.

We also need to promote that good citizenship and character. I can tell you since I've started working with children of prisoners, they sometimes don't know what good citizenship is. They really haven't been taught that. They do not know. We need to advise and not let the parents know that they are, indeed, their first moral teachers, and we know that, and we need to acknowledge that. We also need to help them and teach them, re-teach them, if you will, some good citizenship, and good character education.

We need to identify the problems and assess the progress toward those solutions. How many times do we as educators, do we as parents, look at the problem, but we never move into the solutions. One thing that I've used with middle schools, if you're not a part of the solution, then you're a part of the problem, so we need to talk about solutions as we

NEAL R. GROSS

identify those problems. And last but not least, we support those students in making that transition. These students, and especially at the scared to death to move high school, are adulthood, as we know it; to move into what am I going to be when I grow up, because we try to make them decide that right now. How many of you are in the same career that you were thinking about when you were in elementary or middle school? We need to help them. We need to have some of the things that Jon and some others have talked about, and work study programs, the opportunity to move forward, and to help our children make those decisions, not to make the decisions for them, but to help them in those decision making skills.

Those are the 13 key points that I wanted to bring out, that I wanted everyone to make sure that when you're working for a comprehensive violence prevention program, that you look at each one of these and say am I doing this? Am I doing this? Am I doing this, as you go through those programs that you're looking at. And as we look at the seven elements of a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

promising program, make sure that they have these seven key elements in place, that it's comprehensive. Again, it's not a stand-alone program, it's not the Safe and Drug Free Schools program versus No Child Left Behind, versus the Math Department, versus the English Department, but it's everyone working together, a comprehensive approach, that we have an early start and a long-term commitment, that we don't try to get it all done in one year. We can't, but we look at what's imminent, what we need to right now, and that we make a long-term commitment to that.

We must have strong leadership, strong leadership does not need a disciplinarian that's over your head cracking the whip. It means strong leadership to look at promising programs, to look at changes, to look at what's happening in your school. Just because you did something five years ago doesn't mean it's going to work in today's time, so have that strong leadership that could have action with it.

Also, staff development. Staff development, as we've mentioned before, and that's why I said, he was looking over my shoulder here, staff development

NEAL R. GROSS

means staff development, means staff development, not once, but many, many times. Repeat it, and implement it, make sure that those development programs and those books are dusted off and read, and re-read, and revised as the need be.

Also, look at the family involvement. We have look at the family, including our grandparents. Guys, our grandparents are raising more and more of our children right now, and if we don't include them as part of the family, if we don't make a 56-year old woman as welcome in our schools when she's raising a first grader, as we do a 25-year old mother, then we've made a mistake. If we don't start looking at all avenues of all of our family involvement, and make them feel welcome, and not that oh, well this PTA is for 30 and under, and I'm 60, and I've heard that be said by grandparents that I work with, saying I don't feel welcome in the schools as a first grade mother, so we need to be sure that we look at the family development, and the family involvement.

We also continually need to work with that in our generation of partnerships, and those community

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

linkages that I listened to before. And as we've talked about being culturally sensitive, make sure that we're developmentally appropriate, make sure that we have the books and everything in the languages which are in schools, and who is it that said they had 69 or so languages in your schools - make sure you have a common language. Someone here, I respect this morning, that they had an interpreter here for those that needed it, and that was excellent.

The last slide that I have up here, this is a quote that I love, and it's from - and I don't know who it is here - from Howard Adelman. And I think it just kind of puts it all together, and it talks about fragmentation. It says, "We must avoid fragmentation in implementing programs. The concepts and preventing and responding to violence must be integrated into effective school reform, including socially and academically supportive instruction, and caring welcoming atmosphere, and providing good options for recreation and enrichment." And I think that just says it all. I think pulling that all together is so, so very vital, and so very important.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And the last slide, it's going to take us all, each and every one of us around this table and in this room, and outside this room and within our states, to make that difference. Thank you.

DR. LONG: Thank you very much, Cynthia. Thanks to all of you, and we will now turn to questions from the committee so that we can interact. So we'll entertain questions from committee members. Fred.

MR. ELLIS: I don't know how to begin this. One of the, I don't know, frustrations from little piece of the world is coming like Ed did, from the world of law enforcement over to school security, is that there seems to be almost an exclusive emphasis on the federal level, particularly at the Department of Education, on prevention programs. And I don't say that to say that prevention programs are bad. I think in the world of crime fighting, prevention is the ultimate crime fighting mechanism, or emphasis. the world that I come from, crime fighting basically is made up of the three-legged stool; one is, prevention, another one is deterrence, and another

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

one is enforcement. And it's my perspective, or my
impression that while there's this tremendous emphasis
on prevention, which is a good thing, there's almost
none on the deterrence and enforcement. And,
specifically, looking at and evaluating technologies -
Ed talked about technologies in terms of dual access
technology, video surveillance, student I.D. cards,
use of force issues. We heard on the emergency
management piece where not only, of course, Department
of Education, but DHS, FEMA, particularly FEMA comes
out with publication, for instance, that makes all
these recommendations for education facilities, such
as bomb resistance coating on all of your glass.
Well, Fairfax County, I have more than 25 million
square feet of space, that's more than four Pentagons.
I don't think the Pentagon has yet to do all of their
glass in bomb resistant coating, so to come out and
suggest that we should somehow come up with funding to
address these issues, bomb resistant trash
receptacles, these kinds of things, thousand feet
stand-off parking. Really, we don't even have the
land. The schools already exist, so it's a very

NEAL R. GROSS

frustrating position for us to be in, to listen to
other people suggest how we should be, one, protecting
our schools and doing these prevention programs, but
providing no funding, no assessment particularly of
the technologies to do some of those things. And it
was interesting, Lorraine, you talked about the - and
correct me if I'm wrong - you talked about \$3.3
million, I think you got from DHS, and that was for
the State of Florida, which sounds like a lot of
money, but you and I both know that's a pittance. We
did two generators, emergency generators in Fairfax
County, \$1.2 million. Two buildings of the 247 that
we have, so my point is it's very frustrating from our
end, so I'd like to hear from you guys to see if I'm
just nuts, or have I really hit on something, and
would you like to see somebody at the federal level,
whether or not it's Department of Education, and in
this office, this program being the right ones to do
that. But, personally, I would like to see I think
Bill, correct me if I'm wrong - didn't you guys
partner up with NIJ years ago and did the thing with
Sandia, and the video surveillance thing. It was a

NEAL R. GROSS

great piece on making recommendations on video surveillance, but it would be great see some stuff on dual access technology, student I.D. cards, those kinds of things, and I would like to hear if you guys echo that.

MR. RAY: I won't make a comment on whether you're nuts or not, Fred. I won't make that comment regarding whether you're nuts or not.

It is frustrating to us that are more geared towards the non-educational program issues, and that we are always trying to come up with that latest way of making the classroom safe, whether it be through programs, character education, certainly classroom management issues. But the one thing we, at least I in Denver, and most of my counterparts around the country are charged with, is making sure that our students, our staff members, and our facilities - we can't forget facilities, because without a facility, without the computers in the facility, without all aspects of that, four corners of that building, we don't have education. And we tend to think about security from an eight to five, Monday through Friday

NEAL R. GROSS

concept, and I assure you that it's much, much deeper than that.

Now we have, and Bill's probably tired of us talking about this, but we have very little access, unless you are a true law enforcement entity. And some of the school districts in the country are law enforcement entities, their own police departments, ISDs. Michael over here from San Antonio is the other school districts. We do not have access to Department of Justice, Homeland Security dollars. directly to law enforcement; and, therefore, when -if we're fortunate enough for anything to come down, which for most of us is not the case, the money we count on is the money that comes out of DOE. Those dollars are out of our taxing our own public for monies -- for the majors. And Fred is right, we can't create these thousand foot barriers, there are so many things we cannot do, but there's a lot of things we can do if we have the dollars to do it. personally think access control, I think identification cards, I think knowing who is coming into our campuses not only during school day, but

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

around the clock. A school that's taken out because -
give you an example in Denver, we just had a burglary,
\$27,000 burglary of computers, \$27,000 worth of
computers in one school overnight, and the cameras
caught it, and we got them back. That school was able
to open this morning, as a matter of fact. Without
the cameras, that technology, and the intrusion alarms
to back those up, we would not have gotten the
school's computers back. One computer lab taken out
of just wiped out. Those types of technologies are
so critical, but they are also so difficult to
maintain, to keep them running, to keep those things
going on a 24-hour, 7-day a week basis, we can't
forget school security is a 24/7 operation, and we
need those funds, wherever they come from, whether
from Homeland Security, Department of Justice. I
agree with the comments about NIJ, the research
programs. NIJ has done a tremendous job for us in
taking a look at applicable technologies, and we need
to continue those programs, Bill. We need to get
those things hooked back up, so we know that what
we're doing from a technology point of view, at least,

NEAL R. GROSS

are those things are working.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'd like to just maybe comment MR. AKERS: just real quick on the behavioral side, rather than from the criminal side on this situation; that as far as deterrence are concerned and enforcement, I hope I would get some support here from principal, the colleague over here, but there are some programs out there under the umbrella, huge umbrella called "instructional discipline". It could be the CHAMPS program, it could be the Peebis program, Rob Horner, George Sugai, Randy Sprick, whoever - they're teaching actually, they're teaching teachers consistent, first of all. Then if all the teachers are pulling together consistently on what they're asking these kids to do, then we're seeing a greater compliance issue. That articulates back over to your shop, Ed, that if the kids are complying to civil issues with the teachers, then some of the issues might come into lockstep as far as that behavior thing is concerned, as well.

Being the first high school principal in our State of Kentucky to enforce mandatory drug testing

NEAL R. GROSS

for athletes, we saw a major change, and we saw
something really weird happen, where we actually had
non-athlete kids come up to me and say can we start a
club for drug-free non-athletes, where we have to
offer a urine sample to get into the club? Now I
said, you want to hold that club in a closet because
we only have three kids that could come into that. We
had over 700 kids step up to the plate. We had
wonderful businesses give us - in fact, I still carry
the card in my wallet here, which I can show after
hours for you all - where they were offering discounts
for kids who tested negative as far as the drug tests
are concerned, had the card, sanction card, would go
in and get discounts. We let kids come into our
athletic contests absolutely free because they were
drug free. We got them at the concession stand -
that's where we got the money - a little bit more salt
gets more Coca Cola, but anyhow, bottom line here is
that there are some deterrent programs out there. Now
are they the end-all/be-all, the answer is no. Are
they a step in the right direction, I said I
definitely think so. And so we're seeing more and

NEAL R. GROSS

This lady over here lit a fire, we went from 46 school districts to 72 school districts within six month period of time that are engaging in student drug testing for athletes, and for extra curricular. because of our Safe School assessments that we which I think is a deterrent, as well, we've had four schools in our state that had open lunches, and that's an accident waiting to happen, you know, where kids can leave campus unsupervised, and that becomes a law issue, as well as a school issue there. the four closed because of three out assessments, and saying what a negative issue that is as far as impacts on drugs and behavior, and crime is concerned, so there's some deterrent issues there, as well, that principals are trying to fight with day in and day out.

MS. ALLEN: I just want to speak to the technology piece, again, and we had districts that have quite a bit of funding, and so they're able to use the technology, the key to check I.D., et cetera, but there's other districts that don't. And so based on their needs, they're going to determine if they're

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

going to use those dollars for technology, and so that's something that gets back to, you know, we talked about assessment all day, but it's based on your needs, and with the dwindling resources, how you're going to use those dollars. And we do have some districts that that is so important to them, they will put it in, for example, my county - they had the RAPTOR system identification, and so that's a technology that's used. So it just depends on their need, and the funds available. Would we like to see more funds for people to use that? Yes, but then you have to measure, based on other needs, as well.

DR. LONG: Montean, question.

MS. JACKSON: Hi. And, again, thank you all I'm from Alaska, and something that has for coming. come up for many of us as we've discussed on the breaks, is the active versus passive consent. And I was wondering could someone talk a little bit about that, and some of the strategies that you've used to kind of get the students to participate in the surveys, and get your families involved. evaluation, on evaluating other piece on your

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ancillary programs. We've heard a lot about evidence-based curricula that's delivered in the schools, but I think for many of us, we probably know that with that goes hand-in-hand some other support systems that need to be in place, as we have students coming to school a lot more challenged, and receiving -- perhaps even taking medication and receiving some other kinds of services in the community, so how are you evaluating those components, that it's not just the prevention piece, but it's also the intervention component.

MS. ALLEN: Well, could I speak to one way that with active versus parental consent in our Florida Youth Survey effort. I do have some slides on that, was unable to show them to you, but we actually worked with other state agencies for our Florida Youth effort, and it includes Florida Youth Substance Abuse surveys, and our Youth Risk Behavior survey, and our Tobacco survey, in addition to our Physical Activity and Nutrition surveys, and one of the things, because we're using DCF dollars, which is Department of Children and Families, we, of course, don't need active, but passive - we go ahead and we tell our

NEAL R. GROSS

school districts that it's voluntary, that we're going to be doing these surveys. And some of the districts, because of local control, have decided that they will make sure that the parents say yes or no, and others will say well, we'll let them know the surveys are there, we'll let them see the surveys, et cetera, just to try to get the number of students that we need for appropriate sample sizes, so that's one area that we use another state agency and their dollars to be able to do our Youth surveys.

MR. AKERS: I'm not sure if I understood your question all together, but you were phasing into what I'm calling co-occurring issues that kids have, and how do we, at the state level, address those issues?

MS. JACKSON: It was actually how are we evaluating the schools that are not only implementing evidence-based curriculums in the schools, but also, are providing those additional services that students are in need of to show effectiveness to the Safe and Drug Free Schools programming. Yes, is there anybody evaluating those alternative programs in conjunction with what they already have in place?

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. AKERS: I'm not a state coordinator of
2	that situation, so I have to defer over to
3	MS. ALLEN: We're not evaluating programs
4	that we're not evaluating intervention programs, no.
5	I mean, our office doesn't do that.
6	MS. TIMMONS: I think that's more from the
7	state education agency, and I think more of our state
8	education agencies are looking at the Principles of
9	Effectiveness as a tool to do that, so they're looking
10	at all strategies, not just the programs but the
11	strategies they're putting in place to meet their
12	need, so they're looking at their needs assessment of
13	what they need to do, and the strategies to make those
14	difference. And then as they go back and evaluate are
15	they making that difference, then there are several
16	strategies in there that look at that, but a state
17	education agency person would be better to answer
18	that, I think.
19	DR. LONG: Hope.
20	MS. TAFT: Thank you all for coming, because
21	you've broadened my perspective of what it means to be
22	safe schools; but yet, knowing that the title of this

program is Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities, how would you all recommend that the program be tweaked or reinvented to become -- to keep what's good in it, but also enhance it in some way?

I think one thing, Hope, that I MS. TIMMONS: would do that I would like us to look at is to take down those territorial walls. I think there's too many territorials and boxes that we're in, and I think we need to step outside those boxes in some ways, and make some change among ourselves, not just here, but with all of the colleagues that we work with, or that we need to work with - Juvenile Justice with all of the different programs, Homeland Security, et cetera, et cetera, that we all need to look and see what is our piece in making a difference, how can we work collectively together, and I think it was Jon that mentioned that, and we don't care who gets the credit, as long as it makes that. What's happened, though, is Safe and Drug Free Schools is making difference. They're making an impact, and other people are taking some of that credit, so we need to look at that, as well. But as we look at the changes,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we need to, first of all, contact every one that's at the table who makes those changes, and look at the five Cs, and then go back up to communicate, and then communicate among each other, look at each other, talk among ourselves, and then cooperate, cooperate with each other, give each other the strokes that they need, and to cooperate, and then to collaborate, and truly to coordinate our efforts together to maximize our programs. We could all, across the governments, across the school boards, across the communities, we could difference if make we collaborated, coordinated, and all worked together up that, what I call the five Cs of making change in our efforts.

DR. LONG: Thank you.

MR. RAY: Could I respond, just a quick second. would just like to add that I from perspective, I quess, and I think I've talked others about what can we do, is first and foremost, is acknowledgment that times have changed. We talk about stress levels of our children. You know, they're dealing with things that most of us in this room never had to deal with, and we talk about terrorism, we talk

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about pandemic flus, we talk about 1918. Well, how many people died, I guess in 1918, is that somewhere close with the various flus. Not only do we deal with the issues that we have to acknowledge those issues exist today, but we also have to acknowledge the fear factor of our parents and our teachers. And I'm not sure we do a real good job of understanding that parents are sending their kids off, under concerns that will they see them at the end of the day? And they expect all of us to make sure that they do see them at the end of the day. And that acknowledgment has to come from where we are today, not where we were 25, 30 years ago. Things have changed, and I think we have to acknowledge that we're living under different times today, especially in the past decade or so.

MR. AKERS: I think one other thing too, Ms. Taft, that when you look at school administrators, they have the Jerry McGuire philosophy - show me the money. And they've been used to getting monies from state levels, used to getting monies from the feds, as far as these things, and I think there's a certain amount of an entitlement added, too, that some school

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

administrators have, so now we're going to have to
show them the reason not to give them money if we do
get outside the box and find another way to reallocate
the situation. And so I would think that you would
need to get the stakeholders together and say okay,
let's all think outside the box here state-by-state,
and it may not be just a situation where we need to do
it nationally, but just give the option out there for
school administrators, superintendent-types,
principal-types that come to the table and say okay,
if we were to reconfigure this and re-allocate this
money within our state, rather than going out where
you don't get enough to even - I think one of our
school districts gets like \$1,015, something like
that, what are they going to do with that? But if
they cooperatively shared that monies within maybe
regions within the state or whatever, they might be
able to enhance some regional training, some things
like this where they could maximize their monies. And
then, also, I think we need to ask people, you know,
like Lorraine was saying, look at all the
collaboration that she's got going on with her state

NEAL R. GROSS

with all those folks. I'm sitting here in absolute envy. Well, you know, Homeland Security invites us to sit at the table, but we're at the back part of the table. Homeland Security hasn't offered me a penny yet, and yet we're the ones that they're going to come to when a disaster happens saying can we put the refugees there. And all I want is a fair seat at the table for educators to be able to access some of the monies. Of course, she's a lot better looking than I am, so maybe that's an issue. I don't know.

(Laughter.)

MR. AKERS: But that's what I was thinking about, maybe one year rotate off and see what might happen. But, again, you would have to have a grassroots agreement among the administrators in your state before you tried to even get there, or else they're going to start going to their Congressmen saying hey, they're screwing with our money. Now back them off from this thing because I want my \$1,015 back. It's hot potato.

MS. ALLEN: Well, to piggyback, also, with regard to the collaboration issue; I would love to see

NEAL R. GROSS

at the federal level the prevention system in place that all the federal state agencies that deal with prevention, what their common goals are. And then look at it at the federal level, because at the state level, what we've done is we work with Children and Families, and Health, and Juvenile Justice, and the Office of Drug Control, and we have our own statewide prevention system. All of us bring something different to the table, but yet, I would love to see that at the federal level, what are you all doing at the federal level to do that, and what goals are you setting as a federal government, and see what states are doing, as well. And what we found with our prevention system is that then our LEAs kind of want to mirror what we do, and that collaboration is really improved collaboration.

I feel so fortunate when I come to national meetings because we have very good rapport with Children and Families, and Juvenile Justice, and the Governor's office, and we really do all sit down together, and we like to tease the reason why is because most of them started in education, we just

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

farmed them out to those other state agencies so that we all have a common goal. But I'd like to see that common prevention goal. I don't know if that existed at the federal level, but we're working on it at the state level. It's hard. It's not a simple job, but we are, so that we can pull together the data we need with limited resources, the fact that we can have our Youth survey and Children and Families pays for it. I mean, how incredible is that? And we do other things. We have a prevention conference coming up in September, and all these players, all these state agencies are putting that together, so that's one piece I would like to see, I think would help if we see what the feds are doing.

The second thing to go with what Jon had mentioned was, we do have 72 LEAs, and some of them are pretty tiny, and so we have a built consortia. And what's really nice about that is they tend to be our smaller rural districts, and they tend to be near each other, and so we're able to maximize our dollars that way through either a consortium, or the two consortia that we do have, so it's another way that I

NEAL R. GROSS

would like to see those states that have so many LEAS,
perhaps look at what Jon had mentioned, and
regionalize some of the activities, and to be able to
set some common goals and work on those. And we
talked about the current law, we now are required
through the Uniform Management Information Reporting
System to have this common set of uniform data, and we
have been working since the mid-90s on trying to come
up with, across our state, data for crime and
violence, our substance abuse surveys. And we're
tweaking it, and we're tweaking it, and we feel we're
in pretty good shape that we can across the state look
at that if fighting is happening in Baker County, it
means the same thing as fighting in Miami-Dade,
because we spend so much time training our school
administrators and staff on reporting that back to us
through our automated information system that we have.
So for that piece, I think we could get some common
elements.

And then I really would like us to revisit the criteria by which the PART scores our program, just to ensure that the program is looking at our

NEAL R. GROSS

program outcomes, and that they are aligned. revisiting the criteria, work with out states determine the best program indicators to to reflect program performance. I think that would be really useful for us, as well. Those are just a couple of things I think would improve the program, but I think it's critical that you have the states receiving administrative and state activity dollars can really maximize the use of those because we dollars across out entire state. And again, our state is huge, Florida is huge, and we're able to do so much with such little dollars because of that, because then we bring in all those collaborative partners by having the infrastructure in place. Thank you.

MS. TAFT: I have to agree with you. Having a single definition for prevention in your state with all agencies and departments buying into it makes a tremendous difference. Ohio has just gone through that process, and it's like night and day.

DR. LONG: We have about two minutes left, and the order is Shep, and Susan, and then we'll -- Shep, go ahead. I'm sorry.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DR. KELLAM: I was fascinated, as was Ms.
Taft, and I'm sure everybody sitting around here, with
the breadth of what you all are presenting. It goes
far beyond - I mean, as the day has unfolded, the
picture has gotten very much more enlarged, somewhat
out of focus in some areas, but very much larger. The
role of research in all this, whether, in fact, this
is antagonistic research managing to impose itself in
certain ways that don't make any sense or not, all
kinds of issues that need to be resolved. One of the
things that's not come up, and comes out of a lot of
research is the importance, as Ed pointed out, of
classroom behavior. I think it was you - classroom
behavior management, and we've been doing research on
that for 40 years literally.
risk factors for aggression and trouble with drugs
later, in fact, are school failure and aggressive,
disruptive behavior as early as first grade, and
actually earlier, but those two risk factors have been
the subject of an incredible amount of research. One
of the things that's become clear, and we've tested
methods, is that roughly 50 percent of the first grade

NEAL R. GROSS

teachers in Baltimore, the Baltimore school district being our close, very dear partners in our work, is that about 50 percent of first grade teachers don't have the tools to organize the classroom. And when you actually look at schools of education, they don't even require, it's not required by NCADE, the accreditation nationally of schools of education, and teachers have very little background. And about 50 percent do it, apparently, intuitively, and the other 50 percent don't.

Now imagine kids coming into first grade classrooms who are not very well prepared to be students, or have some attentional difficulties, or who haven't been socialized at home to be students. When a teacher says sit still and pay attention, what happens? Chaos, so you end up about eight or ten weeks later after random assignment, literally, of kids to classrooms and teachers to this kind of condition or that, or standard conditions, and about half the classrooms are chaotic. And it's out of that chaotic half that you see an enormous amount of later problems, so I'm trying to illustrate two things. One

NEAL R. GROSS

is, how research can really help tease out what the early risk factors, and what works and what doesn't for which kids. But another issue is, schools of education don't show up in these conversations. You go from one place to another, one meeting to another with the National Prevention Coalition or what, or Society for Prevention Research, and never hear about schools of education, so what I'm really concerned about is how we reach out and integrate.

Student teachers get SO little field experience before coming into a first grade classroom, or any other classroom, it's incredible. As an M.D., when I think back over 12 or 15 years of how people to think about cardiovascular, taught me how psychiatric, or whatever, it doesn't make any sense. It's no easier to teach reading than it is medicine. That's the facts. I know, because I've been around medicine all my life, and I've been around classrooms all my life. It's a very complex, highly precise process of instruction, and many school districts don't have the coaches, or whatever.

I'm raising the question in the context of a

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

big speech, but I just wondered whether you all could help enlighten us. I mean, surely, where are schools of education in all this, where is teacher training?

MR. AKERS: One of the biggest frustrations I had when I first started my role as a director, addressed all 29 deans of the colleges of education in our state, and it was like I was slapping them in the face saying that we really need - and I was being very diplomatic when I was talking - have you all looked at having your secondary teachers primarily given some kind of behavioral management class? vour elementary teachers in our state get it, but when I did a survey within our state, and I had 80 percent return rate on this thing, those who were in secondary education, only 15 percent of them had behavioral management classes taught to them by the colleges, and those are the people who were leaning over into the special education areas. And I have 35 years into this, and I don't have a doctorate in this, but I have 60 years above my Master's degree, and I had never had the first class on how to sit across the table from a kid, or how to handle the angry parent coming in, and

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

how to deal with these issues on de-escalation. forward 30 years later and Jon Robert Akers, sitting over there at Woodford County High School never had the first class. You would think 30 years later he would have had something like that. And fine institutions, all governed by NCADE and Southern Association, and all the associations that go along with this, I think the deans of colleges of education need to have a freshen up and say let's take a peak at this, like Ed says, the times have changed. kids today aren't fearful of a call coming home from a And I'm sure us boomers in here remember those days when we didn't want to have anybody call home on us.

MS. ALLEN: Perhaps one of the players who should be at the table then would be post-secondary education, as well represented, especially with regard to the colleges of education, that could be a recommendation, because it is very difficult to get into the colleges, and to change, because you can say, for example, Florida requires that they have discipline in their curriculum, but what does that

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

mean? It's embedded, so does that mean that they get it for 15 minutes in one of their classes? I mean, what does it really mean?

know for us, we went ahead with the Positive Behavior Support System, we went ahead and looked at two districts, a small district and a large district, to have them implement Positive Behavior Support in their schools to manage their discipline issues, and we're getting the results back this summer. And I know because they've used it in ESE classes, that they're going to see great reductions in discipline referrals in those schools. We know it from what we've seen in previous schools in Florida have implemented it, and that's school-wide that approach to discipline. It's not just discipline in one classroom, but that everybody in that whole school has the same concept as to what tardy means, what it means to -- as you were talking about, the different language in school, that everyone is on the same page with it, from the principal, to the teacher, to the student, but that it's school-wide, and it's not just in one classroom. So tardy means to Mrs. Jones after

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

the bell rings you're sitting in your seat, whereas, tardy means to Mr. Allen, you're walking in the door.

And that's just a little basic example of getting kids to honor school rules, but it will be really interesting to see the data that we get from the two projects that we've done for discipline.

DR. LONG: Let's go Donni, then Russell, and we'll wrap-up.

MS. LeBOUEF: Throughout the day they've been talking about training, and you all have talked about it on your panel and your presentations were wonderful all but when you said day, within training cannot be, except the union guidelines, and I was wondering how you got around training, because so many of the issues we've spoken about today were about keeping teachers on the cutting edge of what's happening with all of these issues, so I don't know who would like to talk about that.

MR. RAY: It'S interesting. We just went through some negotiations on a union contract that dealt primarily around responsibilities of teachers during an event, that they ask for the training so

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that they could be more proactive in dealing with some
of the issues. In the past, we've said teachers, you
know, if you see a fight break out, dive in. Now
we're saying teacher, if you see a fight break out,
don't. And the unions are saying we don't pay our
teachers to be enforcement officers, but we just
negotiated, I think it'll come up in the start of the
second semester this year, where we will actually go
out and do some restraint training, some other
programs with the teachers, not all of them, but the
teachers that want to accept it, on how to protect
themselves, and how to deal with those moderately
violent issues that take place. It took a lot of
negotiation with the contract with the union to sit
down and say look, we will teach you what you need to
know, but you need to tell us what it is you need to
know, and why you need to know it. And we found them
to be very receptive, at least at the onset.

MS. LeBOEUF: Thank you.

DR. LONG: That was not done on purpose, Russell, I assure you.

DR. JONES: (Off mic.) I have a question and

NEAL R. GROSS

1	a comment. What percentage of the monies that you
2	guys have gotten come from the Department of
3	Education?
4	MR. RAY: Aside from the ERCM grants, less
5	than 5 percent.
6	MS. ALLEN: And with regard to the funding of
7	our office, 100 percent well, of course, you know
8	20 percent goes to the Governor's office. We get 80
9	percent, and of that 80 percent, 93 percent goes to
10	our LEAs, but our funding is totally from Title 4, but
11	as I mentioned, with our collaborations that we bring
12	in other funds, but our office funding is totally our
13	Title 4 funds.
14	MR. AKERS: Are you talking about the U.S.
15	Department of Education
16	DR. JONES: Yes.
17	MR. AKERS: Okay. U.S. Department of
18	Education, we get none, other than grants that have
19	come to us to administer, such as the Community
20	Service Work Project. As far as the functionality of
21	our group, we're totally state money.
22	MS. TIMMONS: And in Oklahoma, our department

within the State Department is 100 percent funded by second --

(Off mic comment.)

DR. LONG: Thank you. Good question, good answer, and I appreciate that metaphor. As we wrap-up today, first of all, I think to remind all of us that we've heard from folks, experts from all over this wonderful country. And these folks came from Florida, to Washington, from California to Colorado, and Kentucky, to Oklahoma, so we heard from all over this great nation, and from really some great experts.

I do keep track of things, also, and I just changed it here, but 85 percent of our panelists, and I did have 75 percent of our committee members, but then Shep said it, and then Donni just said it, so I had to change it to also 85 percent of our committee members that at least one time today said "you all". Where I come from, see, I can't even say it. But I want to, in closing for this panel, want to thank all the gimbals. I think your start of that. You do some things for our children that we know are necessary for them to learn, and sometimes not appreciated enough.

NEAL R. GROSS

So I want to say for all of us sitting here, thank you for what you do for our children, thank God for what you do to keep them safe. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

DR. LONG: And as we wrap-up the day as a committee, a reminder that we start tomorrow morning 8:00 to 8:30 for the breakfast, and then 8:30 in this room, so 8 to 8:30, Continental breakfast, and then 8:30 in this room. And, Debbie, would you address, if you would, and I just mentioned this, about the public comment section that will be here tomorrow, but also ways that folks across this country, if they wish to give some form of public comment, could get to that.

MS. PRICE: Sure. Obviously, most of the world doesn't read the Federal Register, but it is in the Federal Register Notice, and we'll put it in the Federal Register Notice for each meeting. Tomorrow we'll have a public comment period. People will come, basically first come/first serve. They can speak up to five minutes, but we would prefer they keep it shorter, around the three or so minute time period. We have allotted from 8:40 to 9:15 for that, which

NEAL R. GROSS

seems like a small amount of time, but we didn't get any requests for speaking from the Federal Register Notice, so we may have some in the morning. And they would be able to come and speak, and give their comments, and then we will just move on to the next person. There won't be a question and answer time following their comments.

If we don't use all that time, that time just rolls over into working time for the committee, so we have from, like I said, 8:40 to 9:15. And if people would like to provide any additional information, even our panelists today, or anyone in the public, anyone who's working in the areas of Safe and Drug Free Schools, there's not a parameter about who you need to But we have the Safe and Drug Free Schools, we have an email address specifically for this committee, which is osdfsc@ed.gov. Well, I have to apologize for having an O in the beginning of it, because I'm so used to doing Office of Safe and Drug Free School, I stuck an O in the beginning of it. It wasn't until about four weeks after it was up, and I thought why did I even put the O on? It didn't need the O, so

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it's OS - Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee, osdfsc@ed.gov. So that is our email address. It is posted in the Federal Register. Anyone who wants to send anything, any comments to the committee can send it to that email address, and we will get those out to all the members of the advisory committee. So, for example, if someone had - I think Chris Ringwalt mentioned his study, if you wanted to send a cite for that, we can get it out, so we'll get that all out.

We also -- our website is live. If you go on to the Department of Ed's website and click on offices, and ignore when it comes up and continue, underneath offices you'll see boards and commissions, if you click on there, then you'll be able to see our website for our committee. And we will post the presentations from today, we'll post on there, we'll post information on there, as well.

PARTICIPANT: And the website address, please?

MS. PRICE: Well, the Department of Ed's website is ed.gov, that's all you need is ed.gov. But to run it through to get to our advisory committee,

NEAL R. GROSS

it's best to just click on offices, click on boards and commission, and you'll see us there. In the Federal Register Notice we'll put everything, but anyway, so is that helpful to everybody? I think everybody but one person will be here, so it'll be fine. I tell you what, if you leave your notebook here, if you could put, let's say put your name or tag here, because we may have to move them into another office overnight. I don't know if we can physically leave them in this office, in this room, but we'll We've got it in the morning, so I don't think it should be a problem. The logistics for tomorrow are identical to today, getting food over there, and then meeting in here. And we moved it up a half hour so that you could get out of town, for those of you who need to catch flights, a little earlier.

DR. LONG: As we close, I think it's straight up on 5:00. That's when we said, and I want to say that as a way of thanking you for what I thought was an excellent day. You had some outstanding questions. I think we learned a lot. Tomorrow we'll start to put it together, so I would say to you, excellent job,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

							344
1	have a	great evening.					
2		(Whereupon,	the	proceedings	went	off	the
3	record	at 5:02:11 p.m	.)				
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							

NEAL R. GROSS