



U.S. Department of Education

**The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities
Advisory Committee Meeting**



U.S. Department of Education

Barnard Auditorium
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

August 21-22, 2006

Minutes prepared by:
Mark Bernstein
Consultant, Dixon Group
September 5, 2006

AGENDA

Monday, August 21:

9:00 a.m.	Opening Statements
9:10 a.m.	First Panel: State Education Perspective
10:10 a.m.	Questions & Answers
10:55 a.m.	Second Panel: Local Education Perspective
Noon	Questions & Answers
1:15 p.m.	Third Panel: Researcher and Evaluator Perspective
2:20 p.m.	Questions & Answers
3:05 p.m.	Fourth Panel: School Safety and Preparedness Perspective
4:10 p.m.	Questions & Answers
4:40 p.m.	Summary and Closing Remarks
5:00 p.m.	Adjournment

Tuesday, August 22:

8:30 a.m.	Opening Statement
8:40 a.m.	Public Comment
9:15 a.m.	Advisory Committee Discussion
10:15 a.m.	Break
10:30 a.m.	Advisory Committee Discussion
11:25 a.m.	Closing comments
11:30 a.m.	Adjournment

* * *

OPENING STATEMENT

Monday, August 21

Opening the meeting, David Long described the session as an extremely important meeting. Those present would be recommending changes in the SDFSCA's [Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act] State Grants Program.

Addressing the first panel, he noted that their written presentations were in hand. He requested that each presenter limit his/her remarks to eight to ten minutes, so that ample time remained for questions and answers.

* * *

FIRST PANEL PRESENTATION: State Education Perspective

Panelists:

Mike Herrmann -- 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 Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinators

Mona Johnson – Program Supervisor, Washington State Department of Public Instruction; Vice President, Network Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinator

[Panelists in turn made presentations based on their written submissions.]

* * *

First Panel -- Questions and Answers:

Russell Jones noted that several panelists had presented data showing downward trends in drug use and other behaviors. He asked if those declines were regarded as significant. Jeff Barber replied that they were. Jones asked that the significance levels be included. Jones added that he wanted to have data on those young people who were not regularly in school. He asked if racial and gender breakdowns were available on the data. Mona Johnson and Jeff Barber said their states [Washington and Indiana, respectively] had such data, and could make it available. Jones said the reductions were welcome, but repeated his concern that the data presented covered only those children who were in school.

Tommy Ledbetter said he had heard comments that the program lacked commonality from state to state, and that this made assessment difficult. Mike Herrmann responded that if the scope of the program was narrowed [something he said he would not welcome], then universal indicators could be identified. He added, however, that for this program, the appropriate indicator might depend on where a given district was putting its effort; this suggested that a range of indicators was needed so that individual districts had some flexibility. John Bynoe, by way of example, said that if a district was focusing on substance abuse, its program

effectiveness should be determined by looking at changes in student alcohol use, rather than in changes in school climate.

Sheppard Kellam noted that none of the presenters described themselves as researchers; he asked whether they might deem it wise to form partnerships that included research groups. Mona Johnson said her program had collaborated with researchers from the University of Washington; such collaboration had been useful. She added that, while she was not a researcher by training, her involvement with the program had prompted her to better understand evaluation methodologies. Jeff Barber said that if one wished to do a good evaluation, one had to begin with that in mind as an intention. Evaluation, however, was not really the starting point of the pertinent legislation: 'that horse has already out of the barn.' John Bynoe noted that evaluation began and ended with a definition of objectives.

Hope Taft thanked the panel for showing that small sums of money could accomplish a great deal. She noted that the advisory panel had been asked to reinvent the program; she asked panelists for their ideas on this. Second, she noted Jeff Barber's comment that evaluation should start at the bottom and build up; she asked him to elaborate on that. Barber said a process question should be asked: how do changes occurring on the local level reflect funding from the program? That, he added, might be a basis for building an evaluation up from the local, to the state and to the federal level.

Mona Johnson expressed concern about evaluations being developed at the local level; rather, she said, local and state people should meet to develop a methodology that worked best across the board. The state framework, in turn, needed to accommodate the general intentions of the program. This, she said, could be a rather painful process, but it was powerful when all the players were pulled together. Jeff Bynoe said program evaluation should reflect the circumstance that the agency's charge had gone beyond its original charter. Mike Herrmann commented that the program faced 'a challenge of being heard.' At present, he noted, it was attached to NCLB [No Child Left Behind]; when the program was squeezed into the consolidated application process it was hard to get its concerns acknowledged.

Mona Johnson said Hope Taft's inquiry about how to re-invent the program was a very large question. She felt the program was moving in a good direction – communication, guidance and support were all greatly improved. She suggested that the scope of program activities be narrowed; the program's broad range made it difficult to evaluate. Jeff Barber seconded Johnson's suggestion about narrowing the scope. Additionally, he urged adding training requirements that would support capacity building; people, he said, needed to understand better how to put the program in place.

Fred Ellis noted conflicting comments on program breadth: some cited this as a strength; others as a weakness. He said he was pleased that schools were becoming recognized as having assets in times of crisis: they had the capacity to house, feed and transport. He wondered whether SDFS should be the only federal agency providing funds to schools on crisis management issues: should FEMA play a larger role, with the role of SDFS becoming more focused? Mike Herrmann said FEMA and Homeland Security should play a larger role. John Bynoe agreed, but added that his program was now offering all-hazards training.

Dennis Romero expressed interest in capacity building, and asked the panel if it could provide examples of how it was achieved. Jeff Barber said it was not sufficient to provide the Principles of Effectiveness; one needed to work directly with district and school personnel. People who are skilled at implementing academic curricula

were not necessarily skilled at the Principles of Effectiveness; it was not part of their training. His office had asked people at the district level what their highest needs were: commonly, he said, people asked how to do evaluation. His office had provided training for this.

* * *

SECOND PANEL PRESENTATION: Local Education Perspective

Panelists:

Clarence Jones – Coordinator, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Fairfax County Public 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, Los Angeles County Department of Education

[Panelists in turn made presentations based on their written submissions.]

* * *

Second Panel -- Questions and Answers:

Hope Taft asked the panelists what advice they would have on re-inventing the program. Gus Frias responded that if the federal government was willing to invest billions of dollars in the health and safety of the Middle East, it should do the same at home. The program needed to be placed in the context of the War on Terror so it could share in the funds allocated for that purpose. Arthur Dean commented that a better job could be done on the national level to ensure that uniform guidance was provided to states and LEAs in relation to data collection. He believed that if a survey was taken, the great majority of local programs would say they had developed their standards without guidance from above. This prevented the needed uniformity from occurring. He added that his organization had worked with LEAs and states on the evaluation process. He noted, further, that a great amount of assistance was being received by the program at the local level, though he thought this went unrecognized. Ellen Morehouse urged the committee to be aware that ‘the old is good’ – by example, she cited polio vaccine, which has been in use half a century and still worked. She believed the State Grants Program was working and she urged its continuation. She believed it would aid the program if the federal government provided public domain information and scoring, so that school districts did not have to use their resources for this.

Russell Jones said he did not agree that evaluation was the problem. The question the program faced, he said, was how to let OMB [Office of Management and Budget] know the program was being effective. He described himself as frustrated: people in the field were working hard; then they learned the funding was going to be reduced.

Sheppard Kellam asked panelists if they had made efforts to partner with local universities or research groups. Ellen Morehouse said her agency partnered with researchers in many areas, but not in this one. It was a cost issue: such surveys could cost \$50,000 to \$125,000 a year. Her agency did use the Community Care survey; this had also involved costs for writing up the report. Such costs were taken from resources available for programming. Kellam asked if it was possible to restructure the State Grants Program so that money was available for partnerships with researchers, allowing programs to do rigorous evaluation. Clarence Jones said that in Fairfax County, Virginia, his program had collaborated with George Mason University and with local social service, medical and religious groups. They had paid a considerable amount to be part of a Community Care survey. Since then, they had found funds from county government that helped defray the cost. Gus Frias called attention to a one-page reporting form his agency used; it had, he said, taken considerable time to get the various participating agencies to agree on what was adequate. He characterized it as a good form, but incomplete.

Russell Jones commented that he heard repeated references to the need to partner; did, however, these agencies 'practice what they preached?' For example, to what extent was information on 'best practices' being shared? Arthur Dean said his program worked diligently on this: through training programs involving up to 3,000 people; through publications; through involvement with universities, and other steps. He suggested that people in Washington might be unaware of the level of effort being made locally.

Russell Jones asked about follow up: was there a feedback loop in place? Arthur Dean said there was. Jones noted that if one of his program's specialists assisted in the setting up of a program, they were required to make a return visit within a year to see what was actually being done. Ellen Morehouse said that, in New York State, relevant agencies met with each other four or five times a year to share information. She said limitation on funds made this difficult, as some individuals faced five-hour travel times. Gus Frias said his program did the training for school safety teams, but those teams were expected to pass that information along within their individual schools.

Tommy Ledbetter asked if research existed on how much money the program had leveraged nationwide. Ellen Morehouse said her agency received \$1 million from New York State and received a like amount in matches; of the total of \$2 million, less than 25 percent was from SDFS. Arthur Dean said that, as his group did not receive SDFS funds, it had taken no national survey. They had, however, identified members of Congress who were significant to the program, and had compiled data on those members' districts. He believed information on matching funds should be gathered by the Department of Education. Ledbetter noted that Dean, in his presentation, had said the Department of Education needed to supply data to the states; had he any suggestions on how this might be done? Dean responded that the law itself was fairly clear: the needed piece was national guidance that would give the states and school districts direction on how to implement the law; data could then be rolled up from the local to the state and to the national level. Gus Frias said there were programs that failed to meet the standards of effectiveness that were receiving millions of dollars; e.g. a \$650 million program on gangs.

Russell Jones commented that in Virginia, program funds would be withheld if a program could not supply evidence of effectiveness. Ellen Morehouse said that a similar standard applied in New York State; she did not think a stricter standard was required.

Belinda Sims asked how school safety teams were created. Gus Frias responded that this was a state mandate. His agency provided the training; the principal or assistant principal usually headed the team. He believed there were shortcomings in how the information was shared with others in the individual schools. He noted that, even for safety-related issues, educators had a limited amount of time available for training.

Belinda Sims asked how student diversity was addressed during training. Clarence Jones commented that in Fairfax [Virginia] County, 97 different languages were spoken in its elementary schools. Currently, his program translated drug danger literature into seven languages. Recently, they had responded to an invitation from the local Korean community to make a presentation: 300 people had attended; questions and answers were handled through an interpreter. His program was maintaining contact with that community. Arthur Dean said the two key things that held his programs together were sustainability and cultural competency; people received training in the latter. Ellen Morehouse said cultural issues were of greater importance as diversity increased. She noted that most school districts were unionized; there were contractual limits on how many meetings teachers could be required to attend. She did not think the diversity issues were being addressed as well as they could be. Gus Frias said that, too often, school district actions followed on the receipt of federal resources; schools should be leading. At the same time, he noted that California had passed the California School Safety and Violence Act, but had attached no funding to it.

David Long commented that what impressed him was how, whatever the limits on funding, those in the education community managed to get things done. He traced this in part to the level of collaboration that occurred. He spoke of a recent outbreak of violence in his county; he had then spoken with Gus Frias and others on how to respond. No one, he noted, talked about money; the matter was addressed out of collegiality and shared concern. Long added that he had not met Gus Frias until this meeting.

* * *

THIRD PANEL PRESENTATION: Researcher and Evaluator Perspective

Panelists:

Peter Reuter – Professor, School of Public Policy, Department of Criminology, University of Maryland. Co-author: 'Options for Restructuring the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act,' Rand Drug Policy Research Center, 2001.

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

[Panelists in turn made presentations based on their written submissions.]

* * *

Third Panel -- Questions and Answers:

Hope Taft asked for the panel's advice on how the program might be made more attractive to Congress. Peter Reuter said that the researchers might not be the right group to ask. Zili Sloboda agreed, but added that Congress should know that its constituents very much wanted something done in this area. In the focus group with which she had been involved, school principals wanted the program, but did not know where to put it. What excited her about the effort was the joint federal-local effort being made; local districts, she added, don't have the wherewithal, so they look to the federal government for guidance. Peter Reuter identified a tension: on the one hand, Congress was attracted to the entitlement aspect of the program – everybody got something; on the other hand, the wide dispersion of funds made it difficult to show what was being accomplished. Hope Taft commented that the situation had reversed from five years ago: at that time, Congress had been enthusiastic about the program; local communities had not been. Now, it was Congress that was cool.

Sheppard Kellam noted that during earlier presentations, policy people had stressed the need to show effectiveness. To him, there seemed to be a big market for evaluation studies. However, when he listened to the researchers, it did not appear much research was being done. He believed that research and program people needed to create a new paradigm: demographic studies and randomized field trials done in highly select places were needed to produce the findings needed. This, he suggested, could be a marriage of mutual self-interest. Zili Sloboda said the creation of a uniform reporting system would help. She added that many people in public education regarded doing evaluations as punitive. She urged that reviews should be done of administrative operations, not of individual behavior.

Peter Reuter commented that the cost of evaluation could have a major impact on program budgets. He believed that longer term evaluations were needed: studies should not simply ask about initiation into drug use at age 16, but also at age 23. This, he said, would be very expensive research. The longer term question was: what is the status of the nation's drug problem? Chris Ringwalt urged that alcohol be included with drug use. With drugs, he said, use rates rise rapidly until the early 20s, and then flatten out. Alcohol use rates rose more slowly, he said, but continue to rise later in life. If the program was to demonstrate its effects to skeptical funding sources, then it would need to have data that followed young people into adulthood.

Frederick Ellis commented that, during the morning session, practitioners had cited statistics that made a very good case for expanding the program; now, the research panel was saying many programs are not effective. How did the researchers account for that difference? Peter Reuter suggested that, in part, the practitioners' reports reflected the general optimism bias that people apply to what they do. By saying the programs were ineffective, he added, he was saying that the measures they were relying on to demonstrate effectiveness were not reliable. He quoted economist James Heckman as saying: if an evaluation doesn't cost very much, don't expect much from it. Chris Ringwalt added that while the passion and enthusiasm shown at the local level made a difference, it was a difference difficult to measure. It may be, he added, that by the time a particular program was reviewed, the people running it did not have the passion and program fidelity of those who had founded it. To him, he said, it was not surprising that evaluations of such programs did not produce results that squared with what other practitioners believed in their hearts to be true.

Belinda Sims noted that presenters from the first two panels had suggested more options for prevention strategies than for prevention programs. Chris Ringwalt

responded that while he knew how to evaluate a program, he did not know how to evaluate a strategy. Effective and ineffective programs might employ the same strategy. Was a curriculum, he asked, just a concatenation of certain strategies, or was it more: a unity with a beginning, middle and end that should be presented with reference to how it was originally conceived. Zili Sloboda said she was torn on this issue. She believed in strategies: for example, she thought parents should be involved. There were, however, different steps involved to bringing parents in. Some were evidence-based; others were research-based. She felt the field was 'hung up' on poorly defined terminology, so that at times 'we talk across each other.'

Russell Jones asked how the most effective curriculum might be defined. Chris Ringwalt said the short answer was to go to the National Registry of Effective Programs [NREP]. Responding to a question from Jones, Ringwalt said that in his survey teachers had not been asked if they were using an effective strategy; rather, they were given a 'laundry list' of programs and asked to identify any they were in fact using. Russell Jones asked if the study showed if teachers were actually using the curricula they identified; Ringwalt said it did not.

Dennis Romero noted that Ringwalt had characterized the NREP as a 'consumers' guide' approach. Ringwalt said it made the consumer responsible for interpreting the information provided, while removing from the sponsoring agency any pressure from groups that believed they should have been on the list and were not. This, he added, meant that individual prevention teachers had to be educated in how to interpret and select from the options. Romero noted that Ringwalt had reported that 80 percent of schools were using a non-listed program; had Ringwalt been able to interpret the effectiveness of those non-listed programs? Ringwalt said he had not: the study merely determined who said they were using what. Romero said he had seen effective prevention programs that were not on the list. Ringwalt responded that it was difficult to measure the effectiveness of programs not on the list. Such evaluations took years to conduct; they were quite expensive, and if they were not done well, they would not be considered definitive.

David Long asked what had the Department of Education done to address the problem areas cited by Peter Reuter in his 2001 report. Deborah Price noted that the program had received an 'effective' rating, which was the lowest given. The Department had looked at the question: what needed to be done to demonstrate program effectiveness? How could the positive aspects of the program be demonstrated? One result was a grant to fund a long-term research project that looked at state data to permit understanding of what programs states were implementing and with what fidelity they were being used. She hoped the first half of that question would be answered by this fall; the information about fidelity would be available by spring/summer 2007. Price further commented that there were things it might seem logical for the program to do, but which its enabling legislation did not permit – e.g. the program was not permitted to mandate a reporting requirement. However, the program could develop a model data set and provide that to states for voluntary use.

Bill Modzeleski called attention to a study published in the June 2006 issue of *Social Influence*, which made the point that the way a question was framed influenced the answer received, i.e. if you ask people a positive question, you get a positive response. Modzeleski called attention to program changes since 1999: Just as many LEAs were receiving support [about 95 percent of all those in the country]; the average award had declined significantly; the program focus had expanded – first, in 1994 to include violence prevention; more recently, to include crisis prevention and avian influenza. He cited as 'good news' that the Principles of Effectiveness had been

developed in that time and were widely in use; he believed this had assisted in the development of more science-based programs. Modzeleski asserted that 'there is still a list out there' – NREP was not the only reference to which schools paid attention. Finally, Modzeleski said, compared to 1999 when Peter Reuter's research into the program had begun, a great deal more data was being developed by some states and at the federal level. Data-based decisions were being made. The program was developing a uniform data set; he hoped it would be adopted by the states, but the program could not require this.

Peter Reuter commented that the Rand study on which he had worked had been directed at Congress. He believed the State Grants Program was hamstrung by legislation that made it very difficult to be both effective and innovative. The 2001 re-authorization of the legislation was a chance to make changes; however, there had not then been much interest in Congress in undertaking major reforms.

* * *

FOURTH PANEL PRESENTATION: School Safety and Preparedness Perspective

Panelists:

Ed 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 Social Safety, Eastern Kentucky University

Cynthia Simmons – Director, Children of Promise Mentors of Hope, University of Oklahoma Outreach

[Panelists in turn made presentations based on their written submissions.]

* * *

Fourth panel -- Questions and answers:

Frederick Ellis said that, as one from the field of law enforcement, he was frustrated with the federal-level emphasis on prevention programs. To his mind, crime-fighting consisted of prevention, deterrence and enforcement. The program was not placing nearly enough emphasis on deterrence and enforcement, including the use of such technologies as student ID cards, video, etc. He noted that he had been urged to place bomb-resistant glass in his school's buildings. Those buildings were in aggregate 25 million square feet – four times the size of the Pentagon, which itself had not taken that step. The advice simply was not realistic. Measures took money: in Fairfax [Virginia] County, \$1.2 million had been expended to install two emergency generators in high schools.

Ed Ray expressed agreement, saying the situation was frustrating to those who approached it from the non-educational program side. The prime task he and others like him faced was to ensure the security of students, staff and facilities. Unless a

school district was a law enforcement entity [and a few school districts were], the schools had no access to Department of Justice or Homeland Security funds. The only funds available were from local taxes or the Department of Education. He noted an instance in which \$27,000 of computers was stolen; the theft had been caught by a video camera. That camera had allowed the recovery of the computers; otherwise, they would have been lost. Such technologies were critical, he said, but they were difficult to maintain and to be kept running on a 24/7 basis. Lorraine Allen commented that some school districts had sufficient funds to do student IDs, others did not.

Hope Taft noted that the program's title was Safe and Drug-Free Schools. How would those on the panel recommend that the program be changed? Cynthia Timmons urged that the 'territorial walls' dividing the fields of education, social work, juvenile justice and Homeland Security should be eliminated. Ed Ray stated that, foremost, he would urge acknowledgement that times had changed and that students today were generally experiencing higher stress levels. Further, he felt the fears of parents and teachers had to be acknowledged. He did not believe a good job was being done of this; many parents, he added, send their children off to school wondering if they would see them at the end of the day.

Jon Akers said that, too often, school administrators had the 'Jerry McGuire' sentiment: 'show me the money.' He urged that all the stakeholders be brought together and urged to think outside the box, state by state. He noted that no funds had been forthcoming from the Department of Homeland Security; still, in the event of a disaster, Homeland Security would come to him for emergency housing. Lorraine Allen said she was curious to know more about what was being done at federal level. She noted that many of the LEAs in her state were small, so they consolidated to make more effective use of funds. She suggested states with many small districts should do likewise. She suggested that the criteria by which schools were scored should be reviewed, to ensure that these criteria were aligned with program intentions. She said greater clarity was needed on common terminology; given phrases meant different things in different states. Hope Taft expressed agreement that having single definitions would be an advantage.

Sheppard Kellam said that a key to education was classroom management. He said that approximately half the first grade teachers in Baltimore did not have the tools to manage their classroom; the other half managed through an intuitive understanding of how it should be done. He asked those present to imagine children with attention difficulties coming into a class, and the teacher having no other response than to say: 'pay attention.' He believed classes that were inadequately managed produced most of the students with problems. He noted that schools of education were rarely discussed in conversations like the one this group was having; teachers, he thought, got far too little field experience before being given their own classroom. Jon Akers said he shared Kellam's frustration: he had spoken to all the deans of colleges of education in his state about the need for classes on behavior management, and had not found them responsive. He had, he said, been in the field for 30 years and had never had a class that covered such things as how to handle an angry parent. Things were not improving, he added; his son was now in the field and he also had never had such a class. Student populations had changed, he added; students were no longer greatly concerned that a call came home from a teacher. Lorraine Allen commented that there was a need to establish a common language, so that 'tardy' meant the same thing in one teacher's class as in another.

Donni LeBoeuf noted that all in-service training had to be done in accordance with union guidelines. Ed Ray reported that he had recently been through a round of union negotiations that focused on teacher responsibilities. Teachers, he said, had asked for additional training so they could be more pro-active. In the past, if teachers saw a fight break out, they would dive in. Now, the advice been given to teachers was: 'don't.' Teachers' unions, he said, take the position that their members should not be used as enforcement officers; individual teachers, however, want to know how better to handle situations that arise. The question had involved considerable negotiation with the teachers; his department's position had been: 'We will teach you what you need to know, but you have to allow for that to happen.'

Russell Jones asked Ray what percentage of his funds came from the Department of Education; Ray said less than five percent. Lorraine Allen said her program's entire budget came from Title IV. Jon Akers said his program had no federal funding other than grants through the Community Service Work project.

Russell Jones ended the session with an anecdote. In a casual conversation with a NASA scientist, he had learned that launch rockets were powered by gimbed engines, a term with which he was not familiar. He learned that gimbed was a way of tying multiple engines together so they produced maximum thrust and maximum efficiency. Jones thought this was analogous to what the States Grant Program and the advisory committee were undertaking.

[Session adjourned, Monday, August 21, 5 p.m.]

* * *

Session of Tuesday, August 22, 2006

OPENING STATEMENTS:

David Long called the committee's attention to its scheduled September 5, 2006 conference call and to the close-of-day September 8, 2006 deadline for submitting its recommendations to the Secretary of Education's office.

Deborah Price said the objective for September 8 was to supply to senior-level Department of Education personnel information about the SDFSCA State Grants Program, how well it appeared to be working, and what the advisory committee saw at its future. The committee's in-depth assessment would be submitted with its final report, due June 2007. Her own view, she stated, was that students feeling safe in school was a prerequisite to student achievement. She noted that while a number of Monday's presenters had stressed the need for increased funding, she thought it unlikely that Congress would increase the overall education budget. Further, she noted that if Congress were to undertake new initiatives in education, the funds to do so would likely come from existing programs. Therefore, she urged that the September 8 report highlight the program's significance, so that dollars allocated to it were not moved to fund another initiative. Additionally, she thought the September 8 report should tie the program to overall Department of Education goals, including continued implementation of No Child Left Behind, and should respond to the general requirement that, to receive continued funds, programs needed to present data that showed they were effective.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

Russell Jones asked Price if she was saying the committee could not seek additional funds. Price said she was not. Hope Taft said the program had been 'zeroed out' by the Department because of the review conducted by OMB. Price said all programs within the Department of Education were held to the same standard. The House of Representatives, she noted, had reduced program funding from \$347 million to \$310 million; she thought it unlikely that a House-Senate conference committee would increase funding. Mary Ann Solberg suggested including research data showing that school drug use contributed to low standardized test scores. Price responded that this was not at issue; what was at issue was the effectiveness of State Grants Program in curtailing drug use. Price said that suggesting ways to improve the program did not constitute a criticism of it; however, suggestions for improvement could not simply be requests for additional funds.

Bill Modzeleski said there was a major cause-and-effect issue. The group, on Monday, had heard data from the state and local panels showing a decline in drug use. However, there was no clear evidence that this decline was attributable to SFDS. Evaluations that might 'tease out' SFDS' role in this decline were very costly to undertake. He noted that both program and state data had gone to OMB, which had found that data insufficient to its standards. Sheppard Kellam said SFDS was an example of a more general question: how could one know if a social policy initiative was working? He believed the field was close to defining a structure through which researchers, social policy experts and educators could collaborate. Money was not the answer; restructuring was. The group should not be defensive; rather, it should take the view that it would undertake to address the difficult task of determining how well a social policy initiative worked.

Kim Dude said that, as a practitioner, she found the discussion frustrating. She believed a new paradigm of effectiveness was needed. If the group put 'all its eggs' into cause and effect, it would fail, as she doubted change was traceable to a single, specific action. Rather, she thought change came from multiple, reinforcing actions. She said she felt prevention efforts were at a disadvantage: standardized academic tests produced very measurable results; prevention could not be similarly measured. She said that during Monday's session, having heard statements of success from the state and local panels, she had been angered when the research panelists had declared the program ineffective.

Hope Taft said she believed that, at times, SFDS was held to a different standard. She reported having read a statement by a former White House official involved with faith-based initiatives that Catholic Charities had been unable to show their Head Start programs were successful; she noted that not all Head Start programs send in evaluative reports. She suggested that evaluation might focus on the wrong thing: one national study on adolescents had called attention to the importance of connectedness to school and connectedness to family as factors that reduced teen drug use. Deborah Price said she thought this was a good point. She added, however, that the OMB process was in place. Congress, she added, often had its own concerns. She cited Head Start as an example of this: evaluations aside, Head Start was a program Congress wished to support; similarly, Congress had funded the State Grants Program even after the OMB review questioned its effectiveness.

[Discussion paused for the Public Comments portion of the agenda.]

* * *

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Laurie Johnson, Washington State Department of Education, presented written comments from Dr. Ellen Morehouse, who had appeared as a panelist the previous day: In those comments, Morehouse said she wished to respond to the discrepancy between the positive program findings by state and local practitioners and the negative findings of researchers. Evidence was presented of use in Westchester [New York] County of Project Success, which Morehouse described as being 'on the list,' and of use at the high school level of an alcohol-related program that had been named a model in its field. Further, she noted that Chris Ringwalt's study was limited to middle schools, even though elementary and high schools were common users of SDFS funds; she cited Life Skills Training as an effective program generally employed below the middle school level.

Penny Deevers Traywick noted that, among various roles, she was currently the representative of the governor of Alabama on that state's Safe and Drug-Free Schools committee. She said she had heard reference to student assistance programs. She wished those present to know that such programs were a framework through which social and academic resources were delivered to schools. Nine components were involved – school board policy, staff development, program awareness, internal referral, problem solving, case management, student evaluation, education support groups and collaboration and support of community groups. She noted that the program's executive director, Lee Rush, had attended the Monday session, but had been unable to return today.

* * *

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION – CONTINUED

David Long urged that, for the remainder of the session, committee members develop a framework that considered two broad questions. First: what is the function of schools? What are we trying to accomplish in education? How should we prioritize those things? Second: How is this to be delivered? Should this be for everyone? Should we review the formula for disbursing funds?

Russell Jones said he was grateful to OMB for maintaining accountability of how funds were spent on behalf of children. He did not believe cause and effect could always be demonstrated. He noted that Einstein, asked if light was wave or particle, had replied 'both.' Both empirical research and evaluation existed: however, researchers, clinicians, and grassroots people should not be evaluated to the same standard.

Michael Pimentel commented that he had a daughter who had Multiple Sclerosis and that it appalled him when people referred to her as a statistic. He believed statistics needed to be kept at the local level, where small successes meant a great deal. For him, the question was how the group could look at the future of State Grants without clouding itself with the operational characteristics, which he felt should be left to the local communities.

Tommy Ledbetter asked about the phrase 'safe and drug free.' If a school had to be drug free to be safe, then perhaps no safe schools existed, as it was likely none were entirely drug free. He noted that 15 years ago, the drug focus was on alcohol and marijuana; today, it extended to cocaine, heroin and falsely obtained prescription drugs. Second, Ledbetter reported that after Monday's session, he had spoken with Chris Ringwalt, who in Monday's session had reported that few schools were using drug education programs from the approved list. Ringwalt had confirmed that some programs would be added to the list and others dropped, and, following from this, that some programs not on the list at the time they were used were more effective than some that were. This being the case, Ledbetter said, how was it possible to say how often ineffective programs had been used? Additionally, Ledbetter commented that perhaps local State Grants recipients could secure matching funds. He noted that, in his view, any school in which drug use was not increasing and in which school safety levels remained the same constituted a success. As a building administrator, he believed academic performance goals came first; however, meeting those goals required a safe and drug-free environment.

Deborah Price said that, to her, a 'safe' school meant much more than a 'drug free' school; it was a comprehensive word for an environment in which children felt secure. Hope Taft commented that when one considered what goes into making a child a competent, caring, responsible adult, research showed that it was not the program, but the person in charge of that program that mattered most.

Belinda Sims made reference to Peter Reuter's report, and asked what had been done since 2001 to improve those areas the report had criticized, e.g. administrative ineffectiveness, the lack of targeting of resources and inadequate efforts at improving program capacity. Second, she asked about the transferability of funds across Titles.

Deborah Price, responding to the second point, said NCLB allowed school districts to transfer some Title IV funds to either Title I or Title V. Funds so transferred become subject to the spending criteria of the Titles into which they have been transferred. Districts were not required to report that they have made this transfer. Bill Modzeleski said that, in practice, only very limited funds had been transferred in this way. Responding to Sim's first point, Modzeleski outlined departmental efforts to improve the State Grants Program. These included \$10 million a year spent on training; a discretionary grants program to improve data collection; newsletters; best practice reporting, and other steps.

Returning to earlier discussion, Modzeleski said no 'approved list' existed; rather, different agencies had different lists. A list of programs that had some degree of research supporting their effectiveness was made available; school districts were urged to choose one. He believed that, at the school level, SFDS was less about curriculum than about mentoring, and as much about the commitment of time as the commitment of money. One needed step was to move away from programmatic 'silos' to broader-based programs that addressed the range of problems young people face. His own view was that educators were ahead of researchers, due to the time lag inherent in research. This, he added, prompted the question of how researchers could be brought along. Practitioners needed to inform researchers of what was important to them.

Sheppard Kellam said Monday's report on research did not connect with the advisory group; to him, this underscored that the research establishment was unaware of the questions those in the field needed to have answered. He believed practice should drive research. He felt an opportunity existed to create a new structure. The group should say: safe and drug-free schools are vital; socializing children is related to self-esteem; we must focus on developmental trajectories and get in early. This, he said, could not be done from an ivory tower. As part of this, child welfare efforts and public health efforts should be better connected to school districts.

Mary Ann Solberg expressed agreement. She asked when a further score was expected from OMB. Deborah Price said February 2007. Solberg commented that multiple federal programs – e.g. the Drug Free Communities Support Program -- had functions similar to SDFS. Could representatives of such programs be invited to present on how they did evaluation? She urged SDFS be in contact with other federal agencies; it appeared everyone was 'reinventing the wheel.' Better collaboration was needed: Ohio and Washington seemed to be doing great things, but some other states were struggling. Russell Jones seconded this. He said every state university had graduate programs with researchers who would welcome the opportunity to become engaged with SDFS. Further, he suggested creating partnerships that would allow SDFS to tie into Homeland Security and other funding.

Mary Ann Solberg noted that over time SDFS' scope had been enlarged, while funds had been decreased. She believed issues such as terrorism or hurricane response should be funded from other departments, not education. Deborah Price commented that the relevant legislation gave SDFS its mandate in drugs, alcohol and crisis planning; the program's appropriation existed to address these issues as provided by law. The purpose of the current review, she added, was to assess the value of the existing program. Montean Jackson commented that, for her, SFDS had for over a decade been the major player in providing the additional supports schools needed; often, she added, school was the only place a given child might feel safe.

[Break]

* * *

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION – CONTINUED

David Long, reconvening the session, said the purpose was not to reach set conclusions, but to allow views to come together in preparation for the pending conference call. He added that, in listening to the discussion, he thought the 'elephant in the room' was that the circumstance was political. Ultimately, the program was subject to a vote by Congress. The advisory committee should be aware of this and should frame its position in a way that would make it easy for Congress to endorse.

Hope Taft said the group needed to return to basics. The drug-free program was initiated in the late 1980s; then it became 'safe and drug-free.' Congress had been aware of the influence of drugs and alcohol on safety. She believed a definition of what was meant by 'safety' was needed. Second, she said that if anything was done to undermine the passion of people at the local level, funding would not compensate. The committee must show support for local efforts and how those efforts tie to academic achievement. Perhaps the funding formula should be altered to create

incentives at the local level for such things as collaboration, securing of matching funds, in-kind services, etc. Perhaps, she added, funds from Drug-Free Communities Grants and other programs could be dovetailed. People on the local level, she said, got frustrated by doing multiple reports for the same money. Mary Ann Solberg expressed agreement with Hope Taft's views. Russell Jones agreed that a definition of safety was needed.

Howell Wechsler referenced the previous day's statements by researchers that program funds were spread too thin; should, he asked, the practice of giving grants to every school district be maintained? David Long suggested that this might be the first point to address. Tommy Ledbetter noted the following: program funds were said to be spread too thin; existing programs wanted more money; federal appropriation was declining. Perhaps, districts wishing to receive SDFS funds should face a matching requirement. As an example, he cited school systems in the Huntsville, Alabama area that had created a partnership program with the local Chamber of Commerce.

Russell Jones endorsed this approach. Kim Dude said many districts would drop out of the program if matching funds were required. Commonly, she said, the SDFS program might be just one of many tasks for which the local director was responsible. David Long said it was an issue of leadership and a responsibility of the superintendent: if someone offered his district \$500,000 provided it was matched, he would contact business, foundation and other leaders to make sure the money was raised. Kim Dude responded that in many districts, such leadership did not exist. Hope Taft suggested that allowance be made for in-kind contributions. Russell Jones said it was a matter of teaching people to market their passions. Kim Dude said that, at present, she spent much of her time raising money, rather than running the program. Program officers, she said, commonly wore many hats. She said that in many instances, regrettably, support would be forthcoming only if there was a student death. Hope Taft said that at one time, every drug-free school was required to have a community advisory committee; such committees could be the vehicle for fundraising. Perhaps that requirement should be re-instituted. Montean Jackson said that in Alaska many districts were rural and did not have local businesses or others from which matching funds might be sought. Russell Jones said people interested in the problem needed to become empowered.

Bill Modzeleski said SDFS' experience with matching funds had not been good. He believed that rather than solicit funds, it was better to establish partnerships. Tommy Ledbetter said that if he was offered money that required matching, he would find the match. If a program could not match funds, this suggested the program was not viewed as important. Mary Ann Solberg said she identified with Kim Dude's concern. She noted, however, that she was involved with a Drug-Free Communities program that required a \$100,000 match. Early on, she said, the match had been largely in-kind; as the program matured, however, partnerships developed and an increasing share of the match came in money. The program, she said, did not just change the school, it also changed the community; as this was recognized, community support increased.

Howell Wechsler noted that if a district matched \$1,000, then the \$2,000 it had was still an amount which OMB and the researchers had said was too small to be effective. Hope Taft said that in Ohio, schools receiving the lowest amounts of money were doing the best at getting local matches. David Long noted that, as a

political point, Congress welcomed programs that drew in involvement from companies and communities.

Sheppard Kellam expressed reservations about partnering: the effectiveness of partnerships depended on how they were structured and how mutual self-interest was defined. The partnership that was missing, he said, was one that could bring research into practice. He said researchers partnering with schools needed to understand the schools' mission and how that mission could be assisted; too often, he added, research partners came in with a 'snake oil' they tried to impose on overworked administrators. He noted that school districts found that association with research partners was an aid in securing funds. He urged that the highest priority – perhaps, classroom management – be identified, with efforts targeted there. He stressed the importance of information systems; particularly, statewide assessment systems that follow children from school to school. He said he believed SDFS could take the initiative in this area.

Kim Dude asked if it the committee could recommend that teacher preparation include basic information on alcohol and drugs; people with no training in prevention were being expected to implement prevention programs. Deborah Price said the Department of Education was not permitted to mandate requirements for teacher education.

Deborah Price noted that the finding that funds were too thinly spread to support quality had been made even before funding had been reduced. This needed to be addressed. Should the 80/20 funding split between districts and the state governors' offices be continued? Should all funds go directly to states for them to allocate? Clearly, she said, some districts had done good work with small amounts of money, but this was not generally the case.

David Long suggested that a series of questions might be compiled, with advisory committee members responding by email. Sheppard Kellam asked if committee members could suggest questions. Long responded that they could. Hope Taft offered a 'plug' for universality; addiction was a universal problem and she regarded it as unethical to leave anyone out. Deborah Price expressed agreement. If, however, funds were given to districts that did not make good use of them, those funds were being taken away from more effective programs.

David Long said, in closing, that he was deeply appreciative of the group's participation and its passion for children.

[The meeting adjourned, Tuesday, August 22, 11:30 a.m.]

Appendix A:

*Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee
Members*

David Long (Chairman)

Superintendent
Riverside County Public Schools

Kim Dude

Director of the Wellness Resource Center
University of Missouri-Columbia

Frederick E. Ellis

Director
Office of Safety and Security
Fairfax County Public Schools

Montean Jackson

Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinator
Fairbanks North Star Borough School District

Russell T. Jones

Professor of Psychology
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Department of Psychology

Sheppard Kellam

Director
Center for Integration Education
and Prevention Research in Schools
American Institutes for Research

Tommy Ledbetter

Principal
Buckhorn High School

Seth Norman

Judge of the Division IV Criminal Court
Davidson County Drug Court

Michael Pimentel

Chief
San Antonio Independent School District Police

Hope Taft

First Lady of the State of Ohio

Deborah A. Price

Assistant Deputy Secretary
Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools
U.S. Department of Education

Appendix A: continued

J. Robert Flores*

Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
US Department of Justice

Ralph Hingson *

Director
Division of Epidemiology and Prevention Research Branch
National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism

Susan Key*

Chief
Prevention Initiatives and Priority Programs Branch
Division of Prevention, Traumatic Stress and Special Programs
Center for Mental Health Services
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
Health and Human Service

Dennis Romero

Acting Center Director
Center for Substance Abuse and Prevention
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
Health and Human Service

Belinda E. Sims

Prevention Research Branch
Division of Epidemiology, Services and Prevention Research
National Institute on Drug Abuse
National Institute of Health

Mary Ann Solberg

Deputy Director
Executive Office of the President
Office of National Drug Control Policy

Howell Wechsler

Director of Division of Adolescent and School Health
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

* Not present, August 21-22, 2006 session

Appendix B:

Meeting Attendees

August 21-22, 2006

Jon Akers, Executive Director, Kentucky Center for School Safety, Richmond, Kentucky
Lorraine Allen, Director, Office of Safe Schools, Florida Department of Education,
Tallahassee, Florida
Jeff Barber, SDFS Coordinator, Indiana Department of Education, Indianapolis, Indiana
John Bynoe, Associate Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Education, Malden,
Massachusetts
General Arthur Dean, Chairman & CEO, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America [CADCA],
Alexandria, Virginia
Kim Dude, Director, Wellness Resource Center, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia,
Missouri
Frederick Ellis, Director, Office of Safety and Security, Fairfax County Public Schools, Fairfax,
Virginia
Gus Frias, Coordinator, School Safety Programs, Los Angeles County Office of Education,
Downey, California
Mike Herrmann, Executive Director, Office of School Health, Safety & Learning Support,
Tennessee Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee
Montean Jackson, Safe and Drug-Free Schools Coordinator, Fairbanks North Star Borough
School District, Fairbanks, Alaska
Mona Johnson, Program Supervisor, Office of Superintendent for Public Instruction for
Washington State, Olympia, Washington
Clarence Jones, Coordinator, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Fairfax County Public Schools, Falls
Church, Virginia
Dr. Russell Jones, Professor of Psychology, Virginia Polytechnic and State University,
Blacksburg, Virginia
Dr. Sheppard Kellam, Director, Center for Integration Education and Prevention Research in
Schools, American Institutes for Research, Baltimore, Maryland
Donni LeBoeuf, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department
of Justice, Washington, D.C.
Tommy Ledbetter, Principal, Buckhorn High School, New Market, Alabama
Dr. David Long, Superintendent, Riverside County Public Schools, Riverside, California
Ellen Morehouse, Executive Director, Student Assistance Services Corporation, Tarrytown, New
York
Judge Seth Norman, Judge of the Division IV Criminal Court, Davidson County Drug Court,
Nashville, Tennessee
Deborah Price, Assistant Deputy Secretary, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
Michael Pimentel, Chief, San Antonio Independent School District Police Department, San
Antonio, Texas
Ed Ray, Chief, Safety and Security Department, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colorado
Dr. Peter Reuter, Professor, School of Public Policy, University of Maryland, College Park,
Maryland
Dr. Chris Ringwalt, Senior Research Scientist, Pacific Institute for Research and
Evaluation – Chapel Hill Center, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
Dennis Romero, Acting Center Director, Center for Substance Abuse and Prevention,
SAMHSA, Atlanta, Georgia
Dr. Belinda Sims, Health Scientist Administrator, National Institute on Drug Abuse at NIH,
Rockville, Maryland
Dr. Zili Slobada, Senior Research Associate, Institute for Health and Social Policy,
University of Akron, Akron, Ohio
Mary Ann Solberg, Deputy Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Washington, D.C.

Appendix B: continued

Hope Taft, First Lady of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio

Cynthia Timmons, Director, Children of Promise-Mentors of Hope, Norman, Oklahoma

Dr. Howell Wechsler, Director, Division of Adolescent and School Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Catherine Davis, Chief of Staff, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

William Modzeleski, Associate Assistant Deputy Secretary, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, U.S. Department of Education, Washington D.C.