U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 20, 2007

The Advisory Committee met in the Barnard Auditorium, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., David Long, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT

DAVID LONG, Chairman
DEBORAH PRICE
KIM DUDE
FREDERICK ELLIS
MIKE HERMANN
MONTEAN JACKSON
RUSSELL JONES
SHEPPARD KELLUM
SUSAN KEYS
TOMMY LEDBETTER
MICHAEL PIMENTEL
DENNIS ROMERO
BELINDA SIMS
HOPE TAFT
HOWELL WECHSLER

Also Present:
Donni LeBoeuf, representing Robert Flores of the US Department of Justice

Catherine Davis, Designated Federal Officer and Executive Director of the Committee

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
(202) 234-4433   WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701   www.nealrgross.com

I-N-D-E-X

```
1              P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2                                              (9:05 a.m.)
3              MR. LONG: Good morning everyone.  We'll go ahead
4  and get started.  Catherine, do you have any word, I might ask, regarding
5  Shep and Dennis and Bob?
6              MS. PRICE: Bob Flores?  I think Donni is here.
7  Donni, if you want to --
8              MR. LONG: Okay.  I just wondered.  We have three or
9  four not here.  I'm just wondering.  No?  Okay.
10             The one thing that I want to mention because of the
11 change, as you saw from your agenda and what we'll be doing this
12 afternoon, I want to announce to the public and the two of you sitting out
13 there that there has been a change, and this meeting will conclude this
14 morning at 12:30, and then we will resume tomorrow morning at 8:30,
15 and the meeting tomorrow will not be in this room, but rather back down
16 the hallway in the training room.  So tomorrow, 8:00 to 8:30 for the
17 breakfast, and we'll resume that meeting then down in the training room,
18 but wanted to make that announcement for the record.
19             And Debbie, do you have anything that you want to say
20 as we start?
21             MS. PRICE: Actually, no.
22             MR. LONG: Okay.  Okay.  I trust that we'll have a
23 better time getting home this time than we did last time.  As I look around,
24 I know a lot of people were in various airports across the country for
25 varying lengths of time, and I wanted to announce the winner of the time,
26 and that was Michael over here, who had the opportunity to spend the
27 entire evening, I do believe in the -- was it in the Dallas airport?
28             MR. PIMENTEL: Yes, I wrote the second version of
29 Tom Hanks' *The Terminal*.  It was fun.
30             MR. LONG: But it has been difficult with air travel.
31 We all understand that.  So if we could move to the second section,
32 Review of "Building on Results: A Blueprint for Strengthening the No
33 Child Left Behind Act" --
34             MS. PRICE: Do you want me to introduce her for you?
35             MR. LONG: Yes.
36             MS. PRICE: I'd be happy to introduce Holly Kuzmich.
37  Holly Kuzmich is the Deputy Chief of Staff here at the Department, and
38 prior to that she was in the Office of Policy and -- Planning -- there's too
39 many Ps.  OPEPD is how we say it. And before that she was over in the
40 White House in the Office of Domestic Policy Counsel, and before that,
41 we worked together in the Senate.
42             So Holly has had a lot of input on the budget, she's
43 going to give us a review of the budget and the blueprint that they have
44 put forward regarding a perspective on reauthorization.
45             Holly?
```

1   MS. KUZMICH: Well, they're checking out my microphone. Hold on just a second. There we go.

All right. Good morning. I'm going to give an overview. This was our NCLB policy book that we put out about a month ago. It was actually put out right before the budget, so this is our reauthorization policy for the No Child Left Behind reauthorization this year.

And like in previous years, we have done this as a blueprint. Instead of doing a laundry list of legislative changes that we're sending to the Hill, we wanted to go over kind of our key areas that we're looking at in reauthorization and our key proposals for the reauthorization.

One thing I will say, unlike 2001, when we did a very comprehensive rewrite of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, this year we haven't proposed changes to every program in No Child Left Behind. There are some things you won't see in this blueprint, some areas of the law, and, you know, we did that for a reason. We really just wanted to put kind of our key proposals and key changes that we were seeking in reauthorization into our blueprint.

So there are several programs in No Child Left Behind that you don't even see us mention in here. It doesn't mean we don't support them. It doesn't mean we actually might not be looking at technical changes to the program, but we're not looking at any major changes that we as an administration are pushing.

A good example of that -- and it doesn't mean that there won't be discussion around it when we work with Congress on reauthorizing the law. A good example of that is Title II and all of the things around highly qualified teacher.

We have not made any specific changes, and you don't see us say a whole lot about that piece of the law in this, but we know there will be significant conversation around that issue in particular when we work with Congress, and we'll be happy to engage with them then. But in terms of things that are important to us, we wanted to stay around a couple of thematic areas in our reauthorization proposal.

And this policy book that we put out, it came out about two weeks before the budget, but once that budget came out you could see very much where our reauthorization policy and our budget policy lined up in many ways in terms of how we were allocating resources among programs under No Child Left Behind.

And we organized our policy book around five key themes. The first of those is reiterating our commitment to getting all kids to grade level in reading and math by 2014.

I'm staying true to the core principles of the law. We know there's going to be a lot of discussion and debate about that this year, but we really wanted to take a strong stand and say that we want to

1   keep that 2014 time line in terms of getting all kids on grade level in
2   reading and math.
3   We think that annual assessments continue to be
4   important. States now -- all 50 states are giving annual assessments in
5   reading and math in grades three through eight.
6   We want to continue to disaggregate that data by
7   student subgroup, and so those key themes are very important to us as we
8   move forward in this law, and we're going to vigorously defend those
9   pieces of the law.
10   The one new piece in this kind of first them is there's a
11 lot of discussion this year around national standards and assessments and
12 the difference between states in how high or low they set their state
13 standards, and we are once again reiterating our commitment to states to
14 set those standards and their assessments, but we do talk about more
15 transparency around state assessments and how they align to NAEP.
16   As you know, NAEP is now given every two years in
17 reading and math in all 50 states, and so one thing we've asked is that
18 when states do report cards that they put both their NAEP scores and their
19 state assessment scores on their report card so people can see how their
20 state standards line up to NAEP. It's purely a transparency tool for the
21 public to know, and we think that the appropriate place to have a debate
22 about the level of standards is within states.
23   The next area we talk about is flexibility for innovation
24 and improvement, and one of the biggest proposals here is the notion of a
25 grown model measuring individual student progress from year to year, as
26 opposed to measuring cohorts of students over time.
27   We have started a pilot here at the Department already
28 allowing some states to use a growth model. We've got five states right
29 now who are in that pilot and using a growth model, North Carolina,
30 Tennessee, Arkansas, Delaware, and Florida.
31   But to do those pilots, we had to give waivers here at
32 the Department, and so we want to embed that principle into the law and
33 allow states to use a growth model if they meet certain core principles
34 including being able to track individual student progress, having a strong
35 data system, disaggregating their data, keeping that 2014 time line.
36   Those are important parameters for states in using a
37 growth model, and what we would essentially say is any state that can
38 meet those core principles would be able to do that under No Child Left
39 Behind.
40   The other idea that we talk about in this section of the
41 law is this notion that, right now under No Child Left Behind, if you miss
42 your adequate yearly progress targets it doesn't matter by how much you
43 miss them. You're still identified as a school in need of improvement,
44 and we've learned a lot of things over the past five years.
45   We now have really good data about schools. We

know that some schools are persistently low performing and are missing all of their targets. We know some schools are just missing in one particular category, and we want to be able to differentiate among those schools and target interventions more specifically in those schools.

If a school is just having a problem with one subgroup, they really probably need to only be focusing their tutoring and interventions on that subgroup. If they have more widespread problems across their school, they should be focusing on all of the students in their school.

And so we talk about this notion of prioritized support and allowing states to set up a model to differentiate among those schools, and we've given some flexibility in how we talk about it here, because we want to hear from states in terms of how they would propose to do this. There's a lot of different ways that states could choose to do this, so we want to have that discussion as we reauthorize the law.

The other thing we want to do is expand the transferability piece of the law that allows states and districts to move funding between formula programs to address, you know, local needs from year to year. And then the last piece under this is the safe and drug free schools portion, which, of course, you are all most interested in.

What we wanted to do in this piece is, as you know, the state grants program we have not included in our budget for the past several years because of the funding formula and how ineffectively it gets money out to districts across the country.

And so what we did in our reauthorization proposal is said, you know, we do understand the need to continue funding to states and to give them the ability to provide technical assistance and training and best practices to districts in their state.

And what we've done is, instead of zeroing out that state grants program, we've now refashioned it as a program that goes solely to states. It is no longer a formula that goes down to each district across the country.

It would be a formula grant to every state, so every state would receive funding, and they could use it for a whole host of activities, either at the state level, or they could provide some sub-grants to high-need districts as they see fit.

That would be at the discretion of each state in terms of whether they want to sub-grant their money and how much of that money they want to sub-grant, or they could use it all for state level activities, including technical assistance and training and building stronger data systems.

I think something we have seen over the past several years is, you know, states are doing a lot in this area with the, you know, nine percent federal investment that we have in education. We need to target our dollars where we think we can have the maximum impact, and

1   so we decided that was at the state level and to give states the discretion as
2   to how they want to target that funding within their state and what
3   priorities they have within their state, be it school safety and emergency
4   crisis planning or drug and alcohol programs within their state.

5   The other thing we did is our national programs, which
6   are, you know, competitive programs to districts across the country. We
7   align those around four key areas, and those are emergency planning,
8   preventing violence and drug use, school culture and climate, and
9   emerging needs.

10   And so we are really trying to categorize those
11   programs more carefully around the issues we see at the federal level and
12   provide larger grants to districts to do research-based practice within their
13   districts.

14   So the state grants are for more the TA and the training
15   and the data systems, and then our larger national activities grants aligned
16   around those four activities are to develop model programs and best
17   practices across the country and be able to give large enough grants to do
18   research-based practices within those districts.

19   So that's how we've gone at the Safe and Drug Free
20   Schools Program. We have not -- I will say one thing we have not talked
21   about, partly because we have not come up with a great solution, is the
22   issue of persistently dangerous schools, and I know you have all struggled
23   with that issue and tried to tackle that issue. It probably will come up
24   during reauthorization, so, you know, as you keep discussing this issue
25   and have ideas on that, we'd be interested in hearing them.

26   You know, as we started to think about it, it's a tough
27   issue, because if we don't have good data systems at the state, it's harder to
28   come up with a fair definition of persistently dangerous schools and tackle
29   that issue, and so we'll continue to be talking about that issue.

30   The third area that we talk about in our reauthorization
31   proposal is the issue of competitiveness in high schools. It's something
32   we have talked about for several years now and have included several
33   pieces in our reauthorization proposal.

34   We are asking states to use the NGA four-year
35   graduation rate, which all states have actually voluntarily signed on to, but
36   there's no kind of deadline for when they have to implement that. So we
37   would make that a part of the law.

38   Right now states get to set their own graduation rates
39   and define it how they would like, which means that in some states they
40   don't very accurately report the number of ninth graders who then actually
41   graduate four years later. So we have inflated graduation rates. We want
42   a truer picture of what's happening across the country in terms of
43   graduation rates.

44   We also are asking states to get with their higher
45   education community and develop standards and assessments that are

1 aligned to what kids need to know and be able to do when they enter
2 college or the workplace and create assessments around those.
3 We would not ask those to be part of the accountability
4 system. They're purely to raise the level of rigor in high school and give
5 kids accurate information about how they're doing in high school and
6 whether they're prepared for college and the work force, and it's a trend
7 that we've started to see some states already doing, and we want to see all
8 states across the country doing this. We also provide incentives for AP
9 teacher training across the country. This was actually a proposal we
10 announced last year to train additional teachers in low income high
11 schools across the country. Forty percent of high schools don't offer any
12 advanced placement classes. They're usually low income high schools, so
13 we want to expand that.
14 The other thing that we do is right now under the Title I
15 formula districts get to choose how to target schools within their district,
16 which schools to serve under the Title I program.
17 Usually that money is focused on elementary and
18 middle schools, and so we put a new infusion in our budget of funding
19 into Title I that is solely dedicated to high schools to get a proportional
20 share of funding to high schools across the country. So we've got an
21 additional $1.2 billion in our budget to really tackle the issue of high
22 schools and high school reform.
23 The next piece is about helping teachers close the
24 achievement gap. These are all the content pieces of the law. It's a
25 continuation of the Reading First program, which provides research-based
26 reading instruction in grades K through three.
27 It's the Striving Readers Program, which is research-
28 based reading in middle and high schools. It's our Math Now Program.
29 We have our National Math Panel currently at work looking at research-
30 based practices in math instruction, and that would fund grants to districts
31 for research-based math instruction in elementary and middle schools.
32 And then the last piece is science assessments, which
33 are currently required under No Child Left Behind and go into effect in
34 the `07-`08 school year. We would ask that those be included in the
35 accountability system with the target of having all kids on grade level by
36 the year 2020.
37 The last piece of this is an extension of a program that
38 we started last year called the Teacher Incentive Fund. This is the one
39 area of the proposal that we do talk a little bit about teachers.
40 This Teacher Incentive Fund provides funding to
41 school districts and states to reform their compensation models and to do
42 incentive-based pay within their districts, both for teachers who are
43 effective in the classroom and for those moving into high needs schools
44 and high needs subjects like math and science.
45 We stated to give out grants last year, and it's been a

1   very popular program. It's getting to this notion of instead of looking at
2   inputs in a highly qualified teacher, looking more at the outputs in the
3   highly effective teacher, and it's a discussion we're hearing a lot about.
4   Some people are going to take this farther than we are.
5   We don't think we quite yet have the data systems within states to be able
6   to measure teacher effectiveness and how that should be defined, so we're
7   going to continue to fund model programs and hopefully move us down
8   that path.
9   The last piece is some of our kind of boldest ideas
10 under the law.   It's around the issue of school improvement and
11 restructuring and parental options, and it's partly, you know, lessons that
12 we've learned over the past five years with all the data that we now have
13 under No Child Left Behind.
14   We know, obviously, which schools are in need of
15 improvement and which schools need the most help. We've got about
16 1,800 schools in restructuring across the country. That's out of about
17 95,000 schools overall, so about two percent are these schools that have
18 not made AYP for five straight years.
19   We know those are the ones that need the most
20 assistance, so we've put additional funding in our budget and expanded
21 the School Improvement Fund, which provides formula grants to states to
22 target schools in need of improvement, especially those in restructuring
23 within their state.
24   The other thing that we want to do is reform the idea of
25 -- reform, you know, clarify this issue of restructuring. Five years ago
26 when we first authorized NCLB, we didn't really have schools in
27 restructuring. We didn't know who they were and what they looked like
28 and what kinds of things they were doing, and, like I said, we now have
29 about 1,800 schools. We know who they are.
30   We've had schools that have gone through
31 restructuring, and one thing we've seen is that right now under current
32 law, there's five options for how to restructure your school, and that last
33 option is any other form of restructuring, and that's the one that 87 percent
34 of schools are choosing, so we don't really know what they're doing.
35 They're probably not doing very much to actually restructure their school.
36   We are proposing to take that option away and really
37 beef up the other options under the law, which include state takeover. We
38 would actually allow mayoral takeover within that, too.
39   We've seen that, obviously, in New York City with
40 Mayor Bloomberg, and we're seeing that in L.A. and, obviously, a
41 discussion right here in Washington about that now.
42   We would allow schools -- currently the law allows
43 them to become a charter. The one thing that we would say is that there
44 are some states where superintendent want to be able to restructure a
45 school and turn it into a charter, but they have a cap in their state, and they

1   can't do it. And so in that specific case where a school is in restructuring,
2   and a superintendent chooses to do this, we would allow them to disregard
3   that cap and still turn the school into a charter school.

4   One of the other options is turning it over to some sort
5   of private or non-profit management organization. Under the law we
6   would continue that, and the other piece that's currently in law is replacing
7   school staff, and we want to beef up this provision. This one has been in
8   the news a lot lately. It's gotten a lot of attention.

9   There's superintendents who want to be able to replace
10 school staff, move staff around, put in effective teachers into their highest
11 needs schools, but because of their collective bargaining agreements, they
12 cannot do so. So we would give the superintendent the option of moving
13 teachers in and out of a school in restructuring.

14   It would solely supercede that piece of the collective
15 bargaining agreement and actually make this option real. Unfortunately,
16 this option isn't real for a lot of superintendents, because that collective
17 bargaining agreement stands in the way of moving teachers within their
18 schools.

19   The other piece of the reauthorization proposal here is
20 improving our supplemental services program and the tutoring under the
21 law. We would allow additional funding for students with disabilities,
22 LEP students, and students in rural areas.

23   We know those are often the hardest serve through our
24 SES program, so we would allow an increase per pupil amount for those
25 students to get providers -- to give providers more of an incentive to serve
26 them.

27   We would allow districts to actually set aside a piece of
28 that Title I funding to run the program. Right now we don't actually allow
29 them to set aside any money to administer the SES program, which makes
30 it difficult for a district, so we would allow them to keep some of that
31 money to the side to do parental outreach and actually administer the
32 program.

33   The other thing that we would do is we've seen a lot of
34 districts who don't do the best job outreaching to parents. They know that
35 if they don't spend their 20 percent set-aside that they're supposed to keep
36 for public school choice in SES it will roll back to the district.

37   And in some districts we've seen a good job on
38 outreach, and they are spending their 20 percent, or even if they're not,
39 they're doing a good job outreaching to parents and getting the word out.

40   What we want to say is they need to spend that entire
41 20 percent, or it's going to roll back to the state level to try and incentive
42 districts to do a good job in parental outreach.

43   If they can prove they've done a good job, and they still
44 haven't spent their 20 percent, they would be able to keep that funding, but
45 we really want to try and get the word out about that program. We're

1   really just now kind of starting to figure out best practices around SES and
2   how to get the word out to parents and get parents to sign up for this
3   program.
4   So those are the key pieces we've dealt with in our
5   policy book. Obviously, as I said, there's a lot of other pieces that are not
6   included here that will still be part of reauthorization and still get a
7   significant amount of discussion, including all the other kind of titles of
8   the law. So we will be talking about all of those, and they will be part of
9   reauthorization, but this is really where we focused our efforts at the
10   federal level.
11   And I've talked a little bit about the budget and how it
12   weaves in here. You know, the places where we've put our increased
13   funding under No Child Left Behind are around the high school issue,
14   around the school improvement. We increased our funding for the School
15   Improvement Fund, around school choice, where we've put some money
16   in that under the restructuring proposal, and then some other smaller
17   pieces here and there.
18   You know, we have to -- obviously, we will always
19   have a discussion about resources with Congress every time we do a
20   reauthorization, and we will this year, too. So this is our starting point for
21   going and talking to the Hill on reauthorization, and I'm sure we'll end up
22   someplace different in several months, but we're going to work hard to get
23   this done this year.
24   Hopefully, over the next several months you'll see
25   movement. You'll see hearings coming up in the House and the Senate in
26   the next month or two, and then we'll really start to get into drafting the
27   bill.
28   So I'll answer any questions you have.
29   MR. LEDBETTER: You mentioned the Striving
30   Readers Program. What kind of an increase are you proposing in the
31   Striving Readers Program?
32   MS. KUZMICH: We've got the Striving Readers
33   Program up to $100 million. It's right now at about $38 million. We've
34   actually asked for $100 million for several years and have not yet gotten
35   it, so we're continuing to push for that increase up to $100 million.
36   MR. LEDBETTER: I find that there is a -- you know,
37   we talk about the Striving Readers program as if it's not a problem, but we
38   talk about the graduation rates for high school students, and when 70 to 75
39   percent of entering ninth graders are not reading on proficient levels, yet
40   we expect them to graduate in four years, reading at grade level, and we're
41   not funding the program to any extent.
42   I mean, when we're talking about a national program,
43   and there's only $30 million put into it, it makes it very difficult for high
44   schools to meet those goals. What do you think is the problem in getting
45   an increase in that funding?

1   MS. KUZMICH: Well, the other thing that we're
2 pushing, too, is obviously that Title I high school increase could be used
3 for things like Striving Readers. It's a much more flexible pot of money,
4 but superintendents could certainly focus that money on adolescent
5 literacy programs if they chose, so they can work together.
6   I think the issue is just, you know, it's a newer program.
7 People are hesitant to grow it too fast, too quickly, but I do think it's
8 generally a popular program, and it's just one of those, you know,
9 decisions for Congress in terms of how they allocate funding among
10 programs, and programs that have gotten funding before, they're hesitant
11 to cut to put money into newer programs.
12   So it's not one that -- it doesn't have any opposition. It
13 just needs -- I think it needs that linkage made more clearly, that
14 adolescent literacy is one of our biggest issues in terms of why kids aren't
15 graduating from high school, and so we've got to keep hammering home
16 that message.
17   MR. LEDBETTER: Well, when our nation's report
18 card shows such a discrepancy in reading for entering ninth graders, and
19 you talk about the Chapter I programs, Title I programs. Title I programs,
20 if 70 some-odd percent of entering ninth graders are not reading at
21 proficient levels, there's not that many Title I high schools, so you can't
22 take your Title I money and use it in, you know, arbitrarily where students
23 are not reading. It has to be targeted at those schools if I understand the
24 law.
25   MS. KUZMICH: Well, and that's why we've put in our
26 increase. Our $1.2 billion increase in Title I would go entirely to high
27 schools, so while there are not many Title I high schools right now, it
28 would significantly up that number and get additional funding into our
29 high schools, and then it would leave it up to the superintendent as to --
30   You know, you would get to decide how -- you and
31 your superintendent would get to decide how you're going to spend that
32 Title I funding in your high school, whether it be on literacy or whether it
33 be on, you know, some other program. It's obviously very flexible. So
34 those could significantly work together.
35   MR. ELLIS: Yes, I had a question about some of your
36 comments about persistently dangerous definition. My recollection was
37 that this advisory committee took on that issue early on and, matter of
38 fact, submitted an interim report to the Secretary with some
39 recommendations.
40   I'm kind of curious as to why we're hearing that we've
41 struggled with it. My recollection is that we didn't struggle with it at all.
42 It was almost a complete consensus and unanimous support for a change
43 in, the language, so could you explain to me --
44   MS. KUZMICH: Yes.
45   MR. ELLIS: -- what happened with that?

1   And then my other question is can you comment a little
2   bit about the funding, at least right now, for the Safe and Drug Free
3   Schools programs, dollar amounts compared to before? We haven't heard
4   that yet.
5   MS. KUZMICH: Yes. On the persistently dangerous
6   issue, you know, thank you all for your work, first of all, and just because
7   it doesn't appear in here doesn't mean we're not actually kind of still
8   figuring out what to do.
9   We didn't feel like we were at a place where --
10   obviously, these were kind of the top level big picture issues, and we
11   didn't feel like we were at a place where we had consensus yet around --
12   within the Department and with the Secretary to get it into the policy
13   book.
14   We're still going to be working on that, and I don't
15   think we disagree with any of the recommendations that came out of this
16   group. It was how to -- it's how to get it in the legislative language and
17   how to have kind of that national persistently dangerous program, and we
18   just haven't settled on a place yet with the Secretary.
19   So I'll be honest with you on that. We feel like we still
20   have some work to do, especially around the data side. It was a piece that
21   we struggled with, how to connect those two issues.
22   On the budget, obviously, you know, we know that
23   we're always going to have this discussion about money and that, you
24   know, people in their particular programs always want to see their
25   program funded, and we understand that. We've obviously got limited
26   resources, and we have to focus is on, you know, our areas of priority.
27   We do, I mean, we do have a change from last year in
28   the sense that instead of completely eliminating the state grants program,
29   we understand the need to have some sort of formula program to states
30   and really provide money to every state.
31   Now I know that there's disagreement about the level of
32   what that should be and that it's a reduction over previous years. We've
33   had a reduction for this program in general for several years, and we're
34   happy to talk about that. It's just an issue of having to decide among a lot
35   of different areas and having a limited budget every year.
36   MR. ELLIS: Can you actually state for us, please, the
37   budget numbers? Thank you.
38   MS. KUZMICH: Yes, I'm sorry. Let me get it out.
39   The state grants program will get $100 million.
40   MR. ELLIS: And what was it last year?
41   MS. KUZMICH: It was -- hold on. I will look it up for
42   you. Here you go. Debbie knows it. Three forty-six.
43   MR. ELLIS: Thank you.
44   MS. KUZMICH: Correct. We still -- and then besides
45   the $100 million, we also have the money in the national programs that

1   elimination of dollars to fund the programmings and the science-based
2   efforts that they have done. Ohio did a study of the school districts and
3   the amount of funds that they got, and those school districts that got less
4   than $20,000 were doing at least six science-based, evidence-based
5   programs, but that takes money, and if the formula to the school districts
6   is eliminated, there will be no money to do those, to continue those
7   programs.
8   MS. KUZMICH: Well, obviously, we'll be talking a lot
9   about this with Congress.
10   MS. TAFT: So you can do all the training you want to,
11   but you're still not going to have anything that helps the individual child,
12   and, you know, every time I come in this building I see the value
13   statement of the Department, which is to help have equal access and to
14   help all children. I'm worried about a lot of children not getting the help
15   they need in the alcohol and drug and violence prevention area.
16   MS. KUZMICH: Yes. Thanks.
17   MR. HERRMANN: I, too, want to than the Department
18   for recognizing the role that states play in this. I really appreciate that
19   change. Let me make sure I understand. In terms of the budget numbers,
20   basically we've got the $100 million that would go to states. Is the $59
21   million that's in the budget for drug prevention and school safety
22   programs, is that new money?
23   MS. KUZMICH: There is no way to answer is that new
24   money. I mean, you know, we reallocate dollars --
25   MR. HERRMANN: Right.
26   MS. KUZMICH: -- to fit our budget al the time.
27   MR. HERRMANN: Right.
28   MS. KUZMICH: So it is a new program in the sense
29   that it doesn't currently exist here at the Department.
30   MR. HERRMANN: Okay, so essentially the $100
31   million for state grants and the $59 million for drug prevention and school
32   safety programs would replace the $346 million --
33   MS. KUZMICH: Correct.
34   MR. HERRMANN: -- that's currently going through
35   the State Grants Program.
36   MS. KUZMICH: Correct. Correct.
37   MR. HERRMANN: I really think that the loser in this
38   would be local districts. Currently, we have 136 districts in Tennessee. I
39   think seven or eight of them receive some sort of a national grant.
40   So, you know, we're going to have a huge number of
41   districts that will receive nothing, and I'm very concerned that while
42   $10,000 or $20,000 is not much in the grand scheme of things, there are
43   certainly some vital services that some districts have been to provide. So I
44   hope we can reach some sort of a compromise on this.
45   MS. KUZMICH: Thanks.

1   MR. WECHSLER: The fourth area listed under
2   national programs for safe and drug free schools, "Emerging Needs," can
3   you clarify, give some examples of what that might be?
4   MS. KUZMICH: An example, I mean, something we
5   started several years ago was Project Serve and that, you know, and
6   Debbie can probably speak to this. The, you know, events that happened
7   around the country, we needed to be able to respond and provide some
8   funding around that area, and we started the Project Serve program.
9   And so that's an example of an emerging need,
10 something that we had not been doing before but we found we had a role
11 in and wanted to be able to provide some funding around.
12 MS. PRICE: Yes. I think Holly said it exactly right,
13 and all of us, we've heard through all of our meetings that some of the
14 issues that children were dealing with ten, 20 years ago when the program
15 initially started are still there, but there have been a lot of changes, and as
16 time goes on, new issues come up, and so this would give the opportunity
17 for the Secretary to address those specific issues.
18 Besides Serve, emergency crisis grants came in
19 following Columbine, but, you know, there are just so many issues that
20 come up that you can't foresee, and this allows the Secretary to have
21 dollars to address those issues, and they may be -- you know, I mean, you
22 can speculate on what they might be, but quite honestly, we're not sure of
23 what they are at this point, because they haven't emerged.
24 MR. MODZELESKI: I was going to say, Debbie --
25 Debbie, I was going to say that what we want to do is make sure that the
26 Secretary has the authority. For example, the pandemic flu is one that we
27 talked about.
28 It's down there. It's on the horizon. We want to make
29 sure that we have at least the authority to provide support to school
30 districts if that becomes a problem, rather than seeking authority after the
31 fact.
32 MS. KEYS: I wonder if you could speak a little bit
33 more about the use of growth models for evaluation. Is there funding
34 that's going to support that? Are the states responsible themselves for
35 creating their data collection infrastructure, or will there be funding for
36 that? And just if you'd speak more about that, because it's a new idea.
37 MS. KUZMICH: Yes. We don't have funding
38 specifically for growth models. We have funding on probably on two
39 areas that really kind of target that issue. First of all is our state
40 assessment dollars overall. It's about $400 million that we started in No
41 Child Left Behind and we're continuing to fund.
42 You know, most states have obviously done their three
43 through eight assessments, but they need to continue working on science,
44 on high school assessments, a lot of issues around LEP and special ed and
45 assessments for those populations of students, and so that's a broad area of

1 funding that states can use to strengthen their assessment systems.

2 On the data side, we provide -- we request about $50
3 million for our statewide longitudinal data systems grants, and we've --
4 that program has been around for several years, and we have given out
5 grants to about 14 states already, and we've asked for increased funding so
6 that we can get funding to all 50 states to improve their data systems at the
7 state level. Some states are already there and have the capacity to do this,
8 the five that are in our pilot right now and several others.

9 MS. KEYS: Would you identify the five again?

10 MS. KUZMICH: Yes. It's Tennessee, North Carolina,
11 Delaware, Arkansas, and Florida, and we're currently in the middle of --
12 we're going to be reviewing a new round of states in March with our peer
13 review process to get more states into the pilot this year, so there could
14 potentially be some more.

15 So those two pieces of funding are potentially ways for
16 states to strengthen their state systems, but it would be an option for the
17 state. They could continue with the current accountability system in No
18 Child Left Behind, or they could do the growth model.

19 MS. KEYS: And would you also clarify -- you
20 mentioned a waiver -- what that waiver is for?

21 MS. KUZMICH: Well, right now, for the pilots that
22 we're doing, we've had to give a waiver under No Child Left Behind to do
23 those, but it was such an issue of great interest to the community, and
24 that's why we put together a pilot and brought in our peer reviewers and
25 worked with the Hill to start this pilot. So that's why we've proposed to
26 actually write it in the law this time so we would no longer have to use a
27 waiver to do a grown model under NCLB.

28 MS. KEYS: And then how does parental consent come
29 in if your tracking these kids over time? Is that a factor or anything that
30 you have to do?

31 MS. KUZMICH: States -- FERPA already deals with
32 that in terms of protections for students, and states have dealt with that for
33 years. We're not asking states to do anything over and above what many
34 of them are already currently doing.

35 They have ways to protect privacy for students. They
36 assign them a, you know, a random I.D. number that can't be tracked back
37 to the student. So they have to take all those protections themselves, and
38 they have to decide that they want those individual identifiers within their
39 state.

40 So that's a state-level policy decision that we don't ask
41 for and we won't require as part of reauthorization, but if they want to do a
42 growth model, it's obviously a key piece of doing that.

43 MR. ELLIS: All right. If I could just -- first of all, I
44 want to reiterate the point that was made over here by Hope and by Mike.
45 We appreciate what the Department does for our youngsters in our

1   various states, and we're passionate about safe and drug free schools, or
2   none of us would be here.
3   To that end, however, I -- and I know this is a work in
4   progress, so part of our job is to give you something to think about.
5   MS. KUZMICH: Yes.
6   MR. ELLIS: And with the state grants, I was just
7   listening as you're saying $100 million. For the state that I come from, it
8   would be about probably around $10 million. It would be about $1.50 or
9   $1.60 per child. That won't go very far, and I was hearing the same thing
10 from Ohio and Tennessee. And I know you know that, but I just want to
11 throw that out there.
12   Then when you look at that as a part of the big picture,
13 other things that you were talking about such as the incentive based pay, I
14 understand exactly what the philosophy might be. The practicality of all
15 that is it's been tried before in the state of, of all places, Texas, and in the
16 state of California we had a $700 million incentive grant program that
17 went down in flames because the internal politics of the teachers union --
18 so that they were devouring some of their own, because it was up to
19 $25,000 per teacher. It got to the point that they chose not to take it.
20   I think we might want to look as a nation at how to
21 improve teacher technique, get into the classrooms, rather than offering up
22 money as incentives for particular teachers. That's just something to think
23 about, and, as I say, I know that it's been tried before, career ladders back
24 in Texas some 20 years ago.
25   But I'm mentioning that because that then has an effect
26 on the overall that we're talking about, for example, with the state grants,
27 so I'm just using that as an example, and another would be the
28 restructuring.
29   When you talk about mayors taking over school
30 districts, all due respect to mayors, but they're -- and I want to be careful
31 how I say this, but their educational intelligence level is not -- their
32 background expertise is not in that, and again, we've had some good
33 examples of failure, and we would ask that we pay particular attention to
34 failures, and I'll just give you two quick ones.
35   Oakland, Jerry Brown went down in flames, and now
36 you mentioned Los Angeles, but that has gone down in flames, because it
37 was declared unconstitutional. So as we start down these roads, just some
38 things to think about that -- and I'm just throwing those out again from the
39 standpoint of increasing funding in other areas.
40   And lastly, as we put things out, whether it's in an
41 entity of all the states sitting around here or whatever it might happen to
42 be, it's how we market it. And, for example, as we sat here, if I would
43 have started out saying, "I didn't hear you mention vouchers," and
44 vouchers is a big part of, I think, what is being mentioned here by the
45 Department, if I would have mentioned that --

1   I'm going to use this as an example. If we mention that
2   first in many, many places in the country and talking to many different
3   groups, that becomes the talking point, rather than getting at the real meat.
4   So sometimes it's how we market things.
5   And lastly, just as a suggestion, rather than have
6   mayors take over as a part of the restructure, you might want to think
7   about intermediate agencies across this country, because they're fully
8   designed for that.
9   MS. KUZMICH: Yes. Thank you for that. Let me just
10 say a couple things real quickly on that. On teachers, we have --
11 obviously, our boss is from Texas. She learned a lot from the career
12 ladder experience there.
13   We actually -- the program has been fairly successful
14 so far. It requires districts or states to work with their teachers unions and
15 get their buy-in as part of this whole proposal, so we've actually seen good
16 interaction from a lot of districts across the country who want to do this.
17   It's why we're still doing it as kind of a pilot program to
18 see how it's working. We think we've learned some lessons from
19 programs that haven't worked across the states before, and there is a
20 growing -- there's a growing interest in this area.
21   On the whole issue -- you know, let me just kind of
22 speak real quickly on the broader issue. Obviously, we can't provide --
23 you know, every year when we do our budget it's a tough position in terms
24 of what programs we fund and where we put our dollars.
25   We're the federal government. We're only a nine
26 percent investor, so we can't fund every student in every program across
27 the country, and we have to choose, and, you know, it's always a tough
28 exercise.
29   We've -- I think something that we try and go by --
30 there are obviously a couple of key programs where we put very
31 significant funding in, Title I, special education, Pell Grants. Those are
32 probably, you know, three of the biggest programs that we have here at
33 the Department that do provide significant funding.
34   In a lot of other areas we have tried to recognize what
35 our role needs to be at the federal government, that we can't fund every
36 student, every teacher, every program across the country, and we have to
37 make some choices and fund models, pilots, research-based programs,
38 significant pieces that other people can't do, and that's where our area of
39 national leadership is.
40   So, you know, it's always a tough battle, and we always
41 wish that there were more in our budget that we could allocate, but we've
42 got to live within our reality, so.
43   MR. LONG: Go ahead, Kim.
44   MS. DUDE: I know that the focus of this group has
45 been K through 12 funding and issues, but being a higher education

1   prevention person, I was curious if you could tell me.

2   Under the Safe and Drug Free Schools, I know that

3   higher education has access to some of those monies through grants. Can

4   you give me any idea of what higher education prevention funding might

5   be like?

6   MS. KUZMICH: I was going to say I don't actually

7   remember, unfortunately, I'm sorry to say. I know we obviously have

8   some small programs over in HEA.

9   MR. MODZELESKI: We left it open, I think, in the

10   discretionary grant in a portion under those four congruent titles that

11   Holly talked about, to be determined in what we call the specs that are

12   working on with the details within the overall program.

13   MS. KUZMICH: I certainly don't think we have any

14   opposition to, you know, working with the higher ed community, so those

15   are issues to be worked out.

16   MR. LEDBETTER: I notice here that the Reading

17   First, you plan to expand the Reading First Program.

18   MS. KUZMICH: Continue.

19   MR. LEDBETTER: Continue to expand the Reading

20   First Program. No one can argue with the success of the Reading First

21   Program. It's been some remarkable results there, but I think that -- and,

22   of course, my background is secondary, okay, so my background is

23   adolescent literacy. That's where my interest is.

24   And I think that the Reading First Program, as we

25   continue to invest in the Reading First Program, we're seeing some

26   remarkable results, but the adverse effect is actually happening. In grades

27   K through three we're seeing students achieve great success with reading,

28   but when the Reading First Program stops at K through three, after the

29   third grade is where we start to see the decline in reading before they enter

30   high school, and that's one of the reasons why when they enter high

31   school so many of these students cannot read.

32   It's not a matter of them not being able to read. They

33   can't comprehend the written text. Okay, they can pronounce the words,

34   but they can't comprehend the meaning. They don't make the connection.

35   Now I think that at some point we need to look and

36   take a very serious look at the adolescent issue, because what's actually

37   happening to us is we're getting this false sense of improvement in grades

38   K through three, and then the reverse is starting to happen before they

39   enter high school, and we need to expand that program even more. I

40   mean, the Reading First Program is funded at, what, $350 million dollars?

41   MS. KUZMICH: A billion.

42   MR. LEDBETTER: A billion. Okay, $1 billion, and

43   we're only talking about $100 million, and we're only getting $30 million

44   for the rest of the grades past the third grade. Now I'm not in

45   disagreement. The base needs to be established, but once that base is

1   established, we need to expand that program if we expect those students to
2   be productive citizens once they exit high school.
3   MS. KUZMICH: And, you know, that Reading First
4   Program, we have -- we've had better research and better programs to
5   disseminate for states and districts to use. We had the Reading Excellence
6   Act before the Reading First Program, and so there was some base of
7   knowledge to start expanding that program, and we're starting to develop -
8   - we have developed some of that knowledge base in adolescent literacy,
9   and we need to continue to do more, and then we can start to expand that
10   to other districts and schools across the country.
11   MR. LEDBETTER: I think one of the things that has
12   happened -- I know in my state, what has happened, when Alabama
13   Reading Initiative was first implemented, it was open to grades K through
14   12. That door is being closed to the upper grades now because of the
15   funding being directed through Reading First.
16   In the very beginning, all schools were invited to
17   become a part of it, and a lot of the high schools became a part of it, but
18   since then the schools are on their own. There's no help there hardly, and
19   that's why I say that I think that that program is a tremendous program.
20   But as that funding goes to the states, the states then are
21   concentrating on those grades, and they're not concentrating on the upper
22   grades, and I think that there's a connection. There has to be a connection,
23   and once the U.S. Department of Ed, you know, looks at it and says,
24   "Hey, we need to expand this program," then the states will also expand
25   the programs, as well.
26   MS. KUZMICH: Yes. Thank you.
27   MR. LONG: I'm going to bring this to a close. We're
28   running over a little bit, but I think that that's an illustration of the interest
29   in this, and I was thinking about, as you sat out there, first of all, thank
30   you for being here and explaining this and answering questions. I got to
31   thinking how that must feel, sitting in front of about 12 or 14 people, so
32   again, thank you very much for --
33   MS. KUZMICH: That's all right. Thank you.
34   MR. LONG: -- assisting this.
35   MS. KUZMICH: Sure.
36   MR. LONG: Thank you. And next, if we could have
37   our -- we could set up for the panel.
38   We will open with, before they address -- and Bill,
39   you're going to be giving a short presentation first, and then we'll move in.
40   Is that correct?
41   MS. PRICE: Debbie Rudy of our office, who is
42   responsible for all the areas related to data and a variety of issues, was
43   going to make a presentation. Unfortunately, she is ill today, and so Bill
44   is going to do her presentation in place of Debbie. I think you all have
45   met Debbie at a previous -- on a previous panel.

1   MR. LONG: My question then is, as we set this up, I
2 presume we want to have it the same as we've had in the past, or would
3 you -- do you want, since we have three of the people giving the
4 presentations sitting at this table, what are your wishes as to how we
5 practically speaking do this?
6   MS. DUDE: Whatever you're comfortable with, I
7 mean, whatever Mike and Howell are comfortable with, if they want to
8 stay where they are or --
9   MR. LONG: Okay. Mike, Howell, how would you
10 prefer to do this? Okay, let's -- the vote just came from Michael, and if we
11 could have the panelists then please take a seat there so that we can do it
12 in the same manner that we have in the past.
13   And I'll introduce. We know so many of the -- Mike
14 Herrmann, whom we all know, Executive Director of the Office of School
15 Health Safety and Learning Support from Tennessee Department, and
16 Howell Wechsler, Director, Division of Adolescent School Health,
17 Centers for Disease Control, and Doug Hall, Senior Vice President, Pride
18 Surveys.
19   Doug, welcome, and Deborah Rudy, who is sitting to
20 my right over here, now better known as Bill Modzeleski, Office of Safe
21 and Drug Free Schools, Department of Ed, and Bill will be, as we just
22 heard, will be giving Deborah's presentation.
23   So if we could start, please, with Mike.
24   MR. MODZELESKI: I think we're going to start here
25 to provide an overview.
26   MR. LONG: I'm sorry.
27   MR. MODZELESKI: Okay?
28   MR. LONG: Okay.
29   MR. MODZELESKI: Yes. All right.
30   MR. LONG: I apologize.
31   MR. MODZELESKI: Actually, the important folks are
32 going to follow. I mean, that's the -- Mike's going to present reality.
33 Howell is going present the YRBSS and the state portion, and Doug is
34 going to present a little bit about what the Pride survey does at the local
35 level, and I think all three present reality, hopefully.
36   I want to start by saying is that there is a wealth of
37 information that is collected at the national level regarding data. We have
38 the YRBSS, CDC, and that's -- again, Howell will explain that in much
39 more detail, but I will point out that 47 states, two territories use the
40 YRBSS system as a measure of prevalence of alcohol and drug use and
41 other behaviors in their states.
42   Monitoring the Future, which has been going on since
43 the mid-1970s, measures alcohol and drug use between eighth graders,
44 tenth graders, and twelfth graders, and that is done on a national level and
45 comes out every year. We have that information available to us.

1   The National Household Survey on Drug Use and
2   Health is also talks about alcohol and drug use between 12- and 18-year-
3   old students for us, anyway, which is of interest, and that comes out on a
4   regular basis and is available to use.
5   School-associated violent -- that study is something that
6   we started back in 1994, and this is a study that we continue with the
7   Centers for Disease Control in their injuries branch, and that provides us
8   with data on the number of students who are killed either in school, on the
9   way to school, or at a school function, as well as the number of students
10 who are suicide victims while in school.
11   And there is a chart -- one of the things that we've put
12 at everybody's desk is what's called an Indicators Report, which the Office
13 actually pays for most of the data collections that are in here, but to
14 separate out some independence between the Office and the National
15 Center for Educational Statistics is that they have editorial license to put
16 that together, so much of the data that you see on school-associated
17 violent death.
18   The School Survey on Crime and Safety, that is a study
19 which we support, again done by NCES. One of the things that -- that
20 gives us a lot of data on what students are saying about crime and violence
21 in school. The Schools and Staffing Survey, otherwise known as the
22 SASS Survey, again, is a survey conducted by NCES, and that gives us
23 information on what teachers are saying about crime and violence in
24 school.
25   We have the National Crime Victimization Survey and
26 the School Crime Supplement. Actually, they are two very -- two
27 different surveys. The National Crime Victimization Survey is given
28 every year by the Department of Justice, and the supplement to that,
29 which focuses exclusively on school and school-aged kids and asks
30 question about crime and victimization in school is given every other year.
31   The Gun-Free Schools Act data is a report that we
32 collect since 1994 from every state, and that provides us with information
33 on the number of students who have been expelled from school for
34 carrying a firearm to school.
35   So we have data on the number of kids who have been
36 expelled, what grade they're in, and what happened to them, meaning
37 whether they suspended or whether they expelled and were they provided
38 educational services or they weren't.
39   The other one is not up here, and again, Holly alluded
40 to it this morning, and I didn't put it up there, because while it is a data
41 collection effort on the part of the state, it doesn't provide us with any new
42 data, and that's persistently dangerous schools.
43   And so if you look at persistently dangerous schools,
44 what you'll see is that there is a requirement for the state to collect data for
45 the locals, but most of the states have used data that they already are

1 collecting, suspension-expulsion data, Gun-Free Schools Act data, so they
2 really set up a new data set. So the data that's being used for the
3 persistently dangerous comes from existing data sources.
4   Now looking at this data, a couple things I want to
5 point out is that nowhere in here is there anything what's called incident-
6 based data, so I know that there has been -- Debbie and I get badgered by
7 certain groups over time asking us to establish a mandatory incident-based
8 data reporting system.
9   Now there are some of those systems around. New
10 York City has an incident-based data reporting system. California has
11 some remnants of it based upon tings that they did over a decade ago and
12 funded, and then once they withdrew the funding, a lot of that went away.
13
14   And Florida has some systems, some of their school
15 systems set up for incident-based data report. Essentially, that is that
16 every time an incident occurs, be it a criminal incident or a non-criminal
17 incident of a certain magnitude, it's reported as an incident, and so we
18 have that incident reported.
19   The other thing about all of these data sets is that none
20 of these data sets tie back into performance, so there's no way that you
21 could look at this data and say we can tell whether crime is going up or
22 going down. We could tell whether drug use is going up or going down.
23   We could tell what segments of the population is going
24 up or going down, but we can't really tell why. We can't say it's because
25 of Shep's good program or something else. All we could say is that in
26 certain areas, certain states, certain school districts, it is going up or going
27 down.
28   Now at the -- under Title IV, there's three levels of
29 reporting.   There's the Uniform Management Information Reporting
30 Systems, and I think that Mike will talk a little bit about that this morning.
31 That really sets the requirement up for the locals about what type of
32 information they must collect, and this is a system that rolls uphill in the
33 sense that the LEAs collect some of that.
34   The states have the requirement to collect some of that
35 information. They collect it and report it to us. We in turn take that
36 information and report it to Congress, so there's three levels of reporting
37 that go on here.
38   The UMIRS, otherwise known as Uniform
39 Management Information System, Information Reporting Systems, I
40 should say, is a state level system, state level meaning that it is the state
41 that has the responsibility for implementing this particular provision, and
42 it basically requires states to collect information at two levels.
43   One is the building level or the school level, and two is
44 the state level, and there's four things, four basic things that the state must
45 collect. One is truancy rate, so the law basically requires that local

1   education agencies report truancy, not only by the district but by the
2   school building.
3   One of the issues, and I'll talk about it a little bit later, is
4   that it's one thing to report truancy rates, but what we've seen on the
5   national perspective is that not only is there not a national definition of
6   truancy, there is very few state level definitions of truancy, and, matter of
7   fact, in many districts they're using multiple definitions of truancy, so it's
8   hard to measure truancy not only at a national level. Sometimes it's very
9   difficult even at the state level to measure truancy.
10   The other thing that's required at the building level or
11 the school level is the suspension and expulsions related to -- it's related to
12 use of -- drug use and violence, and so what is required is that what is the
13 number -- I should say what is the number of suspensions and expulsions
14 for a alcohol or drug or violence offense, and again, that's at the school
15 level, not at the state level or district level, so that gives you a pretty
16 specific degree of the, using the new term "granularity."
17   The other two -- you like that, Mike? The other two
18 requirements are the types of programs and curriculum services supported
19 with the Safe and Drug Free School funds and the prevalence age of onset
20 perception and health risk perception of social disapproval of alcohol,
21 drug use, and violence prevention. Now these two are done at the state
22 level, and the prevalence age of onset is -- most of that information has
23 come through surveys that are being conducted at the state level.
24   Now, because of time, I want to skip over the reporting
25 and merely say as that all that information that is collected by or through
26 UMIRS is required to be reported, primarily through the consolidated
27 report to the Department of Education.
28   Once we get that information, we develop a report. We
29 collect all 50 states and territories and then submit that to Congress.
30   The other part here is that what we realized very early
31 on in the game is that as we begin to look at the states and their use and
32 measuring of data is that there were a lot of problems. We were using
33 different definitions, different time periods, different measures, and what
34 we began and what we set up is what we call the Uniform Data Set
35 Project, and this project is set out to do three things.
36   One is provide common definitions of all of those
37 things that are to be measured under UMIRs. So, for example, what we're
38 trying to do is make sure that not only all 50 states but all 15,000 districts
39 and all 110,000 buildings have the same definition of truancy, have the
40 same definition of suspension, have the same definition of expulsion, the
41 same definition of an incident is.
42   I mean, right now is that there is not total agreement
43 about what all of these things mean, so even though we're collecting the
44 data, the data is not comparable, because all of these things mean different
45 things to different locations. So first thing in the data set we're trying to

1   do is to get some common definitions.

2   Two is we're trying to describe the uniform data set
3   measure to be used to meet the requirements of UMIRS. So, for example,
4   there are some states that say that what we want to measure is drug use
5   over 30 days.

6   Other states are saying we want to measure drug use
7   over a year, annual drug use. Other states want to say lifetime drug use.
8   So what we're trying to do is set up a standard that everybody could use
9   and agree upon, so we're all collecting the same information and the same
10   measures.

11   And lastly is the way that that is gone about, the data
12   elements required for each measure, so once we have a measure, trying to
13   come to an agreement is basically what are the elements of that measure.
14   What do you really need to do? What do you really need to collect? And
15   make sure everybody's collecting the same thing so we again have some
16   degree of uniformity for all the states.

17   The issues for us are several. One is purpose, and I will
18   tell you is that in the -- when No Child Left Behind was authorized the
19   first time, there was not a lot of discussion about data or data collection.

20   The UMIRS provisions as well as some of the reporting
21   provisions were put in without a lot of discussion or debate, and,
22   therefore, while they went in there, there were some problems that we
23   had, one of them being is that we can't -- without regulation we can't
24   really tell a state how to collect information or specifically what
25   information to collect, and that's why we're doing some work now to try to
26   make sure we could get agreement, and I want to underscore this comes
27   from agreement, not through mandates, what types of information to
28   collect.

29   So it's not only collecting it but how it's to be used, and
30   there is no tie-in in the legislation at this point in time. Matter of fact, if
31   you look at the part and the part score in some of the discussions about the
32   part, one of the interesting things there is that they cite the fact that when
33   you look at the state grant, the formula grant program, is that because of
34   the way the formula grant is set up is that even data that's being collected,
35   it's very difficult to take those school districts that are in greatest need and
36   provide them with additional resources. Everybody gets about the same
37   on a proportionate basis.

38   So it's not only for collecting data. I think that as we
39   move forward what we want to do is try to tie the collection of data into
40   the use of data and for decision-making, and how do we do that
41   effectively?

42   Secondly, what level? Again, we talk about data being
43   collected at three levels, the local level, the state level, and a national
44   level, and we have to basically try to settle in and try to figure that out.

45   I was saying is that while we're going that, we're also

1   going down two roads here. One is that we are complying with the
2   current legislation. I should point out that the current legislation, with the
3   UMIRS provisions, with the biennial report, with all those other
4   requirements, is in effect until another law is passed, so we can't ignore
5   that piece of legislation, but we're going to have to go down and ensure
6   that those data requirements are met.
7   At the same time thinking ahead is that as we're moving
8   along with reauthorization, what types of data collection, what types of
9   requirements should we impose on the states if, in fact, we have a bill that
10 looks like -- whether it's the one that's proposed now or something
11 different, so this is looking at this at multiple levels, not just the level of
12 where we are.
13   And lastly, which measures and which constructs?
14 Again, this is about there are so many measures out there. This gets back
15 to the uniform data set and coming to agreement with the states and with
16 the locals on exactly what measures we should accept on a uniform basis
17 so that as begin to look at the data, we have some comparability at the
18 state level, the local level, and the national level.
19   MR. LONG: Thank you very much, Bill. We will --
20 and I'll ask this. We'll go in order, Mike, Howell, and then Doug, and then
21 we'll get to questions from the Committee. So if we could start, please,
22 with Mike.
23   MR. Herrmann: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I think
24 I enjoy sitting on the other side better, but I'm going to make this quick. I
25 think Bill did a really good job of hitting a lot of what I wanted to cover.
26 Two things I want to try and do is talk about the UMIRS system, which
27 Bill mentioned, and also speak to kind of data collection things that we're
28 doing at the state level that may be a little bit different from this.
29   As Bill said, NCLB really created an expectation for
30 states and locals to create a uniform management information and
31 reporting system. Basically, the system is -- the legislation requires these
32 four elements. The first two have to be collected and reported at the
33 building level.
34   The thing I think that I would say is, you know, when
35 we go to look at each of these individually, you know, you would be
36 amazed. Those of you that are not familiar with schools and data
37 collection, I think you would be amazed at how difficult it is to collect
38 truancy data.
39   We have kind of a running argument for about a year
40 that we lost with the Department of Education about whether or not we
41 already collect and report attendance data for every school. So it was kind
42 of our position for a while that attendance was really just a flip of truancy.
43
44   So we lost that argument, so now we do have a truancy
45 definition, and we are in compliance with this requirement. But it has

1   taken -- it took about two years of work with our attendance folks to
2   finally arrive at a truancy definition that was acceptable.
3   Part of the problem is you've got this whole issue of
4   excused versus unexcused absences, and when you look at that, there's all
5   sorts of opportunities for building level interpretation in terms of exactly
6   how that gets done, but at this point in Tennessee, the definition of truancy
7   is five or more unexcused absences in a year. So we do have that now.
8   I think that's important to remember with truancy is it's
9   very closely tied to some larger state and local data collection challenges.
10 Attendance is a very important data element for schools and school
11 districts. It generates funding and all sorts of things.
12   And one of the things that, while I think Tennessee has
13 a fairly well developed student data management system, you know, we
14 certainly struggle with this whole issue of attendance reporting, and you
15 really can't get to the truancy issue if you don't have the attendance part
16 straightened out.
17   The second area in the UMIRS is the incidence of
18 violence- and drug-related offenses. I think the work that the Department
19 has done with the uniform data set project is very important.
20   We certainly struggle with uniform definitions just
21 within the state. I really think that this measure is more valuable as a
22 trend measure at this point than it is as something that allows you to
23 compare district to district.
24   Just as an example, last year I had a district that
25 reported five students being expelled for the year. When you looked at
26 the reason -- we give them 15, 20 reasons that a student can be expelled.
27 The reason for the students being expelled, all five, was "Other," so one of
28 the things that we've learned, too, is that you really can't allow "Other" to
29 be part of the data set, because it's just -- you're going to get that.
30   We do not in Tennessee collect incident data. We
31 collect data based on disciplinary actions. That's something that has been
32 looked at, but there's a huge push back, I think, from local districts to add
33 any more data collection than they're already doing.
34   The other thing is, you know, sometimes, I think,
35 because disciplinary action is tied to attendance data, I'm not sure that you
36 don't get better reporting on discipline than you might get on incident
37 reporting, so there's kind of some pros and cons there.
38   The other thing that we do collect in terms of incidents
39 is zero tolerance, as well as victim of violent crime data, and just, you
40 know, something that's not been talked a lot about, I think, in this
41 Committee is the whole issue of victims of violent crime, but I do think
42 that can be a pretty important piece of data.
43   We've had some struggles getting the reporting going
44 and getting the definitions going, but I really think once we get that in
45 place, that's an important piece of information.

1   The other required element is the types of curricular
2   programs and services. I think it's helpful in terms of giving you a broad
3   idea of how Title IV funds are being expended. Unfortunately, it really
4   doesn't do a very good job of capturing the scope or fidelity of
5   implementation, and you're essentially getting a laundry list of programs,
6   you know, and I think we know from research that how well the program
7   is implemented and how true to fidelity it is is very critical.
8   Then in terms of incidence and prevalence data, you
9   know, this is generally being obtained through surveys. You know, I
10   think one of the issues is there's a lot of push back at the school level on
11   surveys.
12   They're perceived as being difficult to implement,
13   FERPA issues, costs issues, and we have a lot of parents in Tennessee and
14   I think other states that really don't want students being asked about things
15   like drugs and that dirty three-letter word, sex, which I'm sure Howell is
16   going to speak to.
17   But, you know, for the most part in Tennessee, we rely
18   upon the YRBS survey, which has been very important for us. We do
19   have a lot of districts or some districts that use surveys such as PRIDE.
20   The thing, I think, that I've noticed from the districts that have used
21   PRIDE and other surveys really helps them a lot in terms of being able to
22   speak to what the situation is within our district, because, for the most
23   part, our incidence data is statewide as opposed to local.
24   In terms of looking at some other data measures that we
25   use at the state level, the persistently dangerous schools criteria is actually
26   a combination of some of our more serious disciplinary issues, as well as
27   victims of violent crime data. While we've not identified any school as
28   being persistently dangerous, we do use that measure, particularly with
29   our urban school districts, to identify schools that have kind of a high
30   index on those measures. So I think that's been a useful tool.
31   We also -- the performance targets that Bill mentioned
32   are an element. The Gun-Free Schools Act data -- one thing I know a lot
33   of states use is the Kids Count information that's available through the
34   Anne E. Casey Foundation.
35   Local school districts are required as part of their Title
36   IV application to identify risks and then to match to those risks strategies,
37   so one of the things that we've tried to do to help local districts is
38   consolidate all of the various data pieces that we have available at the state
39   level for them so that they don't have to go out and do all that background
40   work, which I think has helped a lot in terms of getting particularly some
41   of our smaller districts more focused on addressing risk factors.
42   A huge area, I think, for us to look at is AYP and other
43   academic data that's available, and then another area that we've been using
44   is we do have a requirement in the state that every school have a school
45   improvement plan, and part of that school improvement planning process

1 involves looking at school climate issues, how students feel about, you
2 know, their school and belonging and safety and those sorts of things.
3 And then we've also -- there is at the state level juvenile court data that's
4 available.
5   So those are some of the things that I think are
6 important to look at from a state perspective.
7   MR. LONG: Thank you very much, Mike. We
8 appreciate that, and next we have Howell.
9   MR. WECHSLER: I think a number of states including
10 Tennessee are using the Youth Risk Behavior Survey or YRBS to
11 measure incidence of risk behaviors. What I want to do -- so it has great
12 relevance for this discussion, what I want to do is share with you some of
13 the many great strengths that the system has but also limitations, as well.
14   YRBS focuses on a broad spectrum of health risk
15 behaviors. That's very important. Believe it or not, there are other issues
16 that are terribly important to our young people besides violence and drug
17 use, and you see the seven behavioral risk areas that we think are the most
18 important for schools and the nation to address. These are all covered by
19 YRBS.
20   Yes, we are the ones who collect the sex data, and in
21 the beginning there were a number of states that would just cross off those
22 items and collect everything else, but now we're down to only three or
23 four states, one of them my home state, Georgia, but you're not hearing
24 that so much anymore, and one of the reasons, I think, is because people
25 from all sides of the political spectrum have come to see just how
26 important it is to have these data.
27   So it's a great strength that we collect all this
28 information, because it makes it much more appealing to schools, because
29 whereas the Safe and Drug-Free Schools people are coming in and
30 bothering them about surveys for the first two areas, there are plenty of
31 other programs out there that are bothering them for surveys in the other
32 areas. This gives them a chance to do one comprehensive survey, and
33 also within this survey, you can look at associations across and among the
34 different risk behaviors.
35   We've been tracking this for some time, so since 1991
36 we've been doing this every other year, so we have some really good trend
37 data. That's a strength, and then the most important thing, really, is that
38 while there are other national data collection systems, we have a uniform
39 set of measures that are used at the national, state, and large urban school
40 district level, and you can really compare across states and cities and to
41 the national averages, as well.
42   It's a probability sample of ninth to twelfth grade
43 students, anonymous, self-administered. They're still doing it on paper,
44 but in two or three, four years we'll be having them enter it directly on
45 computer.

1   The next-to-last bullet is really important, because the
2 one reason we get a very good response rate from schools that consent to
3 participate is our solemn pledge that this will be done within one class
4 period.
5   What that means is, with all those topics we have to
6 cover, if you come up with a new question that you want to ask, you can't
7 get it in there unless you tell us which ones we can take out, so to put one
8 in, you've got to take one out. We have a very good amount of breadth of
9 topics, but there's limitations to the depth of how much we can go into in
10 each of the specific topics.
11   One thing I didn't mention is that it is appropriately
12 entitled Youth Risk Behavior Survey. One way we have limited the scope
13 of it is that we focus solely on behaviors. We do not have questions that
14 ask about knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, or perceptions. It's just about
15 what they do. We do it every other year, usually in the springtime.
16   You can see with the national probability sample it's
17 approximately 14,000 students that participate, and the response rate
18 overall if you multiply the school level response rate by the student level
19 response rate, it comes out to 67 percent.
20   I'd like to point out that Monitoring the Future has a
21 response rate of 50 percent, so if there are substantial disagreements
22 between the two surveys, I'd put my money on YRBS as being more
23 representative of what's going on in the nation.
24   The good news is, though, that on a regular basis we
25 check. We compare the two surveys, and we find that there are not large
26 differences. They are fairly similar, and they each have their benefits for
27 why we would continue to conduct both of them.
28   This gives you a look over time of participation by
29 states. You can see we're now up to 44 states participating. There are
30 four states that had preexisting systems. They collect data on youth
31 through schools through their own systems.
32   That's their prerogative. There are only two states that I
33 know of that are not collecting any data on youth behaviors through
34 school-based systems, and that's Virginia and Pennsylvania.
35   Important to mention there are no mandates to use this.
36 We give the education agency a little bit of money to help with their cost.
37 We crunch the data for them.
38   We produce and deliver their reports to them, but this is
39 strictly voluntary. They choose to participate. You can see we also have
40 23 states.
41   The number on the bottom is important, that 90 percent,
42 through a lot of technical assistance. Mike is right. It is not easy to get
43 schools to agree to participate or to do this thing right, but we provide
44 extensive technical assistance, and we've now gotten up to 90 percent of
45 the states and cities that have what we call weighted data.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
(202) 234-4433   WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701   www.nealrgross.com

1   In other words, they're doing it in the right way, and
2 they're getting an adequate response rate so we can say that their data is
3 representative of what's going on across the state.

4   There are many different policy applications for the
5 YRBS data. It's used to present a picture of what's going on among youth,
6 to create a lot of awareness among policymakers, media, the public.

7   Many people use it to set program goals. The Public
8 Health Service measures quite a few of the healthy people objectives for
9 the nation through the YRBS national results. It's used all the time to
10 support and tie the development of programs and policies by advocates to
11 support health-related legislation, and it's in just about every funding
12 application you could possibly imagine.

13   I'm going to take you now through what are not really a
14 sample but are just about every single item related to violence and alcohol
15 and drug use that's in the YRBS. We have done extensive testing on the
16 reliability of these items, and the reliability is fairly substantial.

17   These are the violence-related measures. You see the
18 items that are in asterisks. Those are items that are currently included as
19 key measures among the indicators of school crime and safety book.

20   Perhaps of most interest on this one are the items
21 related to what goes on on school property. We ask whether the students
22 have carried a weapon, been in a fight and so on on school property, as
23 well as off of school property. Some of these are 30-day period. Some of
24 these are over the past 12 months.

25   We collect data on a spectrum of behaviors related to
26 suicide. I should mention for the violence-related behaviors, what we've
27 seen in our trends -- and I do have a handout I'll give out later that lists
28 trends since 1991 in these areas -- what we've seen related to violence is
29 that -- how did that happen? Here we go.

30   In terms of violence trends, most of those items that
31 you saw went down across the 1990s and have been pretty flat since we
32 entered the new decade. In terms of suicide, they seriously consider
33 suicide and made a suicide plan, have gone down since 1991. There have
34 been no changes in the prevalence of actually attempting suicide.

35   These are the items that we look at in terms of alcohol
36 and other drug use. Current use is defined as within the past 30 days, and
37 most of these items have gone down significantly since the late 1990s.

38   Other items in terms of alcohol and drug use, we collect
39 data on binge drinking, any kind of drug or alcohol use on school
40 property, and we ask about the age in which they initiated these behaviors
41 so we can report on how many, and it's a frighteningly large number have
42 started drinking or trying marijuana before the age of 13.

43   Now there is a core set of items that are on the national
44 survey, but we leave space for the states and cities to determine if they
45 want to add their own items, and we have a long list of optional items.

1 The problem is it's very hard for those optional items to get on the national
2 core questionnaire, and it's not something we mandate.
3 That's something that, because the states have a vested
4 interest in what's on the national questionnaire, we really have a
5 democratic procedure, and they get a strong vote, so we have to sell it to
6 the states if you want to get new items into the national core questionnaire
7 for YRBS.
8 But here are some of the violence and drug-related
9 optional items that have been used: "On school property, do you carry a
10 gun?" "Have you been harassed or bullied?" "Have you been hit,
11 punched, or kicked?"
12 There's been some interest in students cutting or
13 burning themselves on purpose. Use of prescription drugs is an interest,
14 and what typically happens is after it's used for a couple of cycles on some
15 of the state items, then some of the states try to sell the other states on
16 getting it into the national one.
17 There's also a fair amount of interest in asking
18 questions related to protective factors. That's been really challenging.
19 These are some of the optional items that have been used, really
20 challenging for us, because we haven't really been convinced that there's a
21 good way to do this in the brevity that's needed. Most of the really
22 validated questionnaires on protective factors are quite extensive and
23 would not fit into the one period mandate.
24 To bring this to life, let me show you some of the data.
25 I'm going to show you national data, but every state and city that
26 participates gets this data, too.
27 This is an item I thought would be of interest, the
28 percentage of high school students who were in a physical fight on school
29 property. You can see that males are more likely than females, and black
30 and Hispanic students significantly more likely than white students to
31 have been in a fight on school property.
32 Here's the trend data. Since 1993 we started asking
33 this, and you can see very similar to some of the other violence items. It
34 went down across the 1990s and has been kind of flat since.
35 Now one of the really neat things about having this
36 uniform system at the national, state, and local level is being able to see
37 the differences when you're asked the same questions, and you can see the
38 range here among the states on this item from eight to 16 percent. In the
39 cities, there are lows that go down to ten percent and then highs as much
40 as 22 percent. Sometimes it's more interesting when you see a name
41 attached.
42 This is a different question, the percentage of high
43 school students who were offered, sold, or given an illegal drug by
44 someone on school property. You can see the median across the probably
45 about 41 states that participate is 26 percent. That's the median, but it's

1 really interesting to see which states.

2 Some states, the prevalence is twice as high as in the
3 other states. You can see Arizona, Maine, New Jersey are in the very high
4 end, and Kansas, Kentucky, and Oklahoma are at the lower end. What's
5 causing these differences we don't know, but it certainly raises a lot of
6 interesting questions.

7 And here's one that looks at the cities. This is the
8 percentage of high school students who did not go to school because of
9 safety concerns. The median is nine, and you can see cities like Boston,
10 Dallas, and Miami are below the median, and then other cities like Los
11 Angeles, San Bernardino, and New Orleans are considerably above the
12 median, so these kind of comparisons can be made with the uniform
13 questioning.

14 Researchers do a lot of analyses of YRBS data, very
15 interesting when you can compare the associations across the different
16 behaviors. These are just a sample of some of the dozens and dozens if
17 not hundreds of articles that have been written. I have a one-pager that
18 lists a number of excellent articles that have been written and added to the
19 field from YRBS data.

20 The national, state, and city data that I've been talking
21 about is just one component of our system. Periodically we do other
22 surveys that ask the same questions. In the 1990s we did a household-
23 based survey, so we were able to get at kids who were no longer in school
24 or are home schooled.

25 We did a college survey to ask the same questions of
26 college students. We did a survey of alternative high schools. You might
27 not be surprised to know that the risk behaviors were considerably higher
28 there.

29 Special populations. We do surveys with the Bureau of
30 Indian Affairs schools. The Navajo Nation has done some excellent
31 surveys, and we're constantly doing psychometric studies to see whether
32 the wording of the questions, the setting, the mood of the questions, what
33 kind of impact that has on the results.

34 This is a website where you can get the questionnaires.
35 You can get all the reports, a bibliography of the articles, and there's a
36 wonderful interactive computer program called Youth Online, in which
37 you can actually download U.S. state and cities results and create your
38 own graphs, comparing your state to the national results, to other states,
39 and so forth.

40 I wanted to take just a couple of moments to talk to you
41 not about YRBS but about another system that we have that we do every
42 other year, in the even years when we're not doing YRBS. This is called
43 School Health Profiles. This does not look at youth risk behaviors. It
44 looks at school health policies and programs.

45 You know, when you're talking about $100 million for

all the states, you're getting into the funding -- you're getting into our funding territory. That's close to the type of funding now that we at CDC give, and we've come to the realization that with that kind of money, if we're talking about collecting data for accountability purposes, it's just not fair to hold school programs accountable for making changes in youth risk behaviors.

If we're giving a much more substantial amount of money, say, to a health department to implement a comprehensive adolescent health program of which the school program is just one piece, well, yes, by golly, I'd say hold them accountable for moving the youth risk behaviors.

But we're moving -- while continuing to recognize the importance of collecting data on youth risk behaviors for all the reasons mentioned before, we're really moving in the direction of holding our funded partners more accountable for changes in the number of schools that are implementing the evidence-based policies and practices that our own research syntheses have identified as being likely to be effective, and it's largely through this system that we're able to get that data as to what percent of schools in a given state or city are implementing the evidence-based practices.

So School Health Profiles is conducted by state and local education and health agencies every other year. It's a random sample, a representative sample of secondary schools, and the questionnaires go currently to the principals and the lead health education teacher.

We've gotten better and better. Participation, we're up to 44 states and 16 cities now and with more technical assistance, the number that are getting weighted data will increase.

These are some of the sample topics that we ask about. "What are you teaching in health education?" "What teaching methods are you using?"   "What kind of professional preparation and staff development are your teachers and health-related staff getting?" "Specifically what content are you covering?"

In terms of these key topics, for us, "What are your policies related to physical education, nutrition services?" Asthma is an important issue for us, so we collect data on that.

And then, in terms of violence prevention, these are some of the items. This is very flexible. Unlike YRBs, we can readily make changes in this. These are items that were judged to be of importance, so we can tell you in the cities and states that participate what percent of the secondary schools have closed campus, require school uniforms, use metal detectors, and so on for any issue that's determined to be of importance.

Just to bring it to life, to give you one sample item, I think we'd all probably agree that it's a good thing for schools to have

1   registered nurses on their campuses. What we see when we look at it at
2   cities across the nation is a tremendous variation.
3   We have a number of cities where that is the norm, and
4   80 to 90 percent of the schools do have nurses full-time on campus, and
5   then we have other cities that are certainly no more economically or
6   financially challenged than the ones already mentioned, where it's like ten
7   percent of the schools, so really important insights that can come from
8   this.
9   The competitive food issue is an important issue for all
10   of us. This is just a sample item, the percent of schools where they sell
11   chocolate candy bars, and it's similar no matter what type of junk food you
12   look at.
13   You see there's tremendous variation across states that
14   because we're asking the same questions, and because we're asking about
15   policies and practices, not just about behaviors, we can identify those
16   states where clearly it is the norm to allow students access to chocolate
17   candy bars and other states where that's not what the policy is.
18   So those are the two systems that we're using for
19   accountability purposes, the Youth Risk Behavior Survey to get at the
20   behaviors and School Health Profiles to get at policies and practices.
21   MR. LONG: Howell, thank you very much for that
22   presentation, and next we'll hear from Doug Hall, PRIDE.
23   MR. HALL: Thank you very much. The Los Alamos,
24   New Mexico schools has used the PRIDE survey since 1988, and using
25   their data, school officials in Los Alamos were able to detect an
26   abnormally high number of eighth grade girls -- there were only 250
27   altogether -- but an abnormally high number of those eighth grades who
28   had seriously considered suicide.
29   If it weren't for local data, not national or state data, the
30   local officials in that school system in Los Alamos would not have been
31   alerted to that problem, and it may have been too late before they took
32   action.
33   Since the eyes in the back of my head aren't working so
34   well, if I'm on a slide that doesn't make sense, will someone let me know?
35   But PRIDE Surveys was founded in 1982 in Atlanta to
36   measure local adolescent alcohol and substance abuse problems. Since
37   then we've conducted more than 32,000 building level surveys in all 50
38   states involving ten million or more students. We offer surveys for
39   parents and faculty, as well.
40   Our clients include LEAs, SEAs, public health
41   departments, criminal justice agencies, community-based organizations,
42   CSAP funded programs, all sorts or programs across the board in the
43   country.
44   Let me see if I did it. Yes.
45   We offer six surveys that are standard, so to speak,

1 shelf products, four for students, one for faculty and staff, and one for
2 parents. We also provided administration, support, data collection, and
3 analysis for a number of clients who bring us their own instrument.
4 Our student surveys collect the four core measures that
5 have been identified by HHS and ONDCP and which are also parts of the
6 Principles of Effectiveness. Bill spoke of those earlier. That is 30-day
7 prevalence, perceived risk, age of onset, and parental-peer disapproval.
8 We're also following the effort that Bill also mentioned
9 on the uniform data set in terms of the prevalence of alcohol, of drug use
10 and violence, and feel that our current questionnaires probably capture
11 about 90 percent of what we've seen in the drafts of those uniform data set
12 effort that's coming along. As soon as those are made available, we'll add
13 the other ten percent.
14 Over the past 25 years, we have expanded our coverage
15 beyond alcohol and drugs, adding items that address school safety,
16 carrying guns, gang membership, bullying, school climate, suicide,
17 obesity, risk and protective factors, and character education.
18 Many schools use the data they receive from us to
19 guide their school improvement plans and to track AYP. Each school that
20 conducts a PRIDE Survey receives a report within two weeks, and this is
21 the school building level report that they will receive.
22 You'll see it's quite extensive. It weighs four pounds,
23 so we don't actually send them this thing. We send them -- and I've
24 provided each one of you -- we send them a short executive summary
25 printed and a CD that's a hyperlink, so it's easy to navigate.
26 They can get their data. They can do the same as you
27 spoke of Howell. They can slice-and-dice their data, and that's what
28 happened in Los Alamos. If we don't report it in a standard fashion, they
29 can come in and look at their data and slice-and-dice their data.
30 The cost of this is $1.35 per student. That is less than
31 .02 of one percent of the average spending per student in the United
32 States, so, you know, it is an affordable feature.
33 We produce these reports routinely at the building
34 level, the district level, the county level, the regional level, state level, and
35 national level, so there's an array of data that's available.
36 I previously mentioned that some of the schools are
37 using their data in their school improvement plans and also to track annual
38 yearly progress. This is a selected item dictionary of our instruments that
39 illustrates those items on our instruments that directly relate to academic
40 achievement.
41 You'll notice if you can read this -- I don't expect you to
42 be able to read this. I'm showing it for illustration, but if you could
43 possibly read it, the very top one on the left hand is make good grades.
44 The next one down is skipping schools.
45 This goes through an array of items such as whether

1   your teachers give you praise when you do good work. So this is
2   available online in case you would like to look at it, but you'll see that
3   there's quite a bit of data that is collected by these schools that pertain to
4   academic achievement.
5   I'll only spend a little bit of time in this room, but you
6   could back and ask me, but how do we know these kids are telling the
7   truth? We have done research and development studies testing validity
8   and reliability on these instruments for over 25 years.
9   The most recently we completed in December of 2006
10 with 5,700 randomly selected students in Brooklyn and Queens. The New
11 York field test showed that students in grades six, seven, and eight can
12 complete the survey in one class period and that risk and protective factor
13 scales maintain strong psychometric properties.
14   We've done test-retest on, you know, on the
15 instruments showing a 97 percent exact agreement on the prevalence of
16 cocaine use. We include internal checks in the instrument such as a fake
17 drug and also validity checks for internal consistency or inconsistency
18 such as if a student were to answer, "I use all illegal drugs on a daily
19 basis," that questionnaire would be considered invalid.
20   And we do iteration checks. We look not only at our
21 survey against other surveys in the country but also how local state data
22 compares against itself over time, but you will see this is just one data
23 point here compared to the monitor in the future survey.
24   At the bottom, if you can read that, this is on, I believe,
25 tenth grade annual illicit drug use. We showed 29.7 percent, MTF 29.8
26 percent. This is the same data point over seven years, comparing the
27 PRIDE survey with Monitoring the Future, and, as Howell mentioned
28 earlier, we look at YRBS. I should have been thoughtful enough to
29 compare it to YRBS.
30   These surveys show fairly similar, not exact, findings.
31 We don't have the exact same questions or the exact same methodology,
32 but as the old research saying goes, "Either someone is consistently telling
33 the truth, or they're consistently lying."
34   I want to get into a little data and the applicability at the
35 local level. One of the -- Howell made the point, and I will iterate that
36 that it is not easy to get into schools and to ask them to conduct a survey.
37   Oftentimes, the educators are concerned when someone
38 wants to come in, particularly from the outside, and conduct a survey that
39 measures antisocial behavior of the students. One of their concerns is the
40 adverse publicity that they might get.
41   This chart shows that they shouldn't have that concern.
42 What our surveys show consistently is that while there are drug problems
43 in the schools, drug problems are far more prevalent outside the schools.
44   As you can see, the green bar indicates the percentage
45 of marijuana use by twelfth graders at school, at nights, and on the

1 weekends, the tallest bar. A similar pattern, I might say, is found for
2 buying and selling drugs inside the school or outside the school and for
3 carrying guns. This is the next slide.
4 Adolescents are three times more likely to carry a gun
5 outside of school as a weapon or for protection. We're not talking about
6 hunting guns in this particular case.   Armed with this data, we feel that
7 educators, particularly local educators, are able to say that the schools,
8 comparatively speaking, are safe and healthy environments.
9 I don't think I have to do that, do I? I can point it this
10 way.
11 We all know that what parents think children do and
12 what children do are often two different things. The dark bars, the dark
13 green bars, show the percentage of self-reported eighth grade alcohol use
14 on the left and drug use on the right.
15 The light green bars represent the percentage of parents
16 who say their child uses alcohol and drugs. We think this data can help
17 local educators emphasize the important duty of parents to raise children
18 who are prepared to learn.
19 School officials using our faculty and staff survey -- am
20 I on that one? Yes, I am -- can also learn about their own personnel. The
21 data in the next two slides I'm going to show you is aggregate national
22 data. It's not randomly selected, but when we conduct the survey on the
23 local level, we will do a population study of the faculty in that school, so
24 therefore we would be talking about representative date. So I'm showing
25 you this for example.
26 These are the training needs of students -- of faculty
27 and parents related to alcohol and drug issues, and you'll see that it's two-
28 thirds or more of the faculty and staff tell us that they need training in
29 these issues. I might add we have done -- we have cut this data for
30 schools, because the issue comes up that the certified personnel say, "Oh,
31 that's just the non-certified people."
32 Well, it doesn't work out that way. Both the certified
33 and the non-certified personnel show these needs, as well as, in the next
34 slide, you'll see an even greater percent say that they are in need of
35 training in issues related to violence prevention such as recognizing the
36 early signs.
37 I hope I've been able to show you in this little
38 presentation that local data is being collected and being put to effective
39 use, that the data is vital to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, that
40 the data is rich and reliable and useful and affordable, and it's available
41 within just two weeks.
42 I hope you'll also remember my opening story about
43 those little girls in New Mexico. I think if there were a argument to be
44 made for why there needs to be this capture of this local data, I can't think
45 of a better reason.

I want to go back to a question that was asked before we came forward. No, the state grants portion of Drug-free Schools does not pay Georgina Williams, the prevention specialist in Los Alamos schools, her salary, but without that, this issue would not be on Georgina's plate, and that's what makes it very important.

Thank you very much.

MR. LONG: Thank you very much, Doug, and now if we could enter into the segment of time when we have questions and enter actually into a conversation. Russell.

MR. JONES: Yes. Thanks so much for your excellent presentations, very, very informative. I'm familiar with the CDC's instrument. When I was a member of the number of committees there in the early nineties and up until probably 2003, we vetted that particular instrument, and I see that it's doing very good things.

But I had a number of questions, and I won't ask them all, but since I had a question just before our previous speaker left, and unfortunately, I didn't ask that question because we ran out of time, so I'm going to get my questions in this time as quickly as possible.

But there was a -- you made a statement earlier about the lack of correlation with the data that are begin collected and outcome measures, Bill, and I'm wondering can you say a little bit more about that?

I mean, I'm just trying -- I'm just trying to get some clarity in terms of the data that are being collected here on fairly psychometrically sound instrument and seem to be correlated with some outcome measures, achievement, et cetera. So I'm just trying to get some clarity on that statement that you --

MR. MODZELESKI: Nothing that Doug is collecting or Howell is collecting or Mike is collecting relates back to a specific program. It relates back to an accumulation of things that are being done at the school, at the community, in the churches, so forth and so on.

So, you know, you could take Los Alamos, you know, Doug's question and say, you know, what created crime to go up or down, you know, and you could use the data to show it has gone up or it has gone down, but you can't point a finger and say it's because of the mentoring program or whatever the case may be.

So you could use that data to go back and say, "We're doing the right things." You know, "Here are the ten things we're doing, and look, we've been doing these ten things for five years, and crime is constantly going down," so we could say that, but we can't point our finger and say specifically this or specifically that.

So it gives us a good overview of what's happening at the local level with the PRIDE survey, at the state level with the YRBSS. And, by the way, is that Pennsylvania -- Howell mentioned Pennsylvania and Virginia. They are collecting data, albeit not through YRBSS.

1   Pennsylvania has their own survey, and Virginia has a -
2 - Virginia had a lot of problems with going out and requesting -- again,
3 this is getting back to getting permission to use survey at the state level, so
4 Virginia has a web-based --
5   They're not collecting everything that everybody else
6 is. They are collecting some things. Pennsylvania is collecting more, I
7 mean, so those are two different -- it's not that they're doing anything. So
8 that's the biggest issue.
9   MR. JONES: So what is the reason for the lack of
10 connection between outcome and the data that are being collected? I
11 mean, is that methodological? Is it financial? Is it philosophical or -- I'm
12 not sure.
13   MR. MODZELESKI: All the above.
14   MR. JONES: All of the above.
15   MR. MODZELESKI: All of the above.   MR.
16 JONES: Yes, and how do we attack that? I mean, I think one of the most
17 important things this Committee could do or recommend is a linkage
18 between these data sets and outcomes. Let me be more specific, the
19 linkage of these data sets and programs that are presently being engaged
20 by No Child Left Behind and Safe and Drug-Free Schools. I mean, how
21 do you --
22   MR. MODZELESKI: I'll let Howell and others talk
23 about that.
24   MR. JONES: Okay.
25   MR. MODZELESKI: I will say that we've had
26 experience with this going back now well over eight years. We've had
27 some of the best methodologists and researchers in the world come to the
28 table and begin to have this discussion about that, and they've all told us
29 the same thing is that basically it's almost impossible to take a discrete
30 program and then, say, take that program back unless it's evaluated as a
31 discrete program, but basically say that this program is attributable to
32 these results, especially in those communities or those schools where
33 there's a lot of different programs going on. And what we know from
34 Denise Goddferdson's work is that basically every school in this country is
35 doing not a program but multiple programs.
36   So our sort of substitute for that, and this is after the
37 first part, was agreement on the part of OMB and Department of
38 Education to take a look or a list of programs which we know have been
39 effected, contribute to a certain effect size, provided, as Mike said, is that
40 they were implemented with a degree of fidelity.
41   And so that's being used as a substitute where we're
42 saying is, "Okay, how many schools are engaged in these programs, A,
43 that we know are effective?" B is to then go back and say, "How many
44 are then implementing these programs with a high degree of fidelity, so
45 we know that, or we could assume, that we're going to get a certain

1 outcome?" So that's the best that we have been able to do, these, you
2 know, tying data sets back to particular programs.
3 　　　　　　MR. JONES: So what are we -- do we know what we're
4 finding? And I'm wondering to what extent does -- is Congress aware,
5 and what do they make of these kind of linkages?
6 　　　　　　MR. MODZELESKI: I think there is an acceptance
7 now. I mean, the OMB has accepted these type of linkages. I mean,
8 provided that we could put them forward, OMB has clearly said that we're
9 willing to accept that as part of the measurement for the part.
10 　　　　　　And there are some draft, which I can't talk about, but
11 hopefully within the next month or so we should have some preliminary
12 data on where schools are on doing some of these things. I mean, there's
13 some good news, and there's some not so good news as we look at it.
14 　　　　　　MR. JONES: I'm sorry. Just one last follow-up to that.
15 Then are there budgetary priorities? Let me put it another way. To what
16 extent is budget tied to findings from the connectivity of these data sets
17 and outcome studies? I mean, is there appreciation of kind of the pre-
18 morbid functioning and the --
19 　　　　　　MR. MODZELESKI: Yes. The short answer is yes. I
20 mean, there's been agreement. You know, the other agreement is that we
21 have made some, I think, some significant strides with OMB on
22 recognizing the fact that some of the stuff that we are measuring and, you
23 know, we have about seven performance measures for the national
24 program. Many of them come from the YRBSS, and so if YRBSS
25 indicates that there's been a reduction in alcohol and drug use and
26 violence, we take credit for it.
27 　　　　　　Now, fortunately, the data, the trend line, has been
28 moving either on a straight line or downward, but at some point in time,
29 and I think anybody that's been involved with this for a long period of
30 time realizes is that trend line moves up and down.
31 　　　　　　It does not continuously move down, and we all know
32 that, and, you know, we don't want to sit here or be able to sit here and say
33 just because it's going up it's attributed to a lack of influence or a lack of
34 proper programming on the part of local school districts.
35 　　　　　　There's a lot more to it than just merely what we do as
36 far as our programs or our dollars. I think that that's where we have to
37 begin to dig down and make that connection between specific programs
38 and specific outcomes, which we don't have.
39 　　　　　　And we clearly recognize is that the type of evaluation
40 that Shep has done with his program can be done, but it's a costly
41 endeavor, I mean, and so we'd like to take programs like the good
42 behavior game and say is that if it's done in this particular way, in this
43 particular manner, this is the outcome that you can be expected to receive.
44 That's a lot cheaper and a lot easier to do than going back and constantly
45 evaluating these programs.

1   MS. TAFT: Thank you for this presentation and for
2 telling me about the School Health Profiles that CDC does. I didn't realize
3 that you all did those, that kind of survey in your off years.
4   I'm looking at the chart that you put up of sample
5 topics, and it says tobacco use prevention, but it doesn't say anything
6 about alcohol and drug, other drug use prevention, and I wondered if that
7 was also included, because that might help inform what programs out
8 there are being used.
9   MR. WECHSLER: We ask about alcohol and other
10 drug use in our national survey, which is called School Health Policies
11 and Program Study that we get to do every six years, and that's coming
12 out. The 2006 results are coming out in the fall.
13   I don't believe we currently -- we've been gradually
14 increasing the amount of topics, and because alcohol and drug use is not
15 something that has fallen largely in our domain at CDC, that's something
16 that'll get added in later rather than sooner, but it'll get on there eventually.
17   MS. TAFT: I think most everybody on this Committee
18 would urge a sooner rather than later addition.
19   MR. WECHSLER: Well, these things cost, and we
20 have to -- you know, we have financial resources from other categorical
21 programs that are targeting the other issues that have contributed to
22 building up the system, so it costs.
23   MR. LONG: Next, Shep, first of all, welcome back,
24 and then Dennis.
25   MR. KELLAM: Well, I'm back. I want to call attention
26 to a very major and important distinction, and Russell raised it, and so did
27 Susan, and Tommy did indirectly, Tommy Ledbetter, when he was
28 saying, well, you do the third grade, first through third grade, you know,
29 with the Reading First, and then what the hell happens by high school.
30 They don't stay that way.
31   Well, maybe they do. Maybe they don't. In order to
32 find out over time how kids do, which is what I want to make a distinction
33 about, you have to measure the same kid over time with a unique
34 identifier.
35   Now the data systems we're talking about here are
36 management information systems, technically, and they, in fact, give you
37 an aggregate measure at points of time across populations. You can, in
38 fact, do both. Indeed, the school district does a growth model data
39 gathering on grades.
40   They collect Charlie's grades, kindergarten through the
41 entire course of schooling. Many of the counties and districts have, in
42 fact, such personal information systems and would lend themselves to the
43 kind of growth that we heard earlier.
44   Just as I was walking in, David, you know, I didn't get
45 the name of the person who was talking about it. We were hearing about

1   schools in certain states being provided opportunity to follow kids over
2   time, not just about grades, but also about behavior, psychological,
3   physical, other parameters of health.
4   And it's those kinds of complementarities between the
5   management information system which gives you aggregate data,
6   aggregated at different kinds of configurations, school building, school
7   districts, states, and so on, compared to the growth curve kind of
8   perspective.
9   In a growth curve perspective, you can, in fact, have
10 some kids try the standard program with innovation and other kids try the
11 standard program without an innovation and discover over time what
12 happens to the kids who got the innovation, and that's what we do.
13   In randomized field trials that are population based, we
14 define a population and give it to some kids in some sampling frame,
15 randomized or otherwise, and we compare it to the other kids. So it's
16 extremely important for us to understand that distinction.
17   Another issue is that management information systems
18 generally start relatively later than the kinds of developmental
19 epidemiologic kinds of data systems we're talking about as the alternative
20 or complementary alternative.
21   For example, we know a lot about early antecedents in
22 first grade and earlier, in infancy, even, about the earlier antecedents of
23 school failure, of attention problems, of drug abuse, of tobacco use, of a
24 whole variety of outcomes.
25   There is more knowledge about boys than there is
26 about girls for some reasons that we don't understand. It took us a long
27 time to start studying girls developmentally, you know, in the research
28 field.
29   So, in fact, when you talk about prevention, you want
30 to, in fact, entertain the possibility of going earlier than grade four even,
31 let alone middle school, and talk about these early antecedents as potential
32 targets for intervention.   And, indeed, The Society for Prevention
33 Research every year has programs which start earlier and, in fact, do show
34 impact with rigorous designs, you know, that we can use to understand
35 outcomes that Russell was asking about.
36   The management information systems do not
37 disaggregate programs, but worse, they don't follow the same kids over
38 time necessarily. It's an aggregation across populations.
39   They tell you what's going on, and in some sense we're
40 smitten for a variety or reasons not to join the developmental
41 epidemiology that the schools use with health indicators over time that
42 other people use, although some population data does exist
43 developmentally over time.
44   We need to understand the uses of both and understand
45 how one is far more informative about what works and what doesn't for

1   which kids, because basically you're interested in changing the
2   developmental trajectories of kids, improving the developmental
3   trajectories. That means following kids over time. I throw that for the
4   start of a conversation, not the end of it.
5   MR. LONG: I am not going to have you repeat that,
6   Shep. Dennis?
7   MR. ROMERO: Thank you very much. Thank you to
8   the three panelists. I think your information is just extremely helpful, and
9   especially as we're moving into more of a decision-driven, data decision-
10 driven focus, it only makes sense to use data as we make our decisions,
11 and my comment first is to Doug Hall. I would be very curious to see
12 how YRBS falls in that comparison between Monitoring the Future and
13 PRIDE, so I'd love to see that.
14   My question, I think, Shep might have answered it to
15 some extent, but what is the number one difficulty or stumbling block that
16 you experience in trying to gather the data or trying to get a picture of the
17 communities or the schools or the state? What would be the one issue that
18 you find difficult to get at?
19   MR. HALL: I think it probably would be the perceived
20 administrative burden of doing this, of conducting a survey in the schools,
21 and I use the perceived. For example, the instrument that we tested in
22 Brooklyn and Queens is a modified version of the original 12-page
23 Communities That Care Youth Survey that originated with SAMHSA.
24   We hired Jack Pollard from the University of
25 Washington, who is now actually our Senior Research Analyst, and Jack
26 had had a great deal of experience in the creation of the original CTC
27 Survey. And what we looked at is how could we eliminate some
28 questions, items that perhaps weren't needed.
29   The reason for that is the perception in the mind of the
30 school administrator that the 12-page paper instrument was a burden on
31 the school system, and all of the research has said that students could
32 complete the 12-page CTC original instrument with very little problem of
33 item missingness, some, but very little problem of item missingness in the
34 allotted classroom time.
35   But the perception was that it couldn't occur, so it didn't
36 matter what the statistics or the research said. The perception was it was
37 not possible, so we created an instrument that is a four-page instrument,
38 eliminating items that, one, did not show a high correlation or showed a
39 lower correlation to alcohol and drug use, instruments that local
40 community groups or local school systems would probably be hard put to
41 change.
42   It might be more the role of the mayor or the governor
43 of the state or the President of the United States, so the local organization
44 could not affect some redundancy and also a few of the items that might
45 create some sort of "political" with a small "p" problem. Family

1 management is one of the areas where oftentimes school administrators
2 are not willing to have those type of questions asked in the school room.
3 　　　　　What we have found is that by producing a four-page
4 instrument versus a 12-page instrument, it's about -- you know, the
5 schools that select we'll offer, "Here's what -- you can use this or this."
6 The schools that select, it's about six to one that will go with the four-
7 page, so it removes the burden, you know, or the perceived burden, I
8 would say.
9 　　　　　As I tried to point out in my discussion, there is a
10 perceived cost. "Oh, analysis or data collection is horribly expensive.
11 You can't do that, you know. Schools don't have the money."
12 　　　　　Protection of participants is an issue. The active
13 parental consent is a problem with some schools. They simply don't --
14 schools don't want to do a student survey in the first place, and then you
15 say on top of that you'll have to get active parental permission to do this.
16 This layers another burden on top of the schools.
17 　　　　　So all of these are what I would call -- many of them
18 are perceived, though, and schools that are doing the active parental
19 permission and doing a good job are getting fairly good response back,
20 but it is a burden.
21 　　　　　Those are some of the problems. What we try to do is -
22 - a few slides I showed -- we try to work with administrators to show what
23 the benefits, you know, the public relations benefits can be of conducting
24 these surveys.
25 　　　　　And then there is the financial aspect. Hope knows this
26 well. We conduct the survey for the Greater Cincinnati Coalition, and
27 they feel that having the data has allowed them to leverage about $14
28 million in funding for that coalition, and without that data they feel that
29 people would not have come to the table.
30 　　　　　So that is a small price to pay for such a great benefit in
31 terms of the financial benefit. So one of the things we're trying to do is to
32 work with overcoming these problems with the schools, and that was one
33 of the -- the topic of our workshop at the CADCA conference was it was
34 called "Let's Play Nice," and we put school people and Coalition people
35 together to try to overcome those obstacles.
36 　　　　　MR. LONG: Are you going to answer the Ohio part, or
37 did you have a different -- because Susan -- that's the reason I was asking.
38 Okay. Susan. That's why I asked.
39 　　　　　MS. KEYS: Thank you. I just wanted to follow up
40 with a clarification to something that Shep said. I did not understand
41 when heard the presentation about the growth model that there were
42 indicators other than academic indicators that were being collected, so I'm
43 not sure that health indicators are a part of it.
44 　　　　　It's only academic performance, and although the
45 potential exists, I'm not sure that we heard that they're taking full

1 advantage of that potential by linking back from the student performance
2 to what the actual interventions were or possibly looking at dosage and
3 mobility and those kinds of factors.
4 So it appeared to me that it was looking at only
5 individual level data to see whether individuals were improving
6 performance over time only. So I just wanted to clarify that, because I
7 think that there is potential for doing something different, but I don't think
8 that they're using that full potential.
9 MR. LONG: Thank you, Sue. Hope, Russell, Shep.
10 MS. TAFT: Thank you. We've heard a lot of
11 information from the Department about how they can identify the schools
12 that are most in need and the schools that need extra help, whether it's
13 persistently dangerous or failing schools or schools that are in makeover
14 or whatever you want to call it.
15 And a lot of this is based on No Child Left Behind
16 information, and I was wondering how that is tied into the national grant
17 program for Safe and Drug-Free Schools, since you all spend more money
18 on the National Grant Program than you do on the states grant Program
19 and wondered if there was a tie-in to using the data that you get to on
20 which schools are in the most trouble with the funding that goes out.
21 MR. MODZELESKI: The answer is yes. I mean, for
22 every discretionary grant program there is a section which is called need,
23 and the applicable agency, be it an LEA or a private not-for-profit, has to
24 describe their need, you know, in several terms, you know, whether it's
25 alcohol and drug use or truancy or violence or whatever the case may be.
26 So there is a section in the discretionary grant which
27 talks about need. That need is measured many different ways, but
28 nevertheless it is a significant part of every application.
29 MS. TAFT: Having written some of those grants, you
30 can -- I know that an area can make themselves look very needy, and I
31 wondered if that is correlated to other data that you have within the
32 Department.
33 MR. MODZELESKI: If you're asking whether or not,
34 you know, say, for a PEP grant, the physical education where you get
35 hundreds and hundreds, you know, 700, 800 applications, whether you
36 look at a standard, whether it comes from, say, Centers for Disease
37 Control or not and then say, "Let's measure against the standard," the
38 answer is no.
39 MS. TAFT: Okay. It seems to me there could be a
40 connection there. Also, looking at the PRIDE Survey and knowing from
41 other surveys that I am familiar with there is a -- there should be a great
42 link between schools and communities, because most of the negative
43 behavior activity happens outside of the school building or the school
44 property, and I wondered if there was anything in the reauthorization of
45 No Child Left Behind that would make that link between school and

1 community more specific and firmer.

2 MR. MODZELESKI: Not at the present time, because

3 at the present time, as Holly mentioned this morning, is that it's formula-

4 driven to the state but not formula-driven from the state down to the

5 location education agencies.

6 MS. TAFT: So there's no way that you could say one of

7 the things that would be valued would be a school-community coalition

8 link or anything like that?

9 MR. MODZELESKI: Well, I think, Hope, I think the

10 answer is yes, I mean, and the other thing that Holly mentioned this

11 morning is that the specifics of this, you know, what we call the specs

12 haven't been developed as of yet, so a lot of that can be developed.

13 All I'm saying is that the formula as it's now, you know,

14 derived is that we'll go from the federal government down to the states,

15 and then from there it will not be formula-driven down. Now, there's a lot

16 that can be done, and, for example, is that we could consider is that as

17 these dollars are at the state level and that they go from the state level to

18 selected LEAs that the going down to the selected LEAs will be based

19 upon certain criteria.

20 One of those criteria, if you look at the revised part, has

21 to be need, has to be need measured in several different ways, but that's

22 going to have to be -- that's going to have to be part of it. The other part

23 can be.

24 I'm not saying, and we haven't had this discussion yet,

25 but it's conceivable that as dollars or resources or services go from the

26 state down to the local level, it's based on need.

27 It's also based upon the willingness of an LEA to do

28 certain things to ensure effectiveness such as collaboration with the

29 community, whether it's community, formal community groups or

30 informal groups, but nevertheless that whole collaboration part, which is

31 absolutely key, I mean, because schools can't do it by themselves.

32 MS. TAFT: And just to follow up on that, I mean, I

33 know that you were talking about the state, the formula grant, but in our

34 discretionary grant programs, the majority of those programs have a

35 strong tie to collaboration with the community.

36 The majority of our grants go directly to the LEA. A

37 couple of them can go to community-based organizations, but

38 collaboration with the community is intertwined in most of our

39 discretionary grant programs.

40 I guess my whole issue is, you know, you have all this

41 good data that's derived from various sources. How is the Department

42 using that to inform their decision-making?

43 MS. PRICE: We use it as best we can. I don't know

44 how else to say without being specific. You know, you mentioned about

45 in the discretionary grant programs and the application process of tying it

1 to need, and in that review of those applications, as Bill mentioned, the
2 PEP Grant, it doesn't get 600 or 700 applications a year. Last year we got
3 1,160 and funded 56.
4   So, you know, we do try to review and look at those
5 and see that -- I don't know what the right term for it is. There's honest
6 representation on their grant application of what the circumstances
7 actually are, but, you know, there's limitations within the work that a staff
8 person can do to verify those relationships, but we do as best we can to try
9 to incorporate the data, the use of the data in our grant applications.
10 Going forward, can we do a better job? Probably so.
11   MR. MODZELESKI: Debbie, I'd also add that much of
12 the data that I talked about and Howell's data, although it doesn't apply to
13 Doug's data, is the state level data, and the applications come in from not
14 only local school districts but sometimes local school districts on behalf of
15 individual schools, and so therefore it's hard to take the national data or
16 the state data and then use that at the local level.
17   The problem that we see, and Susan and I have had this
18 discussion as part of the Safe Schools Healthy Students, is that oftentimes
19 is that some of these programs go to a school district and within the school
20 district go to particular schools. For example, you want prevention
21 programs to begin in the elementary schools, and so you're driving your
22 dollars to the elementary schools.
23   The need, however, if you look at need factors and you
24 only pull out need, is you don't see a whole lot of alcohol and drug use or
25 violence, especially if you compare that to the secondary schools, so these
26 are issues we're trying to work through is that, you know, we know it
27 needs to go there, but the need can't be manifested.
28   We also need that locals are going to present data.
29 Sometimes they present state data, but more often they present some local
30 data, and that local data gets back into the reason why we're doing the
31 common core at the national level is because at the local level it's very
32 difficult to compare data that may be submitted by Cincinnati to data that's
33 submitted by Chattanooga, because while they may be trying to say the
34 same thing, is the data is very, very different, and it's hard for
35 comparability purposes to compare one to the other.
36   MR. JONES: Yes. A couple of questions, one to Bill
37 and then just two quick questions for the panel. You know, I'm hearing a
38 number of very excellent questions that are being raised, and, you know,
39 the most recent was by Hope, just the extent to which the data that are
40 being collected are being used to inform decisions that the Department is
41 making.
42   And I'm just wondering. You mentioned that there had
43 been some time where a group of methodologists had come together and
44 discussed various data sets, issues, et cetera, and I'm just wondering the
45 extent to which that group continues to convene and grapples with some

1 of the issues that are presently being discussed.

2 MR. MODZELESKI: It comes together at several
3 different levels, and the level that it comes together most frequently is on
4 the common core data definitions, and that's a -- that meets on a regular
5 basis. I will say is that the data is used to make decisions.

6 One of the ways it's used is to basically look at
7 programming. You know, do we put our dollars into X, Y, or Z? You
8 know, if you have drug use, especially if it's going up in a particular area,
9 we may want to consider putting dollars in there.

10 Now that becomes a little bit difficult, because we don't
11 like to categorize some of these things and say, "Let's just develop a
12 program for methamphetamine use," when that may be going up in certain
13 areas but not all areas. Again, it gets away from this whole looking at
14 this, looking at risk factors and protective factors and try to do it globally.

15 I would say that the -- go back to the point is that right
16 now under the part, there are measures related to alcohol and drug use, as
17 well -- well, alcohol, drug use, and violence use that we're being held
18 against as far as the overall effectiveness of the State Grant Program, so
19 it's being used in that way. Now we could have a whole discussion about
20 whether or not that's fair or not fair, but nevertheless that's where we are
21 today.

22 MR. JONES: I guess I was asking a more basic
23 question, you know, just the use of certain data sets, you know, the
24 management information perspective as opposed to the longitudinal curve
25 growth model data, just the relative usage of those types of data
26 information gathering sets and then their relative merit.

27 I don't -- but their relative application to the various
28 programs that the Department of Education is encouraging. So, it's a --
29 you know, it's a more basic question.

30 MR. MODZELESKI: Let me give you two examples is
31 that in the booklet that you have, the one on the indicators, the very first
32 chart that's in there, I believe it's chart number one, is the chart on school-
33 associated violent deaths, and that, I believe the last data that we've
34 collected with Howell's colleagues down at the injury branch, you know,
35 is that there were 21 school-associated violent deaths.

36 If you take a look at that data and you compare that
37 data to, say, bullying data or you compare it to truancy data, I mean, there
38 is -- because of the high visibility of those cases, there is what I call in
39 many respects the knee jerk reaction to put all your money into police
40 officers, SROs, medical detectors, cameras, or whatever the case may be.

41 So we try to paint a picture of saying, "This is the
42 picture. Nobody should tolerate 21 deaths, but on the other hand, look at
43 the tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands if you believe some surveys,
44 millions of kids who have basically been bullied, picked on, intimidated,
45 threatened, harassed, who aren't going to school.

1   So you look at that from the general perspective. I call
2   it the 30,000 feet perspective. I'm saying is that as we develop programs,
3   these can't be programs that are merely focused on the law enforcement
4   side.
5   They're important, but, however, you can't ignore those
6   other things, and that's where the data basically generally pushes it. So
7   that's one, I think, one clear example of how we use the data to push
8   programming.
9   MR. JONES: Thank you. Just a follow-up question.
10   I'm just wondering the extent to which the data that are collected, to what
11   degree, or maybe I should ask how are the data used to inform evidence-
12   based or evidence-informed intervention strategies and to what extent
13   does that impact -- well, I'll leave that part of it off.
14   Yes, but so just real basically to what extent do the data
15   that you folks are collecting inform the use of evidence, informed or
16   evidence-based intervention strategies?
17   MR. WECHSLER: The evidence we collect and the
18   data we collect in terms of our risk behaviors really are to set priorities, to
19   guide broad policy decisions, not to design a specific intervention.
20   Sometimes they're included. Some very impressive
21   interventions actually use YRBS data to try to teach children about norms
22   so that they, you know, correct misperceptions that the great majority of
23   kids are using drugs or alcohol or whatever. So that's one way that it's
24   used, but basically it's to set priorities, to decide where to put resources.
25   On the other hand, when we're looking at collecting
26   data on school practices, those practices are derived largely from evidence
27   of interventions that have been shown to be effective, so we wanted to see
28   to what extent our schools implementing those practices that quality
29   evaluations have shown to be effective.
30   MR. JONES: I'm sorry. And do we have data on that?
31   Does the CDC have data?
32   MR. WECHSLER: Data on what?
33   MR. JONES: On the last point that you made. You
34   were saying that -- well, I'm sorry.
35   MR. WECHSLER: If we know, if we can come to a
36   scientific consensus over what are the effective practices, which we've
37   been able to do in some fields, then we can design items that can be
38   collected in these kinds of surveys. To that extent, we have, yes.
39   MR. JONES: yes, I'd certainly like to get my hands on
40   some of that. You know, and then just going back to the policy, you're
41   saying that your data are used to impact policy, and do we know what --
42   so policy related to the Department of Education, but more specifically,
43   the No Child Left Behind and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools initiative.
44   So do we -- are those data being used to develop policy
45   within this group, within this sphere, within the Department of Education?

1   MR. WECHSLER: I think that would be an interesting
2   question for Mike --
3   MR. JONES: Okay.
4   MR. WECHSLER: -- at the state level.
5   MR. Herrmann: First off, in terms of using data, you
6   know, local LEAs are required to conduct a needs assessment, and on the
7   application we ask them to tell us what are the needs that are identified.
8   Okay. Directly below that section we ask them to tell us the strategies
9   that they propose to implement as a result of those needs assessments.
10   So what we do then, in reviewing the application, is
11 there a connection between this need that was identified, these risk
12 factors, and the strategy that was selected to use the Title IV funds for. So
13 I think that's the most clear-cut sort of connection between the data, if you
14 will, and the strategy.
15   Now I think the thing that's important to recognize is all
16 this data that we've been talking about is really not risk factors. I mean,
17 you know, what we're really talking about is incident data that's kind of,
18 you know, two or three steps down the road from what we are really sort
19 of targeting the strategies at.
20   A point that I wanted to make, because we missed it
21 and it's related to Shep's inquiry, I think, I think we're really, in terms of
22 data collection, we're kind of on the verge of being at a whole new level of
23 collecting and being able to use data.
24   I think historically we've collected data about issues,
25 incidents, problems, whatever, that's been centered around the particular
26 problem, but more and more we're moving to a data management system
27 that is centered around the student.
28   And once we make that move from being centered on
29 the problem to being centered on the student, then I think questions about,
30 you know, what kinds of interventions were introduced and what kind of
31 effect did they have, I think all that's going to sort of roll out of it.
32   But we're kind of at this stage right now where we've
33 got more data than we know what to do with. We haven't figured out how
34 to use it in a way that really benefits students, but I think we're getting
35 closer.
36   I think the challenge is our folks, like you, the
37 researchers, are they in touch with the folks within the departments that
38 are really pulling this management system together so that, you know,
39 once some of these basic bugs get worked out, and the basic system gets
40 in place, are we going to be in a place where we can move pretty quickly
41 to use that information.
42   MR. HALL: I would like to just add another dimension
43 to this. The instruments that we offer do get to causation. The original
44 PRIDE Survey instrument, which is a one-page, you know, front and back
45 instrument, was looked at by SDRG at the University of Washington, and

1   they identified 55 risk and protective factor items on the original
2   instrument that appeared in 1982.

3   Using that data, evaluators are able to look at
4   performance outcomes. Now what we -- we don't provide that evaluation
5   service, but most of the people who use our instruments do so voluntarily.

7   That's probably 90 percent, you know. There may be a
8   few out there that have the gun to their head, but, you know, there's not
9   many, so most of the people use this voluntarily as part of an overall
10   assessment or evaluation aimed at getting performance outcomes.

11   For example, we collect data that's provided to the SIG
12   Grants in three states and a number of others. A number of the grantees
13   under the national programs that receive the Safe School Healthy Students
14   use PRIDE data as part of their evaluation.

15   So I wanted to sort of -- there was something out there
16   that sort of seemed like, well, this is not being connected, but it is. I
17   would say the difference is it's being collected on a sporadic basis across
18   the country. This is not something that's been done universally in every
19   single school system and every state but is being done in many schools
20   systems throughout the United States.

21   Would we like to see it in every place? Of course, you
22   know. I mean, that was, you know, the -- that was the whole idea behind
23   the introduction of our questionnaire in 1982.

24   As you know, if you look back historically at that time,
25   people were out attempting to make interventions and prevention on
26   alcohol and drug issues without any data at all except the Monitoring the
27   Future, which wasn't applicable at the local level.

28   So I think that is being done. We would help. We
29   would support any effort to try to see how we could standardize that or
30   make it closer to a standardization. We know that there are enormous
31   challenges in doing that, but that would be the goal is if we could
32   somehow as a nation collect data that would guide every single program
33   in every single program in the country. That would be the goal.

34   MR. LONG: If we could go with Shep and then
35   Tommy, and then if we bring this segment to a close.

36   MR. KELLAM: I like Mike's optimistic view that we're
37   on the verge of reinventing the information systems we've got so that
38   they're useful to kids program decisions and help us integrate health and
39   education, and child welfare you could throw in, as well.

40   We are, I think, in this group in the business of trying to
41   lay out some kind of a map of where we go from here, pulling together
42   education, prevention, and information and policymaking into one thing.

43   We've got an enormous array of separate information
44   systems out there. I mean, they're all over the place, and we haven't really
45   learned to use the data in the interest of how you run the school, or how

do you teach a kid, or how do you get inside the kid's head and think about self-interest, risk behaviors, and the like.

We know that, for example, early mal-adapting to school in the form of jumping around, breaking rules, and fighting, particularly among boys, is a huge risk factor for later drug abuse and violent behavior and the like. On the other hand, it's also an enormous risk factor for poor achievement and school failure.

So we know these -- in the kids, these early risks are all integrated. The information system the school gathers regularly is, in fact, a developmental epidemiologically potentially useful information system. It follows Charlie over time and across schools in many school districts.

Not all school districts have a computerized tracking system, but many do, and so we have that precedent when it comes to following grades and even some behavioral issues like suspension and expulsion. It's on that developmental record.

So it's not like we're starting from scratch, but then we have to somehow see how we can connect up to and make universal language with the kind of things that are collected in the YRBSS and PRIDE and the like so that they, in fact, do relate to a potential for making policy decisions.

I think that the next generation which we should lay out might say something like this, that we've got now the beginnings of education management information systems in every state as part of no kid gets left behind, and we haven't learned how to use that data, either, except to blame the school and not give them any money to fix anything, let alone methods.

So that management information system, though, that tells us how well the states are doing and the school buildings are doing can be used to map where the problems are, the hot spots. That's the function of demographic epidemiology, show you where the trouble is and something about the qualities of the trouble.

There's a second level where you begin to take that apart and look more intensively with proper sampling at what are the causal issues that bring about those hot spots. That's the second level, and there we can use data like we've got, management information system. It borders on meeting developmental data, as well.

The third level is where we're following kids over time and trying out programs in some systematic fashion like randomization or something that does the trick in that regard so that we can test what works and under what circumstances for which kids.

Those are three levels, and they manage to integrate these different kinds of information systems potentially. So I think that we need to keep thinking about how these data systems can be applied to outcomes and can be applied to policy, as Russell has been pushing.

I was optimistic. Susan corrected my

1 misapprehensions about where you were in the process of moving toward
2 following kids over time. One of the things that we have to be aware of is
3 what Dennis raised, and that is that this all requires an enormous amount,
4 and Hope's been talking about this since I met you.
5   It's got to do with the partnerships, the partnerships
6 between the community, including health and the school building and the
7 researchers who can, in fact, help look for a shared vision, because the
8 way you get these information systems integrated to policy and integrated
9 at all anyway is to have a partnership which sees mutual self-interest in all
10 that happening.
11   I mean, we've been working inside Baltimore's school
12 district for 30 -- I don't know how many years, since the early eighties.
13 We've been doing randomized field trials, doing all kinds of stuff.
14   Ninety-five percent of parents give us written consent
15 to do this stuff, you know, assigning kids to classrooms and so on. They
16 do it out of mutual interest and working through trust.
17   So the partnership becomes critical and bringing these
18 information systems together and bringing the institutions together in this
19 next generation of work, where information really is at these three levels,
20 you know, down to the level of what works for which kids over time and
21 is applicable to policies.
22   So somehow we've got to sketch out a framework, and,
23 in fact, the Secretary, David, you know, raised that when she visited us.
24 So you keep talking about an integrated information system. Is anybody
25 going to let you do that? You know, what are the political problems?
26   Well, this is a serious issue, so how do you protect
27 kids? But we're already doing it in part, and something's been keeping us
28 from bringing things together. At the next stage I think we ought to try to
29 map it out.
30   MR. LEDBETTER: Doug made reference a moment
31 ago about some problems with collecting data where you use surveys and
32 so forth, that school administrators sometimes don't want to participate in
33 some of these things. I don't disagree with you, okay. I'll say that up
34 front, but I want you to understand how we think.
35   When we talk about school accountability, and that's
36 what No Child Left Behind is all about, basically, it's about accountability.
37   That accountability starts with the principal of the school or the
38 headmaster or whatever the terminology might be, and it goes down.
39   If the principal is being held accountable for the school,
40 for the progress of the school, then that principal holds those teachers at
41 that school accountable for what happens in those classrooms. Those
42 teachers want to protect their instructional time. If they're being
43 accountable for what happens in their classroom, then they're very
44 protective of their instructional time.
45   Therefore, that principal is pretty protective of that

1   instructional time, also, and principals nationwide today are more
2   protective of the instructional time than ever before in the history of this
3   nation, and that's not a bad thing. Okay, that's not a bad thing, but I just
4   wanted you to know that all of this kind of fits together.
5   Sometimes we may appear that we're in conflict with
6   each other. Being able to take a survey and reduce it to 45 minutes, that's
7   great, but from our perspective it would be better if you could reduce it to
8   25 minutes, you know, because as the teachers are concerned about their
9   instructional day, and from state to state the number of instructional days
10 vary from state to state.
11   There's no standardization across the United States
12 about how many instructional days, and that time has become so
13 important to those classroom teachers. Therefore, it has become so
14 important to those principals that it's not that they don't want to go in there
15 and get that information.
16   It's just a matter of -- just a matter of principle to them
17 that they need to protect as much of that instructional time as they can and
18 make certain that instruction is actually taking place in those classrooms,
19 and that's the reason.
20   MR. HALL: Thank you, Tommy. We are aware that
21 that is a big problem, and I think I should have said that earlier and was
22 maybe doing it in a very roundabout way when I was discussing how we
23 were reducing the length. I think we are acutely aware of that issue, of
24 time on task or time off task, and we appreciate your comment. Thank
25 you.
26   MR. LONG: And with that we will bring this segment
27 to a close, and with that, first of all, even though, and I said this, we've had
28 three of our presenters that have been with us for months and months. I'd
29 like to take this opportunity, Howell, thank you very much, Mike, Bill,
30 and Doug. Let's give them a big thank you.
31   With that, we'll take a very brief break and then come
32 back to wrap up this segment.
33   (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 11:56
34 a.m. and resumed at 12:12 p.m.)
35   MR. LONG: First of all, before or as we get started on
36 this segment, when we are done with this segment in about 15 minutes or
37 so, if you would please take your materials with you today. That's a little
38 different than what we've done in the past.
39   The reason for that is for the fact that we're heading to
40 Fred's home and then tomorrow morning with the movement of the
41 meeting into the other room. So if you would please remember to take
42 anything that you wish to have tomorrow with you today.
43   And Catherine, if you would please explain, just before
44 we break for lunch, how is this going to work for a visit to Fred's?
45   MS. DAVIS: Sure. We'll break for lunch, and there is

1   shuttle transportation provided for the preparatory research portion of
2   today, and the shuttle will be leaving when we finish lunch around 1:15,
3   and it'll bring us back to the Department, and we should arrive back at the
4   Department around 5:00, so.
5   MR. LONG: Okay, and if you would -- thank you,
6   Catherine.
7   MS. DAVIS: And then Fred can explain over lunch
8   what we'll be doing.
9   MR. LONG: Okay. Thank you. If we could -- I want
10   you to be thinking about this, because tomorrow morning, as you note in
11   our agenda, we start at 8:30, again a reminder, because that's different
12   from today.
13   We'll start at 8:30. Then we have about 35 minutes for
14   public comment. Last time -- I'm just going back historically -- last time
15   we had zero or one, so if that happens we'll just collapse the agenda and
16   move it backwards.
17   Then at 9:15, as you see, the FERPA presentation, but
18   the reason I'm bringing that up is the fact that I'd like to spend a few
19   minutes tomorrow morning, so that you have time to think about it, what
20   we would put into a recommendation regarding data.
21   So be thinking about that, not -- that's rhetorical for
22   right now, but we spend a few minutes tomorrow morning, what we
23   would bring forward as a recommendation in the report to the Secretary.
24   We do have a few minutes, so if any of you have any
25   comments on the things that went on this morning -- when I say things, I
26   mean from the presentation on building on results or the panel or anything
27   else for the good of the order as we break for lunch. Anyone? Hope?
28   MS. TAFT: Just a comment on data in general, and as
29   Shep says, I'm always talking about the community and schools and how
30   they need to work together. I would hope that the Department of
31   Education as they develop their uniform data set would cooperate with
32   CSP and SAMHSA and ONDCP and OJJDP so that there is one agreed
33   upon set of data that needs to be gathered, either by a school or
34   community to satisfy all the requirements here at the federal level so that
35   there's not a multitude of different kinds of surveys that need to be done at
36   the local level.
37   MR. LONG: Could I ask as a follow -- and I think we
38   would all agree with that. I would like to ask a follow-up question. How
39   many of you representing the various states that we have sitting around
40   this table, how many of you have that consolidated comprehensive data
41   system that was just --
42   I think therein is -- I hear what you're saying. Therein
43   is our problem. We can't do it on a state level, and let alone a national but
44   again, it begs for the conversation.
45   MR. JONES: Me? Oh, yes. I was just going to follow

1   up, and I'll make this recommendation tomorrow, though, but if there was

2   a framework, or if we knew what the framework was that's being used in

3   terms of the kind of data sets that are being collected, the method at which

4   the data sets are being collected, and then the linkage between those data

5   collections and intervention policy, that would be great, you know, but I

6   don't even know if that framework exists, or I don't know the extent to

7   which that's been discussed and revisited based on, you know, new data,

8   new events, et cetera, you know, but just a framework and a live

9   framework that we're operating from.

10   MR. LONG: Shep?

11   MR. KELLAM: Yes, I just -- well, I certainly agree

12   with both Hope and Russell. Leaving aside the politics of it, because I

13   think in some sense that gets wrapped up in the whole idea of the

14   partnerships, there's the politics becomes mutual self-interest, and that you

15   work through in the forming of partnerships.

16   But the idea of an integrated data system, one that is

17   anchored around kids learning and all the related things that go into kids

18   learning and developing academic and psychological and physical well

19   being is a huge, powerful idea.

20   It's what Secretary Spellings asked about when she was

21   here visiting us, and it seems to me that the relationship in that partnership

22   to the people in the school building and in the institutions, Child Welfare

23   and Public Health, that brings together a framework around the mission of

24   the institutions involved, and integrating that with researchers then

25   becomes, in fact, a new basis for science itself, and we're on the verge of

26   doing that.

27   We've tried that with Safe and Drug-Free Schools a

28   little bit, but the Safe Schools Healthy Student program was an early

29   effort to try to make that happen, and I think we've got to somehow build

30   on that.

31   I think that Hope and Russell are absolutely right, that

32   our job is creating a framework, a simple framework that brings the data

33   together, different kind of data with policymaking, with the people that --

34   parent, kids that run institutions so that it's one enterprise.

35   MR. LONG: Thank you very much.   Any other

36   comments about anything that happened this morning or any new events?

37   MS. DUDE: I don't know if this is going to make sense.

38   I've got a bunch of notes here, because I have so many things bouncing

39   around in my head right now, but speaking as a prevention person who is

40   there on the front lines -- now, granted, I'm with college, but I work

41   closely with our local high schools and the prevention people there.

42   It just seems to me we're setting them up for failure.

43   First, they wear many, many hats. The person who does prevention is

44   typically like a high school counselor or a junior high counselor who's got

45   a million other things to do, and then we're giving them very little money.

1   We're expecting them to change behavior in a child that
2   since birth had been inundated by all these other things in their life, the
3   messages they hear, the parents, the things happening in their
4   neighborhoods and all of that, and it's the -- I'm a believer in that concept
5   of it takes a village to raise a child and that the school system is one
6   member of that village, a very, very important member of that village.
7   But we have this great data that shows that -- kind of
8   profiles, gives us a snapshot of what things are like at that particular
9   moment, and that helps guide our prevention efforts, but as has been said,
10   it doesn't really evaluate our prevention efforts, and yet money seems to
11   be tied -- unless I'm misunderstanding, money seems to be tied to our
12   ability to evaluate our prevention efforts.
13   And with that comes the several assumptions. One
14   assumption is that a prevention intervention is going to change behavior,
15   and I'm of the belief that many prevention efforts change behavior, not
16   one, and that we in the prevention field need to create as many a-ha
17   moments as we can throughout that child's life from K all the way through
18   higher education.
19   We try to create a-ha moments, and it's the
20   accumulation of those a-ha moments that ultimately might create behavior
21   change. It kind of inches a student down those stages of change. It kind
22   of inches them down, and yet to evaluate a prevention effort implies that
23   that one thing made that change happen, and I think that's setting
24   ourselves up to make a very difficult - you know, it's almost impossible.
25   And what Tommy said also, and I completely
26   understand what you're saying, but that creates an additional frustration
27   for the prevention person in that one great place to have prevention efforts
28   occurs in the classroom, and yet I know in our Columbia public schools
29   it's virtually impossible to get in the classroom to try to do a prevention
30   effort because of just what Tommy was saying.
31   There are all these other things, very, very important
32   things that need to happen. So what's happening is this prevention person
33   has to find something they can do after school, in between classes, or
34   during lunch or whatever, and so we're just -- it just seems to me that
35   we're setting prevention folks up for failure, especially if the same time
36   we're doing that we're decreasing their funding and increasing the
37   expectation that they know how to evaluate their programs, which most of
38   them don't.
39   For one thing, it's almost impossible to evaluate, but
40   also you're expecting these people to know how to do that kind of
41   research, and they just don't. And some of the things we've said in passing
42   -- I mean, these are things like, "Well, they can partner with local
43   colleges."
44   Well, first, a significant number don't have a local
45   college next to them, or secondly, my experience with the -- we have

1   tremendous researchers on our campus, but they're so busy doing their
2   own research, they don't want to take the time to necessarily help a local
3   school. And so, again, nice idea in theory, but not necessarily the most
4   practical approach that would happen.
5   And so I think the thing I'm most concerned about is
6   the cycle that we're creating of we give them a little bit of money. They
7   can't show results, so we decrease the money, and yet we need the money
8   to be able to do the best programs and to be able to evaluate, so it's just
9   that vicious circle or cycle that I'm just really concerned about.
10   I love the data, and I use this kind of data all the time,
11   because we have similar data on the college level. I use it all the time to
12   inform my practices, and when you can show trend data going down, it's
13   nice to think that it's your practices that help make that number go down,
14   but the fact that we can't prove it then, again, creates that cycle of
15   frustration.
16   And so I just -- I don't know what my point is. My
17   point is I don't want funding to go down because they can't prove their
18   effectiveness, because I think it's very difficult to prove their
19   effectiveness. Maybe the researchers can prove the effectiveness, come
20   up with these best practices, but to expect the local schools to prove their
21   effectiveness I think is very, very difficult.
22   There may be some school systems that can do it very
23   well, but I have a wonderful school district. Columbia public schools are
24   great, and yet they have a very hard time doing the very things we're
25   talking about doing in here, so I just want to put in my two cents for that.
26   MR. LONG: Thank you, Kim. Anything else for the
27   good of the order before we break?
28   MS. TAFT: One tie-on to what Kim said. I have found
29   in Ohio that with the threat of reduced funding at the federal level, many
30   of the drug-free school coordinators at the local level find other
31   occupations, and therefore when little money does come through, then
32   they have to start all over again, hiring someone new, getting that person
33   educated and trained on what a drug-free school coordinator is going to
34   do, so it's very detrimental, the ups and downs of the funding cycles.
35   MR. LONG: Anybody else?
36   MR. HERMANN: I agree with everything that has
37   been said. In my mind, the message that comes through is, to a certain
38   extent, what we're dealing with is perceptions and sort of
39   misunderstandings about programs and whatnot.
40   So I think it really behooves the Committee to look at
41   every opportunity to improve the strength of the program, the structure,
42   you know, opportunities that we might have to make recommendations in
43   a number of different areas. So while it's frustrating, I also think it's an
44   opportunity to try and move forward, and I want to make sure that don't
45   lose complete sight of that.

1   MR. LONG: Thank you, Mike. I saw your red light

2 click on there.

3   MR. MODZELESKI: I don't know, Dave, whether this

4 is going to be the time. I just want to bring up, and we may want to

5 discuss it at another meeting, but sort of hold your calendar.

6   We're in the process of sending out hold-the-date

7 messages to the state education agencies about our national conference,

8 which is going to be held here in Washington, D.C. August 2, 3, and 4, so

9 I will be more than happy to provide a briefing at our next meeting, but I

10 think if you could just put a hold-the-date for August 2, 3, and 4 here in

11 Washington, D.C. will be our conference.

12   And that is -- actually, it's interesting. The theme of the

13 conference -- I don't have the title exactly right, "Looking Back and

14 Moving Forward." It's the twentieth anniversary of the -- which began as

15 the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act and has morphed into Safe

16 and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, so 20 years of experience.

17   We'll be looking at where we've been, where we are,

18 and where we need to go, so many of the things that Kim talked about and

19 Hope talked about and Mike talked about, I mean, looking at some of

20 these issues will be part of that conference in August.

21   MR. LONG: This, I think, Kim, could be an a-ha. Let's

22 talk sometime about some -- we're breaking for lunch, so this makes it

23 easier -- some type of involvement, looking back, where we are, going

24 forward, some of the things we've done here as a Committee, just maybe

25 we could have a discussion in the future about a potential degree of

26 involvement with this Committee. A-ha.

27   Anything else that -- okay. If not, then it is 12:30, and

28 we will break for lunch. Thank you.

29   (Whereupon, the foregoing matter adjourned at 12:28

30 p.m.)

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

1
2
3