



U.S. Department of Education

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



*Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities*

Advisory Committee Meeting

*U.S. Department of Education*

Barnard Auditorium  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20202

January 16-17, 2007

Meeting report prepared by:  
Mark Bernstein  
Consultant, Dixon Group  
January 25, 2007

## AGENDA

*Tuesday, January 16, 2007:*

- 8:30-9:00 Breakfast and registration
- 9:00-9:05 Opening Statement and Announcements
- 9:05-9:10 Introduction of Panel I: Non-public schools
- 9:15-9:30 Overview of Departmental Guidance on Non-public Schools:  
Maureen Dowling, Education Program Specialist for the Office of  
Non-Public Education
- 9:30-10:50 Panelist Presentations  
Joe McTighe, Executive Director of the Council for  
American Private Education
- Patrick Basset, President of the National Association of  
Independent Schools
- Jack Clark, Director of Technology and Nonpublic School  
Services for the Colonial Intermediate Unit of  
Pennsylvania
- Michael Caruso, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary  
Schools and Government Relations for the Archdiocese  
of Washington, DC
- 10:50 – 11:45 Questions & Answers: Committee to Panelists
- 11:45 – 12:30 Lunch
- 12:30 – 12:35 Introductions of Panel II: Trauma  
Dr. Steven Marans, Professor of Child Psychiatry at Yale  
University and Director of the National Center for Children  
Exposed to Violence
- Dr. Marleen Wong, Director of Crisis Counseling and  
Intervention Services for the Los Angeles Unified School District  
and Director of Trauma Services Adaptation Center for Schools  
and Communities

Dr. Lisa Jaycox, Senior Behavioral Scientist at RAND Corporation and a clinical psychologist

- 12:35 – 1:35 Panelists Presentations
- 1:35 – 2:15 Questions & Answers: Committee to Panelists
- 2:15 – 2:30 Break
- 2:30 – 2:35 Introduction of Panel III: Rural and Urban Schools  
Liz Redmon, Federal Projects Director for McNairy County Schools, Tennessee
- Doug Swanson, Former Federal Projects Director for Gage County Schools, Nebraska
- Melissa Thompson, Project Director for Garfield-Heights Public Schools, Cleveland, Ohio
- Lynne Krehbiel-Breneman, Project Director for Minneapolis Public Schools in Minnesota
- 2:35 – 3:55 Panelists Presentations
- 3:55 – 4:50 Questions & Answers: Committee to Panelists
- 4:50 – 5:00 Summary
- 5:00 Adjournment

*Wednesday, January 17, 2007:*

- 8:00 – 8:30 Ethics Briefing
- 8:30 – 8:40 Opening Statement
- 8:40 – 9:15 Public Comment
- 9:15 – 10:15 Discussion of Advisory Committee Members
- 10:15 – 10:30 Break
- 10:30 – 11:25 Discussion of Advisory Committee Members
- 11:25 – 11:30 Closing comments and adjournment

*Session of Tuesday, January 16, 2007:*

*Opening Statement and Announcements:*

David Long, chairman, called the meeting to at 9:00 a.m., and introduced the first panel.

*Panel I: Non-Public Schools*

Panelists:

Joe McTighe, Executive Director of the Council for American Private Education

Patrick Basset, President of the National Association of Independent Schools

Jack Clark, Director of Technology and Nonpublic School Services for the Colonial Intermediate Unit of Pennsylvania

Michael Caruso, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Schools and Government Relations for the Archdiocese of Washington, DC

\* \* \*

*Overview of Departmental Guidance on Non-public Schools:*

Maureen Dowling, Education Program Specialist for the Office of Non-Public Education

Maureen Dowling framed discussion of non-public schools:

- First, the law provides for equitable participation of private students and teachers.
- Second, consultation must be timely and meaningful. This, she said, is a central idea: consultation must continue through implementation and assessment of services.
- Third, expenditures must be equal, per-pupil. She noted that funds went to states based on school enrollments, influenced by the number of low-income families.
- Fourth, services are to address the needs of private school students and teachers. She noted that services middle school students in a private school need might differ from public school students; the grant should reflect both.
- Fifth, the LEA remains in control of funds. Private schools were reminded that because the LEA was financially accountable, questions of program accountability were directed there.
- Sixth, services must be secular, neutral and non-ideological.

*Summary of Comments:*

Joe McTighe said the Council for American Private Education [CAPE] was a coalition serving diverse non-public schools; one purpose of CAPE was to cooperate with public schools on

educational improvement. CAPE believed that, where health and safety were concerned, government should treat all students alike. He noted that, at the fall 2006 White House conference on school safety, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings had said non-public schools should be included in reviews; he thanked the committee for responding promptly. He identified CAPE's efforts on disaster planning, pandemic influenza and other issues. He noted that the federal departments of Commerce, Education and Homeland Security had launched a program, 'America is Safer When Our Schools Are Safer,' that did not involve non-public school participation; he urged equitable allocation of public funds. McTighe thanked Deborah Price, Department of Education, for reaching out to non-public schools. He urged that the committee, in its recommendations, urge state and local public school agencies to include nonpublic schools in prevention planning and other activities.

Patrick Bassett said the National Association of Independent Schools [NAIS] represented 1,300 college preparatory schools with 500,000 students enrolled. These schools, thus far, had experienced relatively little violence. Bassett suggested this was because: First, most such schools had narrowly defined missions, thereby offering a good match between student, family and school. Second: the schools generally operated adult-supervised after-school activities. Third: the schools were small, thereby allowing for greater intimacy and wider participation in school activities. Bassett expressed unhappiness that the distribution of National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] radios to schools had excluded non-public schools. He welcomed the recent legislative change that permitted non-public schools to apply directly to the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA] for reimbursement for damaged facilities. He noted that non-public schools could serve a public purpose by being a laboratory for 'what works' on issues such as drug use; he called attention, as promising, to the 'social norming' approach that some non-public schools were pursuing to teenage drinking, marijuana use and early sex. Empirical data showed, he said, that these behaviors were less common than teenagers thought; this finding could favorably influence teen behavior.

Jack Clark represented a consortium of nonpublic schools in eastern Pennsylvania, with 9,000 students enrolled. He presented a 'Crisis Response Manual' that had been developed and shared with non-public schools across the state; a template had been created that the local administrator could complete. Flip charts were developed for classroom teachers. Subsequently, administrative teams had been trained in how to work with first responders. He identified, as current priorities, comprehensive all-hazards training and an effort to learn common language and structure from the National Incident Management System [NIMS]. He said he believed the state Department of Health had not worked smoothly with the state Department of Education; Point of Dispensing sites [PODs] had been established without input from LEAs, or from Regional Anti-Terrorism Task Forces. Further, he felt county level support was missing. He felt that, in practice, disaster preparedness was being driven by the schools; principals and others knew that parents and the community expected them to act, and they behaved accordingly. He said the next step was to coordinate completed plans, involving all appropriate parties, and then have regular review and updating of those plans.

Michael Caruso said the Archdiocese of Washington DC schools enrolled 34,000 students in Washington and five Maryland counties; his own role was to link Catholic schools with essential resources. He said that, in health and safety, good planning and coordination were vital. He

noted that the post-9/11 burst of public funding to public schools had not much reached non-public schools. He noted, as an obstacle to enhanced school safety, that private schools were not permitted to apply for federal funds; therefore, they were not in a position to take the lead. Caruso said he believed coordination between the school safety office and Title IV offices was not good; in consequence, important programs that require non-public participation had not been fully implemented within the spirit of the law. He said systematic tracking was needed to assure participation of non-public schools. He urged that, if regional education summits on homeland security were held, non-public schools should be involved. He urged the committee to remember that, if non-public schools were not included in health, safety and security efforts, then the 'chain of protection' was weakened across the nation.

*Questions and Answers:*

Deborah Price presented background on the provision of NOAA radios to schools. These were being distributed by the Department of Commerce, of which NOAA was a part. The Department of Education had assisted in determining which communications tools were needed. The initial decision was to give radios to public schools thought to be at highest risk; subsequently, when the pertinent earmark was increased, distribution was extended to all public schools, K-12. Since then, a further decision was made to distribute radios to all non-public schools, day care facilities and institutions of higher learning. The decision memo is proceeding, and a positive response is expected.

Joe McTighe [panelist] expressed appreciation for the Department's efforts, but took exception to Deborah Price's summary. The original earmark, he said, specified distribution of NOAA radios to all schools, public and non-public. Somewhere between earmark and implementation, McTighe added, the decision was made to limit distribution to urban public schools; not, he noted, to urban schools generally. He quoted from a letter received from Department of Homeland Security, stating that when current distribution was completed, DHS would work with the Department of Commerce to consider possible distribution to additional categories, if funds remained. His concern, McTighe said, was the 'hierarchy of concern': at risk urban public schools; other public schools; non-public schools.

Michael Caruso [panelist] noted 'a broader point:' if a pandemic occurred, it would cut across public/private school lines; if children in one school were not undertaking needed health practices, this would weaken protection of all children. Caruso asserted that looming health and safety issues required that the same criteria be applied across all schools.

Michael Herrmann asked panelists for recommendations they might suggest for state-level actions. Michael Caruso [panelist] said he did not completely blame LEAs for failing to consult fully with non-public schools. While the Department provided guidance on this to the states, states were sometimes lax in providing guidance to LEAs. Further, he noted needs assessment surveys of adolescents that had not included students from nonpublic schools; they might provide different responses if given the opportunity.

Patrick Bassett [panelist] said children would learn little if they were given a book on preparing for a 'dirty bomb' attack. It would be better if statewide simulations were organized: schools would evacuate one day; then resume classes the next. Placing resources on the Web might be useful, but was not equivalent to actual simulation. He believed states could play a larger role in organizing such simulations.

Susan Keys said consultation should extend beyond emergency and safety issues; she asked panelists what recommendations they had for federal action.

Joe McTighe [panelist] called attention to a recent Title I manual, calling it a model for educating both LEAs and private schools on Title I implementation. The key, he thought, was implementation of the approval process: if the law required private school participation, approval should depend on some clear evidence that such consultation was occurred. Michael Caruso [panelist] suggested creation of an essential expectations checklist for use by LEA applications.

Patrick Bassett [panelist] said the appropriate federal role depended on how large one wished to think. In a pandemic, millions of students might be kept at home, perhaps for three to six months. The federal government could ‘incubate’ an education culture for computer and web-based education; it could fund programs ensuring that every District of Columbia student had a computer; it could foster development of an open source ‘wiki-curriculum,’ including lesson plans for students at all levels.

Russell Jones asked how panelists thought the Department could assist with communication between federal departments and, second, what might be achieved by regional inter-departmental summits.

Michael Caruso [panelist] said the committee could play an important advisory role on how such summits were organized; rather than consist of panels presenting information, he said, they should be ‘scenario-based.’

Maureen Dowling [Department of Education] said the federal government could monitor state-level program implementation; further, site visits would assure requirements were being met.

Michael Caruso [panelist] urged creation of a questionnaire/checklist to determine whether an LEA was informing private schools of the amount of funds their participation might trigger; and asking whether surveys for needs assessment included nonpublic school students. Such questions could be part of the monitoring and application protocols.

David Long described collaborative efforts in his own district [Riverside County, California], where the Homeland Security effort involved 52 separate agencies; private school representatives routinely took part in pertinent meetings. Local organizations, he noted, had undertaken this effort independently, without seeking federal funds. Long endorsed the suggestion that alternate methods for delivering lessons be established.

Jack Clark [panelist] noted that NCLB reauthorization was pending and, further, that SDFS funding had been declining. The committee, he knew, wished to be able to demonstrate results for expenditures; this was difficult: for example, what results could be shown for its efforts at pandemic planning? Clark said many things were not directly measurable, but Congress still sought such measurements. Michael Caruso [panelist] suggested that the best efforts made with crisis management grants be identified and presented to school districts to demonstrate the state of the art.

Bill Modzeleski noted that current application procedures obligated LEAs to consult with non-public schools on grants; he acknowledged that this was not working ‘100 percent.’ He noted that SDFS was a ‘decreasing pie’ – average grants had gone from \$8.00 per student to \$4.50 per

student; in consequence, LEAs were being pushed to extend consultation at a time when they were making cutbacks. Nonetheless, he felt consultation was improving.

Fred Ellis said the limited funds available from SDFS frustrated many LEAs. Many districts wished to provide for emergency preparedness, but the hardware involved was expensive. The Department of Education lacked funds for this; considerable money would reach Washington D.C. from the Department of Homeland Security, but Ellis doubted local schools would receive any of it. Dennis Caruso [panelist] said schools did not receive sufficient priority in DHS funding; if ‘something happened’ at a school, this would change quickly. Ellis said the committee should consider what could be done to secure funds from non-Department of Education sources.

Jack Clark [panelist] said lack of communication remained a problem; first responders needed a ‘push’ to communicate with schools. Joe McTighe [panelist] noted there were 29,000 private schools; many small, isolated and with limited staff. He doubted that many had emergency management plans; considerable work remained. Russell Jones asked if the problem was one of funding or one of priority. McTighe said: both.

Michael Caruso [panelist] said all Washington D.C. Archdiocese schools had emergency management plans; staff and parents were surveyed to confirm knowledge of the plans. Russell Jones commented Virginia schools had plans, but did not practice them. Caruso suggested forms be sent home for parents to sign, indicating they had read and understood the emergency information.

\* \* \*

## *Panel II: Trauma*

### Panelists:

Dr. Steven Marans, Professor of Child Psychiatry at Yale University and Director of the National Center for Children Exposed to Violence

Dr. Marleen Wong, Director of Crisis Counseling and Intervention Services for the Los Angeles Unified School District and Director of Trauma Services Adaptation Center for Schools and Communities

Dr. Lisa Jaycox, Senior Behavioral Scientist at RAND Corporation and a clinical psychologist

### *Summary of Comments:*

Dr. Steven Marans discussed trauma, asking those present to recall the experience of awaking from a nightmare as a child. He identified stages of this event, i.e. acute reaction; search for protection; hyper-vigilance; reasserting safe reality; and return to sleep. He noted the difference between nightmare and trauma was that in trauma the dangers were real. He said severity of trauma was influenced by such ‘event factors’ as the child’s physical proximity to the event and by such ‘individual factors’ as the child’s previous history. He said the ability/failure of adults in



the child's world to recognize the child had been traumatized was particularly important. He described intervention strategies, collaborative strategies and the role a school might play in addressing trauma. He discussed how traumatized children were to be identified, saying that if adults waited on children to identify themselves, 'we wait in vain.' He identified various principles of intervention.

Marleen Wong identified various effects on learning that followed from exposure to violence. She presented a diagram showing the very high number of unsolved murders near South Los Angeles high schools. She presented information on high trauma rates and the effects thereof revealed in school-wide screening in Los Angeles. She described CBITS [Cognitive Behavior Therapy for Trauma in Schools], an intervention strategy. She recommended that schools 'return to the idea' of teaching the whole child, including the child's social and emotional concerns. She suggested the training given teachers on trauma may be outdated, noting that teachers in urban schools frequently 'burn out' because they are not prepared for what they encounter. She urged efforts to 'build a knowledge base of what works.' She urged that teachers, attendance workers, social workers and others be assisted in working together.

Lisa Jaycox reported that 30 programs existed for school-based interventions on student trauma; most use cognitive-behavioral techniques: only five had received a controlled trial. She described the field as developing. She reported the results of a Port-Katrina study. Concurrently with this study, a Tool-Kit describing trauma and pertinent programs for addressing it had been created and distributed to hurricane-affected schools. She noted that, commonly, school principals believed students were returning to normal even though studies of students suggested otherwise. She said there had been little implementation of the trauma programs that had been described. She noted enormous post-hurricane difficulties in communicating with families: housing and telephone numbers changed frequently, etc. She recommended better evaluation of existing programs and that staff training should occur prior to any disaster or crisis; she suggested that trauma intervention training might help build a school's capacity to address mental health problems.

#### *Questions & Answers:*

Susan Keys asked panelists what could be done to build resilience into children. Steven Marans [panelist] said students who had been victims of violence in the home were far more likely to be victims of violence elsewhere; his program had developed an intervention strategy with domestic violence which involved follow-up visits by the police. Families involved showed a 50 percent decrease in subsequent calls to the police. The question, he said, was how to break the cycle of trauma. Lisa Jaycox [panelist] said intervention should not wait for children to manifest full-blown Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder [PSTD], but should occur when symptoms appear.

Marleen Wong [panelist] reported that in her recent visit to Israel she had investigated how preventive efforts were made when '6,000 rockets are falling every day.' In this circumstance, she said, trauma might be expected to be likely, but in practice was not. The strategy developed included behavioral intervention and education about trauma; it was aimed at developing social and cognitive skills and was presented to the country's children in advance.

Steven Marans [panelist] said social cohesion was a protective factor. He praised the development of after-school programs for children at high risk and said supervised opportunities for pro-social behavior were important. Adult direction was needed to re-establish normal activities for children who have been traumatized.

Michael Pimentel asked who should take that lead and what training did they require. Maureen Wong [panelist] said the superintendent and school psychologists, attendance workers and others needed to make an integrated effort to identify a community's priority needs. Steve Marans [panelist] said a broader understanding of child development was needed. He urged that when various professionals came together, they talk not in terms of their individual expertise, but instead create a framework centered on the child. Otherwise, he said, a 'silo effect' directs attention further and further from the child. Further, an educational effort that trauma hurts, lasts, and costs was needed.

Fred Ellis noted that only five programs had been evaluated; what was the substance of the evaluations? Lisa Jaycox [panelist] said some programs evaluated had shared characteristics: they were directed at diverse types of trauma; they used elements of cognitive behavior therapy. Two other programs had been developed overseas: one in Gaza, the second in Israel. Evaluation showed programs reduced PTSD symptoms and depressive episodes. She noted the evaluations had not involved control groups, and looked at short- rather than long-term outcomes. While, she added, decreasing PTSD symptoms correlated with higher grades, a cause and effect relationship had not been established.

Ralph Hingson asked how researchers addressed the issue of family confidentiality. Steven Marans [panelist] said confidentiality was addressed early when law enforcement individuals might be involved. When asked, about 85 percent of parents agreed to sharing information which a police officer; he noted that many uncooperative parents had themselves been victims. Parents, he believed, were reluctant to come to mental health centers where they believed they would be judged; they could better be reached through a domestic violence shelter or a police sub-station.

Maureen Wong [panelist] described a two- to four-session process which informed parents about PTSD symptoms and asked if they were aware of incidents involving their children. Often, she said, children withhold such information. Perhaps as a consequence of such sessions, some parents stopped being punitive towards their children. Often, she added, once a parent was engaged, they identify an additional family member who needed assistance.

Montean Jackson asked if research had been done with military children. Lisa Jaycox said military authorities occasionally requested materials, but she was unaware of any systematic research on military children. Bill Modzeleski said problems were more common with children of National Guard members, as the Guard lacked the support system the military has.

Maureen Wong [panelist] said that school personnel who were aware of problems of student trauma were often ready to tackle them; others were not. Any given school would take its cue from the building principal; if the principal said this is something to deal with, it happened. Steven Marans [panelist] said trauma was not limited to in-school events or exposure to violence: if a child lost a parent to sudden death, symptomatic behaviors were expressed in the classroom.

Russell Jones said trauma screening of children should become part of education; this need not be solely an in-school effort, but would involve referral of students to appropriate agencies. His experience was that when parents were made aware of the effect trauma had on their child, they 'beat down the doors' to get help. Bill Modzeleski said his experience was that many people do not believe in screening and see it as having negative consequences. Lisa Jaycox [panelist] said many people were concerned that screening represented an intrusion into family business; her research project had lost families because of this. Steven Marans [panelist] said some people regarded researchers as exploitative, 'writing articles off of other people's pain.' He described answering, as part of a television program after 9/11, a phone call from a second grade teacher: her principal had instructed her to have her children draw pictures related to that event; she had been uncomfortable with this. Marans said there was a 'faddish, cultish' view that if you talk about it, everything will be OK; there were, he said, 'psychological ambulance chasers' who seek to intervene in intrusive ways. Jones said this underscored the need to have relationships in place before a traumatic event occurred. Mistrust, cultural differences and linguistic conflicts militated against successful intervention.

Fred Ellis referenced the movie 'Black Hawk Down,' in which a wounded sergeant orders a private to get in a vehicle and drive. The private responds that he, too, has been shot. The sergeant says: 'We're all shot; now get in and drive.' Ellis said he believed that 'we've all' been traumatized, but did not believe that therefore everyone should be in treatment. Potentially, he believed the concept had some real value. He said that while it appeared sensible to say that trauma affected school performance, he would welcome evidence-based studies on the matter.

Steve Marans [panelist] said 'trauma' was an overused word; it did not refer to someone being upset, but to someone unable to function properly. Not everyone who experiences a traumatic event developed PTSD; many people who do, recover. However, trauma affected a significant number and presented significant costs. Russell Jones said the educational culture should be informed that trauma hurts, and continues to hurt. The first step was to educate teachers on the importance of trauma, so they can refer children to those qualified to work with them.

\* \* \*

### *Panel III: Rural and Urban Schools*

#### Panelists:

Liz Redmon, Federal Projects Director for McNairy County Schools, Tennessee

Doug Swanson, Former Federal Projects Director for Gage County Schools, Nebraska

Melissa Thompson, Project Director for Garfield-Heights Public Schools, Cleveland, Ohio

Lynne Krehbiel-Breneman, Project Director for Minneapolis Public Schools in Minnesota

*Summary of comments:*

Liz Redmon presented demographic information on the McNairy County [Tennessee] public schools, described the sources of funds and the purposes to which they were put: she noted that SFDS was the district's only source for drug education. She reported academic progress: the district had met AYP and was above state average and state target. She believed federal funding and accountability for their use had aided local efforts. She said that, in general, 'to be effective, we must inspect what we expect.' She identified, as community needs, provision for juvenile justice software; creation of a juvenile detention center; increased parental involvement in prevention, and required parental involvement in intervention. She said efforts to engage parents had been deliberately extended to include those with doubts about the program; often, these became the source for good ideas. Her county's goal, she said, remained: no child left behind.

Doug Swanson presented a 'slide show' on Adams, Nebraska, with 489 residents. He said many Nebraska school districts were small; resources were limited; people were uncertain how to access them; and, commonly, a stigma attached to seeking help. He added that schools were often isolated from the community; more effort was needed to engage the business and faith communities and to create effective coalitions. He identified a tendency to employ self-devised strategies, rather than use evidence-based programs. Swanson noted that in-service training for teachers was difficult, as insufficient substitutes were available to cover their classes. He said that in small communities turnover was high among police officers; commonly, officers moved to larger settings as that became possible. He noted one police chief's statement that rural parents were more tolerant of alcohol and drug use; further, as the local tavern might be the only social venue, teens readily associated alcohol with social life. He believed, however, notable progress was being made in changing long-held attitudes.

Melissa Thompson said the Garfield Heights [Ohio] school district was an 'inner ring' district – that is, adjacent to the city of Cleveland; such districts, she added, characteristically had high student mobility, racial and economic diversity, and cultures of violence. On violence, she reported a parent survey that placed "keeping students safe and healthy" as of higher priority than curriculum and instruction; in consequence, she said, the district had instituted a district-wide emphasis on character education. She noted that the district's receipt in 2003 of a \$3.9 million Safe Schools/Healthy Students [SS/HS] grant had permitted steps not otherwise possible, including stronger collaboration with local first responders and local mental health providers. She noted that SS/HS funding would soon end: the programs was paying salaries for four current staff members; funds from other programs could not be so be used. She urged continued support for school districts in meeting 'the needs of the heart' and the perspective that 'at risk students are at promise.'

Lynne Krehbiel-Breneman noted that 99 languages were spoken in the Minneapolis district. She identified three needs of urban schools. First: strong, stable leadership. She noted that Minneapolis schools had in the past four years had four superintendents; four directors of curriculum; five finance clerks, and numerous other changes. Second: a broad definition of learning that reflects the needs of young people. She noted increased screening of three-year olds had occurred, but there was a shortage of placements for those identified and a lack of professionals trained around best practices. She noted that, often, because of the existing

seniority system, the least experienced teachers were assigned to schools with the greatest needs. Third: honest, data-based conversation between schools and community agencies, leading to collaborative decision-making. In Minneapolis, lack of stable leadership had compromised this. She urged support for: initiatives that aligned community resources; development of schools' cultural competence, drug/mental health awareness and anti-racism; and other efforts.

#### *Questions & Answers:*

Russell Jones asked for the reasons for high turnover in the student population. Lynne Krehbiel-Breneman [panelist] cited: lack of affordable housing; individuals responding to employment opportunities; and, people leaving homes to seek needed safety in shelters. Jones asked these issues were being addressed. Krehbiel-Breneman said a Minneapolis school's office focused on homeless and highly mobile students; this office had developed strong collaboration with the city.

At Howell Wechsler's request, Liz Redmon [panelist] identified the programs funded by SFDS. Wechsler asked what would happen if funding was removed. Redmon said 'we would struggle' -- no other immediate source of funding was available. Wechsler asked if Redmon would accept a chance to either double or eliminate that funding; Redmon said she would.

Michael Pimentel asked rural panelists to characterize relationships with local law enforcement. Doug Swanson [panelist] said the SS/HS grant received had prompted a much improved relationship; shared meetings were frequent. Liz Redmon [panelist] described relationships with law enforcement as good; with juvenile justice, the relationship was just now developing, following appointment of a new juvenile judge.

Michael Pimentel asked which was better: greater funding for a shorter period, or lesser funding for a longer time. Doug Swanson [panelist] said the priority was to create systemic change, not hire personnel. Money spent over a longer period might permit better planning and reduce pressure to start spending. In any case, sustainability needed to be addressed. Melissa Thompson [panelist] said her program had known funds would be available only for a time; in consequence, she had taken over program management, rather than retaining someone who might leave when funding ended. Because she was part of the school's leadership structure, her taking management meant the safe schools agenda was always represented. Lynne Krehbiel-Breneman [panelist] said that, because of her district's size and complexity, SS/HS had worked 'sneakily' to infiltrate the system. Staff had been told that, if their service was something students would need beyond the current year, they must attach it to some other program. She believed larger amounts for a shorter term better enabled establishing partnerships. Liz Redmon [panelist] said she favored working with initially higher funding; to assist in creating coalitions, with funding then stepped down. Doug Swanson said SS/HS funding had been viewed as a launching pad; he believed activities over the next decade would happen as a result.

Fred Ellis asked Doug Swanson [panelist] if Gage County [Nebraska] schools were a SDFS recipient; Swanson said they were. Ellis noted Swanson's statement that 45 percent of students reported drinking in the previous 30 days; he asked whether there was evidence the program was

working. Swanson said SDFS funds were limited; the effort began in 2003; he believed a higher level of organization had been achieved in a community that had not previously addressed its problems. Local culture took time to change; he believed a difference would be shown in the future.

Susan Keys said workforce development was a particular issue in rural areas; should greater flexibility be shown in the standards for those who deliver services? Liz Redmon [panelist] said when her district first sought a social worker, they were immediately able to hire a master's level social worker who was new to the community; when they sought to add a second social worker, an individual with bachelor's qualification was readily found. She believed lowering standards would decrease the effort to find capable people; expectations for competence and training should be maintained.

Susan Keys asked about use of technology in service delivery and supervision in rural areas. Liz Redmon [panelist] said their initial goal had been to have one internet connection per classroom; they had built from there. She noted, as an obstacle, that the local courts kept a paper-only file. She noted that larger first-year funding made it possible to put technology in place.

David Long noted that stability and sustainability were undercut by student mobility; he sought figures on this from panelists. Liz Redmon [panelist] said that the two schools in areas with little rental property had very stable populations; the six schools in areas with more rental property had student mobility of 28 to 30 percent. Doug Swanson [panelist] said student mobility in Gage County, Nebraska was low. Melissa Thompson [panelist] said student the Garfield Heights, Ohio school system had extremely high mobility, perhaps 30 percent.

David Long asked about rates of teacher mobility. Liz Redmon [panelist] said teacher mobility in her county was low. Doug Swanson [panelist] said somewhat higher teacher mobility might be preferable. Melissa Thompson [panelist] said teacher mobility in the Garfield Heights schools was low. Lynne Krehbiel-Breneman [panelist] said Minneapolis schools had high teacher mobility, driven by a declining student census and the effects of seniority. Long asked panelists how many superintendents each had had in the past decade. Redmon, Swanson and Thompson each said: two; Lynne Krehbiel-Breneman said: five. Asked to comment further, Krehbiel-Breneman noted one superintendent's departure for a larger district and political factors that had prompted subsequent turnover. Long said he believed high mobility of administrators and teachers worked against stability and sustainability; the matter merited discussions with teachers' unions and school boards.

Russell Jones asked the panelists for information on racial composition of students. The responses were: McNairy County, Tennessee -- 87 percent Caucasian; 11.8 percent African-American; 1.2 percent other. Gage County, Nebraska -- 99 percent Caucasian; Doug Swanson commented that some Nebraska LEAs have a high Hispanic population. Garfield Heights, Ohio -- 47.9 percent Caucasian; 38.4 percent African-American; 13.7 percent mixed race, Asian and other. Minneapolis -- 71.8 percent African-American; 28.2 percent white.

Russell Jones asked if some problems identified by panelists could be traced to a lack of cultural competence training. Lynne Krehbiel-Breneman [panelist] said it could; personnel with unconscious racism tended to project it onto students. Liz Redmon [panelist] said that for some years African-American students comprised less than five percent of all district students; as that

percentage increased, the district undertook diversity training for all central office staff and teachers. She added that Tennessee has been emphasizing poverty training; otherwise, teachers from middle- or upper-middle class backgrounds might lack sufficient empathy for students who were poor. She noted, further, that a low percentage of those in the gifted program had been African-American; the district had created a class to expand the experience background of African-American students. Jones commended these activities and asked how they had been funded. Redmon said poverty training had been funded by Title I; diversity training had been funded locally.

Melissa Thompson [panelist] said that, in Garfield Heights, race was an emotionally charged matter. The community, she said, had not entirely welcomed the rise in the proportion of black students. She noted survey results showing that some black students thought white students were favored; some white students thought the reverse. She said some district personnel were inclined to assume that being black meant one came from a culture of poverty.

Tommy Ledbetter endorsed Liz Redmon's [panelist] statement: 'if you don't inspect it, don't expect it.' He asked would the program had a better chance of being sustained if funding decreases came from salaries, rather than elsewhere. Redmon said that if funding started high, and then backed down, the program created was more likely to be sustained than if a program was funded in full for three years, with funding then eliminated entirely.

*David Long adjourned the Tuesday, January 16, 2007 session*

\* \* \*

*Session of Wednesday, January 17, 2007:*

*Opening Statement: David Long*

David Long noted the timing of the FY2008 federal budget and the pending reauthorization of NCLB; he asked whether, given these, the committee's further recommendations remained pertinent. Deborah Price said the committee's actions remained relevant to reauthorization. She anticipated that President Bush's State of the Union address, scheduled for January 23, would discuss education in general terms, including reauthorization of NCLB, but not specifically address matters now before the committee. She noted, further, that the FY2008 budget proposal would be presented on February 8; the Department of Education would present its proposal for NCLB reauthorization at about the same time. She said a conference call to committee members could give them early word on these developments. Price noted the panel's interim reports on the State Grants program and Persistently Dangerous Schools had been forwarded to Secretary, and placed on the Department's website. She doubted another interim report was needed on the previous day's topics. She suggested the committee proceed with its planned full report in June; its recommendations and advice would be part of the reauthorization process.

David Long asked if the committee was 'in synch' with the various timelines. Bill Modzeleski described the February 8 budget statement as at the 'macro' level; it was uncertain how rapidly Congress would act. He said that throughout Title I's existence, all administration proposals were changed as they moved through the legislative process: there would be 'other

bites at the apple.’ Deborah Price noted that Congress had, in 2006, made many changes in higher education reauthorization; even if NCLB reauthorization was introduced tomorrow, the committee’s voice would remain important. Responding to a question, Price said the committee’s June 2007 report would go to the Secretary and be posted on the Department’s website, making it accessible to the public, including members of Congress.

Russell Jones asked who had created the advisory group. Deborah Price said the committee’s charter came from NCLB; Bill Modzeleski said the committee’s existence was itself an example of how the legislative process worked: the original NCLB proposal had not included an advisory committee as part of Title IV.

*Public Comments:*

Myrna Mondlawitz  
Educational consultant, Washington D.C

Myrna Mondlawitz said she spoke on behalf of a recently organized group, the National Consortium of School Violence Researchers and Practitioners, which had formed after the fall 2006 White House conference on school safety. The group consisted largely of researchers and academics. As one activity, it had issued a statement on the subject, one subscribed to by a list of organizations. She supplied the committee with copies of this statement.

Robert Morrison  
Director of Policy  
National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors

Robert Morrison said his organization represented state and territorial drug abuse directors; it believed continued federal funding was vital to keeping young people drug-free. In particular, he said, his organization favored increased partnership at the federal, state and local levels to assure accountability and effectiveness. He believed such collaboration would assist in the task of data reporting.

*Close of public comments.*

*Committee Discussion:*

Russell Jones asked how the committee could ‘embrace’ the expertise of various panelists and others. David Long said committee members were free to draw upon the ties many had to professional and other associations. Deborah Price said only a limited number of panels could be convened and public comment accommodated. The program had announced through the Federal Register that anyone could submit information that would be forwarded to the committee; she noted an email address specific to the committee existed for that purpose.

David Long suggested that the committee pull together its thinking on the panelists’ presentations.



### *Discussion of nonpublic schools*

Susan Keys said the requirement for consultation with non-public schools seemed unevenly followed; she suggested application guidelines clarify this requirement and require grantees to specify how they would satisfy it. She endorsed preparing a brief statement for non-public schools of what they should expect from LEAs. Fred Ellis endorsed Susan Keys' summary; suitable formal requirements were in place, he said: there was disconnect between policy and implementation. Susan Keys endorsed the convening of interdepartmental summits on handling of large-scale traumatic events. Belinda Sims noted that nonpublic schools had been left out of needs assessment activities; they might not participate if the needs of their students were not being addressed. Michael Herrmann said that not only did non-public schools have rights, they also have responsibilities; for example, to participate in needs assessment in a timely manner.

Deborah Price commented that the Office for Non-public Education worked closely with associations of non-public schools; the focus was on associations because the very large number of non-public schools precluded working with them individually. She noted work done with the Office of Non-Public Schools to share information on grants available for pandemic planning; she said two national sessions held in 2006 on emergency management training assistance had drawn participants from 42 states, including many from non-public schools. She noted at times LEAs would reach out to non-public schools only to be told that the latter were not interested. Bill Modzeleski termed the situation a 'two-way' street: often, non-public schools did not realize their own responsibilities. He further noted that smaller LEAs might have only a quarter-time individual engaged in grants work, which made it difficult for them to reach out to non-public schools. Michael Herrmann commented that participation by private schools had been a key issue when his district had been monitored in 2006.

Dennis Romero endorsed Michael Caruso's [panelist] comment that more public/non-public communication was needed in school safety and crisis planning. David Long noted there did not seem to be a need to 'remake the wheel.' The general message appeared to be: this is a two-way street; collaboration is important.

### *Discussion of student trauma*

Russell Jones said panelists had well described the impact of trauma on students and their performance. Susan Keys noted panelists spoke from an intervention perspective; she believed efforts should be directed in advance at creating more resilient children. Michael Herrmann said he believed the Department of Education had been out front on the issue: the previous year, Tennessee had a major school shooting; he much appreciated the support that had then been forthcoming from the Department.

Ralph Hingson called attention to a recently published handbook on injury and violence prevention; injury, he said, was the leading cause of death among persons under age 44. He noted that alcohol-related driving deaths had been cut in half, in part because states had made use of data showing the contribution drinking made to accidental death. Similar efforts, he said, should be made with murder and suicide. A national survey that had quizzed college students on 'second-hand effects' of drinking found high numbers of assaults and 'date rapes' being committed by students who had been drinking. Such data, he said, raised local awareness of the need to protect the innocent.

Fred Ellis said the trauma panel appeared to have a good grasp of the obvious. Of course trauma hurt, he said: homes destroyed; domestic violence; neighborhood violence. Those working with young people should know about trauma and its effects. He did not, however, favor general screening or assessments of children. Montean Jackson said that, to the causes cited for trauma, she would add the historical problems faced by some indigenous populations, as well as environmental trauma in some places.

Russell Jones, responding to Fred Ellis, said the central question was how could trauma be assessed and remedied. Bill Modzeleski noted certain 'broad-based agreements': First, he said, children are resilient; the effect of trauma differs greatly from child to child. Second, a small percentage of children need significant care. He believed trauma could be reduced through good education practices, but questioned what these might be. He referred to the medical statement: First, do no harm. He believed children were sometimes damaged by efforts to assist them. Questions remained: Who do we treat? Do we screen? These, Modzeleski added, were very much a local decision; the state-of-the-art was not such that the Department could make definitive statements.

Fred Ellis said he did not dispute the importance of trauma; he rejected, however, the notion that all children be screened for whatever trauma they may ever have experienced. School personnel needed to know how to recognize trauma and to make referrals as needed. He would like more empirical evidence about the efficacy of treatment efforts, and of which programs worked best.

Kim Dude said she had been shocked by the map presented showing the proximity of unsolved murders to Los Angeles schools. She believed students were most at risk immediately after the close school; she believed after-school efforts should be funded so that schools would be safe havens during those hours.

Tommy Ledbetter said, as a high school principal, that nearly every graduating class experienced trauma; e.g., loss of a classmate through automobile accident, suicide, etc. Educators had to deal with trauma all the time; however, he opposed screening students. His community regarded him as responsible for student test scores; it was true that trauma affected test scores. The public schools, however, could not be everything for everybody. Screening for trauma, and the implications of screening, was more one thing that was going to 'load the camel' until it could not walk. He agreed the Department of Education should identify best practices and make this information available to schools.

Deborah Price said that following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, she and Bill Modzeleski had worked with various experts to develop a publication offering advice to parents and teachers on responding to student trauma. She thought it was a valuable tool; people should be familiar with the issues prior to any traumatic occurrence. Price said screening was a sensitive issue: many parents were concerned that those conducting screening would announce something was wrong with their children; she said this view needed to be understood. She noted that the Department was trying to determine 'best practices' related to student trauma.

Russell Jones cited a 'misperception': no one had advocated screening or assessing all students, only those most at risk; nor were schools being identified as responsible for treating trauma, only for making referrals to other agencies. Susan Keys suggested that 'trauma' needed clarification: did it relate to general events, such as a school shooting, or to individual life experiences, or both. The committee's recommendation would depend on which definition was employed. Ralph Hingson distinguished between screening and case finding. With the former,

he said, there was an obligation to have a remedy at hand. Hingson said perhaps 15 studies of high school/college-age drinking showed that brief interventions can prompt a large decrease in such behavior.

Bill Modzeleski said the Department of Education had no position on screening. He said several prominent private organizations were pushing for screening in schools; after an incident, they would recommend universal screening. He noted the public's view that anything done in a school building during school hours was the school's responsibility.

Kim Dude suggested posing certain questions in schools, e.g. do you feel safe in school? Do you feel connected to school? The survey could ask about the behavior of others. Combined, this would provide a useful picture of the school.

David Long summarized discussion, commenting that virtually everyone experiences trauma at some point; he noted the negative consequences of this. He thought it important to keep in mind that educators had a continuing concern with meeting achievement levels, and that this remained the first focus of their efforts.

#### *Discussion of Rural and Urban Schools:*

Kim Dude noted the presentation about Nebraska: the committee had discussed the need of schools to partner with local business communities; in less populated places, there may be no business community with which to partner. Michael Ellis said he was struck by the lack of resources in rural Nebraska. He wished to hear more from urban districts on the effect high levels of violence had on the learning environment. He was aware of high schools with twenty to thirty security officers, yet fights broke out immediately in front of them.

Bill Modzeleski noted that panelists were all recipients of Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants; they were examples of what can be done when leadership, planning and adequate funding were brought together.

Montean Jackson urged that attention be paid in data collection to the number of students who were homeless, or transitional; high student turnover in many LEAs needed to be a focus of attention. Michael Herrmann called attention to the impact of the work of one individual, Liz Redmon, over time.

Howell Wechsler said that, by calling attention to what districts that had received adequate funding could accomplish, the panel returned the committee to its charge. He noted that SFDS, which gives small sums to many districts, had been receiving failing grades. Should the committee challenge the 'grading system' – that is, stress that general benefits to the nation accrued from the program. Or, should it accept the grading system, and then redesign the program to have more measurable impacts. He encouraged the committee to address this question directly.

Seth Norman questioned whether one set of rules could be fashioned for all the country's schools; there was a need to differentiate between different kinds of districts. Ralph Hingson said the issues needed to be addressed beyond the limited moneys available from the Department of Education; interventions that improved a community's safety environment had broadly involved schools, the police, health departments and others. Perhaps the committee should look at ways to support programs that created collaboration. Dennis Romero agreed,

calling attention to two hearings held relative to substance abuse prevention. The purpose had been to galvanize key community components and ask them to assess their community's problems and to develop approaches to addressing them. Susan Keys said the SS/HS initiative acted locally as Dennis Romero had described; they were an excellent demonstration of federal/state collaboration.

Michael Herrmann suggested a question: what basic things does every school need for moving forward? He noted that Tennessee had focused attention on preparing schools for crisis management: such steps did not necessarily take great funding, but did require someone to exercise leadership. Howell Wechsler asked what share of SDFS funds remained at the state level. Michael Herrmann said: four percent remained to monitor grantees and provide technical assistance. Bill Modzeleski said the four percent was for staff; an additional five percent was available for statewide training, including skills training.

Howell Wechsler said that if, in rough, SDFS was funding 10,000 school districts with \$20,000 each and Safe Schools/Healthy Students was funding 100 districts with \$2 million each, then the total funds involved were equal. The question was: how to devote Title IV efforts?

Michael Herrmann said every 'silo' had its own relationship to the state. Tennessee, he noted, had received a SIPSE grant, which he believed would support a more collaborative model. He noted that large questions were often raised near the end of a meeting, and consequently not deeply addressed. He urged the committee focus on ways to make collaboration a larger part of its discussions. Bill Modzeleski noted a contradiction: SDFS supported research-based programming; yet, over half of LEAs received less than \$10,000 annually, too little to pay for research-based programming. He believed the program's basic model needed to be reconsidered.

Dennis Romero noted that supplying school building floor plans to local first responders did not require money; it required someone undertaking to do it. Could the committee recommend a series of such steps schools could take from a prevention standpoint? Michael Herrmann noted that such steps could be compiled as a foundation and presented as an expectation. Bill Modzeleski said the Department had been done much in such areas, which he characterized as 'low-hanging' fruit. Belinda Sims noted that the committee had received reports on very good models; efforts were needed to take advantage of these examples.

David Long noted that the committee would meet again in 30 days. He suggested the number of panelist reports be reduced from three to one, to be made and discussed by Tuesday 11:45 a.m.; the balance of the meeting could be reserved for the broader matters that had been raised. These could include: how government agencies could collaborate to leverage resources; how collaboration could be brought to the local level; how various models under discussion could be incorporated. Howell Wechsler said broad discussions often proceeded in circles unless they proceeded from some written framework. Long termed this an excellent point. Bill Modzeleski suggested the committee wait until the State of the Union Address and the FY2008 budget statement had been made; otherwise, they might be 'placing the cart before the horse.' He suggested that he or other Department officials could report on these matters at the opening of the committee's next meeting, so that discussion could proceed with that knowledge. David Long called this a useful suggestion.

Tommy Ledbetter said the committee appeared to have completed a circle: at its first meeting, the idea that individual SDFS grants were too small had been discussed, but no action followed. The committee now faced the same question: how to best use the money available?

He believed the question of whether all LEAs should be funded must be resolved before many other points could be addressed.

Bill Modzeleski said the Department could not resolve that issue, but could inform the committee of the administration's plans for Title IV. Michael Herrmann asked if that meant the committee should not make separate recommendations. Bill Modzeleski said: not at all. The 'macro' level NLCB proposal would come forward; it would frame discussion and recommendation. Deborah Price suggested that providing the 'black and white' of budget and reauthorization proposals would give the advisory committee a context for making recommendations; final recommendations were not due until June 2007. Fred Ellis said he thought it would be useful to see what the budget proposal contained; hypothetically, it might say: 'Do A, B, C;' the committee could agree, but add, 'Also do D, E, F.' These were not mutually exclusive.

Ralph Hingson noted discussion had covered matters he had not known were within the committee's charge, e.g. avian flu, dirty bombs. While it was important to identify available funds, he said, it was also important to reach consensus on the program's aims and, further, to determine how the program would collaborate with other agencies with which it overlapped.

David Long said the final 45 minutes of discussion had been particularly fruitful; the portion of the next meeting reserved for panel presentations would be greatly reduced to allow for additional discussion of broader points. Long adjourned the meeting.

*Appendix A:*

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

**David Long (Chairman)**

Superintendent  
Riverside County Public Schools

**Kim Dude**

Director of the Wellness Resource Center  
University of Missouri-Columbia

**Frederick E. Ellis**

Director  
Office of Safety and Security  
Fairfax County Public Schools

**Michael Herrmann**

Executive Director  
Office of School Health, Safety and Learning Support  
Tennessee Department of Education

**Montean Jackson**

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

**Russell T. Jones**

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

**Tommy Ledbetter**

Principal  
Buckhorn High School

**Seth Norman**

Judge of the Division IV Criminal Court  
Davidson County Drug Court

**Michael Pimentel**

Chief  
San Antonio Independent School District Police  
\*Only present January 16, 2007

**Deborah A. Price**

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

**Ralph Hingson**

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

**Susan Keys**

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

**Dennis Romero**

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

**Belinda E. Sims**

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

**Howell Wechsler**

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