UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
+ + + + +
SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
+ + + + +
Tuesday,
January 16, 2007
+ + + + +

The meeting was held in the Bernard Auditorium of 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C., at 9:00 a.m., David Long, Chairman, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

DAVID LONG, CHAIRMAN
DEBORAH PRICE
KIM DUDE
FREDERICK ELLIS
MIKE HERRMANN
RALPH HINGSON
MONTEAN JACKSON
RUSSELL JONES
SUSAN KEYS
TOMMY LEDBETTER
SETH NORMAN
MICHAEL PIMENTEL
DENNIS ROMERO
BELINDA SIMS
HOWELL WECHSLER

ALSO PRESENT
CATHERINE DAVIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICER

I-N-D-E-X

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

8:06 a.m.

CHAIRMAN LONG: We'll be starting right away and we'll be staying right on schedule with the various panels and so forth that we have. First of all, I'd like to introduce the panel and then as soon as I do that, I'm going to have Maureen Dowling give us an overview as we head into this first panel.

The panelists on my left, depending on where you're sitting back there in the crowd, but on my left, Joe McTighe, and he's the Executive Director of the Council for American Private Education, Joe, welcome. And next to Joe is Patrick Bassett and Patrick is President of the National Association of Independent Schools, Patrick, welcome. And next to Patrick is Jack Clark, and Jack is Director of Technology in Non-Public School Services for the Colonial Intermediate Unit in Pennsylvania, Jack, welcome, glad you're here. And on his left is Michael Caruso, who is Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Schools and Government Relations for the Archdiocese of Washington, DC, Michael, welcome. And with that, I'd like to introduce Maureen Dowling, who will give us an overview -- and by the way, Maureen is the Education Program Specialist for the Office of Non-Public Education and Maureen will be giving us an overview as we head into this first panel. Maureen.

DR. DOWLING: Thank you. Good morning, everyone. Again, my name is Maureen Dowling. I work in the Office of Non-Public Education in the Office of Innovation and Improvement here at the US Department of Education. I want to thank the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools and the Advisory Committee for inviting me here this morning discuss with you the equitable participation of private school students and teachers in federal education programs. And of course, the focus today is on the Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug Free Schools.

In your packets for those, if you'd like to follow along, on Tab 3, we've included a copy of the PowerPoint. Following that, we have department guidance on the equitable participation of private school students and teachers and then we thought it might be helpful to include some statutory language from the Title IX, Uniform Provisions. The Title IX, Uniform Provisions govern the equitable participation of private school students and teachers in the Title IV, Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. So Tab 3 and I'll go ahead and get started.

If I had to sum up in six points the equitable participation provisions, it would include these points. First and foremost, since 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the law has provided for the equitable participation of private school students and teachers in federal education programs. So the equitable participation is not new under the No Child Left Behind Act, which it has reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Second, critical is that the law requires timely and

meaningful consultation between the local educational agency, the LEA, and private school officials. And I'll elaborate on these points as I go on this morning. The third point, in general, expenditures are to be equal based on a per-pupil allocation. So what the LEA is expending in a particular program for a public school student and a private school student, it would be an equal per-pupil allocation.

Also, number four, that the services that are going to be offered under these various federal education programs within the parameters of the program, the services then are to meet the needs of the particular population to be served, whether it's the public school teachers, private school teachers, public school students, private school students.

Five, the LEA, as the recipient of those federal education funds, always is to remain in control of the funds. And I sell my colleagues in the private sector, "You're not going to receive dollars to your school for these federal education programs. You're going to receive benefits, services, materials and equipment". And finally, the benefits, materials, the services, they are to be secular neutral and non-ideological in nature.

Those are the six packed points that cover the major areas regarding the equitable participation of private school students and teachers in federal education programs. Now even though the focus is on Title IV, Safe and Drug Free Schools, one of the items in your packet is this red, white and blue booklet and I thought it would be helpful to let you know that in addition to the Title IV program, there are about 11 other major programs that require the equitable participation of private school students and their teachers, and these programs include, beginning with Title I, improving basic programs operated by LEAs, Reading First, Even Start, Migrant Education, and then under Title II, Preparing and Training, Recruiting Highly Qualified Teachers and Principals, the Mathematics and Science Partnership Program, and Enhancing Education through Technology.

Also under Title III, the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Program. Under Title IV, we have the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. And you'll note within the Safe and Drug Free School Programs we have the state grants, which are the formula grants which require the equitable participation. But there are also a number of discretionary grants under the Title IV Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. Those listed here, including Safe Schools Healthy Students Initiative, Grants to Reduce Alcohol Abuse, Emergency Response and Crisis Management Grants, Mentoring Programs, Grants for School Basic Student Drug Testing and programs for Native Hawaiians, all of those discretionary grant programs also require the equitable participation of private school students and teachers. Those discretionary grants are also covered by the Title IX, Uniform Provisions and by the guidance that we've included in your packets this morning.

Also under Title IV is the 21st Century Community

Learning Centers and then under Title V we have two programs, Innovative Programs and Gifted and Talented Programs. So just so that you have an understanding that it's not just this one program that has required it and that this has been the case since 1965. Clearly, though, programs have been added to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act over the years.

When I go out into the field to present to local educational agency federal program directors and private school officials, I tell them if they leave the room and they've forgotten that they were even there that day, they don't remember titles and numbers and who was that woman, the one thing you want to remember is consultation. Is it the rock, the foundation of effective programs. And within the law and then backed up in guidance and regulatory language what is required is timely consultation and meaningful consultation.

So what do we mean by meaningful? Well, it's to be meaningful so that in the end, what is developed is a very effective program that maximizes those federal education dollars and is effective so at the end of this school year we can look at that program and assess it and say, "You know, it did what we hoped it would do". So what needs to be discussed during that consultation process between the LEA officials and private school officials?

One, we need to know how are we going to identify those private school students' needs? And then what services will we offer because generally within any program there are a host of services to offer and programs as well as materials and equipment. How and where those services will be provided for the private school students? And again, because we're basing this on the needs of the students, we're going to want to know what will the outcome be and we're going to want to discuss how will we assess this program?

And I mention to people when I go out into the field, if you've been doing this program for the past five years, and you're sensing well, we do it because it's just what we've been doing for years and we get it and it's free from the Federal Department of Education, if it's not having the effect you want, that's critical to address that. So we need to assess it to make sure we're expending these funds for effective programs.

Also what mechanisms will be used to provide the services and who is going to provide those services? Under some programs where there might be employees of the district involved, a district also has an option to, perhaps employ or contract with a third party provider that they might believe, you know, this third party provider has the skills and experience to do this as opposed to perhaps using our own employees. So that's an option that needs to be discussed, who is going to provide the services?

Also what's critical to the discussion is the amount of funding that's available. Clearly, when a discussion takes place, it's important for the private school officials to know whether we're talking

about $500.00 that the LEA can expend on a program for their students, as opposed to $15,000.00. That's going to take the discussion to a whole different level. So the law requires that what is discussed during the consultation is the amount of funding that's available. And what will be the size and scope of the services that the LEA will provide, and key, critical is how does the LEA make decisions about these programs throughout the year? As a private school principal, how will I know when the equipment or that materials will show up at my school or do I need to go and pick them up somewhere? Or when will that program begin that's going to be directed towards our middle school students in the prevention of drug use -- of drugs, excuse me?

Also, and this aspect is new under the No Child Left Behind Act, is in the discussion between the LEA officials and private school officials, it may be that the private school people bring to the table a third party provider. Perhaps they've gone to a conference and they've gone through the exhibit hall and they've met these third party providers who do very effective programs, so they might bring that to the consultation table to say, "You know, we've heard of someone who does a wonderful program here on crisis management, or on conflict resolution and we've heard they're very effective and we even know some other private schools that are using them". And they can bring that suggestion to the district to ask, "Could you use the funds that have been generated by our students and in a sense hire this third party provider?"

But the law allows that if there's disagreement on that point on using a third party provider, that the private schools may ask the school district to put in writing why they will not use a third party provider in the provision of services. Critical and something that again, based on my experience as I travel around the country, some local educational agencies do this very, very well, the consultation, and they make sure that the consultation takes place before any decisions are made that's going to impact the participation of private school students. Some districts, and you might hear about this morning, have developed a time line in consultation with private school officials that says, "All right, in February expect this letter and in March expect that we're going to have a general consultation meeting, and then before you leave for your summer vacation, we're going to make sure that we've discussed the programs that will be implemented for the following school year".

But sometimes what happens, and this is more so with what I've found particularly with the discretionary grant programs, because as you may be aware, when it comes to some of the discretionary grants, other entities, not just local educational agencies, may also apply for a grant and I remember about a year ago, might have been two years ago, receiving a phone call from a community based organization. It was one of the mentoring grants and they said, "You know, we're getting ready to submit our grant in a couple days and we heard about, do we have to talk to private

school people"? "Oh, yes, you do, let me tell you what part of the law that's in". "Well, if we do that, that's going to ruin our grant."

I said, "Well, no, that's what the law requires". It's very challenging, as you know, just in life, in general, when you don't do something up front and then you have to go and fix it later and there's frustration. So to the extent that districts do this well and they do it in advance, we have that maximum participation of private school students and part of the reason for this is, perhaps the district knows very well what is needed by way of safe and drug free schools for the middle schools it operates but let's just say for purposes of discussion there are some private schools and they might be K through 8 and their middle schools are included in their K to 8 program. But perhaps those private schools middle -- their middle school students, what might be needed for them might be different from what is needed for the public school students in a particular area. So it's critical that the LEA would have that information. So then as the LEA or this other entity develops its grant, it can say, "Oh, we want to make sure we accommodate this need". As I mentioned to LEA people, the goal should be we don't look at public, private, we look at here are the children, how do we serve the needs within these limits and within the limited amount of funding that we have available? And again, all those items under consultation apply to the discretionary grant programs also.

Expenditures, this is addressed in the law and I've quoted for you there, noted, the actual language but generally, as these funds go to the states based on number of children enrolled in schools, number of children from low income families, then what happens as it gets down to the district level, the district is looking at the number of private school children enrolled in private schools and develops a per pupil allocation and then multiplies $5.00 is the per pupil allocation and we have 10 children in this private school, well, we have $50.00 to expend on behalf of these students. And so we're going to consult with the private school officials, what are the needs.

In some areas, and you might hear this this morning, some private schools join together and ask the school district to pool the funds that have been generated on behalf of their students to then expend on those students. So as opposed to a little school here generating $1,000.00 and a little school here generating 2,000, again for services, not to receive those funds, it can be more effective if the District says, "On behalf of these 10 schools we're going to pool the funds that you've generated under Title IV so that we can then provide a really robust program". And sometimes that happens where you might have a group of Catholic schools or a group of Lutheran schools but it doesn't have to be one singular faith in that regard. And just as I noted all those programs at the very beginning, Title I, Part A, which we're not going to discuss today, which I call it the monster of all programs, is very challenging to understand, how expenditures are

generated for that are different. Just as a little side note, I always have to make sure I say that so there's no confusion, but for all those other 11 programs, it's a per pupil allocation.

Well, how do we know that in the end we've actually provided equitable services? What are some of the guiding principles? This is taken from the regulations. As you'll notice as we go through -- have gone through the slides, I've cited the actual statutory language, but here I'm citing some of the regulatory language that generally has the district assessed and addressed those needs of the private school students and teachers? So have they consulted with the private school officials in a timely and meaningful way? And then have they provided benefits and services that meet the needs?

Sometimes what can happen is a district has clearly examined their students' needs, knows these are the three top needs, we've examined the needs. We're going to develop programs to really meet those needs and then in consultation with private school officials, they might say, "These are three programs, would you like to participate". Well, that does not meet the requirement of the law because the law requires that first we need to identify the needs of those private school students and teachers. We cannot just offer them services in a sense, "This is what you can have, take it or leave it". It has to be, "Now that we've assessed those services, this is what we've developed". And there are many times when the programs that have -- that the district develops for its public school students and teachers are also very appropriate for private school students and teachers. But again, the starting point is always what are those needs because we don't want to implement a program that doesn't meet real needs because it's not going to be effective in the end.

Also that the district is to spend an equal per-pupil amount, that's one of the ways we define that they've provided equitable services, and that the opportunity for private school students and teachers to participate is comparable to that of public school students and teachers. Thus, this relates to time lines. If at the beginning of the school year a program in the public school system begins operating in September, then we would anticipate that the programs for the private school students would start in September unless through consultation it was decided that it would be better if it started in October for whatever particular reason.

As mentioned, again, not only does the LEA always remain in control of the funds and the funds are the local educational agency's funds, not the private school funds, what we also remind private school officials is that because the Department, the Federal Department of Education holds states accountable and then states have to hold their local educational agencies accountable for implementing these programs, that then results in the LEA always making the final decision about these programs because when our monitoring teams go out, we're not going to ask private school officials, "Have you implemented this program correctly,

are you making sure you're evaluating it"? Those questions we're going to direct to the local educational agency because they are accountable, they are the fiduciary agent. They always make the final decision.

Now, on that note, what we anticipate is I like to ask the counselors here in the Office of the General Counselor, my colleagues who are lawyers, well, "What if there's discussion about that decision?" They say, "Well, we would expect that any decisions that are made that there's a rationale behind them and it's a reasonable rationale". There might not always be agreement between the public and private school officials, but that in the end if a decision has been made, and let's say there is disagreement, we can inquire and at the Department level what response we would get would be a rationale that was legitimate and reasonable.

Also, the services are to be, and the materials and equipment programs, secular, neutral and non-ideological in delivering those services to private school students and teachers. In general, the allowable activities, whether it's a formula grant or one of these discretionary grants, whatever the allowable activity might be or activities in most cases, those would also be available to private school students and teachers. And those allowable activities are going to be addressed during that consultation process. One final note about this and mind you, I usually get anywhere from one to three hours on this topic, but some local educational agencies have developed what is called a non-public school working group and they bring on board representatives, perhaps one representative for all the Catholic schools, one for maybe independent schools and it might be anywhere from 10 to 20 people on this non-public school advisory board and some districts do that and particularly when they're discussing discretionary grants which you have a tight time frame and they've got to complete that grant and they've got to submit that grant. Those types of groups can be helpful where the lead entity for a particular group of private schools can gather information and say they're developing a grant, a discretionary grant. We need to know what are the needs of private school students. And that's just one what you might call a best or an effective practice that I've found through my travels as I've been out there.

Finally, this information is our contact information for the Office of Non-Public Education. We're the liaison office. One in four schools is a private school. A little over 5 million students are private school students and we bring their concerns and interest to the department and then we also assist them in accessing through the local educational agencies these benefits and services that are available to them. So I think there's going to be questions at the end and I will end here. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much, Maureen. I don't know if that's on. The light is on, I'll just talk loudly. Thank you and we will now be moving to the panel and you are exactly right, the format is this; we will be having questions at the end. So we'll go from -- we'll start

on my left with Joe and then if we could go from Joe to Patrick to Jack to Michael, and then when we are done with the presentations, and then that might also include any questions, Maureen, that might be directed to you from out committee.

So again, thank you so much for being here. And with that, I'll turn it over to Joe McTighe.

MR. McTIGHE: Thank you for inviting us this morning. I was thinking on the metro on the trip down that when one considers all of the circumstances under which testimony is given in this town, the chances are pretty good that any given piece of testimony is either to defend oneself or explain oneself or otherwise keep oneself out of jail but I'm happy to assure you that this testimony has nothing to do with any of that. In fact, this is all about a very pleasant and I think non-controversial topic and a topic around which there is general and broad and bipartisan agreement, namely the need to protect children from harm, but first some background on CAPE.

The Council for American Private Education is a coalition of 16 national organizations and 30 state affiliates representing private elementary and secondary schools. One in four of the nation's schools is a private school and 11 percent of all students attend them. That translates into 28,000 schools and about 6 million students pre-K through 12. Approximately 80 percent of those students are enrolled in schools represented by CAPE member organizations.

Our nation is blessed by a rich diversity of schools, some rooted in religious tradition, some that provide intensive academic experience and some that are specialized for particular populations. Whether public or private, these diverse schools constitute the American educational experience and share a worthy goal, the education of our country's children.

Together public and private schools work to insure an educated citizenry. Together they strive to help students reach their potential and contribute to the common good and moreover, all the children in these schools, public and private, are part of the American family; indeed, part of the human family and thereby, entitled to certain rights and protections. CAPE member organizations, which are listed on the slide you've just been viewing, are themselves, diverse. The CAPE -- I just want to make sure -- I need a little mirror here to see what's going on behind me but I'll have to trust in technology from this point forward.

The CAPE board and the state network representatives deliberate extensively. They listen to one another carefully and they endeavor to reach agreement on important public policy issues. One of CAPE's core purposes is to cooperate with the public sector to improve the quality of education for all of the nation's children, regardless of the schools they attend. And quite naturally, we are advocates for the equitable opportunity of private school students and teachers to participate in

appropriate programs at the state and federal level. Given this perspective, we welcome the occasion to offer the following comments relating to student health and safety.

CAPE member organizations do not agree on every point of public policy but they do agree on this point; when it comes to insuring the health and safety of children, the government should treat all students alike. Now, at a certain level there's a common sense element to all of this. All students are citizens and all citizens are entitled to certain protections. Police officers, fire fighters or first aide providers do not put certain students in a second class treatment category on account of the type of school they happen to attend. If a fire breaks out at a public school, they are there. If one breaks out at a private school, they are there. They are there because their mission is to protect the public and children in private schools are part of the public.

The same even-handed treatment is also generally practiced at the federal level. The response in the wake of the 2005 Gulf Coast hurricanes serves as an example. The Bush Administration and the Education Department made it clear that help was going to be provided to everybody in need. When the hurricanes struck, they did not draw distinctions between public and private schools. The storms flattened and flooded all effected buildings with the same ferocity and they uprooted communities indiscriminately.

The President and members of Congress on both sides of the aisle concluded that government assistance should not draw distinctions either. Children who needed help, got help no matter what school they attended. And schools that needed emergency disaster relief got the relief no matter what type of school they were.

So whether the crisis is a hurricane, a pandemic flu, or a strike by terrorists, public and private schools are all in it together. They all have the same goal, to ease the pain of those in need and to insure that students receive a decent education with minimum interruption. To achieve these goals, all government disaster relief and crisis management activities should extend to all schools.

Let me turn to the particular reason for this morning's focus on private schools. During a Q and A session at the White House Conference on school safety last October, a questioner, after noting that a private school had been the scenes of the shootings of students in Pennsylvania the previous week, asked how private schools might be included in government plans and programs to help protect students.

Secretary Spellings responded by saying she intended to ask the Committee, quote, "To take a look at that issue on how we can be more coordinated". The next day, during a conference call with education leaders, the Secretary reiterated her intention to ask this Advisory Committee to include the topic of private schools in their discussions on school safety. The fact that this committee is so quickly addressing this

issue is testimony to the Secretary's, the Department's and the Committee's commitment to serving all students.

In her report to President Bush at the conclusion of the School Safety Conference, Secretary Spelling said, quote, "We know also that these sorts of incidents can occur in inner city America and in Amish communities, private schools and public schools. Really every single community has to be alert", unquote. We couldn't agree more and we are eager to work with the committee and with Department staff to carry out the Secretary's obvious commitment to protect the nation's students no matter what type of school they attend.

But despite good intentions, there are some obvious obstacles to extending government disaster preparedness activities to private schools, especially at the state and local levels. Quite understandably, there is a natural network of coordination between government officials and public schools when it comes to establishing channels of emergency communication and connecting with community emergency responders during a crisis situation. But that same natural nexus does not always extent to private schools. I believe the Federal Government, and this covers all appropriate agencies, including Education, Homeland Security and others, would do well to encourage, if not mandate, the establishment of state and local crisis communication networks that encompass all schools. Along these lines, we propose having the Education Department sponsor a special meeting or series of meetings on the issue involving key government and private school officials; having the Education Department develop and issue brief, a DVD instructional kit, a resource guide, and other resources on the topic of private school inclusion in crisis planning, including the topic in workshops and other gatherings sponsored by the Department and other agencies, identifying and disseminating model school level disaster plans, especially suited for private schools; identifying and disseminating model private school/public school government agency partnerships relating to crisis planning and finding other ways and incentives to encourage state and local government officials to include private schools in emergency planning activities and finally, finding effective ways to advise private schools of the resources available to promote school safety.

You should know that we, in the private school community area also taking crisis planning very seriously. At CAPE we have taken significant steps to make a private -- to make the private school community aware of crisis planning resources. We have devoted a page on our website to the topic, a page that provides convenient links to government resources relating to disaster planning, pandemic flu, natural disasters and promising practices for coping with the crisis.

In addition, we have devoted considerable space in our monthly publication to reporting on events and promoting Department resources related to the topic. Clearly, however, much more needs to be

done both by the private school community and by government agencies. Permit me to identify one concern that highlights the need for additional focus on this issue. I will be brief, knowing that the topic is going to be covered by my colleague, Pat Bassett from the National Association of Independent Schools.

Three federal departments; Commerce, Education and Homeland Security have launched a program entitled America Is Safer When Our Schools Are Safer, a new program to protect our children. The initiative involves the distribution of NOAA all-hazard public alert radios to schools, but despite its inclusive title, the program has actually been designed to protect only some students, namely those in public schools. My understanding, however, is that efforts are underway to include private schools in the radio distribution and I applaud those efforts and encourage their quick success but the underlying issue is that when the program was in initiated, the safety of an entire group of students, namely those in private schools, was overlooked. We cannot allow some students to be thought of as second-class citizens when it comes to issues of health and safety. All children should be protected by a program designed to provide schools with early warnings that allow quick and appropriate action during threatening events. When a crisis starts, minutes and sometimes seconds can make the difference. That thinking is what inspired the decision to equip public schools with NOAA radios and the same thinking should have prompted the inclusion of private schools from the start.

Finally, allow me briefly to mention another matter, the Emergency Response and Crisis Management Grants Programs, which I know will be covered by my colleague Mike Caruso from the Archdiocese of Washington in his testimony. I urge Department officials to find ways to guarantee that applicants for grants relating to school safety describe and carry out their obligations to insure equitable participation by private school children and teachers. The law requires equitable services and the Department, when approving grants, in fact, before approving grants, should insure that the requirements of the law are carried out.

In closing, I want to thank in the presence of the Committee, the Department, Assistant Secretary Price, and members of her staff for the outreach to the private school community on matters of school safety. Tara Hill provided private school leaders an excellent overview of school safety programs at a CAPE meeting last February and she joined colleagues in offering an informative panel presentation on crisis planning at the Department's Private School Leadership Conference in the fall. And Deputy Secretary Price met with private school representatives in December to discuss various matters. We very much appreciate the time that the Office has devoted to the safety of students in all schools public and private. I mentioned at the start that my overall topic, protecting children from harm, is non-controversial. Indeed there is nothing controversial about keeping students out of harm's way and helping those in need. Doing

so is simply a matter of basic human decency, not controversy. Helping one another is what we do as a nation, as a community, as a family. We reach out to our brothers and sisters without distinction. Their needs become our needs. The controversy would be to turn away.

I urge you not to turn away from the students in private schools when carrying out federal programs relating to school safety and I urge you to encourage state and local authorities to include our students in schools in their plans for preventing and reacting to a crisis. Again, thank you for establishing this forum, for inviting us to participate and for considering our comments and suggestions. CHAIRMAN LONG: Joe, thank you very much for your comments. We appreciate that. Next, we'll turn to Patrick Bassett, who is President, as I indicated earlier, of the National Association of Independent Schools. Patrick?

MR. BASSETT: Good morning. In school, you're supposed to say good morning back.

ALL PARTICIPANTS: Good morning.

MR. BASSETT: Thank you. By the way, when we need quiet, we raise our hand in school. That only works in elementary school, not middle school or high school. This is my 37th year of working with schools. I started as a teacher and a coach and a dorm parent in an all-boy's boarding school Virginia and then after about 10 years of that, I had two daughters and a female basset hound and I moved to become the head of an all-girls' school so my world changed dramatically. Eventually, I became the head of a coeducational school in Connecticut. Now, this is my sixth year in this role as the President of the National Association of Independent Schools. We represent about 1250 college prep schools throughout the United States and another 50 or so throughout the world and about 500,000 students. I might add that I grew up and went to public elementary, junior high and high schools, very good schools in a suburb of Rochester, New York and they were safe and drug free schools back in those days. I'd like to comment first on the notion of school safety.

Independent schools, in particular, private schools in general, have been blessed, at least to date with relatively safe history of absence of acts of violence. The first thing I want to talk about with safe schools is the enemy within, those folks we know, our own staff and students who have the potential for bringing violence into our schools. There are several factors that I believe have protected private schools and I share them with Advisory Panel because I think they have implications for all schools. Obviously, one factor is that our schools have narrow missions. We cover the entire gambit of school age population, but each individual school defines what segment of the school age population it chooses to serve. So we have schools whose mission it is to serve just the gifted. Most of our school serve average to above average college-bound kids, but we also have schools that -- whose mission it is to serve under-served and under-privileged kids in the inner city, students with learning disabilities or

what we call learning differences. So key element for the safety in our schools, key factor is that we have narrowly defined missions and as a consequence, there's a match between the student, the family and the school. The kids want to be in that school, they know they need to be in that school and that makes a huge difference in terms of a sense of belonging. I might add that when you feel you belong in a school, this is your school, not only do you succeed academically but you're part of a larger ethos for the school to be safe.

For those of you who are parents just of young children, I would have to tell you this, to disabuse you of your most fervent hope; that in fact, your influence will not waiver as your child becomes an adolescent. Truth be known, for everyone who has been a parent of an adolescent, you know this, the peer group defines one's behavior, once you separate, individuate and separate from your parents and that's what happens during adolescence. So choosing a school, public or private, where there's a sense of belonging is absolutely critical.

The second factor is that our kids in private schools, are involved in supervised after school activities. I can't tell you how important this is as a factor for school safety and child well-being. It turns out, if you're involved in after school activities that are salutary, healthful, organized, you do not do antisocial behaviors, you do not do behaviors; sex, drugs and rock and roll that actually happen quite freely in the unsupervised world for most kids.

Thirdly, is our school size. It's related to the other two factors. The average private school, I believe, Joe is 200 or so students; is that right? The average independent school is more like four to 500 hundred. These are manageable numbers. The great movement in America from the `50s in the public domain has been consolidation. We have massively large public schools. It is a hugely irrational idea to have 1,000 middle schoolers, junior high kids or 1500 junior high kids together.

Here's why; the adults do not know the kids. They don't know all the kids, they don't know their families. So what works in the private model I would recommend and of course, Bill Gates is funding this to the tunes of multiple millions of dollars in the public domain, find ways to regroup even in large public systems into smaller manageable schools, schools within schools.

By the way, the relationship between all these ideas is this; in a large public school system you have to be an NFL or NBA prospect to actually make the team. This is why so few kids participate in sports. They don't have the option of participating. How about a small private school? If you can fog a mirror, we're recruiting you to play on the team, right? So here's the deal, everyone is on a team. It could be chess team, the debate team, basketball team. Virtually, the ethos expects you, the adults recruit you, you're on a team and it produces many, many benefits, not the least of which is the one we're talking about today, a sense

of belonging in a safe school because the kids own the school. The culture they adopt is the school's culture, framed not just by the kids, but by the adults.

A third factor, a fourth factor is the fact that we've actually developed crisis plans. We have security consciousness. Many independent schools, private schools have long feared attack, especially, for example, the Jewish day schools. If you want to see the best protected and safest schools in America, go to a Jewish day school because they have for so long, been fearful of the kinds of attacks we've seen.

And lastly on this particular point of school safety, I believe that there is a high touch, high tech future for grade schools in America in the 21st Century, and if you know what high touch, high tech looks like, you'll know that it is the future programically and academically for schools both -- not either or, both and, high touch, high tech. Well, the same is true for safety and security. What I think you'll find more schools moving for -- towards and perhaps the panel will think about it and research and recommend it, our security systems that aren't policed literally by armed and uniformed guards. This is inhospitable and invasive and intrusive and it creates a mentality that is anathema to what school is supposed to be.

Instead, the future will be high touch teachers trained to observe changes in behaviors or the unexpected arrival of adults that you don't know. High tech will help in many, many new directions, including smart cards, and neural networks in schools that will help track everyone who is on campus and provide for a future that is more secure.

My second theme this morning was actually brilliantly covered by my colleague and that is the program, the NOAA radio program. The only thing I would add to Joe's incisive remarks would be this; we're curious on how this could happen. How does the legislative and regulatory process work so that 10 percent of the school age population would be ignored in something as basic as providing for services under emergency conditions because when the hurricane came to New Orleans, it didn't segregate by public versus private. And when the next disaster strikes there won't be that kind of distinction made.

So we're actually encouraged that because we've made a lot of noise as the private sector, we're moving in the right direction but we're fearful that this could happen at all. So that sense of concern, I really did want to represent.

Third, I'd like to say something about the Stafford/FEMA Hurricane Relief Programming. Of course, prior to 2006, independent and private schools were ineligible to receive reimbursements from FEMA because we were expected to make any applications through the Small Business Administration, SBA in the event of a disaster. And of course, the consequence for that was that this interrupted services towards this 10 percent of the population, dramatically in the cases in which disaster

struck.

Thankfully, in 2006, legislation was passed and signed into law amending the Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act and restoring federal aid for the repair, restoration and replacement of private, non-profit educational facilities. So really what I wanted to place into testimony is I thank you and an expression of our gratitude to the work of those of you who have made this possible.

I might add that NAIS and our private school colleagues educated thousands of Katrina students, displaced students and it represented really the best of what the private school universe is about. Probably 85 percent of the schools charged no tuition whatsoever. Those that did charge tuition were some of the Houston schools that had to take in hundreds of students and add faculty. So for me it's a model of what this panel is really about, the notion that given the power of the government and the eleemosynary and charitable inclination of the not for profit world and schools, we can do powerful things quickly when called upon.

And then the last thing I'd like to share some thoughts about is really not as much on the agenda today but worthy of some contemplation and that is the notion of drug free schools and I know the committee is intently interested in and committed to that future. Actually, statistically, it's clear to everyone the students in America are much more at risk from drugs and alcohol, tobacco products and incidentally, premature experimentation with sexuality, much more at risk than for any of the other crises and emergencies that we're paying attention to today. And so I'd like to suggest that private schools are by no means immune from this disaster that's hit American schools. The increased incidents of the use of alcohol and drugs and early experimentation with human sexuality. We do believe, as I've tried to reflect in everything I've said this morning, that there's a public purpose to private education. We believe that for 300 years private schools in American have been a laboratory driven by the market. We know what the public expects from their schools because they pay a lot of money to send their children to private schools, so what is working would be a good question for any group or panel to examine. And so actually what's promising is an experiment that I just want to bring to the panel's attention.

It's a programming called Social Norming. And here's the idea behind it. We're actually as a culture, very misinformed about the use of drugs and alcohol. For example, if you ask the typical American what percentage of adults have a drink every day, let's just test this little hypothesis I have here, would -- well, some of you actually are experts around the panel, so I'm going to ask you not to respond. But for the rest of the panel or anyone in the public who's joining us, what percentage of Americans do you think have a drink every day? Someone take a guess.

Mr. Chairman, what would you guess?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Forty-seven percent.

MR. BASSETT: Forty-seven percent. Let me have three points so we can triangulate this at little bit. Forty-seven percent, someone take another guess. Sixty-five percent and give me a third guess, adults, yes, adults, 80 percent. Exactly, this is the common perception and it's largely because the people in this room belong to the socioeconomic class actually that does have a drink, including myself, every day, but in American only 11 percent of Americans have a drink every day. So we wildly overestimate that. It reminds me of a story. Kentucky, you know, we have a kindergarten class in one of our independent schools in Kentucky and the headmaster overheard this conversation in the playground. There were two boys and a girl, and the girl said, before school stared, "Well, let's play family". And she said, "I'll be the mom, this boy, you be the dad," and then the third child, the other boy said, "Well, that's not fair, whom can I be, who can I be", and the little girl thought for a minute and she said, "Well, you can be the grandpa". And then he thought for a minute and said, "Well, that won't work, we don't have any bourbon".

So, what I'm saying -- but the antidote is the expectation is that everyone drinks, but the reality is not everyone drinks, a very small minority drink every day. Here's the point about social norming, every teenager in every American school, public and private thinks that everyone drinks, thinks that everyone experiments with drugs, particularly marijuana, and thinks that everyone is having sex. So the social norm thing, the normative thing to do apparently in every teenager's mind is to experiment with alcohol, drugs and premature sexuality.

It turns out when you actually do the polling, here's what you find and this is also true in America's universities; that not everyone, in fact the minority behavior in schools is to experiment with alcohol and drugs, that minority behavior is to experiment with alcohol, drugs and human sexuality. And in American universities, the minority behavior is to drink to get drunk. And yet, if you ask your own kids in college, they'll tell you everyone is drinking to get drunk, you know, starting on Wednesday night. So once you actually do the research and publish the results, guess what? Teenagers and even college kids decide, you know what, it's normal not to do that. And so what I'm really trying to do is use an antidote to illustrate that larger point of the public purpose of education. We have the freedom and the will to experiment with safety mechanisms, with crisis planning, with alcohol and drug programming and we think we owe it back to the larger society to be experimental schools and share with you what seems promising. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much, Patrick. We appreciate that and we'll next move to Jack Clark, Jack.

MR. CLARK: Thank you, David, members of the Committee, honored guests. I want to express my appreciation for the opportunity to present here this morning. I'm going to give a little bit of a different type of presentation, although I do echo what my peers are

presenting, but I'd like to present a little bit more of a success story of what can be done depending upon structure and depending upon how the programs are handled. I represent a consortium of non-public schools that are administered by intermediate units in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania has a structure of regional educational service agencies called intermediate units. There are 29 intermediate units to service the 501 public school districts and numbers of non-public schools and they service those in terms of special education services, professional development, consultation with curriculum and a number of other areas. My responsibility is to administer a state-wide program called the Act 89 Auxiliary Services Program that provides remedial services, counseling, psychological services, a number of different things for the non-public schools. And we also serve as the LEA for the non-public schools for the federal programs. Now, this makes it very interesting in that we don't suffer the problems that are caused by having the empty seats on the bus type syndrome where a large public school district puts a program in place and they have a very small group of non-public school children and it's tough to find something that meets their needs when you're dealing with such a small number. For instance, in my particular intermediate unit, Unit 20, which is in the upper right-hand corner there, we have about 85,000 public school students and 13 school districts. With the non-public school structure we serve, there's about 9.000 students, so the numbers are small in relation.

When we looked at these particular programs, one of the things we did a number of years back when I was still working for the parochial school system was to put together a consortium of intermediate units. Due to the fact of the expansive amount of paperwork you're all familiar with for federal programs, we felt it would be worthwhile if one of the intermediate units of a group of four if us did, Safe and Drug Free Schools, another one did the Title II Professional Development and so forth. So we teamed up and this has made things extremely effective. And that highlighted green area on the map, that's the consortium that's administered by my intermediate unit to do Safe and Drug Free Schools Programs for the non-public schools and about 50 public school districts. There are 11 non-public high schools, approximately 70 elementary and middle schools and countless early childhood and pre-school programs that come under this group. So it makes a sizeable group and we have probably the best functioning advisory committee in the state, with law enforcement represented, social service. We have legal people, we have parents, we actually have students who come to our advisory counsel meetings. Right now they're reviewing the budget, reviewing programs that are effective, working on our application to make sure that we do have proven programs that are being put into place that are scientifically based. So this has made things exceptional and one of the products of our committee has been a crisis response manual.

This started back in about 1985 when some of the

schools had programs in place dealing with substance abuse and they had a manual, "This is how we deal with problems," and we were putting student assistance programs in place. Then eventually the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program came across and we created this advisory panel and they thought, "Well, this is a great idea, let's just take this substance abuse manual that we have for schools and expand it into a number of other areas. So it was an outgrowth of earlier substance abuse manual and it was developed by practitioners in the field.

We set up committees for the different chapters and brought in all the experts and this particular project is reviewed and updated annually. And the manual itself is available on the website. I have a web address there where you can find this under auxiliary services. Click on the crisis manual and you'll be able to find that.

The reason I want to go through this rather quickly is because to talk about
-- I want to focus on the crisis response itself and the issues we have in working with the public school district. When we developed our manual, we developed a standard process for each different section; a purpose, what triggers the intervention process and procedure so that you could follow a common approach to all issues and people would be comfortable in responding and things would start to be internalized much easier, similar to the all hazards planning approach that's now fostered.

We also listed a number of additional resources in the crisis manual. Our first section, of course, dealt with alcohol, tobacco and other drugs, different topics and dos and don'ts for parents. There's a wealth of resources there. The purpose of the manual was not to set policy but to implement procedures and to be able to point out where local policies needed to be implemented to support your procedures. The definition of in loco parentis, the responsibility of the schools we have in Pennsylvania, examples of policies, also our single county agency contact sheet, all different types of help and resources.

Our second section dealt with child abuse, suspected child abuse by school employees. We have copies of the Child Protective Services law in there as a resource. We then got into death in the school community, provided sample letters to parents, how to respond and deal with this death, whether you're dealing with students, whether you're dealing with parents who are very close to the school or actual staff members.

A suicide section because that's been one of the major issues unfortunately that we deal with, with children this age group. How to handle not just the aftermath of a successful suicides but when you do attempts and we're actually even implementing University of Columbia's Teen Screen Program now, very successful in the non-public schools to provide some information for parents for children who may be at risk so there are a lot of resources in this.

We have a section on medical emergencies, how to handle medical emergencies, helpful procedures to put in place and to local school and different charts, resources and so forth. Actually, it gets rather extensive and that's what's nice about having some representatives from the medical community on your advisory counsel. This is one of the areas that when we're talking about communicable diseases, we already did have something in place there but it's a section that typically has to be expanded much as is being done in the public schools, just to have a pandemic plan response so you can show your local community you're addressing issues in that area.

Natural disasters, dealing with different types of natural disasters that may occur. Up in our area, we recently had some serious flooding in the eastern area. We are susceptible to small earthquakes in different sections there. We have mine subsidence and a number of other problems there. Also going along with our natural disasters anything you could imagine we try and put on the list.

Weapons and violence had been an area where we drew from the resources from DARE office and law enforcement and legal people who were on our committee and our local state police and task forces have been very helpful in putting these procedures in place. We are one of the areas where we have had shootings. It was nice to have these procedures in place. They're predating Columbine and so forth but about six years back we did have a shooting up at Newman High School in Williamsport and luckily we had a policy in place that helped us to keep things on track.

Other topics there dealing with gangs. Copies of our Gun Free Schools Act, a list of members who are trained in first aid. We get into custody issues, another hot topic with the public as well as the private schools, dealing with missing children, procedures for handling issues with missing children and tracking them on field trips and an official chapter we have that's not listed in your handouts is Meagan's Law which is a Pennsylvania law for tracking sexual predators.

With our crisis manual, it was so successful and we did have it in place there for many of the parochial schools. It was shared with the other private schools across the state. The Pennsylvania Department of Education found out about it and liked it and actually gave us a grant to distribute the template. It was basically a template in Microsoft Word format so that a school building administrator could take this and tailor it and it helps. You know, why re-invent the wheel but it helps point to major issues that should be covered.

So we distributed this on a CD a number of years back to all the public school districts in the state and we developed a website which was listed on that third slide at IU 20 from which to download the manual, and it's been used extensively. We've had downloads from countries all across the world. An outgrowth of the manual was the flip charts for

classroom teachers for quick references. It's nice, there are little flip charts instead of looking through the whole manual. The procedures that the administrators have, they can look up what happens when we're dealing with an intruder and quick reference, who do I call, how do I handle these things. The schools have done this, one of the public school districts adopted this same procedure, so we've been sharing that and it's gone quite well.

We've gotten involvement on our advisory committee in working with the development of our manual and by the way, I have a copy of the template just to show you the size of it. I can bring this out and leave this with the committee but you can review this and it has a lot of helpful resources. Much of this is -- some of this, I guess relevant specifically to Pennsylvania but it's a step-by-step procedure that local building administrators can use in putting their plans into place.

Following the development of this and all the recent concerns that we've had with respect to crisis management, we began to work in training our administrative teams from the non-public schools and the incident command structure as well as the national incident management system so that they would know how to interface with the first responders when they came into their building. Not only would they know how to interface with the first responders but they would be able to support one another because they would understand the structure that was in place at a particular school building.

In our area the public school districts have absolutely adapted the plan format that we have in place. They've also been trained in the incident command structure and in NIMS. Many of them, as I told you, are developing flip charts for their teachers and flow charts for the administrators so they can respond quickly and help each other out.

Our current priorities, both in the public schools and the representatives of the private schools are sitting elbow to elbow with the public school districts in developing comprehensive all hazards planning. They are learning the common language structure from the NIMS. They're working with the first responders. They're conducting tabletop exercises and practice drills that go well beyond your severe weather drills.

The major areas that seem to be focused on right now are how to respond in terms of natural disasters, how to deal with school security and violence, and of course pandemic planning. In Pennsylvania, our government support has come to the schools from resources we were able to pull down from the FEMA website, also from the Department of Education, the resources there and the Pennsylvania Management Agency website. We've been getting our training in the instant command structure, NIMS, at least in my particular intermediate unit where I'm located from the Director of Emergency Services training at the local community college and he's worked both with the non-public schools as well as the public school districts. The state police are doing workshops on vulnerability

assessments for the schools and assisting in consultation but they are stretched rather thinly. The issue that we're all dealing with is the lack of support in some areas. Our State Department of Health finally picked up the phone to talk to the Department of Education when they were informed by the Governor that they didn't the authority to close the schools down by themselves. This is only under that authority of the Secretary of Education. So they finally started to talk to one another.

They went and established PODs, the Points of Distension throughout the state without any consultation or input from the local emergency management agencies, without any input from the Regional Anti-Terrorism Task Force and without any input from the schools. Many of these sites that they selected or some of the sites they selected were school buildings that were actually under construction and things that would be impractical. Yet they had school districts that were willing to work with them if they had picked up the phone ahead of time and said, "Sure, we have a nice spot and we'd like to include this right here". So there's a lack of coordination on a rather large scale.

We find the county support has been missing and we really have to coordinate with the county. Our superintendents and many of you are very familiar with the issue, we're -- the superintendents are accountable to the parents for the health, safety and welfare of the children as well as the staff. And it's hard to answer questions to parents about why you don't have a plan to put into place when you're trying to pass things off to the county. They don't want to hear that. They don't send the children off to the county every day. They send them off to the school district and you had better be prepared. So what has happened in our particular area, the schools are driving the disaster preparedness planning. The schools have taken what they've learned from the ICS trainings and NIMS training, taken their plans, made them NIMS compliant and conducted the research to develop response plans to put into place. And now they're at the stage where they're going to be taking these plans to the county and asking the county to support them and to be compliant with plans that they have prepared according to the national standards. And I don't think this is an unusual situation that you would find across the country.

School districts have to be responsive to parents, have to put plans into place whether the support is there from the local government or not. As I said, the schools are concerned about the safety of the students and staff. The answer is not forthcoming. Our next step is to coordinate the completed plans, review and update them regularly and to put procedures into place to help children. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much, Jack. To answer one of the things, just a statement you made, yes, it is almost the same everywhere and that's why we're listening, that's why this will be a good discussion afterwards. Michael, if we could turn to you, Michael Caruso.

MR. CARUSO: Thank you, good morning. I'm going to try to breeze through my testimony and not hit all the points that are in my written testimony. Does everyone have the testimony? And I don't have the PowerPoint unfortunately this morning but distinguished Advisory Committee members, honorable federal public servants and honored guests, I'm very, very pleased to have this opportunity to present remarks and participate in the follow-up panel discussion and I do want us to get to that because I think the synergy and discussion that can happen there is sometimes the most fruitful.

Concerning issues related to crisis planning and school safety as they relate to Catholic schools, I handed around an overview of the Catholic schools of the archdiocese of Washington that I represent. There are 34,000 students in our system of schools, 76 of them are archdioceses schools with two archdioceses high schools. Most of the archdioceses schools are elementary and middle schools and the remaining schools are -- about a quarter of them are independently operated Catholic high school and middle schools.

We're in six different jurisdictions including the District of Columbia and five Maryland county surrounding Washington, DC. The geographic area for the archdioceses is 2100 square miles. I've worked in the education profession for the last 25 years serving the archdioceses of Washington since 2003 and my role, I'm not a security chief, although I play one about every six weeks. My role really is to link the Catholic schools with essential resources and my involvement though with the Council of Governments Security Chief's Group and then the National Group that's met every year for the last three years that I've been a part, has really been to sensitize me to the fact that the external threats are very real to all of our schools.

The same essential factors that influence public schools have influenced Catholic and non-public schools' approach to rethink school safety and crisis preparedness strategies and procedures and there's a constellation of factors that you're all aware of. It started with Columbine, 9-11, the global war on terrorism, the war in Iraq and most recently the potential for a flue pandemic. These are all key big factors that are driving all of us and it's raised the consciousness level in non-public, private schools the same way as it has in public schools. I'm a parent of two young children, one six and one nine, and this has really become an important part of my life both professionally and personally as I suspect it is for all of you.

Logic dictates that there be a heightened sensitivity to the vulnerability of all children no matter where they go to school. We are most concerned. We do have internal threats, just like everyone else and they were alluded to, but we are most concerned about the external threats and the common misperception is that non-public schools and private schools don't think they have a problem or they don't worry about school

safety and nothing could be further from the truth.

Now, some people like us and all of you worry about it a lot more than some others especially in the suburbs who believe that somehow it's not going to happen there, but most of the schools do worry about it, especially the school leaders and parents increasingly worry about it.

No school -- to paraphrase the poet John Donne -- is an island unto itself. And Catholic schools, while we pride ourselves in the safety and security of our internal environments, we really are concerned and we worry about the potential for a flu pandemic the way everyone else does and we worry about the proliferation of gangs and natural disasters and in another 9-11 and unfortunately it's likely to happen.

And what we need to do and we know is to plan accordingly and we know that good planning and good coordination go a long way to anticipating these complexities and addressing them. Now, I'm just going to -- I don't want to whine about it, but it is a reality, after 9-11 there was a burst of public funding to public schools and other public entities as there should have been. Those funds, for the most part, did not reach non-public and private schools. The additional funds, you're familiar with how they were -- how they were provided and they were provided for very important things. It makes practical sense to do everything possible to insure that the non-public schools receive equitable and meaningful support for school health and safety because our students to go school across these venues.

I've provided a couple of examples of promising practices. They're not the only promising practices but they are a couple of examples. One is a children's health alert network. The information is in your packets. It essentially is a program in which the Montgomery County Government Health Department received a federal grant about three years ago and the Catholic schools, 30 of them in Montgomery County report attendance essentially every day, most of them still participate in that as do public schools. And what it is intended to do, the information goes to Johns Hopkins is if there's any kind of dramatic change in attendance, it can render a signal that there may be a health problem. It's really a bio-terrorism initiative and health initiative.

The problem with that initiative is, there was a burst of funding. We're all continuing to participate but there's been no follow-up funding. In Price George's County, this is just one example, we're working with the special forces unit in which we provided all of our school floor plans in case there was a major incident in which those SWAT teams would need to get into the schools, they would know where to go.

Again, this is an initiative that's kind of done in isolation. It's important. It's not being done in the other five jurisdictions and it probably should be but that particular partnership doesn't exist there exactly the same way, and yet if it were connected with a comprehensive approach, it could really be a good model.

What I want to just shoot to are impediments to enhancing

school safety and emergency preparedness and my focus is really around the whole area of Title IV. But a key challenge, a couple of key challenges faced by non-public schools is that, number one, they're not permitted to apply directly for federal funds. We're not LEAs. So we're really, you know, at the mercy and at the invitation of the public schools and we have really, really good relationships with them but we can't be the lead. And there's some interesting things going on in Pennsylvania, as there are in New York where there are pass-throughs, voluntary pass-throughs that are occur that enable non-public schools to access money more readily and therefore, supports.

But the consequences that nearly all the efforts to enhance the non-public schools readiness has been without the benefit of the technical assistance training and implementation support that the public schools have realized.

Another challenge that I want to mention that impacts Catholic schools is kind of a broader contextual issue that I've observed and that has to do with the fact that there's a separation between the school safety offices in the public school systems and the Title IV offices. As most of you probably know, there is not really a lot of coordination between those Title IV programs, per se, and the security offices. Now, that's not necessarily a criticism, it's just an observation and we are impacted by that separation. Those groups meet separately. So in the end, important programs such as Title IV that require non-public participation, have not been fully implemented within the spirit of the law and let me just mention a couple of reasons I think why. But before I do, I just want to mention that I believe, as this whole panel does, I'm sure, that Title IV is a vital service for school safety and crisis planning in the United States. It's just astonishing to me that this isn't really abundantly clear to the Congress and to others in the Administration.

Although it's not the only funding source to supplement school safety and crisis, preparedness needs, the programs and services supported under this program are really vital. The Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools has a very modest budget relatively speaking and with limited staff done amazing things and created a national crisis blueprint, management blueprint for all hazards approach to school emergencies. Even the Title IV programs provided to public schools invariably benefit the non-public schools.

Our students interact with one another, peer mentoring, suicide prevention, alcohol, drug prevention, gang awareness programs are among the many programs that are literally seen. And here's the point, we can't ignore the fact or minimize the fact that our nation is now faced with extraordinary threats to its national health, safety and security at home and abroad. All of us in education are challenged to think differently about the programs and services we provide and the priorities we're making with the limited resources under our stewardship.

Now, many non-public schools are seeking to use the Title IV for emergency preparedness. To get back to that other impediment where you have your school safety offices over here and your Title IV program offices over here and that -- the non-emergency preparedness programs that are going on. Those are very important programs, but at a time really when the efficacy of the Title IV program is being questioned by the Congress and the Administration, this Advisory Committee has an opportunity to recommend new ways of focusing the Title IV funds to address current and anticipated realities that address the health and safety of school communities across America. For many Catholic schools the Title IV funds and the supports are the only supplemental supports to enhance our capabilities and align ourselves with the emerging standards of efficiency that the public schools are really ahead of the curve on.

As this Advisory Committee prepares to make recommendations to the Secretary of Education, I hope that you'll keep in mind that the public schools can't afford not to include non-public schools much, much more deliberately and systematically. Let's face it, children from the same schools often attend a combination of public and non-public school. Spouses and friends work across those venues. An isolated and disenfranchised non-public private school communities are a risk to everyone. They weaken the chain of protection within and across our nation's school communities.

I've mentioned two impediments here or concerns that I have with regard to number one, the categorical or formula based funding flows to the LEAs, the public schools through the states and we need to insure that equitable participation for non-public programs is assured.

Let me just kind of allude to what Maureen Dowling mentioned in terms of how that Title IV funding occurs. Essentially bottom line, some of you or many of you may know how it works, but basically what you have is the LEA public schools will send the non-public schools a sheet that indicates, "Do you want to participate in all these 11 programs, one of them is Title IV, yes or no"? Usually it’s not accompanied by our approximate equitable proportion of funds.

So if I'm DeMatha High School in suburban Maryland, I don't know that there's possibly $10,000.00 of equitable proportion of funds. No one has told me, okay? Six hundred and fifty thousand dollars is provided by -- to the state, to Prince George's County, which is the jurisdiction in which that particular high school is located, for instance. DeMatha and the rest of our 30 archdioceses schools in Prince George's County still don't know what our equitable proportion is. We think that it's probably around $10.00 a head and we're still waiting for that funding. But without knowing the dollar amount, we can't consult meaningfully. So what happens?

Usually, there's a unilateral offer of services to our non-public schools. At the participation, the non-public participation meeting

last spring, basically what happens, and this happens in a number of jurisdictions, is the menu of peer mediation, alcohol awareness, court programs that expose adolescents to what it means when you get incarcerated, all those good programs are described to us and we are offered those services. That is not equitable participation and it doesn't meet our most compelling need right now. And our most compelling need right now is for crisis preparedness. So I've mentioned a couple of our key concerns with respect to those and I've posited some questions for the LEAs.

And somehow this needs to get in terms of implementation guide just to the LEAs. For the Title IV discretionary grant program for emergency preparedness, equitable participation for non-public programs must be assured. Despite the deliberate efforts by the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools and they've done a number of things that are really important, there still appears to be a lot of gray area concerning implementation of this. I've also posited a number of questions that the committee can take up with the staff, the Office of Safe and Drug Free School staff in terms of looking at the protocols that are used at the front end of applications and also at the tail end of applications in terms of the implementation.

The bottom line is that there needs to be systematic tracking of those that indicate non-public school participation to assure that it actually happens for either the categorical or competitive grant programs. Having good positive advisory committees at the state level and at the LEA level is another way, is a way that that can happen. Now, in the Washington area we have very positive conditions. We have excellent relationships with our public school systems. Our superintendents in the Catholic school systems attend the meetings with the public school superintendents. I attend meetings with my colleagues, the school security chiefs. These are all excellent conditions but -- and those relationships grew out of all that's happened in the last six years, but we need to do more than follow the lead of the public school systems. We follow the lead of the public school systems for delays and closures of schools, for instance, but we need to do more than that. The government officials -- and we do that because the government possesses more intelligence than we do. So we assume when the public schools close, they have garnered all the possible information concerning health and safety and they are using more complete information to make those decisions.

Last Friday, the Washington Region's top elected officials for Maryland and the District of Columbia and Virginia, the new governor, Governor O'Malley, Mayor Fenty and Governor Kane convened a summit on security, pledging to cooperate on homeland security issues. The focus of their effort was on cross-jurisdictional communications, public awareness, critical infrastructures, protection planning, intelligence sharing, et cetera, et cetera.

The National Capital Region is to receive 411 million of the

747 million in urban area security initiative money that's being directed to provide support to the six high-risk urban areas. It really may be time for a series of regional school summits on homeland security to prepare all schools in America to act as a seamless education community in the event of one or more catastrophic or otherwise horrific incidents as my colleague Joe McTighe alluded to.

It's time that our public and non-public school education leaders were provided with the supports to plan appropriately for a national and regional emergency that could threaten the stability of the education system nationally as well as locally. And I mean, just looking at the Washington area, I mean, we're a decision making center obviously for the nation. And the same really is true for the other regions of the country.

I've mentioned our Catholic school goals and I won't go over all of them, but basically, they mirror the goals of the public schools and I've taken the template of the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools' competitive grant program and we've developed a blueprint that we're shopping around to the Title IV LEA offices.

The important thing to note now is that we're ready to act and yet we're waiting for the LEAs to respond and I believe in some cases they will respond. Our purpose is to formalize our school safety and emergency planning activities as the public schools have and to align ourselves with those standards of proficiency that the public schools, as I've mentioned, really have the curve on. We recognize the need to work with community partners but to achieve this, we need the technical assistance and the training for our central office as well as our school staff and students, as well as enhanced communications for parents.

Of immediate concern, and I have to mention this because it kind of brings it all back, is the need for federal support to develop guidance around the whole issue of a potential infectious disease outbreak. And we've been told in a number of briefings that it could be as short a time as three to four weeks if something really happened, before a pandemic would hit. We tend to think of it like it's going to be six months or six years from now but there is real genuine concern and we read about it every day and I'm showing your intelligence that there are various kinds of things happening that indicate that the potential for this could happen.

And even if it were done on a much more isolated smaller scale the repercussions could be devastating. We're talking about what it would mean to close our schools for three to six to nine months. We're talking about the economic impact on our schools. The same impact could occur on local jurisdictional budgets as well. And we're trying to plan for how we would go about withstanding that. We would welcome -- let me just say this, make this as an overture, we would welcome the Archdioceses of Washington and I would suspect with other partnering non-public school organizations, an alternative funding opportunity for an innovative partnership collaboration based on best practices, national standards and

data driven decision making. We want to focus on global pandemic and other catastrophic incident preparation. If funding, we will work, we are prepared to work with the Federal Government, the state governments, the jurisdictions in this region.

This Advisory Committee really should consider proposing to the Secretary as a proposal, not only for the Washington Capital Region but strategically throughout the nation collaborative, innovative initiatives and moving on it with dispatch, not a year from now where we put it out to bid. I'm not talking about $50 million. I'm talking about $3 million say, to jump start a number of innovative initiatives to parallel and mirror the really good best practices that have been occurring through the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools Competitive Grant Programs.

Let me conclude by thanking Secretary Spellings, this committee for the opportunity to present and be part of the panel discussion. I want to engage with the panel. I also want to acknowledge the really, really good work and fine efforts of the professional staff in the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools, Bill Modzeleski, along with Assistant Deputy Secretary Deborah Price. I'm going to miss Tara Hill and Sara Strizzi and a number of other people. An amazing staff, they really do amazing things on a very relatively modest budget. There's no finer or committed staff in the Federal Government or the private sector and I hope that my remarks and my written remarks which are more detailed, will be helpful as you develop recommendations to the Secretary to insure that all children and the staff who work with them every day can keep all children safe in America. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Michael, thank you very much. We've been here almost two hours. I'm going to ask that we take a five-minute break and in the meantime, Maureen, if you could then come up to join the four panelists as we enter the question and answer.

MS. PRICE: Can I just identify who these are, do you mind? Let me mention one thing; we've got some international guests that have come in and are observing us today. Rita, could you stand and just identify where they're from because at the break time you -- just generally.

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Generally, they're from seven countries. (Inaudible) Yeah, just very briefly.

MALE PARTICIPANT: This is a program sponsored by the International Visitor Leadership Program of US Department of State. We have eight guests from eight different countries involved in politics and education who are looking at civics education in the US.

MS. PRICE: And the countries?

MR. SKOUGSTAD: The countries are Burma, Egypt, Romania, Peru, Colombia, Turkey and Malaysia.

MS. PRICE: Thank you, just so that if during the break you wanted to chat with them.

(Applause)

(A brief recess was taken at 9:44 a.m.)

(On the record at 9:52 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: I think, Maureen, yes, you've found a place there. Now for those of you that are panel members, this now is a very freewheeling question, answer discussion so that we can start to synthesize some of the information to see what the committee wishes to do with it. So with that, if we could please start with committee questions and away we'll go.

MS. PRICE: I don't necessarily have a question but I wanted to give a little bit more information about the NOAA radios, just because as the Advisory Committee is looking at a variety of things it would be helpful for them to know kind of the background and the current status of that as well.

While you mentioned Hurricane Katrina and the response with the public and private schools, it really was outstanding. Private schools were taking in public school students. Public schools were taking in private school students and they looked at them as a community in need as a whole. And that was an outstanding example. The NOAA radios, while I described it, may not have been the outstanding example that Hurricane Katrina is but let me give a little bit of background.

The NOAA radios are all hazard radios that are being provided to schools but they're not being provided from the Department of Education. They're being provided -- NOAA is part of Commerce. Homeland Security actually is the entity that is doing this and so they are the ones who have taken on this responsibility. The role of Education has been to help them identify the communication tool to reach those goals in communities that they're trying to reach.

And clearly they want Department of Education involved because you know, we -- it's schools, it's our subject matter, but last year there was an earmark, so a particular amount of money put in the Appropriations Bill to provide -- and it was a smaller amount of money, it was actually the year before last, to provide NOAA radios to some schools and it was a pilot project. It was a small amount of money. So Homeland Security -- I always pronounce it wrong, UASI (phonetic) which identifies those communities that have the highest risk in the country. And so the decision was made to give radios to public schools in those school districts.

Then the earmark increased and it was a much larger amount of money and so they thought that they would try to distribute the radios to as a many schools as possible, thinking they could get some, but because they were able to contract such a particularly low price for the radios, they were able to distribute -- Homeland was able to distribute those radios to all K through 12 public schools in the country and still had some money left over.

Now, their -- you know, everything moves in a department

by a decision memo that is then approved by that particular Secretary and their decision memo, that had been as far as it goes. Since then, they have determined that they will be getting NOAA radios to all non-public schools, K through 12 in the country in addition to daycare facilities and many institutions of higher education. That decision memo is currently at the Department of Homeland Security going -- moving forward and there are some legal things they had to figure out about getting -- particularly daycare facilities is kind of cumbersome but do they have the authority to give the dollars at XY and Z. And so, you know, no one is saying no but they had to work those elements out.

Those are -- that decision memo is going forward and no reason to believe that there will be anything but a positive response to that, but that is Homeland Security's authority to say yes or no, not ours. So I can't pre-empt them or usurp their authority in that. But those are expected to go out this spring. So -- but you know, should private schools have been incorporated in the early thing, you know, we can see now that there are reasons to incorporate both but nonetheless, the nature of the beast being what it was, this is the circumstances that we had, but they will be going out to those school districts and can be a valuable tool down the road. So I just kind of wanted to give an update about that process and let you know.

MR. McTIGHE: If I could just offer a comment, and we appreciate all that the Department has done in trying to expedite the remedy for this what we consider a problem.

MS. PRICE: Well, I should say that that decision to go forward with the public schools has been -- I mean, nothing in the Federal Government happens quickly. That was all discussed prior to all of these other conversations.

MR. McTIGHE: Right, I understand. The background, even to go back a little bit further, the original appropriation, which was an earmark in the DHS appropriation, specified for the distribution of NOAA radios to schools across the country. Now, you have to know a little bit about legislative lingo to realize that when Congress wants to deal only with public schools, they say public schools or they say LEAs or they say school districts, some peculiarly public school descriptor.

When they say schools, they mean all schools. They mean public schools, they mean private schools. So somewhere between that appropriation earmark and the implementation of the program, which took place, as you described, at DHS, the decision was made to focus on public schools rather than schools in general, including the initial decision which was to focus on schools in the most at risk urban areas. That could have been public schools and private schools in the most at risk. In the urban areas at risk includes everybody.

So that was one of our concerns, that from the get-go this program was designed for public schools. And here's a -- I just want to quote from a letter that I received when we initially raised a fuss about this

program. We got a letter back from the Department of Homeland Security and you know, she described the whole, you know, series that you described, the 2005 appropriation, the 2006 expansion, et cetera. But here's an interesting quote; "When the current distribution is complete, DHS will work closely with the Department of Education and Commerce to consider possible distribution to additional categories of schools through this joint initiative, if there is remaining funding". So listen to the hierarchy.

Okay, we're going to take care of public schools first, okay, and we're going to take care of public schools in urban areas that are at risk first. Then we're going to take care of all public schools and then if there's money left over, we will consider protecting the well-being of kids in private schools. That's our concern about this program, the hierarchy of consideration. If that applied to any majority, minority group and you were to say, "We're going to take care of the majority in providing this level on service and then if we have money left over, we'll consider providing the same services to the minority". Do you get the point? And that's exactly our response. I mean, we're trying to avoid that kind of thinking from happening again.

MR. CARUSO: Kind of the broader point is -- and I come back to pandemic, because pandemic, if there's anything I know that alcohol and drugs and certain things are impacting us immediately, but the likelihood of a catastrophic national or regional issue, you know, it's more likely that a pandemic or health-related emergency could be impacting across then there's no argument on it. If my kid goes to a public school, neighborhood school, and then another child goes to a Catholic school or another private school, and one school is doing all the right things in terms of health practices and then the other school somehow it just didn't get all of that information. You're not really fortifying and making and minimizing and isolating the virus. So I think the more important thing is there are some looming national issues related to health and safety where this is just an example of. We don't need the same level of funding but we need to make sure that we're applying those safeguards and those protections across venues and we're applying them and providing the support so it's not an unfunded mandate.

So that when we're shoring up and fortifying various things, whether it's being concerned about intruders and looking at your zone of protection or looking at your health zone of protection in your practices that those practices are being improved and enhanced across public and non-public/private school lines.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Other questions or comments from the committee, yes, Mike?

MR. HERRMANN: First off, I just want to thank the committee, particularly Michael and Jack for raising the issues about crisis preparedness. Those issues, I think this committee has, perhaps, not heard as much about as some of the drug and violence issues but I do think it's an

important thing to think about in terms of the overall Title IV picture.

As a person associated with state government who has responsibilities for insuring that these private school issues get addressed. You know, I heard the recommendations in terms of steps that the US Department could take. Do you have recommendations or thoughts in terms of things that should be happening at the State Department of Education level?

MR. CARUSO: Well, I guess one observation I would make is that you can't kind of blame the LEA completely for the way they act sometimes. I think it's -- you know, the Department of Ed can provide guidance, provides the guidance to the states and to the LEAs to some extent, but the states need -- and in our case it's the District of Columbia and the State of Maryland, need to be more -- need to be more mindful of the fact that they need to be providing guidance, that those LEAs need to be breaking out those, you know, $650,000.00 for Prince George's County and five hundred some thousand dollars for Montgomery County and those LEAs need to know when -- that they need to be breaking those out and they need the guidance from the state. And it's not just a federal matter, it's the feds talking to the state because I suspect, for instance in a couple of jurisdictions, the Title IV program officers who are really good people doing programs for the populations they're doing them for, eluded to the adolescent survey, such and such adolescent survey and when I said, "Who did you do the adolescent survey with", to drive those programs, those mentoring programs and alcohol programs, they did them with the public school students, not the non-public/private school students. Now, students are students but they're not the same students. And if you survey your public school teachers and staff, you're going to get a different response from non-public school teachers and staff, okay?

The supports that exist for the public schools don't exist for the non-public schools. The same initiatives aren't happening. Therefore, you know, we -- hence we have decided in the Archdioceses of Washington we need to get ready for major, all hazards approach, major incidents that could happen, including an isolated or broad based evacuation of the Washington metropolitan area if a major incident occurs. You have to worry about the here and now, but those kinds of things could happen here more than anywhere else, but coming back to it, the state needs to provide and exercise more guidance, so the LEAs tend to be looking to well, in my last audit they said that adolescent survey was fine. They said the assessment that we did based on that was fine. Well, a unilateral provision of services you know, is not enough. So I don't mean to be a whistle blower, per se, it's just a reality. You know, so the states have a responsibility.

I don't know if anyone else has any thoughts about the states.

MR. CLARK: Yeah, I'd like to make just a couple quick

comments; on the state level both for the non-public and the public schools, in Pennsylvania it seems to be somewhat out of the hands of the Department of Education. The decisions are being made by the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Health, just without consultation. Consultation is finally starting to pull into place but they have to work together as a team and this is something that has to occur there.

I think Pennsylvania has a model of using educational service agencies. There's 23 states with educational service agency systems. Thirteen of them have what we call a Type I ESA put into place by the legislature like we have in Pennsylvania, that really can pull together some of these programs and administer them on behalf of the non-public schools regionally. That would be much more effective in designing programs to meet their needs and assisting in coordinating with what they're doing and what the public schools are doing.

Not only do we do that with our agency but we also meet with our public school superintendents on this particular topic on emergency planning and helping them to develop plans that the county is not doing for them, that the state is not doing for them. So I encourage making use of that type of a structure where it can be.

Mr. BASSETT: Just a word about how kids and adults learn; you know, if we gave you a book and we did a presentation for you on how to prepare for a dirty bomb, let's say, you know, it's very academic and it's the way schools work but NOAA would absorb anything that would be useful. But if we asked -- if there were an event, we're going to do a simulation, do a statewide simulation in October of 2007, and I know my parents and my school were going to expect us to participate, and we've have to evacuate that day and we'd have to use the local medical emergency facilities and we'd have to be able to provide educational services to our kids for the next day. Let's do a two-day simulation.

That's actually how schools one, would get their act in gear to be prepared and two, we'd actually have some professionals who could see how well we did and how poorly we did is more likely and we'd get better preparation because people learn by doing. They don't learn by listening, they don't learn by studying. All the resources on the web, nice to have and important to do but it doesn't even come close to comparing by actually doing something. So the state could play a large role in actually seeding some simulations, let's say.

Actually, you could do it. You could do it two ways. You could do a real simulation or you could do a virtual simulation, on second life, for example.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Very good, thank you. Susan.

MS. KEYS: It seems from Mr. Caruso's presentation that the need for this consultation that we heard about is something that's important regardless of whether it's related to crisis preparedness or emergencies, it's just general program funding. And we talked about how

the state could be important but I guess I'm wondering if you have recommendations for what the role of the Federal Government could be because in some cases, I know one of our major grant programs that the Department of Health and Human Services shares with Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools is Safe Schools, Healthy Students. And those grant funds go straight to the local education agency, not through the state.

So what do we need to do to better equip non-public and private schools to engage in this consultation role or to educate the local education agency about the importance of that role, so if you have some thoughts on that, of what we might recommend.

MR. McTIGHE: I think we have to distinguish between discretionary grants and regular grants or universal grants, if you will. With respect to universal grants, the model I would hold up in terms of educating LEAs about their responsibilities and educating the private school community, too, about, you know, what they might be entitled to under a particular grant program. Because, frankly, the private school community has a lot to learn, too, and people within the private school community are not, you know, fully aware of all that's available to them under various title programs.

The model I would hold up is a model that was just promulgated actually, between the Departments of Office of Non-Public Education and the Title I Office. It's a manual relating to the implementation of Title I. It's Q and A documents. It's model consultative calendars and agendas and the like. It's really a hands-on document that people can just take and duplicate and adapt to use in terms of, you know, involving the private school community.

There's no reason why that kind of thing couldn't be developed for the other federal programs as well. With respect to the discretionary grant programs, I think the key there is the implementation of the approval process itself. So that if there are stipulations in the law that require, for example, consultation, outreach inclusion of private school folks, then when that application is reviewed by the Department, it's -- there have to be real clear guidelines as to whether or not it's going to be approved without some verification or some mention of the kinds of consultation that was supposed to take place.

We participated, for example, recently in a Blue Ribbon Schools Grants program that awards Blue Ribbon School status to a whole variety of schools and public and private. And there are some stipulations that the schools have to observe if they're going to be approved for the program. Stipulations as refined as a nine-digit zip code, for example, on the application. If you don't have the nine-digit zip code on the application, your application is put in the discard pile.

And the same is -- even more so should be the case with an application from a school district that is supposed to adhere to consultation and critical services requirements. If they don't mention it, if they don't

explain how they're going to carry that out, that application goes in the discard pile and school districts will quickly learn what the requirements of the law are because you know, they'll learn from experience, I guess is the --

MR. CLARK: And along that same line, although Pennsylvania doesn't have this issue, because the advisory counsels for the non-public schools, the Safe and Drug Free Schools design their programs to meet their specific needs. Some of the other programs, like Title I, we have a sign-off procedure that's all done on line. When the school districts submit their applications for Title I, if they don't have a sign-off of a non-public school to show that they have been consulted on all the different items that are under the law, you know, prior to decisions being made, there's a checklist there, if that consultation isn't there, it's not a veto but it does put a flag up for the State Department of Education reviewer who is accepting that application and they pick up the telephone and find out what's going on.

So it's a very successful type of a process that could be implemented rather easily with these applications.

MR. CARUSO: I mean, I guess whether it has to do with the formula or the competitive grants, maybe a policy -- Title IV policy implementation brief like essential expectations checklist, not some document that's going to take two years to go through the approval process, but something that's distilled, that's based on what we've just discussed and is an extension of what Dr. Dowling indicated is one possibility. Another one is to look to Title IIA which is the program for professional development which much more routinely, that's one of the other 11 programs, much more routinely that same jurisdiction that I eluded to asks us do you want -- our various schools, "Do you want to participate in Title IIA, Professional Development monies for teachers and staff"? They say, yes, that's an immediate indication of that's -- they're among the number of schools that need to have an equitable allotment generated and that determines how this -- whether it's going to be five dollars per student or whether it's going to be nine dollars per student, because the more schools involved, the less money per head that is going to be generated.

There is a model looking to Title IIA. I think that with Title IV it just kind of emerged with the schools -- my sense of it, the school districts have really good people. These are really smart doctors of education who are implementing programs based on best practices and believe that there -- that, you know, they have a basis for the decision to continue these programs. So when you mention to them, you know, "Have you thought about emergency preparedness", I mean, our school security chiefs for the most part don't know anything about what's going on with the Title IV program because they don't really have to do largely with that day to day bailiwick when it comes to emergency preparedness.

So it's an embedded, you know, culture for Title -- you

know, for program officers at the LEA level and it winds up impacting us because these people aren't used to having requests for a focus on all the kinds of things we're talking about.

MR. BASSETT: I would respond to what should the Federal Government do or what could the Federal Government do by asking how big do you want to think? In other words, let's take -- let's go down that road of avian flu pandemic or dirty bomb, when we are going to have literally, potentially millions of kids at home and their parents at home because they can't go to work because their kids are home. So how will we sustain education for nine weeks or six months or whatever it actually might take? And the only way you're going to sustain education in that scenario is through Internet exchanges, teachers and kids and every family and very household inter-connected. So the future of that is actually on our doorstep and I don't know how much the government is interested or willing to invest but you could play an extraordinarily useful role in incubating, funding the incubation of a culture, an educational culture where that's going to be able to happen overnight. And if you haven't seen one computer per child stuff on the Internet, just Google it, one computer per child.

Of course, this is the MIT initiative for $100.00 computers and they're there. Why wouldn't the government fund some pilot programs so you knew that every family in the DC area had a computer or if they didn't have one, got that $100.00 computer. By the way, if you start exploring what that one computer per child movement is doing, the MIT computer, absolutely astonishing.

Check out Mini Tam Tam on the one computer per child. It's so far beyond anything we've seen in terms of capabilities. So my point would be if you want to invest, invest in wiki curriculum. Everyone on the panel, I'm sure, knows what Wikipedia is, open source alternative to highly expensive published encyclopedias. Well, wiki curriculum is the next step, which is open source curriculum.

So when all of our parents are at home instead of at work, and they have to connect with their teachers, with their kid's teachers, there's lesson plans for every kid at every level, that's open source, state of the art, best accessible lesson plans. So we need to really jump start that kind of stuff and the Federal Government could play a role in that.

MR. JONES: Yeah, I was just going to quickly follow up. To what extent are trauma type information on that particular website?

MR. BASSETT: Trauma, you mean trauma for the children?

MR. JONES: Yes, right, yes, just the information about the impacts of trauma and how --

MR. BASSETT: Yeah, exactly, you can find anything on Wikipedia and if you went for a trauma and you didn't find anything, you'd start it and that would, in fact, begin the beginning of a whole community

of the world contributing until we got the best of the world's knowledge on how to help your child in a trauma situation.

MR. JONES: So specifically, what would a recommendation be to the Department of Education to enhance?

MR. BASSETT: Well, I think you should be contributing to Wikipedia because that increasingly will be the source that we'll go to. It's current. It's daily updated and it's what we need to have. I think you should be contributing to wiki curriculum by funding, you know, the early adapters out there who are already contributing so we'll have a worldwide first class curriculum for the third grader stuck at home.

And by the way, the reason you would want to do this is that there are a lot of kids who can't go to school, a lot of American kids are not served because they can't go to school, they have some kind of disability. And so there would be a reason to do this even if weren't fearful of the pandemic that's coming.

MR. JONES: Yeah, you know, I think that ties into the point about -- I forget who made it on social -- in fact, you made it, right, I mean, just in terms of what we don't know about the impact of trauma on children and that may be a mechanism whereby that information could be shared.

I just wanted to share a comment. I've heard a number of very interesting things, very interesting initiatives that you folks are doing with limited funding. It sounds very good. In fact, Jack, your manual sounds just outstanding. I'm going to be meeting in Richmond next week. We're updating our crisis management plan and I'd like to get a copy of that and take some of that information on.

But I'm wondering, the extent to which I heard a number of things in addition to funding, just communication, I thought a couple of things came up that were quite right on, and I'm just wondering, to what extent how -- to what extent can the Department assist in two things; one greater communication between the Departments of Health and the Department of Education and then secondly, this whole notion of these regional school summits that I think, Michael, you brought up. Just communicating with the key partners, we know that there's great information out there and lot of people doing great things, but the breakdown of communication often leads to very poor results.

MR. CARUSO: Yeah, and when I think about those, I think about carefully crafted summits that would have input. I mean, I would think that this group would be a key advisory group to construct what they look like which would include the kinds of inter-departmental involvement and activities that would go on at those summits. So you know, you've got the Department of Education; you've got the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Commerce, HHS. Those in particular are key departments that would be

-- have to be involved in the structure of this.

And I know that sounds like a very complicated thing but it's absolutely essential because if anything were to happen all of them would be involved in the response. So you know, I always think of it in terms of scenario based things. So instead of it just being an information delivery conveying activity where people get around and have panels that would be interesting, there would be scenarios involved, I would think involved in that.

And it's something that we need to do sooner than later and it may be that that's the microcosm of what then is proposed be done within all these communities, the kinds of follow-up activities that are done within a close proximity to those summits that within 60 days these certain activities will be happening throughout the country. But I guess, back to your point, it's inter-departmental, it has to involve at the federal level and then at the state level you've got a similar constellation of departments, and then at the local level. I mean, in Montgomery County, we have a Department of Homeland Security that was spawned as a result of 9-11, which is a model.

The other thing I want to just mention is again, in the event of a major incident that would close the public schools in any one of these jurisdictions, our Catholic schools would close. We follow them. We would assume that if it's significant enough to close the public close, it would be significant enough to close ours. So it would force -- you know, and we're impacted by those factors.

DR. DOWLING: Susan, I just wanted to jump back to one other item on what can the Federal Government to in its role. I'm glad I didn't have to follow -- I love you thinking here, but the Department program offices monitor the states to insure that the programs are being implemented as required by law and in that monitoring they'll also do site visits to local educational agencies to insure that what the law requires is being implemented at that local level and that states are overseeing what the LEAs are doing.

And as related to equitable participation, one area that might be worthwhile to examine is do the monitoring protocols across the Department address equitable participation? I've had the benefit of participating only in Title I, so I'm aware of the ones we use for Title I which are very intricate, very detailed. As monitoring teams walk away, they know for certainty whether Title I has been implemented for students in private schools. So that may be an area that may be worth addressing, across programs.

MR. CARUSO: And the checklist that I mentioned that would have more force and effect coming out of the Department may be the non-public office in terms of Title IV with -- in concert with the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools would have certain questions like does the LEA let the non-public/private school know the total Title IV allocation for the jurisdiction in which they are located and/or the formula, usually the

approximate per pupil allocation that will be used as the basis for services when they ask the non-public school or school system to respond in writing whether they wish to participate in the Title IV.

That's a mouthful but it is in the testimony. Does the LEA adopt a same service approach to Title IV which we know some of them do, it's a unilateral provision of services, it's not in concert with the law. Surveying public schools children without offering to complete an assessment of the non-public school needs under Title IV is a more positive way to flip it around to say do they assess non-public school needs rather than just using the survey they used to survey public school students.

And I have a similar few questions that could be posited and embedded in the monitoring protocol and the application protocol. I think that's what Maureen is saying, but the important thing is that the guidance needs to come out. Even if it's non-regulatory and advisory, it's sort of an extension of what we've learned by having these discussions and even Dr. Dowling, Maureen Dowling's comments really have really become richer based on her experience, I think in the LEAs and at the state level.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Just some comments, not trying to address all these but this has been very interesting. I alluded to this at break, very interesting for me to hear. Most of what I'm hearing does not exist where I work, so that's why I found it interesting. The reason that it doesn't because we have a very close collaborative relationship with all the agencies and I'm talking about a rather large -- it's Riverside County, California. We have 405,000 students that reside in the county and I heard someone mention square miles. We have 7,200 square miles, so it's a large educational entity. And yet, we have very little of the things that I'm hearing described by you as problems. And the reason that I think we don't have too many is because what I mentioned earlier, we have a very close collaboration and by that I mean as it relates to we now have a Homeland Security Department in the county. And we work very closely together with 52 agencies.

We meet constantly and we have a communication system all set up for the 405,000 students. We try to -- if something comes up, we can get to them in approximately 30 seconds. If they are not there, their parents will be notified either on their home phone. If that hits twice, it goes to their cell phone for 2.1 million residents. So there's a lot of communication tools that are set up.

When we talk about the plans and the workshops that we conduct as an intermediate agency and that's why I was glad to hear Jack talk about some of the things that he did. We do as a county educational service agency, we do these things. So Susan, when you were asking about the Federal Government or Mike, when you're talking about the state, they are very helpful to us in offering umbrellas and general plans and then we see it as our task to do. So we simply go do it.

And the other part of that, there's no private schools from

California sitting on the panel because I don't think they would be saying that at least in our area because everything that we do, I didn't know there was a difference. They just all come. So when we have a meeting, they're there. When we have a -- we're working on a plan for these, they are a part of those students and they are a part of the plan. So a lot of these things, that's what I said, I find interesting, but realizing that there are differences across this great country, and that we have to address those, some other things that I didn't hear very much, I just had a meeting last week with the County Sheriff and the head of Public Health and we're setting on March Air Force Base.

We've established a training center together and we will train all bus drivers, all teachers, all administrators, all classified. We have about 50,000 of them in the county and we will systematically train all of them. If there's something that happens on a bus, there will be simulations of the bus. We're going to build a village. We, as a County Office of Education, will supply that village because we'll build it out of relocatables.

They're going to supply the training from the Sheriff's Department and the Fire Department and what I'm saying is, we aren't coming to the Federal Government to ask for any money. We're going to do that. So the County Office of Education, Fire, Sheriff and we aren't asking for any grants and we aren't asking for any -- we're just going to go do it. We figure it will cost four or $5 million to get it up and running.

Now, when I say just do it, we also spent a lot of time developing a very close relationship, as I know you do, with the business community, so they will be literally pouring millions of dollars into this effort. So there's all different ways to skin a cat and as we -- that's why we have these discussions, because there are places and there are states and there are sections of a state, Jack, I really enjoyed hearing what you were doing in Pennsylvania.

So as we continue talking about this, I think that as we work together, we can come up with a solution on many of these things. One other thing I just remembered, Patrick, you brought up a good point about what happens when all those children are home. We just got our own TV channel along that same line because out of this collaborative effort the Sheriff's Department asked that same question. So we've got a TV channel we work with. We've got five different channels -- or not channels but stations across the county. We have a collaborative effort for that so we are now developing with the teachers and we're putting DVD lesson plans and we're going systematically through all the courses in case that happens so that we have shelves of -- so there are ways, but you're right, we really have to think about all of those possibilities.

MR. JONES: Yeah, David, that sounds right on, what's happening out in California and I'm wondering, you know, the answer isn't always money. You know, even though I was --

CHAIRMAN LONG: One correction, not California, Riverside County, California.

MR. JONES: Oh, sorry. I'm sure there's a difference. But, yeah, we know money is important. I was in LAX the other day and I was talking with a banker. He said, money not only talks but it walks. Anyway, money is not always the answer. Sometimes it's just kind of reconstructing what we do in working together in different agencies, organizations, et cetera.

But I'm wondering the extent to which the good things that are being done there could be communicated to others. That model, I mean, it sounds like an effective model. I'm just wondering the extent to which that template could be passed on to you know, members of the panel and others to see the extent to which --

CHAIRMAN LONG: And I'm not suggesting that we do it. I'm just -- I was responding to some of the things that I heard that I know that we do. I'm sure that there are things all across this country that they're just wonderful models, and I know the Department has done a good job of pulling those together and I think that's a good takeout from my personal point. I was just trying to answer some of those questions but I think the Department really has -- and they could project some of those models across this country.

MR. JONES: Yeah, you know, just for example, I'm wondering to what extent are the best practices in terms of calling upon the private sector to do some of the many good things that, you know, that need to be done and the extent to which that's being done.

MR. CLARK: David, I just wanted to make one more comment. When we talked about the role of what the Federal Government could do, the Department of Education and so forth. We're on the verge of the reauthorization and we know the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program has been slipping a little bit in terms of its funding. I think I'd like this committee to make some suggestions either to the Department or the Department to work with the legislators on structuring the program so that what you put in the program is able to be measured in terms to show a success.

We've been discussing something that's been extremely important to us that work with the non-public schools but the same types of situations apply to all the public schools but how do you measure that your Safe and Drug Free Schools program has put these programs in place to be able to have people address issues such as terrorism or pandemic planning? It really can't be measured.

And I testified before the Democratic members of one of the House committees a number of years back on education funding and I just remember a question that came from one of the representatives from Chicago. He said, "You know, I had a drive-by shooting in my District last week. You're telling if I put more money into Safe and Drug Free Schools I

wouldn't have to deal with stuff like that?" I mean, it shows a disjointer from what we're trying to accomplish here, which is very much long-term and very serious type of issues that are being addressed that if perhaps this could be written into the legislation when it's re-enacted with the reauthorization, we would be able to show, yes, we are helping all these schools in developing their crisis response plans, being more integrated with the Departments of Health and Homeland Security, being able to provide for the health, safety and welfare of the children in these types of crisis. We really can't measure those types of things, yet, Congress is looking for measurable types of items and they look right back at what's in the legislation and if you say what you're going to do and you can't relate that.

And I think it's a charge that would be well worth undertaking from the this particular committee to identify a few of those items and work with the committees that are put together for the reauthorization to put something into place, because this is an extremely valuable program and it's -- this is an extremely important exchange in my mind to be able to look at these issues and what's the state of the art there.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Other comments from members of the committee or questions or any closing comments from any of the panel members?

MR. CARUSO: Just one idea based on what was just said, is the competitive discretionary grants, and again, I'm probably going to get -- Bill is going to kill me on this, but I don't know -- I know the year before last there were 93 grantees. What were there, about 50 or 60 this year? The discretionary grant, the crisis management grants. Anyway, of all of those, the last three or four years, there have to be, you know, a dozen that are absolutely stellar and would be models and have excellent evaluation plans and have the measuring what they do. And it may be based on the new prior and emerging priorities that there could be some kind of even a review, competition or maybe a review to identify those that would be highlighted and gleaned and you could glean from them to develop, you know, the state of the art. They really represent the state of the art.

MR. MODZELESKI: First of all, let me pass out that I want to thank Michael for really being at the heart of helping us for the past couple of years in much of the training that we do in emergency management and crisis management, emergency response, crisis management. We're changing the name, by the way, to confuse you even more. We're going to make it simple but we're going to continue to confuse you and Michael has been a cornerstone and I think realizes after not only coming to the ERCM trainings but also bringing the grantees in and I remember I think it was last year when we were over in Arlington, Alexandria, we did a training and Tara and Sarah were up there on the stage talking about the need for non-public participation in schools and there was an absolute uproar from the people in the -- who received the grants saying,

"Why do we have to do this"? I mean, so as part of our education process, and what I'm passing around is something after that which we instituted last year, we instituted this year, which is a requirement and Michael you could pass this over. You know what it is. Basically, it's the -- it is the -- what we put in our ERCM application which really requires prior to the receipt of the funds that the public, the LEAs sit down with the non-privates and work out these issues. So it is something that we've done with the ERCM grants. I would love to tell you that it's working 100 percent of the time in 100 percent of the applications.

I think we're doing a better job at it. I think the schools are getting a better understanding of what needs to be done but I also want to say picking up on Russell's comment is that money not only talks but it walks, is that what you have happening in the districts around the country is a decreasing pie, not an increasing pie. So there's a struggle among the LEAs about okay, we had $8.00 per student, that was the high, about 8.50. We're now down to about $40.00 per student, so programs are not only being cut at the say non-public but what you have is this case where local school districts, local school districts are having to cut dollars, they're having to cut staff, so it makes our job working with non-publics all the more difficult. I'm not saying it's impossible. I'm just telling you that money is an issue here.

We need to figure out how we're going to work that out. But there are some models out there. You know, we've funded about 400 school districts now since the beginning or the inception of the emergency planning grant and actually, there's at least one this afternoon that is going to testify and I know Marleen is sitting behind me and will also talk. Marleen has done some training and maybe you could comment on the training that we put into this thing. But there are some models out there and part of what we have a contractor do is identify those models and pull those models out.

What has been more difficult than just identifying models is identifying models that have a good non-public participation. And I also want to point out is that in many ways, what Mike has done here with the Archdiocese in Washington DC also could serve as a model. Fred chaired for many years, and is still chairing what's called the COG here in Washington, that's the Council of Governments, whereby all of the jurisdictions in and around Washington DC meet. There's a subgroup dealing with school safety and so we do share information. We do share communications. I mean, so it is an excellent model, not probably 100 percent. It's not where any of us would want to be but I think it's moving in the right direction. It's one of those things for whether it's UASI sites or other jurisdictions where we might be able to build on it, say here's the beginning of something that's really working, is that we've got the non-public sitting at the table and again, it's not perfect, but nevertheless, Michael could pick up the phone and probably talk to anybody, Fred in

Alexandria or Arlington or Washington, DC or Prince George or whatever it is.

I mean, that's where we want to really on it, so I assure you is that we are moving in that direction. We'll continue to look at some models and try to get them out there for not only public schools but for the non-public schools.

MR. ELLIS: I just wanted to make one comment and maybe bounce it off the panel and see if this has any sound of truth to it. One of the frustrations from the LEA perspective is, I think you eluded to it earlier, is the

-- and Bill certainly hit on it, is the money issue. There's not a whole lot of money through the Department of Ed's Safe and Drug Free Schools. That's drying up. And we often want to spend money doing things such as the Emergency Preparedness and trying to harden schools using technology as every, you know, federal agency, whether it's FEMA or DHS, FBI, everyone knows in their mind how to harden the school but the school itself it seems. Everyone has some theory on how to do it.

But anyway, the recommendations are fast and furious whether it's to access technology, video surveillance, visitor control kinds of things, all these different hardware issues that cost a lot of money. The fact of the matter is the Department of Ed grants don't have that kind of money. And I thought it was interesting and Mike, you eluded to the Department of Homeland Securities UASI grant coming to the National Capital Region for about $411 million. It's my experience that the education community will probably get zero of those dollars from DHS.

So my frustration is the Bill Shop (phonetic) and the Department of Ed does as good a job as possible spreading the small amount of, relatively small amount of money that they have across the country, particularly for schools to do plan development, to practice, exercise plan development and collaboration, those kinds of things, paperwork if you allow me to use that term, but a critical piece nonetheless. It's very important.

But for buying stuff, hardware, whether it's NOAA radios, which quite frankly, in all seriousness, if a private school didn't have a NOAA radio before the distribution, shame on them. At 18.95 at Radio Shack, everyone of you should have had one.

Having said that, you could probably use some help with, you know, video surveillance, door access, those kinds of things. So that's my feeling. I just wanted to kind of -- I see your heads nodding but I'd like to at least hear some feedback on whether or not there's any truth to my personal vendetta.

MR. CARUSO: Well, UASI funding, I know this particular advisory group has a charge specific to you know, I guess Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools, so I don't know if it's permitted to look at that broader. I mentioned that UASI funding because it was so -- I mean, it just

came out. If you can, I think it's worthy of looking at it. I've got two -- you know, several articles that were written on it and the reports are out right now.

You know, it makes no sense, I mean, it doesn't make any sense to the public schools and it doesn't make any sense to us that the -- that education in schools are kind of embedded in with the number of 50 categories and we're embedded in Category 16, embedded in it.

I can guarantee you, if something happens and it probably will, unfortunately, suddenly there's going to be an epiphany and somebody is going to decide, yes, schools are worthy of being a category. Somebody needs to note that it is worthy, that schools are worthy, where most of the school age kids, you know, in America are at these settings of focusing on it much more deliberately and some of those funds for priority initiatives and we know what the priorities are, you know, ought to be -- you know, they ought to be beneficiaries of that.

And when they're beneficiaries, it's a matter of public health and safety. It's not a matter of we're paving our school -- public and non-public school campuses with this money.

MR. ELLIS: Yeah, and that's kind of my thought that, perhaps -- you know, the money is not going to come to the Department of Ed through Bill Shop. It's just not but could the Department of Education do something more to push back on the rest of the federal bureaucracy to make more money available through DHS or other entities for the kinds of things that Mike's talked about?

MR. CLARK: Just related to that allocation comment, we found from our experience of training the non-public school, as well as the public school district administrators in the NIMS system communications, so they could be integrated with the first responders, we found that there's a lack of communication that goes on there. We don't see any of the mercy management planning in the schools but even the first responders really need a little bit of a push to communicate with us. Our group that's been doing the training has started their outreach now to the first responders because they think, well, when there's a crisis they're going to come in and they're going to take over the schools. And you ask them, "Well, are you going to manage 200 kids, how are you going to handle those kids"? Well, then we get back to the concept of unified command and working together and it just brings things back to reality.

But these discussions are really just starting now and the communication needs to be pushed up. They need to get some pushes from Homeland Security and so forth to be able to talk to us to work cooperative with the group that are trying to work with them.

MR. JONES: Yes. Okay, we're running out of time but I had a question. You know, we've talked a lot about from the top down. We talked about the forced multipliers, the Federal Government Homeland Security, Departments of Health, et cetera, but I'm just wondering from the

panel, to what extent are families engaged in your different emergency management procedures? You know, one thing that we found in our clinic is that if there's an emergency that -- if there's traumatic experience that occurs, the extent to which families are involved, that's really going to determine the outcome to a great -- you know, to a great extent and I'm just wondering to what extent are families involved in your emergency plans and how were you able to bring that about?

MR. McTIGHE: I kind of got a chuckle from your question involving families in the plans. The prior question is, how many schools actually have emergency management plans? And in the private school community, you've heard from some systems, like the Archdiocese of Washington, where they're fairly well-organized, fairly well networked. But the private school community is 29,000 schools. A lot of these schools are isolated schools and they're for the most part, relatively small schools, so they involve the minimum of staff, a principal, a classroom teacher for each classroom and that's it. There's not a lot of support beyond that.

So my first question would be, how many of those schools have emergency management plans and the answer is, sadly, probably not an awful lot. So I think we've got to deal with an even more fundamental question, much less involving parents in the development of emergency plans. The fact is how many schools actually have plans? And this is so fundamental, this issue, that I think we have to, you know, just stop thinking in terms of the public school model which is elaborate and which is you know, well-staffed and you know, not as well-funded as anybody would want it to be but better funded than any of our systems are and look at a much more stripped down reality.

And so I think there's an awful lot of work that still has to be done.

MR. JONES: Is that a funding problem or a priority problem, restructuring and I'm sure they're all?

MR. McTIGHE: I think it's both. I think it's getting the message out but beyond just the funding there's also the ethos question. There's also the awareness question and you know, even the comment about shame on the schools that don't have NOAA radios, you're right but the reality is that, you know, without some sort of connection with programs like that, they're not even thinking along those lines, unfortunately. So we have much more fundamental education that has to take place.

MR. CLARK: And Russell, with our plans when we put the master plan together, we did make use of the parents on our advisory committee extensively to be able to give us input on that. And when these plans are taken on a building level, and filled in and they put their local contact information, they do also work with representatives from their local parent groups and that's important from the point of view of establishing some credibility response and being able to share with your school community that you do have a plan without sharing all the details of the

plan which would compromise its integrity.

They are able to say, "Yes, we do have a plan and we did have Mr. Smith and Ms. Jones and so forth on the committee that helped us develop this and they're comfortable with it, but we can't share all the detail because some of these are security issues".

MR. CARUSO: And that was one of the questions that was on an assessment that we did at all of our schools. All of our schools have crisis plans, emergency management plans. And one of the questions we put on had to do with parental knowledge of the plans as well as staff knowledge of the plans. So it's kind of the next step is being sure everybody -- not only is -- are people familiar with the plan and can practice it but they know what their role is and they know how they would act in case of certain kinds of emergencies.

MR. JONES: Well, one of the problems that we have in Virginia, we have plans but people don't practice plans. You know, and I'm just wondering the extent to what do you do to get people to practice a plan? It's great to have it, but --

MR. CARUSO: I think what Patrick said and I think that not that we want to mandate, you know, something, but it may be that what we need to do is voluntarily have assurances of some sort across different populations, including parents and there's an assurance that it goes home and that -- you know, there's models that could possibly be developed to make sure. And some of them are based on our own plan, but as we come to understand the kinds of public health practices that need to be occurring in the home as well as in the school, it may be that there's a need for an assurance where everybody has to send home an assurance form to parents that they've read this and they understand X, Y and Z.

And it doesn't guarantee it, but it goes a long way toward insuring that we've moving toward where we need to be on certain practices.

CHAIRMAN LONG: As we bring this to a close, I'd like to one last time, thank you, Michael and Jack and Patrick and Maureen and Joe. We really appreciate the information and we appreciate the dialogue. So let's thank the panel.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN LONG: And with that, we will now break for lunch.

(Whereupon at 10:54 a.m. a luncheon recess was taken.)

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

11:36 a.m.

CHAIRMAN LONG: We are now ready to start with our second panel for the day which deals with trauma and the panel members, I'll start on my left there, let's see, Steve -- Dr. Steven, I want to ask, Marans?

DR. MARANS: Marans, okay, I did not want to mispronounce, Dr. Steven Marans, Professor of Child Psychiatry at Yale University and Director of the National Center for Children Exposed to Violence, welcome Steve. And next to Steve is Dr. Marleen Wong, Director of Crisis Counseling Intervention Services for the Los Angeles Unified School District, welcome Marleen.

And thirdly, Dr. Lisa Jaycox, Senior Behavioral Scientist at RAND Corporation and a Clinical Psychologist. And as we have in the past, we will have presentations from each. And I understand that Lisa and Marleen will be sharing like a 10-minute video after your presentation. The only other thing I want to announce on this, it will -- and as you know, you were sitting in the audience, I do believe when we had the first panel, and then the questions, comments from panel members and the discussion which is always very helpful.

In this one, I just want to let all three of you know, all can ask questions but Russell Jones. Russell cannot ask any questions on this one.

MR. JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay, with that, Steven.

DR. MARANS: Well, since it's beat up on Russell Jones day, everything I say has been pre-approved by Russell and if you don't like it, then talk to him, please. First of all, it's a pleasure to be here and this morning we were hearing the word "collaboration" a lot and often when we talk about collaboration, we're talking about how do we connect the dots, how do we connect the dots between services that have an impact on kids and families and communities and I'm the opener for my colleagues and my job is to give an overview on some of the issues of trauma and the reason for actually beginning with an overview and thinking about conceptualizations and phenomenology is because that really should be the basis on which we think about plans, intervention strategies and how do we begin to connect the dots.

One of the things that I always find impressive when the likes of us do presentations to non-mental health folks and we actually see this in operational situations after emergencies and crises, where too often for our minds, to my mind in particular, I can speak for myself right now, but too often we think about mental health professionals as the counselors who come in and deal with the clinical issues following overwhelming events. And too often mental health professionals think in those ways, too. I think you'll see from the discussion and hopefully as we get

into it, that as we look at the phenomena of trauma we see that the demands that trauma creates are far broader than the specific area in which mental health professionals are traditionally trained and in the same way that the roles for providers, first responders, teachers, school administrators, other social service agencies have key ingredients and elements to helping children, families and communities in the entire nation recover from what we talked about as traumatic events.

Now, I take a real -- I'm on thin ice with what I'm about to do. Sometimes people walk out of meetings when they're told they're going to do an exercise. I usually do, but this is going to be a brief one and it's a way to get us into the spirit of trauma. I promise you, you will not be too overwhelmed. What I'd like you to do is just for a moment, pick a time somewhere between when you were seven and 12 years old or 13 years old and pick a time when you can remember waking up from a nightmare. You can do this with your eyes open or closed. I will insist that you reopen your eyes, even if it is after lunch.

Okay, so if we have a couple of hours, we would be unpacking this together, but I'm going to do some of it for you. So you remember waking up and can anybody just shout out some of the first things that they felt when they woke up? There's Dr. Jones being fancy, anybody else? Okay, I'm going to get it started, racing heart, increases respiration, eyes darting around. Yes, being terrified, but when we talk about terror, let's break it down.

Pit in your stomach, and then you've got that big decision, right? And you want to scream out because you want somebody to come and rescue you, but you sometimes find yourself speechless, without words. And then you have that big decision of well, if nobody is coming to me, I'm going to them, right. But then you have to decide, are you going to get out of bed because what if, you know, what got you in the dream is waiting for you on the floor. There are these big decisions.

And then you walk down the hall and you go to parents, right? And you're in front of parents and if they're awake, they look at you and they see that you're kind of stricken and looking upset and they may guess that you've had a nightmare and they look at you and they say, "Have you had a nightmare", and you kind of barely get it out, "Uh-huh, uh-huh". And what did your parents tell you then? "Well, go back to sleep, go back to bed, it's only a dream", right? I'm doing the short version but you'll see why in a moment.

So you stumble back to your room and you keep saying to yourself over and over, "It's just a dream, it's just a dream", and it's not working. It's not acting like, you know, the reassuring mantra and so you get back to your room and you turn on the lights. You try to find a dog to get into bed with you. You get a cuddly toy.

I had an older brother and a younger sister and sometimes I'd climb into bed with them and I'd always make sure I was on the inside

because as much as I love them, I figure whatever was going to get me was going to get them first. You turn on the radio, you keep the lights on and you do your best to try to not go to sleep, right, because sleep is where the terror is residing, right?

And every sound in the house, you know, you're startled, you jump, you're waiting and you're just looking around every corner, every shadow for what might get you. So let's think for a moment about, well, what are the dreams about? Well, again, I'll do the work for you, you know, about being chased, about monsters, anybody else, fire. I mean, all the things, right. And if you think about it, all of the things that we've experienced in terms of these acute reactions, the search for protection, hyper-vigilance, darting around, looking, watching out for where the danger is lurking. Eventually, we're able to reassert that there's a safe reality, that what was in our dream is not in our bedroom and eventually fatigue takes over, we go back to sleep.

And if you think about the themes of the nightmares, the themes that are powerful enough to disrupt our physiology and our sleep, they basically come under these headings, don't they, if you think about it; loss of one's own life, loss of life of a significant other, loss of love of another or of one's self. You know, there's nothing worse than those nightmares that are you know, about showing up to school and not being ready for an exam or damage to the body, if there's injury that some aspect or functioning is impaired, loss of control of impulses, affects or thoughts. Anybody who has ever gotten so anxious knows what they mean when they say, "Oh, my God, I'm losing it", right? "I'm losing it", means, "I'm losing my mind, I'm losing control of how I think and feel and act", and anybody who has ever had contact with somebody who is in the throws of a psychotic break, knows that however weird and crazy they look, what one is seeing is sheer terror, because they no longer have the ability to organize and mobilize actions and thoughts in a linear fashion.

And then ultimately, the idea of loss of control of a sense of agency. You know, every day we wake up, we're so familiar with what we can anticipate and we can plan and prepare and those are the ways in which we're able to take action and respond to new challenges. What happens when the world around you robs you of all of those touchstones that allow us to prepare? What happens when suddenly the house that you're used to waking up in every morning and having coffee and juice and going to school or going to work is gone because of a hurricane and daily life is not returning so quickly?

So why do we talk about nightmares? Well, one of the things that we talk about nightmares for in thinking about trauma is that one of the major differences between nightmares and trauma is that nightmares, the dangers are emerging from our imagination and we're able to get relief from them because they're not real. In trauma the same kind of physiologic activation and difficulties in retaining and regaining order and control are

not so easily regained when the nightmare comes true, where there is no escape back into sleep and away from the imaginary images.

When the imaginary images have actually come true, there is a convergence between the things all of us fear the most and our inability to avoid them, to fight against them and, in fact, to have the normal controlling capacity to deal with them as we usually do. And so we think about psychological trauma as an overwhelming, unanticipated danger that leads to a subjective experience of helplessness, loss of control and terror. There's an immobilization of normal methods for decreasing danger and anxiety and where there is a neurophysiologic dysregulation that compromises our ability to mediate our feelings, our thought processes and our behavioral responses to the stimuli before us.

Now, we know that in children -- and I'm going to go through these quickly because what will be far more interesting is the discussion that we can have after our presentations but what we often see is traumatic repetitions and you can see that in many ways, depending on the age and we'll get into that in a minute, there are different ways in which the traumatic repetitions occur. In younger children one sees a repetitive play. In older kids, one may see flashbacks and distress when reminded, et cetera. We also see avoidance, numbing and regression. And if you think about these areas, these become general and again, if you go back to the nightmare situation where one takes all sorts of actions to try to avoid the sense of loss of control in the situation where there has been a real loss of control, these aspects of avoidance and numbing ourselves to fear, et cetera, can have major implications for the way we function and the way children function and the children function in daily life.

Increased arousal can lead to a whole range of somatic difficulties, sleep difficulties, eating difficulties and include the notion of increased aggression, increased irritability and anger, hypervigilance, exaggerated startle response and if we think back to the classroom, decreased capacity for attention and concentration. How can you learn when you are spending all of your energy looking over your shoulder, avoiding every opportunity that may present itself with feeling small and helpless again? No wonder that the kids who are most likely to be involved in all of the behavioral difficulties are the kids who have the greatest level and the greatest number of opportunities to feel small and helpless. And what better way to reverse the feelings of helplessness and being frightened than becoming that agent of fear and becoming the object of everybody else's terror?

We also see, you know, some of the same things in terms of decreased responsiveness and with the developmental regression, one thing to remember is, is that there is an adage in our field that the last tasks and abilities obtained are the first that are lost.

We know that there are major neuro-physiologic correlates the kind of behavioral and affective and cognitive changes that occur and

that some of these changes that lead to the areas, symptom areas that I've just described can actually take on a permanent cast and this is especially true when the level of trauma is chronic and the support systems available for recovery are less available.

And there, we see that post-traumatic symptoms can become chronic, that they can result in a variety of emotional behavior, social and psychiatric sequellae and some of the examples of the difficulties include depression, anxiety, attachment problems, learning problems, eating disorders, suicidal behavior, substance abuse, violent and abusive behavior and somatic problems, that is multiple problems involving stomach aches, headaches, and increased vulnerability to illness.

By the way, substance abuse is not so surprising when if self-medication, particularly for older kids and adolescents, becomes a tried and true measure for avoiding the sense of helplessness that they're experiencing on a regular basis. Helplessness in spirit can be wiped out if you sedate yourself enough. The reason for looking at exposure rates and I don't want to go into all of the details, but you'll get a sense from looking at the numbers that the kinds of sources for trauma and particularly violent -- trauma that's from violent exposure and abuse and neglect, are really quite extraordinary. One of the things that we look at in addition to the things that have come up now is that in Christine Hogan's study in New York City, looking at kids after 9-11, one of the things that was so striking was the fact that of the kids who were surveyed, about 64 percent of them in grades 4 through 12 had experience multiple episodes that had reached traumatic proportions well prior to the attacks of 9-11. We know that domestic violence which is an enormously pervasive problem in this country affects up to 15, 15-1/2 million kids who are exposed up close and personally to violence that happens between parents on an annual basis.

One of the things that we know, again, going back to understanding phenomenology as a way in to understanding what we can do in response is looking at some of the factors that mediate between exposure and the realized nightmare and the outcome. So we think about how do events, external events, affect lives directly? Well, there's physical proximity. It makes a big difference whether you're watching something on TV that's about bodies being damaged, people being shot, killed, maimed, et cetera, and having it happen right in front of you.

It's the same in terms of emotional proximity. Whether or not the victim of any of these events is a relative, a parent, a brother, a sister, an aunt, an uncle, is enormously different than a stranger. Somebody called me around, just after the tsunami. This was a reporter who was doing an interview on the impact and she was horrified that her adolescent kids were not more concerned about the victims of the tsunami. They were more interested in who was dating whom. Well, this is not surprising. It's age appropriate. It would have been very different if the tsunami had hit their neighborhood as we saw in Katrina and Lisa will talk about that in a

bit.

Secondary effects are of enormous importance. Again, if we go back to that last sort of over-arching source of danger, the loss of control and agency, the level of physical and social disruption is an enormous predictor for outcome and level or capacity for recovery. Again, an individual factor, none of these are too surprising. I want to just point to one of the other major factors that is a predictor for poor outcome which is the failure of adults and children's worlds to recognize that they've even been traumatized. And if you think about it, this goes with the phenomena itself, you know, "Get thee behind me". Anybody who's had an overwhelming event, knows that the first thing they want to do is to say, "Well, it's done, I'm okay now", right. And it's often not until weeks after that people feel that something is sneaking up on them and they're not done.

But then if you're a parent and you've got -- you're struggling with your own issues and you've got kids who a few weeks after an event, are causing you more trouble, keeping you up late at night, getting into more fights, they're not telling you, "Mommy and Daddy, I'm feeling scared about what happened". They're acting it and by now parents may not have been able to recognize and the symptoms continue.

So when we think about intervention strategies, we think about acute responses in terms of stabilization, making contact, actually identifying kids and families who are at greatest risk. We think about the need for monitoring, surveillance and follow-up because so many kids will become symptomatic well after the original event. We think about peri-traumatic and longer term that are clinic based, home based and school based and here, one of the most significant ingredients is increasing the communication and recognition between parents and children of the impact of overwhelming events and then we think about longer term trauma-focused kind of behavioral treatments that need to be available.

I want to just focus on one last thing and I have two minutes, one minute, two minutes, good, is we want to think about if there is such an enormous problem and one of the things that you'll see in the slides is this is at an enormous cost. When we don't treat kinds who are traumatized and they wind up our jails, we know how much that costs. When kids are 45 percent more likely to engage in delinquent and violent behaviors when as adolescents when they've been exposed to domestic violence without any treatment or intervention, we know the costs, so that one of the things is how do we identify these kids? If we wait for them in our clinical offices, we're never going to see them. We're going to barely see the tip of the iceberg.

So part of it is who knows how to recognize kids that are having difficulties secondary to the events that are happening in their lives? And too often mental health professionals aren't thinking about who they need to be working with. They're not thinking about working with the police, first responders, EMS. They're not thinking about working and

stepping into the shoes of their educator colleagues and not just going in and telling people what to do but understanding what the nature of the contact is with the kids themselves as a way of thinking about the range of things that need to be taken care of. Again, just going through these quickly, too often when we have overwhelming events, we think that the kids think the way we do. Maybe in the discussion we'll have some time for examples, but typically kids are not thinking about the events that way adults do. If we don't take the time to listen, we're not going to know how to help them. The other is, determining whether there's a continuation of cessation of a threat.

You can talk until the cows come home but if there's still threat in your home, or in your neighborhood, you're barking up the wrong tree. If you're not working with law enforcement who are informed about children's development and you're informed about law enforcement to work together in identifying what's needed, those kids and families may be stuck with the same threat that brought you there in the first place.

Psycho-education, helping people understand what's happening to their minds and bodies can serve as an anchor that can serve the basis of introducing knowledge as opposed to simply shame in the face of feeling small and helpless. And again, going back to this very crucial ingredient of re-establishing order and routine in daily life is not something that is done in the consulting room of the mental health professionals. It's done in our classrooms, in our neighborhoods and our after school programs.

We're not going to have time to go into all this. This is a very brief example, if we have any time. One of the things we've developed, one of the reasons that I was asked to join you all today is that in New Haven and in communities around the country for the last 15 years we've been working closely with law enforcement, school personnel, Child Protective Services and the juvenile justice system in providing and learning how to work together to identify who can come in at what angle into the lives of children and families who have been exposed to violence and other catastrophic circumstances and we see, you know, literally thousands of kids every year and do a range of interventions, but one of the most important ingredients goes back to the issue of collaboration, and I'm going to stop, is that before we can begin to collaborate, before we can begin to talk about collaboration, and to think about the multiple roles that different service providers have in the lives of traumatized kids and families, we need to actually know about what each other thinks, the prospective of the other, the skills, the resources and the activities.

This old model of coming in like the calvary and saying, "We're going to tell you what to do, chief, we're going to tell you what to do school principal, et cetera," this is over. And in part, it's wonderful to be humble in any of our fields, because it opens the door to scratching our heads, going back to phenomenology as the basis for thinking about what it

is we have to offer and how we mobilize the resources the kids and families need at times when they are least able to look after themselves. And last, principles of intervention, do no harm, think about the threat, restoration of external structure, parents and other care givers as primary mediators for kids when they are unable to rely on themselves.

Interventions need to be age appropriate. We need to think about the specific trauma elements that may vary enormously and how do we listen long enough to identify what they are in order to address them. Optimal responses require collaboration. And finally, the worst time to begin collaboration is in the middle of a crisis. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Steven, thank you very much. And next we'll move to Marleen.

DR. WONG: Well, thank you very much, Dr. Long and to members of the panel. Just to give an example of some of the things that Steve talked about, which were so apt, I was at Columbine High School and worked in that situation with Bill for a couple of years afterwards and the importance of calm routine became so important. I was there on the day that the kids returned to Chatfield High School because Columbine was still a crime scene, and I was standing next to a teacher and a young man came up to her, I mean, it was just an amazingly emotional scene.

Kids were pouring into the school. The Chatfield High School kids went in the morning. The Columbine kids went in the afternoon. And there were signs from all over the country, probably from some of your schools saying, "We're with you. Our prayers are with you", and it was very moving. And a young boy came up to the teacher who was standing next to me, who happened to be a math teacher, and the boy said, "Oh, Ms. Smith, I'm so happy to see you".

And she sort of like stepped back. And you could tell this wasn't her best student, you know. And he said, "I can't tell you", and he said a whole bunch of things about the media and it's so horrible. And they turned, you know, Columbine into joke and, "I'm really pissed off", and all this kind of stuff.

And then he said, "Ms. Smith, I can hardly wait to get back to class and hear you talk about math". And she said, "Oh, my God, that's amazing". He said, "I don't want to do math; I just want to hear you talk about it".

(Laughter)

So calm routine is everything. I want to talk a little bit about Los Angeles Unified School District, which is the second largest school district in the United States. This is my 32nd year in Los Angeles Unified, and I've played a variety of roles there, including the Director of Mental Health for about eight years, and now the Director of Crisis Counseling and Intervention. We have a student body of about 740,000 children K through 12 and with the new building program, we'll have over 1,000 schools in an area of about 700 square miles. The work that I'm

going to be talking about was really done in the last nine years and one of our very valued research partners is here and will be speaking next and that's Dr. Lisa Jaycox.

And the reason why we began to engage with research partners, UCLA and with RAND, is because as we began to go out to many of these crisis situations -- and let me just say that the whole area of child trauma and witness to violence began in LA Unified School District, in 1984 when a mentally ill man who lived across the street in a second floor apartment building, across the street from the 49th Street Elementary School, began shooting onto the school and held the school under sniper fire for an hour and a half at 2:30 in the afternoon as children came out of school.

And at the end of that hour and a half, two children were killed and several other students and staff were shot and wounded. And it was the beginning of a long journey of learning about trauma and its impact on learning.

So beginning with that time and nine years ago we really wanted to know how many children actually sitting in our classrooms today, not special ed kids, not in any special program but just sitting in our classrooms that have been exposed to violence in the community outside the school. We're not talking about child abuse, we're not talking about domestic abuse. We're talking about crisis incidents that occur on the way to school or on the way home because we know that the first criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder in children is exposure to violence, it's exposure to a traumatic event.

So with our partners we began this research and what we discovered along the way are a couple of things. And one is looking at how do children who have been exposed to violence differ from those who have not. And what we learned is that they have decreased IQ in these particular studies, that really the case -- the case for trauma and education and its association has been made. That they have lower grade point averages than children not exposed to trauma. That they have more days of school absence. They have decreased rates of high school graduation and in a survey that we did of 28,000 children, especially among African American youth, if they're exposed to community violence before the fifth grade the associations with expulsion and suspension are very, very high.

So what about the achievement gap? We talk about that a lot. At least in California where we talk about why is it that minority students seem to lag behind quote unquote "their Caucasian counterparts". And one of the things that we haven't really looked at is what kind of social environments do they come from, what kind of community situations do they confront all the time? They may have loving parents, they may have good teachers. Why is it that despite decades of reform we still have children who drop out or who don't do well? And one of the things we haven't looked at is impact of their exposure to violence in the community

and the effects of trauma.

There have been some national studies that have been done just about violence exposure and you can see here in Kilpatrick Study that was completed in 1995 that actually a large portion of children in the United States if we take this study, many more children in this particular generation have been exposed to community violence than any other previous generation. I want you, however, to hold onto the figure of 27 percent. Twenty-seven percent in his study is exposed to no violence.

Now, I'm going to show you a study that we did in Los Angeles Unified School District and you can see there that only six percent of students in an urban area of these 28,000 students had been exposed to no violence. Actually, many of them had multiple experiences of either being hit, kicked, punched or threatened with a gun or a knife. And even though these are figures from Los Angeles, I suspect that in many urban areas and maybe even non-urban areas where there's high poverty and crime, that there might be similar kinds of results.

To make this more graphic, I want to show you something that was put together, published in the LA Times and taken from information from the Los Angeles Police Department. And it really speaks to the kind of social ecology that children live in before they come to school. So this is an area of the far west San Fernando Valley, those of you who know Los Angeles know this is the area where the big earthquake was, the Northridge Earthquake. And what this represents, those little Monopoly sized houses that are numbered are elementary schools. And the black dots represent unsolved murders over the past 10 years, not all murders but unsolved murders. So you can see that children walking to school would pass by these places and this is where a crime had occurred that had not been solved. Now, I want you to compare this to South Los Angeles. Are you ready? Can you imagine what this looks like in your mind, the difference between a suburban area and an urban area. These are not all the murders, these are just the unsolved murders. The children who go to school in these neighborhoods come to school in a completely different mindset and it's no surprise that there are higher rates of suspension, expulsion and school dropout.

So how does this distress from violence and trauma effect students in the classroom? Well, in keeping with what Steve has just described, they do have an inability to concentrate. They're thinking about, "How do I get home safely?" They do have preoccupations with the traumatic incidents that may have occurred and in our survey the students didn't have just one experience with community violence, they had multiple experiences with community violence.

They do avoid school because getting to school is because getting to school is a matter of danger. Also, they develop many other behavioral and emotional problems and especially among young males, they act themselves out of school. They become very, very aggressive. So

which students are at greatest risk for violence exposure? In our survey we found it was children who were of ethnic minority status. They were -- had lower socio and economic status in their family.

They were older children in middle school and high school. They had early conduct problems and they lived in areas of high poverty and crime and of course, they were mostly males. So why should we have a program for traumatized students? This is a story from Martin and it's a story that you probably heard from one of your students before.

"One night several years ago, I saw men shooting at each other and people running to hide. I was scared, I thought I was going to die. And after this happened, I started to have nightmare. I felt scared all the time. I couldn't concentrate in class like before and I thought that something bad could happen to me and I started to get into a lot of fights at school and with my brothers."

Teachers who hear this story say, "Wow, Martin, that's really terrible, I hope you're walking home with somebody and I'm glad you're here and you're safe at school". But let's take a look at the story from the perspective of post-traumatic stress disorder. "One night several years ago, I was men shooting at each other and I thought I was going to die". This is life threat. This is your child's perception that his life is in danger. "And after this happened, I started to have nightmares". So it's now in his sleep, he has interrupted sleep.

"I felt scared all the time". The fear is now generalized. It's not just where he saw the incident. It's not just where he passes by during the day. "And I couldn't concentrate in class". He's cognitive impairment now and something bad, a sense of foreboding is going to happen to me. If you talk to some gang members they'll say, "I'm not living long. I'm going to live until I'm 18, maybe I'll live until I'm 19. I don't have a high expectation of living".

"I started to get into a lot of fights and school and with my brothers". So what can we do about this? Well, one of the things is really to address trauma in schools. And first is the early detection of violence exposure and associated distress. And teaching children how to cope better with distress and to learn social problem solving skills also helping parents and teachers, both of whom care greatly about their children but are remarkably poor identifiers of children who are traumatized. Of the thousands of children that we have screened for post-traumatic stress disorder and depression, less than five have ever been referred for treatment.

One of the things I'd like to talk about is CBIT, Cognitive Behavioral Intervention for Trauma in Schools. And as part of this screening, we wanted to know how many of these children had been exposed to violence and you can see here, this is kind of a summary of it, that over -- almost 90 percent, close to 90 and in some instances over 90 percent of these children and this was survey of one year of 772 kids, over

80 percent had witnessed violence. Of those a number of them were victimized, that is over 6 percent and over 40 percent, if you think about that, of your friends, if it was your community, your church, your school, over 40 percent had had direct experience with gun or knife violence.

We also found that in terms of the screening -- and here we have the top part that shows the victimization, that 20 percent of the students who were exposed to violence had clinical levels of post-traumatic stress disorder, unidentified, and an additional 16 percent of these children had clinical -- depression in the clinical range.

Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Trauma in Schools is a program developed by Dr. Lisa Jaycox for schools and in use by school personnel. It's 10 sessions of therapy for trauma symptoms and rather than go through all of this, I want to go also through some of the elements of this, and that is educating students about trauma and common symptoms.

Most of the kids say, "I feel like I'm going crazy, I feel like I have no control". And so we help them to be able to deal with that element of fear by helping them to train with their thoughts how to reduce that anxiety and how to calm their fears so that they can begin to problem solve, learning to face the trauma, learning, again, to re-engage with others and building skills to get along.

I want to say that there was one school, at all the school shootings that we've dealt with, there was one school in which test scores actually went up, they didn't go down and that was Columbine High School. And that was because Columbine invested in counselors in the school, additional staff, mental health people from the community to come in and treat those children for the kinds of problems that they were facing after the school shooting.

CBITS is tailored for delivery in schools. It is a short training of about two days. It happens bell-to-bell and it can be doubled up so that if there is a change in the schedule there can be two sessions during the week rather than one.

CBITS was also developed in our multi-cultural district and originally was work done with students who had been in the US three years or less who spoke Russian, Spanish, Korean and Aremian and our work since then has evolved over the last few years to involve mostly Latino students and African Americans.

Here's just a brief overview of the randomized clinical trial that was a study that was conducted by RAND, by Dr. Brad Stein and it shows -- it's an effectiveness study of CBITS and as you can see here, there were 769 students that were screened. A hundred and fifty-nine of those were eligible. A hundred and twenty-six students had their parents and they themselves consented to this treatment and 61 students received the program immediately and 65 students received the program at a later date. Here's some of our outcomes, and that is that treatment does improve trauma symptoms. You can see here that the solid red line shows the

students who did receive treatment dropped right out of the clinical range of post-traumatic stress disorder.

Time is a mediator, so on the dotted line, you see that overall the children did improve a little bit but there's still some clinical range of PTSD. As they receive treatment, they also even dropped lower out of the clinical range of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and the earlier group maintained their gains. The improvement in symptoms lasted over time.

Here we see what parents reported as far as their children's relationships within the home and their psycho-social impairment scores, and you can see here that the children who received treatment their impairment scores dropped so that they were doing better. Those students who did not, the parents did not see any improvement at all in their behaviors.

I'm going to skip over this next and tell you that we did find that as their trauma symptoms decreased, the grades did improve, in some cases a full grade point higher than at the beginning of the school year. And the children did -- the teachers did report fewer classroom learning problems. We did attempt to look at -- to achieve the status of having an evidence based program which has now been established with the effectiveness study in The Journal of American Medical Association.

I'm going to skip -- this is just a little slide about improvement of attendance and improvement of grades in our most recent group of students. But I wanted to jump to some recommendations because I think that this is what the heart of what we're talking about today is how the programs in the US Department of Education can really make a difference in school outcomes, both in terms of the social and emotional health of children as well as their academic progress.

First of all, I want to go back to the idea that we are teaching the whole child, that if we don't address in many cases, especially in urban areas, the social and emotional problems of children, that we really cannot achieve the educational outcomes that we want. Based on the recommendation of the President's -- President Bush's new Freedom Commission on Mental Health, there are several recommendations. One is bring science to school services. Many of the people who work in our schools, the counselors, social workers, the psychologists, they were trained what they were trained to do, five, 10, 15, 25, sometimes 30 years ago.

Science has moved forward, far, far forward at this point in time. We need to train all of them in the effects of trauma and trauma interventions, especially evidenced based trauma interventions. We need to help teachers with pre-service educational and trauma in learning so that these young teachers who are filled with ideals and enthusiasm, they go to our urban schools and they burn out.

How many of our teachers do we lose because what their expectations are and what they're taught are completely at odds with what

they actually see in front of them every day in the classroom. The second is, build a knowledge base for the treatment of trauma. We need to know that what our counselors are doing actually have an outcome, have an educational outcome; not only improve the mental health status of children but also have an impact on grades and attendance.

The third is, and this is Recommendation Number 4 in the President's New Freedom Commission, expand and enhance school-based mental health programs, organize, re-organize, reconfigure, the existing school and community health resources and mental health resources into an integrated whole at the school level and at the district level so that school psychologists, school social workers, school counselors, attendance workers, are all working together around one goal which is to improve the academic and social and emotional status of children.

I want to thank you very much for inviting us to be here today and I thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much, Marleen, and now we'll turn to Lisa.

DR. JAYCOX: Thank you. I'm going to be sort of building on what Marlene talked about and try to answer a few questions in terms of not just CBITS but other interventions, what interventions are available for helping students recover from traumatic experiences, what are their characteristics how -- what are the issues around disseminating these programs and from there I'm going to be drawing on some recent work, talking with school personnel in the Gulf States in terms of how they worked with the displaced students and their own students as schools reopened to deal with that particular traumatic experience.

I have to just have faith that it moves when -- yeah, okay. So first of all, what interventions exist? We've just done a couple big literature reviews and some work related to Gulf States where we found at least 39 programs and were specifically developed for use in schools and dealt with some sort of trauma. Some are geared towards violence exposure. Many are geared towards sort of diverse different kinds of traumatic experiences like our program CBITS. Others are specifically geared towards loss or grieve, those kinds of things.

Most of them are using some kind of cognitive behavioral techniques. Those are the best proven in clinic settings and fortunately they've been sort of pulled into the school setting and they really work in the school setting in that they're sort of didactic and have small group exercises. They really lend themselves to sort of classroom based learning.

Unfortunately, only about five of them have been evaluated in any kind of controlled experimental trial. Ours is one and there's -- the other ones are listed up there also. So it's really a developing field. We don't have a lot of evidence for many of the programs but since many of them incorporate these sort of proven techniques from other interventions

and have a lot of commonalities, there's some faith in many of them.

So what are their characteristics? They tend to be brief, time limited for students and groups. That means that they tend to be rather cost efficient. We're not talking about individual long-term counseling either with a school counselor or the mental health professional but rather pulling groups of kids together. The short-term, 8 to 20 sessions is generally the sort of parameters. Some of them have components for parents and teachers.

Working in schools has sort of some real pros and some real cons. The real pros are you really have good access to the kids. So whereas many kids don't ever make it to a specialty mental health clinic, they are in school every day. That's their job. They're there and if you're able to integrate services onto the campus, then they're available for those services. You don't need to rely on someone to give them a ride every day. You don't need to worry about how motivated the parents are, what the parents' live stressors are, you can work with the child regardless.

The downside is that that often means you have less access and less involvement from the parents. So that's sort of a double-edged thing. Most of the interventions that are out there focus on both symptom reduction and skill building. So the idea is that you're both trying to help them deal with the traumatic experiences that they've already gone through but also recognizing that many of these kids live in urban, high stress environments and they will be exposed to another traumatic event. So you're trying to build some skills for the future, relaxation skills, social problem solving, ways to talk with people about their problems, ways to get support from peers, teachers and family members. So it tries to work on both of those.

And to date most of the programs have relied on using some kind of clinician or mental health professional. That's changing a little bit. There's at least one program that has some good evidence behind it in Israel that is being run by teachers and we're working with MAMH funding to redevelop CBITS so that it could be used by non-clinicians, like school counselors and teachers.

So then we get to the question as to whether schools are using these programs. And we do a lot of work nationally through SAMSA funding, the National Child Traumatic Stress Network to try and support schools to use these kinds of programs. Marleen is running that project and she is including both RAND and UCLA in those efforts. So we're developing dissemination materials and such that we'll give you an example of in a few minutes.

But the fact is, we're working with a select few school districts around the country and most schools are not using these kinds of services even though they have kids who are experiencing a lot of trauma and who are feeling both uncomfortable at school and showing signs of impaired learning.

So the study I'm about to talk about with -- following Hurricane Katrina is an example of sort of an opportunity to look at why schools are or aren't using such programs because that was an example of everyone perceiving a big need for some sort of mental health intervention for these students who are highly effected and yet many schools were not successful in implementing such programs.

So our goal in this study was to try and look at what schools were doing for their displaced students. After the hurricanes hit, you know, we have our CBITS program. It's available. We do a lot of training and technical assistance around the country but we just got a few calls after Hurricane Katrina and I believe that's true for other people who have interventions, too. It was very spotty and we very quickly realized that even though we knew about all of the mental health programs that existed, the schools in this region did not and that there was really no place to find it easily. It wasn't gathered in one place. So one aim of the project was really actually to gather all the information on one place and provide that information for schools in sort of a school friendly place, so we developed a toolkit for that name. I'll pass them out. We have one thing that describes that so you can see it and I have an example here, if anyone is interested.

So we tried to pull together information that was -- we thought would be relevant to schools and we interviewed school personnel both public and private in four states; Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas trying to target the school districts that took in the most displaced students at first and then as we continued talking to school personnel in schools that were reopening and sending back their students, in which case all the students were effected.

We tried to look at from the school personnel perspective what they saw as the need for these students and what they were putting in place for them, what worked and didn't work.

So first in terms of need, I'd have to say that the sort of educator perception of need really differed from place to place. And there's a huge variety in the kinds of schools that we interviewed, so some were college prep, private schools. Some were intercity schools that had many high need students already and then accepted a huge number of displaced students who were also very vulnerable students from inner city New Orleans and had multiple needs themselves, so a whole range, but we noticed that very quickly educators and school principals, for instance and their superintendents were saying that they needed to get back to academics. They did a lot around quickly enrolling students and finding uniforms and desks for them and really served as a hub in the communities that they served to get these families settled and acclimated and the kids enrolled in schools. But by, you know, February it was, "Okay, enough of that, we need to refocus on academics and on testing standards and meeting our goals for that.

So some schools were really getting back to academics

quickly and kind of leaving the mental health issues aside. But in one school district for instance that screened many, many of the displaced students, they screened everyone they could, they were finding that 40 percent of the high school students for instance were scoring in the highest level of need in terms of mental health services using a screener put out by the National Child Traumatic Stress Network. So clearly the need was there at least in some school districts but not necessarily perceived as something that they needed to be focused on. Just to give you an idea of what we did with the toolkit, we drafted the toolkit and then also got feedback from it. We sent it out very quickly in January or February of 2006 and then as we re-interviewed school personnel, we were able to get more feedback and in fact, learn about a number of programs that school systems were developing. So if you can kind of imagine, I mean, it's great to hear that school districts were motivated to do that but I can think of one school district where there was one social worker for the whole district and she developed her own program, curricula, from scratch which is a huge effort and a valiant effort, but there were many, many programs she could have taken off the shelf had she known about them.

So there was a real lack of information. A lot of school districts were doing their -- what they could on their own with limited staff time and resources and then I'd hear from the next school district over that they had already invented that thing and were using it. So for instance, hearing one person say, "Well, you just really don't know how to screen the kids, though", and we're trying to develop a screener and find out about that and the next school district over, they just screened everybody around. So that was a real issue in terms of not hearing about communication between school districts and if you know New Orleans and Louisiana at all, a lot of them are very small parishes with limited resources, so not the big school districts we tend to see other places.

Okay. In terms of interviewing the school personnel, I've talked a little bit about this already, we targeted schools and school districts that took in a lot of displaced students with a lot of variations so that's something to note as I'm talking because not only did they vary in terms of size and resources, they varied a lot in terms of pre-existing mental health need within their student population and some had very well developed school based mental health centers for instance, funding mechanisms and funding streams and were able to really leverage those resources. Others had one school counselor per school, the sort of standard model without any really extra mental health support around it and, therefore, were not able to do so much.

I've already sort of mentioned this a little bit, but the schools really did rally and put the primary emphasis on getting kids registered, enrolled in school and they were very proud of their effort around this. It's quite impressive what they did, especially when you imagine that in many of these communities they also -- the school personnel who were trying to

do this had their own personal damage and displacement issues going on. If the community wasn't very damaged, they still were accepting visitors into their homes and multiple people living with them, but often had some damage. And in some communities, you know, like in Southern Mississippi and clearly New Orleans, have long-term issues to deal with outside of school. So one of the things that we've been talking a lot about is sort of the role that educators are thrust into in a situation like this, to be both the caretakers for our children, but also be enormously tax themselves on a personal level, so we heard a lot from school personnel about you know, really putting their all into it but not being sure how longer they could keep it up.

And hopefully that they could get some, you know, sort of respite over the summer to sort of recover from this year of really intense stress and work -- both at work and at home on a personal level. We didn't see a lot of implementation of the kind of trauma programs that we -- that we talked about earlier, CBITS or other programs and I'll talk a little bit about the reasons for that.

The kind of barriers that schools talked about were lack of capacity, as you can imagine, limited funding, lack of trained staff to implement programs, having had not quite enough resources to meet the needs of their students before and then now all these extra displaced students. If you can imagine having sort of a flood of students who are sort of the most needy, most at risk for mental health problems come into the school it really shifts the school population in the direction of having a huge number of needy students. So that's what many schools faced.

The competing priorities I sort of mentioned on a personal level, but also on a community level, there is a lot of need to focus on rebuilding, even the school building, get new supplies and equipment and all of that was very pressing, of course. And so it displaced some of the issues around mental health. Other barriers are problems communicating that's I've already mentioned. Some staff members, you know, didn't even want to talk to me about it. They sort of said, "It's enough already. We're tired of talking about Katrina. It's in the media every day. We need to put it behind us." This is probably sounding familiar based on what Steve said earlier.

That there is often a sort of impetus for people to try and put the trauma behind them and the teachers and school personnel were doing that too, even if the students weren't necessarily ready for that. And then there was also enormous difficulty communicating with parents and sometimes that's required for mental health services to get permission to do an intervention with the child.

Phone numbers were changing, housing was unstable, phone numbers that students were registered under changed immediately as people found housing. So really, if you take your sort of urban difficulties communicating with parents and triple them, it might be the situation here.

People really didn't have ways to communicate, especially with the families residing in the trailer villages, because there were not good communication lines set up with that.

So trying to sort of put this all together, it is a little hard to put together because of the variety of different kinds of schools that we talked with but it's not just enough to have resources but rather your resources and your needs already have to sort of be in balance so some of the school districts that had high need populations but really were struggling to meet those needs already were not able to kind of put in more effort for these displaced students.

Some school districts were really lucky, they had just gotten safe students -- Safe Schools Healthy Students funding and were able to shift the priorities on that to focus on displaced students, that kind of thing, but you can imagine that it would be hard to write a grant in the midst of all of this chaos and try to apply for funding. So really one of the things that we learned is, you know, that there are these existing barriers that are always the case for getting mental health services to students, but even more so during a time of disaster and because the whole community is effected and everyone is sort of at their limit already, don't have time to sit down and write a grant or develop new materials or attend a two-day training.

So more and more we've been thinking about how that training needs to sort of be pre-positioned. There was one story that -- from a woman, social worker in Mississippi who had implemented some grief program prior to the hurricane, so she had gotten trained on it and implemented it in a few small groups for students in her school district. And everything in the community was wiped out. This was in the very -- right along the coast and she lost all of her materials except for this one program that she found floating in a zip lock bag in her living room. So that was the program she implemented.

It was, you know, fortunately applicable to the kids in terms of loss and grief but you immediately kind of have to imagine it being -- floating there in a zip lock back to be useable. It can't be something they need to go to Chicago to get trained on.

I am talking too much, I guess. Okay, conclusions; the window of opportunity for addressing the student mental health issues was small in many school districts, so there was a window, although many school districts started to do more training over the summer after the hurricanes hit and we've been involved with some of that. One thing that was really impressive is that the schools leveraged their crisis intervention training and their crisis intervention teams in order to be able to respond to the hurricanes and then -- but then really stopped there and quickly turned back to academics and sort of set aside the mental health issues. And information about the programs really needs to sort of be on the shelf already with training pre-disaster.

In terms of recommendations, we clearly are at the infancy stage in terms of evaluating these kinds of programs so there does need to be more of that but having the programs really isn't enough. We need good training and good staff development prior to a school crisis or a community-wide disaster. And the thing that these kinds of trauma interventions can offer besides offering specific interventions for traumatized students is that they draw on the same kinds of concepts that are really important for treating other problems like behavior problems and depression and anxiety. So bringing evidence-based treatment towards trauma would go a long way towards also getting people ready to implement other kinds of programs that we know are proven for use in schools. I'll stop there.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much, Lisa. Now, let me ask, when I stepped up there, Marleen, you and Lisa were talking about a --

DR. JAYCOX: Yeah, since we each took our time, yeah, we can skip that.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. I appreciate all the flexibility. I saw the conversation going back and forth.

DR. JAYCOX: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Now, to an important time and that is to have comments and questions and enter a dialogue so that we can synthesize some of this information. So yes, Susan?

MS. KEYS: I'd like to ask you to comment, a lot of the presentation had to do with helping kids that have experienced trauma and you touched on getting professionals and teachers and communities ready for some type of large scale trauma or in this case maybe an individual who experiences trauma. Can you comment on recommendations for building resilience so that you can look from a preventative perspective and hopefully have less children that are severely traumatized?

DR. MARANS: That's a great question. Let me give you one example around domestic violence where we know so much about the cycle of violence. I mentioned the delinquency but what I didn't say is, is that you know, both boys and girls are 158 to 250 percent more likely to be victims and perpetrators of inter-personal violence if they've been exposed to domestic violence. So one of the things that developed out of our partnership with law enforcement and Domestic Violence Services and others is the idea of taking what we know about the pattern and psychological and safety experiences of domestic violence and kind of develop an intervention that would interrupt it, which also means interrupting a level of exposure. So what we did was these are some of the most frustrating, fourth most dangerous kind of law enforcement call for service and often it's not a good mix in terms of what women feel from law enforcement -- typically women feel from law enforcement in a domestic violence situation. In our work, because we have learned so much from

each other, we've developed an intervention strategy where domestic violence advocates, clinicians and police officers would respond after the acute call for service and do unannounced follow-up visits.

Now, lots of people are horrified saying, "Well, that's intrusive". In fact that's not what we found in our survey from these women and we had a controlled study and what it demonstrated was that the women and kids who had the outreach in which there was safety planning, mental status review, psycho-education, et cetera, were much more likely than their control group to get additional social services, both for themselves, both adults and kids, and much more likely, about 50 percent -- 50 percent decrease in severity of violence and police calls for service. It's one example about thinking collaboratively and looking at the phenomena and then saying, "How can we interrupt the cycle and how can we decrease the level of exposure and increase the level of a sense of agency and control?" Just one example.

DR. JAYCOX: I was just going to say that some of the work in the urban areas like the CBITS program and several of the other ones that were on the slides, is that we know that they're exposed to things on a regular basis, trauma in the community. And so it's not exactly prevention but really more early intervention. We're not waiting until they're sort of full blown PTSD and they're disabled, but rather trying to get working with them when they have some symptoms and so it's sort of earlier in the cycle.

And maybe Marleen, do you want to talk about the programs you were --

DR. WONG: Yeah, I spent two weeks in Israel last month around the holiday season and I spoke with many, many colleagues who are dealing with exactly this issue about how do you provide universal and preventative efforts around a situation in which 6000 Katyusha rockets are falling every day on a very small country and you don't know where the rockets are going to come and everybody is subjected to these air raid siren type things and you just dive under a table, you jump out of your car. You just get out of the way. And so trauma is highly likely in a population like this and yet, it's not.

So what -- in talking with them what I found is and as you look at that spectrum of prevention sort of you know, there's universal applications, there's selected and there's indicated and you look at certain populations. And we all have them, in, you know, communities of high poverty and crime. What they did was they took an intervention, cognitive behavioral intervention, and they sort of front-loaded it. I mean, they took the first few pieces of it which was education about trauma, how do you -- what thoughts do you have about this? Which of those thoughts are not -- don't help you to problem solve but get you stuck where you're at? And then how do you develop more social skills and cognitive skills in order to deal with that? So they took those first like four segments of

cognitive behavioral intervention and literally taught it to all the kids in the country. Now, they don't have any outcome measures but I think it's a very promising kind of direction, where you see now that they're still -- they're dealing with some of those threats but at the same time, if you go to Israel, life is going on. I mean, they are doing just -- they have fear but you know, people are out in the street at night, people are enjoying life. The kids are out there playing. They're not frozen. They're not looking like our inner cities where kids are being forced to stay inside because it's dangerous outside.

DR. MARANS: I think it raises a really important point and one of the differences between what we see in Israel and what we see in some of our high crime neighborhoods and communities is the notion of social cohesion as a major protective factor. And so we have a programmatic or a therapeutic intervention on the one hand, but one of the most successful interventions that is protective and part of social cohesion have been the after school programs that we've developed in our country that have been decreased over the last several years. We know about the connection between after school programming for high risk kids and this is not -- you don't need to be a professor of psychiatry or child psychiatry to recognize that if you want to increase protective factors, supervision is an important one.

If you want to make sure the kids have an opportunity for pro social development, then give them the opportunity for pro social behavior, so that, you know, this idea that if we go back to the phenomenology, if one of the sine qua nons of trauma is the erosion of executive functioning and organized gratifying behavior, et cetera, then we have to have some support. Somebody has got to have these kids' backs that can help them re-establish the level of order and executive functioning and group activities, if they can't have the level of support and supervision in their homes or neighborhoods, well, we need to think about how to up that ante on that, I think.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Mike?

MR. HERRMANN: In terms of building networks of folks at the school level to support children in responding to these traumas, who do you think are the most likely candidates? Are they teachers, school counselors, and what kind of training would you need to prepare them for that role?

DR. WONG: Well, I think in this country, you know, the way that most school districts are organized is that there's a superintendent of schools and then you have a whole group of people who are a support to the district and it's Health and Human Services. They might be called Social Services, Attendance Counselors, our School Psychologist, very important, School Social Workers but really to integrate those folks together into some sort of support system that then begins to look and assess what does our district really confront, what do our children confront

and how do we -- you know, what's the big picture here that we need to address. And it may be different from community to community.

You know, maybe it's more of a bullying situation rather than exposure to violence but I think that we're also finding more evidence that children who are bullied do reach the level of trauma and get to the point where they don't want to go to school, they don't -- you know, they have all of those symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder. So but integrating those resources, because I suspect that in every state we're spending you know, hundreds of millions of dollars on counseling programs and they get splintered off but they need to be re-integrated so that they serve the needs of the child.

DR. MARANS: Just to add to that, I think one of the common denominators that's often missing is an appreciation of children's development. And if you have a broader appreciation of children's development, then you can begin to do more of the connecting of the dots, and it's not asking everybody to be everything.

You know, teachers who complain about being turned into substitute parents have legitimate grievances but they're not supported if -- for example, there's a wonderful SRO, School Resource Officer Program but the teachers and the SROs only connect when the kid's in trouble. It's not helpful if the SRO, the School Resource Officer, is so separate from the rest of the policing districts that they are not able to transport in-tell between what's happening in the community and the schools and vice versa, and it's not useful in devising strategies for intervention for the most troubled and troublesome kids if the teachers and mental health folks and law enforcement and all these folks aren't talking from a similar frame of reference, not about their expertise in what they can do but about what a child is needing and how they can bring those areas of expertise to it and talk from the perspective of the child.

And something that came up this morning about resources and money and the money walks, well, one of the issues is, when money walks, it's hard for people to be very interested in listening to what the other knows. And we get into the silo effect and we get further and further away from what it is to be this child and by the way, what it is to be this teacher or this cop or this judge, et cetera, et cetera.

And we get far away from saying, "Well, whoa, hold on a second. Who is this kid and how is that the starting point for where we need to go"?

MR. JONES: And may I also respond to that question? You know, so, you know, who do you go to, who is the go to person? Is it the teacher or the counselor or whatever? And I think first of all, as the panel is pointing out, it's just, first of all, educating our culture, our teachers, our superintendents, et cetera, to the fact that trauma hurts. It's the gift that continues to give. Educating individuals that it's a real phenomenon and that children experience. I mean, you guys have quoted many wonderful

statistics, actually dramatic, drastic statistics. You know, one statistic is up to 91 percent of children in high-risk areas actually experience this traumatic events. But again, it's just educating school professionals that indeed, trauma is very prevalent, it hurts, it also lasts.

So given that, you know, one of the things that we're doing in our clinic and in fact, this is based on Steven's model, the CDCP model is, first of all, teachers are busy. They're trying to pass, you know, getting the children to do well on standardized tests, et cetera, but first of all, it's just educating teachers to the impact of trauma, just simple psycho-education and then having those teachers refer children to counselors. Counselors seem to have somewhat more time than do -- well, I'm sure counselors wouldn't want to hear me say this, but we found that counselors in our district are better able to work with children. So teachers referring children to counselors and then working with those counselors. We've got great dialogue with counselors in our area with our clinic and so those cases where the counselors can't deal with children, they simply refer onto our clinic.

And so we've got trained graduate students and other mental health professionals actually screening children, assessing children, diagnosing children in appropriate instances and then carrying out intervention. So, you know, there are ways of getting the job done. But again, I think first of all, it's just educating, you know, educating America that trauma hurts, you know, and that it lasts, and it costs, yeah.

DR. JAYCOX: Yeah, I just wanted to add that in addition to sort of training the teachers and school administrators, there's also supporting the teachers and school administrators because both from the Katrina example and the inner city example, the staff members are exposed to the same stuff every day and have their own symptoms, their own burn-out issues, their own desire not to get into it too far with the students and so they need help, too, both in learning how to help their students but also, now, how to help themselves, I think.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Without naming names, I just thought as you were in this cycle that we all work in, sometimes -- and you've mentioned it two or three times, those that have been victims of different types of trauma then sometimes get into education, don't mean to be but they're trauma givers. And somehow we have to help break that. I heard that two or three times stated in a different way.

Other comments or questions? Yes, Fred?

MR. ELLIS: Yeah, for Lisa, in one of your slides you talked about there were at least 30 programs for schools and only five have been evaluated in any kind of controlled trial. Can you speak a little bit about the five that have been evaluated, the results of that?

DR. JAYCOX: Yeah. CBITS is one of them and so Marleen presented that. There is -- a few of them are quite similar. So the UCLA Trauma, Grief Program, CBITS and something called Multi-

Modality Treatment for Trauma, MMTT, have a lot of components in common and are for diverse kinds of traumas and they also sort of incorporate those cognitive behavioral techniques. The other two are ones that have been developed overseas, so one is the classroom based intervention which has been used in Gaza and in refugee camps and in displaced persons' camps and so that was tested actually by USAID and then it has been sort of revamped and it's been used quite a bit in New Orleans, Save the Children funded its dissemination. So it's been tested there and that's been used here.

And then the last one is one that is just newly developed and being used in Israel in elementary schools and middle schools for ongoing terrorism kinds of events, similar to what Marleen.

MR. ELLIS: And the evaluation, I'm assuming that they do the efficacy of the programs are.

DR. JAYCOX: Yeah, it's a reduction in PTSD symptoms, behavior problems and depressive symptoms usually. I mean, it's very hard -- I'm sure many of you know that it's hard to do school-based research especially when you're delivering some kind of intervention because there's the need to serve all students that you identify as a need, for instance for intervention programs. So they don't tend to be long-term outcomes for any of the programs to really look over time, unfortunately. They tend to be more short-term types of symptom reductions and unfortunately, you know, we've tried to gather information on grades. It's really hard to fit into an experimental design, because the grades are collected at certain time points that don't match your intervention experiment. And you know, grades come middle year and end of the year whether or not your experiment, your intervention happened at the right time point.

So that's something that, you know, we have a lot of interest in trying to get more information about, how does it really change academic indicators and we feel like that would help schools get more interested in these kinds of programs, but we're just not quite there yet with the research. Marleen mentioned, we have indications that improvement in PTSD symptoms map onto improvement in grades but you can't directly link it to intervention effects.

DR. WONG: In terms of just this committee, we wanted to give you a copy of this manual which Dr. Jaycox developed and this is the intervention that we talked about that the evidence-based study was conducted. So we'll leave this for the committee.

MR. HINGSON: As I listened to you talk about the types of incidents that these young students are exposed to, it struck me that a lot of these are family generated; domestic violence, child abuse and so on. Could you tell us a little bit about the engagement of the parents in all of this and how you deal with that and issues of confidentiality and the -- there must be a whole series of those sorts of issues being worked through.

DR. MARANS: That's a great question and it also goes

back to connecting the dots and some legal issues. I want to take up the confidentiality quickly because when we present on our law enforcement/mental health partnership, that's always one of the first things that comes up. "Well, we can't talk with each other", et cetera, et cetera. Well, people forget that parents, unless they've crossed the line, they're in charge and if you ask parents as part of your standard of care, "Is it okay if I'm in touch with Officer so and so and vice versa", services are always introduced as voluntary and you sign waivers because the parent has a feeling that you're on their side and you want to do what's right by them and their children.

We have about an 85 percent acceptance of the sharing information. It's very limited. It's very limited to the issues that the other professional is going to be able to address. So that whether it's with the police or Department of Children and Protective Services or Domestic Violence Advocates, the kind of information that's shared is specific to what these other professionals are going to bring to the table.

The other part is, is that one of the things that didn't come up although it was implicit, many of the parents who are difficult to reach are themselves the -- this is an inter-generational issue. And do you know what it's like being a teacher when the parent doesn't show up? You just get mad on them, you know. And the problem is, is that they're not showing up to PTA meetings and they're not coming to school conferences because they're also depressed and they're also limited.

One of the things that in consultation that I was doing in Louisiana, I'm blocking because it was so unpleasant, but going to one of the trailer camps of evacuees from the Ninth Ward, the rate of school suspensions and all the problems that were being described earlier was only matched by the clinically significant rates of depression amongst the primary care givers that was off the charts in terms of general population.

So partially, we're often not very successful in our efforts and it takes a special effort to reach out to parents. Where the efforts are in some ways easier, are when the circumstances are more serious. That when for example, parents have crossed the line, have gotten involved in abuse and neglect, that's where the state is often able to increase and bring leverage to a situation that can be productably motivating for families.

Otherwise, we're looking at how do we engage parents where they are better? How do we stop waiting around for parents to come to either schools or mental health clinics, where they feel they're going to be judged and looked down upon when they're already feeling low? How do we use some of the natural, you k now, places that they're likely to come to whether it's domestic violence shelters and increasing the services we have available there, whether it's meeting in substations of police departments, whether it's -- so there are a range of efforts that are afoot but this is a major issue when what you're trying to do is engage someone who themselves have been so traumatized over a period of time and then acutely in a kind of

engagement that is counter to what they're experiencing.

DR. WONG: One of the things that we saw in schools -- and my staff, they're all part of the teachers' union. I mean, they're part of the district, so they're not coming from a community agency. They're actually part of LA Unified School District. So parents are accustomed to talking to counselors and despite that we also get the consent. We get active consent for parents.

And we engage them in CBITS and that there are two to four sessions where we talk with the parents about you know, what are some of the symptoms of PTSD, do they know about the incident that their child had been involved in and it was surprising that, you know, children protect parents. They don't tell their parents about what happened to them. They don't tell them all the problems that they're having; they're not sleeping, they're afraid, or all of that kind of thing, but one of the really lovely things that seem to happen between the parents and the children after this treatment and I don't know if it was the treatment or just because, you know, they were able finally to come together and talk about this was that parents stopped being punitive with their kids.

You know, they finally got it, like, "I didn't know that that's how it was affecting you". And they stopped -- in fact, one of the fathers said, "I was getting really physical with my son because he wouldn't go to school, he wouldn't go to sleep at night. He's wake up and he wouldn't follow directions and he was getting into fights". But during one of the first years that we did this program, 76 percent of the parents -- so we had all these kids, hundreds of kids. Seventy-six percent of the parents said, "There's someone else in my family I want you to see. Now I understand what this is about. See my husband, you know, see my brother". I mean, they all had someone that they recognized clearly were traumatized.

DR. MARANS: We don't like to use the word "normalizing" but you get the idea that the approach that has been discussed in terms of psycho-education makes a big difference if somebody -- and we all know this from medical illnesses, right? When you're feeling really anxious about what's going on with you, it makes a big difference when somebody tells you what's going on with you and arms you with some information. So the experience of using these kinds of approaches says, "Well, of course you're having this experience and here they are, and here's what can be done". And sometimes parents need more assistance in feeling like somebody has got their back, whether it's in terms of safety but also being able to experience that the teachers and the counselors and anybody else aren't wagging their fingers saying, "What terrible parents you are", but, "Well, of course you're having a tough time with this". DR. JAYCOX: Just to touch on the confidentiality issue, most of our work has focused on screening kids for community violence because of those privacy issues and then many of them turn out to have other traumatic events in their past that sort of come out over time and then we deal with them as

they come. So it is more acceptable for the school and the community to say this is a study about community violence that's what we're going to focus on and then once the kids get into groups, they end up talking about domestic violence that they've witnessed and other things and we do end up having to report child abuse, you know, to some degree.

It's not all the kids but then as it comes up, then we can handle it.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Montean, Belinda.

MS. JACKSON: Hi, a quick question on whether or not there currently is any studies or any research being one on the military child and children that attend non-DOD schools as well as the children that attend DOD schools and the services and support that's provided.

DR. JAYCOX: I know that DOD has been in touch with us occasionally to ask about our program and other programs, and we've sent them materials because they are interested in doing this kind of programming, for instance, on the bases in Germany but I don't think that there's been any systematic research that I'm aware of on kids. Do you know something?

MR. MODZELESKI: There is some, Montean. I mean, many of the states are working not only with the military children, I mean, where they're seeing more problems are with the National Guard and reserve units which don't have the support of the military. So Mona Johnson (phonetic) in Washington, Pennsylvania, there's three or four states I think that are doing quite a bit of work with -- and I don't know whether Mike knows any, but there are about three or four states.

DOD has a small unit working on this. Unfortunately, if you go to the Department of Defense and ask about this, they'll tell you the same thing you heard today is not enough resources, not enough time, not enough energy to do this. As a matter of fact, a key person working on this for DOD is leaving DOD and going out to Hawaii to do this on a local level. So you'll lose the leadership at the DOD level.

MS. SIMS: Thank you. My question sort of dovetails off of that in that it's what has been the uptake of the CBITS program as an example, in general and specifically within the LA Unified School Districts?

DR. WONG: Well, we're sorry we weren't able to show you but we had children from LA Unified actually speaking on this video about how when they would go into school and what their -- what their experience with trauma was and how it was dealt with differently with teachers and also a little bit about how CBITS has taken off.

I think that people who recognize that they are dealing with traumatized children are more than ready for this. They're ready to get into it. I think that the acceptance is like in any other situation. If they recognize that there's a problem, they're more than ready to take it on.

Where the problem hasn't been recognized or they say,

"Well, that's just those kids and that's how they, you know, deal with things," and you know, make sort of blanket statements about you know, their behavior, they're not so interested. So we have schools that have hired three social workers and psychologists to deal with these issues and we have schools who say, "That's not my job and I'm not going to do it". So but CBITS has also been disseminated around the country, so there's different places, for instance, Madison, Wisconsin and Baltimore and in Minnesota we have some sites. In the Native American Reservations in Montana there's a big effort around CBITS. We have CBITS Australia and Japan. I mean, you know, places where people -- yeah, little pockets where they recognize, "This is that I'm dealing with".

You know, and we had a teacher on the video say, "I knew it wasn't because these kids were stupid. I just couldn't figure out what it was when I walked into my classroom, I'd just feel the hair come up on my arms because something had happened last night and these kids were acting out. And until I started asking those questions, you know, like tell me about what happened last night", and she started getting the answers about, you know, "I saw my brother shot, I saw this happen", it was then that she began to realize that there had to be something before learning to be -- something that went along with learning, you know, where somebody had to sit down with these kids and talk about what had happened to get them to a place where they could actually attend to what was going on in the classroom.

So I would say it just -- it really depends on the interest of the individual educator and it starts with the leadership. If the principal says, "Yes, this is what we're dealing with," it's school-wide.

MS. SIMS: And are there key items or brief measures widely available for use in terms of, you know, screening for trauma exposure and then being able to -- you know, to do it on a wider scale, for example, if this were going to be integrated into a safe and drug free school screener for example?

DR. WONG: Yeah, well, we -- everyone keeps asking for shorter and shorter, so we have done some work to try and shorten what we used originally and I think we're now down to a seven-item community violence exposure screener and a nine-item PTSD screener. So it's really quick but it doesn't focus on all sorts of traumas. It sort of depends what the school is interested in screening on.

You know, some are more interested in getting at the family stuff or there's been a recent event and would want to focus in on those things. But we do feel like we have good scorers and such for picking kids who might benefit from some kind of trauma focus program and have some short measures.

DR. MARANS: Lisa just made a reference to something I think is really important, that when we think about trauma and heightening awareness, it's not just about exposure to violence, you know, and this is not

just about our schools, it's about our hospitals and a whole range of services that come into contact with kids. When kids lose a parent suddenly to, you know, a sudden death and gee, surprise, surprise, there are symptomatic behaviors that are presenting in the classroom, what's the teacher supposed to do when a kid has just had emergency surgery and is coming back after a prolonged absence from the school?

You know, one can kind of, you know, wind out the list. So I think this idea about considering again the awareness as Russell was pointing out, of what are the links between overwhelming experiences in the lives of children and the way they present behaviorally and in compromise functioning, that's the key.

MR. JONES: Yeah, well, stated. Lisa, just in response to Belinda's question in terms of screeners, yes, there are several other very short screeners within the National Child Traumatic Stress Data Core that could be given out to children systematically and, you know, boy, it's my hope that the Department of Education really takes that on and that that become a very fundamental component of the, you know, educational initiative that children are systematically screened for the occurrence of traumatic events and in assessments and that kind of thing. And again, it doesn't have to be the Department of Education doing all of that. I mean, once we know that children need a certain criterion on that screener, they can then be referred out to you know, other agencies; community psychologists, psychology clinics, et cetera. I mean, that can be done. It's just a matter of doing the gimbling if you will, with other organizations who are expert in the assessment, treatment and diagnosis of traumatized children.

But I think I want to go back to another point. You know, the importance of -- you know, there's a saying that culture counts. That was benchmarked by, I believe, Secretary David Satcher some years ago, talking about the psychological impact of any number of things on people of color. But I think culture counts. But in this context, I think, trauma counts. You know, and if the Department of Education could convey that message that, indeed, trauma counts.

There was a question asked earlier in terms of how receptive are parents to interventions, et cetera. You know, what we found and I've heard that from many of my colleagues, that once parents become aware of the impact of a traumatic event on their child, they beat the doors down to get help. Once they realized that trauma has not only a psychological but also a biological and neuro-biological consequence, parents will jump at that. They -- parents are protectors of children but you know, parents don't know what they don't know. If they don't know that this traumatic event impacts my child, you know, not only for the short term but the long term, there's no need for intervention. And in fact, what parents often do following a traumatic event is get over it and let's move on. I've had parents tell me that for many years following fires and Hurricane Andrew, and even

Katrina. "It's over, let's get over it and let's move forward".

But once parents hear the message that, indeed, trauma hurts, trauma lasts, I think they're very prone to seek out screening and to seek out interventions. And even though, you know, we only have five interventions so to speak that are evidenced based, there are many, many, many more that are evidenced informed, that's simply meaning that the components of those strategies that are evidence based, are also part of those that are evidenced informed.

So again, there is solid treatment strategies, intervention strategies, to help children across our nation that are traumatized.

MR. MODZELESKI: Before we go down this road, I have a question and Russell, maybe you could jump in, too. I mean, listening to all of you and having many years of experience, it's sort of like if this is the first time I've landed here, I'd say there's absolutely no problems with screening and there's -- merely tell the parents that trauma hurts and that everybody is going to jump in and that this is -- you know, this is easy.

Our experience tells us otherwise. Our experience tells us that screening is, even as easy as it is, nine scale or five scalers, that there are many people out there who don't believe in it, who don't trust in it; as a matter of fact, feel that there's some negative consequences to it. There's still many people that don't believe that trauma hurts. So the flip side of that is what are the negatives, I mean, that we should be looking for because this is not merely doing it because we are well aware of the obstacles.

So could you talk briefly about what those obstacles are? Why do people still fight us tooth and nail on screening and fight us tooth and nail on trauma, to be quite frank with you?

MR. JONES: One response might be it's just in terms of culture. You know, it's the culture of the way people think. You know, I don't know the extent to which, you know, those individuals that you're talking about have been educated to the impact of trauma and also the prevalence and incidents of trauma in -- you know, in those families, in those communities, et cetera. So I think that's just -- again, that's psycho-educational piece, I think, is very important and again, the incidents again, and the prevalence of that occurring in that community, in that family, is essential.

DR. JAYCOX: Whenever we conduct a research project together, we have many issues with trying to recruit families to participate and some of the reactions are that, "Well, my child doesn't need it so I'm not going to let you screen. I think everything is fine". But also some fear that there will be some intrusion to family business and concerns about child abuse or domestic violence or other things going on at home, immigration status, all sorts of things.

I think this could open up too many personal issues. And so I think that's where we lose families in our research projects. And the research projects put a lot of extra hurdles into consents that school

programs don't always have. But when we've implemented just as a program, we have much better success. If a school rolls out a program that doesn't need a lot of extra forms, scary forms signed, it tends to go better. But still, I think, it does sort of cross the line into questions about home life or parents are concerned about that, that is one of the barriers.

DR. MARANS: I think there's another -- I'm glad you raised it, Bill. You know, the other element -- I would agree with what's been said. The other element is, you know, I think Lisa was sort of alluding to this, you're going to do the research and then what? So there's the whole exploitation issue which, I think, many communities feel particularly from an academic side.

I find I have to explain away being part of Yale University. I have to remind people that we're out 24/7. It doesn't matter what time of night or day, et cetera, et cetera, and actually, as Russell says, when we're in somebody's living room, we're welcomed, but if you come in and say, "We're going to do research," well, then it's just, you know, Yale writing articles off the backs of people's suffering.

I think there's another element. America is just a wonderful country of fads, isn't it? And so there have been some terrible egregious things done in the name of trauma and help. After 9-11 Bill Moyers asked me to take a phone -- you know, do a phone thing with him on television. And I got this call from a teacher. She was a second grade teacher in New York City and this was just a week and a half after the attacks. And she said, "I was told by my principal that I was to have all of my second graders draw pictures and talk about the attacks of 9-11." She said, "I felt awful doing this".

There is an ersatz not based on the science that Marleen and Lisa were talking about but a kind of a faddish, cultish, whatever knee jerk kind of if you talk about it, talk about it, talk about it, everything is going to be okay. And you know, one of the things -- we talked a lot about the backing away from trauma but there's a flip side and the flip side is the psychological equivalent of ambulance chasers.

And you know, when you feel immobilized, when all of us feel immobilized, what do we want to do, we want to get active. We want to get busy. We want to do something. Well, sometimes that can be done in a way that's intrusive and insensitive and unplanned and unregulated and that has an enormous additional impact that puts people off and rightly so.

And the media doesn't help when it's -- you know, the camera and the microphone in the face of people who are going to perserverate after they've been overwhelmed and trauma, trauma, trauma is being rammed down people's throats. That's not a good way of reassigning and helping people regain a sense of agency. So thinking about how we do that is also part of a public health approach to this issue that Russell keeps going back to and ways in which we contextualize people's experiences in science, in subjective experience and bringing the two together.

MR. JONES: You know, Bill, in response to your question, just real quick, it's about relationships. And I think many times when traumatic experiences occur, there aren't relationships on the ground. You know, when people are traumatized, they're more likely to respond to people that they know, people they have a track record with. And I think that attempting to do screening without having relationships with individuals or anything else, people are turned off.

We wrote a book chapter not long ago and it's talking about how to do research and how to carry out services with people of color and marginalized populations. And we talk about some very specific things that mitigate against individuals wanting to become involved in what we do, whether it's in the school or whether it's a research thing. We talk about mistrust. We talk about access. We talk about culture and we talk about linguistics. And the extent to which those things aren't discussed within individuals, I think dictate specifically, the likelihood of them not becoming involved in what we do. So it's just -- it's using our science to reach the unreachable so to speak, or to reach the under-served if you will.

One of the things that we did down in New Orleans is did focus groups with mental health professionals to find out their perception of the storm and their perception of needs and their perception of the needs of those that they were working with, developing those relationships. And once that's done, in many instances, folks are much more open to allow you to do what it is you would like to do in hopes of you know, assisting them to deal with their grief, dealing with their stress and other reactions.

So it's relationship, I think it's relationship building.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And we'll close with one question, Fred.

MR. ELLIS: Actually, it's kind of more of comment. I'm glad Bill brought that up. I'm reminded of that movie, if you've seen it, "Black Hawk Down", where the Army guys are in their Humvees driving through the urban area getting shot up and at one point the Humvee stops and this old salty sergeant is all shot up and bleeding and he turns to this private and says, "Get in and drive", and the private looks at him and says, "Sarg, I'm shot". And he said, "We're all shot, get in and drive".

And that always has struck me, as Bill said or eluded to, you know, almost the American culture. I think Steven was very insightful on some of the resistance that you might face on some of this. Having said that, you know, I think it is a very interesting -- it's a fascinating area, but I do think there is an element of -- maybe it's the word "trauma". People don't understand what in the world you're talking about trauma, what do you mean trauma. "We're all traumatized, we all have things that happen in our life and don't send me a psychologist who is going to analyze me all the way back to childhood where I had a nightmare". You know, that, I think, turns people off. But I think the concept of what you all are talking about, I think, potentially has some real value.

I guess, my point, it would really help if we had the empirical evidence -- evidence-based stuff to convince folks like me that, "Hey, this is worthwhile doing, it's worthwhile pursuing. You know, it makes a lot of sense anticdotally, common sense-wise, and boy, it sure would be great if I could see some real differences in some GPAs and some reduction in suspensions and expulsions and behaviors and things like that".

DR. MARANS: I think we all agree. The only thing I'd underline is your point about the over-use of the term "trauma" goes back to the issue of public education. Trauma is not about being upset. It's about having your brains scrambled and it's about not being able to function the way you could before an event and then not being able to recover as quickly.

It's also important to note that not everybody who's traumatized develops PTSD. And not everybody who's traumatized doesn't recover. Most people do. The percentages that Marleen was referring to, these are significant number. When we're talking about 20 percent of the population she was describing, this is a significant number and it's costing our country billions and billions and billions of dollars.

So in addition to the heartfelt sympathy that we feel for people who are impaired by overwhelming, truly overwhelming mind and brain altering experiences, we have to also get better at being able to do the work that monetizes and demonstrates not only the symptomatic changes that can occur but the cost savings that can occur as well, and in the opposite direction, the cost incurred when we don't do what need to be done.

CHAIRMAN LONG: The -- and maybe we could engage this committee on this one. I was thinking along the same lines as we talk about students and we talk about attendance, think what it does for those that -- in the educational community, those that teach and those that are in the classified force and some of our states, I would -- in the larger states, that would cost several billions of dollars a year just in absenteeism from the reaction. I was also in closing thinking Marleen you were talking about Israel and then we were talking about culture and that's what really makes this an interesting subject and a very difficult subject for the American public to tackle.

And with Israel, with pretty much one culture, and then this wonderful crazy quilt we call America, with all of our cultures that are present, and I do believe that culture plays a tremendous part. I was thinking about in some of our communities with the -- how the African American community might take a different view than -- and I would go clear to the other -- the Hmong community or the Native American community when we start to talk about the same subject. So, it's very complex, very important. We deeply, deeply appreciate your expertise. This has been incredibly interesting, Steve and Marleen and Lisa, thank you

so much.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN LONG: We'll take about a 10-minute break and be right back with our next panel.

(A brief recess was taken at 1:28 p.m.)

(On the record at 1:39 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay, for our final panel of the day, and this panel will speak to and we'll be asking questions about rural and urban schools because this has come up in our discussion in prior meetings and that's of course, why these experts are here.

And I would like to, starting on my left, Liz Redmon, Federal Projects Director for McNairy County Schools in Tennessee, welcome. And next to Liz is Doug Swanson, Former Federal Projects Director for Gage County Schools, Nebraska, Doug, welcome. And next to Doug is Melissa Thompson, Project Director for Garfield-Heights Public Schools in Cleveland, Ohio, Melissa, welcome. And next is, Lynn Krehbiel-Breneman, Project Director for Minneapolis Public Schools in Minnesota, is that good, okay?

If you're looking at this list, there was a different spelling but I checked to see and I got the right spelling and everything. If I remember right, Lynn, you don't have to answer this, just recently, I think the Hawk-Eyes beat the Gophers in basketball. Okay. We will start with Liz and then go to Doug, Melissa and Lynn and then as you know, because you folks were sitting in the audience, we'll have a dialogue. So thank you all for being here, and Liz.

MS. REDMON: Thank you. Distinguished members of the Advisory Committee, thank you for giving me the opportunity to give you glimpse of what a rural school system looks like, what funding streams we raised to meet the needs of our students, what prevention and intervention programs and activities we use, statistics for the programs, our academic achievement and our needs for continuing to meet the needs of our students and our community.

Let's being by looking at -- taking a demographic look. McNairy County is a rural county in southwest Tennessee with a population of 25,285. We border Mississippi. The per capita income is $19,393.00 and the median household income is $30,154.00. Our school system has 3,997 students in kindergarten through 12th grade and then we have with a 53.6 percent being economically disadvantaged. We also have 125 pre-K students all of whom are economically disadvantaged. Our ethnicity percentages are 87.05 White, 11.78 percent African American and 1.17 percent Hispanic.

As a small rural system, we braid various funding stream dollars to accomplish the federal mandates, the state mandates and the needs of our students. I know from looking at your transcripts on the web that you've already talked about in prior meetings about the state grant

portion of Safe and Drug Free Schools and also the discretionary funds. When I first began working with Safe and Drug Free Programs back in 1987, our basic grant was about 45,000.

As you can see on the PowerPoint slide, it has dropped to $20,315.00 for this year. This is the only pool of money for drug prevention and character counts for the regular school program. The 21st Century Learning Center grant is the source of funding for our after school program which serves 1300 students each year. Providing students with additional time and the assistance of certified and trained staff to actively engage students in meaningful, remedial and enrichment activities in a safe, secure environment addresses a multitude of academic, wellness, social and emotional needs. And if you remember in our prior, he said it even builds resilience.

Title VI is Rural School Money and we have received this for two years now, but we're not assured of this. When I chased it all the way back, when we didn't get it one year, I found out it was based on kind of an elusive type formula that didn't make a lot of sense but we're proud that we have it. This provides funds for technology, for training for teachers, and also a social worker to assist with our Student Assistance Program.

The Youth Violence and Drug Prevention Grant is a competitive grant and it has been used to develop student assistance program which is a combined effort of administrators, counselors, educators and parents to identify and provide assistance to students who are experiencing difficulty coping with the school and/or home environment.

And one of the things we're really proud of and I've listened to a lot of the discussion today is we are now having a lot of parents contact the school and say, "I'd like to refer my son or daughter because they are experiencing some difficulty or they've had some kind of trauma". And when you get to where the parents call the school to ask for help, you know you must be doing something right.

This is a three- year grant and it has allowed us to train staff, hire a social worker, and implement the program. And I'll explain this program a little bit more and its impact. This year in October we were awarded two Learn and Serve Grants to further meet the needs of more drug awareness and education but both of these are in our after school program. The LAB, which is the Learning Alternative Behavior grant is a state grant but if you'll notice in each of these funding streams that we braid, the funding is declining and yet we are expected to continue to meet increased teacher salaries, increased other cost and I'm wondering when that's going to kind of hit at a crossroads and we forget to -- we're not as effective as we once were.

I know it's the responsibility of the local system to absorb more and more but there's only so much you can when it's a very rural system with very limited industry or business base and a very limited tax

base. What I want you to see on the next slide are the prevention and intervention programs and activities that we've been able to implement because we took the basic state Safe and Drug Free Grant and we used it to identify needs and then to develop strategies and programs to meet the expectations and to implement those programs.

The first four are funded with Title IV Safe and Drug Free funds. As we evaluated the effectiveness of what we were doing, we realized that our efforts were not enough. Years ago someone said when you start drug prevention programs, you need to have in place some intervention programs because you will flush out programs. The search began to identify new funding streams to accomplish these needs as they arose because when we started, we started purely as prevention.

The McNairy County Drug Alliance, ours is probably one of the oldest ones in the state and it's been ongoing and meeting quarterly to address the needs. When they began working with us, they looked at what we needed and what could we do to address it, and DARE was an outgrowth of these discussions. The Selmar (phonetic)Police Department and the McNairy County Sheriff's Department sent officers to be trained to DARE. No school funds, no grant funds, they took it upon themselves. While DARE has not proved effective in a lot of places, it has in our county because these are the officers that they see in the community. These are the officers that they work with and they have built that relationship that you're talking about. In fact, one of our officers told me just recently that one of the young men that had just gone through DARE he saw him out late at night one Friday night and it was about 12:30. And now this is in 5th and 6th grade and he knew he shouldn't have been out.

He asked him, called him by name, again, the relationship, called him by name and he said, "Is this where you need to be"? The young man looked at him and said, "No, sir". And he said, "Then don't you think you'd better get where you need to be?" And in a rural area you can do that, but again, it's the relationships.

Together partnerships were forged and new directions were taken where we were going and what we needed to do. The need for an after school program came next. We have probably 80 percent of our parents work. They needed something after school. We also knew that we needed extended time for students because a lot of times, they just need more time or it needs to be presented in a different way. We were fortunate enough to be one of the last cohorts for the 21st Century Learning Center Grants from the Federal Government.

That started out at 840,000 and now we're funding at 540 through a state grant, so we try to make the best of everything we have. The LAB came about the same time because we had students that couldn't function in the regular classroom. The Student Assistance Program was implemented with a Youth Violence and Drug Prevention grant to be the early identification, referral and counseling vehicle. The first year we

trained four teens and hired one social worker who served 77 students. Evaluation showed us that one social worker for eight schools was not enough. The next year we received Title VI funds and we added another social worker.

This slide shows that together they served 160 students last year. Now, look at this; this year, August to December, again because the program is becoming more widely known, parents are now referring their children because they begin to have these problems at home. In this first semester this year, they've already served 141 students.

All of these programs have been prevention and intervention efforts to address the underlying needs of students so that with assistance they would be able to focus on the business of getting a quality education. If the kids have underlying problems, they cannot focus. The statistics on this slide show that we are making progress but we still have work to do.

This shows the discipline hearing authority and also our LAB and what we're trying to do. What is the payoff of running these various funding streams to meet our student needs? The academic achievement reported on our annual report card published by the state shows our progress. You can see the academic gains that have been made in 2005 and 2006. Our system improved in every area in grades 3 through 8 and we made our wonderful AYP, Annual Yearly Progress under No Child Left Behind.

Our percent proficient and advanced is above the state average and above the state target. Our graduation rate is 90 percent. Have we made it? No, we're still striving for the NCLB goal of 100 percent. What has helped us is being held accountable, being able to have basic ground amounts and then being able to access various funding streams to address the identified needs.

Now, in looking at this slide, you'll see that we didn't -- it just didn't happen overnight and it was a combination of the intervention, it was a combination of the after-school funds. It was a combination of everything and everybody working together. There is no silver bullet in the school business and each child is very, very different.

Now, what's still needed? In looking at our community, we know that we need more staff to follow through with what we have implemented. In my school system, I do all the federal projects; I, II, IV, V and VI. I also supervise the after school grant which serves 1300 schools, the youth violence grant, and in between work with community partners and also write grants. Being forced to wear the multiple hats in a small system is rather grueling. And over time, overall effectiveness slips. To be effective we must inspect what we expect. I've told them in our system that we are on our third year of our state funding for our 21st Century and that we've been told if we make our gains, if we do what we say we're doing and do it effectively, we will get another year of funding.

So I said, you know, people can drop in any time and the schedule is posted. And what is posted is what's supposed to be going on. And it's supposed to be effective. Well, recently we had some people come to visit from another school system and they all went into shock. We're doing it, we're okay, we're on track, we're on track.

And you see, again, you must be able to inspect what you expect and you must be held accountable and that's what it's all about. What has helped us is being held accountable but then being able to use that basic grant as a source of identifying needs and then being able to access those additional streams. Our community has also identified four areas that must be addressed. We have a new juvenile judge who is working with us and interestingly enough, on his truancy cases that come before him, he is now sentencing parents to community service in the schools and they are doing janitorial work, which is rather interesting. Not many parents want to do that so maybe they will get their kids up and get them to school.

Some of the things that he mentioned and some of the things that we want to work on in our system are first of all juvenile justice software. Any time you seek grants, you must what your basic needs are and then you must have a plan. Well, in his probation office, he has an 82-year old and 80-year old that have been working and they have not wanted to use computers. So therefore, they have passed up all the money available for juvenile justice software. So if any of you know where we might access some money for juvenile justice software to track and summarize the data, please let me know.

We must have increased parent involvement at the prevention level. You know, when you're doing prevention activities and we usually have -- we have two what we call family fun nights a year; one in the fall and one in the spring, and we have anywhere from 400 to -- well, from 100 to 400 parents that come. We feed them. We have programs that share what we're doing and we also try to listen to what they have to say.

But at this level, a lot of times it's the parents that are already supportive of the school. What we've got to have is also required parental involvement at the intervention level. When the juvenile judge met with us, he said, "Can you mandate parents be involved"? And I said, "Yes, sir, we can". We have to have parent permission in order to test, assess or work with children individually.

However, the problem is that parents can refuse service and if you'll remember on the slide we had some that it showed parents' refusal of service. We've been trying to address that, weren't quite sure how, and he said, "I'll tell you how you can do it". He said, "Give them a choice". Okay, I like choice, we can deal with that. "But we're offering them services, what else can we do?" And he said, "You can give them the choice of taking advantage of the services you're offering or if the situation doesn't improve, whether it's truancy or misbehavior, you can tell them that if it doesn't improve, that you will file a petition with the juvenile court".

He said, "But I hope you'll use a little common sense and not overrun my court". So we're going to try that. Another thing that we do not have in McNairy County, being in West Tennessee almost all treatment dollars, almost all intervention dollars as far as juvenile justice and so forth, goes to Jackson or Memphis. So we really need a juvenile detention center, some place where he can at least put these kids because by the time they come through his court, there's not a lot that they can do. Working together, we can achieve these goals but what we need is continued funding of current programs and activities, but then we need to be able to access specialized funding. So we are a big believer in the basic grant fund, grant program, but we also know that that can help to identify our needs, that can help us begin to plan certain activities and programs, but then we like being able to apply for discretionary grants and then also we need to look for some specialized funding to address the needs.

When we evaluate in each year we evaluate the programs, we have advisory council meetings. One of the things that we're very careful to do is to not include just parents and just community people who believe in what we're doing but to also include those parents who are nay sayers, those ones that probably have given us the most grief, because by including them, we show them that their opinions are important to us and believe it or not, some of the best ideas have come from them because find out that maybe they haven't had good school experiences.

They don't feel welcome and we've been able to address some of the very issues that have kept parents from participating in what we do. Overall, our goal is truly no child left behind and we can do this if we realize that all bad behavior is not the same. It's caused for different reasons and until we find out what's going on, we cannot address the needs of that child. Our system wide slogan is building the future one child at a time and as long as we truly take that to heart and we look at the needs of one child at a time in order to build the future one child at a time, we will be able to be successful.

This is my information. If you have any questions or want to know about any of the other programs, I'll be glad during the question time to answer that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much, Elizabeth. And next, we'll turn to Doug. Doug.

MR. SWANSON: Thank you very much. I appreciate the invitation to participate today. I anticipate that many of you have worked with rural settings, directly or indirectly in your careers and that some of you may have not. So what I'm going to do is give you a little bit of a tour of what rural Nebraska and rural states like Nebraska are like. I'm going to give you some of the views from rural America, talk about some of the general issues. I'm not going to talk just specifically about what's on in our grant programs, but I'm going to talk about some of the general issues going on with rural schools and communities, some of the school safety concerns

in rural communities, some of the alcohol and drug issues and then talk a little bit about what's working and what could be done better. I will try to do that in the 20 minutes allotted and first I just wanted to explain, I am currently from the University of Nebraska, Lincoln Extension Program, Land-Grant University. I work with the 4H Youth Development Program, so I have contacts in all 93 mostly rural counties in our big state. Our state takes eight hours to drive across one way and four hours the other way.

I know there's bigger states than ours but it is a large state. And so I tried to take the perspective of many parts of our state, not just Gage County. I used to be in a role similar to yours working with five local public school districts, four of the very rural in Gage County, Nebraska and that's how I got invited here because we've worked with several federal grant programs.

So now, it's time for a little break. Why don't you jump in my van with me and we're going to go to Adams. Adams, Nebraska sits about 30 miles south of Lincoln. Lincoln has about 225,000 so the residents of Adams have a lot more access to things that a population center has than many rural towns do. However, it's still 30 miles away. Adams, as you can see, is small town. Let me pull my slides out here so I can see what you're seeing.

I want to -- the first place we should probably go is to the city hall. And this isn't 40 years ago. These pictures were taken Saturday. As you can see, the city hall might have limited hours so the best way to reach them is just call them. Every good town has a library. This is the library. It's been one of our partners in many of our programs in the county. It's a little difficult to access partners sometimes because they have no phone line, they have no computer access. A 75-year old volunteer who staffs this from 1:30 to 4:30 two days a week, has a phone at home but no answering machine. So my project assistant has actually driven the 30 miles to Adams to set up programs with her on the hours that she knows she's available. And if you're going to be doing school projects and you need a library, it's a nice little library but as you can see, it's limited hours, you have to plan ahead.

As we go through Adams, this is Main Street, the business district. Here's the primary businesses. There's a bank, that's the big building. We've got the little grocery store in the middle and a restaurant on the right. That's pretty much the businesses. They're pretty lucky. There's a lot of towns this size that don't have those three things.

As you can see in the background, we're in the middle of farming country and this is the staple of the community, one of the reasons the community exists is the grain elevator. It is actually, this town is building a new multi-million dollars ethanol development facility. And there's one other staple that every little town needs is the funeral home. And then there's the school. It's one building, K through 12. They are actually expanding and building onto the building because like I said,

they're only 30 miles outside of Lincoln and they're starting to get acreages that people live south of Lincoln and they're starting to grow a little bit.

So this town has lots of aspirations but on our way out of town I just want you to see, little towns have lots of aspirations. They're trying to raise $250,000.00 for their community center but you can see they're thermometer is stuck at the bottom as far as raising funds for their new community center and that their signs is tentative that they'll do this if we can. So now we're back to the meeting.

I just wanted to set some context to what rural Nebraska is like. Hope you enjoyed your tour. Tips are welcome. Adams has 489 people. As I was explaining to you, the size of Nebraska, as you can see almost 500 of Nebraska's 600 towns are less than 1,000 people. I live in Beatrice which is about 30 miles south of Adams. We have 13,000 people and we're a major population area. We're the 11th largest city in Nebraska. We have the big new Walmart. We -- people come for groceries from miles around in the northern Kansas, everything. We're the place to be. Nebraska has 1.7 million people and then I didn't put a map of this up but I also talked to the panhandle a lot preparing for this on Friday. The panhandle is a lot more remote because these small towns don't have Lincoln 30 miles away from them.

There are 11 counties in the panhandle of Nebraska, if you've ever seen that portion and there are 90,000 people in those 11 counties. They have a lot of challenges and I've included their challenges in my presentation today.

Just to give you a brief picture of the school systems in Nebraska. Adams actually falls in the I believe, the 20 -- I think they're just moving up into the 42 to 79 per class. And this is not just elementary centers, this is K through 12 average of class sizes in Nebraska school systems. One of the reasons there has been some legislation in Nebraska of eliminating the districts that aren't K-12 and one of the real issues is geography because as I explained these small towns aren't close to larger places and so this is the school sizes. And we can talk about these numbers during discussion but I just wanted to give you a picture for number of kids per like 8th grade or 10th grade or whatever.

I've already mentioned this but, depending upon where you're located, a town from 2500 to 20,000 is considered a major business center. I'm not just talking about Nebraska. I'm talking about Wyoming and North Dakota and South Dakota and some of the places you guys come from. This isn't news to you. Many times schools is the only facility available for public gatherings, so that just draws dynamics to how the school is involved in the community.

And unlike some of the things we heard in the last panel where we saw that map of number of unsolved murders, in these communities, yeah, things happen but not very often and so there's a safe feeling. There's a lack of acknowledgment of problems. It's -- the schools -

- when something happens, they've been trained but they're not used to it. They're a little softer. They're not as hardened on some of these things.

So now I just want to move onto the general rural issues that I gathered and one of the problems is that there's a lack of knowledge of services. We found in gathering a directory of services in Gage County which has about 20,000 people, that we have over 140 services that either exist or reach out in or outside of the county, reach out to our citizens but people don't know what they do. They don't know that they exist. They don't know -- just because it's named this an agency in rural America might do 10 things and you don't know because they have this name that they also do the thing that relates to your problem.

There's a huge stigma about receiving help, especially in the mental health area but in other areas as well. The feeling is they want to stay underground. They want to go to another community for help, even if it means driving three hours because they figure nobody else needs help. They figure that they're the only ones, but in all reality, in the small town everybody knows they need help. And many of them want them to get help and most of them would help them in any way they can but it doesn't eliminate -- even though they're caring and understanding and want them to get help, it doesn't eliminate the big problem and that is everybody knows everybody and even though they're helping and caring, they're still going to talk about it. They're going to talk about their problem, their problem is going to be public knowledge and that's what people are afraid of.

So as we move on down that slide, many times, even though you would think this wouldn't be the case, we're finding the schools isolate themselves from the rest of the community. They kind of have the same issue, "We don't want to open our doors and let them know what our problems are." But really these issues related to mental health and alcohol and safety, they're community issues, not school issues. It's just schools are where we can get to the kids sometimes.

One of the things and this was really like some things I heard in the last panel, is that support for teachers are necessary. Some of the traumas we were talking about earlier this afternoon were based on one-time really awful experiences but you were also talking about cumulative things. And we have, for example, one of our small rural schools is kind of becoming a drug culture, lots of family structure falling apart, lots of poverty, no transportation and they're not dealing with one trauma event that happened but these kids are dealing with multiple trauma events, and the teachers, we set up a teachers' support group from our therapist and they were knocking down the doors to come in. We need to provide mental health support even when there's not an obvious trauma for our teachers.

Let's see. One of the things that I don't want to skip over is the reality of getting training for staff when you want to train them in working with trauma, train them in crisis teams, train them in new curriculum, train them in whatever. In many parts of our states people who

can teach, are teaching. There are no substitutes available. So therefore, you can't pull a team of teachers out to train them because there's nobody to sub for them.

Our state is working on some initiatives to improve that situation but this was particularly evident in the panhandle. They just told me, "We can't pull teachers out to train them because there would be nobody with the kids". Therapists are overloaded. There are therapists around. It takes -- and this is probably the same in the urban area, though. You refer them, it will take at least three weeks to get an appointment. I don't think that's probably a lot different. Because of all the issues the schools are dealing with, there sometimes is a lack of a focus on education in the schools because there's so much other stuff they have to deal with. And we know that's important because if the kid is not ready to learn, they can't learn anyway so you have to undo or create an atmosphere where the kids are ready to learn but they're dealing with so many things other than education. Communications is a challenge especially out in the western half of our state. A lot of people have internet but dial-up and there's other kinds of issues related to communications as well.

The untreated generational problems, I wanted to mention, I had a therapist -- and maybe this is a description you've heard before, but we put some therapists in the schools and they were doing mental health for the kids with parental involvement and that's certainly the way to go. It helps break down the stigma. It helps with transportation issues which we have. It helps with lots of different things but one of the problems the therapists were finding is they described it to me as an onion.

They said, "When we started to unpeel the layer with the kid, we found out it really had to do -- the layer was -- under the layer was another layer of the onion which was parent's problems, which we talked about before. And you just kept on peeling and it was generational because there hasn't been mental health services available in these towns, they haven't been able or willing to drive to Lincoln. They have things that are effecting them that are way deeper and you just keep unpeeling and unpeeling and -- am I a slide off? Thank you. I've gone too far? Is somebody else doing that? Back up one more, one more. It's hard when you can't see it, so I appreciate that.

Okay, just see if there's anything else left on that slide. I think I got about five minutes left. Support for teachers is important. Lack of education. Okay. So the schools are left to deal with lots and lots of problems. So the important part is community partners but part of the challenge we have there is we have the same people doing everything. They're at every meeting, they're at every event. They're at everything because -- not because we don't have enough partners. It's just that not everybody is involved. We're not engaging the business community. We're not engaging the faith community. We're not engaging all the people that need to be engaged and through our grant's involvement we've done a really

good job of we actually tore apart three groups that call themselves coalitions and merged them into one coalition. And that took a lot of work but it really made a difference and I think Michael can share some of the impact that we've had in doing that. That's one of the things that we've been really successful in.

One of the other issues in the rural communities is because of lack of funding, lack of staff, lack of whatever, they tend to create their own programs instead of using the evidence-based programs like Step 1 or hundred of other things. And I think they may be missing out on some opportunities by not buying into the evidence based programs. And there's lots of reasons for that.

I'll move quickly through some of the next slides but bullying, physical and mental intimidation between kids is an issue that we have. One of the problems in creating crisis teams and other kinds of -- we have skip teams, we have student assistant teams, is it seems that the person who gets chosen for those teams is the new person, the new staff member, because they don't have enough on their plate yet or they don't have as much on their plate yet, but the right person with the right personality, with the right knowledge, with the right experience isn't on the team. So that's a problem.

We certainly have the never happen here syndrome. We're not hardened by daily violence in the area. The ability to comply to some things because of the size of staff is an issue. I mean, I think we're doing a good job of complying but it is an issue. And one of the things that is really happening in partnerships with our law enforcement is law enforcement turnover in small communities is high because it's low pay, it's entry level positions. They have no connections to the community so they move on. And one of the things that we did in our grant was instead of training a team of officers, we took a couple of higher level officers that we knew weren't going anywhere and we trained them to be trainers and now they are training -- this particular training was how to deal with an active shooter in the school. And now those two officers are training everybody as they come and go, and it's much better to do it that way than to continually lose people that went to this major big time training.

I already moved on -- there's a button down here I didn't know and that's what's doing it. I'll get my finger off of that.

Our police chief used to work in Omaha, which is with suburbs three-quarters of a million people, most of our 1.7 million. Now he's the police chief in this town of 13,000 and he says -- although everybody says this, he sees a huge difference in the that's the way it's done here when it comes to alcohol and drugs. He says parents condone it a lot more in rural than in city. He says there three groups of people. There's a group of people who, like us, they're really against alcohol use among young people and then there's the group that don't care at all, and then they are the most danger group are the ones that give it lip service but go buy it

anyway. And that's the largest group in his opinion.

The bar is the only community gathering spot in many towns like Adams, so kids from day one see alcohol being an important part of every activity in the community. Family structure is dropping. Drug culture is moving to the community. We've got rental houses that have meth residue and hotel rooms with meth residue. We've got meth labs being made in backyard. We've got all those issues and just the issue of, "I partied, I made it, so will my kid", and I don't think that's unique to rural.

What's working, and I'll try to wrap up here real quickly, is the awareness and ownership of issues is increased through coalition activity through doing things that are data driven, taking surveys and finding out what's really happening, that's something we're getting much better at in Nebraska. The grants that are available, all of the ones are really making a difference in communities and the fact that most of them are now requiring coalitions to give to funding is outstanding. You're creating relationships that weren't being willing to be created before and it's important.

The trend to putting mental health support in schools is important. Schools are starting to do a little bit of that on their own, even if they don't get a grant. Putting social workers in school helps teachers to have time to teach and it helps with the stigma of the mental health issue.

Other things, the connections being made, coalitions, safety plans, crisis teams, they wouldn't happen without the money and the encouragement to do that. Meth laws seem to be helping a lot and that's where the changes of not being available to buy the things that you make meth labs with. Data collection is huge and we have an abundance of caring, dedicated people who continue to challenge themselves and get better.

Lastly, some of the challenges and it's not to say that people don't understand the need for all the things behind No Child Left Behind but in small staffs, there's some real challenges and it adds stresses in all the requirements for the testings and standards and the other types of things. People aren't against it, they just -- it just adds one more thing.

One of the problems we had is that grants come, they approve solutions and then school boards and communities don't get behind continuing and sustaining the efforts and the last thing is we have schools who turn down opportunities because of the fear of looking bad if other people get into their system. Sustainability is important. Community issues, community owning the issues, not blaming it on the school is important, having youth leadership, that's one area we've got to get better at, getting youth involved in these processes.

I did include a handout that I won't spend time on now but I would encourage you to look at it. I will just briefly explain that the handout is statistics of the four most rural schools in Gage County related to risk behavior compared to the statistics statewide in Nebraska including the

urban and you will see that we're a lot higher on things like drinking and driving, carrying a gun, reporting poor family management and number one, is we are huge compared to the larger towns on our kids believe their parents' attitudes favor drug and alcohol use.

These are interesting numbers. They're relative to other small communities and we'll be glad to talk about them in discussion. Time goes fast. I appreciate your attention.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you so much, Doug. And next we'll turn to Melissa, Melissa Thompson.

MS. THOMPSON: Good afternoon. I'm going to actually step up for a moment and give you some additional materials that I've prepared for you today. I do have more if you run out. I'm not exactly sure which number it is in your binder; however, I have prepared an outline for you to follow along with my remarks this afternoon. There is no PowerPoint but rather the materials in front of you and the outline.

Good afternoon to you again, invited guests and federal project officers that are in the room. On behalf of the Garfield Heights City Schools, Board of Education, Dr. Jeanne Sternad, Superintendent of Schools and the phenomenal staff of the Center for Learning Support Services, I am proud to lead. It is an honor and privilege to participate in this panel to consider the unique needs of rural and urban schools and to discuss what can be done to better meet those needs.

I am also pleased to join my fellow panelists, Liz, Doug and Lynne, who I've enjoyed meeting and getting to know today and when the Fiesta Bowl results were not favorable for this Ohio State University graduate, I am honored still to represent the great State of Ohio and I am still proud to be a Buckeye.

One of 13 first ring school districts in Cuyahoga County, there are unique challenges confronting Garfield Heights City Schools. First ring, also known as inner ring, are communities in Cuyahoga County that border Cleveland and are marked by significant student mobility, racial and economic diversity and cultures of violence. To illustrate these challenges, please consider the following. In December 2006 enrollment in Garfield Heights City Schools was 4,108 students.

New enrollment data beginning in July 2006 through December Garfield Heights City Schools enrolled 782 students, withdrew 477 students and changed the address of 149 students within the District. The great majority of new students enrolled in Garfield Heights City Schools move in from Cleveland or from other first ring or inner ring communities. In 2002/2003 school year, when we first submitted our Safe Schools/Healthy Students Federal Grant Application, the racial demographics in Garfield Heights City Schools was the following; 78 percent Caucasian, 16.9 percent African American, 2.5 percent multi-racial, 1.4 percent Asian, 1.1 percent Hispanic and .1 percent American Indian.

As of December 2006, our students are; 57.9 percent

Caucasian, 34.8 percent African American, 3.9 percent multi-racial, 1.9 percent Asian, 1.5 percent Hispanic and 2 students are American Indian. According to 2000 census, of the near 80,000 students in the 13 first ring school districts in Cuyahoga County, 17 percent are living in poverty. The 2005/2006 state report card for Garfield Heights City Schools indicated that 38.1 percent of our students were considered economically disadvantaged. This was based on enrollment of over 3800 students.

Our current enrollment has grown to over 4,000 students, most of whom are economically disadvantaged. It is reasonable to assume that this percentage has increased. The culture and violent and increased awareness of internal and external threats are experienced in Garfield Heights City Schools like many other school districts around the country. We are noticing an increase in aggressive behaviors and a decrease in proud in solving skills among our students. Mental health and substance abuse prevention and intervention are part of our daily routine. Social skills groups, anger management classes and a district-wide theme of character education has become the way Garfield Heights City Schools does education. At a survey conducted in December of 2006, parents indicated their top priority is keeping our schools safe and our students healthy. This was more important to them than curriculum and instruction. So what has been done in the Garfield Heights City Schools to meet the unique needs of our students? The Garfield Heights City Schools, as part of the Garfield Heights Learning Community, demonstrates basic values that meet the needs of the heart with clear academic goals applying to all children in appropriate facilities and where all community members work together.

Meeting the needs of the heart to make conditions right for learning is our message. The Center for Learning Support Services is the central office department largely responsible for the programs and services in the district and community that promote safe schools and healthy students and families. There are four primary programs and initiatives within the Center for Learning Support Services. They are, Safe Schools/Healthy Students, the Garfield Heights Youth, Family and Teen Services Program, affectionately known as GYFTS, the Alternative Juvenile Program, and the Garfield Heights Family to Family System of Care. A brief fact sheet and more detailed brochure are included is the folder that I provided.

In 2003 we were fortunate to be the recipient of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Grant. Now in our fourth year no cost extension period, we are completing the activities that never would have been possible without this funding. As a result of this grant, we became aware of safety concerns in and around our district and more importantly, we were able to respond. There are electronic security doors at each of our five school buildings. There are large letters above each exterior door on every school building.

District staff now display photo identification cards and upon entering a school building in Garfield Heights City Schools visitors now receive a red visitor identification badge. Safety plans are in place district-wide and electronic floor plans will soon be filed with the Garfield Heights Fire and Police Departments. Safe Schools/Healthy Students funding strengthen our collaboration with these local responders and the emergency response and crisis management grant awarded in October of 2006 will continue our work together.

This school year, with our emergency responders, we will participate in tabletop exercises, functional drills and work on a comprehensive pandemic plan and I also want to note that our non-publics, based on discussion this morning, are involved in that process and are included in our planning efforts. Of the 12 staff within the Center for Learning Support Services, four are paid exclusively from Safe School/Healthy Students. They are directly responsible for keeping our students safe and healthy.

Included in the GYFTS program are the social workers providing the group counseling, violence prevention and character education programming to our students in grades pre-K to 12. They also make the mental health and substance abuse treatment referrals for students requiring this level of intervention. The staff member coordinating the alternative juvenile program interrupts the violence in the school district and community by providing services directly to those students committing misdemeanor or status offenses, including assaults and drug abuse.

The Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court provides partial funding to support this program. Together these four grant paid staff members, the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Grant paid staff members, are responsible for the 255 referrals made to community based mental health and chemical dependent treatment agencies receiving Safe Schools/Healthy Students funding.

Finally, the Garfield Heights Family to Family System of Care became part of the Center for Learning Support Services to work with children, teens, birth parents, relative and kinship care givers, grandparents, foster families and adoptive families actively involved or at risk of involvement with the Cuyahoga County Department of Children and Family Services. In this program, we provide clothing and food, referrals for counseling, and resources to secure housing including the payment of security deposits and utilities.

Funding for this program is provided by the Cuyahoga County Board of Commissioners. In addition to these programs, there's a host of partnerships and projects managed through the Center for Learning Support Services. As a central office administrator in the Garfield Heights City Schools and Director of the Center for Learning Support Services, and I'll add Project Director for the Emergency Response Crisis Management Grant, and Project Director for the Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant, I

believe we are traveling along a positive path to keep our schools safe and our students healthy. However, we are at a crossroads in our journey and it raises the question, what can be done to better meet the needs of our students? While our commitment to meet the needs of the heart to make conditions right for learning began over 14 years ago when Dr. Sternad, our Superintendent, wrote and submitted the first grant to local foundations to begin the work in our learning community, it has been grant funding and Title IV, Safe and Drug Free Schools funding that has allowed us to truly realize our vision. Based on the work in Garfield Heights City Schools, funding from the US Department of Education to prevent youth drug use and violence and focus on emergency response and crisis planning, has been integral to our success.

In Garfield Heights City Schools our crossroad is the challenge of knowing that the road leading to these programs and services not only meet the needs of the heart to make conditions right for learning but also keep our schools safe and our students healthy. The other road is that of school funding in a state where levies are difficult to pass particularly in first ring communities experiencing increased rates of student mobility and poverty. And Garfield Heights City Schools Safe Schools/Healthy Students funding will soon end and Emergency Response and Crisis Management Funding is not for personnel.

Title IV funding supports our safe school help line and allows the purchase of prevention materials and direct services for students; however, these funds are also limited. Search Institute research has found that the 40 developmental assets are powerful influences on adolescent behavior, both protecting young people from many different problem behaviors and promoting positive attitudes and behaviors.

The staff of the Center for Learning Support Services reflects and reinforces these assets and more importantly, it creates a caring school climate to develop these assets in our students. Before I close, please allow me to share a brief story about Jay.

I began my career in Garfield Heights City Schools as a case manager in the GYFTS program and my office was located in our middle school. Jay, at the time, a sixth grade student, was my first referral. His risk factors were high and his perceptive factors low but for me Jay was not a risk, he was at promise. His journey was difficult and sometimes plagued by destructive behaviors, including substance abuse.

Slowly but surely and at times very slowly he persevered. With his parent's support, he willing became the poster child for turning risk factors into protective factors. He traveled around the State of Ohio with me sharing his story with school and community leaders in many venues. He won the hearts of many due to his honest feedback and at times harsh judgments of the self-righteous attempts of educators and youth serving professionals to help youth. I was so proud and I have to share, I was so proud to take this picture with Jay at is graduation last year in June. I'll

make sure that you'll get an opportunity to see closer.

Last week Jay, now a sergeant in the United States Army, called to let me know he was home from Iraq. On Friday, I took him to lunch and he shared his many accomplishments and of course, in Jay style, shared his opinions on education, politics and life at 20 years of age. I told him how proud I am of him. When I mentioned to him my visit with you today, he said, "I'm proud of you, too, Ms. Thompson." So with Jay in mind, again, I ask, what can be done to better meet the needs of our students? Continue to support school districts like the Garfield Heights City Schools in achieving the mission of meeting the needs of the heart to make conditions right for learning where schools are safe and students are healthy and at risk students are at promise. Thank you for your time and attention. I appreciate this. I appreciate the opportunity. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Melissa, we're all proud of that you do, too. Lynne, you're next.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Good afternoon, Deputy Secretary Price, Chair Long, committee members, Ms. Davis and my fellow panelists. It's very nice to be with you today. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the conversation and I hope that all our remarks today are helpful to you as together we are trying to figure out ways to help rear strong, healthy, good decision making, resilient students.

I just have to say there are Ohioans everywhere. I am transplanted to Minnesota and this afternoon we're going to talk about Minneapolis, Minnesota but you just need to know, we're everywhere.

In my remarks this afternoon I would like to do a couple of things. First of all, I would like to highlight for you three general areas of need from the perspective of an urban district, that of Minneapolis, Minnesota. And I'm speaking from my experience and also from my past eight years in the Minneapolis public school district both in the Office of Safety and Security there and then for the last four years as a project director for Safe Schools/Healthy Students with the able assistance and I want to publicly acknowledge my Federal Project Officer who is with us today, Ms. Jane Hodgdon Young and ably supported by Mr. Michael Wells. So it's nice to see you both and I can't say enough to you as a panel about the wonderful support we have received from these colleagues. They are very dear to us.

The second thing I will do in my remarks today in addition to highlighting three areas of need is that I will share with you some examples of how those needs manifest themselves, so that you have a sense about what we're talking about in an urban perspective. I'll offer a few thoughts of how things should be and complete my remarks with some suggestions to you about how you and we can work together and some ways in which you could be of some ongoing help in urban situations. So that's my focus for today.

First a bit of context, Minneapolis Public Schools is an

urban district. You have two slides that show some of the important features of Minneapolis Public Schools. There are a couple of additional shadings that I would like to add to the information that you see on the slides. In addition to the information on the slides, Minneapolis Public Schools has 90, 9-0 languages spoken. We have about a 30 percent mobility rate. We have many young people who are homeless or highly mobile, who spend several nights in shelters until they have to move to another shelter. Sometimes those shelters are in the area of their neighborhood schools, sometimes they are clear across town.

We also, like many schools, are losing some students to private and charter schools and in the State of Minnesota it's particularly easy to organize a charter school. I think it's helpful for us as urban districts to look at the learnings we can learn from the private schools and from the charter schools but from an urban standpoint, we also have seen a decrease in student census because of the private and urban, I'm sorry, charter schools.

My hunch is that as I share with you some of our issues this afternoon that you will find them similar to some of the points my colleagues have raised but I would like to submit to you today that what is unique about the perspective from an urban district is the shear difference in size, scope and scale of the situations about which we're going to speak. I would like to anchor our remarks today in a quote that we have used as the hallmark of our Safe Schools/Healthy Students work and it has helped keep us on track as we have gone down the road of many changed in the Minneapolis Public Schools. A bit of wisdom from our elder, "Let us put our minds together to see what lives we can make for our children". That has helped us stay on track.

Three needs from the urban perspective that I'd like to share with you today and I will highlight them and then speak in a little more depth about them. First of all, the need for strong, articulate, stable, focused leadership at all organization levels. Secondly, a broad definition of learning that derives from the needs of children and young people and the third need is a need for cooperative, honest, data based conversations into shared planning and decision making among school districts, city and county entities, community organizations and families. Let's take a look at each of those.

Strong, articulate, stable, focused leadership at all organization levels; we are in the fourth year of Safe Schools/Healthy Students. It's a discrete period of time which we can stand back and look at. In that time, Minneapolis Public Schools has had four superintendents, two of whom, including the current one, have been interim. Four directors of curriculum and instruction, five principal investigators, five finance clerks, and 21 personnel changes that have only to do with Safe Schools/Health Students. I'm not speaking about the district as a whole, I'm speaking about one set of discrete programs. Additionally, we have had one

county reorganization in the area of children's mental health and wellness and we have had three police chiefs in four years. Therefore, I need to share with you and stress, we need to do what we can to encourage strong leadership at all areas of an organization.

What should that look like? The slides suggests, this has played itself out this lack of leadership in the fact that it has taken two plus years to get a social skills curriculum into the district. It has taken two and one half years to work out the process by which the police alcohol and drug use citations have a channel for getting into where people can help the young people. And I do not say any of this in faulting, I think you know that, but I do say it in terms of the realities in which we are trying our best to serve kids and you have helped us through your support and we still have much work to be done and so that, of course, is my goal in sharing some of the examples from our district.

The second need about which I want to speak is the broad definition of learning. We need to acknowledge that learning goes beyond basic academic areas and beyond tests. These are critically important but we need to think about services that derive from students' needs and we need to start with a need-based approach and our friends on the trauma panel made those points, Marleen particularly over and over again, just incorporate some of her thought because it's certainly true in our urban experience.

Why is this important? Again, let me share from some of our experiences. We have been able to increase in Minneapolis and in Hennepin County the number of early childhood screenings at age 3. That's great and now we don't have enough appropriate placements. We have been able to, because of the screening, have some placements and with some state help, we are aware of more in-home and relative health care but we can't get those folks trained around the best practices in early childhood education. So we have not yet managed to bring together all of the players in this large area who need to work together, obviously systemically.

So if you have more kids screened, that's great but then I would argue that it's unethical to screen and not have resources to help the very kids whom you have -- whom we have screened. Similarly, we have young people who need drug and alcohol support. We do that screening but, again, we have services that are not sufficient or in an area with 90 languages and all the cultures and ethnic groups that we have, we have services that are not culturally appropriate.

Through Safe Schools/Healthy Students, we have been able to make some connections. We've been able to help some agencies get connected with us so we're definitely on the right path. But again, I highlight this as a need in an urban setting. We have experimented with mental health services in the schools. We have increased them and we have been able to increase the cultural responsiveness of services. We've had wonderful partnerships by which we brought in community organizations

to work with out students and these are community organizations that are focused on various ethnic groups, culture groups. So we've been able to get the beginnings of responsive, culturally responsive drug and alcohol support. We need much more training. We know that and we're trying to figure out how to build that into our sustainability plan. Again, I highlight that to you so that you are aware of where we are seeing needs and together we can think about those. We are exploring some funding models also, so I'm hopeful that we, in executing our responsibility under the grant, will be able to come back to you and in another six to 12 months and say, "We have a funding formula that we think will help lots of districts", and so I think that's incumbent upon us as part of our responsibility.

Our teacher very much need cultural competence training. One of my colleagues tells the story and describes himself as having been working in schools. He says, "First, I spend 15 or 20 minutes with a young man who is Hmong and I talk with him about whatever it is that's on his mind." And he said, "And then I turn around and I face a boy soldier from Africa", and none of us has yet the cultural competence to handle, address, assess, the needs of our kids and we owe that, and again, we're working on that. We have begun looking at teaching teachers what signs to look for in mental wellness and we've also piloted teaching our teachers about the concepts of mental wellness in other cultures because not everyone would describe mental wellness in the ways in which we do and we want to be -- we want to honor that and be effective with students in all the cultures. So that gives you some ideas there.

A broad focus on learning that comes from student needs also has to include human resources alignment. Let me just remind you that in our district we have high staff mobility so that we have had a team of consultants working with schools in leadership teams helping them know how to put into place school-wide behavior systems and the year after many of those team members are in another school because of bidding, because of a seniority system, which is not helpful many times to our students.

In many cases our least experienced teachers have ended up teaching our students with the greatest learning needs. Now, this is not the first time you've heard that, I know but I want to just give you some of the scoop from Minneapolis. HR concerns and HR aligned against student needs is critical and we need to figure out how to get there quickly.

Seniority has cost us many teachers of color who have come out of school and are younger in their experience levels and they're gone with every round of cuts. And because of some of seniority rules, we cannot always get the best folks in the best positions. That's important, so you need to know that these are, again, issues with which we struggle.

And finally, the third need that we have as an urban district is some honest dialogue about what's going on in our district. We need to talk about the isolation of students of ethnic groups, of gay, lesbian, bisexual and trans-gender students, of racism, the lines between that and

crime and violence. Just yesterday our interim superintendent, Dr. William Green was interviewed by Minnesota Public Radio and he reminded us all that when you think the way to be safe on the street is to posture how tough you are, or the way to be safe in school is to be a smart aleck or be tough, or when you're really afraid that you might be hurt after school because the latest rumor on the street about who's doing what to whom and we do have gang violence in Minneapolis, your thought is not on learning.

We need to figure out ways to come together as agencies to address this. We need to look at homelessness which as you all know, often leads to substance abuse and co-occurring mental health and chemical health issues. We need to look at a group of institutions and people at the racially and ethnically divided City of Minneapolis, again with the sense of isolation. We get into the "My kid, not your kid", the decisiveness, the lack of cooperation. We have many ethnic communities. We struggle with the best ways to educate all folks and we need to get the conversation on the table with all of the agencies, with the citizens with our parents.

We need to talk about the relationship of the district with community organizations because schools can't do it all. We have not done well at reaching out in the past. We need to have these conversations about who can do what, who brings what to the table but the center of this has to be driven by student need and by honest dialogue.

The struggles and barriers that I've presented on this slide many of those we have talked on. I have offered them to you as reminders and as illustration of the struggles and barriers particularly with working with the community. It took us four years to get a community partners manual together that would insure children safety and adult safety. Communications in a large urban district is a very difficult matter. It's the old, you don't turn the Queen Mary around on a dime in terms of accommodating change. We need some models for accomplishing change in huge systems.

We have, again, tried and been successful in small pieces. We intend to keep it on. We're working sustainability plans with Safe Schools/Health Students and with our newly received ERCM grant and so finally, I would just offer to you some ways in which I think you can be of help in urban districts. Just as Safe Schools/Healthy Students requires the cooperation and the sign-on of agencies in order to get the grant, I would urge you as a committee to carry that through in all of your grant approaches or in all of your work, and that would be beyond the initial application. That would be in terms of field visits and ongoing monitoring. That's been great for us. It's often been the impetus to get people together, to get institutions together across institutional boundaries, across political boundaries, across personality boundaries.

We intend to go forward with professional competency development around cultural competence, chemical and mental health awareness, anti-racism, work. I would suggest to you that that is an area

where you could join us and other urban districts in putting wisdom, in perhaps putting dollars but in being explicit that these are some of the hard issues that we have to talk about now.

I would suggest that for districts who are thinking about implementing a systems-wide learning and behavior supports, that you again, strongly urge this, that you begin to talk more about the best practices for district-wide approaches. We need to think about that in our district with our 30 percent mobility. We now have the staff in place to do that. I would suggest that that is key to success in any district and urge you to offer that message.

I would love it if you could help fund some work to explore the most effective staffing systems for learners. I will cheer, you will cheer, we will do it together but I would love that to be done. We could certainly use the help, we could certainly use the wisdom and I would like you to help us and we, as I've said earlier, will be glad to help you in terms of finding approaches and formulas that make mental and chemical wellness support to students economically viable because that takes the work of a lot of people and a lot of minds.

So I hope that this has shared with you a perspective from urban life. I'm thrilled with the work that we've been able to do. We have so much more and I thank you for your help, would love you to stay involved with us and we with you as you think about some of these topics and put the tough ones on the table for the sake of the future lives of our kids. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much, Lynne. As we now move into that next phase and I think one of you characterized it best when you said the conversation, so if we could have that conversation. And before Russell asks the first question, if it's any solace to you, if I recall Ohio State did win in basketball the other night, so that -- Russ.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: This is a losing proposition, don't you think?

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: Thanks so much, panel, for the many excellent points that were made and also gestures or places of success that you met. But Lynne, since you went last, the recency effect, but I'm just wondering, you were talking about the high turnover rate and I'm just wondering if you can give us a sense of why that is or why that was and to what extent the Department could assist with that.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Many causes, I think, Russell. One is lack of affordable housing. That manifests itself in mortgages paid and lost. It also is the rent cycle of you can afford a place for a month or two and then you can't afford it and so you move elsewhere or move with a relative, that's another reason. A third reason, economic conditions, some new job growth in Minnesota, in Minneapolis, some not so. Sometimes family or spousal abuse and so leaving home for the safety

of spouses and children and therefore, the shelter existence. Those are the responses that come most to mind in response to your question.

MR. JONES: Have there been mechanisms set in place to address those issues or --

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Yes. We have a department now of Learning Supports that focuses under McKinney-Vento on homeless and highly mobile students. This year we were able to pull off a stronger collaboration with the city and the county so that we didn't have just school workers going out and trying to help families, but we have school workers going out with friendly police people, and I'm saying it that way because these are the not and talk cops they call themselves, and they are going out of a position of solicitness and not you know, "Where the heck are you", and finger pointing and that kind of thing, and we've tied them in with some of the community agents also are sending representatives out.

We have moved some of the early childhood screening that I told you about. We've moved that out into the shelters. The whole concept of the school learning to go out to where the community is and where those needs are is still a learning curve for us. We're getting there. So those are some of the things that have happened to address it.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Howell?

MR. WECHSLER: I have a couple of questions for Elizabeth. I want to follow up on your third and fourth slides. Your third slide lists a whole bunch of funding streams and then the fourth side lists a lot of really neat sounding programs. I'm wondering is there any way to really separate out which of the programs really resulted from -- specifically, from the Safe and Drug Free Schools funding that you got.

MS. REDMON: The first four on the fourth slide, the Drug Alliance, is a direct result of the Safe and Drug Free Schools and that has been in existence since 1987 to help us plan, organize and determine needs. The Character Counts also is funded with Safe and Drug Free Schools. The Aspire and Junior Team Board and Life Skills, the first four are funded with Safe and Drug Free Schools.

MR. WECHSLER: And that's with the 20 to $25,000.00?

MS. REDMON: Yes.

MR. WECHSLER: What would happen in your district if there were no -- if that source of funding was removed?

MS. REDMON: We would struggle. We would have almost no prevention dollars because the only other prevention dollars that we have come through the 21st Century and that's after school. Through the Learn and Serve we have just recently received a Meth Free Tennessee Learn and Serve Grant which is also in the after school program. If we didn't have that basic grant, we would have almost no prevention activities.

MR. WECHSLER: And what would happen if that prevention grant was doubled?

MS. REDMON: Then we would be able to expand our student assistant program. We would be able to work more with parents to get that parent involvement. You know, we could expand. We could hire a person who would be
-- if it was doubled, we could hire a person at least part time to oversee all of those prevention activities which would make them much stronger.

MR. WECHSLER: One last question, and I don't know if you ever saw that show but I want to play Deal or No Deal with you. Here's the deal. The deal is you can double that pot of money. The catch is that half the school districts in the country are not going to get any more funding from Safe and Drug Free Schools, so there's a chance that you'll get zero, but there's also a good chance you'll get double. Are you going to take the deal?

MS. REDMON: Sure.

MR. HERRMANN: Let me follow up on that one, too, and just a suggestion, Howell, Liz is very familiar with the Coordinated School Health Model. You two might want to have a conversation after this about sort of Liz's plans because I think you would be very interested in that. I don't think it necessarily applies to the work of the council, but I want to be sure and mention that.

This is -- I have a question for the rural folks first. Can you characterize for me your relationship with your local law enforcement agency?

MR. SWANSON: Our relationship with the law enforcement, the sheriffs, the local police in Beatrice, the county attorney and all that has really increased with Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant that we got in `02. They came to the table. They were to the table some before but that grant really, really helped it because they saw their role, they saw the justice, they saw the involvement of people they could relate to.

We have a really good relationship with schools, talk to them regularly. They have meetings together. We were lucky enough to have an officer in school for awhile. I don't think that's there any more but the issues of confidentiality and all of that, I just think the relationship is strong.

They're sharing information, they're working together. They're developing plans for individual kids with law enforcement in schools and other agencies all involved in the same room together and I'd say it's strong.

MS. REDMON: Ours with the law enforcement is good. With Juvenile Justice it's just now beginning and that's exactly why we did not apply for Safe Schools/Healthy Students, because we didn't have that partnership. We are seeing that with new Juvenile Judge taking place. I mean, he's talking with us. He is looking at what are the needs of the students and I can see it strengthening, and I can see it really making a difference.

MR. HERRMANN: And then the second question, really, I think is for all of you. You know, one of the things I wonder about is, is it better to provide a small amount of funding over a long period of time or a relatively really substantial amount of money over kind of a three or four-year period. And I'm wondering -- I think all of you either have ended a Safe Schools/Healthy Students Grant or approaching the end to it. What's life like after the grant? What kind of things are still going to be in place and over the long term, what kind of things will you have gotten out of it?

MR. SWANSON: Just to respond to a couple of those points, I think that there's a real need with grants to consider systemic changes rather than just hiring a bunch of personnel because we ran into the thing of hiring a bunch of mental health therapists for the schools and then being able to sustain personnel is difficult. I think -- I've worked in some other areas where similar amounts of money spread over five years might be as effective, even though it's less per year than say, large amounts for three years because you get some planning time, you maybe don't build that year one budget up as big. I think large amounts of money are still very useful like the Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant but extending it over just a little bit longer period of time and also really encouraging sustainability plans from day one and maybe not so much -- I don't know, you need some direct personnel but you really need to think about how you're going to sustain direct personnel, service delivery personnel.

MS. THOMPSON: I'd like to respond because as Doug indicated, we really were beginning with the end in mind, knowing that it was not going to be there forever, talking about Safe Schools/Healthy Students. And one of the -- I'll share that one of the challenges and I think it served us well, and I'll be very honest, for me it was a challenge truly but also being a central office administrator and part of the district's leadership and administrative team, but serving as the project director, while it truly has been two and now three full time jobs, a lot of work, but on this end of it, I would not have done it differently because while there was a lot of work, and a lot of work, because I'm part of the leadership structure and my direct supervisor, with or without the grant, is the superintendent of schools, the agenda of Safe Schools/Healthy Students emergency response crisis management has always been at the table. That is the agenda and it has become part of the way that we do business. So it's part of the infrastructure of how Garfield Heights City Schools does education.

I mention that and it's -- again, it was a lot of work but at the same time it was worthwhile because when things were being discussed it was no longer the what we do as educators and what we do in the school district, and then Safe Schools/Healthy Students, but it was part of the discussion that was so inter-woven to the point now where in the survey results that I shared, that our parents have indicated that Safe Schools/Health Students is more important than curriculum and instruction.

Now, that might be concerning but at the same time they recognized that this is so vital to the way that our district has to do business because of the challenges that we face and the things that our students are confronting, they've determined that this is necessary. Now whether they vote and allow us to raise taxes in order to keep that is another story but we did not, as Doug indicated, did not spend a lot of money with the staff because that does result in turnover. If person knows that, you know, I may not have my job after three years, then if something else comes along within a year's time being in that position, they're going to leave. So again, we really started at the beginning with our sustainability planning. What is it that we're going to have to do making sure we were communicating to the board of education and to our community, our parents and working with our business partners.

And I'll share one just from a sustainability standpoint. Ponderosa Steakhouse is working with us to provide family night, a buffet type style restaurant, you know, and that money goes to support our character education programming, so that when we no longer have Safe School/Healthy Students, that conversation began two years ago. So that way the parents that are coming to feed their children, they can see where the money is going. It goes for character ed. It goes for this particular program or initiative and it's not just going into the abyss of, you know, school funding, "What are you guys really doing with the money"? This is something concrete that all of our young people will benefit from.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Our situation primarily because of the complexities of the district and driven in part by the size, Safe Schools/Healthy Students has not been able to assume the kind of position that you have just described Melissa, but it has worked more sneakily intentionally to infiltrate the system. And as we have talked about sustainability, the four ways that we have talked about it with our folks have been if you are providing services that students need, they need to continue after this year. So hook them onto something that already exists in the district, join with an outside organization, private, public, and integrate that work with the work of the organization, expand the competence and the skills of personnel because personnel may go to a different school but they're still there after the grant is over. And fourthly but literally in fourth position is look for additional money because we don't want to construct other systems that need to keep this churn of money going. So in direct response to your question, the short term larger amounts of money has been the most helpful approach to us in getting the partnerships established and getting people's minds set from day lackadaisical there's a beginning and an ending so people don't get into that, "We've always done it", or, "We think we're going to do it", cycle and by being real clear, this has to go on for our kids. So that has allowed us to take some risks and be out on some limbs that we wouldn't have been able to with a lesser amount of money or with something that continued and therefore, people got lackadaisical.

MS. REDMON: One of the things, too, is that we know that any kind of sustainable change takes three to five years. So by putting those restrictions in place, those expectations of forming coalitions, bringing people to the table to work together and then -- and it takes money to train people to get things going. So really what works well is that larger amount of money at the beginning and then possibly even stepping down where you gradually withdraw as opposed to just being a large amount for say three years and then it's gone.

MR. SWANSON: I just wanted to real briefly respond to your last direct question that said what's life like after Safe Schools. It's really good actually, because I saw Safe Schools as a launching pad. We have been done with it for awhile. We were `02 funded but the things for the next 10 years that are going to happen related to safety, school environment and drug and alcohol are because of safe schools. There's a launching pad.

MR. ELLIS: That's probably a good segue into my question. The data that you provided in the presentation talks refers to the Gage County risk and protective factor survey data both for Nebraska statewide and the percent in Gage County. Is Gage County a recipient of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Programs?

MR. SWANSON: Safe and Drug Free Schools, yes. I -- I mean, yes, they are.

MR. ELLIS: I'm not trying to give you a hard time but just looking at the data, you know, in your slides you make the reference that the programs are working and yet, 45 percent of the 10th graders have used alcohol in the last 30 days, 20 percent have been smoking cigarettes, 11 percent prescription drugs, 27 percent binge drinking, 40 percent drinking and driving, 10th graders, 37 percent believe the laws favor drug use, 62 percent believe their parents favor drug use. Fifty-three percent of the kids have a low commitment to school.

MR. SWANSON: Absolutely, let me respond to that.

MR. ELLIS: Okay, I'm wondering what's --

MR. SWANSON: Okay, the Safe and Drug Free Schools is limited amounts of funds -- and I didn't even work with those. I would have to talk to the individual administrators in the schools about where they go. It's really small amounts but the reason I say things are working and that it's a launching pad to the future is because we did do that data in `03 and it's starting to improve but what is improving is our level or organization and our level of impact before Safe Schools/Healthy Students. And it takes so long when you have a community that hasn't addressed these issues.

Before Safe Schools/Healthy Students, nobody worked together. We had four or five different organizations that were all doing the same thing and they never got beyond awareness. Well, if you don't get beyond awareness, you never get to behavior change. And now we're working together and the anticipation is we'll get to behavior change. Do

these numbers show success over the last 10 years? Absolutely not, absolutely not, but we've got the Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant in `02 and it -- you don't change that culture in three years or four years.

But the systems are -- I think if I came back here in seven, eight years, the numbers would be much better because of the way we're organizing as a community. We're now using data to make decisions. We didn't even do this data before, ever. So as far as your direct question on Safe and Drug Free School monies, I honestly can't even tell you how it's used because it's so small.

MS. KEYS: I wanted to ask -- another issue that we really haven't touched on but is really kind of a pressing issue particularly in rural areas has to do with workforce development and I think in particular in the mental health field, and I don't know if you've experienced not having sufficiently trained personnel even when you have grant money for positions that you might have available. And if we're thinking about developing infrastructure using grant money for sustainability, might we need to be thinking about how to incorporated within those programs the expectation that some dollars go towards the development of a workforce and that's one question.

And then the second question is do we need to become more flexible in our expectation of who delivers what kind of services because of just the lack of certain kinds of professionals. So thank you.

MS. REDMON: Let me address that because in our rural system, when we first started out particularly with student assistance program and I became looking for a social worker, it was kind of interesting because we immediately were able to find a master's level social worker who had just moved into the community. When we added the additional one, again, we didn't find a masters level but we found a bachelors level working with our masters level and she's currently working on her masters level. It's almost like if you lower the expectations, then you don't really look for and find those capable people. And I think you have to have that level of competence, that level of training. If you don't then your program is not going to be successful.

So while I say don't lower the expectations, I'm also saying, make sure that there are funds for training to find additional people, if necessary, or to find initial people, if necessary, but I think that the expectations have to be there for it to be successful.

MS. KEYS: And let me add just one other thing and that is something that we haven't talked about which I think is, again, particularly relevant for rural areas is the use of technology both in service delivery, supervision, et cetera so if you want to comment on that, too.

MS. REDMON: Technology is something that when we first started, it was kind of interesting, our goal was to have one internet connection per classroom. We have gradually built on that through E-rate and through some other areas that have been very, very beneficial to help us

develop that technology. You have to have that mind set, just like what we are experiencing now with the juvenile court system. They didn't want technology. They didn't take advantage of technology and now they're still keeping a paper file and you can't follow through with that.

When we started the students assistance program, we bought computers with the idea that we wanted to compile data, we wanted to be able to -- we know that data is important in order to know whether you're being successful or not. And I think technology is something that has to be incorporated, it has to be planned for and that's where having the large pool of money the first year gives you that opportunity to put those pieces in place.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Could I ask some "-bility" questions? I've heard, just a series of quick answers because it might be helpful for me anyway. When I say "-bility" questions, I mean, I've heard sustainability, and I think we would all agree that to have sustainability that we have to have stability because I heard a thread of that through there.

And then what gets in the way of that is mobility. So that's why I said talk over a question about "bilities". And we have a rural situation, we have an urban situation here. Let me ask first of all if you'd just quick answers, what about your approximate percentage of student mobility, if we could just go one, so we can get rural to urban just to get an idea and then I'm going to ask some questions about --

MS. REDMON: In our school system we have eight schools. We have two that are very stable because there's very little rental property. Our two larger areas where there is more rental property, we have a higher mobility rate. Our mobility rate in those larger areas is anywhere from 28 to 30 percent. In the two schools where there's very little, it's interesting because we don't see that turnover in students and therefore, we don't have the problems we do.

Now, are we finding an influx of people coming in? Yes. We're not sure how people find McNairy County but we're getting a lot of people from Florida, from California and from the larger cities. So it's almost like people are looking for stability and by looking at -- for instance, 40 percent of our teachers have masters degrees. We have 30 percent of our faculties can retire within the next five years. So we've had that stability. And it's almost like we're seeing people seeking that.

MR. SWANSON: Ours is low.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Low, I would imagine very low.

MR. SWANSON: Yeah, I don't have a number. It's talked about but it's low.

MS. THOMPSON: And I mentioned that as an inner ring suburb of Cleveland, ours is extremely high. And it's actually one of those indicators that explains first ring districts, one of those things that we all share and that is high rates of student mobility and it follows what Lynn was speaking of, we refer to it as an eviction cycle, often the case.

And I've talked with our municipal court judge that hears our evictions in Garfield Heights weekly and she's making referrals to us because of that, because we'll find that people are moving into places where they knew that they couldn't afford it but operated off of a cycle where, "I have to stay somewhere". So, you know, it is one of those kinds of situations and they go between the first --

CHAIRMAN LONG: When you say high do you mean 40 percent, 50 percent?

MS. THOMPSON: You said, 30, I would probably agree to about 30 and I mentioned the actual raw numbers for us from start to beginning from the start of the school season for the 2006/07 school year and up to December that we were noticing how many young people came in, how many left that withdraw and new enrollment cycle.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And you said about --

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Around 30.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay, and what I want to get at, that was just a baseline. What would you say just a straight shot comment about mobility of teachers, because there's a point to be made here for what we're talking about with the mobility of teachers with the least experienced teachers teaching the youngsters that are at the highest risk. Do you have much mobility?

MS. REDMON: We don't have a problem with that because we don't -- all of our schools are funded equitably. All of our schools have pretty much similar populations. We just don't have a lot of movement from one school to another.

MR. SWANSON: Ours is low and I would say in my personal opinion, sometimes it needs to be a little higher.

MS. THOMPSON: Ours tends to be low also actually.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And Lynne, yours tended to be --

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Ours tends to be higher and I don't have those figures with me, David, but driven by two things; first of all decreasing student census, so fewer jobs, so job cuts, and then combine that with the seniority bumping and bidding as you all know it, that we perpetuate the cycle of less experienced, most needy kids.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And the last question; number of superintendents in the last 10 years? Two, two, two.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Five.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. See, I think that something that the Federal Government needs to start to pay attention to and could be helpful, it's like the gorilla in the room, when we talk about mobility and when we talk about it with students, but when we start to talk about teachers and having those least experienced teachers teaching the youngsters and all these things we've heard today at the highest risk and then add one more ingredient to that, the tremendous mobility of superintendents and just -- I'll just ask one, why do you think that you've

had five in the last 10 years? You are on tape. Seventeen -- is that 17 seconds or 17 minutes?

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Yeah, what you're witnessing is me trying to not be caution, just try to figure out how in the world to summarize. Our longest tenured superintendent, Dr. Carol Johnson, who was there for I believe six to seven years, left to go to a larger district, that is Memphis. In her wake the board put an interim superintendent in place who was in my opinion doing a very good job but the board misread the community, did not do an appropriate vetting or get community input and the politics led to his not being appointed as the permanent superintendent.

In the third case, our superintendent brought some strengths and some politics caught up with the superintendent. And in this case now, Dr. Bill Green, our current interim, who has expressed an interest in staying in the job as permanent, became the healer in the community outreach, mender of fences and the board is now faced with a very difficult decision as to whether to keep him without a search or go through the time, the money, the possible disequilibrium of a search in order to be transparent in its process versus keep him as a known quantity, certainly as a respected leader for the sake of stability and all these kinds of things that we've been talking about, including getting a coherent behavior management and curricular process in place across a very disparate district.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And the reason that I asked those questions, I think that we've -- that the Department might want to think about, if you could be a catalyst, I truly believe that until we in American education face the fact this mobility factor, especially with teachers, and pull in CTA and American Federation of Teachers and start to really have a conversation about it, and at the same time pull in a group called board members and because board members are the ones that we're talking about here, that's the reason that we have -- one of the main reasons that we have tied to contract, that we have a dialogue with the National School Board Association that emulates out to the different states so that we can start to talk about this high mobility with those leaders because I'm hearing all of you say, whether it's rural or urban that it gets in the way of stability and sustainability.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: One of the facts that our board was given to consider as it was thinking about is it going to do a search or not for our permanent superintendent, the board was told by one of the outside consultants, I believe, that it expects that this spring there will be 12 openings in urban districts.

CHAIRMAN LONG: In what geographic area?

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: For superintendent. Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Twelve openings in what geographic area?

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Nationally, I believe but of major -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN LONG: We just had 10,

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN LONG: We just have 10 in our county, so that's why --

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Oh, understand.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Other questions? Yes, Russ?

MR. JONES: Yeah, an issue that we haven't talked about is race. And I was just wondering if I can get a sense from the panel the breakdown of race and ethnicity groups within your purview.

MS. REDMON: We're 87/13 if you put it all together, 87 percent Caucasian and 13 percent other, almost 11 percent of that being African American.

MR. SWANSON: In the specific county where I've worked it's 99 percent Caucasian. I was trying to represent Nebraska as a whole as a rural state. There is a major increase in the Hispanic population where some school districts are 50 to 75 percent now Hispanic and we also have several Native American tribes in our state as well, but those -- the Hispanics are gathered around the meat packing plants in our state. And those rural districts, like I said, are over 50 percent Hispanic.

MS. THOMPSON: And in Garfield Heights it's 47.9 percent Caucasian, 34.8 percent African American and the balance would include multi-racial, Asian, Hispanic and American Indian.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: And in Minneapolis, on the second slide in your notebook we have the breakdown, African American 71.8, White American 28.2, Latino, 16.4, Asian American 9.7, Native American 4.3 and then breakdowns for special ed, English language learners and free and reduced.

MR. JONES: Yeah, thank you. The reason I ask that question, Lynne, you brought up, I thought a very good point. You brought up a number of very good points, but one in particular was cultural competence. And I'm just wondering the extent to which the lack of cultural competent training has led to some of the untoward consequences that different ones of you have faced.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: It certainly has. In our situation, Russell, one of the most painful ways in which lack of cultural competence has manifested itself is through staff and teachers who don't know how to relate to students or who, because of their unconscious racism, hold different expectations for kids and knowingly or unknowingly convey those.

MR. JONES: Can you provide an example?

(Pause)

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Millions are running through my mind. I'm sorry. Let me just collect my wits for a second.

MR. JONES: Sure.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Most of them are painful.

MS. REDMON: While she's thinking, let me give her a little bit of time to think. MR. JONES: Okay.

MS. REDMON: I know sometimes when you're trying to do that. We have moved up into -- for awhile we only had about less than five percent minority of any kind. As we moved on up, we did diversity training with all of our administrators, our central office staff, our principals and assistant principals because we thought they needed to know what the differences, what the various backgrounds. And then in Tennessee, a big emphasis, I guess it's been nearly four years ago, we brought to -- they brought to Nashville and put a lot of money into poverty training, went through the Ruby Paine training and so forth because what we were seeing in Tennessee was a definite increase in poverty. And this helped tremendously because then we trained someone and then we came back -- we trained four people in our district and we came back and worked with our school districts.

And at that time, one of the sub-groups that was not making AYP was out economically disadvantaged. But by coming back and sharing that training with our administrators, and with our teachers and making that concerted effort, within two years that's no longer a problem.

We also look at with our African American students what was happening there because we weren't seeing them make that difference. And we made concerted efforts. One of the areas that we were particularly seeking was that we had a low percentage of African American students that were testing for the gifted program. And so what we have done is we have a class at our school that has that largest population and it's a class to expand their experience background so that they can do better --

MR. JONES: That's great.

MS. REDMON: -- on the individual achievement or IQ tests and so forth, because we know that that is culturally biased and that's our way of addressing that. But I think if school systems will look at and identify those needs in those sub-groups and then put time and effort into the training, you're going to avoid some of the things that Lynne was talking about because if you're teaching and the only background you have is a middle class or an upper middle class, you can't have that empathy.

One of the best things that came out of the Ruby Paine training was a questionnaire, "Could You" -- and we had to go through -- we answered three different ones, "Could You Survive in Poverty"? And we all flunked it, you know, we couldn't. We didn't know how to access all the different things. The interesting thing, too, was that the majority of people that went through the training also discovered they couldn't survive in wealth because, you know, to me if you can save money and have something that looks like, then fine, but in wealth, huh-uh.

MR. JONES: Right.

MS. REDMON: So I think that you have to look not only at diversity but you've got to look at your sub-groups.

MR. JONES: Yeah, that sounds very good. In fact, there's a term we have for that, it's called cultural gimbling. And you're interacting with folks of different colors, ethnicities, backgrounds, et cetera. Let me just a follow-up question, was that training funded by this initiative and to what extent is it ongoing?

MS. REDMON: The poverty training was funded through Title I. The diversity training was funded through local funds.

MR. JONES: I see and is it ongoing training or is it just one time?

MS. REDMON: No, no, it's ongoing.

MR. JONES: Great. Excellent.

MS. THOMPSON: If I may, I'd like to respond to the question as well. In Garfield Heights, race in particular is a very emotionally charged situation. I mentioned that when we submitted the Safe Schools/Healthy Students proposal initially, 78 percent were Caucasian, 16.9 percent African American. Now, we are 57.9 percent Caucasian, 34.8 percent African American. That has created a significant problem in the Garfield Heights community.

Not everyone in the community has received the changing demographic in Garfield Heights very well. In fact, you know, the survey that I mentioned that we did in December we surveyed students, parents, staff members in the district. Everyone in the district received the survey and one of the things that continued to come up was the -- from our students, some White students feeling that African American students were being treated differently. African American students feeling that White students were being treated differently.

In fact, we had a parent -- and this will just give you a little insight on where we are as a learning community in some respect. There were an opportunity to write in comments and a parent -- now, of course anonymous, we have no idea but a parent wrote the comment was, and I have to say this was a provider that we work with, so this was an out-source type of survey. This is what they do for a living. They do a phenomenal job and have been working with us as a result of Safe Schools/Healthy Students.

The parent indicated that the safety problem in the district has to do with all the Black people and that her children are now having to play with colored people and so that's an indication of where some residents in the community are as it relates to race. And it is a real issue in the district and community and sometimes is quite a challenge to overcome. We are doing training as Liz stated. We also have the work of Ruby Paine.

One of the challenges that we confronted, however, was for some it was an issue of culture of poverty, therefore being synonymous

with Black, African Americans and having to really work through that. And Dr. Wells, who I love dearly, has really helped me and worked through that piece because it's greater than just culture of poverty. It's culture poverty. It's not culture of poverty for African Americans. And so that has constantly been this piece that we're trying to massage and work through and it has to be ongoing for that reason.

Certainly it was a great opportunity to have these consultants come in and work with us and the work continues including on Friday of this week. So it is yet a work in progress.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Thank you for the thinking time. I have four or five examples for you.

MR. JONES: I'm a clinician.

CHAIRMAN LONG: You only get one, however, Lynne.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN LONG: You only get one, however.

MS. KREHBIEL-BRENEMAN: Not for a topic as critical as this. From the most individual level to the systemic level, Russell, here's a give and go. I have a person on our staff who works in a couple of middle schools, a couple of high schools. He was gifted with this incredible ability to connect with kids, all kids. If I could clone him, I would.

In a particular high school -- and he wanders around and talks to kids. He also does some groups and things like that. But for the purposes of this story, a recent couple of weeks ago, he was walking in one of our high schools and he saw a young lady outside of the classroom. They greeted each other. She was looking pretty glum and he asked her," What's the deal."

"Well, I got into trouble in Ms. Jones' room". My staff person is an African American gentleman. The young woman with whom he was speaking is an African American young lady. My staff person's name is Mr. Martin. Mr. Martin came back the next day, same young woman outside the same door, same period. "What's happening"? Similar discussion, "I got in trouble in Ms. Jones' room". The story unfolds. "I tried to tell her what happened, she didn't listen. I tried to tell her what happened".

Okay, long story short, Mr. Martin made his rounds several more days and the young woman was at her post outside of the classroom away from instruction time with apparently an unresolved issue between her and Ms. Jones. Now, I don't know any more. I do know that at least from her perspective as reported to me, there was something going on there between her and Ms. Jones.

I know it takes two to tango, but I also know that racism lives and that appeared to factor into that individual situation.

On a larger level one of our -- a couple of our high schools now and eventually all of them, are going to be looking at their small learning communities, the SLCs because a couple of those SLCs

inadvertently have become sorters of kids in part by race. So some of the kids know, "Oh, the dumb kids are in that one", or, "The kids of color are in that one". I will say certainly that was not foremost in anybody's mind in creating small learning communities, but that -- be that as it may, whether it was foremost in their mind or not, the fact remains and now those boundaries on those small learning communities have been changed. So that's good news, but White privilege, inadvertence, who knows and again, this is not a situation in which I was directly involved, Russell, but on a more systemic level, yes, issues like that.

And finally, on the broadest sweep, Minnesota has one of the largest achievement gaps between students of color and White students in the country. Now this is not just Minneapolis, so I have to say, I've switched a frame here. But you all know that and we know that painfully. So whether it's at the individual student level or at the highest level, we have issues of racism and cultural competence that we've only begun to work out and we have a huge need to go much further very quickly. There are some examples.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you, Lynne. And we'll close with either a question or a comment from Tommy.

MR. LEDBETTER: Yes, I have two questions but one of them is just very short. I mean, it's a geography lesson. McNairy County, Tennessee, I know that Adams and Ruskin are 30 miles south of Lincoln and I can make some reference to that and Minneapolis and Cleveland, but McNairy County, Tennessee, what is the county seat of McNairy County? I'm trying to get a place in my mind where --

MS. REDMON: Selmer.

MR. LEDBETTER: Selmer.

MS. REDMON: We're directly south of Jackson Tennessee and we border the Mississippi Line.

MR. LEDBETTER: I know where you're at. Now my question, you mentioned that you think that it's important to have large sums of money funding the first year and then gradually reduce those, that that's a better way of funding the program. One of our panelists earlier today used some terminology that -- they didn't say it exactly the way I use it but you know, being a school administrator, I believe that the terminology is pretty close to my philosophy on things. And that is that if you don't inspect it, don't expect it because it will not happen. And that's pretty basic to the way I view programs in schools.

The funding for these programs, the personnel that are involved in the supervision of these programs that's a big area of funding. I understand when you're talking about salaries, you're talking about a lot of computers instead of just one, to just have that one person at full salary.

If the salaries were the area that was reduced from a year to year basis, do you think the programs would have a better chance of being sustained if say the program in your school system, the first year you

funded the salary at 100 percent and the second year at 66 percent and the next year at 33 percent and then the fourth year, obviously, there's no funding for it, do you think that your school system would maintain that position for that person being able to gradually reduce that salary? Do you think they would pick it up?

MS. REDMON: It has happened in our system where we have started out with totally funded and then gradually backed down. It is more apt to be sustained that way than if it's totally funded for three years and then it's gone because you have to build that -- help the community see the need for it. Now we haven't invested in a lot of salaries, other than our after school program. That's the largest part of our after school program, but in the supervision of it, we didn't add a lot of additional people for two reasons.

I wrote the grant, I knew what we wanted to do and I asked to supervise it and so therefore, you know, I just added another hat because I knew if we brought in someone new, it would take at least a year to get up to speed and then at the end of the term, that person would be gone. Therefore, what we've done, we've put the money -- the first 21st Century grant, we bought a lot of computers, we bought a lot of software. We looked at what the needs were and then we put it into after school personnel. We didn't put it into a lot of extra salaries.

MR. LEDBETTER: But you're a rural school system where an urban school system may have more money invested in salaries because they're supervising more.

MS. REDMON: Right, but in what areas we have, we have found that if you step it down, it's more apt to because see, the board will pick up 25 percent. You know, we won't have this if you don't pick up the 25 percent. But if you just totally -- you just kind of have to play games and you have to sell it and make it something you can't live without.

MR. LEDBETTER: Well, I guess the thought that's in my mind is how much easier would it be to sell the importance of the program to the board if they only had to absorb a portion of that salary each year.

MS. REDMON: It would be much better, that works better and the thing about it is, now our parents are saying like with our after school program, "Well, we'll be glad to pay for it when the funding runs out", because they see how nice it is to pick up their kids from a safe secure environment with their homework done and with the extra help if they need the extra help or with the enrichment if they don't need remediation and then all of them have that second hour doing something that's fun and they've learned something from it.

So I think that's probably going to be a lot of our sustainability is that sliding scale.

MR. LEDBETTER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much, panel. We appreciate it. Thank you individually, Elizabeth and Doug and Melissa and

Lynne. And let's give them a big thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN LONG: And a reminder for us that tomorrow breakfast is 7:45 to 8:00 and then from 8;00 to 8:30 we have an ethics briefing. I don't know which two of you on the panel caused this. I won't go into names.

MS. DAVIS: This is a mandatory briefing for all non-federal members of the committee, so the federal members, if they want to slip in at 8:30, you're more than welcome to, but from 8:00 to 8:30 for the non-federal members, there's an ethics briefing in the break room.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And we won't get into it, but some of the states for elected officials have already had this. So, I mean, this is --

MS. DAVIS: I think the federal level is --

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Not through the Department of Education.

CHAIRMAN LONG: No, but I mean, it's a federal, so as I say, we don't need to get into it. But what I want to do is thank all of the panels and also thank this wonderful committee; great questions, a lot of information and through eight hours you've finished absolutely one minute early. You're wonderful. Have a great night.

(Whereupon, at 4:01 p.m. the above-entitled matter concluded.)