

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+++++

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+++++

TELECONFERENCE

+++++

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 20, 2006

+++++

The Advisory Committee met by teleconference at

2:00 p.m., David Long, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

DAVID LONG
KIM DUDE
FREDERICK E. ELLIS
MIKE HERRMANN
MONTEAN JACKSON
RUSSELL T. JONES
SHEPPARD KELLAM
SUSAN KEYS
TOMMY LEDBETTER
SETH NORMAN
MICHAEL PIMENTEL
DEBORAH A. PRICE
DENNIS ROMERO
BELINDA E. SIMS
HOPE TAFT
HOWELL WESCHLER

CATHERINE DAVIS, DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICER
DONNIE LEOEUF, SURROGATE FOR J. ROBERT FLORES

NEAL R. GROSS

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

PROCEEDINGS

1:10 p.m.

1
2
3 DR. LONG: Given what our objective is for today, if we could
4 start on page 3, then, for the potential recommendations as they go forward to the
5 Secretary of this interim report. There were, on page 3, designation of unsafe
6 schools, six different potentials there.

7 Any discussion, changes, thoughts?

8 MR. ROMERO: This is Dennis.

9 DR. LONG: Yes.

10 MR. ROMERO: The number two option, the number two item
11 here, consider incidents of violence as the only factor. If you recall, I had some
12 reservations about that piece, and per our last conference call, earlier this morning
13 I was able to email that I hope everyone received the research data that supports to
14 the contrary. And I'm certainly willing to entertain a conversation about this at
15 this time.

16 DR. LONG: Dennis, this is Dave. Yes, I did get that. Maybe I
17 misunderstood what you just said, but number two, consider incidents of violence
18 as only one factor, not the only one, but -- or am I misreading it?

19 MR. ROMERO: I'm sorry. You're absolutely right.

20 I guess -- I do not take exception to that point now.

21 DR. LONG: Okay.

22 MS. PRICE: You know what we could just do there after B-
23 just to make sure that people understand that. After it says only one, we could put
24 parentheses, not the only one, and just have that. It's redundant, but it might be
25 helpful in reading it.

26 DR. LONG: Deborah, can we add i.e., substance abuse?

27 MS. PRICE: Sure, sure, sure.

28 DR. LONG: Thank you.

29 MS. KEYS: Can I make a comment? This is Susan Keys. On
30 number one, change the terminology, can we also give some further indication that
31 -- of what we wanted it changed to so that there's some remark about why
32 persistently dangerous was not acceptable? I know it's later in the report, but not
33 to suggest different nomenclature, but nomenclature such as, and give some
34 examples?

35 DR. LONG: This would be a question for Debbie, perhaps
36 relative to that, and that is, since this is going to be an interim report as we head
37 toward the June report, is that something, Debbie, we should do now, or wait? I
38 don't know the answer to that.

39 MS. PRICE: Well, to be really honest, I know that, you know,
40 within our -- within the Committee, we've looked at, you know, kind of bantered a
41 few suggestions about, but -- and then in my office, we've also bantered some --
42 and nothing is really, we haven't really come up with examples. But what we
43 might want to say is just add a half a sentence in there about why -- because of the
44 strongly negative connotation of persistently dangerous to change that to a
45 different nomenclature that --

46 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think we've talked about it
47 being very stigmatizing to schools.

48 MS. PRICE: It isn't as stigmatizing.

49 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I think that would be fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I think perhaps maybe you
2 can use some of the same wording. It gets rather specific a little later on in the
3 report, relative to the name persistently dangerous. In the minutes, I mean.

4 DR. LONG: Okay, any others on this first segment of
5 designation of unsafe schools 1 through 6?

6 MR. KELLEN: Let me just free associate with you a little bit,
7 you all. This is Shep. This is the first recommendations that we lay out, and I'm
8 concerned with the designation and probably, you know, let me start another way.
9 There's an assumption in these six that isn't really spelled out, and it has to do
10 with whether the concept of persistently dangerous schools is really a useful
11 concept. I mean, in a sense, we're messing around with the wording, considering
12 other aspects of violence, and in addition to violence, other aspects of behavior.

13 There's an underlying sense of displeasure about the whole
14 concept, and this doesn't really come out and boldly say that this program has
15 certain worthwhile aspects like giving parents choices of transferring kids as
16 needed. But it doesn't really come down on the question of, is this really a good
17 idea at all, or would you not be better served by indicating that we ought to be
18 monitoring kids' progress, as we are, fixing that to include bad behavior,
19 physically unsafe behavior and so forth. There's something missing for me in the
20 power of this paragraph, and I wondered if other people share it.

21 I think the whole thing, in other words, is a dumb idea. And
22 what really is needed is an understanding that there are risk factors like violent
23 behavior, physically aggressive behavior, bullying behavior, that are highly
24 associated with poor achievement, and that together these are, in fact, major risk
25 factors for later drug abuse, further violent behavior, and all kinds of bad
26 outcomes. And that separating this part of the safe schools, safe and drug-free
27 schools out, is not as useful as maintaining a focus on the real task of safe and
28 drug-free schools, which is essentially from a prevention point of view as well as a
29 crisis intervention point of view, going to have to be more positive.

30 I mean, we need to get in there earlier. We need to, in fact, help
31 kids learn and reduce the risk factors, and we need to be very tuned in to early
32 evidence of dangerous behavior so that we do prevention.

33 I guess what I'm saying is is that there's a preamble or a tone of
34 this which I find fairly unacceptable, and that is we can sort of tinker with the anti-
35 climate survey, well, what do you do with that? You know, I mean, there's
36 something missing about this.

37 I don't know if anybody shares that view.

38 DR. LONG: Anyone, response to Shep?

39 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think that we're missing,
40 maybe, the bigger picture, but maybe don't have it set in the bigger context that it
41 needs to be.

42 DR. LONG: Debbie, could you have Bill play with -- not play
43 with, to try and incorporate a conceptual one or two sentence? Our caveat there
44 perhaps would be, politically, do we -- it's the approach. Since this is law, do we
45 then say that it is -- clear off the table, and will that get such a response that it
46 won't be paid attention to? Or do we approach it different? Again, I don't know
47 the answer to that; I'm just throwing that out.

48 MS. PRICE: Well, I think either the legislation is specific; it
49 uses that term. So to change the legislation would mean legislative -- something

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 legislation.

2 So in reauthorization -- but I do think that we could put, as you
3 said, have built up something in there, kind of in a bigger context and saying -- a
4 shorter sentence of what Shep said, but if we are to look, and sort of looking at it
5 from two perspectives.

6 One, is this the best approach, and is this getting us where we
7 want to be by identifying schools that -- whatever term we have of -- so that we
8 can then have parental choice. Or, is this the vehicle that gets us there, or would
9 we be better off, and if the answer is, no, that's not right, then that's one thing, but
10 if we are constrained to stay somewhat within the legislation and just make some
11 fixes to that current legislation, then I think what we're seeing here in these fixed
12 things address that perspective.

13 Does that make sense? I sort of rambled.

14 DR. LONG: No, I think it does, but to get back to Seth and
15 Hope there, and I guess I would repeat and have people respond to it that have --
16 Bill, in listening to this, to incorporate that because I think that is important,
17 because I was hearing the same thing that Seth and Hope were hearing, that there
18 are some sweeping conceptual things to look at, and then say, these six will, in
19 regard to the designation of unsafe schools and start to get there, but that one, two,
20 three sentence intro.

21 MR. KELLEN: That was Shep, not Seth.

22 DR. LONG: I'm sorry.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One of those S guys.

24 DR. LONG: S squared.

25 MS. KEYS: Susan, not Hope, but I think -- it's Susan again.
26 The point that Shep's making is that we really want to emphasize what we had
27 discussed was that this should be set within a public health framework.

28 MS. TAFT: And Hope would agree with that.

29 DR. LONG: It would be helpful to me, then. and maybe for
30 others, and I must have missed on Seth and Shep, but if we were to identify each
31 time. And I, on that second comment I did miss. I thought it was Hope's voice. I
32 apologize.

33 So Debbie, that can be done with Bill?

34 MS. PRICE: Yes, I think so. Let me just ask, Bill Duncan, are
35 you on the call? I think he's probably in the muted call, so we can't hear from him,
36 but we can do that.

37 DR. LONG: Okay.

38 MR. ELLIS: Dave, this is Fred.

39 DR. LONG: Yes.

40 MR. ELLIS: I hear what the folks are saying. I guess I would
41 suggest reading down to the next paragraph where it talks about recommendations
42 focused on approving school safety. It talks about focusing on prevention of
43 incidents, and it give some examples and partnerships with community prevention
44 programs, a variety of things and again, it talks about focusing the effort on
45 improving school safety by doing some of those things which I think is what we've
46 heard about. I just don't think the two issues are mutually exclusive.

47 DR. LONG: I agree, Fred. As I started, I think we're going to
48 be looking at sets of potential recommendations, the first one being designation of
49 unsafe schools. Then as you indicated, the second set will be recommendation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from folks on improving school safety, and then we'll move on to data and so
2 forth. What I was hearing was that, if we could have one, two, three sentences on
3 conceptual as we head into those different subsets of recommendations.

4 MR. ELLIS: No, I understand that. What I was hearing from
5 some of the members was that we recommend doing away with the whole
6 program kind of thing and say, scrap that and go to this program. And I'm not sure
7 that's, in fact, what the group wants.

8 MR. KELLEN: I understand -- this is Shep. Or Seth,
9 whatever.

10 (Laughter.)

11 I hear what you guys are saying. I think it really is a question,
12 as Deborah laid it out, of whether we think this program is -- you know, is ill-
13 conceived. It's clear that everybody believes that parents should have options and
14 move their kids to a different school as needed. And that even the bullies should
15 have options, or certainly have responses.

16 The question is, is this really a good direction to add to the
17 general "No Child Left Behind" concept. And I would argue that the sense of the
18 Committee and the visitors was that this is a failing program, and I think it's
19 dangerous for us not to reflect what people said from the local level and the
20 statewide level, as well as their own deliberations that the information system just
21 doesn't work. It probably is made worse by the designation of "persistently
22 dangerous" as words. But that really is not going to fix the whole information
23 system question.

24 It's separate from the assessment systems which are already
25 expensive and on-going. It's separate also from the individual school building and
26 school district information systems about each child. It really is an ill-conceived
27 program. And so I guess my own sense is that our responsibility should be that
28 the view of the Advisory Committee, and of the expert witnesses, was that this
29 concept needs to be rethought, but at the very least, we ought to consider these six
30 items. And then that does lead better into the second paragraph, which has some
31 positive aspects to it.

32 DR. LONG: Just listening, and I'll repeat what I said. I want to
33 be careful about throwing the baby out with the bathwater so that nobody will
34 listen to us.

35 So I would again like -- I'm trying to put all these together. Go
36 ahead and have the introductory statement regarding the concept that I've heard
37 two or three of the members talk about, but then get into specific in different areas.
38 We're not talking about designation of unsafe schools, and then move on to
39 school safety so that there are some specific things to talk about,
40 recommendations, with the conceptual statement right at the beginning.

41 MR. LEDBETTER: Dave, this is Tommy. This is a
42 preliminary recommendation. This is not a final recommendation, is it?

43 DR. LONG: That's for June. That's correct.

44 MR. LEDBETTER: All right, this is the preliminary
45 recommendation, and we haven't even heard -- we haven't even received all of the
46 information yet, and I think we shouldn't prejudice our final report by saying, at
47 this point in time, that the program doesn't work and no parts of it work and we
48 need to throw it all out.

49 Obviously, the program has some -- there's some problems with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the program and, you know, I think we need to just keep in mind that these are
2 preliminary recommendations, just as it says on the report, and that we don't need
3 to get hung up with all of this. We need to try to move forward and wait about
4 final recommendations until we have all the information.

5 DR. LONG: With that in mind, can we go through these
6 segments -- we could even circle back if we have to at the end, but to get -- wade
7 through these various headings, and if we can call designation of unsafe schools
8 number one, and then as Fred was moving to the recommendation focused on
9 improving school safety, which would be number two, if there are no other
10 comments on one.

11 And as I said, we can circle back, but we have quite a few of
12 these sections. If we could take a look at the improving school safety potential
13 recommendations for the interim, as Tommy just mentioned here. And there we
14 have seven of them.

15 Any comments, changes, input on those seven?

16 MS. PRICE: This is Debbie, and I have just a very minor
17 change, but I do think it could potentially be significant, and that's in number
18 three, under creating a program for school safety equivalent to the National Blue
19 Ribbon Schools.

20 The National Blue Ribbon Schools' program had some
21 significant flaws, so rather than say, equivalent, I would say, with similar
22 characteristics, or similar to or -- because I just think equivalent might be -- it isn't
23 what we really want. We don't want to duplicate something, steal ideas from it.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, I think the idea was to
25 make it a positive thing that people would want to change their systems for, as
26 opposed to making it a negative thing, the way it is now.

27 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have no problem with using
28 the word "similar."

29 MR. ROMERO: This is Dennis, same here.

30 MR. NORMAN: Seth, same here.

31 MR. ELLIS: This is Fred, no problem.

32 MR. KELLEN: Same for Shep.

33 MS. SIMS: I agree, this is Belinda.

34 DR. LONG: Any other -- good point, Debbie. And Hope, you
35 outlined that, what really the thought process was from the Committee.

36 Any other thoughts on the seven under that -- I'm just adding
37 the numbers here. Number two, are the improving school safety potential
38 recommendations.

39 MR. PIMENTEL: This is Mike. I just have kind of a general
40 thing. Recommendations focused on improving school safety. Is this going to be
41 the extent of our recommendations related to school safety, or is this within the
42 context of the unsafe school choice issue?

43 MS. PRICE: This is Debbie. I would say this is in the context
44 of unsafe school choice issue, because that's the overall issue that we focused on.
45 I do think that we can be broader in our final report, and if we have more
46 substantial recommendations regarding school safety overall, I think that that
47 would be a good spot for them. Unless, David, you disagree, but it seems like we
48 are looking at it from the standpoint of unsafe school choice options.

49 DR. LONG: Right, this is the second focus area, and it is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 interim, so, absolutely.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, I'm fine.

3 DR. LONG: And again, it's hard when we aren't face to face,
4 but I'll ask one more time if there's any on the seven. If not, we'll go on to number
5 three, which will be the next paragraph, which talks about data issues and the
6 Committee's possible recommendations and their -- I do believe there's five of
7 them listed there.

8 MS. TAFT: Excuse me, David, this is Hope.

9 DR. LONG: Yes.

10 MS. TAFT: In the last sentence of the paragraph just before the
11 one that you started us on, it says that one member of the Committee drew all
12 members' attention to an important example of the second recommendation. I
13 think it should be the seventh recommendation, because that's the one that talks
14 about bringing the community in.

15 DR. LONG: Right, got you. Any --

16 MS. SIMS: This is Belinda. Can you hear me okay?

17 DR. LONG: Yes.

18 MS. SIMS: I just have a question. I don't want to put people
19 offtrack, but it's just a point of clarification here. In the way the recommendations
20 are worded, something seemed clear to me that the state education or the LEA
21 would implement some of these recommendations coming down from Ed. But
22 some of the other recommendations, such as the ones under improving school
23 safety, seem like things that the Department of Education would have to put in
24 place, in some way, provide the guidelines, or maybe the states are going to do
25 that. But should we be clarifying whose role, who will be responsible for certain
26 recommendations, or are these just recommendations back to the Secretary, and
27 you will all implement it as you see fit?

28 DR. LONG: But again, and that is a good point, but I'll say it,
29 and then Debbie, you can react to it. But this is on the unsafe school option
30 portion, and it is the preliminary report, and of course, we can put all the rest of
31 the meat on that, I would think, for the June report to the Secretary.

32 MS. PRICE: Yes, and I do think that, in really delving into the
33 recommendations and trying to see how -- putting the rubber to the road, so to
34 speak, we'll have to kind of look at what -- like, for example, number six is
35 providing guidelines, training for assisting students who are victimized. I mean,
36 as we look at it, that will have to kind of go through that process of okay, well,
37 what is the federal role here. Is this a state role, and that really gets down, I would
38 think -- those specifics are really more in the implementation of recommendations.

39
40 There might be, and I can really kind of go through and look,
41 but, and see if we can articulate specific federal, state and local roles, but I think a
42 lot of them are sort of a combination of the three, and so we might be better off
43 keeping them, at this point, vague about who has implementation of them.

44 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, that's fine.

45 DR. LONG: Any other -- we're on the number three, the data
46 issues that the potential recommendations, of which we had, I believe five.

47 Any others? If not, let's move to the fourth one, which would
48 be the last sentence at the bottom of that page. We also talked about parental
49 notice of safety conditions of schools, and the Committee has identified two

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 potential recommendations, and that's found right at the top of page five. There
2 are two of them.

3 Any comments on those two?

4 (No response.)

5 If not, if we move to an assignment of number five, which
6 would be regarding the transfer option -- believes the Department might consider,
7 and then there are two, really would be recommendations relative to -- specifically
8 to the transfer where there's two of them listed. That's the second paragraph on
9 page five.

10 Comments on those?

11 MR. ELLIS: Dave, this is Fred.

12 DR. LONG: Yes, Fred.

13 MR. ELLIS: I was trying to remember; I know everyone, there
14 was clear consensus on not having victims moved. I think that was
15 understandable, but I don't remember how we got to this requiring movement of
16 students who victimize others. I mean, just jumping off the page, it sounds like
17 another unfunded mandate, and I think all of us would agree that the last thing we
18 want to do is do another unfunded mandate. So I'm not sure what the wording
19 should be, but I do remember a clear consensus on not requiring victims to move,
20 and I think that was very unequivocal.

21 I'm just not sure whether or not we want to, even in the
22 preliminary recommendation, mandate movement of victimizers, whatever those
23 might be, you know, what kind of criteria -- you know, you assault somebody one
24 time, and now that the school system has to move you, do they now have to
25 provide you with transportation? You get back into all the other issues with that.
26 I don't know. I just throw it out there, because that kind of scares me a little.

27 MS. KEYS: This is Susan Keys. Just, a further comment on
28 that point. I thought we had talked more about supporting the movement if the
29 victim wanted that as an option. I mean, I think we get into a box because in some
30 cases, the person that=s victimized might want to move, and then if they end up
31 moving, does that mean the person doing the victimization should also be required
32 to move? I mean, I think we want to come more on the side of providing options
33 and choices rather than mandates.

34 DR. LONG: That was my feeling, too.

35 MS. PRICE: This is Debbie. I think that's right, because
36 sometimes the nature of a school district doesn=t -- you know, when we talked
37 about those one high school, one middle school districts where choice gets
38 difficult. And we also talked about the victim having options there that, you
39 know, if they want to move, that certainly would be appropriate, but still having to
40 look at how the victimizer is dealt with.

41 MR. KELLEN: I mean, it's very important, this is Shep again.
42 If you look at the epidemiology, that is, how many kids in a school where there's
43 not good achievement and there's a lot of acting out behavior and drug use, we're
44 talking 10 or 15 percent of a school population, easily.

45 MS. TAFT: This is Hope. I'm looking at the statistics for Ohio,
46 and statewide we have 11,736 kids who were sent to the office for harassment or
47 intimidation, which is kind of like bullying. That's a lot of kids.

48 MR. KELLEN: Right, so we're not in a situation where we can
49 -- it doesn't even make therapeutic sense to transfer those kids automatically, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we've got no place to transfer them, anyway.

2 MS. PRICE: Well, and you know, keeping this in context of
3 the unsafe school choice option, those -- we're talking here about not just bullying
4 incidents, but unsafe school choice option deals with criminal offenses. So the
5 world of the victim and the victimizer gets much more reduced.

6 MR. KELLEN: Not much. If you look at the prevalence rates,
7 they're very, very high, Deborah, of arrests, how they're correlated. Could be as
8 many as 80 percent of kids who are in the top, say, 20 percent or so of bad
9 behavior.

10 MS. PRICE: Yes, even if you take use, possession, sale of
11 weapons other than a gun or explosives, there were 3300 of those kids in the Ohio
12 school system last year. That's still a pretty big number.

13 DR. LONG: I think, just listening, it sounds like we're all
14 saying about the same thing, and I think Susan hit it on the head. What was that
15 terminology, if you can recall, Susan, about promoting positive outcomes? I don't
16 recall the wording you used.

17 MS. KEYS: I think I said that what we need to do is promote
18 options for people, rather than requirements.

19 MS. PRICE: I like that.

20 DR. LONG: If we can soften that up, and I think that's what
21 everyone was saying. So if that terminology could be softened.

22 MR. KELLEN: If I can suggest one other quick thing, and that
23 is to scratch out who is transferred after number two. Also, where possible,
24 encouraging counseling to the victimizers, scratch "who is transferred."

25 DR. LONG: That would become a moot point, or could be.

26 Any other comments on what is now number five, the transfer
27 option? There's two things we're discussing there. If not, we'll move on to six,
28 which talks about -- again, in the dialogue, the Committee expressed concerns that
29 the choice option creates a mandate for states without providing funding to help
30 fulfill the mandate, and then two other potential recommendations there, which we
31 can call number six. This is the third paragraph in, two points. The first one starts
32 "allow a waiver." Any input or comments on those?

33 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I, personally, I think that
34 number two is very ill-advised. I mean, that's just adding to the flexibility, which
35 could easily -- our job should be to guide, or how to use the money most
36 effectively to accomplish the mission. What this seems to say is, give it to the
37 Governor or give it to the local folks and let them figure it out.

38 I don't think we've really thought about what are alternatives to
39 state grants programs. For example, if you took the child assessment systems in
40 each of the states, and you said, where are the school districts which have the
41 greatest need based on the child assessment systems, that could provide criteria for
42 where to focus state grant and aid money. And indeed, we could provide
43 guidelines of how to use the money most effectively.

44 DR. LONG: As I recall, number two, and correct me if I'm
45 wrong, as I recall number two, it was more like a comment made toward the end
46 of the meeting. I don't recall in-depth discussion relative to this, but maybe I'm
47 just trying to recall that in my mind.

48 MR. LEDBETTER: Didn't this go back to the report we got
49 from California, Dave, where they said that the schools that were identified as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 persistently dangerous were not the persistently dangerous schools? That the
2 schools that really needed the money didn't qualify for it because they were -- they
3 hadn't been identified as persistently dangerous.

4 DR. LONG: She mentioned it, the person from CDE, the State
5 Department -- I think you're exactly right, Tommy, made that comment, yes.

6 MR. LEDBETTER: I think that's where this came from was to
7 give the states some leeway, where if they know that there's a school out here that
8 is persistently dangerous, but even if it hasn't been identified as persistently
9 dangerous, to try to do some intervention at that school before it is identified as
10 persistently dangerous.

11 MR. KELLEN: Let me ask you a question. Is what's -- what is
12 referred to here by the state grants program? Is that unique to this persistently
13 dangerous program, or has that got to do with the entire state grant and aid for safe
14 and drug-free schools?

15 MR. LEDBETTER: Well, it doesn't say state grants program.
16 It just says, provide money for states to use in school safety measures, allowing
17 the states to provide grants to local education associations.

18 MR. KELLEN: Well, it says on page five, last sentence,
19 number two, continuing the state grants program as currently administered.

20 DR. LONG: But that is qualified, I think, Shep, by the opening
21 phrase of that last paragraph, "though not directly related to the USCO program,
22 there are two additional possible" -- so I'm not sure that ties straight to what --

23 MR. KELLEN: I just don't know what it refers to, but I don't
24 think there's much that I would say, continue the program as currently
25 administered at whatever level. I don't know what it's referring to.

26 MR. LEDBETTER: Well, that down there, the way I
27 remember that, Shep, that statement was basically referring to making the LEAs,
28 and I think I was the one who brought that up, but requiring the LEAs to write
29 grants, because there wasn't enough money. There were so many comments about
30 there not being enough money, and making schools compete, or making the LEAs
31 compete for the state grants, and let the states determine which ones were the best
32 programs, and to use the money that way.

33 MS. TAFT: And then there was also, this is Hope. There was
34 also the thought that we wanted the states to do all of this monitoring and
35 verification, but if you took away the states' programs, grants programs, there
36 wouldn't be anybody at the State Department of Education to do any of that.

37 MR. LEDBETTER: There would be no monitoring of it.

38 MR. KELLEN: Well, I have no problem with that. But from a
39 public health point of view, I just don't want to see us say, it's okay to continue the
40 state grants program, broadly conceived as currently administered. I think it isn't a
41 workable model. I do think that we're spending a lot of money on assessments.
42 We need to be, in fact, getting the most out of those assessments, and at the very
43 least, I'd like to see the state grants program focus on areas of greatest need, you
44 know, and have some process of evaluating how the money gets used, and
45 whether they're being used for programs with proven effectiveness.

46 MR. LEDBETTER: Well, if we changed the terminology
47 there, if we marked out "as currently administered, but@ and just substituted all of
48 that with the word "back,@ "continuing the state grants program by allowing states
49 to use discretion in providing grants to LEAs."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KELLEN: I still don't think that makes it, Tommy. I
2 understand where you're coming from; I do agree with you that the local level is
3 the right level for understanding what is going on. The problem I've got is that
4 when you give somebody inadequate funding and say, make the best of it, I'd
5 rather say, okay, we're spending millions and millions of dollars on the assessment
6 of kids in schools; why not use that to understand where to focus the money? And
7 so you give the money in more appropriate amounts to locations that could use the
8 program most.

9 And then I'd add the caveat that we'd like them to use effective
10 programs, and not just any old program.

11 MS. PRICE: Okay, this is Debbie. Can I pop in here, because I
12 think we've merged our conversation, as David identified it, paragraph six and
13 paragraph seven. And I'm getting a little confused. Let me just give it kind of a
14 summary statement because maybe -- in paragraph six, it's looking at the unsafe
15 school choice option, and it's making recommendations to, one, allow waiver from
16 the option if the state already has an existing program. I think we saw an example
17 of that by a couple panelists.

18 And two, and this isn't identifying the state grants program as
19 the program, but that the Federal Government should provide for states, so dollars
20 for states to use in school safety measures allowing states to provide grants to local
21 LEAs. And that is, as Tommmy mentioned earlier, for those states that see a
22 school that's in need, call it in need of improvement, because they are at risk of
23 being persistently dangerous, to provide some funds to have them address those
24 measure so that they can address the problem.

25 So I think that now where we go into the state grant, that
26 paragraph seven is specific to the state grant program.

27 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm looking at number two, last
28 sentence on page five.

29 MS. PRICE: Okay, so because we sort of blended our
30 conversation there. But Shep, your point of giving dollars to areas of greatest
31 need --

32 MR. KELLEN: And adding some criteria, what kind of
33 programs would be advisable. And I don't have a problem with, you know,
34 making these decisions local. But I think some guidelines would be useful.
35 Number one, take advantage of the really expensive assessment systems we're
36 currently doing, make them work for us, plus where the needs are, and what kinds
37 of needs there are. And then giving the states guidelines, and then saying, go to it.

38
39 MS. TAFT: This is Hope. But isn't that kind of the way it
40 works now, Debbie, that those programs have been federally evaluated -- the local
41 school districts don't have to do quite so in-depth evaluation?

42 MS. PRICE: Well, yes. I mean, one of the requirements of the
43 state grants program is, those dollars that are funneled down to the LEAs, that they
44 need to use those dollars on effective programs and, you know, you can go to
45 several different lists of what those would be -- What Works Clearinghouse, the
46 Hay, and a few other lists of what those programs could be, so they use their
47 dollars on those programs.

48 One of the problems is that, what we've heard from, the cost of
49 those programs, sometimes they're more than the dollars that they have in the state

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 grants --

2 MR. KELLEN: Okay, well my solution to that is that they use
3 the assessment systems to indicate where the needs are. Very deliberately, make
4 those assessments of school problems and needs work for us.

5 MS. TAFT: But -- this is Hope again. I don't think that there,
6 because we have no national data, there's no way anyone at the national level can
7 say that one school district is more needy than another school district. And, what I
8 know from risk and protective factors, every child is at risk, and every child needs
9 help in building up their protective factors. So, I don't know how you can tell any
10 parent that their child is not worthy of prevention dollars.

11 MR. KELLEN: Okay, let's go back a minute. First of all, we're
12 talking about the state level -- the assessment system at the state level indicating
13 where the areas of greatest need are. And preserving to the state the decision-
14 making as to response to those needs. And then offering them, as you guys are
15 saying, programs which have some demonstrated effectiveness to meet those
16 needs. And that adds two elements to just leaving the program as it is.

17 One is that it does, in fact, provide some guideline as to how
18 you decide where to put the few dollars there are, and mainly put them where the
19 epidemic is.

20 And secondly, provide some guidelines as
21 to the kind of programs which would be acceptable. And then the last
22 issue is, and leave it up to the states to make those decisions. And I would urge us
23 to consider those rather than just saying, okay, let's go as we are doing. Because I
24 don't think we're doing a very good job, frankly. I mean, I think the dollars are far
25 too few spread far too thinly. And I think states differ dramatically, and I think
26 that we're not making use out of the assessment systems.

27 DR. LONG: For the sake of our conversation here, and as we
28 start to wind this down, are we getting into, back to the preliminary report on that
29 last paragraph? Perhaps back to the preliminary report that's already gone to the
30 Secretary when this one deals with choice option? Because maybe that opening
31 phrase is operative, though not directly related to the choice option, two additional
32 possible -- and then it seemed to my mind even as I read that that we kind of went
33 back to the state grants. Not to leave it out, but it just seems like we've, this is
34 something that we could put in the final report, or am I missing?

35 MR. KELLEN: No. I think it's, it's very confusing. And, as a
36 matter of fact, one of the biggest problems from a public health point of view is
37 the multitudes of information systems we're setting up, the one having to do with
38 USCO being the notoriously failing information system. So that's one issue.

39 I mean, there are too many information systems and not enough
40 use of the ones we're -- we need.

41 So I think that we shouldn't go not directly related to USCO.
42 And this final paragraph here, my urging would be that we either focus on USCO,
43 or we back off and make some general comment that the USCO information
44 system is not working, and that we have information systems throughout each
45 state which could tell us where schools are with needs, including bad behavior
46 needs, and that those ought to be guiding where we put the few dollars we've got,
47 and that we ought to be using effective programs to address those needs.

48 MR. LEDBETTER: Shep, your problem with this whole thing
49 is the two words in there, or three words in there, "as currently administered." To
you, that means discontinuing the program the way it always has been.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Is that correct?

2 MR. KELLEN: Yes, pretty much. It even backs off, as
3 Deborah is pointing out, from the USCO, and now we're talking about state grants
4 and aids generally, I guess. I just think this paragraph is a bad paragraph. I think
5 that we ought to make up our mind, are we talking about USCO, or are we talking
6 about state grant and aid generally, number one. Number two, I do
7 think the USCO information system has failed, and it's a huge waste of principals'
8 time to be doing a failed information system. And it's expensive money-wise, and
9 it's also not making use of the information systems we've got, that we're spending
10 a lot of money on, and we need to connect up to service, educating kids in
11 prevention.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So maybe we should just
13 eliminate the whole paragraph.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think in the long run that that's
15 the best suggestion, because it really is going back to our first preliminary report,
16 and let's just leave this out. We can leave this in our to be pondered list for our
17 future meetings and discussions, and save it for the final report.

18 DR. LONG: If we could do that, that's --

19 MR. KELLEN: I'd settle for that.

20 DR. LONG: We've talked about the one through five to six,
21 and we got a little -- it looked like we're starting to merge a few things, so,
22 Debbie, for the sake of putting this together, if we can go the one through five that
23 we talked about with all the recommendations, and just reword or leave out that
24 number six which those paragraphs didn't seem to gel, that caused some of the
25 confusion, can either be reworded or left out at your discretion, and perhaps sent
26 out to the Committee.

27 We've done this before, and then some reactions to verbiage.
28 My question is --

29 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can I add one quick comment?
30 I do think there's some value to the sixth paragraph, because what it's saying is,
31 regarding -- it's not really identifying where those funds would come from, but it's
32 identifying the need to provide states funds to address the issue, whether it's in
33 need of improvement or persistently dangerous. So I think that it's -- I think
34 paragraph six provides a couple of options to the unsafe school choice: one, if a
35 state has a program already in place, it's addressing this.

36 Why duplicate efforts? And then the idea that there are some
37 needs for some funds in this area. So I think it's more, they maybe could be more
38 a finding than a recommendation of -- but I think that information is helpful.

39 DR. LONG: I'm sorry. I misspoke. It was six. What I meant
40 was seven that starts out "though not directly related." Take that off. That was
41 one where we got confused with the state grants program.

42 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right.

43 MR. PIMENTEL: This is Mike. But you're going to leave
44 paragraph six in, is that correct?

45 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. That's what I would do,
46 leave six in and take seven out.

47 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, okay. Give me the
48 numbers.

49 DR. LONG: Yes, and therein is a good lesson to you. I just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 kind of assigned those, and then I misspoke at the end, but it might be helpful in
2 the future for all of us, when we're not face to face, if perhaps those were
3 numbered, and then we might be able to follow them, perhaps a little easier. Just a
4 thought.

5 Debbie, the next steps, we'll meet again, of course, in
6 Washington on January 16th and 17th, and then we have a conference call on
7 December 18th, and on that December 18th, our charge will be to discuss the data
8 requirements portion that we'll be heading into. I just want to make sure that we're
9 all on the same page, there.

10 MR. KELLEN: What was bad about the data? Say that again,
11 David, if you would, I'm sorry.

12 DR. LONG: Yes, that will start on the 18th as we prepare for
13 the -- that will be the conference call, Shep, on December 18th, as we prepare for
14 that third group to come in, which will be January 16th and 17th in Washington.

15 So, it won't be a long one, but we'll start to head toward that
16 discussion with potential names and so forth.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I've got a problem which I don't
18 know of any solution to, but I'll mention it, anyway. I'm scheduled for some
19 elective surgery on the 16th, and I'll be out a week, if I do that.

20 MS. PRICE: December or January?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: January, I'm sorry.

22 MS. PRICE: I have a problem with January, too.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good.

24 MS. PRICE: Can I send a substitute?

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll just toss in mine. I thought
26 we said the 15th and 16th, not the 16th and 17th. And I just want to clarify. I
27 have something on the 17th, but I'll try to make the change, but is it the 16th and
28 17th, or is it the 15th and 16th?

29 DR. LONG: We originally had the 15th and 16th, and several
30 Committee members suggested, I do believe that we change so that we --

31 MR. LEDBETTER: The fifteenth is a holiday.

32 DR. LONG: I do believe that was the conversation that was
33 moved to the 16th and 17th.

34 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

35 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And there's no way to move it
36 again, I guess.

37 DR. LONG: It would be tough for me. I don't know; others
38 could speak to it.

39 MS. PRICE: I think, you know, granted, we want to work
40 around as many members' parameters and fit it in as possible, but what we can
41 always do is , you know, look at the calendar, see if there are alternative dates that
42 could be better. I don't want to set it up for a definite change of dates.

43 But we can email back and forth between now and our
44 December meeting.

45 MS. DAVIS: Can I just chime in here real quick, Debbie? We
46 do have to send, post that in the Federal Register in the next couple of weeks, so
47 we'll just have to make sure that we decide that before the posting date.

48 MS. PRICE: The January meeting?

49 MS. DAVIS: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. PRICE: We'll just have to play with it a bit.

2 MR. KELLEN: Okay, well, if you do what you can, that would
3 be great. But I was particularly interested in being there for the data requirement,
4 what to do about the data, so if you can move it, I'd appreciate it. If you can't,
5 maybe I'll talk from the hospital telephone, or something.

6 DR. LONG: Shep, this is Dave. Up front, I want to be really
7 honest with you. I called the doctor to see what day you were having that surgery.
8 (Laughter.)

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If I'm going to be out of town,
10 then I can get a replacement.

11 DR. LONG: Is that acceptable, Debbie? I don't recall what --

12 MS. PRICE: Sure. You can always have a representative attend
13 the Commission for you. If there was a reason to vote on something, they
14 wouldn't have the ability to vote.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, but they could speak up.

16 MS. PRICE: They can certainly --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great.

18 DR. LONG: And I think we have had several --

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, we have had substitutions
20 and I just didn't -- wanted to make sure it was okay.

21 MS. PRICE: They're only parameters, only because we don't
22 have -- no one is representing a particular association as members of the
23 Committee, so we would just ask that whoever represents you, if you're not there,
24 is not a representative of an association.

25 Because too many associations would like to be members, and
26 once we open that door, then we get in trouble with everybody else.

27 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can understand that.

28 MS. PRICE: And that's the only parameter.

29 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay, great.

30 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If we change that date, by when
31 will you make that decision?

32 MS. PRICE: It would have to be really soon to make that
33 decision.

34 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, I'm going to go ahead and
35 pencil in the 16th and 17th, then.

36 MS. PRICE: Well, the percentages are very strong that the
37 dates will stay the same, but we should give it a fair look at.

38 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The problem I have is that
39 education and public health really have not had much to do with each other, and
40 there are three of us, at least, on the Committee, who are public healthers and
41 researchers, Susan, Belinda and myself, and Russell, who is a researcher of a
42 different sort. And a lot of what we're talking about really has to do with how you
43 use information systems, and what happens if you've got too many, and some of
44 them are failing, and what's the history of that in public health. And it's been a
45 disastrous history.

46 So this becomes a very critical issue in public health to think
47 about how the assessment, the epidemiology, really needs to feed into where you
48 invest your crisis intervention, as well as your prevention and on-going time. I
49 mean, it's in many ways at the crux of a public health perspective on safe and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 drug-free schools.

2 So anyway, this is the big topic that I think we need to make
3 sure we are very careful about.

4 DR. LONG: Any other questions, comments, by Committee
5 members?

6 MS. TAFT: This is Hope again. Can you give me a little bit
7 more information than people who are knowledgeable about data for the types of
8 persons that we'll be looking for to present to us in January, so I can begin
9 thinking of names of people?

10 DR. LONG: Well, I think, and Shep hit it on the head. People
11 that would swirl from not just -- I mean, we have folks from the health and health
12 services background and research, but also, as that dovetails with educational
13 research, because we're going to have to put those two together. Beyond that,
14 unless Shep has something to add to that, just as we did, as we headed into these
15 other suggestions with the others, we had them on different levels. For example,
16 the last one we had them from the standpoint of law enforcement, and then state
17 level. So I think that's another thing we'd want to keep in mind would be the
18 various levels of researchers, and where they swirl in their daily lives and their
19 research, and who they report to.

20 MS. PRICE: Yes. I think that's right. If you kind of look at the
21 panels as we've had them so far, we've had, you know, kind of the broad
22 perspective on it, kind of, you know, when it comes to data, we really would want
23 those researchers, exactly as Shep described, we also want to get people who are
24 on the ground implementing those programs or making, trying to make sense out
25 of them. Those, you know, all those different levels. You can have a panel on
26 each of those.

27 And, to be absolutely honest, I haven't really sat down and
28 thought, okay, if we identified what those four panels should, you know, represent,
29 you know, who that would be, so, and any input into, Catherine, about your
30 concept of what should be on a panel, you know, at a hearing, or whatever we
31 want to call it, on data, that would be really helpful, because, coming into the
32 eighteenth, then we'll talk about, you know, suggestions for what those panels
33 should be and, you know, get your input on that.

34 But I think, you know, those can be emails that we send around
35 prior to the eighteenth so, just at the eighteenth, it's not a surprise for who, what
36 we're looking at.

37 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That sounds good. Because the
38 more I can get this picture clear in my mind of what kind of people you're looking
39 for, the better it will be for me to come up with suggestions.

40 MS. PRICE: Sure. Absolutely. I think that's, I think that's a
41 really valid point for everybody. I think that's right.

42 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, Debbie, just to be clear.
43 We'll be getting something that, some basic parameters or descriptors on what
44 we'll, what the data panel should consist of?

45 MS. PRICE: Well, I think -- one, we really would like for you
46 all that have your fingers in these pies to give some thoughts about, you know, if
47 you were, if you were suggesting four panels and you want to hear from all of
48 those in that, you know, obviously, a limited world of four panels, but, you know,
49 what are the, what would those be? We would love to hear that, that input from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you, so that, you know, and see those comments read, because I do think we'll
2 probably look, there will be somebody representing the states on the LEA level
3 that's dealing with issues of data, SEA level, the big broad picture, you know,
4 what all that should be.

5 You know, if you, especially those of you who are involved in
6 research, if you have suggestions for, not a person on the panel, but kind of what
7 each panel should represent, that would be helpful.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

9 DR. LONG: Any other comments by Committee members? If not, these
10 are, in closing, these are always difficult, you know, we're from all across the
11 United States, and not having the luxury of being able to see each other and talk to
12 each other, I think, again, you did a marvelous job. This is tough to do. So, thank
13 you so much, and everyone have a wonderful, wonderful Thanksgiving.

14 MR. LEDBETTER: Dave.

15 DR. LONG: Yes?

16 MR. LEDBETTER: Before we leave.

17 DR. LONG: Yes.

18 MR. LEDBETTER: This morning, here in Huntsville,
19 Alabama, we had school bus that went off of a viaduct and wrecked, and we've got
20 several reports this morning. It was not one of our schools, but it was an adjoining
21 school system to us in the Huntsville City school system and they, we understand,
22 we've been told there's been four to seven who died in the accident and so forth, so
23 I hope that you all will keep them in their, keep their families and all in your
24 thoughts and prayers.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Which high school was it?

26 MR. LEDBETTER: They were students from Lee High School
27 in Huntsville, Alabama, headed to their vocational technical center, and they were
28 on the Interstate highway, and the bus went over the rail and came off of a viaduct
29 and hit down below, and we haven't had, you know, all the information is pretty
30 sketchy at this point.

31 They have different reports from 20 to 47 students on the bus
32 and, I mean, they're, they're trying to piece it together, but they say that there's a
33 lot of students that are critically injured at this time. And one of the teachers here
34 at my school had a nephew that was on that bus, and his sister called and told him
35 that she didn't have no word if he had lived or not, and they were on their way to
36 the hospital this morning, too.

37 So, you know, when things like that happen around the country,
38 you know, we all need to be, you know, thankful that it's not one of ours, but we
39 need to be thoughtful of the families involved. And I'd appreciate it if you all
40 would think about them.

41 MS. PRICE: And Tommy, if you hear of it, you know, we'll,
42 this is the kind of thing that we do some follow up on from my office, and if you
43 hear of the name of someone attached, at, in that school district that we should be
44 in contact with, if you'd let us know, that would be great.

45 MR. LEDBETTER: Well, Dr. Ann Roy Moore is the
46 superintendent of the Huntsville City School System. And --

47 MS. PRICE: What was her first name?

48 MR. LEDBETTER: Her name is Ann Roy Moore.

49 MS. PRICE: Ann Roy, okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LEDBETTER: But Dr. Moore is the superintendent of
2 that school system and it's, it's a school system of about 23,000, 24,000 students.
3 But, it was something that's going to be pretty tragic for all, all of us around here,
4 and I'm sure it will be on all the national news tonight.

5 MS. PRICE: Yes, that's really terrible. Thanks for letting us
6 know --

7 DR. LONG: Thank you for letting us know that, Tommy, and
8 most certainly they will be in our thoughts and prayers.

9 MR. LEDBETTER: All right. You all have a good day, and
10 we'll see you on the eighteenth. Talk to you then.

11 (Whereupon, at 2:13 p.m., the teleconference was concluded.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701