

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

INTRODUCTORY MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,
JUNE 13, 2006

+ + + + +

The Advisory Committee met in the Columbia 1 Room of the Holiday Inn Capitol, 550 C Street Southwest, Washington, D.C., at 8:30 a.m., David Long, Chairman, presiding.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

- DAVID LONG, Riverside County Public Schools
- FREDERICK E. ELLIS, Fairfax County Public Schools
- RUSSELL T. JONES, Virginia Tech University
- TOMMY LEDBETTER, Buckborn High School
- MONTEAN JACKSON, Fairbanks North Star Borough School District
- SHEPPARD KELLAM, M.D.American Institutes of Research

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

SETH NORMAN, Davidson County Drug Court
HOPE TAFT, Office of the First Lady
MICHAEL PIMENTEL, San Antonio ISD Police

EX OFFICIO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

DEBORAH A. PRICE, U.S. Department of Education
BELINDA E. SIMS, Ph.D. National Institutes of Health

ACTING DESIGNATED FEDERAL OFFICIAL:

WILLIAM MODZELESKI, U.S. Department of Education

ALSO PRESENT:

VICTOR MEDRANO (Representing Howell Wechsler, CDC)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Call to Order 4
David Long

Overview of Day II 10, 56
Discussion of Purpose of Advisory
Committee, Expectations of the Committee,
and Committee's Charge

Period for Public Comment 50

Introduction of Advisory Committee Members 53
for the Sake of the Audience Members

Concluding Remarks 128

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

8:30 a.m.

CHAIRMAN LONG: It is 8:30, so we will call this meeting to order.

First of all, I would like to call your attention to just a few housekeeping things, quite a few housekeeping things.

First of all, welcome to everyone again, bright-eyed and bushy-tailed this morning, all ready to go.

I would like to call your attention to the agenda that was published. This is our first meeting.

So this is an indicator of where we will be going and the things that we will be talking about.

As we get into our second meeting and our third meeting, we will be quite prescriptive and we will know exactly what the parameters are. Today we are going to have some rough parameters and go in that direction. But I want to let all of us know that, depending on what the discussion is, we might move a little to the left or a little to the right. Can I say that in Washington? I just thought about that.

(Laughter.)

A few things also that I want to point out and I want to hand out. First of all, this is a written answer to a question that was asked concerning lobbying by members if they are here for a two-day meeting and the meeting ends in a half-day, which is today. Someone asked the question if you could then go to visit with a Member of Congress or a Senator, and would it be okay to discuss business from your district or from your police force, or wherever you happen to be from?

This is the written answer to that. The answer is, "Since we end today, and if you happen to have one of those meetings, then, yes, it is permissible as long as you are conducting your business and it's not the business of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Committee." So we wanted you to have that in writing.

Some of the things that we will be talking about today will be this: We're going to be talking about really what the purpose of the Committee is, what our charge is, the expectations of this Committee. We are going to talk about -- and you will be giving the answers -- the issues at hand and then the process to get at those issues.

We are also going to be spending some time on a calendar, because another important element of this will be that of communication. I always worry that whenever we come together with groups like this that then, when we leave, that we want to make sure

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that we have ways to share that information and we
2 have some very specific dates so that we can get back
3 together to communicate and continue with that
4 process.

5 I would like, as we start, to just mention
6 a few things from yesterday. When we were going
7 through the housecleaning and were hearing from the
8 different parts of the Division as to what goes on in
9 the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Division, and some of
10 the questions that were asked and some of the things
11 that you came up with, I just scripted some things. I
12 think it is too many years as a principal and being in
13 a classroom, but I wanted to just play a few of those
14 things back to you because I think it is very
15 important.

16 I think yesterday was important to reflect
17 the level of expertise that sits around this table,
18 the depth of the expertise that sits around this
19 table. I heard words like "children" over and over,
20 as we hoped that we would, and a word that in 15
21 minutes I heard seven times "relationships," because
22 it's important to all of us.

23 Michael and I had a chance to visit this
24 morning. We talked a lot about relationships. I
25 think many of the things that we are going to discuss
26 and some of the issues, and the processes to get
27 there, will use that term over and over.

28 Another term that was used four or five
29 times that it is critically important is no surprise,
30 but I want to play this back for you this morning as
31 we start, and that's "passion." I think everyone who
32 sits around this table today is filled with passion
33 for those children, and that's why you're here.
34 That's why Montean came from Alaska to be at this
35 meeting.

36 I would like to also, just as an
37 observation, a couple of things -- well, more than a
38 couple -- some things that were just observations
39 yesterday: Montean, you get the award for flight
40 longer than meeting.

41 (Laughter.)

42 Didn't you say it's 12.5 hours from
43 Alaska? Okay.

44 I've been in thousands of meetings, as I'm
45 sure you have. I've never been in a meeting where a
46 Seth and a Shep sat next to each other.

47 (Laughter.)

48 The other thing that I want to mention, I
49 think it's important, whenever we have committees like
50 this, it does represent various parts of the country.

51 I heard from Alabama and Tennessee and Texas and
52 other parts of the country, but for many of us other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 parts of the country are quite bland. I happen to be
2 from California. I was originally from the Midwest,
3 so my speech is rather bland, but I love to hear those
4 of you from Alabama, Texas, and Tennessee talk. I
5 just have to tell you that. It's great, especially
6 you, Judge. You've got a wonderful bravado.

7 We say that we have expertise and depth of
8 expertise, and I think sometimes we just say that and
9 we don't pay any attention to it. So this is going to
10 take about a minute and a half, but it's going to
11 illustrate a very important point. I am going to ask
12 -- and we're going to start with Fred -- just to
13 illustrate for those of us that are visual, the
14 Committee members, and if you would say the number of
15 years that you have been in the field, whatever your
16 field is. For some of you, it's police work; some of
17 you, it's education. But I think rather than just say
18 expertise and years of experience, let's illustrate
19 that. So I am going to ask the Committee members, and
20 we'll start with you, Fred, number of years.

21 (Whereupon, the Advisory Committee members
22 stated how many years of experience they each have.)

23 CHAIRMAN LONG: Three hundred and seventy-
24 seven. The reason, as I said, that I think it's
25 important to do that occasionally is, when we say the
26 expertise and the years of experience, when you think
27 of it that way and add them up, it truly gives us some
28 breadth and depth of experience. Of course, that
29 leads to expertise.

30 Another way, Seth, to look at that, with
31 the 377, is 3.77 centuries.

32 Let's do this: By the way, I'm going to
33 stick to the schedule, one part of it that will be
34 set, because this was a published agenda and an open
35 meeting. So at 9:30 we are going to have a period for
36 public comment. So wherever we are at about that
37 time, I will pay attention to it; we will then move to
38 public comment.

39 The first thing that I had talked about
40 was the purpose, charge, and expectations of this
41 Committee, and then moving into some agreement on the
42 issues. So putting all that together, I want to give
43 you a second handout that will help us with that.

44 We will wait for that to come around. As
45 that's coming around, I'll make this announcement:
46 Would you please, as you speak, if you would make sure
47 that you turn the microphone on so that the
48 transcriber can pick it up. All of this is being
49 recorded and we want to make sure that everything is
50 picked up. That's the little button on your left
51 there that will click on for the red.

52 Everybody have the handouts, "Safe and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Drug-Free Schools" and "Communities Advisory
2 Committee"? It's about a three-pager. Everyone
3 should have that now.

4 As indicated, I would ask, first of all,
5 agreement on the issues. Yesterday, also when the
6 information was being given to us and there were
7 questions and some discussion, some ideas popped out.

8 So what we are going to be talking about today, and
9 need some input from you because you, as the
10 Committee, will be deciding this, we want to find out
11 what those issues are.

12 As we get to that, I would like to have
13 you take a look right at this first paragraph because
14 that really will codify what we are talking about with
15 the purpose, charge, and expectations of this
16 Committee.

17 The first paragraph, first page, where the
18 Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as
19 amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, NCLB,
20 contains the provisions for the Safe and Drug-Free
21 Schools and Communities Act, including the State
22 Grants Program, the Secretary asks that you address
23 questions related to three topics within Title IV of
24 NCLB regarding -- and this also popped out in some of
25 the questions and some of the comments. So I'm going
26 to just take a look at those three -- it's coming from
27 the Secretary -- and then we will start talking about
28 the issues.

29 The State Grants Program; the second one
30 was the Unsafe School Choice Option, and the third,
31 requirements for data. As I said, this came out in
32 your questions and it came out in comments.

33 So the first part of what this Committee,
34 as we start out of the box, I would like to hear from
35 you what the issues are. These are the three coming
36 from the Secretary.

37 We also heard from Deputy Secretary Simon
38 some of the same comments in his welcome to us
39 yesterday. So I would like to hear from you from the
40 standpoint of these three, and then if there are any
41 additional points or issues that need to be added as
42 we go forward, because first we have to identify those
43 issues.

44 Also, as we have that discussion, I would
45 like to have you think about, when I talked about
46 breadth and depth of experience, we want to talk about
47 and think about the number of issues that we want to
48 wrestle with. I think we would all agree that with
49 the geographics involved and the time that is
50 involved, that we do not have time for six, seven,
51 eight issues. So we want to keep the list small, but
52 it is important that we identify them.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, with that, if we take those three, I
2 want to ask the question, first, are there problems or
3 any discussion on those three to the point of, should
4 these be the issues we tackle? Not answering the
5 question, because as you can see, there are questions
6 attached, and we will come up with questions as we
7 have meetings throughout the year. Right now we are
8 just talking about the issues, the big umbrellas. So
9 the question is, anything on these three, include and
10 start from there, and add.

11 DR. KELLAM: Say a little more about your
12 question to us.

13 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry?

14 DR. KELLAM: Say a little more about your
15 question to us.

16 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. We're looking at,
17 we are trying to get the number of issues. So my
18 first question -- and keep the list short or small --
19 so the first question relative to that, are there any
20 problems -- do we just stay with these -- not just --
21 do we stay with these three and build on it? That's
22 question No. 1. Question No. 2, if that is yes, then
23 what do we add?

24 So my first question would be, are we okay
25 with the three as issues, not the internal workings of
26 them, just the issues? Is that a yes? Okay.

27 The reason I'm saying that is because this
28 is being recorded, and I see the head nods, but they
29 didn't. So that's why I was asking the question.

30 Shep?

31 DR. KELLAM: The question that I'm trying
32 to wrestle with is an issue which probably transcends
33 all three. It has to do with, how do we make better
34 partnerships between research and practitioners,
35 school districts, for example? It has to do with a
36 fundamental missing bridge between the research
37 programs that people carry out and the practice issues
38 that school districts deal with.

39 So, for example, many prevention programs
40 compete with curriculum and instruction around reading
41 for time in the classroom. That's an issue that comes
42 out of the fact that the prevention research is not
43 necessarily or even usually developed from within the
44 context of the school district's mission. So that
45 many prevention programs, for example, will look at
46 violence outcomes but never include achievement,
47 reading achievement, as part of the outcome measures,
48 even as a mediating or causal issue. Kids who learn
49 behave better is a general scientific inference we
50 have drawn.

51 So where does the question of partnerships
52 fit in?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN LONG: Let me throw this out and
2 see if this works for us: that we have the three that
3 were mentioned and that popped out yesterday, and that
4 we now look at -- and I think you've gotten us off to
5 a good start -- look at other potentials for that
6 fourth, or if there's a tie or another big one, we go
7 fifth, because you will decide that.

8 So we now have those three, and if we
9 could start with what Shep just said, an idea, and
10 then after we throw all those ideas out for trying to
11 arrive at that number four or that number five, you
12 will decide that through a process of just discussion.

13 So the first one, Shep, can I just say,
14 "partnerships"? We need some kind of a bullet.

15 MS. TAFT: Or is it research to practice?

16 DR. KELLAM: It's both. The requirement
17 for research to practice is a partnership that gets
18 the research developed and inside of the mission of
19 the institution.

20 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Would it be better
21 -- and I thank you for that, Hope -- research to
22 practice?

23 As long as the specific issue is not
24 overly abstract. I mean I think that there are
25 elements -- for example, we don't train researchers
26 how to do research inside school districts.

27 MS. TAFT: And there's some thought that
28 if prevention was embedded in all of the classwork
29 material, we would get more prevention and more
30 academics at the same time.

31 DR. KELLAM: Right, exactly right.

32 CHAIRMAN LONG: Let me just make a
33 comment. I agree with Shep's concern, and he made a
34 comment that I think kind of hits the nail on the head
35 in terms of this specific topic may be a little bit
36 abstract for a separate, specific issue for the
37 Committee to look at. My own personal opinion is that
38 these three are pretty ambitious in and of themselves,
39 and, in fact, embedded, particularly in the first one,
40 the State Grants Program, there are some specific
41 questions already in here about trying to determine
42 the efficacy of programming in terms of making a
43 difference in the school.

44 I think we will get to your points which I
45 think are very valid points, but I'm not sure at this
46 point that we really need to make a separate topic. I
47 mean I think these three are going to give us plenty
48 to do, and we will get to your very important one, I
49 think, in the process.

50 DR. KELLAM: Yes, I just want to endorse
51 that because I think what we are going to end up with
52 is not just a laundry list, but some kind of three- or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 four-dimensional model that we can make.

2 CHAIRMAN LONG: I think both of you make a
3 good point. It might be that, as we continue on this
4 discussion, it might be that instead of adding a
5 fourth or fifth, we might be talking about inherent
6 qualities of the three. I think that was the point
7 that both of you were getting to, and I think that is
8 a very valid point.

9 So even given that, we want to make sure
10 that we have the opportunity to keep talking about
11 that. If there are other points to add or if they
12 become more of these inherent qualities for the three,
13 then you will make that decision.

14 Any other either points or qualities?

15 JUDGE NORMAN: It would appear to me that
16 if we address the three major points that the
17 Secretary asked us to address to begin with, after we
18 have cleaned that up or we have come up with whatever
19 we decide on that, then these other issues that Shep
20 brings up are going to come up and we will know how to
21 address them at that point in time. Right now we
22 don't know whether they are going to fold into one of
23 these three matters or not. So if we address these
24 three matters first, then later on we will have a
25 cleanup session to pick up anything we haven't
26 covered. If Shep's idea doesn't fall into one of
27 these three -- and I personally think it will -- then
28 we will clean it up later on.

29 DR. JONES: Well, I think that we are
30 going to end up doing these things simultaneously. I
31 think the research is part and parcel of each of these
32 questions. I don't think these questions can be
33 addressed without looking at them from a scientific
34 perspective and bringing to fore what we know about
35 that process and how that process impacts on
36 intervention strategies, outcomes, evaluation of those
37 outcomes, et cetera.

38 So I think we are going to hit each of
39 these, and the research will kind of underpin and,
40 hopefully -- hopefully -- guide all, if not much, of
41 what we do.

42 CHAIRMAN LONG: Are there other comments?

43 (No response.)

44 What I am hearing is that we stick with
45 the three and flesh them out, and when we say, "flesh
46 them out," then we get back to the two points that
47 were made by Fred and Seth. That is that those
48 qualities will pop out or some of those overarching
49 questions that would be inherent to all three of those
50 focus areas would be apparent. Are we okay with that?

51 Okay, then the three areas, the focus
52 areas, that the Committee will delve into will be the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 State Grants Program, the Unsafe School Choice Option,
2 and requirements for data.

3 This might be one of the toughest meetings
4 we have because we are trying to figure out where we
5 are going. So this is a tough one. Once we know what
6 is out there on the table, I have a feeling that this
7 group is going to jump right on it and we won't have
8 any problems. But it is finding the way today. So
9 that is good and that is appreciated.

10 We now have the three focus areas.
11 Something else that I asked about, and another thing
12 that we have to determine today then, what is the
13 process, what process are we going to use to find out
14 and to jump on these three focus areas? There's all
15 kinds of processes that we could use.

16 When we start to talk about this, we are
17 going to have to involve the calendar because I had
18 mentioned communication earlier, but at the same time,
19 depending on what the process is, it is going to tie
20 into the calendar because depending on what the
21 process is will dictate the time allotment that is
22 going to be necessary to delve into these three focus
23 areas.

24 Do you want me to give you some
25 suggestions? Let me just start with one. I know
26 that, as I indicated, there are all kinds of ways to
27 get at this.

28 But one that is a proven way to do it, and
29 it can take many shapes and forms, that is with focus
30 groups, meaning having three or four experts that you
31 would identify as a Committee we would then invite in.

32 They would talk about these subject data or the State
33 Grants Program. We will just take one of the three.
34 You would identify as a Committee some experts that
35 would come in, and three or four is usually the proper
36 amount so that we don't take too much time with too
37 many on one panel or one focus group.

38 Let's hear from the experts that you
39 identified and then give you an opportunity -- we have
40 an hour and a half, two hours, for each one of them.
41 You determine that. Then it gives you an opportunity
42 to ask questions and enter into a dialog with the
43 experts that you have identified.

44 Tommy?

45 MR. LEDBETTER: What are our other
46 choices? I mean that sounds fine, but are there other
47 choices?

48 MS. PRICE: Just an offering, some
49 suggestions for some things that I know have been done
50 at other advisory committees or commissions at the
51 Department, most have had focus groups, a couple of
52 focus groups, where they invited panels, three or so

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 panels with three or four people on a panel to hear
2 from in a really condensed day, so to speak. So to
3 hear from them, get a lot of input, as well as
4 receiving information from experts in the field that
5 send the information in and then all that information
6 is given to all the commission members.

7 Because even when you invite people in for
8 focus groups, I mean you can identify two or three
9 people in the field that are experts, but, clearly,
10 there are multiple people and multiple perspectives on
11 issues and you do want to be able to hear as much as
12 possible. One person at a previous committee said
13 that he felt like he heard all there was to hear, but
14 he hadn't heard it from everybody, and he needed to
15 hear it from everybody.

16 Then one tool that can be used is the tool
17 of a conference call where, after the Advisory
18 Committee has received information or thought through
19 and kind of chewed up issues, to come together in a
20 conference call and then to talk about that, to get
21 some focus on that and get some directions, raise more
22 questions so that you know what additionally you need
23 to answer.

24 That's a way that budgetwise is efficient
25 but also for your calendars and travel schedules can
26 be really efficient, is to just plan conference calls.

27 Of course, with the briefing we had
28 yesterday on the Federal Advisory Committee Act, those
29 would be open, and so that number would be published
30 and people could listen to the conference call. But
31 it has proven to be a good tool for some other
32 commissions that have been here.

33 MR. ELLIS: Just a comment: I like the
34 focus group idea. I like being able to bring in the
35 experts and ask them specific questions.

36 I think one thing that would be very
37 helpful, though, in terms of process is that prior,
38 well prior to that meeting, that we get read-ahead
39 material, both from the Department of Ed's side in
40 terms of, for instance, the State Grants Program, kind
41 of a refresher about that program, what it is, the
42 parameters of it, everything you guys would like us to
43 know about it, and if we could also get, for instance
44 -- there's obviously been questions about it. There's
45 been criticism about it. If we could get that ahead
46 of time to allow us to kind of understand the issues
47 better prior to having the experts in.

48 Then I don't know; we may want to do it
49 like a conference call or something prior to the
50 appearance of the expert witnesses, so we can meet
51 just telephonically as a group, identify what we see
52 are the key issues. So that when the folks come in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here, we are not wasting their way and they are not
2 wasting ours, and we can get to the meat of the matter
3 and then follow it up however we think.

4 MR. MEDRANO: Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

5 CHAIRMAN LONG: I got a note and I misread
6 the note.

7 MR. MEDRANO: May I add to what Fred was
8 mentioning? Because I, too, agree that looking at
9 focus groups is probably beneficial. But, as I sat
10 here listening to your questions, and because I am a
11 very, I guess, direct individual in terms of laying
12 things out, it would seem to me that yesterday we
13 heard certainly the breadth and the scope of the
14 Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and specifically
15 their state program, which was extremely beneficial.

16 But I think what is important for us as we
17 address this particular question is, where is it that
18 the Office wants to be either two years from now, five
19 years down the road, or ten years down the road? I
20 certainly would like to hear from the Office as to
21 that aspect of it.

22 Then, secondly, I would like to hear --
23 and this may be from the focus groups -- what are the
24 successes and some of the implementations of the
25 programs that exist in that Office and what's out
26 there? What guidance is being provided to the state
27 education agencies and local education agencies around
28 these initiatives or activities? Is there a
29 consistency across the board? I don't have a handle
30 on it, and that's what Fred was getting at, is having
31 more information along those lines.

32 Then, thirdly, looking at some of the gaps
33 that exist, identifying where we can strengthen the
34 state program.

35 Then, finally, I think from here we can
36 certainly move forward with addressing maybe some of
37 our recommendations to the Office in terms of
38 strengthening the state program.

39 CHAIRMAN LONG: My response to that would
40 be -- and then I will have Debbie Price, since she
41 represents the Department -- but just as an outsider
42 out in the field, I am looking forward to listening to
43 the experts. Fred, thank you for that idea, which is
44 a good one, to have the read-ahead and the information
45 well ahead so we can formulate questions, so that we
46 can at least simulate some of the information so we
47 know what to ask.

48 But as we bring those experts in, I would
49 think, from my perspective, it would be helpful so
50 that I can get some of those questions, I can get some
51 of those answers, so that we can then put that in the
52 report to the Secretary to offer up some direction

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from all the expertise around this table, so that she
2 can then synthesize that information and either accept
3 or reject it.

4 So I would need to hear some of this -- I
5 think I know quite a bit about some of these, but that
6 is why we have the experts.

7 Debbie, would you like to comment?

8 MS. PRICE: Regarding the perspective of
9 the Department and where the Department wants to go,
10 basically, I would say our desire -- besides this
11 being our task to do, the functions of the Office, we
12 have a very heart-felt concern and desire for the
13 programs for dealing with issues of drug/alcohol abuse
14 and prevention, violence prevention, making the
15 classroom an atmosphere that is really conducive to
16 learning, that kids come to school with respect and an
17 eagerness to learn, so that truly, as our legislation
18 is named, no child is left behind.

19 Our focus is to present programs that
20 maximize those issues, those perspectives, so that if
21 we have a program -- I'll pick on the mentoring
22 program. If we have a mentoring program, that it
23 really is -- obviously, at times we are constrained by
24 parameters of legislation, but working within the
25 parameters of the legislation, making sure that that
26 program is to the best of our ability designed in such
27 a way so that it is effective; it is the federal
28 dollars -- there's respect for the federal dollars and
29 how they are used, and that children's lives are being
30 enhanced because these programs are there. They are
31 learning. They are coming out of school with better
32 academic achievement.

33 I think in the broad spectrum, having
34 programs that are effective in children's lives that
35 are not duplicates of other programs, that tackle
36 issues that are in front of children and parents and
37 teachers, I think that is where we want to be. That
38 does change some.

39 I think when you were given the briefings
40 about the programs of the Office yesterday, you could
41 see that there's been some evolution of things
42 happening and different issues arise. We are always
43 looking at new issues. So there's a life to it. So
44 we don't want our program to be stagnant, either, but
45 we want it to be able to move and address those needs
46 of the education community as they develop.

47 If I could say where we want to be, that's
48 in a very broad sense where we would want to be.

49 DR. JONES: Well, a couple of things.
50 One, I think what would be very helpful is, if
51 possible, to have these three questions more
52 objectively defined. I mean they are very broad and,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 boy, it's just kind of difficult to kind of get your
2 arms around those.

3 I'm sure that is what is expected for the
4 Committee to do, but just a bit more clarity in terms
5 of -- so, for example, the data, are we talking about
6 the way data are collected? Are we talking about how
7 long data are collected? Are we talking about how
8 data are analyzed, how data are written up,
9 interpreted, et cetera? I mean there are just a
10 number of different aspects that I think go with that
11 question as well as the others.

12 I'm sure that is part of the work that
13 this Committee should do, but, again, just objectively
14 defining the nuances of each of those questions.

15 Then, related to that, and I know this is
16 something that we did at the CDC for a number of
17 years, is trying to get a critical kind of an analysis
18 of what has been done, the extent to which it has been
19 done, going back, I think, Victor, to what you are
20 saying, how well it has been done, what works, what
21 doesn't work. So we kind of have a baseline.

22 I was very impressed with what was
23 presented yesterday, just the enormity of projects,
24 the depth and the breadth, scope of projects. But to
25 be able to look at those projects critically and to be
26 able to determine the extent to which the projects
27 have internal and external validity, I mean just some
28 very basic -- you know, I'm kind of putting on my
29 scientist hat, but just some very basic questions in
30 terms of the rigor in which the various programs are
31 being carried out and the extent to which that rigor
32 is being reflected and the outcomes.

33 It is certainly understandable that you
34 are working within certain parameters. Again, we face
35 that time after time at the CDC and other groups. But
36 even within those constraints, if you will, there are
37 varying degrees of rigor that can be engaged to
38 enhance the likelihood of desired outcomes.

39 I guess I am saying a number of different
40 things, but one thing that would be very helpful for
41 me, if I had kind of where we are and what is working
42 and moving on from there.

43 MR. MODZELESKI: Russell has some good
44 points. I think that we can streamline these. From
45 our perspective, if you take the data one, for
46 example, I think, simply put, the data one I would say
47 is, where do you want to be? At the end of the game,
48 where do you want to be? Is the current system of
49 collecting data getting you there?

50 In other words, here are the requirements.
51 We could outline the requirements, and there's
52 multiple requirements in the legislation for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 collecting data. As I mentioned yesterday, it is
2 collecting data, everything from the school level, not
3 the individual level, as Shep was talking about, but
4 from the school level up to the SEA level we're
5 collecting data. Then beyond that, at the national
6 aggregate level for, say, studies, whether it is
7 something like monitoring the future or the large-
8 scale CDC YRBSS. So there's a lot of data.

9 Is that getting you what you want, yes or
10 no? That is a relatively simple question. If it is
11 not getting you what you want, then, basically, I
12 think that leads you to a next level: What should we
13 be doing?

14 In saying that, it gets a little bit more
15 complicated because then you raise issues of dollars,
16 because for every data piece that you collect, it is
17 going to cost some money. It gets into authority. Do
18 we as the federal government have the authority to
19 collect certain pieces of information? Because you
20 just can't say, because it is nice, we want it; we
21 like it; let's have it. There has to be a legal basis
22 for collecting data.

23 Then I think the third question is that,
24 once you have it, what are you going to do with it and
25 how are you going to use it? Because collecting data
26 for data's sake or just for collection purposes isn't
27 really good public policy. There has to be some uses
28 or some basis for collecting it.

29 That is sort of putting that in as
30 simplistic as I can, but I think you have to start
31 basically saying, where do we want to be in regard to
32 collecting data?

33 DR. JONES: One other thing to maybe throw
34 on the table is the extent to which the breadth of
35 activity -- I've always had a little saying that I
36 would rather do a few things well than a lot of things
37 not so well. I know there are many things that are
38 mandated by Congress that we've got to do. But I am
39 just wondering the extent to which we might consider
40 -- maybe this is a way to look at it: It's
41 prioritizing. Maybe that is the word I am looking
42 for.

43 Are there some programs that are more in
44 need? Are there some programs that we need to get to
45 first, and then there are others that maybe can wait?

46 So prioritizing. I don't think I can put it a better
47 way.

48 DR. KELLAM: I'm trying to build on what
49 you guys have been talking about. Yesterday I think
50 we all agree was a huge amount of material,
51 descriptions of projects that I hadn't any idea
52 existed. So that the scope of what we are about all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of a sudden became not only more clear, but more
2 wondrous.

3 This looks like a huge core area of
4 executive function in the government for pulling
5 together everything from mental health, public health,
6 you know, criminology, around a core of education,
7 which makes incredible sense. In fact, people argued
8 about doing that for the last 100 years. It is sort
9 at the essence of the mental hygiene movement and the
10 early literature on delinquency, and so on.

11 So it is a huge picture we are talking
12 about. It reminds me of when ADAMHA came into
13 existence and even HEW in Eisenhower's time. The
14 whole idea was to pull the government together into
15 some kind of integrated, reasonably integrated piece.

16 That raises the question about -- I
17 remember when ADAMHA was invented, before SAMHSA,
18 Gerry Klerman, who was a contemporary of mine, found
19 -- he was the first head of ADAMHA -- that there were
20 14 different agencies, without even hardly counting,
21 that were in the prevention business. They didn't
22 talk to each other, had no real understanding of the
23 programs across the agencies.

24 So one of the questions is, how many
25 people are doing mentoring research or carrying out
26 mentoring programs? So one of the things that I think
27 we have to do is to pay attention to the functions
28 that are spread out that are somewhat disconnected and
29 how to bring them into some common focus and function.

30 That means talking to people; for example, the guy or
31 person who runs the assessment systems, the current
32 statewide obligated management information systems
33 that tell you which schools are failing or not.

34 Because somehow we have to know how that
35 data fits with where we need to go and who else is
36 collecting data, and what are the guiding logical
37 principles that guide the collection and the use of
38 the data. So we need to explore the government
39 agencies and find out, in fact, how much piecemeal
40 function is going on that we could handily bring
41 together or at least advise to bring together.

42 MS. TAFT: I think we also need to keep in
43 mind that this whole piece of legislation will begin
44 to go under review in 2008 -- 2007?

45 MS. PRICE: 2007 is when --

46 MS. TAFT: It is supposed to start?

47 MS. PRICE: If they start on time --

48 MS. TAFT: Right, right.

49 MS. PRICE: -- it would be 2007.

50 MS. TAFT: But whatever we do, I think we
51 ought to have our recommendations in the pipeline
52 early enough to affect that reauthorization. So I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 don't want us to get too broad in scope that we never
2 come around to some recommendations.

3 MS. PRICE: Just to complement what you
4 said, Hope, we have the reauthorization coming around
5 in 2007. There may be some recommendations that we
6 want to do. But, at the same time, I think it is
7 really significant to look at, are there changes that
8 could happen or issues to address that can be
9 addressed in manners other than trying to actually
10 change the legislative language? Is there guidance?
11 Is there regulation, just general implementation?

12 Because, quite honestly, there may be some
13 things that are much more straightforward to address
14 rather than legislation because legislation, as you
15 know, gets tricky because there is over 500 of them up
16 there who dink around with what you think is good.

17 MS. TAFT: I agree. I think that the
18 sooner we can get some recommendations, the more
19 helpful we will be to the Department to make the
20 program viable and an asset to not on the Federal
21 Department of Education, but also to the local LEAs.
22 That could help in a multitude of ways.

23 MS. PRICE: Right. It is very subtle in
24 the wording of the first paragraph, but I see that the
25 Secretary has requested us to look at these issues and
26 to give her a report that includes findings as well as
27 recommendations. Findings, you know, statements of
28 fact about programs, can actually be as strong
29 sometimes as recommendations because they tell you
30 -- you know, if you just have recommendations, you
31 sort of miss your perspective on it. So I am pleased
32 that the findings aspect is there so you can state
33 those pieces about what you believe about something as
34 well as your recommendations.

35 MS. JACKSON: I'm back to one point that
36 was made a little earlier: What are the gaps and the
37 existing problems with regard to the program and
38 needing to have that baseline data and information, so
39 that we have somewhere to start and we kind of can
40 move forward.

41 Because, again, for some of us, there may
42 be regional issues; there may be the financial
43 monetary issues that played a role in why certain
44 programs are doing some of the things that they are
45 doing. So we may identify, because of the lack of
46 funding and availability of funding, why certain areas
47 are doing less than what some of the other areas might
48 be doing. They don't have the infrastructure in
49 place. They don't have adequate staffing, or
50 whatever.

51 So I am really definitely interested in
52 looking at the original report that was talked about a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 little bit yesterday, the PART report, so that we are
2 able to identify some of those core areas. So that as
3 we look at these three areas that we are tasked with
4 making recommendations and looking at some findings,
5 we have a baseline to start with.

6 CHAIRMAN LONG: Good point. Good point.

7 Other comments?

8 DR. JONES: Yes, just real quick. The
9 idea of the recommendations I think is very good, but
10 I am hoping that we can put that in our agenda so that
11 that's gotten to. So once that date comes -- I mean
12 this is 2006, isn't it? So that that can be done.
13 I'll stop there.

14 CHAIRMAN LONG: Other comments?

15 (No response.)

16 If not, we would like to start to put some
17 of this together in how we do communicate. To do
18 that, we are going to have to look at a calendar and
19 work through some of the things.

20 We have talked about focus groups, three
21 of them. We have talked about the experts. We will
22 put that together in just a little bit. But right now
23 I think we need to talk about the calendar.

24 This is a draft, and that is why it is
25 written that way. So this can be changed, but we
26 needed some kind of a backbone to start from. So I
27 will hand this out to you now.

28 Everybody get one?

29 Now this sometimes can be a tough one
30 because we come from all over the country. Some
31 people fly 12.5 hours, Montean, and others drive
32 -- Fred, what is it, an hour or less?

33 MR. ELLIS: It seems a lot longer some
34 days, yes.

35 (Laughter.)

36 CHAIRMAN LONG: So we have folks from all
37 over the country. Keeping that in mind, let's take a
38 look at this draft, bearing in mind the discussion we
39 have had for the past hour relative to the three focus
40 groups.

41 If you will start right there at the top,
42 the meeting that we have had today, then suggested --
43 but then we need to start, as I said, to put some meat
44 on the bones here.

45 A Committee conference call in July, that
46 would be a conference call wherever you happen to
47 live, which will cut down on some of the things that
48 we talked about with travel. But that will be an
49 important one. It is important that as many as
50 possible, like with all the meetings, would be either
51 on the line or physically at these meetings, because
52 we will have to start to put the focus groups

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 together. Not just put them together, it's going to
2 have to come to closure at that one because people
3 have to be notified. Before we leave today, we are
4 going to want some suggestions from you, so that we
5 can get started, because people have to be contacted.

6 Hope?

7 MS. TAFT: It is hard for me to tell you
8 dates or general ideas without my master calendar and
9 to give you suggestions of names without my brain
10 being at a place where I have all my data collection.

11 But one of the questions I want to know
12 is, how long do you think these conference calls
13 usually will last?

14 CHAIRMAN LONG: I would guess --

15 MS. TAFT: Because I find --

16 CHAIRMAN LONG: It is going to range, as
17 we start out the box, we should be able to conduct
18 that business in one hour to an hour and a half at the
19 most, but probably one hour.

20 MS. TAFT: Because I find that it is very
21 hard to keep my focused attention on long conference
22 calls. Is that a nice way to put it?

23 (Laughter.)

24 CHAIRMAN LONG: Or 45 minutes. How's
25 that? And that is a good point, because when we don't
26 have the face-to-face contact, it is just like earlier
27 I asked, just for the sake of the audio, is that a
28 "yes," because we can quickly in five, ten seconds,
29 when a question is asked, people do this (indicating);
30 on a conference call we can't do that. So sometimes
31 that expands it. But I would think no more than an
32 hour.

33 Yes, Belinda.

34 DR. SIMS: Just looking at the calendar
35 and reflecting on the comments that have already been
36 made, would it be helpful before we zone in on --
37 well, we have the draft calendar here, but figure out,
38 what will we be tackling as our first issue in July?
39 I'm assuming we can't cover all three of these within
40 the context of one conference call or one focus group
41 meeting.

42 Should we work with Russell's suggestion
43 around prioritizing what we are going to do first?

44 CHAIRMAN LONG: That is a good point. A
45 suggestion would be that in that first conference call
46 that we are zeroing-in on the August focus group
47 meeting. So that in the Advisory Committee conference
48 call in July, whatever date we select, that we are
49 putting that all together.

50 We are then talking about who are the
51 three or four experts that are going to be sitting
52 there, what is the time slot. We will start to zero-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in on some of the questions, get specificity and
2 clarity. So I think at that conference call we can do
3 that as we head and set up for the August focus group
4 meeting, if that makes sense.

5 MR. MEDRANO: Could I add to your piece a
6 little? I agree with you; one area for me, too, is in
7 order to be able to provide you some information on
8 experts, I would like more clarity, I guess, in terms
9 of what we are looking for in terms of who we want to
10 try to recruit. Because experts is a broad area. To
11 me, an expert is certainly Dr. Jones over there
12 sitting as an expert in his field, but also looking at
13 I would consider a coordinator out in the school
14 system who actually does the work and lives it every
15 day being an expert as well.

16 So some clarity, I think, along those
17 lines, as well as the extent of what we are trying to
18 accomplish during that focus group. I mean each one
19 of those needs to have its own specific intent of what
20 we are trying to get at.

21 MS. PRICE: Not to pass the buck, but I do
22 think that with the expertise that we have on the
23 Advisory Committee, and as we look, from our
24 conversation today, and as we look at some of the
25 questions under the three topics that need to be
26 addressed, that people come to mind that we think --
27 you know, it might be a state coordinator; it might be
28 someone in the research field.

29 But we know, boy, if we talked about this,
30 this person would be great. So I do think offering a
31 suggestion not just of a name, but of what that person
32 could address, because I think that David is at a
33 disadvantage to specifically right now articulate we
34 need these, these, and these.

35 You can see those areas of expertise and
36 those subject matters that you all know and look at
37 that and see, what are we missing; what direction do
38 we want to go? You know, to ask.

39 I'm not saying that what you ask isn't
40 workable, but I think it is more of a process than
41 just a straightforward question at this time.

42 MS. JACKSON: And I don't know if this is
43 appropriate, but then could I make a suggestion that,
44 at least for the August focus groups, that we focus in
45 on one of the three issues; for example, the State
46 Grants Program, since the re-PART will be occurring, I
47 guess, in this fiscal year?

48 Maybe our focus group experts and
49 community member experts, research experts, would be
50 focused around this issue. So that when we talk in
51 July, we can come to that phone call with specific
52 suggestions pertaining to that issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think as we deal with that issue, we
2 will probably be touching on the third point, the data
3 collection, and the second as well.

4 DR. JONES: Yes, I like that idea of
5 determining which of these we are going to focus on
6 first.

7 You know, in terms of experts, we are the
8 experts. We are the experts. Certainly, we need
9 outside input and that kind of thing, but we are the
10 experts in many ways.

11 I think it is important before we bring
12 the experts in that we know what we want the experts
13 to do and to be just as precise about that as
14 possible.

15 CHAIRMAN LONG: Shep?

16 DR. KELLAM: Yes, I think you've got to
17 start and aim somewhere. That is as good a place as
18 any. I mean one, two, three makes sense.

19 The problem we've got, if we do that, and
20 let's assume we are going to do that because all the
21 other options have equal evil aspects, we are in
22 danger of losing the cross-cutting aspects. The way
23 my head works, if you get a little more of a geometric
24 model, a multi-dimensional model, we can then see how
25 these things cross-cut.

26 So, for example, if we are looking at the
27 state programs, that that is the topic, the basis and
28 effectiveness of these state programs necessarily
29 involves data. It drives the need, in fact, for a
30 kind of data which is piecemeal across the country;
31 namely, data on individual kids over time that are
32 aggregatable at multiple levels. So you can measure
33 effectiveness if you follow Charlie over time, but you
34 can't measure effectiveness for subgroups or for girls
35 versus boys.

36 If you've got aggregate data, average data
37 for a school building, it doesn't tell you whether, in
38 fact, there's a progression toward better or worse for
39 individual kids. So you've got management information
40 system data, which is what we've got a lot of, is not
41 sufficient.

42 So I think that we have to understand that
43 we can focus on each one of these separately and at
44 the same time realize we are building a multi-
45 dimensional kind of information system.

46 CHAIRMAN LONG: And that's where those
47 inherent qualities we were talking about probably pop
48 out also.

49 DR. KELLAM: Yes, right.

50 CHAIRMAN LONG: Tommy?

51 MR. LEDBETTER: Looking at the calendar,
52 you've got two meetings for focus groups. Would it be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 possible for us to address in the first meeting the
2 school grants and in the second meeting the unsafe
3 school option, and include the data on both of those
4 with those two meetings, where at the first meeting we
5 are looking at state grants and the data for that or
6 against that, and looking at the unsafe school choice
7 option, the second meeting, with the data along with
8 that? That way, we would be covering all three of
9 them just in the two meetings. Is that an option?

10 CHAIRMAN LONG: I think that would be up
11 to you, and I think it is a good option. If I could
12 take that good option and put it in a parking lot for
13 about five minutes, because it is now 9:32 and we have
14 a posted agenda that says there is a time at 9:30 for
15 public comment.

16 So I want to respect the posted calendar
17 for the open meeting and at this time ask if there is
18 any public comment. If there is, would that person
19 please step to the podium? You will have five
20 minutes.

21 Is there anyone wishing to address the
22 group in public comment?

23 (No response.)

24 If not, your idea comes back out of the
25 parking lot.

26 MS. TAFT: Is it out of order to ask the
27 people who are here for the public comment section to
28 identify themselves, just so that I would know who is
29 interested in this topic?

30 CHAIRMAN LONG: If they wish to, and I'm
31 saying that because some might not wish to. You are
32 asking, as a Committee member, if the people in the
33 audience would identify --

34 MS. TAFT: Yes. When I serve on other
35 advisory committee meetings and they have the session
36 like this, everyone goes around the table and
37 introduces themselves and then everybody in the room
38 also introduces themselves. So it gives everybody a
39 feel of who is here.

40 So I just wondered if we were going to do
41 that.

42 MS. GAYL: I'm happy to introduce myself.
43 I'm Chrisanne Gayl. I'm the Director of Federal
44 Programs at the National School Boards Association
45 here in Washington.

46 CHAIRMAN LONG: And if anyone else wishes
47 to --

48 MR. SPICER: Good morning. I'm Malcolm
49 Spicer. I'm with the Community Development
50 Publications. I write about funding for substance
51 abuse and mental health services, and, coincidentally,
52 First Lady Taft, I have written about your under-age

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 drinking prevention program. Now that I have your
2 address, I will make sure to send you a copy of that
3 piece.

4 I would like to take this chance to ask
5 for, if I could receive copies of the additional
6 material that you have passed around, Dr. Long --

7 CHAIRMAN LONG: Absolutely.

8 MR. SPICER: -- to help edify my coverage.

9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN LONG: Absolutely. Thank you for
11 asking.

12 MS. ABATE: Hi. I'm Candice Abate. I'm
13 the Executive Director of the Hepatitis Foundation
14 International. I'm here today because I wanted to
15 make you all aware of our programs which focus on
16 healthy lifestyle behaviors, not only hepatitis
17 prevention, but also substance abuse prevention.

18 The liver is a part of the body that very
19 little is publicly known about, and we are trying to
20 change all that, raising the status of the liver.
21 More and more data is coming out showing that
22 information about liver wellness is having a great
23 impact on healthy lifestyle behaviors.

24 Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you.

26 If there is anyone else that wishes to
27 identify, please step up.

28 I appreciate your comment also for those
29 in the audience, Hope; we will go around the table to
30 introduce. So thank you for that suggestion.

31 Anyone else in the audience?

32 (No response.)

33 If not, Fred, if we could start with you,
34 if you would introduce, for the sake of the folks in
35 the audience, who you are and what you do.

36 MR. ELLIS: Sure. My name is Fred Ellis.

37 I am the Director of the Office of Safety and
38 Security for the Fairfax Public County Schools in
39 Fairfax, Virginia.

40 MS. JACKSON: Good morning. My name is
41 Montean Jackson, and I am the Coordinator of Safe and
42 Drug-Free Schools for the Fairbanks North Star Borough
43 School District, K through 12.

44 DR. SIMS: Good morning. I'm Belinda Sims
45 from the National Institute on Drug Abuse. I'm a
46 Health Scientist Administrator in the Division of
47 Epidemiology Services and Prevention Research.

48 MR. PIMENTEL: Howdy. I'm Michael
49 Pimentel, and I'm the Police Chief for the San Antonio
50 Independent School District in San Antonio, Texas.

51 MR. MEDRANO: Good morning, everyone. My
52 name is Victor Medrano. I'm with the Centers for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Disease Control and Prevention out of Atlanta, Georgia
2 in the Division of Adolescent and School Health. I am
3 a Program Consultant in that Division.

4 CHAIRMAN LONG: My name is Dave Long, and
5 I'm the Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
6 from Riverside, California.

7 MS. PRICE: I'm Deborah Price, and I'm the
8 Assistant Deputy Secretary for the Office of Safe and
9 Drug-Free Schools.

10 MR. MODZELESKI: I'm Bill Modzeleski from
11 the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

12 DR. JONES: I'm Russell Jones, Professor
13 of Psychiatry at Virginia Tech University and Director
14 of the REACT Program, Recovery Efforts After Child
15 Trauma.

16 JUDGE NORMAN: I'm Seth Norman. I'm a
17 Criminal Court Judge out of Nashville, Tennessee.

18 MR. LEDBETTER: I'm Tommy Ledbetter. I'm
19 a Principal of Buckhorn High School in New Market,
20 Alabama.

21 MS. TAFT: My name is Hope Taft. I'm
22 First Lady of Ohio.

23 DR. KELLAM: I'm Shep Kellam, Public
24 Health Psychiatrist/Prevention Researcher, Director of
25 the Center for Integrating Education and Prevention
26 Research in Schools at the American Institutes for
27 Research.

28 CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you all for the
29 introduction. Each time we do that, it reminds me,
30 with the opener, of the breadth and depth of the
31 expertise sitting around this table. It's exciting.

32 I'm going to suggest this: It's 9:37.
33 Let's take a break until 9:50. Could we do that?

34 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
35 the record at 9:37 a.m. and went back on the record at
36 9:53 a.m.)

37 CHAIRMAN LONG: While we're waiting, I
38 want to go right back to that same point so that we
39 could continue that discussion, because it is
40 extremely important as to how we put the calendar
41 together.

42 We are going to go back to your point
43 relative to the point and the focus group and how the
44 focus groups go together. Your point, I do believe,
45 was have it in two focus groups, a special time for
46 the State Grants Programs. We calendar in two dates.

47 I think that is what you were saying.

48 DR. KELLAM: It is the integration of a
49 state program, how it might be usefully integrated
50 with the information system, the management
51 information system, giving you a sampling frame. It
52 would help guide which project should go where at the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 level of the Department.

2 For example, one criteria would be we need
3 to get representation of certain kinds of populations
4 to test Program A. So this management information
5 system tells us where to go to find populations that
6 we want to represent.

7 When you then attach that to the question
8 of, okay, but is the program working and for whom, you
9 follow kids over time in the same sampling frame, so
10 that we know and can specify exactly what's working
11 where and where it isn't working.

12 So there is a fundamental integration that
13 we need to get in our heads about how these pieces fit
14 together. Of course, underlying all that is the
15 question of partnerships, the question of, how do you
16 get in there and do these programs and work out the
17 trust issues and the like?

18 But I think that is what we need to begin
19 to think like as we are thinking about, what is about
20 the state programs, projects, that kind of structure
21 for disseminating programs, how would you make it
22 bigger? How would you make it better? Or how would
23 you find out that it is working? It is by integrating
24 these pieces.

25 CHAIRMAN LONG: Let me see if I've
26 captured what you just said. That is, I'm trying to
27 bring it back to the numbers and the focus groups and
28 the calendar. Then I'm also trying to integrate what
29 Hope just brought up as well as Tommy.

30 So if we have on the first focus group in
31 the morning, for example -- I'm just going to pick
32 some broad -- the morning of the first date that we
33 have State Grants; afternoon, data; the next focus
34 group, persistently dangerous. I'm trying to put that
35 in the middle, if that would make sense.

36 So I am just trying to bring some of those
37 ideas together to see if that is what you are saying
38 or if that is okay.

39 DR. KELLAM: I think we need a little bit
40 in the beginning of that day and a half, or whatever
41 it is, to get some idea about the parameters we need
42 to think about as we think about state programs, just
43 to get a little map of what are the issues and how do
44 they relate to data; how do they relate to issues of
45 effectiveness, and so on.

46 So then if we have an hour or so of that
47 -- I don't know, how long would it take us to come to
48 shared vision here around some kind of understanding
49 of how measurement and assessment could fit into where
50 you put programs or are the programs working?

51 You can't really talk about, are the
52 programs working or what do you make out of the Rand

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Report, or somebody else's report, without looking at
2 some of the issues about effectiveness.

3 CHAIRMAN LONG: You made me think about a
4 potential Plan D. That is, what if we started with
5 data for an hour, because that permeates the others
6 that we are talking about; then had the focus group,
7 the morning focus group, on state programs; then had
8 the afternoon focus group on data, or would that make
9 sense?

10 If it is going to permeate, maybe we
11 should start with that.

12 DR. KELLAM: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN LONG: I mean that is a thought.

14 DR. JONES: I don't know what I missed,
15 but I think that assessment should be like No. 1,
16 because we can't evaluate anything if we don't know
17 what we are measuring. So looking at the assessment.

18 DR. KELLAM: Okay, but I think that if we
19 -- in other words, we don't have to pick up, Russell,
20 maybe we don't need assessment at the most abstract
21 level. I mean I think we could say, okay, a real
22 understanding, a real mission today, let's say, is to
23 understand the state programs.

24 Let's start with assessment because that's
25 going to give us some tools to think about
26 effectiveness and distribution, dissemination, and so
27 on. How would you fix it? Where would you like to be
28 in five years with the state programs, including
29 cutting them out or doing it right, or what does the
30 next stage look like most preferably?

31 DR. JONES: Yes, I like that. Yes,
32 assessment in context.

33 DR. KELLAM: Right.

34 DR. JONES: Yes.

35 MS. PRICE: Let me just chime in just a
36 little bit. I realize that the State Grants Program
37 is a broad, extensive program that touches communities
38 in every spectrum you can imagine, from large urban
39 communities to the smallest rural community of one
40 school for the middle school and high school. So that
41 program in itself is really asked to address that huge
42 spectrum.

43 I do think that we have to be careful
44 first to understand the strengths of the program, how
45 it is working in those communities where, as
46 significant as research and showing that the programs
47 are effective, but the tools aren't there, but they
48 somehow put a small amount of money together, and they
49 are doing something that really makes a difference in
50 kids' lives.

51 Would it be duplicated and would it work
52 in another community? Maybe not. Maybe so; maybe

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not. But in that community they did something that
2 really affects the community.

3 We need to be able to look at the State
4 Grants Program and appreciate the vast differences of
5 it, but yet look at it and say -- I mean we are really
6 asked to kind of almost be a rubberband and stretch to
7 the maximum and see that, and then bring it back to
8 the very nutshell of the program.

9 So as we are looking at the data and the
10 research and all of these aspects, I do want us to
11 still get the appreciation of the overall program, the
12 breadth of the program, if that makes sense.

13 MR. MODZELESKI: Debbie, if I could just
14 pick up on that, because I do think that we are losing
15 sight of the questions that are on this page here. So
16 if you go back and take a moment here, I want to bring
17 you back to the questions being asked.

18 I think Debbie's right that some of the
19 questions get back to the very basic things. This
20 program is now asked not only to do alcohol and drugs,
21 but I would say it is a program about sex, drugs, and
22 rock and roll, and everything in between. School are
23 engaged in everything in between.

24 The question is, and it is a very
25 appropriate question, is that the right direction to
26 go? We are not saying, yes, this is great and this is
27 wonderful. I mean this is an Advisory Board question
28 about whether or not this program has been diluted to
29 such a point that it is doing all things to all
30 people, and then, in essence, is doing nothing for
31 nobody. That is essentially it.

32 So there's very basic questions which I
33 think we need to get down to and we are asking for
34 input on. As I mentioned yesterday, this started off
35 in 1987 as an Alcohol, Drugs, and Tobacco -- that's a
36 word that we don't use at all anymore, but Tobacco
37 Prevention Program, and now we are into all of those
38 issues. Few schools are dealing with tobacco except
39 with Legacy dollars. Violence prevention;
40 preparedness-related issues; suicide prevention;
41 after-school programs; mentoring programs; truancy
42 programs.

43 I mean I could go on and on and on, and
44 that's both the blessing and the curse of the program.

45 The blessing is that it has a lot of flexibility; the
46 curse is it has a lot of flexibility.

47 So I think that part of what we are saying
48 to the advisory group here, and it is one of the
49 questions here -- and by the way, I would also say
50 Debbie and I know this full well, that all of those
51 issues that are on the table today, what we know about
52 tomorrow is that there will be new issues on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 table.

2 Fred and I come from the great
3 Commonwealth of Virginia, and we just had a question
4 the other day from the State Education Agency about
5 utilization of Title IV dollars for pandemic flu
6 planning. So, here again, we go down and are asking
7 for the funds to be diluted even more to get engaged
8 in doing other things.

9 So I want to bring us back to the essence
10 of here -- and everything that Shep and Russell have
11 been talking about are things we need to get to, but
12 we also need to get to some of the basic things about
13 the program, the design of the program, the purpose of
14 the program, and whether or not, if you take -- you
15 know, I think it's \$310 million is what the House
16 appropriated, at least in the Subcommittee markup.
17 Think about taking those dollars and dividing it
18 15,000 ways based upon population, and you come to
19 about three or four dollars per child per school year.

20 Then the question becomes even more
21 difficult: As you begin to get into data-related
22 issues, that's money. You know, it costs money to
23 collect data. So do you want to take -- I mean this
24 is a question; it is not an answer. The question is,
25 do you want to take precious dollars away from
26 programs and then put it into data?

27 It is a balancing act: the assessment
28 part that Russell talks about, the research part that
29 Seth talks about, very important, but those are also
30 dollars that have to come with somebody.

31 So there are some basic questions that,
32 again the Deputy Secretary laid out here, I think,
33 that we are trying to get to and that we really need
34 your feedback on.

35 MR. ELLIS: Just a couple of comments. I
36 agree with Bill; I think we need to kind of stay
37 focused. I think it will be very easy to get wrapped
38 around the data question and the research. That is
39 just my sense, that we will get wrapped around that
40 axle very quickly if we digress real deep into that
41 before we deal with our main charge.

42 I think it would have been helpful to have
43 had these questions yesterday while we met and were
44 provided the overall topics, the three topics. The
45 questions and the issues associated with them are
46 really the gist of it, and I think they are the simple
47 -- not simple in many ways, but the overriding charge
48 is to answer some of these basic questions about these
49 programs. I think that is a useful effort.

50 Again, I would resubmit to us to kind of
51 focus on, before we meet with, before we identify
52 these experts, we need to get the pros and cons of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 each topic. We need to get the pros and cons of the
2 State Grants Program. What is the criticism of that?
3 Why did OMB, or whoever it was, provide those
4 decisions in terms of effectiveness? Let's get down
5 to those.

6 Again, let's hear the success stories.
7 Then we can come together as a group and say, "Who do
8 we want to come?" We want to hear from some folks who
9 have taken this money and done some great things in
10 their community. Maybe we need to hear from some
11 folks who maybe applied for and didn't get a grant, or
12 ones that never put in for it: "Why don't you put in
13 for it?" What are the issues associated with that?
14 So we can answer some of these questions about those
15 topics.

16 I think the data thing is the thread that
17 runs through all of this. It seems to me there's two
18 pieces to the data. One is the specific questions of
19 whether or not the requirements for data under No
20 Child Left Behind are appropriate. That is kind of a
21 broad data question.

22 The other ones, I think a lot of them are
23 Shep's issues in terms of, are they doing the research
24 appropriately? Are we measuring what we are supposed
25 to measure when we do a program?

26 To me, as the layperson and the non-
27 scientist among a group of scientists --

28 DR. JONES: You sound pretty scientific to
29 me.

30 (Laughter.)

31 MR. ELLIS: I don't know about that. But,
32 to me, there are two different issues. One is, are we
33 collecting the right stuff for No Child Left Behind?
34 Then the other things are, are we evaluating programs
35 that the grants pay for appropriately? Are they
36 giving us the answers we are searching for?

37 So, anyway, that's my point. Let's kind
38 of stay focused, get the read-ahead material, identify
39 some questions and experts early before we get them in
40 here, so we will know exactly what it is are the pros
41 and cons of this issue. So we can get at it when we
42 meet with them.

43 CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes, Shep.

44 DR. KELLAM: Dave, I feel like I'm an
45 obstacle to moving ahead, but I sympathize with what
46 Fred is saying. I didn't say, "empathize." The
47 reason I am saying that is that I am looking at the
48 first question. It says, "Currently, as implemented,
49 what are the strengths of the State Grants Program?"
50 Well, who the hell knows?

51 I don't have any way of assessing the
52 strengths of the state program because I don't know

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 who receives it. I don't even know what the "it" is.
2 I know that it is many things.

3 So, in my untutored -- I take that back;
4 that is just sarcasm -- but in my tutored brain, I
5 think that what we need is some kind of way of
6 ordering what the state programs are all about,
7 somehow of categorizing the kinds of programs,
8 understanding who, as you are saying, Fred, who gets
9 them, who doesn't.

10 The only way to know that -- and I've got
11 another problem, too, and that is that the current
12 massive data collection is a political balloon that's
13 going to be torpedoed by the next political fights. I
14 mean it is sitting out there. All it is doing is
15 blaming schools for failing.

16 When this happened with registries in
17 public health, whether it was venereal disease or with
18 mental disorder registries, and so on, the absence of
19 linking the data system we currently have, which is
20 very expensive, to real services did them in
21 eventually. People don't want to just keep on
22 collecting data like we're collecting without somehow
23 connecting it to improving services.

24 So the obvious connection is to take the
25 same data we are collecting -- we are already paying
26 for it, though. In fact, every school district, many
27 school districts have information systems about each
28 kid that you can tie into.

29 So there is a lot of data being collected.
30 I'm just arguing that we need to use the data in
31 conjunction with the grants for these local programs
32 so that they inform each other.

33 Five years from now I would like to see
34 these programs mapped in a data field that tells us
35 who is getting what and is it really working. Are
36 there really good things happening?

37 So, as I see it, these need to come
38 together early, not in big abstractions, but in very
39 concrete ways.

40 CHAIRMAN LONG: I think what I was
41 hearing, some of that, it is going to be critically
42 important. What you are bringing up, Fred, about the
43 upfront information on the material, so that you get
44 that ahead of time, and some of those things that --
45 and I saw you shaking your head over here, Debbie.

46 Lastly, Shep, like it or no, I picked up
47 just a tinge of empathy.

48 (Laughter.)

49 MR. LEDBETTER: If I can go back to my
50 original question, I think my original question was,
51 could we tie those things together in the meetings? I
52 guess dealing with some of these things, I look at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 them and when I look -- I guess what I am trying to do
2 is explain what I was asking.

3 If we could take the State Grants Program,
4 and when I look at the questions here or the bullets
5 that are outlined here for the State Grants Program,
6 the things that jump out at me are, what are the
7 strengths and the weaknesses of those programs? Now
8 weaknesses is not in there, but, obviously, if you are
9 going to look at the strengths, you have to look at
10 the weaknesses of those programs.

11 What are the difficulties in determining
12 the effectiveness of the programs? Therein lies your
13 research and your data, and so forth. All right.

14 Are there emerging issues? There's always
15 emerging issues. It's what are those emerging issues
16 that may need to be tied into those things Again, all
17 of that ties back to the data.

18 I'm a little bit like Fred. I guess it
19 goes back to my graduate school. One of the first
20 things I learned in graduate school is you can take
21 numbers and make them say anything. It just depends
22 on your perspective.

23 But my questions about data are: Is the
24 data that we are using consistent? Is it the same
25 data from state to state? Those kinds of questions
26 are the questions that I have about data.

27 To coin an old Southern phrase about
28 comparing apples to oranges, you know, it is very
29 difficult to do that. If we are looking at the exact
30 same data, it is very simple for us to make decisions
31 about what are weaknesses and what are strengths of
32 programs, and so forth.

33 If it is possible, I still believe that
34 -- Fred made the statement that we can get wrapped
35 around the axle with data, or something to that
36 extent. I think that we could take every one of these
37 meetings and not discuss anything but data and occupy
38 all that time, but we still haven't answered these
39 basic questions.

40 The questions to me are whether or not
41 these programs are working. If the State Grants
42 Programs, if they are working or if they are not
43 working, then the question there, when you turn to the
44 second page, is: "Could state and local flexibility
45 be balanced with additional core requirements that
46 would encourage LEAs to address specific issues?"
47 What would we need to do to make them work? That's
48 what that means to me. What do we need to do to make
49 them work?

50 If we can't make them work, well, then
51 maybe we need to eliminate them. But they are either
52 working or they're not working. If it's broken, let's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fix it or make some recommendations to fix it.

2 MR. MODZELESKI: I think Tommy has a good
3 point here. One of the things that I would put on the
4 table for discussion of the whole issue is, how do you
5 define what's working? I mean I know that Mrs. Taft
6 had some information that she sent forward on programs
7 that were working in Ohio. Five people could take a
8 look at that and have different opinions about whether
9 or not they were effective or not. And that's neither
10 to say it's right or wrong.

11 All I'm saying is that, if we need to or
12 if we are going to basically make some decisions about
13 whether programs are working or not, then we may need
14 to take a step back and come to some decision about
15 how do we define effectiveness. Effectiveness
16 probably is more than an effects test and an
17 evaluation.

18 That is where Russell and Shep may go, but
19 that is not where Fred and a lot of other people are
20 going. It gets back to the basic question about, if
21 you are sitting before a PTA and you want to bring a
22 program and a PTA member is asking, "Is this working?
23 How is it effective," I think that we are going to be
24 able to articulate that in plain English very much as
25 a State Grants Program.

26 OMB wants one level of effectiveness. I
27 think citizenry wants another level of effectiveness,
28 and practitioners want yet something else.

29 I think that as an Advisory Board we want
30 input back from you also about, what is effectiveness?

31 How do we measure effectiveness? I mean, how do we
32 know that something is working besides going through a
33 random assignment evaluation? We are not going to do
34 that for every program. It is just impossible to do.

35 We want some practical information about
36 trying to determine about how we could sell this
37 program as being effective.

38 MS. TAFT: Couldn't you go back to the
39 core dataset that is outlined in the legislation?
40 Because when drug use goes down, it is a good sign of
41 effectiveness, no matter what you are doing.

42 We know from research that when perception
43 of harm goes up and perception of social disapproval
44 goes up, then drug use will go down. So, to me, those
45 are some of the basics, that if we can get the numbers
46 to move, we've done something right.

47 MR. MODZELESKI: Well, and herein lies the
48 problem. Because the numbers go up, we can't assume
49 it is because of what we did. Because the numbers go
50 down, we can't assume that we did it.

51 It means that somebody is doing something
52 right, but it is probably not just this program. It

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is parents. It is community groups and organizations.
2 It is schools. It is churches, faith-based
3 organizations. So it is a whole series of people that
4 are doing things right.

5 I think that is sort of one of the issues
6 that we face within the first part, trying to ferret
7 out or trying to tease out exactly who is doing what
8 to cause numbers to go up and down. We face the same
9 problem today. To a certain degree, it is trying to
10 figure out -- YRBSS just was released -- Thursday of
11 last week, Victor, I guess? -- Thursday of last week.

12 There was mixed news. Some of the news was good;
13 some of the news was not so good.

14 I would love to say where those trendlines
15 went down, or started to go down, that was because of
16 our program, but I can't say that. Because we can't
17 basically tie what we are doing to demonstrate -- we
18 think we have a part of it, but we are not certain
19 exactly what part of it.

20 So what that gets back to is that, aside
21 from science -- and, again, that's the science part,
22 but aside from science, are there other measures or
23 other ways that we could basically begin to determine
24 or begin other measures of effectiveness?

25 I think, again, this first question about
26 what are we doing right, and it gets back to
27 effectiveness, that is a very basic question I think
28 that needs to be answered.

29 DR. JONES: Yes, so is that third
30 variable, right, the infamous third variable? But I
31 am wondering, there aren't -- I guess there are data
32 that do exist presently that give us some sense of
33 what we see as effective versus non-effective. I
34 guess those data would be in the hands of those that
35 determine that the grant program would no longer be
36 funded, is that correct?

37 Now I am wondering, what criteria were
38 used in that determination, and then to what extent
39 that may give us inroads into what some of the
40 evaluative factors are in determining effectiveness,
41 et cetera?

42 MS. PRICE: Not to specifically answer the
43 question you just asked, but to answer around that
44 question --

45 DR. JONES: I must have a specific answer.
46 (Laughter.)

47 MS. PRICE: No, but in the hopes of
48 getting to the specific answer, I heard a variety of
49 people mention a variety of points, all sort of
50 gelling-in on needing more specific information. We
51 had the briefings yesterday about each individual
52 program that were very broad and gave you a general

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understanding, but there are specific elements of
2 each. I'll pick on the state data. I mean the State
3 Grants Program.

4 There's specific legislative language that
5 established that, and there are specific aspects of
6 that grant and how it works, as well as the Unsafe
7 School Choice Option. We have guidance at the
8 Department on the implementation of that, and just a
9 variety of, what were the questions asked in the first
10 PART review of the State Grants Program by OMB? What
11 are they going to be looking at for the new PART
12 review? -- and have a good understanding of that.

13 So just in listening today, I am starting
14 to make a list of pieces of information that you all
15 need to have to be able to review to think of
16 directions to go and answer some questions, and to
17 raise more questions to work off of.

18 If you as you on the way home come to
19 think, "I'd really like to know more about 'X,'" if
20 you all would just send it to me, send those questions
21 to me, and we will try to get that information.

22 But we will put together what we believe
23 is really a broad packet of information for all of
24 you, to get out to you, so that you can see and review
25 that.

26 If you all have something that addresses
27 this specifically that you would like all the Advisory
28 Committee members to have, send it to me; I'll make
29 sure it gets out, and where it is possible, will
30 either identify that or will put that up on our
31 website, once we get our website established.

32 DR. JONES: Good answer. May I just
33 follow up?

34 MR. MODZELESKI: Could I try to give you
35 an answer to your question first?

36 DR. JONES: Oh, yes. Sure. Sure.

37 MR. MODZELESKI: Absent a measure for
38 trying to look at how this money is spread out and
39 saying that it was these dollars that had an impact
40 and this is why it is effective, a measure for proving
41 effectiveness that has been agreed upon by the
42 Department of Education and OMB is to look at what we
43 have research on and what we know works. So we have
44 selected a group of programs from -- actually, we are
45 working with a contractor called Westat. So we know
46 that there's a group of programs that have
47 evaluations.

48 This is more than one evaluation showing
49 positive results over time, showing reductions in
50 alcohol and drug use or violent behavior -- the going
51 back into schools, doing a survey of schools to
52 basically determine how many schools are implementing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 science-based programs. That's level one.

2 Level two, going back and then looking at
3 the same schools, the same programs, to look at
4 fidelity of implementation. So it is not only that we
5 are looking at the programs, but we are looking at the
6 fidelity of the programs.

7 What is that going to give us? If we go
8 to the conclusion -- and I think it is a good
9 conclusion -- of saying that we already have from
10 research, we know from evaluations that if you
11 implement Program X, this is the result you're going
12 to get, and if 50 percent of the schools in the United
13 States are implementing Program X, and to a degree of
14 fidelity which is going to lead to that conclusion, I
15 think then we will say that we are in pretty good
16 shape.

17 On the other hand, if we have this whole
18 listing of schools which we have agreed upon are
19 effective and we go back and we do a survey of schools
20 throughout the United States, and we find out that
21 only 10 percent of the schools are engaged in these
22 programs, then we are going to say we are in a
23 problem.

24 So it is going to give us a picture, not a
25 perfect picture but at least some picture of the
26 number and the percentage of schools in this country
27 that are implementing programs that have been
28 determined thus far to be effective, and "effective"
29 won't be an elusive term, but basically it has more of
30 a scientific -- getting into effect sizes.

31 MS. TAFT: How long is that list, and does
32 it include the ones from NIDA and NIAAA and SAMHSA?

33 MR. MODZELESKI: I'm sorry, I was afraid
34 you were going to ask that question.

35 (Laughter.)

36 It is interesting because the list is
37 currently being discussed. Information is being
38 collected on, say, 50 programs, but at the end of the
39 day it may be that we only agree 35 are going to be
40 ones that are measured.

41 So where do the programs come from? They
42 came from a combination. They came from the
43 Department of Education. They came from NIDA. They
44 came from CSEP. They came from CDC, and it came from
45 the HAY listing. So those are the listings that we
46 took the programs off.

47 We are trying to --

48 MS. TAFT: And not Justice?

49 MR. MODZELESKI: And Justice, yes. I'm
50 sorry.

51 We are trying to resolve some differences
52 that exist, as you know, between the lists. So that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is where we are right now.

2 There is a group of programs that clearly
3 fall into the category we want to measure. There is a
4 group of programs that clearly fall into the group
5 that we don't want to measure, and then there's this
6 gray area that is in the middle. That is what we are
7 trying to figure out right now, where these programs
8 go.

9 MS. TAFT: I assume that you know that
10 SAMHSA is redoing their list?

11 MR. MODZELESKI: Yes. Yes.

12 MS. TAFT: When that list gets identified,
13 can it be shared?

14 MR. MODZELESKI: Sure.

15 CHAIRMAN LONG: I am going to try to bring
16 focus back to the calendar, so that we can start to
17 put some of this together.

18 We've identified the three focus areas.
19 So the question is, so that we can get the first two
20 steps on this calendar, when we will have the first
21 conference call and then when we have the first focus
22 group, the next meeting here in Washington. Here's
23 what will drive it. It gets back to the parking lot.

24 With the three focus groups, if we say the
25 August focus group, that meeting, do you wish to have
26 all three -- remember, it will be a day and a half.
27 So there's a potential for having a focus group in the
28 a.m., one in the p.m., and one the next a.m., like
29 this morning, for three focus groups.

30 Or is that too much and we should have two
31 in that one day-and-a-half meeting and move the last
32 focus group, whatever that happens to be, to the
33 October focus group meeting? That is really the
34 question at hand now because that will drive the
35 calendar.

36 MS. TAFT: To keep my brain from on
37 overload, I would like to suggest that we have one of
38 the issues in the afternoon of the first day and one
39 of the issues in the morning of the second day, and
40 then the afternoon of the second day is a time to
41 discuss what we have learned and put some parameters
42 on it or do some discussion of it.

43 CHAIRMAN LONG: That put a different
44 dimension on the meeting, because for those that come
45 from a long distance, one of the reasons that we go a
46 day and a half and stop somewhere around 11:00 or
47 12:00 is so they can get to the airports to head home.

48 If it was in the afternoon, that would change the
49 dynamic, but it could be done if that's what the group
50 wishes.

51 MS. TAFT: Well, from those of us who
52 don't quite live as far away as Alaska, and I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 appreciate your long trip, I think the Department
2 could save some money and we could save some time if
3 the first meeting started late enough in the day, say
4 ten or eleven o'clock, so that we could fly in the day
5 of the meeting and save at least one overnight expense
6 for the Department, was my only thought.

7 MS. JACKSON: Just so you know, with it
8 being a 12-to-13 hours' flight, oh, definitely not the
9 day of the meeting. I wouldn't get here. I started
10 at 12:00 a.m. Alaska time, which is four hours ahead
11 of you, and I didn't get here until almost 5:00 p.m.

12 MS. TAFT: Yes. Well, I understand that
13 there's some of you like you and California who live
14 so far away that you would probably come in the night
15 before, but there's others of us from Ohio and
16 Tennessee and Texas who could get here by taking an
17 early-morning flight in. I'm just thinking of
18 economics, basically.

19 DR. JONES: With all due respect, that
20 really doesn't work. I've tried that many times, and,
21 boy, with flights, some folks would get here at 10:00;
22 some would get here at noon; some might get here at
23 3:00. I mean I like to save the Department's money,
24 but I really think we ought to come in the night
25 before. I hate doing it because I can get a lot of
26 work done at home, but coming in the night before and
27 starting early in the morning has worked best in many
28 instances.

29 MS. PRICE: But, speaking to a point that
30 Mrs. Taft made, obviously, not specific to the day
31 schedule, but the concept of taking half of a day to
32 focus on one, half a day on the other, and the other
33 for giving the Advisory Committee face-to-face time to
34 discuss what they previously had heard seems like a
35 workable tool to me because it gives you an
36 opportunity for input and then to kind of digest some
37 of it amongst yourselves as a whole before you go off.

38 So that it seems like an appropriate use of time,
39 however you put that on the calendar day.

40 CHAIRMAN LONG: For the sake of
41 recapturing, we will stay at the day and a half,
42 keeping the first day all day; the second day a half
43 day. Then the slots become important. So we have a
44 half, a half -- I mean we have three slots rather:
45 half day, half day, half day.

46 Would you rather have a focus group first
47 like, I'm just going to say, state grants, then a slot
48 of discussion time, and then the third slot the next
49 morning, like today, that we have the other focus
50 group, or would you rather have focus group, focus
51 group, the second day, like today, discussion?

52 DR. JONES: Just a very basic question:

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 What's the focus group doing to do? Let's say we have
2 a focus group on grants. What would they do?

3 CHAIRMAN LONG: The focus group will be
4 made up of experts.

5 DR. JONES: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN LONG: They will give
7 information. We will then, as an advisory group, ask
8 questions and enter into discussion with them, and
9 between and among ourselves and the panel.

10 DR. JONES: Okay. So what kind of
11 information would they give us? I'm just trying to
12 wrap my arms around it.

13 CHAIRMAN LONG: And that's why we are
14 having the focus group. That is, they are the
15 experts. They are going to be giving us information
16 on the three focus areas.

17 DR. JONES: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN LONG: I mean I can't answer the
19 question --

20 DR. JONES: Okay. So I'm wondering, they
21 would probably need to know what those topics were
22 prior to coming, right?

23 CHAIRMAN LONG: Sure. Sure.

24 DR. JONES: So I am wondering the extent
25 to which we -- and maybe that's in one of the
26 conference calls. I guess we are going to have a
27 conference call to say what those specific questions
28 are.

29 CHAIRMAN LONG: Right.

30 DR. JONES: I see.

31 MS. PRICE: And I think that is what we
32 talked about a little this morning, to get input from
33 you all on, as you see this, issues to be addressed
34 and identifying people that you think would be
35 articulate on that issue, and then to work that up so
36 that you have your focus group. That focus group
37 could come -- you know, I have seen it on a variety of
38 commissions where they come and they present, say, 15
39 minutes, whatever, 20 minutes each, a panel of three
40 or four people.

41 At the end of the panel, the Committee has
42 an opportunity to ask questions and get answers, and
43 move onto the next panel, but that each panel member
44 provides more than an outline, but not necessarily
45 word-for-word verbatim, but their materials on what
46 they are going to present, so that you, as advisory
47 members, have an opportunity to look at it and review
48 it, think about some questions ahead of time. Because
49 in some cases 15 minutes will be plenty of time for
50 them to say everything they need to say; in other
51 cases it is the nutshell. So for you to be able to
52 have their materials.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So it is hearing from the advisory
2 members, also getting that information ahead of time
3 so you can give it some thought, hearing it, and then
4 being able to ask additional questions.

5 MR. MODZELESKI: Debbie, if I could give
6 some examples, I think that, for example, Chief
7 Pimentel and Fred belong to a group that we sponsor 40
8 police chiefs. One of the things that I hear from the
9 chiefs over and over and over again, and this goes on
10 for the last 10 years, is that, "It is nice to have
11 Title IV and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act, but,
12 you know, we don't get a penny from that."

13 So it may be that they want to recommend
14 to the Chair one or two chiefs who are articulate and
15 outspoken and willing to talk about their perception
16 of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act.

17 Mrs. Taft and Montean belong to an
18 organization that is made up of the state education
19 agency representatives, the coordinators. They both
20 may want to contact them and ask for two or three
21 people, put those names up, and they would come
22 forward and talk about their views and perspectives of
23 what they like.

24 You and Shep are part of a coalition of
25 researchers around the country, many who have worked
26 directly on these programs, some have worked
27 indirectly, and some who have been the recipient of
28 funds from these programs. I would say get some
29 researchers in here to talk about what works and what
30 doesn't work.

31 Tommy is a principal. Although yesterday
32 he talked only about, he said that there wasn't a
33 relationship, I think that part of the principals'
34 association, I mean we could tap into them. We could
35 get principals at the table and talk about whether
36 this program has worked or hasn't worked, what's the
37 good parts of it, and so forth and so on.

38 So each of you is bringing an expertise.
39 What I would say is to reach out to your colleagues
40 and your constituents around the country and say,
41 "Here, we are looking at this thing. Can you help us?
42 Can you identify anybody that could really help us?"

43 We, I mean as far as Debbie and I are
44 concerned, we would be more than happy (a) to identify
45 the research out there. For example, when we get to
46 the persistently dangerous or unsafe school choice, we
47 have done a lot of work with the VERA Institute of
48 Justice in New York and they have done studies, and do
49 you want to speak to the VERA Institute of New York?
50 We could link you up with them.

51 On this particular issue, we have the Rand
52 study that was done six, eight years ago -- I forget

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 exactly when it was -- that, actually, we were part
2 of. I'm very familiar with the Rand study. We could
3 hook you up with the Rand study.

4 What I would suggest is use those
5 resources that are had, whether they are school police
6 chiefs, whether they are state SEA Safe and Drug-Free
7 Schools coordinators, whether they are LEA Safe and
8 Drug-Free Schools coordinators, whether they are
9 principals or superintendents. Those are the people
10 who use this program every day, and more from a
11 research perspective, give you a very practical
12 perspective and practical understanding of what are
13 the good points and what are the negative points of
14 this particular program. I would use that.

15 MR. MEDRANO: David, and I appreciate
16 Bill's comments; I think they're right on target. But
17 I would like to go back to something that Tommy
18 mentioned earlier, which is it seems now that we are
19 incorporating into the first focus group the three
20 focus areas. I agree with Tommy in terms of the fact
21 that data is interwoven into the two, because the
22 third one is specifically around data.

23 It seems to me -- and I throw this out
24 only as a recommendation to the entire group -- that
25 we look at that first focus group to be on the state
26 programs. My fear is that it is extremely broad in
27 its focus, and we specifically talk about drug use,
28 the prevention of drug use, as well as violence. But
29 even within each one of those, it's magnified into
30 many different areas.

31 I think Bill mentioned the magnitude of
32 what they go into and the things that they work on. I
33 think coupling both Safe Schools as well as
34 incorporating it with the State Grants Program is a
35 bit much. I say that as well because, as we talked
36 about earlier, when you first asked us to consider
37 other areas, other focus areas, my sense is that other
38 focus areas are going to surface when we delve into
39 just one area.

40 So from my perspective, I think that we
41 would be much better off looking at the state program,
42 having our focus group folks at the table. We listen
43 to them in the morning. We talk about data in the
44 next half, and then that third, or that next morning
45 is that the Committee works on looking at the gaps,
46 looking at some recommendations, looking at all those
47 pieces, and settling itself into that one particular
48 focus area, and then the second focus group following
49 the same format.

50 I'm just worried that we are trying to
51 lump everything together too soon.

52 CHAIRMAN LONG: Could we build on that and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just say, then, for this first focus group, which is
2 scheduled in August -- and we will set the date, and I
3 hope that is going to give you some objective. So
4 we'll try to work on it.

5 On the first day, that first chunk in the
6 morning, if the focus group could be on the State
7 Grants; then in the afternoon, data; then the next
8 morning, putting those all together and discussing and
9 the questions that pop out, the new information. Then
10 we head to the next focus group, which is scheduled
11 sometime in October, per your determination. That
12 first chunk will be persistently dangerous, followed
13 by more data, because that will weave in and out.

14 It might be that we revisit, if we find
15 that that isn't enough chunk for the State Grants, we
16 go back. There's nothing wrong with that. We want to
17 make sure that we cover these, and I am hearing that
18 from all of you, that we cover these well and that we
19 ask the right questions and get the right answers.

20 Does that sound logical?

21 DR. KELLAM: Yes, it sounds logical. The
22 problem I've got is that it skips over a process part.

23 That has to do with where this group is in
24 understanding a common language, a common vision for
25 things like strengths, weaknesses, effectiveness, and
26 so on.

27 I think that we should not be naive. As
28 we become a group, that we understand, have a common
29 language for things like, what's research; what's
30 effective, as a word; where are we going in the long
31 run.

32 My concern is that what the science tells
33 us, to me anyway, is this is a very typical group that
34 has to come to understand that when you talk about
35 effectiveness, you are talking about data and program
36 and community acceptance and partnership and a whole
37 variety of issues that have to do with human
38 development in the context of communities at different
39 levels: federal/national, you know, state, and so on.

40 We are just becoming aware of that in
41 education research. We have this big fight in
42 education research, randomized field trials versus
43 every kid is different and we should observe every kid
44 and how they learn, and they are all separate and are
45 all different. How do you put those together?

46 The reason I am talking about this is we
47 are going to focus groups, and frankly, I don't know
48 who the three people would be that I would trust to
49 talk about an integrating concept that we are,
50 hopefully, building. I think if you talk to people
51 like Jon Cohen at AIR, who is in charge of assessment
52 as a big division of AIR -- in fact, they are working

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the Ohio assessment system. If I asked Jon, how
2 would that apply to telling us whether effectiveness
3 of the state programs is working, he would look at me
4 like I was nuts. There is no bridge between the two
5 at the moment.

6 So, in some sense, we are making
7 recommendations to build the five-year developmental
8 program, to make the thing in five years more
9 effective than it is now, whether it is state programs
10 or local programs, or whatever it may be, and to
11 integrate the NIHes into all of this, and to get the
12 OJJDP into it, you know, to make all these a better
13 kind of functioning, integrated kind of system of
14 human development and support thereof.

15 So I am worried that we are skipping over
16 us coming together as we are going into focus groups,
17 and I look at a June deadline. We are supposed to
18 make recommendations by June. It sounds like some
19 kind of a Broadway production. I mean it is a big-
20 time thing we are doing. I don't think we should do
21 it naively.

22 When I say, "effectiveness," yes, I mean
23 data, but I've got in mind we shouldn't be thrown out
24 by a police department in a school district. That's a
25 criterion. The first rule in public health at Hopkins
26 was: Don't get tossed out of the community. I mean
27 that is a measure of effectiveness, to stay in there.

28 So I just think we should keep in mind
29 what we are building. It ain't going to be simple for
30 this group to function any more than it is broadly
31 simple for the nation to discover that it really can
32 apply Food and Drug Administration criteria to does it
33 work when you're talking about kids and teaching them
34 to read and teaching them to behave as students.

35 CHAIRMAN LONG: No, I think that what you
36 say has merit, and I want you to know I sympathize
37 with what you say. But --

38 DR. KELLAM: Okay, I accept that.

39 (Laughter.)

40 CHAIRMAN LONG: And you said it best: We
41 are given the charge with a very definitive timeline.

42 We all know that. So we will operate as best we can
43 in that timeline. To do that, I think we will rely on
44 folks like Shep to bring those things forward as we go
45 through the one, two, threes on the focus areas. So
46 those things, hopefully, will all pop out, and there
47 will be things thrown on the table for discussion, but
48 I think we have to get at those one, two, threes of
49 those focus areas.

50 We have defined what they are that first
51 day, State Grants. Then we said that we would have
52 data in the afternoon, and then the next day

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 discussion to bridge the two, and things like that can
2 pop out. That will be our first focus group. Then we
3 will head toward the second one.

4 Yes, Victor.

5 MR. MEDRANO: David, and I agree with
6 Seth, 80 percent of it; I think that 20 percent lies
7 in the fact that we're always going to have
8 differences, even if they are researchers or program
9 people, where we are going to differ.

10 But I would propose, then, that we have
11 two Advisory Committee conference calls prior to that
12 first focus group, so that some of those issues can be
13 brought to the table. The challenge with that,
14 though, I mean we can discuss this all afternoon face
15 to face and never come up with answers. It is even
16 worse when you have it on a conference call when folks
17 are trying to interject. So that is a real challenge.

18 But in order to be able to try to do that,
19 then I would recommend that we move the September
20 Advisory conference call to August and switch those
21 around, the same way with the -- have two conference
22 calls potentially prior to the third -- or the second
23 focus group.

24 MS. PRICE: I just have one question.
25 Does the Advisory Committee want an opportunity to
26 have a conference call following the focus group to
27 help them congeal their thoughts and see what
28 directions they want to go for the next focus group?
29 I think having that Advisory Committee conference call
30 between the two focus groups is a useful hunk of time
31 for them to actually be able to communicate.
32 Otherwise, I think we are set with the scenario of
33 designing both focus groups before we hear from
34 anybody. I don't know that that gives us our best
35 result.

36 MS. TAFT: Maybe we just need to add
37 another Advisory Committee call and have two in July
38 instead of one, and have two before the August meeting
39 and then keep a conference call between the focus
40 groups. I don't know. It's just another suggestion.

41 MR. ELLIS: My comment would be, it really
42 to me depends on at what point in this timeline do we
43 get the read-ahead material and do we have time to
44 digest the issues? I think we could stay with this
45 calendar, and if in our July conference call we
46 haven't had time to read ahead or there's a lot of
47 questions that remain to be asked, or we still need
48 more time to identify experts that we want to bring
49 in, or whatnot, we could always schedule a quick
50 conference call in there. I think most of us have
51 schedules flexible enough that we could spare 30
52 minutes for a quick call just to touch base.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So I think that is the important piece, is
2 getting the information ahead of time, giving us
3 enough time to digest it and to identify the issues we
4 want to talk about.

5 MS. PRICE: Let me just, from an
6 administrative standpoint, bring back one of the
7 briefings we had yesterday on the Federal Advisory
8 Committee Act. Because our meetings must be open to
9 the public and we have to print a Federal Register
10 notice notifying of the meeting, which includes our
11 Committee-wide conference calls, a spontaneous
12 Committee-wide conference call, although you can do it
13 and you could get some waivers on timing for Federal
14 Register notices, but it is always the best to keep it
15 in the structure so that you don't have to do waivers.

16 But we mentioned yesterday that the quorum
17 for this Advisory Committee is ten. The members of
18 the Committee can meet in small groups as long as they
19 are not a quorum or from the standpoint of perception
20 or just like very close to the quorum. But if three
21 or four people want to discuss an issue in a separate
22 conference call, they are certainly able. The
23 specific is that you can't come up with -- you can't
24 make a decision and say, "We are going to do this."

25 But to gel and to process the information,
26 Committee members can communicate and talk, you know,
27 that phrase from Saturday Night Live, "talk amongst
28 yourselves," talk amongst yourselves as long as you're
29 not pushing that edge of a quorum and as long as you
30 are not making decisions and setting directions for
31 the Advisory Committee.

32 But as you are coming up with thoughts and
33 questions, analyzing the information -- so if we have
34 our conference call setups, say, in July and you all
35 feel the need to discuss more, you can certainly talk
36 amongst yourselves. You just should not -- you know,
37 you have to make sure that you don't set it up so that
38 you always are just under the quorum so you never have
39 to have a public meeting, so to be wise about that in
40 an appropriate way.

41 Is that helpful?

42 MR. ELLIS: Deborah, thank you. Yes, it
43 is. I forgot about that. I appreciate your reminding
44 me.

45 Would it be helpful, then, to just go
46 ahead and schedule two calls and then we can always
47 cancel the second, or is that something we can do?

48 MS. PRICE: I think it's your call.
49 Obviously, we realize that there will be times when
50 you can't make it to a meeting. But if your schedule
51 allows for that, I think it is really -- at the same
52 time when the Secretary asked you all to be a part of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this, they realized you have very full-time jobs and
2 very full-time responsibilities, and we want you to
3 invest time in this, but we also want to be respectful
4 of your actual commitment and what puts dollars in
5 your pockets.

6 So it is the choice of the Committee. If
7 you want to establish that, put a second one in there,
8 you certainly can. There's no reason you can't.

9 MR. LEDBETTER: What is the reason that we
10 need two conference calls in July? I fail to see a
11 reason for two conference calls in July. Now after we
12 have our meeting in August, we've got one conference
13 call down between it and the October meeting.

14 Now if the conference call in July is to
15 help prepare us for the August meeting -- and I'm just
16 making an assumption here -- one should be sufficient.

17 Now after that meeting, we are going to have a
18 discussion the second morning of everything that has
19 happened. Do you really feel like we need another
20 conference call to discuss all of it again before the
21 October meeting? September, the conference call, I'm
22 assuming again that that is to prepare us for the
23 October meeting.

24 MR. ELLIS: Yes, I agree with Tommy. I'm
25 comfortable with this, but what I was hearing was
26 there was some interest on some folks' part to have a
27 second call before the meeting, and I'm okay with
28 that. But I agree with you; I think we shouldn't do
29 it unless we need it, but there are some parameters
30 there about notification to the public ahead of time.
31 So I'm comfortable with this, quite frankly.

32 MS. PRICE: And that notification, I
33 believe, is 30 days prior to the meeting we have to
34 post it in The Federal Register. So it isn't a
35 quickie.

36 But, you know, quite honestly, it is
37 helpful to put down as close to the dates that we are
38 going to be meeting, so that we can work schedules,
39 but there may be a time when we all say, "Look, we
40 scheduled this for then and we really need to back it
41 up two weeks ahead of time." You know, you can add
42 down the road as you see fit. You can subtract down
43 the road as you see fit.

44 Some of it is experience. As we
45 experience meetings, we will see more of what we need
46 to get the calendar to really reflect and provide the
47 information that we want. Right now I think to set
48 kind of a good-faith effort as to what the calendar
49 will require timewise of all of you is an important
50 thing to kind of get established fairly soon, so that
51 you have a good idea.

52 But once The Federal Register notice is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out, it is pretty much written in stone. But until
2 then, we can be flexible, and if we have to move
3 things, move things. If we have to add things, add
4 things.

5 CHAIRMAN LONG: Michael, Shep, Russell?

6 MR. PIMENTEL: I know I have been
7 relatively silent this morning. Please in the future
8 know that I will voice my views.

9 I have sat here this morning just
10 observing the dynamics of this group forming. Back
11 home I was recently asked how many children I have,
12 and I responded by saying 63,000 children. Yesterday
13 I took an oath, and yesterday that oath extended to
14 more than a million children in our country, and I
15 intend to be a part of this Committee and represent
16 myself for them.

17 We are not even agreeing on a schedule.
18 We have a lot of work ahead of us. As we progress,
19 all of these issues we are discussing are certainly
20 going to be looked at, and I see a lot of passion and
21 a lot of anxiety. We are not going to walk out of
22 here today solving anything.

23 It is going to be our future visits and
24 working together that is going to get us through this.

25 Everybody is bringing valid points forward and they
26 all need to be addressed. That is our duty. That is
27 our charge.

28 I, for one, just want you to know I'm
29 ready to meet whatever the schedule is. The schedule
30 doesn't have to meet me.

31 DR. KELLAM: That was a pretty important
32 comment. I think we all need to endorse that.

33 What I was going to comment on was three
34 steps lower in virtue and importance, I guess. But,
35 anyway, getting back to the focus groups, the question
36 that we haven't really addressed too much is, how do
37 we really choose the people who are going to come as
38 experts? The examples, I'm not sure we are on the
39 same page, but maybe we need to think about that
40 together for a little bit.

41 Because I was thinking experts in I don't
42 know what, demography or effectiveness in demography,
43 and not getting thrown out of the community, and being
44 useful to really assessing effectiveness, and so
45 forth, and how you do that.

46 But it makes a big difference whether we
47 are getting people to talk about existing school
48 information systems and how we can tie onto them, or
49 we are talking about the data, for example, in the
50 afternoon, the second session, what are their problems
51 and issues?

52 I can imagine people in Baltimore, for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 example, who are really very good at data but have
2 major problems in how you measure effectiveness of
3 kids across schools, you know, in different tracks,
4 and so on. That's one kind of expert.

5 Another kind of expert is somebody like me
6 who does developmental epidemiology and evaluation of
7 preventive trials, and blah, blah, and you go to the
8 Society for Prevention Research and pick three guys,
9 one of whom necessarily is a woman or maybe two.

10 I mean I'm being facetious, but I think
11 that it makes a big difference how we think about the
12 focus groups, who we invite, and how that is going to
13 generate our conversation. I'm not clear that I know
14 what, Dave, you and Debbie, whom I've learned to like
15 a lot in the last 36 hours, and I feel very warm about
16 the group in general, but what's your vision about who
17 these folks are?

18 CHAIRMAN LONG: That would be in the back
19 seat, quite frankly, right now, and I'll get to that.

20 Russell, you were going to say something.
21 Then I'll answer.

22 DR. JONES: Yes. I'm really having a
23 problem with process. I can understand and appreciate
24 the focus groups, but, again, I'm not clear as the
25 why's and the who's of that focus group. To me, it is
26 kind of an epistemological question: How do we
27 measure effectiveness and how do we define
28 effectiveness? How does that relate to this context?

29 I'm not sure. I'm a clinician animal
30 researcher, and one of the things that I've come to
31 appreciate is the case study method. I was thinking,
32 would it be helpful to maybe do a case study amongst
33 ourselves in terms of what this next meeting, what
34 these focus groups would do, what a focus group would
35 do? If we know what the goal of that focus group is,
36 then we could better prepare the kind of questions
37 that would enable this focus group to do what it is we
38 are expecting it to do.

39 So, to me, again, I'm just trying to hang
40 my hat on something a bit more specific, a bit more
41 concrete to move me forward.

42 CHAIRMAN LONG: I appreciate that. I'm
43 over here with Michael. It is interesting, whenever
44 we bring a group of people together, we also, on the
45 other hand, have a group of practitioners that might
46 have 4,000 high school youngsters that are on a
47 campus, and somebody issues a bomb threat, and we
48 don't have time sometimes to think about it. I'm not
49 saying this counter to what you are talking about.
50 I'm just saying there's all different facets. We move
51 very quickly and we make snap decisions, and somehow,
52 by the grace of God, we make good decisions and all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those youngsters are safe.

2 That's some of the things that we will be
3 doing here. There's a lot of faith involved with what
4 we do sometimes. I've come to understand the last few
5 hours that there's going to be a lot of faith as we go
6 forward with this Committee.

7 So, to that end, as a practitioner, let me
8 suggest July 10th as the first conference call. Did
9 that cut to it?

10 MS. TAFT: And then can I suggest August
11 21st and 22nd as our meeting dates?

12 DR. KELLAM: I'm sure it doesn't matter to
13 anybody, but July 10th is my wedding anniversary.

14 (Laughter.)

15 CHAIRMAN LONG: Bring your wife.

16 MS. PRICE: Bring your wife. It's a
17 conference call. It's a conference call.

18 CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes, that's the first one,
19 a conference call.

20 MS. PRICE: And let me throw just a
21 thought out. Rather than right now trying to be very
22 specific about the who and the questions that they are
23 answering for the focus groups, let me just ask if
24 each of you individually thought through, okay, we're
25 going to have a focus group on Safe and Drug-Free
26 Schools. What do I think I want to hear? Who do I
27 think could help address that question?

28 Because we are going to have a very
29 analytical, very scientific approach to it, and we are
30 going to have the average Joe Blow approach to it. I
31 do think that both are important to hear from.

32 But if you all think, as I would approach
33 this, I would go this way, and I think that we need to
34 -- I'm happy to be a hub of a wheel, but get it to
35 Dave; get it to me or Phyllis. Get that information,
36 compile that, put those thoughts together. Get those
37 thoughts out to you all. Get your input back on it.
38 From there, that focus group will gel.

39 I think it is impossible to answer that
40 question in the definite right now, but an approach to
41 answering it, I think that is a good approach because
42 you all have your area that you know of people that
43 can help address this question in one way or another.

44 DR. JONES: Okay, but -- yes, but, sure, I
45 have an area. I have several areas. I can give you
46 questions that I think are very relevant. But just
47 because those questions are relevant -- they are
48 relevant in a context. They are relevant in the area
49 of children and fire. They are relevant in the
50 context of children and trauma.

51 I think what we are trying to do here as a
52 group is come together with a kind of a group think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and --

2 MS. PRICE: But I think what you do is,
3 after you get the input from everybody, give that
4 information out and then you get the group think of,
5 okay, this is who we want to hear from. But I don't
6 think you can do that until you get the input of
7 everybody.

8 DR. JONES: Well, I don't agree. I think
9 you can get the input from everyone, but I think
10 getting that input in a particular context related to
11 a particular project or a particular theme in a
12 project, et cetera, may be a better use of your time.

13 MS. PRICE: Well, we do have the questions
14 under each topic.

15 MS. TAFT: If we can answer these
16 questions, we will make a good start.

17 MS. PRICE: If we can answer these
18 questions on this paper, then that gives us clear,
19 some good direction and approaches to it.

20 MS. JACKSON: And that is what I was going
21 to go back to once again. Until we get that
22 background information from the re-PART, that whole
23 evaluation piece that OMB actually used as a criteria
24 for program planning, and all the rest, to look at,
25 does the data even match for some of the programs that
26 have been implemented across the states? Has the data
27 that we have been collecting over time, ever since the
28 inception of Drug-Free Schools that changed and moved
29 into Safe and Drug-Free Schools, are we collecting the
30 right information?

31 So until we kind of look at those four
32 measures that they actually took a look at from
33 strategic planning and all the rest, and then talk at
34 the July Advisory conference call, after we have
35 looked at the information, after we have taken a look
36 at our states' programs and how it has been
37 implemented, I agree I don't think we can get to who
38 might be the best individuals or who we might even
39 throw out on the table as possibilities to come before
40 us as a Committee as we start to look at the
41 information.

42 So I really think, I know for me, I need
43 to take a look at those measures. Again, once we look
44 at that re-PART report, might we also notice that
45 there is some uniqueness and we can never be the same,
46 or have we been implementing programs that are
47 effective for the different regions, parts of the
48 state, communities, based on, again, resources and
49 other things that might need to be taken into
50 consideration, or are there some commonalities and
51 some common ground on the data that we could possibly
52 collect across the nation, as we implement whatever

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 programs we are implementing?

2 DR. JONES: So is that brought into focus
3 with these questions? Which of these focus --

4 MS. JACKSON: I believe they are. I
5 believe after this meeting -- again, I am needing the
6 background information as we take a look at currently
7 what are the strengths of the programs that are
8 currently being implemented. I will not be able -- I
9 can pull out my own information about my State, but,
10 again, does that match the criteria of OMB and what
11 they are looking for?

12 Again, I would like to see the report that
13 was produced and take a look so that I could
14 effectively evaluate and come to the table at the
15 teleconference and say my State did very well at
16 meeting those objectives, looking at some of the other
17 areas and regions, and again what were some of the
18 problems.

19 DR. JONES: Okay. So then how will we --
20 I mean I like that. How will we determine the
21 strength of the -- I mean, will the information that
22 you guys give us enable us to determine that?

23 MS. PRICE: No. No. That's what we need.
24 No.

25 DR. JONES: That's the purpose --

26 MS. PRICE: We need input from people.
27 The PART initially in 2002 reviewed the program in a
28 very definitive way. The PART report is not
29 particularly extensive.

30 DR. JONES: Okay.

31 MS. PRICE: We can give that information
32 and that is a tool we have, but hearing --

33 DR. JONES: So then maybe a focus group
34 would consist of folks who have developed this PART
35 and --

36 MS. PRICE: No.

37 DR. JONES: No? No? Help me.

38 MS. PRICE: One of the things, seeing the
39 PART review will help you understand its function and
40 how it is done. It's not a report -- well, it's a
41 report, yes.

42 DR. JONES: Okay.

43 MS. PRICE: As I said, some of the tools
44 that will be helpful to you, we will really work very
45 quickly at compiling those and getting those to you,
46 so you have an understanding of what that is. When
47 they PART a program, it asks, it addresses it, it
48 looks for effectiveness, but it is very specific. So
49 it will be helpful to understand what that specificity
50 was, what they looked at. But we will get all that to
51 you.

52 DR. JONES: Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm going to start to wrap
2 up here. I just want to give you fair warning there.
3 You mentioned for our first conference
4 call Monday, July 10th. Because of the disparity of
5 time zones that we represent, what is the best time?
6 If I said 10:00 a.m., how would that resonate? No?
7 DR. JONES: Eastern Standard? Are we
8 talking about Eastern Standard or?
9 MS. PRICE: If you go from East Coast to
10 West Coast --
11 CHAIRMAN LONG: If we say 10:00 a.m. --
12 MS. PRICE: Pick a West Coast time and
13 we'll adjust it to East Coast.
14 MS. JACKSON: There's a four-hour time
15 difference. I'm typically at work about 6:00 a.m.,
16 but no earlier than 6:00 a.m. Yes, earlier than
17 10:00.
18 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay, what if we said
19 10:30?
20 MS. JACKSON: That would work just fine.
21 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay.
22 MS. PRICE: Now are you talking Eastern
23 time?
24 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm talking Washington,
25 D.C., 10:30 a.m., and then you adjust to your
26 particular time zone.
27 DR. JONES: It sounds good.
28 MS. PRICE: Out of consideration of six
29 o'clock in the morning, quite honestly, you know, we
30 can't think at six o'clock in the morning. What if we
31 said two o'clock in the afternoon, and then that would
32 make it ten o'clock in the morning for you, and
33 somebody is going to be talking during lunchtime?
34 MS. JACKSON: I'm very flexible.
35 MS. PRICE: And you know what, we can
36 change the time for the next one after we see how it
37 works. But I just feel badly that someone is going to
38 get up at six o'clock in the morning.
39 MS. JACKSON: Again, that's just fine.
40 That's why I wanted to make it clear; I don't get up
41 at 6:00; I'm up at 4:00 a.m. every morning, but I'm
42 very flexible. So whatever time you guys select, I'm
43 fine.
44 MS. PRICE: Okay. Well, I'm the lazy one.
45 You guys pick.
46 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay, Group, what time did
47 we agree upon?
48 JUDGE NORMAN: I suggest 2:00 p.m.
49 Washington time.
50 DR. KELLAM: Thank you, Your Honor.
51 CHAIRMAN LONG: Then the second thing that
52 we want to nail down, the focus group meeting time,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 meaning the date. Is Monday, August 28th and half a
2 day on the 29th, which is a Tuesday, okay? I'm sorry,
3 I put down the 28th and 29th because that was my first
4 choice and I read it here. I'm sorry, the 21st and
5 22nd. The 21st, all day Monday; the 22nd, half day.

6 MR. ELLIS: I've got a problem. I sit on
7 a federal grand jury in the City of Alexandria, and
8 I'll be doing that that week.

9 MS. PRICE: That whole week?

10 MR. ELLIS: Yes, Tuesday, Wednesday,
11 Thursday, the 22nd, 23rd, and 24th.

12 MS. TAFT: See, now if you do it in the
13 afternoon and then the full day, I'd already be in
14 Washington the 16th and the 17th, I could join you in
15 the afternoon, and to give you the whole day, the
16 18th, but that's my other window of opportunity.

17 CHAIRMAN LONG: I've got a Board meeting
18 the next day, so I've got to get back to California on
19 Wednesday. So it's going to be Tuesday night.

20 MS. PRICE: Fred, but you would be
21 available on the 21st all day to hear the input? It's
22 just the half-day, the discussion, that you would
23 miss?

24 MR. ELLIS: That is correct. You can meet
25 without me. That's fine, but I won't be here on the
26 22nd.

27 MS. PRICE: But we will have a transcript
28 for you to read.

29 MR. ELLIS: That's fine.

30 CHAIRMAN LONG: But you would be all day
31 the 21st, you would be with us?

32 MR. ELLIS: Yes, I'd be available on the
33 21st, but the 22nd I can't.

34 CHAIRMAN LONG: Then can we say all day
35 the 21st, half-day on the 22nd? Okay.

36 I'm exhausted.

37 We've established the first meeting time
38 for the conference call, July 10th, which is 2:00 p.m.
39 Washington time, and the first focus group meeting on
40 the 21st and 22nd of August here in Washington. Okay.

41 MR. ELLIS: At the conference call do you
42 want us to propose names of persons who would
43 appear --

44 CHAIRMAN LONG: And before. There will be
45 two parts. The emphasis is on before, to get them in
46 to Phyllis. Debbie, is that appropriate?

47 MS. PRICE: Get it in to Phyllis, whose
48 email is here if you don't have it. You can get it in
49 to Phyllis, who is the DFO, the Designated Federal
50 Official, or you can get them in to me, either one.

51 JUDGE NORMAN: Can we have a copy of that
52 list before the first conference call?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. PRICE: Absolutely. Absolutely.
2 CHAIRMAN LONG: Then the second part of
3 that answer is, Judge, we will then pick up in the
4 conference call on that base list, yes.
5 MS. TAFT: To follow up on the suggestion
6 that we go out to our different groups that we are
7 affiliated with to generate names that might be good
8 for that panel, could we have this document in email
9 form, electronic form, so that we can send it out and
10 say, "This is what we want to discuss. Who are good
11 people to help us discuss this?"
12 MS. PRICE: Sure.
13 MR. LEDBETTER: Are we going to look at
14 September and October dates now also or not?
15 CHAIRMAN LONG: Would you prefer to do
16 that or would you rather do that on the first
17 conference call? I have had two or three people at
18 break who said, "Please don't go too far into the
19 dates because I don't have my calendar." That was the
20 reason, but that is a good question, Tommy.
21 So if we could entertain that also on the
22 July 10th conference call? So have your calendars
23 with you so we can coordinate for the rest of the
24 year.
25 Any other questions or comments as we
26 bring this to a close?
27 DR. KELLAM: These dates are typically
28 Monday and Tuesday? The dates are typically Monday
29 and Tuesday? No?
30 CHAIRMAN LONG: As we started, we just
31 wanted to get out of the box, but as we go through
32 that on the July 10th conference call, we will
33 entertain any combinations. Another good question.
34 MS. PRICE: Just a general question,
35 because I know in a previous commission that I was on,
36 we had a lot of athletic directors, and they flat out
37 of the box said, "Don't ever pick a Friday. We never
38 can be there."
39 Is there a specific day of the week that
40 is particularly bad for any one of you? Then it would
41 be easier to kind of work off that.
42 MR. LEDBETTER: Fridays are always bad for
43 me.
44 MS. PRICE: That's really helpful.
45 MR. MEDRANO: I would suggest staying away
46 from Mondays. Most people have to travel on Sunday in
47 order to get here for a Monday morning meeting, which
48 takes away time from family.
49 CHAIRMAN LONG: And that will be food for
50 conversation on that July 10th. So keep all those
51 things in mind and we'll go through them as we set the
52 next dates.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ELLIS: And for me, that grand jury
2 obligation lasts through December, and it's always the
3 fourth week of the month, Tuesday, Wednesday, and
4 Thursday. So if that is helpful -- again, don't
5 cancel a meeting for me.

6 CHAIRMAN LONG: Any other comments or
7 questions as we close?

8 (No response.)

9 If not, Debbie, thanks to you. Bill,
10 thanks to you.

11 Thanks to all of you. I have gotten to
12 know some of you very quickly. I look forward to
13 meeting and having the chance to speak with the rest
14 of you individually. This is going to be exciting.
15 We have some great folks sitting around this table.
16 So thank you so much for getting out of the box.
17 Thank you.

18 MR. PIMENTEL: Thanks to the members of
19 the community for being here also.

20 (Whereupon, at 11:15 a.m., the meeting of
21 the Advisory Committee was adjourned.)
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701