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

VOLUME II

WEDNESDAY FEBRUARY 21, 2007

The Advisory Committee met in the Training Room, 1W105, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C., at 8:30 a.m., David Long, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT

DAVID LONG, Chairman

DEBORAH PRICE

KIM DUDE

FREDERICK ELLIS

MIKE HERRMANN

RALPH HINGSON

MONTEAN JACKSON

RUSSELL JONES

SHEPPARD KELLUM

SUSAN KEYS

TOMMY LEDBETTER

MICHAEL PIMENTEL

DENNIS ROMERO

BELINDA SIMS

HOPE TAFT

HOWELL WECHSLER

ALSO PRESENT

Donni LeBoeuf, representing Robert Flores, of the US Department of Justice

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

A-G-E-N-D-A

Welcome, David Long, Chairman	4
Public Comment	4
Discussion	5
FERPA - LeRoy Rooker, Director of Family Policy Comp	
Discussion (continued)	71
Russell Jones, Virginia Polytechnic Institute	75
Wran-un	84

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

8:39 a.m.

MR. LONG: I wanted to, as we get started, remind us and I've had several questions. I've been talking with the Dixon Group and the question was about expenses and checks and so forth. They are here now and at the break you can pick them up from the table right back here by the door where you came in.

Anything else, Debbie, as we start that you want to say? If not, we'll move right into the public comment phase of the meeting. If there is anyone -- it's a little more difficult in this room as I'm speaking in the microphone. It there is someone behind me that wishes to step forward for public comment, would you please come forward at this time.

Seeing none and hearing none, we will then move on. I have just been informed that LeRoy Rooker, who will be giving the FERPA presentation, will be here at the time that is stated here so we'll go ahead and move to discussion. Then as soon as it's that time, LeRoy will come in and make that presentation.

Let me start this out. This was to have been originally in our original thought process and agenda and time frame to have been a conference call but because of things that happened such as the release of the report that we heard a summary of yesterday and the budget, things we talked about, this meeting was changed from a conference call, the original time table and agenda, conference call to a face-to-face meeting here in Washington. Let me just start this discussion.

Maybe, Debbie, I need to ask you, we are scheduled to be back in March. Given timetables, given things that have happened, should we in March have that face-to-face meeting in Washington or conference call? That's one part of the question.

The other would be then taking it up to June when the report is due. What about the April and May meetings because they were originally scheduled, if my memory is correct, to be two conference calls in a row. If we could start that, what is your feeling?

MS. PRICE: Let me just mention what that pattern represents. The thinking was in March we would have had these meetings and we would have had discussions. We could come together as an Advisory Committee and start to put some meat to what we would go forward with in our final report.

Then Bill Duncan, who I think just went down to the other room, he would draft up some things which we would e-mail back and forth and then those conference calls would be the times when those issues that weren't worked out by e-mail could be discussed and then the final report would be given to the Secretary.

I woke up this morning thinking about this. Whenever

an Advisory Committee does a report it's printed and bound and it's a nice looking document. It won't be in that structure in June. What we would present to the Secretary is a Word document.

Then after that document is actually presented then we would go and get it actually bound because that process of actually printing the final report has to go through so many editing things and GPO and all of this that it takes forever.

If we had to wait for them until we presented it, we would have written the report last month. Once we present the report to the Secretary it will be online and people can get it. It just won't be as pretty as the final report document.

MR. LONG: What's the thought? We're in February now. Knowing that the report to the Secretary will be June, what about the March meeting which is supposed to be face-to-face and a conference call in those three months? Is that still appropriate or should that change?

MS. TAFT: I'm much better at seeing documents like this than I am reading them over the screen or the internet so I wondered if it was possible to maybe have the people work up a document of what recommendations we have come up with so far, put them all into a document, send that out to us, let us do a conference call in March and then come back in April and really kind of fine-tune it and talk about those recommendations.

That would give them time to get something prepared by June. I just think that we need some time after we've gotten the initial document to come face-to-face and discuss what's in it instead of doing it by telephone because telephone conversations don't always make me as focused on the conversation at hand as a personal meeting does.

MR. LONG: Other comments?

MR. JONES: Yeah, I like that, the iteration of that. I think it would be great if we could get what has been proposed, I guess including this meeting, mapped out.

Then coming together because I think there is something about coming together and walking through the recommendations and making sure that we are coming to consensus and throw out whatever we don't think. I think that's a good plan, not that I need another trip to Washington.

MR. LONG: Others?

MR. HERRMANN: I agree with holding off on the March meeting and going to April. I think one thing I would like to get fairly quickly is some sense of exactly what the recommendations are to this point because I think I'm kind of confused about exactly what those are. It felt like we left a lot of things up in the air. I just want to be sure we are on the same sheet of music at this point.

MR. LONG: Shep.

MR. KELLUM: Yeah, I was going to endorse what the

NEAL R. GROSS

folks are saying this morning. One of the questions is what is the state of our shared vision about what we want to do together in the way of a report and how does it jive with what the Secretary has asked us to do.

I'm assuming we are working toward some kind of a framework for the next stage of bringing all the kinds of data together into one place with policymaking and with practitioners in the field as to what we really think needs to happen to what seems, to me, to be a hugely

This is ranging from what we learned yesterday from Fred and his group to talking about data systems that are all over the place and the very expensive and not integrated data systems that are not applied to practice but, in fact, hang out there potentially pejorative to school buildings rather than helpful.

fractionated bunch of operations with very little interrelation.

The partnership issue -- I'm looking at Hope. The partnership issue which is probably the least taught of all aspects of research in education and research on anything, graduate students are just not taught how to relate to school district in a way that helps the school district accomplish its mission.

The research establishment stands aloof. The components I think stand aloof. I would hope that the report really is an integrative document at the right level of abstraction without the details of the plumbing.

That does lay out a framework for bringing things together and it's not the first time this country has tried to do that but I think it's important to pursue that end. I have to apologize. I got up this morning about 5:30 -- I'm looking at Deborah -- and talked to Dave about it a little bit yesterday.

I sent out a long-term impact paper on the first and second grade randomized field trials we've been doing in Baltimore for 20 some years. Just to give you a sense of what a rigorous trial looks like in partnership would not have been possible without 95 percent of the families and more providing written consent in partnership with the school district.

That kind of partnership, which brings together the research with policy and with program and how do you roll it out if it works. All those issues need to be in one framework. I mean, we've got to somehow begin to apply. We're just not teaching people how to do research anymore.

We are trying to bring the researchers, the policymakers, the practitioners into one place to accomplish institutional missions. I would think that a short report which could somehow bring that off would be a very important contribution.

I would like to see us aim that way. I think we do need to come together. I was listening to Kim yesterday talk about her doubt that, in fact, you can really tease out what works precisely in the context of a gazillion things going on in every school building and, you know, how

NEAL R. GROSS

you do that, the limits of what you can do in a trial and so forth.

All that requires us to come together to come up with a shared vision, I think. We're not there yet but, as Mike was saying yesterday, Mike Herrmann, I think we are approaching something like that kind of a shared vision and need to work on it. That's what my hope would be for what we get out of all of this.

MR. LONG: Mike.

MR. PIMENTEL: All right. Let me get my little Texas mind straightened out here because I know what I want to say but sometimes I select the words and don't communicate the message I want to convey.

At this table here is a tremendous amount of resources and I want to go along with what Russell and Hope have suggested about the meeting in April because I have got to admit there is a spirit of confusion that is lying within me that is causing me to have some concern.

I do try to be as positive as I can. I do believe that at this table it's not that often we are going to pull together the different sciences and skills and expertise that is here to discuss these things that can have some meaningful impact on the lives of our children across our country.

I have no misgivings about what I am here. I know that I serve in an advisory capacity. I have no misgivings. I do know what that is. I do understand Secretary Spelling's obligation and commitment to our nation.

But as we move forward, we have an opportunity here to make meaningful contributions and the Secretary has an opportunity to take advantage of the suggestions and recommendations we bring forward. I just hope and pray that whenever we get our report done that we are submitting a report of substance and not rhetoric and bureaucracy.

I would like to go over it and review what it is we've done because I go home tomorrow or today and, quite frankly, I'm going to go, "What did I get out of this meeting?" That is going to be that I saw some snow. Sorry.

MR. ROMERO: Good morning, all. I agree with everyone's comments. I think particularly Mike's comment about sort of beginning to have a dialogue as a group and see where we stand. I think we all have a lot to learn from one another but, at the same time, we have a lot to offer to the table.

I am humbled by sitting with this group here because when I hear someone say, "I'm a principal," I cringe and I go back to my days of being in high school again. Not that I didn't have such a bad time there just for the record.

I think we need to start putting some meat from our own perspectives, from our own expertise, and have an open discussion about some of these issues. I know that I am learning tremendously and I honestly am having a tremendous appreciation for the work that the

NEAL R. GROSS

April?

This is really important and the issues are so vital to our nation's children. I think we owe both the Secretary, we owe the Department of Education, and we owe it to the kids that we all serve to really ensure that we have a common understanding or are willing to reach a common understand but we don't do that unless we first start to have that dialogue. I would suggest that we do this at the April meeting and begin to move forward in that direction.

MR. LONG: Susan.

MS. KEYS: Just given the sentiment, I am a little concerned about letting go of the March meeting as a time for us to begin our dialogue. Do we have sufficient time to do what we need to do if we don't come together in March and possibly repeat and come together again in April to finish our work?

There's a lot to be done and a lot of good dialogue that needs to occur. Is it unrealistic to have something to us to begin working with in March? I'm just asking. It just seems to not come back again until the middle of April when the real meat of what we need to do is still ahead of us. I'm just asking the group. I'm just happy to do whatever.

MR. PIMENTEL: Coming together in both March and

MS. KEYS: Well, I hate to let March go when we don't know how much is ahead of us. Why not keep on track and see what we can accomplish. I just think it's a long time between now and April.

MR. LONG: Montean.

MS. JACKSON: I would definitely like to suggest that we have our preliminary drafts to us before the March meeting so that we can tie it back into the blue print and begin working on aligning some of the things that we have already recommended that may or may not have been considered in this initial blueprint.

The other piece that I would like to see added is a revisit of the overarching mission of Safe and Drug-Free Schools. Again, I think some of the things we addressed early on with regard that we may be too broad. Safe and Drug-Free Schools has turned into a very broad mission and objective that may not be able to be accomplished, especially with declining funding resources.

Again, I would like to state that some of the issues that came up for me yesterday were things that I thought definitely were not included in this draft blueprint that were brought up at past meetings with regard to the flexibility of it remaining at the LEA level versus the state level and the data collection.

I would like to see some information regarding data collection and what has been collected at the SEA level that has been submitted to the Department of Education on an annual basis and what additional data collection information that possibly was needed or would

have been beneficial because, again, there has been an assumption made on several of us as I've listened to a lot of these meetings that one research isn't aligned with practice with what is being implemented in LEAs.

I know for a fact that the Department of Education and the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools has supported evidence-based and SAMHSA has provided us with that list that much of the funding has gone toward using evidence-based curricula as we implement our programs.

Data collection has been going on for years and we have used multiple data collection streams from climate surveys, YRBS, PRIDE surveys, etc., etc. Again, I am unclear myself as to what additional information is being requested or has been requested and has it not trickled down to LEAs so that we can provide either SEA national that information.

I kind of would like a little bit more information provided to me as a Committee member so I can see where we're at, where we need to go, what things besides just the charge that we had on the table by Secretary Spelling what other things might be of interest or we could be providing this advisory board.

MR. LONG: Fred and Howell.

MR. ELLIS: I think, Susan and Montean have some great points about timing. As much as I hate to commute to D.C. from Northern Virginia, this morning was two hours, I think we really do need to. Even though we have spent a lot of time hearing from a lot of experts and a lot of different panels and have had some discussion, I think the real meat of what we have left to do is this discussion among us.

To me there seems to be three major topics. One is addressed in the charges that we received from the Secretary which is, of course, the main purpose of this Committee's existence, providing the answers to those issues that she wanted feedback on.

I think the other one is one that Montean hit on is that during our process we have either heard or discussed. Jim has been very consistent in bringing about his advocating his issues in terms of the long-term longitudinal studies and whatnot. I could never accurately restate what he has so many times.

I think those are all legitimate issues that the Committee should consider. Let's hash them out, let's discuss them, and let's see which ones, if any, we want to include in our report back.

Then the final issue, I think, is funding. I think we have an opportunity to talk about funding. We all know that the administration's budget proposal is probably going to be modified a great deal when it gets to Congress. I think we have an opportunity to keep in mind who the audience is for this report.

Although it is addressed to the Secretary, there will be many other people reading it. I think it would be wise for us to consider that and to maybe take this chance to state what we feel on a consensus kind of format.

In order to do that, my point was I think Susan is right on the money. I think we need to get some basic information from the recordkeeper folks to us by March. I think that would be very wise. I think the easy part is getting through the charges from the Secretary relatively easy. I think the more difficult ones are the last two.

MR. WECHSLER: I just want to speak up on behalf on our beleaguered friend the writer who I saw when Montean suggested that we have a report delivered to us in advance of the March meeting I saw a shudder go through him. I don't know what he would write.

What you described is the simplest task, responding to the charge from the Secretary. There are three things and we have come to agreement on one of them, safe school choice, but the two more complicated ones, the data and the state program, we have only scratched the surface.

If he were to write something for us in advance of March, unless we accomplish a whole lot in the next few hours, I don't know what he would say. I don't know what use that would do.

MS. JACKSON: But maybe then that would just be it. That's where we start. That's where we're at. We resolved item No. 1 and all the rest still need to be discussed. Then we could be drafting up again our ideas, recommendations, and suggestions so that when we meet in March we are prepared to discuss the other items that still are left sitting on the table. I believe some of us have just gotten a little lost and everything is kind of gray.

MS. KEYS: Have we had two preliminary reports? Okay. So I think even to just go back and see what came out of those preliminary reports is a starting point.

MR. JONES: Yes, just real quickly. I mean, I think both Montean and Susan are right on. Matching the blueprint up with or that the expectations of the Secretary with what we've been doing is so important. I keep having this thought process that there is nothing worse than a sharp image of a fuzzy concept.

I'm not sure if we're sure what it is in some instances we are to be doing and then how to go about doing that. I guess to put it briefly I agree. I think we need to see where we are, what the concepts are, what the topics are, etc., the progress that's been made, and then how to move forward.

MS. TAFT: The Secretary called the Advisory Committee together because it was written into the law of No Child Left Behind. She has some very important things that she would like to see accomplished with this. I think Congress also had a few things they would like to see accomplished by this Advisory Committee.

If you look at who's around the table, you get a sense that Congress really wanted to make sure that the Department of Education was

integrating their safe and drug-free school efforts with the efforts of the other federal agencies and with the state and local LEAs and SEAs because of the composition of this group.

I don't know that we have even talked about that or how it could be more seamlessly integrated into the other things that are happening at various Government levels. I also think they were very concerned about the gathering of data and the use of data.

I was a little disappointed in this meeting in that I know at least I suggested some other people to talk about data from a state and local perspective and there was not a panel convened to talk about that level and how you could build a data system from the ground up that would be useful at all levels.

I agree I think we have some more work to do before we are ready to present anything to the various audiences from the Secretary to the Hill and to the people at large because what is recommended by this group, even though it is only advisory will resonate out in the field.

MR. LEDBETTER: I'm not sure I'm quite as eloquent as Russell or Montean but I think I agree with both of them. We have heard a lot of people make presentations to us. We've had a great deal of discussion but when it comes right down to it, I'm not sure what we have accomplished to this point.

I, too, would like to see something in writing where we can look at it and say, "These are the things that we have agreed upon and these are the things that we have not."

At least then we would have something to reference and move forward because we can come together and come together and come together but until we have something concrete that we can look at and say these are the things that we have agreed upon, I think it's very difficult for us to make much progress.

I guess I'm a visual person. I would like to have that in my hands where I can look at it and say, "Okay, I agree. These are the things that we have reached some consensus on.

MS. SIMS: Good morning. Guess I just want to make sure I'm on the record as agreeing with these last comments that have been made about rethinking what we do with our time for March. I think maybe a meeting would be appropriate with the Federal Government but I can go either way. I go with the flow.

Regarding what Hope was saying about not discussing, sort of coming together of the different federal entities around the table with regard to Safe and Drug-Free schools and all the other programs going on, I mean, I would say that if we looked back at our notes and the transcripts from these meetings, we would learn that it has been brought up numerous times at our various meetings.

At the state grants meeting some of the presenters of those panels even talked about wanting streamlining of the data systems,

coordination so that they weren't repeating these evaluations for all the different entities that they are involved with, drug-free communities, SPF-6, Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

I think it has been brought to our attention and we have even brought it up amongst ourselves so we need to revisit what we said, what's been requested by the people that we have asked to come and present to us, and see whether or not we have a specific recommendation regarding that and, if not, then we need to include one.

The things that really resonate with me from these various meetings we've had have been the panelists' presentations, just hearing from people out in the real world who are trying to do this program.

Going back to the first meeting with the state grants program everyone got up there and said whether or not they thought it was worthwhile to continue the program. I know that everyone got up there and said basically, yes, it's worthwhile but the resources are very tight. A decrease in the available resources will bring this program under more pressure to actually be able to be implemented in a quality manner.

We really should go back and look at what we've heard and line it up with this proposal for the coming budget and make some specific recommendations not just based on how we feel but based on the testimony that has been given to this Advisory Committee.

MR. LONG: Kim.

MS. DUDE: I think whenever you're in a group or whenever you plan anything it's kind of a ready, aim, fire sort of concept. I think we have spent probably 80 percent of our time in the ready stage by getting informed through all these panels. I've found them all very fascinating. I have learned a great deal.

I think we spent about 20 percent of our time aiming and, of course, we are nowhere near ready to fire. I think we should have a March meeting and we spend our entire time aiming. No more panels. Just the entire time just talking because we really had very little time to do that, to really process everything that we have learned so far.

I think it would be unfair to expect the writers of this to write down what we have processed because we really haven't processed very much yet. We really haven't aimed very much.

We have come up with some conclusions but not very many so I guess I'm of the opinion that I would rather have us meet in March and spend the entire time processing and coming up with the direction that we want to take. Then allow the writers to put that all together and then look at that after that point and we decide whether that's where we want to fire or not.

MR. LONG: Shep and Russell.

MR. KELLUM: Yes. Let me follow up with a comment that Belinda made. I think there is a lot more that we have talked through than we can retain just in memory. If we go back and do what you were

talking about, Belinda, look at what the notes are, what we've said. Just look for the big ideas.

Just abstract the ideas that make some salience to a person who is trained in writing to pull out important notes, important items. Just have those circulated and I think it might be a refreshing review of the different perspectives we bring. I feel like that in some sense instead of processing, as Kim was talking about -- I guess it was Kim that said that.

In a sense we are saying the same thing over and over again because we haven't somehow managed to move ahead in understanding each other. That takes time and I think that it's correct that we really need to spend time doing that. For me it would be very helpful just to look at an abstraction from what we've said of key points. Just see what they look like.

MR. LONG: Russell.

MR. JONES: Yes, I think Kim really hit the nail on the head, the work process. To just put on my therapeutic cap for a moment, it's very important when you are talking with a client to get as much data as you possibly can but the real active ingredient is a processing of that information, pulling it together, integrating it, etc. I think we have done a lot of data gathering but in terms of processing and synthesizing that information, that is yet to be done.

MR. LONG: Several thoughts. One is I want to ask the folks -- first of all, I agree. I am also one of those visual learners that needs a series of bullets, even if it's a one-pager. The other thing I don't need is like 11 pages. Hear me, Bill? I say that for his sake because that leads into the next part.

A couple of committee members have alluded to that and as professionals we all understand that we only have so much time in a day. We all have full-time jobs. If this could be succinct where have we been, even if it's bullet form, that's fine.

Just so that we can see it and then start to pull our collective thought processes together so that when we come together for that discussion that we do have those bullets to see where we've been and where there has been agreement, or where there has been some semblance of agreement because that will save time also.

I do agree that I think we probably agreed on a little more than we think. As you said that, I started going back in my mind. I think there has been agreement on some things that if we put them down it might take a 10-minute discussion and say, "We've been through this. Is there anyone that really has a big disagreement over this?"

If we could do that, the other thing I wanted to ask about, before that next meeting there's 18 business days. I would ask can you physically -- I can't see you back there. Can you physically pull that together? If that can be pulled together, and I think that's a question we have to ask because that gets back to your ready, aim, fire.

If that can be pulled together to get out to us so that we can start to arrange our thoughts, then we go back to the March meeting. Then I want to ask this bearing in mind that part of this is a selfish part of a human being. Should that be a one-and-a-half-day meeting or a one-day meeting?

For us when it's a day and a half, it's three days for us because we travel one full day and then we meet and we leave at 11:00 or 12:00 and then we get home at 10:00 at night or 11:00 at night, which is fine but I want -- I'm asking that from a selfish point of view.

MS. JACKSON: Then, David, would the following two meetings be telephonic?

MR. LONG: Then we would go to those to ask what the Committee wished to do.

MS. TAFT: Maybe the March meeting could be a one-day meeting because we will have something to respond to. Then the April meeting could be a day-and-a-half meeting where we would really put the final touches on whatever we decide in March.

MR. LONG: Even if it's a one-day start at 8:00 instead of 9:00. There's about six or eight of us sitting in the lobby of the Holiday and we could be doing this. If you said one day, I would propose that we start earlier to get in more discussion time if that is your --

MS. DUDE: Selfishly, I would rather have one-and-a-half-days in March than coming in March and April. I mean, the number of times we have come to D.C. is just an unbelievable number of times and it has become very difficult for me professionally and personally.

I would rather -- I guess maybe we don't decide on the April meeting until we have the March meeting. We may get enough done in March that we don't need to have the April meeting. I would just like to put the vote in for between March and April having one meeting if possible.

MR. LONG: Kim just put C on the table. That is a consideration. If we have instead of a one-day in March if we have a day and a half and then perhaps, because we don't know the answer to that, as you stated, that we would then not have an April meeting face-to-face. Then it might be the potential that we have a May meeting but we don't know. That would be dictated by how it goes in March.

It now appears from your very candid discussion that a March meeting is necessary so let's plan on a March meeting. When I'm talking I'm just watching. March meeting, day and a half. Is that correct? Then see where it goes from there as to what we do in April and May.

I'm sorry. We just got a cue that even when you ask a question if you would please hit the mic so they can get it on the record. I think that the question was from Tommy Ledbetter would that still be on, is that, the 19th and 20th? I don't have it in front of me.

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

MR. LONG: 19th and 20th. The answer was yes, or do

45

you wish to have that up for discussion?

MR. JONES: I cannot do it that day. I'm really sorry. I'm scheduled to do trainings in Baton Rouge and New Orleans. I can't do it on the 19th.

MR. LEDBETTER: I can be here the 19th but I cannot be here the 20th.

MS. KEYS: Catherine is suggesting an 8:00 to 6:00 meeting on the 19th.

MS. DAVIS: Your second day meetings are only three hours so if you extend the first day from 8:00 to 6:00 you are adding two hours to the normal day so it's a long day but if it helps alleviate some of the travel angst.

MR. LONG: I want it noted for the record that Catherine and I did not talk. That is an option now hearing this discussion. Tommy, you said you could not be here the 20th? Is that what I heard?

MR. LEDBETTER: The 20th is the day I go to St. Petersburg, Russia.

MR. LONG: Is that an option if we have the one-day on the 19th from 8:00 to 6:00?

MR. HERRMANN: I like that option.

MR. JONES: I would really like to be here, you know. I can meet the following week. I can meet the week before but I would really like to be at that meeting if there is any way possible.

MR. LONG: I'm only going to say I think this was the scheduled date.

MR. ROMERO: I would suggest if we could do it the week after because I, too, am not available. I will be in Rhode Island the first day. I have to be in, I think, Milwaukee the next day. I also, with Russell, would like to be very much part of this.

MS. PRICE: With all due respect, the dates have been planned since the beginning of this Advisory Committee and have been known by all Advisory Committee members. I just want you to realize that if we move it, we are going to miss somebody else so we do need to know because we have the <u>Federal Register</u> notice ready to go to the <u>Federal Register</u> tomorrow.

We need to have a decision today on what we are going to do. I do mean that with all respect. These dates have been out there since July and have been known by all and were agreed to by all. If we are changing it, we need to figure that out now and then consider who would not be there if we move the dates.

MR. ROMERO: Can I suggest and maybe take a poll and see who else is not available that day.

MS. PRICE: Let me mention one other thing and this might give you some time to think. Lee Rooker because we didn't have a public speaker came down early so he has been sitting here waiting and

now it's now for his presentation. Is this something that we can listen to Lee's presentation and then come back to talking about the dates so that we are not keeping Lee, out of respect for Lee, out of his office for an unknown quantity of time while we decide a date?

MR. LONG: Then, with that, we'll have Mr. LeRoy Rooker, Director of Planning Policy Compliance Office, to talk to us about FERPA. Thank you for being here.

MR. ROOKER: Good morning, everyone. We'll talk about a couple of items here that we administer out of my office, the Family Policy Compliance Office. We administer the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act which affects the privacy protection of student education records. We'll also talk about another law we administer, Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment which has to do with the surveying of students and regulations around those particular surveys.

I'm happy at any point to entertain questions also or at the end. I think everyone has the handout so we'll just move quickly through. I know you have lots going on here. These are very brief summaries of the laws.

In terms of FERPA it relates to three primary rights that parents have. They have rights to inspect and review education records, to seek amendment of those records. They have a right to have some control over the disclosure of information from those records.

Rights belong to the parents. Once they turn 18 the rights are transferred to the student or post-second institution. Everything falls into one of those three primary rights.

Education records are records which are directly related to the student and maintained by the school or party acting for the school. Virtually anything that is maintained at a public school on a student that is identifiable to the student is going to be an education record. This includes things like handwriting, video/audio tapes, computer media, microfilm, microfiche. Any means by which those records are maintained.

To be directly related means in some way it's going to be personally identifiable to that student. Personally identifiable includes the student's name, a social security number, a student ID number. Also includes other information to make the student's identity easily traceable so if you've got something where information is de-identified, then it's not directly related. It wouldn't be personally identifiable to the student or directly related.

If it's easily traceable to the student, even though other personally identifiable information may have been deleted, it's still going to be an education on that record. That's where you get into issues like small cells and those sorts of things.

MS. PRICE: Lee, could you give an example about classroom with a small minority population and what that might look like?

MR. ROOKER: Sure. In terms of the easily traceable

and, as I mentioned, the small cell issue, if there is statistical information being provided that would generally be nonpersonally identifiable so social security numbers and other identifiers are taken out of that, but coupled with other information may identify the fact that a particular member of a minority population, for example, could be identified out of the release of information based on various pieces that would be part of that information disclosed.

If you had a subset of information that indicated in this subset all of the students failed to pass the particular class and that identified those students -- if the information could identify those students even though other personally identifiable information had been taken out, it would still be protected information under FERPA.

Generally to release any kind of personally identifiable information from education records take a consent from the parent or the student so that is when it's being disclosed as a general rule outside the particular school.

There are a number of exceptions, however, that permits the disclosure of information in personally identifiable form in FERPA. One is to school officials at the school district who have an legitimate educational interest and others in the school where student seeks and intends to enroll from one school to another.

Information could be transferred on that student. Any information at a particular school could be transferred to the other school. The information can be disclosed to state and local officials in connection with serving the student under the juvenile justice system.

If there is a state law in a particular state that permits the disclosure in order to serve a student prior to adjudication, then information could be disclosed on that particular student. This comes into play with atrisk students. Again, it's based on there being a state law that permits this kind of disclosure.

In order to do that, any receiving party of that information has to certify in writing they won't further redisclose that information and only use it for the purposes of this particular student.

Information can also be disclosed to comply with a judicial order or subpoena as long as notification is given to the parent. Health or safety emergency exception. If the health or safety of the student or others is at risk, the information can be disclosed to the appropriate parties.

Directory information. This is information not generally considered harmful or an invasion of privacy if disclosed and includes things like names, address, date and place of birth, dates of attendance, degrees awarded, that type of general information that would not generally be considered harmful or an invasion of privacy.

However, I should mention here, too, parents have the right to opt out of the release of directory information so it's not an absolute

NEAL R. GROSS

that information can be disclosed without consent under this exception. If a parent opts out, then it could not be.

Education records can be disclosed to school officials who have been determined to have a legitimate educational interest. Districts have to define this term, the term "school official" and "legitimate educational interest" among others who could be school officials with a legitimate educational interest or law enforcement unit officials at the school district.

Those law enforcement unit officials employed by the school district who could be designated as school officials with a legitimate educational interest at the institution, at the school, which is a way there is an exception in FERPA to the broad definition of education records.

It says that law enforcement units created at the school district by the school's law enforcement unit is created for law enforcement purpose and maintained by that law enforcement unit separate and apart from other education records would not be education records.

They are exempt from that definition. This permits school districts to release information that generally would not be releasable without consent. It's a significant exception in FERPA that Congress carved out for disclosure of information related to law enforcement issues at the school.

Yes, question?

MR. HERRMANN: Are those specifically law enforcement agencies based out of the school district, not a law enforcement agency that is working through a memorandum or whatever with the local police department?

MR. ROOKER: You could have. It's generally law enforcement unit officials who are employed by the school district. However, you could have through contract with local law enforcement in a community to have individuals who perform that function for the school.

However, in order to do that it has to be made clear that at the time they are serving as the law enforcement unit official for the school they are a school official. They could not provide information back to the local law enforcement from education records, for example, or any information to which they might have access. Yes, you can have different arrangements in regard to that. When we wrote the regulations on this several years ago, it was made clear every school district can have a law enforcement unit associated with them, even if it's someone who performs other functions at the school. You could have a principal at a small school also be the law enforcement unit official there. It would be a matter of designating them as serving that other function.

The health and safety emergency exception that's in FERPA says that the disclosure can be made to the appropriate parties in connection in an emergency if the knowledge of the information is necessary to protect the health or safety of the student or others so it's not

NEAL R. GROSS

 just to protect the student. It's the student or others which, again, gives some latitude there for schools in terms of releasing information here.

That's the FERPA piece in terms of education. I don't know if there are any particular questions about educational records before we move on to talk about the surveying piece that we do.

MS. PRICE: I don't have a specific question but I'm wondering if Shep or Russell or some of those that are more focused on the data issue because I don't know just if you would glean out from your presentation that some of what you've talked about directly reflects some of the issues related to collecting data on kids and tracking. I just wanted to mention that so that I could instigate those questions if you have them. Maybe give an example and does that conflict with FERPA.

MR. ROOKER: Yes, sure.

MR. FLORES: I think a key question here has to do with what is considered adequate procedure for obtaining consent. A lot of times researchers think about doing passive consent or they will send out letters saying, "We're going to be collecting this type of information.

Please let us know if you don't want your child to participate..." in this, that, or the other study. Is that acceptable under these rules or does there have to be a written consent for each piece of data that's collected?

MR. ROOKER: Some of that would depend. We'll actually get into Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment more talking about serving of students and that sort of things. In terms of what Debbie was mentioning that efforts to collect data, to do research on students, and an effort to do this based on information and education records is clearly affected by FERPA because, as you can see from this, that if something is directly related, that student is personally identifiable in some way, that information under FERPA generally has to be protected from any kind of redisclosure so when you get into a lot of different types of research, this can impact on that.

We have opined on this particular issue. I actually have a letter on our website to the Tennessee State Department of Education relating to collection or release of information to researchers for research purposes and how that can generally be done under FERPA, although doing a longitudinal study becomes quite -- it's more difficult because, again, you've got to keep in mind the small cell issue and that you don't identify students through the collection of information that's there. All of this is affected by FERPA.

MR. KELLUM: Let me say something research-y. In actual fact, a lot of what you've been saying boils down to the partnership between the researchers and the local school district and the facilities. What is a school official becomes an issue.

In Baltimore, for example, the research team is declared part of the school district. We carry IDs and the like. Nonetheless, we get

active written consent on anything which is beyond the day-to-day monitoring of grades and the like because we believe that if we can't get active consent, we've not done our homework in partnering with the families.

Through the school district and the school building through the principal we have to establish that kind of rapport which allows the mutual self-interest of families, school buildings, and researchers to come together in a common vision.

We don't train researchers how to make those partnerships so a lot of the research enterprise comes from the fact that researchers are not very good at establishing the kind of rapport which makes these regulations actually of mutual importance to the research as well as to the school district and the families. That's the underlying process that we have to somehow bring to light.

In Baltimore, for example, we do randomized field trials. There are many components of that including random assignment of kids to classrooms. The school district, the Board of School Commissioners, says that it's their function to assign kids to classrooms. They don't want to do tracking so they are in favor of balancing classrooms so random assignment when you work through trust turns out to be for the families very often the quote is "creating an even playing field" so some kids are not in one classroom because their parents are more vociferous and other kids are dumped into the bad classroom where the classroom management is likely to be very poor.

There are a lot of process issues. What they come down to is the way the researchers, the school district, and the families really work through the very legitimate concerns. FERPA is not an imposition on researchers.

It is a facilitator. It is supposed to make it possible to establish some guidelines of what you're supposed to do if you want to muck around with somebody's kids. I'm trying to get some tone to the whole thing.

MR. ROOKER: Sure. That is an excellent point, each point you've made there. I would re-emphasize the signed consent provision in FERPA is a wonderful thing. Signed consent is a wonderful thing because as you deal with families, if you are really doing in depth research and really going to deal with them, then that is why that consent provision is there to say, "Hey, they can give you access to anything."

MS. KEYS: I just wanted to clarify for my own sake. FERPA has to do with a request for an existing record.

MR. ROOKER: Yes.

MS. KEYS: Student record where the PPRA is more a request to survey a student.

MR. ROOKER: Yes.

MS. KEYS: One is asking permission to access

NEAL R. GROSS

something that already exist. The other is to collect something new.

MR. ROOKER: That's a very good summation. You are absolutely right because FERPA deals with education records. That's what it affects. It is not a confidentiality law. It doesn't say you can't talk to kids or any of these sorts of things.

It says how the school treats a record that it maintains is important and has to be treated in a very particular way. In terms of the PPRA, as you point out, this deals with the surveying and it is, if you will, a future record almost. It deals with two things here.

One, we have Department of Ed funded surveys. If you have a Department of Ed funded survey, then before a minor student is required to participate in such a survey that reveals information concerning one or more of eight protected areas of information

- -- we'll look at those in just a moment here
- -- that active consent, consent from the parent, would be obtained.

We've got an active consent with a Department of Ed funded. Other funded surveys, HHS, CDC, state entities, if someone else is funding it, then schools are required to notify parents of students scheduled to participate in the survey.

Again, if it gets into one or more of these eight protected area and provide them with an opportunity to inspect and review the survey and also an opportunity to opt their child out so this is passive consent.

If it's funded by anyone other than the Department of Education, the consent is passive which means you notify the parent and tell them if they don't want their child participating to tell you in writing as opposed to the active consent which would tell us it's okay to survey your child.

Those eight protected area I'm not going to go through all of them here but you have them there on the next couple of overheads but they are all, you will notice, nonacademic in nature. They are personal. They get into different types of behavior, attitudes, this sort of thing.

If the survey doesn't venture into one of these, then it's not subject to PPRA. If it does venture into one or more of these, then PPRA does come into play either active or passive consent, either one. One of the things that's required regardless of whether it's active or passive consent is direct notification to parents of students who are participating in these surveys.

This is either through U.S. Mail or e-mail of those students who are actually going to be participating in the survey or asked to. There needs to be -- there are actually a couple of different notifications here.

We have models on our website for any that are out there available to any school. There is a general notification that goes to the general population. It can be sent home in the backpack or any other means.

Then there's the direct notification for those students who

are actually going to be surveyed and that's where we get into U.S. Mail or e-mail directly to the parent the notification to advise the parent of their right to opt their child out of the activities, the specific or approximate date scheduled for the activities and the right to inspect and review the survey material.

So that is a very quick run-through of PPRA. PPRA, as pointed out, is something future or something that is going to be done so you are notifying parents, the school districts are notifying parents and where appropriate getting consent for having the opt-out on the surveying.

Again, only if it gets into one of those eight areas. We get lots of questions about different types of surveys that don't get into these areas and those aren't affected by --

MS. PRICE: Lee, for the Ed funded that is required, what about if it's voluntary, if you do a survey that's voluntary?

MR. ROOKER: Right. The term required is not a defined one so what we look at is the totality of the situation. We would look at whether, indeed, it was a voluntary survey or not. One investigation we did in New Jersey dealt with what was called a voluntary survey but every student who missed was brought in to take the survey afterwards.

The totality of the situation told us this was not voluntary. This was a required survey called voluntary so it depends on what that really looks like.

Then the issue comes down to because PPRA the right belongs with the parent so at what point can you let the child make the decision as opposed to the parent. What age and that sort of thing. Again, all of the totality of that comes into play when we look at that.

MR. ROMERO: Just one quick question. Are the notifications if they are voluntary notifications, and obviously this is going to go to the parents, are they offered in other languages besides English?

MR. ROOKER: We don't have them available in any language other than English. There are school districts that do notification both for FERPA and PPRA in other languages depending on the size of a particular population.

MR. JONES: Just real quick, do these guidelines supersede or are they fully consistent with HIPAA and IRB guidelines?

MR. ROOKER: Okay. In terms of HIPAA, FERPA when it comes to medical records, which is where we go with HIPAA, that FERPA applies to medical records at schools as opposed to HIPAA. That is in the HIPAA regulations and is made clear that records that are subject to FERPA are not subject to HIPAA's privacy rule so FERPA is what governs there. We have information on our website on that, the HHS regulations, for example, that are there.

In terms of IRB we work closely with the office here at the Department that is charged with the administering of that particular law. Those IRBs have to comply with the requirements of both PPRA and, when appropriate, also with FERPA.

They are very good in making that known to the various IRBs that when you get into actual either surveying of students if it gets again into these areas that you need to be aware of PPRA and comply with that. If you get into accessing student records or needing to access student records again, then it's got to be in compliance with FERPA which generally means signed consents to do that.

MR. JONES: So if I'm approved by my IRB to do research, surveys, etc., I can assume that these guidelines have been met or not?

MR. ROOKER: I would never assume they are but they are subject to both of these laws. Again, IRBs are determined other than here at the Department of Education. The Department of Education, though, in working with the various IRBs around the country are very conscious of both of these laws and bring them to their attention. Hopefully they are being pulled in when they make any kind of determination on any request.

MR. KELLUM: Russell's questions are not trivial. I don't know how many of you know what all these initials are. IRB, Institutional Review Board, that is the local agency inside the institution that judges whether you've met FERPA or HIPAA or anybody's overriding guiding principles.

It's interesting because one of the tasks of this Advisory Committee is to bring together, you can see from the makeup, across federal agencies, researchers, policy makers, program people, and so forth. An IRB of a school district is not the same IRB as at Johns Hopkins School of Public Health or at American Institutes for Research.

These are institutional IRBs who, in fact, can get into very interesting debates as to whose jurisdiction any particular program is going to happen. What we are talking about is a process by which the researcher and the policy makers and the institutions need to come together, another example of partnering.

How those criteria get interpreted is going to be an increasingly important process. Just the idea of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, the word "Schools" implies one IRB, drugs and the rest, NIH, and so forth. We are talking about coming together on how we oversee information systems.

As we create integrated information systems across education, health, child farewell and the like, these are going to be an underpinning that protects the kids and the families from undue exposure and injury.

When the Secretary says, "Can you make an information system everybody will agree on," the answer has got to be yes because we have to somehow come together across these institutions in any case. We have to learn to do it.

MR. ROOKER: Very good. MR. LONG: Montean.

MS. JACKSON: Also, because many of our LEAs actually have drug and alcohol programs within their systems, as well as some of the partnering that goes on with local providers, what about 42 CFR? Is that aligned with FERPA? Again, if consents are being signed at the school level for the release of information under the governing regulation of 42 CFR is that sufficient?

MR. ROOKER: Yes, as long as, again, if consents are being signed consent can get anyone anything for any purpose so the key Mr. Kellam mentioned is getting that consent. If that's there, you can do anything with that. You simply fill in what's going to be disclosed and to whom.

MR. LONG: Thank you very much, LeRoy. We appreciate the presentation. Thank you for coming down and sharing this with us.

MR. ROOKER: My pleasure. Again, you will find contact information in your handout so if there are questions that come along or if you run into questions as you are dealing with your constituents as well, hopefully we are very accessible. We also have our website up there which has a lot of information on it as well that could be helpful and follow on on this.

MS. PRICE: Let me just give a commercial for Lee's office, the Family Policy Compliance Office. There is not an office here at the Department that doesn't have their fingers -- their fingers aren't in our pies in one way, shape, or form. Those pictures of the desks are exactly what their decks look like up there.

One complement to give to Lee and Ellen, particularly Ellen Campbell who has listened in on several of our meetings, also from that office, they really are there to help people before they get themselves in the middle of a problem and can usually figure out what those circumstances are.

Not ways to get around the law but ways to directly address the law as we look at the Advisory Committee things and as we address those things. But even as you go out into your day-to-day jobs that touch on these things, if in doubt just ask them because they really are quick to get a response.

They really do want to work with you so that all are aided in this process. It's an office to really be complemented in what they do because, like I said, every office here at the Department touches them so their workload is heavy but they do a great job.

MR. ROOKER: Thank you, Debbie. Great point that Debbie makes right there is we would a whole lot rather get involved ahead of the problem than after. It's a lot easier to keep out of trouble than it is to go back and walk the dog back so it's better if we can get in. If you've got

45

questions at any point or they come up, they arise, we are happy to work to try and see what are the limits that we have there.

MS. PRICE: Another thing is so many folks think because FERPA or PPRA is out there that they are just really hesitant to do anything when they really have the ability to do a lot of things. I've seen that with many of the regulatory agencies like DEA. Doctors are afraid to do certain things because they are afraid of the DEA.

If you are trying to do something to get the direction and support and clear guidance from FERPA is only helpful and helps eliminate those barriers out there and those fears that several education communities have.

MR. LONG: Thank you again, Lee.

We'll take a break. If we could start again at five after.

It's six minutes of.

(Whereupon, at 9:58 a.m. off the record until 10:08 a.m.)

MR. LONG: Folks, if we could please come back and find our areas, we'll resume. Okay, folks. As we resume, I would now like to go back to the conversation that we were having to bring that to closure and that subject is when we would meet next and what the duration of that meeting would be. I think there was consensus that whatever the length of that meeting or the date, then that would dictate what would then happen in March and April.

Mike, you had your hand up.

MR. PIMENTEL: I did hear how some people are having some problems with the conflict in the date. However, I would strongly -- very strongly recommend, and I know you were being very kind by saying with all due respect. The fact is we all knew what the dates were. We worked through that all together.

As much as I love Russell, Dennis, you just can't make it but that doesn't constitute me having to go back and reschedule and look at my availability. I would strongly suggest we just stay with the dates we have set.

I love the idea of going until 6:00 and making it a oneday meeting but with consideration to those who have to travel so far to allow them the opportunity to stay that night and take the next flight out in the morning. If we can, I'm fine with that.

MR. JONES: I love you, too, Michael, but I sure want to be at this next meeting.

MR. LONG: You two, enough. I'm just going to ask how many could and would prefer to meet on the 19th? Let's see a show of hands. Let's see if we can just do this. Sixteen. It will be the 19th. The next question, although we have mentioned it, I would also like to ask this.

Would you prefer -- how many would prefer to meet from 8:00 to 6:00 and make the 19th a one-day meeting? Let's see a show of hands if you wish to do that. It will be the 19th of April and we will

45

say?

meet from 8:00 a.m. until -- I'm sorry. I apologize, the 19th of March. After all of that I said the wrong month. The 19th of March from 8:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. Thank you for that.

The other thing I think, with all the discussion we had on dates and times and what was going to happen in the future, great consideration, all of that discussion lasted about 14 or 15 minutes just prior to LeRoy and then just after. I want us to bear that in mind because several of you have alluded to the fact that we have quite a group sitting around here.

I think when we really -- this gets to the second part, the segue. We get that one or two-pager from Bill and I talked to him at the break and he said absolutely he can do that and get that out in a rather quick fashion. I don't think you used that term, Bill, but in a timely fashion.

Then we'll start to bring those things together. I think some of that discussion when we see those things we can do some of the very positive discussion and come to some agreement.

Having said that, I received -- I'm not sure what this was. Catherine said something about Russell.

MS. PRICE: You had something that you wanted to

MR. WECHSLER: Yes.

MR. LONG: This is back on page 9, Russell, where it says, "For additional items on the agenda there will be a five-minute timeline." That's on page 12.

MR. WECHSLER: Okay. Five minutes.

MS. PRICE: And that's on your handouts for everybody.

They are in the inside pocket.

MR. JONES: Just real quickly, I'm going to try my very best to make that meeting on that Monday. Maybe I can fly out of here right to New Orleans.

I've got all kinds of goodies. Let me just bring some information to the attention of the Committee. First of all, I wanted to thank the Committee for allowing the panel last meeting to talk about trauma. I just wanted to highlight a couple of things that were said and also distribute some information.

The information that is going around is information from the National Child Traumatic Stress Center as well as information from the National Children's Center of Poverty, National Center for Poverty at the Columbia University.

I also sent out some information on the -- you guys should have gotten an e-mail concerning the impact of trauma on children. There is also some information coming by Langtree and Briere out of Long Beach, California.

The point is just to -- I thought there were a number of very excellent question raised subsequent to the discussions and I just

wanted to kind of summarize some of that information. I've got this written so I'll read this in the interest of time but, again, just pointing out the important role, the potential role of trauma on children.

In 1990 former President George Bush set a goal stating that by 2000 all children would be ready to learn. Despite many valuable efforts, in 2007 this goal is yet elusive. One obstacle preventing the obtainment of this goal might be trauma.

To date the nation's school children are yet to be systematically screened, assessed, or treated for traumatic stress. In spite of its prevalence, 25 percent of children and adults in the general population and 90 percent of youth experience trauma in high-risk situations.

These situations include 50 percent of youth in the child welfare system, 60 to 90 percent of children in the juvenile justice system, and up to 91 percent of urban youth. The point is attention needs to be given to this very vital area.

I just have a couple of real poignant statistics here, in fact, I had one of my graduate students, Rachel Moore, collect for me. Just a couple of, I think, real important points. The question is how does violent exposure impact learning? That was one of the questions asked last time.

These findings are within the last 10 years. Decreased IQ and reading ability, lower grade point average, more days of school absence, decreased rates of high school graduation, increased expulsion and suspensions, the achievement gap.

The negative affects of trauma exposure may explain one aspect of the bleak reality that African American and Latino students continue to trail far behind Caucasian peers in schools such as higher dropout rates from high school after generation education reform. Again, just a few facts.

I think it's also important to look at the role of trauma following natural and technological disasters. Doing multiple deployments to the Gulf Coast just recently as last week in Mississippi the devastating of Katrina on children was drastically and painfully observed.

I had an opportunity, in fact, I first met Deborah as well as the Secretary, in the Gulf Coast area where a wonderful series of seminars were set up to educate school principals and other officials of the impact of trauma. And also the commitment of the Department of Education.

I also subsequent to that had the opportunity to meet with Laura Bush and to advise her on the impact of children and trauma and meet her in New Orleans shortly after the storm. There is no doubt there has been a good commitment of both the Department as well as the White House in terms of Katrina as it relates to education. However, there is a lot more that needs to be done.

We were at a meeting at the National Center for Children of Poverty at Columbia. This was called by Jane Knitzer. We were coming

NEAL R. GROSS

up with wonderful recommendations in terms of what needed to be done to help children impacted by trauma.

I asked the group if I could bring those recommendations here and have them presented to the Secretary. You all have those. I just wanted to highlight the first four of those again, just the need for attention to the potential impact of trauma on children in our nation. Again, I'll just go through the first four.

No. 1, develop statewide and tribal-level trauma coordinators across the country in partnership with SAMHSA.

No. 2, build the capacity of learning communities, especially childcare settings and school-developed trauma informed culture.

No. 3, develop a mechanism for training, teachers, and administrators on recognizing the signs of trauma, building trauma-informed learning environments, developing trauma-informed responses, and understanding, knowledge, as well as much about the history of a child's youth and his or her family to better serve as the whole child.

Last but not least, 4, examine the unintended consequences of the implications of No Child Left Behind and develop interventions that support children, youth, and their families to help them succeed.

Then we've got a number of very specific steps beneath there. Again, I just wanted to bring this attention to the Committee and would be very happy to assist in following up on this in any way possible. We've got a very active team at Virginia Tech. We've got six outstanding graduate students and 13 to 15 undergrads and we partner with national and international organizations around the country. Thank you very much.

MR. LONG: Thank you very much, Russell. I'm a numbers nut and I also read. Just a question. I think it's the fourth page, recommended responses.

MR. JONES: Yes.

MR. LONG: I didn't know where all this went out to, what the audience was. Recommended responses, No. 3, the last sentence there. "At least half the 100,000 school buildings and all the 1,500 school districts." I believe that would be 1,000.

MR. JONES: Okay, yes.

MR. LONG: I'm just pointing that out so if this goes out to someone that they might raise that question.

MR. JONES: Exactly. Thank you.

MR. LONG: I think it was just in haste to get this published. Thank you very much.

MR. JONES: Thank you.

MR. LONG: Yes, Montean.

MS. JACKSON: This goes back to the original item that you mentioned for Bill and the two-page document. I was just wanting to make also a possible suggestion or recommendation.

Perhaps it would be in matrix form perhaps with in one column the information that we are charged with and then any of our recommendations that are aligned with one or any of the particular objectives that we are expected to respond to. Maybe another column for possibilities or whatever but just matrix form might be help as well.

MR. LONG: I think that's a good point. As you were talking I turned to Bill and, true to Bill, he just went, "Yes." Good suggestion and you have an answer.

Yes, Dennis.

MR. ROMERO: Just one comment to Russell on the No. 1 item. Just as an FYI, later this past summer I made a very wise commitment to bring issues of children trauma to the forefront of mental health and substance abuse services and to that end Dr. Lark Hong came on board as a senior policy adviser. She has really done a lot of work in this area.

We also have established and developed a policy with tribal entities across the nation. In fact, we're starting what I call our road trip to all ten consultation centers starting this month. One of the topics for discussion is issues of trauma, suicide, and prevention and early intervention issues so just as an FYI.

MR. JONES: In fact, I met with her last week in Pittsburgh so I'm very, very aware of that initiative. Thank you.

MR. LONG: As we head then for March 19th so that we are very focused, it's going to be, as we said, 8:00 to 6:00 one-day meeting. I was keying off what Montean just said about a matrix. Is there anything else that we need or need to do or should receive prior to that meeting so that at 8:00 a.m. on the 19th that we have a full day of extremely productive discussion?

MR. KELLUM: Going back to Montean's idea, it's a little bit complicated. What we are trying to do is to look at those three questions that we were to address as an Advisory Committee. One of our questions is sort of an elephant in the room when we are talking about what the nature of the report is and how we come to shared vision.

It's how much we integrate across those three versus deal with each of them separately. You can't deal with information systems very creatively if you're not going to ask how does it relate to program and policy. All of a sudden we're talking about crosscutting.

I just would be wary of grouping all our recommendations within each of the three rather than having an opportunity to see across the three. How would you see these really operating in a much more forceful integrating fashion.

It's not that it's either/or but somehow if we create a matrix, we want to make sure that you could do crosscutting across the three. It's extremely important because things like encouraging partnerships across researchers, policymakers, practitioners, program people,

community institutions, families, and the like.

That crosscuts all three. You can't do information systems, as you just heard from LeRoy, without partnership because they require participation and buy-in and neutral self-interest and the like. Anyway, just wanted to throw that out.

The other thing is, Dave, I really recognize the importance of parsimony but I'm not sure a one-pager is going to do it. We could compromise. Not 15 but somewhere in between is likely to be what would be most useful.

MR. LONG: I think in that discussion with Bill whatever is appropriate to make sure that the information comes forward, sure.

MR. LONG: Ralph, did you have --

MR. HIGGINS: We made a decision to meet on the 19th for a full day but somehow I thought I heard the possibility that we should continue to keep the morning of the 20th open. I'm wondering if we are trying to compress too much into one full day.

MR. LONG: I don't have a problem with that personally but that's my response. Any other comments to that? It was my understanding that it would be 8:00 to 6:00. Any other comments?

MR. HERRMANN: I think if we just work really hard and agree that we are going to shut it off at 6:00 we'll probably get as much done. I mean, for me if we're going

to -- I would really prefer the one day simply because I'm so far behind at home and at work and everywhere else. That's just me.

MR. LONG: Yes. I'm sorry.

MS. SIMS: I don't want to go against Shep but I do like Montean's idea of somehow structuring or summarizing the information in some kind of a graphic format like a matrix, something that we can just get a quick summary of what some of the recommendations are, where they line up. Maybe they will be repeated in the different cells, you know, some of these issues. I think that we have attended to the issues of not treating these three areas as silos enough that the final report wouldn't end up that way. As a way to start I would sort of like to see it all in bullets on a page or maybe a front and back somehow as a way to get started. It's just easier for me than getting a 10-page document.

MR. LONG: I just -- and I want to qualify this. I have one of those superintendents in the counties that we run for office. I would propose that it be a one-page on 11 by 14 paper. The point being that I think we can get it but it's important that it be succinct.

I think also in a discussion like this we see the personalities of the positions we hold. Some of us are in positions where we are used to one-pagers because anything more than that we won't read the second page anyway.

I don't mean that as a negative. It's just the way it is. I

think however Bill can arrange that to be as succinct as possible so that we can move forward with a very positive discussion on the 19th.

Yes, Shep.

MR. KELLUM: Not to disagree with my Program Officer who gives us the check but I do -- she doesn't give me the check. No, seriously, I think we could have it both ways which is a great solution to almost anything. If we have things organized by the three aims, that's one issue.

I think maybe we ought to say let's have a crosscutting parameter so that where there are recommendations which deliberately cut across these three that be noticed because, in fact, that gives us a building block for thinking about a report which hopefully is not going to be in three chapters but will somehow have some kind of integration across data, policy, programs, partnering, institutions, and the like.

MR. LONG: I'm also trying to bear in mind those 18 business days that Bill can get us something that we can be looking at. I think if we keep this as simple as possible bearing in mind your discussion, that it can be crosscutting.

I know now that you sit here, Shep, you're laboring under the assumption that you're going to get one of these one-pagers. Bill just said he's not going to send it out to everybody. Never mind.

Yes, Russell.

MR. JONES: I don't think the two are orthogonal. I think we can have the one-pagers and the one, two, three but also have the crosscutting. I think both can be done. I've sat on committees where you do both.

MR. LONG: Again, I want to be very conscious of his time and I think to have it very succinct and whether it's a one-pager or whatever just do it and then we'll go from there but we've got to have something down. I'm concerned about the 18 days. I really am.

MS. KEYS: I think we ought to let Bill figure it out.

MS. PRICE: My experience in working with Bill is he is very capable of figuring out how to best meet all the needs of what you said here. We'll move on to another subject and Bill will take of it.

MS. KEYS: The only thing I wanted to add is I think we're coming together again for a day. It's going to be a roll-up-your-sleeves work-hard day and I think it's important that we all come prepared to work and that we have reviewed and understand the charge and understand what some of the materials are that we have been sent previously.

We do have two preliminary reports that we've read those, that we've made notes, and that we are really ready to make the best use of that day that we can.

MS. TAFT: Speaking of what might go into that report, are we going to have any recommendations on data coming out of this

meeting?

MR. LONG: Yes, and we'll get to it as soon as Tommy - that question was asked yesterday. We gave two suggestions. We'll go back to that and then you can enhance it if you wish.

Tommy.

MR. LEDBETTER: I'm not sure that I understood what he meant when he said it earlier but, Russell, is this what you meant by focusing too hard on the fuzzy? Is that what we have been doing here?

MR. JONES: Yes. I think we got the fuzzy. It's a sharp image of the fuzzy. I'm sure we're going to move that along nicely.

MR. LONG: The question if we could enhance what Hope was just asking and that is any recommendations on data bearing in mind -- we are going to be getting this one-pager bearing in mind we'll have that one full-day of discussion.

One of the things that was mentioned yesterday when the question was asked is that we have a common and coordinated data system. That was one that I think four or five people mentioned. Then from there we said if you had other recommendations it could be part of the infamous one-pager.

MS. TAFT: I would like to emphasize that all of the at least federal level departments have a common language so that people at the local level can have the same set of guidelines and that it be built from the bottom up so that data is useful at all levels which, I think, can be done. I think NASTAD is working on an effort under that parameter for SAMHSA right now to make it an integrated system.

MR. LONG: Others? Ralph.

MR. HIGGINS: Looking at some data recommendations, there are a few pet peeves that I have or agendas that I would like to put on the table. One is I was looking through this book where they were talking about the numbers of suicides and homicides in schools.

I think that we ought to be thinking not just about what happens during school hours on school property but what happens to young people who happen to be students. A lot of the harm that they may encounter may occur in the community and outside of the specific school boundaries.

That is why you heard me before talk about the need for schools and communities in which they are located to work together. One of the things that I think would be very important, the STOP Act, which has just passed the Congress, included a provision that all unnatural deaths under 21 be tested for alcohol.

I think that is very important. The last two decades alcohol related traffic deaths in the United States of the population have been cut in half. The greatest declines have occurred among people who are under the age of 21 partly because of raising the legal drinking age to 21 and zero tolerance laws and education that went around those.

But we don't have that type of data for homicides, suicides, falls, drownings, burns, and so on. I think it is very important now that we have this law on the books. There's no money behind it but this be something that we emphasize the importance of.

I think that we need to learn more about the trends in homicides and suicides and what proportion are alcohol related. It cost about \$50 per post mortem test which in the grander scheme of things to me is a small investment for that type of data.

Second thing I think that would be useful in the Youth Risk Behavior Survey or in the PRIDE survey or other surveys that are collected to include information about the secondhand effects of alcohol and drug use. I think that Henry Wechsler from the Harvard School of Public Health did a great service to this country when he included questions about secondhand effects of college student drinking.

We find if we take the data that he's collected and project it out to the populations that those samples are supposed to represent, that there are nearly 700,000 college students every year who are assaulted by another drinking college student and nearly 100,000 date rapes and sexual assaults perpetrated by another drinking college student.

What that information about secondhand effects does is it provides a -- it creates a sense of obligation that the colleges and the communities in which they are located need to do something to address the problem. I think that would be very important.

I noticed in the 2005 youth risk behavior survey unlike the 2003 survey that the questions about academic performance suddenly are no longer there and I don't know why that is. I think that it would be very useful if students could continue to be asked about their grade point average and if we include questions also about absenteeism. That would enhance the data collection. Those are just a couple points I wanted to make sure I got across.

MR. LONG: Good. Thank you. Other comments

MR. JONES: Is this the recommendation time?

MR. LONG: Yes.

MR. JONES: I had a couple but I can wait.

MR. LONG: No, this is --

MR. JONES: Now is the time. Great. Okay. So based on the information that was shared yesterday a number of questions were raised some of which had been raised before. I think one thing that would be good is a critical analysis of the current data collection methods and that includes both the management information systems, the YRBSS and the PRIDE as well as growth models.

Secondly, perhaps a clarification of the relationship of all data methods within the No Child Left Behind and Safe and Drug-Free Schools initiatives. Those relationships to policy, assessment, as well as

NEAL R. GROSS

regarding data?

intervention efforts so they can kind of see those linkages there.

Third, a cost effective analysis of our measurement systems, dollars and sense, where that's taking us. Are we really getting the bang for our buck. The articulation of a conceptual and empirical framework for the assessment and intervention strategies that are presently being engaged.

Application of an initial conceptual and empirical framework and where things went awry. That relates to what Bill was saying yesterday, Bill Modzeleski, saying that he had brought together a group of researchers and scientists and kind of mapped out a framework. I'm just wondering what that framework looks like and to what extent it has gone awry if, in fact, it has gone awry.

I think I've just gone one or two more. A review of the systems of care with relationships to partnership-based initiatives. That is kind of thinking outside of the box. I'm hoping that we can glean from information that is presently in the literature in terms of building partnerships, the integration of different systems of mental health as well as public health care systems around the country.

A critical review of the translation of data collection to practice. We've got tons of wonderful data but I'm not sure the extent to which those data are being translated into practice.

Then last but not least, and I don't know how doable this is, but hire -- what is this? Okay, yeah. It's kind of a business model. I don't know how this would be done but it's kind of an assessment of the translation of this knowledge into evidence-based practices, how we would actually do that. I mean, I don't know if we can do that as a group but just kind of get the detail in terms of how our data is being translated into practice.

MR. LONG: Thank you, Russell. Any others as it relates to -- yes, Mike.

MR. HERRMANN: One of the things that I think was very clear to be yesterday in reflecting on the presentation that I gave and that other folks gave is the data collection for this program has not kept up with the scope of the program itself.

I think if you look at where this program was when NCLB was authorized, you know, there are all sorts of issues around school security, around traumatic events, around youth suicide issues that at our level we spent a lot of time on but those measures are not even addressed in any of the other pieces that we've been looking at.

I think there is really a desperate need to sort of revisit all of that data collection piece and really look at pieces of data that address the scope of the program as it is at this point because I think the program really has changed dramatically since its inception. I think that is a very important piece.

I think the other thing is somehow we've got to get to a

NEAL R. GROSS

realistic point about what is reasonable to expect schools to collect and states to collect given all the other challenges that we have and sort of the scope of the funding that's available because all of the money that's available to state and local programs could go to data collection and there would be no funding left for programs. I think we've got to come up with a realistic sort of expectation for that.

MR. KELLUM: There's a lot of overlap in our comments and that's reassuring. I would like to see us, first of all, endorse the idea that we've developed a plethora of data-gathering operations with more or less success but at great expense and that we recognize that these have not reached their full utility which is to say the application of the data to practice and the institutional structure.

That's No. 1, to recognize that we have all these pieces that are very expensive but they are not being integrated sufficiently and integrated sufficiently and integrated with practice. That's a recognition.

I would like to see us also recognize that data are extremely expensive in person power, financing, time, all of those issues of expenditure so we recognize that. What we want to do is create an integration of data gathering with practice and institutional structuring so that these are all one operation with different function, not separate operations.

They are going to integrate across federal, state, and local institutions those activities which are necessarily interrelated. Academic achievement, drug abuse, school failure, delinquency and violence all have common risk factors that need to be addressed. Kids don't come in separate components. The same are being addressed from different perspectives but separately.

The model of healthy students or safe schools which did begin to bring together all these components is a model that we should be pursuing further. That's at the kind of integrating structuring level.

At the concrete level we've got now a very expensive state-wide assessment systems operating. They are management information systems. We are using them to identify places where there are big problems but separately from solutions to those problems.

The management information systems give us opportunity to see how we can allocate what little money there is from each agency but collectively there would be more money across agencies to bring to bear on those hot spots of problem areas. The data should be guiding the allocation of resources. The data that tells us where the problems are and the quality of the problems should guide how we think about allocating our resources and what kinds of resources.

So the management information systems are a necessary component. But, again, in regard to data we have not brought to bear enough light on the fact that we are in each school district in every school gathering developmental data. The grades and scores and achievements

NEAL R. GROSS

 and expulsions, suspensions are all part of a single child's record over time.

With proper safeguards of the kind we saw Fred illustrate and his staff yesterday, we should be able to integrate these management information systems with individual school records.

In order to do that we would need to have a partnership which we've talked about in general but must be specifically specified within FERPA guidelines that allows for information to be used about each child over time to see what is working for which children under what circumstances and what more is needed.

We need to have, in other words, an integrated data system which highlights hot spots through the management information systems, the slice in time, the salami slice in time that we do, with the growth modeling or the developmental records of children so that, in fact, we can monitor progress of kids academically and all those things that impinge on academic performance including trauma and other matters.

So what we're talking about is creating a framework which builds on safe students and health schools, whatever it is, and which, in fact, allows us to collaborate and partner at the federal, state, and local levels.

I think that's what we should be aiming at. We need to discuss the feasibility. One of the issues is recognizing the vital importance of bringing the NIHs and the SAMHSAs and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools, those with a research mission and those with a mission of rolling out what works and at the federal, state, and local levels bringing those into one perspective.

The bottom line is they have to be partnering. They have to be partnering at those three levels, the federal, state, and local levels. You can't do randomized field trials which is the way you find out what works for which kids very precisely and under what circumstances without partnering with families, school buildings, school districts, and the feds, the NIHs and the SAMHSAs and the like.

One other thing. The major frontier in research these days is not can you find something that works. There are programs out there that do impact with rigorous randomized trials as to what works, at least in some areas. We need more of such programs. Our real frontier is what the heck do you do if it does work?

How do you roll out a program? How do you take a program from one trial, repeat it in a different place or in the same place and roll it out from 12 schools to 115 schools as in Fairfax County? What is that roll-out process? That cuts across all of our institutional boundaries.

It's no longer purely research. It's no longer purely dissemination. It ain't a question of are they using effective programs. I can tell you we now know that they are not "they." The people in the front line are not going to use these programs with fidelity unless there is

continuing mentoring at multiple stages within these institutions and with monitoring of fidelity.

Whether it's instruction we're talking about as in open court or whether it's the behavior monitoring or management in classroom levels, or whether it's a family classroom program, they all require fidelity of implementation.

The kind of monitoring and mentoring that we're talking about is really research frontier as well as a practice frontier. We're talking about reorganizing ourselves not from a different direction but following the logical next steps of the huge investment we've made in research and practice and institution building.

MS. DUDE: One thing I would like to add, I don't disagree with anything you just said. Actually, this is different than that, and that is if we are discussing adding additional questions or changes in questions, it seems like most of the questions we ask are asking about negative behaviors that they may have participated in.

I have mentioned this before but I would like to put a plug in for asking positive questions as well whether they be protected behaviors they may have or the whole injunctive norm idea of what they think of people who do negative things.

That way the practitioner can not only look and see, "Okay, here are the negative behaviors I need to address," but, "Here is some positive information I can feed back to the students to hopefully help change their behavior." I just want to put in a plug for asking positive questions as well.

MR. LONG: Thank you, Kim.

Russell, Howell.

MR. JONES: Just real quick. Kim, in response to what you said, that's right on because in trauma research we've been guilty of asking negative questions.

However, there is recent data that suggest this whole notion of post-traumatic growth when asking people what was the silver lining following Katrina, for example, we found in the Harvard Katrina study that many people felt that they could do things they couldn't do before.

They felt a greater closeness to other family members and they had a greater faith in God as a result of the storm. There can be positive things that come from negative experiences.

MR. WECHSLER: I have three specific suggestions in relation to data. First of all, as the state program evolves into some new form perhaps, it is absolutely incomprehensible that the different states are using different measures to look at the same variables. It just doesn't make any sense. You have to be able to compare across states, compare across school districts.

Is it hard? Yes, it's very hard to come to consensus.

There has to be something done with people at the state level. People are going to be unhappy. A little secret we have about data collection is that all of the measures stink. Nothing is ever very satisfactory. It's the best you can come up with. People are going to be unhappy. It's okay. You have to have similar measures being used across the states. There's no question about that. The other two comments focus on what it is that we're measuring. I just want to remind people we had a very powerful and persuasive panel. It seemed to me the thing I took from it was that in their opinion perhaps the most important thing to measure were perceptions of the school climate. to have an impact on those.

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28 29

30

31

32 33

34 35

36

37

38

39 40

41 42

43

44

45

When it relates to what are the real measures that we want to get, you guys are absolutely right on in terms of bringing it back into program. You have to tie the data into program. Where we get led astray when we focus only on the extreme outcomes, the behavior outcomes, drug use and violence and suspensions and truancy, yes, we want

Yes, we need to continue measuring them but the reality is there are 9,999 other factors in society besides Safe and Drug-Free Schools that are having a strong impact on those outcomes. We need to look at more intermediate measures.

Those are probably the most important measures to assess whether Safe and Drug-Free Schools is truly having an impact. The perceptions of school climate would be one. You should hold Safe and Drug-Free Schools accountable. Can they move the dial on improving the perceptions of the school climate.

Then the third comment is related. That is that the other thing that is an intermediate measure that we really ought to be holding programs accountable for is are they increasing the number of schools that are implementing the science-based practices that the research literature has identified as likely to be the most effective things in improving relevant behaviors.

It's not easy coming to agreement on those. There will be lots of controversies and challenges but there have been solid studies on this for decades now. It's time for the research community and the program community to come together.

At least we can say if more schools are doing these things, A, B, C, D, and E, that's good for the nation so let's try to measure how many schools in my state under my Safe and Drug-Free School program are implementing those best practices.

> MR. LONG: Thank you, Howell. Susan.

MS. KEYS: I just wanted to say that I thought what Shep summarized very comprehensively is a very bold move. Personally I like being bold. I think he's proposing or recommending a very radical

change in the way we do business, the way NIDA does business, the way CDC, the way SAMHSA, the way the Department of Education goes about data collection.

He is really suggesting and I think we need to recommend to the Secretary that she use her ability to convene at the secretarial level a further discussion of how this collaboration might go forward and very dramatically change how we use our institutional resources to collect the kinds of data that we need to inform Congress and to support the programs.

It definitely has to be linked with the program. Unless we really undertake some very profound system changes, it's going to be a drop in the bucket and not really impact what needs to be done.

MR. LONG: Okay. Let's start to wrap this up.

MR. LEDBETTER: At the risk of muddying the waters a little bit, I think I just need to throw this out there for your consideration. We speak about data. I'm not sure that everyone understands the climate of education nationally right now. The most obvious thing that's happening is a reduction in funding. We are all aware of that.

One of the things that looms out there is that if you look at your building level leaders throughout the nation who are within retirement age within the next five years, you're probably looking at between 40 and 50 percent of all of them leaving the field within the next five years if they choose to do that.

Now, with that said, does that create a problem? To me yes, it does. Most of us who -- most of the principals in the United States recognize that. They recognize that there is going to be an extreme shortage of building-level administrators.

How does that tie to data? To me there's two aspects of data. Collecting the data is the simplest part of it. Once the data is collected then you get into the interpretation of the data. What does it mean? Having the data is useless to you unless you can get some interpretations from the data to try to figure out what the data means.

As a building level administrator that is the important thing to me. No one to this point has mentioned or even thought about how we will train all these new building-level administrators as to how to use this data. With a decrease in funding that just complicates the problem.

Having the data irregardless of what type of surveys we use or anything else is pretty meaningless if we can't teach the people how to use the data. When we come back next month and so forth, I think that's something that is pretty important that needs -- to me there needs to be a recommendation of some type that goes into all of this about trying to train people about the data.

I can be quite frank with you. I receive my PRIDE survey reports. I get them. What do I do with those reports? I read them, I look at them, and I say okay. I either think our problem is worse, it's better,

but what am I going to do with it.

Our principal has been there for a long time and these new principals are going to take it and look at it and they are overwhelmed with everything else they have coming across their desk already. Will they take that information and use it? I'm not sure they will unless there is some training provided for those people.

Over the next five years you're going to see some major changes in the leadership and education throughout the United States. I think it's important that if data is the key, and the research tells us that data has to drive what we do.

I don't care if it's an academic classroom or wherever, data has to drive what we do. If data is the driving force behind what we're doing, then there needs to be some recommendation about some training for all of these new folks as to how to use all this data.

MR. JONES: Just two quick points just to follow up on what Tommy is saying. That's right on. You know, any masters level or doctoral level student will tell you the most difficult part of doing a thesis or a dissertation is interpretation of the data. It's not collecting it. It's the interpretation of it and making sense out of it in a conceptually relevant fashion.

I just want to echo what Susan said. I mean, I think what Shep is saying, and I think we are in agreement, is going to the Secretary and really arguing for a paradigm shift, I mean, in the way we do business to do it differently. We are doing some things well but without the integration and the level of nuance kind of thinking, the frameworks.

I mean, you know, looking at it differently. Looking at it from a different perspective and doing business differently. We're not pleased with the results that we've gotten from many of the initiatives within the context of No Child Left Behind and Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

The question is how do you change that? It's going to take the brain together of the different parties, the NIMHs, the SAMHSAs, the CDCs. You know, it's gimbling, man. Hopefully we can get it done but, Shep, I like so much what you're saying and I really think that's the way to go.

MR. LONG: Yes, Ralph.

MR. HIGGINS: Yeah. I think the points that were just made about the interpretation of the data are really critical. You know, I don't think it's so much a matter of researchers going and providing information to school administrators about how to interpret the data that we collect.

I think we have just as much to learn from you about how you think the data ought to be interpreted and what measures you think are important and what are the objectives that you think are important to be achieved in your educational systems and do we have the right measures to

assess whether or not we are meeting your goals or the goals that your community thinks are important.

As I listen to Shep and others, I think one of the things we ought to do, and I don't know the specifics of how to put this together, but I think we need to think about developing some kind of ongoing process where there can be continuing dialogue between the various types of parties that are around this table around this type of issue so that we can engage in a continual improvement process and not have just a snapshot of recommendations that will go off into cyberspace somewhere but rather to have a continuing dialogue so that we can really thrash through these issues over time together and make continuing improvement.

MR. LONG: Thank you.

MR. HERRMANN: Yeah. Tom brought up an excellent, excellent point. It's just kind of right in front of us because with NCLB, I mean, there's just a whole profession that has developed in terms of collecting, interpreting academic data.

I think just now maybe they are beginning to start to realize that folks have to know how to use that data. The problem is this data is not connected to that data and somehow we've got to be sure that connection gets made and that training happens. That's an excellent point.

MR. LONG: Yes.

MS. SIMS: Just to remind the group that I think a week or so ago Dennis had sent around some articles showing the link between drug abuse prevention programs and academic outcomes. The information is there. At the last meeting I suggested that we come up with ways to distill this information in the formats that can be useful out in the community through either tool kits or little brochures or something just so that as we are going out if our recommendations are around integrating all these data systems and trying to look at the links between what we're doing in terms of programming and academic outcomes that it really has a leg to stand on. Research also supports that this is important to look at. The programs that they're doing can have an impact on students' progression academically.

MR. LONG: As we wrap this up, this has been -- this is the type of conversation that we need to have for eight hours. That is why I'm excited hearing this and as we look forward to March 19th.

I was thinking as you were talking about -- as we were talking about the integrated systems and putting this together, and we all know this but this is why I think there has to be a recommendation regarding, Susan, what you were saying, Shep, and what a lot of others were chiming in to say about that integration and the things that are going on with all of the discussion.

It's already happening across this great country in spite of us. This is the way we humans are. On a district level if the district office isn't doing it, those sites will do it anyway. They will find a way and they

NEAL R. GROSS

will get it done for the children.

On a county level or an intermediate level it's the same way. On a state level it's the same way. If the state is not doing it, and now

way. On a state level it's the same way. If the state is not doing it, and now we're talking about data, the integration and those outcomes, the counties and the intermediate agencies and the districts will do it anyway for the children.

I would say the same thing. If the Federal Government is not doing it, the states will do it anyway for the children. What we're really saying is let's put that together. Let's just say it because people talk about it and that is my way of saying -- I'm hearing it now in this discussion. That's why I'm so excited about the 19th.

I think we need to be outside that box. We have to be creative. We don't have to agree. It's what you say is going to go into that report. My recommendation, I'm hearing it here, is that they be very strong creative recommendations.

With that, I'll -- this was a great discussion. Debbie, you wanted a minute to wrap up here.

MS. PRICE: I just wanted a minute because yesterday Fred asked a budget question and it is information that we've sent to you so I encourage you to continue to read the things Catherine sends to you. I did print out the budget dollars that went out.

There are two things because I'm not sure if you all follow the funding for 2007 but we were under a continuing resolution that kept continuing and kept continuing. We had some assumptions of what those numbers may be for 2007 but we weren't confirmed. There are a couple of numbers in this chart under the 2007 current that are not accurate because since this went to Congress, the budget proposal, they did the CR.

One is the mentoring number in 2007 should be \$48 million 814. Let's see. The overall total -- let me just see here -- the subtotal under national programs -- anyway, I'm getting lost looking at this, Larry.

Anyway, nonetheless, this gives you a pretty good idea. They will revise this chart. It just hasn't been revised yet to give you the accurate numbers but you can see what the 2007 budget numbers are and our appropriation numbers are in the President's budget proposal for 2008.

I know that we sent out the link to the budget information in the big budget book which is more like this rather than this. It has some descriptions and dialogue about what is done. The budget justifications recently went up on the Department website so you can look more at that for the future but these are the numbers.

MR. LONG: Well, thank you very much, folks. Everyone be safe.

MR. JONES: I just want to thank Catherine Davis for doing such an outstanding job. I think she does that consistently so just wanted to thank you publicly.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 11:12 a.m. the meeting was adjourned.)