

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

++++

THE SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND
COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

++++

Monday
March 19, 2007

++++

The meeting was convened at 8:00 a.m. in the Barnard Auditorium at the Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C., David Long, Chairman, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

DAVID LONG, Chairman
KIM DUDE
FREDERICK ELLIS
MIKE HERRMANN
RALPH HINGSON
MONTEAN JACKSON
RUSSELL JONES
SHEPPARD KELLAM
SUSAN KEYS
TOMMY LEDBETTER
BERTHA MADRAS
SETH NORMAN
DEBORAH PRICE
BELINDA SIMS
HOPE TAFT
HOWELL WECHSLER

ALSO PRESENT:

DONNI LEBOEUF, For J. Robert Flores
PEGGY QUIGG, For Dennis Romero
CATHERINE DAVIS, Executive Director and Designated Federal Officer for the Committee
WILLIAM DUNCAN, the Committee's Writer
WILLIAM MODZELESKI, Associate Assistant Deputy Secretary for OSDFS

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

I N D E X

	<u>PAGE</u>
Opening Statement and Announcements	4
Public Comment	6
Discussion - State Grants Program	8
Lunch	
Discussion - Unsafe School Choice Option	212
Discussion - Data	267
Summary of Findings and Recommendations	
Closing Remarks	352

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

PROCEEDINGS

Time: 8:12 a.m.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Welcome, everyone. Is this on? Okay.

First of all, I want to -- Peggy, would you mind introducing yourself, sitting in for Dennis today. Would you introduce yourself to the group?

MS. QUIGG: Good morning. I am Peggy Quigg, and I am the Director of the Division of Community Programs at CSAP, SAMHSA, and basically I have the Drug Free communities Programs and our HIV and Methamphetamine Programs in our portfolio, and happy to be sitting in for Dennis this morning.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And we did that on purpose. As she was shutting that off, Fred was just telling me. Dave, just as you are getting ready to start, I am going to do that so it will remind you.

If you will -- For some of you, to your right, some of you to turn around and look, on the table on my extreme right up against that wall, you will see a row of notebooks, and those notebooks are filled with all of our meetings, minutes of all of our meetings and all of our conference calls.

So that if there is a need or someone has -- As we talk about some of these things and making recommendations, if that comes up, we do have a back-up to double check.

That is a perfect segue into -- and Bill, thank you very much. I thought you did an excellent job. I know this is very difficult. What you really received and have in front of you, the potential recommendations. It is about a five or six-page document.

What you have there in front of you is a synthesis of all of the things that are contained in all of those books up against the wall. So, Bill, an excellent job in bringing that from several thousand pages to five or six. We appreciate that.

First of all, I want to go to public comment, and then after public comment we will talk about what we will be doing for the day and how we might approach it and what we are looking for when we walk out of here this afternoon.

So first of all, I would ask: Is there anyone that wishes to make a public comment? Hearing none, we will then go to talking about what will happen -- or what we are looking for, for today. That is this.

As indicated earlier, Bill, excellent job with all these sheets in front of us. We have the three areas and the questions that the Secretary asked. So what we would be looking at today as an objective would be to take those three areas that we have talked about and head hearings regarding and have -- start to put down some very specific recommendations.

Now these recommendations will be, as you know, what you as experts sitting around this table think and feel, and then putting that together and correlating them with the things we heard in the hearings. You will be the filter. So what you say because of your years of experience and expertise will then be the recommendations that we are going to put down, and it will be in those three areas that we spent so much time on.

Those three areas, of course, State Grants Program -- we will start in that order. First, we will have the State Grants Program, then the Unsafe Schools Choice Option, and then thirdly, Data.

So if we could concentrate on the recommendations, I am not sure that we need to spend a lot of time going back over just the findings or the facts, but we might have to discuss some of those, of course, to get to the recommendations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So with that in mind -- and I will stop right there. Any other comments that
2 anyone has from the committee? Yes, Russell?

3 DR. JONES: Yes, just a question. I am wondering where does the additional
4 issues tie in, the non-public schools and trauma on the last page.

5 CHAIRMAN LONG: I think that, if time allows, we can do that, and also since
6 we did spend some time on that, that we can also offer up some recommendations, bearing in mind
7 that the Secretary had three very basic questions she wants answered. But we did spend time on
8 that. So to come up with recommendations on those two areas or at the end then to ask if there are
9 other areas or other recommendations the committee wishes to make in general; because this will
10 come, of course, from you. Yes?

11 So having said that, as indicated, if we could start with the State Grants Program,
12 and again try to be -- Our objective is to try to pull it in so that we have some very clear, succinct
13 recommendations to the Secretary as we go forward in these three areas, and then based on Russell's
14 question, the other two areas toward the end.

15 So first of all, State Grants Program. We can do this many ways. I hesitated
16 there, because many of us in this room were teachers for so many years that, as soon as I get to
17 something like this, I actually looked at the imaginary flip chart up there to start writing things
18 down, because we just are used to that as classroom teachers.

19 So if we could start with recommendations in this one area of State Grants
20 Program. Hope?

21 MS. TAFT: I would like to see a strong statement linking alcohol and drug use to
22 academic achievement or lack thereof, to set the framework that this is a very important issue to be
23 discussed and to look -- that's why we are looking at it, because in General Dean's testimony there
24 was a whole page and a half of the relationship between alcohol and drug use and academic
25 outcomes. So I think that is very important to set the stage that ways.

26 Then I would like to see that the principles of effectiveness be seen as an entirety
27 and that this whole program is the portal -- is the school's portal for the community to be involved
28 with the schools, because it is very important for the school and the community to join hands in an
29 effort to reduce alcohol and other drug use.

30 There is research in Ohio that shows that those communities that have done that
31 have far less alcohol and drug use than those schools and communities which have not linked up.

32 CHAIRMAN LONG: As I was listening -- and this is -- and I can only speak for
33 myself. This is going to be difficult for me. I am a visual learner. So this is going to be a tough day
34 -- I am just going to say it up front -- for me, and I see about three or four others of you going like
35 this, because we are used to seeing things, and are visual.

36 Would it be helpful -- I will ask those of you, those of us that are the same that
37 way. Would it be helpful if we went down through what Bill has set up so that we have an outline,
38 and then pull recommendations from the questions?

39 Some of them might not need to be answered. We can just say we don't think so.
40 We will just go on to the next one. That is up to you, but for example -- and I am just taking what
41 Hope said; it made me think -- the very first box on the left currently is implemented where the
42 strengths -- and then it talks about findings and recommendations.

43 The one thing that I heard, and I'll ask you, Hope, was that second bullet. I mean,
44 it could be wordsmithed and so forth, but it is like an umbrella over the top, and I think we would
45 probably all agree that we would want to make that a pretty strong statement that that umbrella --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 that Safe and Drug Free Schools is absolutely critical for student learning to take place.

2 MS. TAFT: And the State Grants Program is really the backbone of prevention
3 across this country. If it disappears and becomes a non-universal program, everybody and their
4 brother who we don't want to have access to our children's brains will. You know, it is really the
5 stopgap measure between kids and only pro-use messages.

6 CHAIRMAN LONG: So from that first area, if we take that -- and I'll leave it up
7 to you as to the language. We will put this down and then, of course, this will come back to us for
8 wordsmithing and adding and so forth, but today we are going to try to get those recommendations
9 out. But I heard backbone and stopgap and that umbrella with that second bullet.

10 I am going to go on, but if I am going too fast or you have things to say, you just
11 step right and say, Dave, hold it, let's talk about that.

12 DR. KEYS: Could I just add a point to clarify, that I think we are making that as
13 a recommendation, not as a finding as it is listed here.

14 CHAIRMAN LONG: Right. Yes, everything we do today, we are going to be
15 coming -- The objective is to get it to a recommendation, and good point, Susan. Even though it is
16 listed as a finding here, this has now been 180, and it is becoming a recommendation.

17 MS. PRICE: But what is the recommendation? I mean, it was a statement that
18 was given, and a statement is not necessarily a recommendation unless it has a "therefore X," and so
19 what would the recommendation piece of it be?

20 MS. TAFT: Therefore, the State Grants Program or Safe and Drug Free Schools
21 should be continued and should be funded.

22 MS. PRICE: I think we have to talk about that more than just blanket
23 acknowledge that that is the way it would be worded.

24 MR. ELLIS: Because the question is what are the strengths of the program, not is
25 this program worthwhile. The question is what are the strengths of the program? What we have
26 suggested is kind of a blanket statement that we all really like the program, because safe and drug
27 free schools are a precursor to education. Well, of course, they are, but what are the strengths of
28 this program? I think that is the point that needs to get put in there.

29 MS. TAFT: My comments were kind of geared as an introduction to the whole
30 report or an overarching statement that there is a connection between safe and drug free schools and
31 academic performance, and that the program is a backbone to prevention and everything else hangs
32 off of that.

33 CHAIRMAN LONG: Russell?

34 DR. JONES: I guess I just need a point of clarity in terms of how we are going to
35 proceed. If we are going to go, you know, Item 1, Item 2, Item 3, Item 4, Item 5, one of the things
36 that I didn't see in here was the rich discussion on page 13, 14 and 15 of our last meeting where there
37 were some broad, overarching recommendations made. I didn't see any of that included in the
38 discussion, which I think has implications for how this information is framed.

39 CHAIRMAN LONG: Let Mike, and then I will respond. Mike?

40 MR. HERRMANN: In terms of a strength, I think --

41 DR. JONES: Wait, wait. I'm sorry, I didn't get a response to my question.

42 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. The response, Russell, is that we can pull 13, 14
43 and 15. As we start out, I don't want confusion on what we are talking about as far as clear
44 recommendations and also introductory statements.

45 So what I was taking as Hope was saying some introductory statement, we can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 get -- we will have to get 13, 14 and 15. I don't have that in front of me, and as I --

2 DR. JONES: No, go ahead. I'm listening.

3 CHAIRMAN LONG: As I indicated, all the minutes are right over here up
4 against the wall. So if you can, in a couple of sentences, tell us what pages that is on.

5 DR. JONES: Yes. Well, you know, there are a number of things just in terms of
6 the framework, the conceptual model. We were talking about -- I think Shep made a number of very
7 interesting recommendations in terms of the data systems, the connection of the data systems with
8 the outcome, screening, intervention, etcetera.

9 I thought that was a very rich discussion in terms of making a very bold statement
10 to the Secretary in terms of, you know, how we are framing this.

11 You know, I guess we want to be careful that we don't set round data in square
12 holes. You know, do you see what I'm saying, because --

13 CHAIRMAN LONG: I see what you are saying, but that was also one of the
14 questions. Data is one of the questions, and when we get to data, then we can talk about, I would
15 think, a recommendation that could tie all these things together.

16 What I am concerned about is that we start crisscrossing questions, and we have
17 the three very distinct areas, if I am seeing this correctly: State grant, persistently dangerous. There
18 is school choice and data.

19 So as I heard that, I think that is a very important point in my mind, but I'm
20 asking. This is not a statement. I'm asking. It's a question. In my mind, that would come under
21 data, and then we would say, well, we could tie that together.

22 DR. JONES: To me, it's broader than data, but I submit to the Chair.

23 MR. ELLIS: I think we talked a little bit about this last time at our last meeting,
24 about what form this discussion was going to take, because I think this, obviously, is probably the
25 most important discussion we've had to date and we will have as a committee. But it seemed to me
26 that I thought we came to an agreement that our first charge, our first responsibility, was to answer
27 the Secretary's questions, i.e., this committee was put together for a specific purpose.

28 It was charged to answer specific questions, and I think that was the purpose of
29 the template. I think Montean had suggested that last time, and I think that is useful to accomplish
30 that required, if you will, task of the group.

31 Then we are done with that. When we get done with that piece, then I think there
32 are some other issues that came up. A couple of them were highlighted in the back in terms of the
33 trauma piece and the non-public schools, and I know Shep -- you know, I'm sure we will hear more
34 from Shep on his piece.

35 Then, you know, we also talked about having an opportunity to talk about funding
36 recommendations or comments or whatnot. I mean, that is the way I had conceptualized this process
37 today. You know, let's do our obligations to the Secretary, answer her questions, and then the
38 quicker we can get through that piece, the quicker we can get to some of the additional ones.

39 MR. HERRMANN: In terms of a recommendation, to address, I think, what
40 Hope was saying, the recommendation is that we maintain the infrastructure that is provided through
41 the State Grants Program that enables every school district in every state department of education to
42 be engaged in the struggle to maintain safe and drug free schools.

43 I think the recommendation is to maintain the infrastructure.

44 CHAIRMAN LONG: And I want to get back to Russell, too. You said
45 acceptable. I want to -- didn't want to just leave that hanging.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 DR. JONES: Certainly. I just want to make sure that there is time left to integrate
2 some of those other -- some of what I think are core issues. But, yes, I'm in total agreement.

3 CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you.

4 DR. KELLAM: Well, let me just agree on one hand and say, if you take this as
5 we have decided, you know, one question at a time, we have three tasks. The problem is that for me
6 as a public health -- or the recommendation for safe and drug free schools is that we have to have
7 guidelines as to how to spend the little bit of money that there is available, and those guidelines,
8 from a public health perspective, are very, very, very clear.

9 You put the money where the problems are, and you weight the local
10 infrastructure, the nature of the partnerships that exist in each locale, to allocate the money. That
11 means that you use the data we are gathering at great cost as a basis for understanding where the
12 problems are and where the partnerships are and where the opportunities are.

13 So that means that the recommendation I would make is exactly that, that we go
14 to the next stage. We declare victory over the last, and we say in this next stage we can be very
15 much more pointed as to how we spend this money and what we create as incentives for local
16 additional funding, but that the core of the next stage should be using the No Child Gets Left Behind
17 statewide assessment systems, for example, as a basis for allocation, along with qualities of
18 infrastructure at the local level, including partnerships, particularly.

19 So I think that we can make these recommendations, but they will be crosscutting.
20 We shouldn't worry about it. We can take these as three important issues and, as we come to the
21 data at the end, we will necessarily have a good sense of how the data fitted into the
22 recommendations, if we agree that they should. So we should proceed as we are saying, but not with
23 the idea that these are, in fact, as separate as they may seem.

24 The Secretary did ask us, is it possible to create an integrated data system which
25 will, in fact, be then used to pinpoint children's needs over time as we use academic records
26 currently in every school building. Is it possible to extend such an information system?

27 Last time, we learned from staff and others that it is possible to protect civil
28 liberties and parent roles while we are doing that kind of recommending.

29 MS. PRICE: When it comes to recommendations, I do think that each
30 recommendation needs to have a discussion about a recommendation. Because someone offers it
31 doesn't necessarily mean it is the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, and we need to come
32 to consensus on those recommendations. We can't just blanket accept that a recommendation is put
33 forward, therefore it is a recommendation.

34 That would fall more under the category of a finding. Recommendations need to
35 have discussions and receive consensus of the Advisory Committee to be considered a
36 recommendation.

37 CHAIRMAN LONG: Howell?

38 DR. WECHSLER: I have to have questions about the recommendation to
39 maintain the infrastructure as exists. Clearly, this group was formed because this program is
40 receiving flunking grades repeatedly from the powers that be. So there are two options.

41 One is to challenge the validity of the grading system, which would entail a lot of
42 recommendations. The other is to develop some kind of new and improved approach, but to just say
43 accept the existing infrastructure is just going to go back and flunk again.

44 MS.PRICE: And I would -- You know, I'm in a bad position in one way, because
45 I am in charge -- My office is charged with implementing this program, and I feel very positive and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealgross.com

1 strong about the program, and I like very much that we address these issues. But in all honesty, I
2 have to say there are significant problems with the State Grants Program, and we can't just -- You
3 know, to respond to it by saying let's just continue to do what we are doing isn't addressing the issue.
4 It is not realistically looking at what the circumstances are.

5 You can say, we will just fund it more. It isn't going to get funded more. The
6 Department of Education is getting a certain amount of money, and those dollars have to be spread
7 around the programs, all of the programs, and you know, it is push and pull.

8 Is one program better than the other? Not necessarily so, but programs get
9 different amounts of money. So as we look forward to what our recommendations are, if we
10 recommend that we get more money, maybe we can keep it where every LEA gets dollars, but right
11 now we heard -- You know, I won't forget that one person said \$300-some dollars is what their LEA
12 got, \$750 is what their LEA got, and we have to ask the question, is the value of spreading the
13 dollars so thin, while it gives some money to somebody and they can actually do something, but can
14 they do anything significant, and would it be more beneficial if some of the -- you know, if they
15 were spread in a different scenario where there were larger numbers of dollars.

16 I think that we have to -- You know, we can present a recommendation to keep it
17 the same, and we have to say but for that to be a viable program the dollar have to improve. If the
18 dollars don't improve, then what do you do about it?

19 I think we are shortsighted to just say same old, same old. Am I concerned about
20 every student in this country related to drugs and alcohol? I absolutely am, but we have to realize
21 this is the only program, besides one other program at the Department, that funds in the manner that
22 it does. That other program is funded at \$3 billion. It is hugely different.

23 I get excited, because I do -- I am very -- I am part of Safe and Drug Free Schools,
24 because I have a heartfelt interest in it, and I really want what is best for students. I do not want
25 students involved in drug use and alcohol or all of the negative behaviors. But when we look at how
26 the program is addressed, we have to look at those elements.

27 The Federal role in education is not equivalent to the state role in education.
28 Look at the Federal role. Look at what the reality about the dollars is. If we could get double the
29 dollars, I think that would be great. We could make certain recommendations. That is probably not
30 going to happen, no matter what we do.

31 If that is not the case, then we should offer a recommendation for what we do if it
32 isn't, so that we can get the best value and make the biggest impact in those communities and in
33 those states.

34 MRS JACKSON: Okay, here goes my passion, Deborah, with regard to a little
35 bit of money stretched a long ways. I think one of the problems perhaps has been the lack of good
36 data collection or good dissemination of that information from the state level to the national level.

37 We have sat for almost a year now and heard some wonderful presentations of
38 people that are doing some great things across the nation with regard to Safe and Drug Free Schools
39 funding, and I believe we all would agree here around the table that an ounce of prevention is worth
40 a pound of cure.

41 So for the LEA that receives \$378 to a village that may receive \$78 and the
42 pulling together of a community to address an issue that is facing our most valuable asset in our
43 country, which is our children, and to get the tribal leaders and elders and other folks to begin talking
44 about inhalant abuse or whatever might be going on in our communities, I think, again I'm not quite
45 sure how we measure all of that, but the societal costs, I think, and the benefits long term as we take

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 a look at our nation that we are actually reducing the onset of use, we are educating our communities
2 and our children about the harmful effects of any kind of substance use, I think, is imperative.

3 So again, the cost effectiveness of a prevention education and awareness and
4 intervention program, I think, outweighs the cost of treatment and other societal outcomes long term.

5 So I wanted to say that. So I believe that there are things that we do that just have
6 not been totally measurable by this program, but what has been a benefit and has been a strength as
7 we look at the strengths of the program has been the flexibility to take a look across communities in
8 our nation and be diverse and flexible in determining what are the needs of the program on an annual
9 basis, taking a look at the needs of the community.

10 I believe that at the local level that that has been very effective. I believe it loses
11 something as we move it up to other levels that need to make those decisions and those
12 determinations, but at the local levels, I think we have reflected here over this past year that we have
13 been doing a great job.

14 With regard to funding, as we look at substance use as a health issue, I would like
15 to make a recommendation that the dialogue really does need to begin at the Federal level for some
16 perhaps broader connectivity and linking to Health and Human Services, for instance. This is
17 looked at as a health issue, but yet and still, it is the Department of Education that is funding the
18 program.

19 Again, as we have added other components onto the Drug Free Schools, the Safe
20 component, again that is put on the national Program of Safe and Drug Free Schools and maybe not
21 necessarily tapping into Homeland Security.

22 On page 2 we did make a recommendation for some additional, I believe,
23 dialogue to improve the coordination of various Federal resources related to school safety, etcetera,
24 and etcetera. So that is in the first box, and I think it is the third bullet, fourth bullet down.

25 So again, I would like to say that I believe that we need to expand really at the
26 national level what types of funding comes in to fund the program, and that maybe it shouldn't have
27 only been the Department of Education ever, as this is a health initiative. Thank you.

28 MR. HERRMANN: Just a clarification about my previous recommendation,
29 because I was basically trying to move us off of where we were at. It would be my thought that,
30 clearly, there are some issues with the State Grants Program that need to be addressed.

31 I think the thing that I wanted to say is I think it is important in any overall
32 scheme of what is being done with the broad Safe and Drug Free Schools Program to recognize the
33 importance of that infrastructure of engaging local education agencies and state education agencies
34 in the process.

35 It is my assumption that, as we ran through the rest of these -- the rest of the chart
36 here, we were going to identify some changes. So --

37 DR. KEYS: In listening to the discussion and to the reality that Debbie paints, I
38 think I concur with what Shep was saying about, if you only have so many dollars, you need to use
39 those dollars where you are going to have the greatest need.

40 Montean was suggesting that we do greater partnerships at the Federal level, and I
41 don't think that those partnerships only need to be about bringing more dollars to the table.

42 I think that SAMHSA's Center for Substance Abuse Prevention has created
43 through their strategic prevention framework a funding system at state levels that funds using
44 epidemiological data to determine how you drive the priorities of your program.

45 So a partnership of this program with the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 at SAMHSA to not just look at it in terms of dollars that come to the table but programs that are
2 already there that could help local communities do the kind of prioritizing that we are maybe
3 recommending or states doing the prioritizing that we are recommending to see where they want to
4 deliver the dollars that they have.

5 It may be that not every community is going to get \$300. It may be that those
6 dollars are delivered to areas that have been identified as most in need and that that identification
7 process can occur through maybe a partnership with SAMHSA.

8 I don't know what the Department of Justice is doing, but I guess maybe the long
9 and the short of it is I think need-based delivery of dollars is good, and that moving forward and
10 investigating what leverage points exist with other Federal programs may strengthen this program.

11 MR. LEDBETTER: The first two meetings, the way I remember the first two
12 meetings, we dealt primarily with the State Grants Program. The initial meeting when we were
13 called here, it was we have to look at this program; we have to determine if it is working. If it is not,
14 we have to make some judgment as to whether or not it could be fixed and, if it could be fixed, how
15 can it be fixed. That's the way I remember the first meeting.

16 The second meeting when we spent all the time hearing from State Grants people,
17 I never heard anybody make a presentation that the program needed to be eliminated. I never heard
18 that, though it was strongly inferred by the Department that the program was broken and it needed to
19 be fixed.

20 Now what was broken about it -- and this is how -- I am going to go back to what
21 you said a moment ago. I agree with you totally that what we need to do here today is to look at the
22 program and make some determinations along those lines.

23 If it is broken, can we fix it, and how can we fix it? A lot of the discussion that
24 we had -- again, I'm trusting memory, but a lot of the discussion we had was about the money. I
25 think all of us agree that there is not enough money. The money was spread too thin, and that is
26 noted here as a finding.

27 Now we discussed matching money. We discussed grants from the state rather
28 than a blanket grant that everyone could receive, the LEAs having to apply for grants with the states,
29 where the states would pick and choose who would get those grants.

30 Now whatever we decide to do, I think we need to lay this thing to rest today on
31 the State Grants. I don't think we need to spend any more time on State Grants. We have spent two
32 meetings talking about State Grants, and surely we can reach some consensus here this morning,
33 recommendations, as a committee about what we need to do with State Grants.

34 Another thing that I heard was that the way the grants were evaluated, the
35 effectiveness of the grants -- the way they were evaluated, there was no consensus from state to state
36 about that.

37 Again, I'm trusting memory, but I thought that the Department did not want to say
38 in the beginning that this is how you need to use your money. They left that up to the states, and that
39 created part of the problem. When the Department allowed the states to determine what their needs
40 were and then the Department came back to evaluate it, from one state to another the needs may
41 have been different, and that made it very difficult. It is not like comparing apples to apples, and
42 that was part of the problem.

43 I think that we need to just go ahead and look at those things and try to make
44 some recommendations this morning and move on and leave the State Grants, because the State
45 Grants -- we have spent a third of our time or more just on State Grants.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 DR. KEYS: Could I just make a suggestion? It would really help me to move
2 that newsprint, and I would be happy to just take some notes of what I'm hearing are the key points,
3 so that we can go back and say, yes, this is the point we want. You know, I'm happy to do that. It
4 would help me enormously, because I can't --

5 CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you. I'm glad to hear there's at least one or two
6 others out there, but we are used to this type where we have something in front of us. So if that
7 could be brought -- And the scribe is? Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. Russell, then
8 Hope.

9 DR. JONES: Yes. Just in terms of process. I can see our time getting away from
10 us quickly, and I'm wondering if it would be beneficial to provide a certain amount of time for each
11 recommendation, to make sure that we don't run out of time; because I hear over and over and over
12 again the importance of infrastructure, the importance of partnership-ing, the importance of
13 evaluation, etcetera, I think, which cuts across the various recommendations.

14 So I can understand and appreciate the need to run through the recommendations,
15 but I think we need to do that in a timely fashion so that there is time for the rich discussion that I
16 think encompasses everything that we are attempting to do.

17 CHAIRMAN LONG: I don't have a problem with that at all. You set the -- if we
18 say one and a half hours per for the three, that is four and a half hours, and then that which is left will
19 be for the overall and the infrastructure. Would that -- I'm just going to throw that out as a starting
20 point, which would mean, Russell, that we now have seven minutes left for the first one, but that we
21 then would -- if we start that clock now, we have used approximately -- so if we say until quarter of
22 ten to wrap this up on the State Grants -- or 10:00 o'clock, State Grants, and then go from there,
23 because I agree with Tom.

24 To your point, is that acceptable? That would give us another one hour and 10
25 minutes on State Grants.

26 MS. TAFT: So that would be changing the schedule and the agenda that we
27 delivered to us.

28 CHAIRMAN LONG: No. I think I said -- I'm sorry. I was looking at the ten
29 o'clock. The answer to that is yes.

30 DR. KEYS: Could I take a stab at just summarizing for our notetaker what I think
31 our key points are that we want to keep in mind?

32 I think we heard that the infrastructure of state and local community linkages is
33 important to this program. I think we heard that the program is important to continue, and it is
34 important to rethink how it is currently structured.

35 I think we heard that it would be important for limited dollars to target prioritized
36 needs. I think we heard a recommendation that there be greater collaboration at the Federal level,
37 not only in terms of dollars but also in terms of the kinds of programs that can bring services and
38 already created infrastructure to bear on the problem. And someone help me if I'm leaving one out,
39 but I thought those were sort of the key points.

40 MS. JACKSON: Susan, could you restate the one on need?

41 DR. KEYS: That if we have limited dollars that those dollars should be directed
42 toward areas of highest priority need. We are not going to have dollars for all students, all schools,
43 and I think someone said that possibly instead of having dollars go right to the local communities
44 that it go through states, and states do some priority. I don't know.

45 I'm just trying to recapture, and I might be wrong, but I just think it would be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 helpful if we got something up there.

2 CHAIRMAN LONG: And just for the sake of everyone, as soon -- I can only
3 speak for myself, but we have a broad felt tip on the way as we speak. Yes?

4 MS. TAFT: I feel conflict between some of those two statements, because how
5 can you keep your infrastructure, which is basically every school district gets something, and then
6 yet say but since we don't have enough money, we are going to leave some of these school districts
7 out. That, to me, just doesn't add up.

8 Maybe we ought to think about keeping that infrastructure in place so that every
9 school gets something so that they have a portal to their community to get more to go with it, and
10 encourage coalitions among school districts or consortiums among school districts to pool their little
11 amounts of money to get more amounts of money, and also to make a range within the formula so
12 that there is some flexibility within the states to maybe take a little bit from the school districts that
13 are getting humongous amounts to give a little more to the school districts that are not getting so
14 much.

15 In Ohio, it ranges from \$1,000, which is our base low, to \$700,000. Now I would
16 think that some of the schools are having a hard time spending \$700,000 effectively. But every
17 school gets something.

18 MS. JACKSON: I just wanted to speak to the need for the funding. I know
19 within our state grants program that there is a needs assessment that is completed annually with the
20 application process for the funds and what your plans are for utilizing those funds, etcetera. So that
21 is done, no matter how much money you receive. Everybody has to do that needs component.

22 So I was confused by that one as a recommendation when that is already a part of
23 the application process, determination of need.

24 MS. PRICE: But doing a survey for need and then having the results of the
25 survey show where the greatest needs are -- is/are -- are two different elements. I mean, everyone
26 does the survey, and that is significant, but then the results of the survey show what areas have the
27 greatest need. I think that is what they were -- I'm just dialoguing.

28 MS. JACKSON: Then what would be the criteria that would be set for which
29 LEAs have the greatest and most significant need? Would it be based on violence? Would it be
30 based on --

31 MS. PRICE: That's part of the recommendation process or, you know, one of the
32 strong elements of the structure that show up in almost all of these is the importance or the
33 significance of the SEA, the State Education Agency. That may be a determination of that state
34 education agency to determine and define how they define the need. It may be a Federal role of
35 defining the need.

36 Again, the state may make a -- You know, the Federal role could do, as Hope
37 suggested, a cap, a minimum cap and a basement and a ceiling range, but then the state could do
38 that. The individual state could possibly receive the funds, and that state determines whether they
39 are going to, by whatever formula they decide, give those dollars down to the LEA or the state could
40 do a need-based assessment and do it by need.

41 I mean, you know, I think that there's a lot of perspectives that you can take on
42 how it is done, you know, and how that falls into place.

43 MS. JACKSON: And then here goes my -- I get to be the devil's advocate. It's
44 probably the most vocal. Anyway, then do we lose our flexibility that currently is part of the
45 program by allowing the SEA to make a determination that one size fits all or this is the criteria we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 want to address this year. You know, again the flexibility has been for the local LEAs
2 to take a look at their discipline data and a number of things that are going on in a particular
3 community, and focus their efforts toward those things. It isn't just the survey. It isn't just the needs
4 assessment.

5 So if it is at the SEA level, I think we lose some flexibility that has been a part of
6 the program, and that's made it successful in a lot of our communities.

7 MS. PRICE: Yes, and you may. You know, flexibility comes with two sides of a
8 coin. You know, in one sense, as Tommy mentioned, it gives you so much flexibility that you can't
9 make the judgment about -- from state to state about if the program is effective, and then we end up
10 with a bad review or whatever. But you know, that flexibility -- I mean, there's good parts about
11 flexibility. There's bad parts about flexibility.

12 Sometimes you give entities the ability to be flexible, and they don't make wise
13 decisions. I mean, so that, I think, is part of the conversation of figuring out who sets the criteria for
14 the flexibility.

15 DR. KELLAM: One of the conundrums we have -- Just to repeat with the light
16 on, one of the conundrums we have nationally is that we collect an enormous amount of data of all
17 kinds, and it has no relationship to anything we do. That's a fact.

18 We see Lloyd Johnson's data on drugs nationally. We see all kinds of data. We
19 are spending huge amounts of money as we speak in every state in how things are going across these
20 states.

21 We have not learned how to use that data, in Susan's term, epidemiology data, to
22 tell us where to put our attention. Now there are two criteria that we need to do.

23 One is we need to make the infrastructure of the Safe and Drug Free Schools --
24 Hello? I'm trying to be serious, and I guess what I'm saying is I hope we can come to an
25 understanding of how these fit together.

26 The solution to Safe and Drug Free Schools infrastructure is to make it (a) data
27 based, (b) multiple levels of partnering across the Federal, state and local agencies and partners,
28 including community organizations, so that there is in fact a common vision about how we are
29 spending our money. It is not just pieces here and there.

30 The thing I think we have to learn about as a group is how the data can inform the
31 need. If we didn't have epidemiology, we wouldn't be able to do public health programs against any
32 other diseases, and from my point of view as an M.D., drug abuse and violence are diseases. They
33 are pathological responses to environmental demand, and people respond in the best they can, which
34 is often not so good.

35 You do this solution by using your data to tell you where the problems are, what
36 are the opportunities in each locale for partnering to bring focus and integrated services to bear with
37 children.

38 The only thing I could say is that, having worked in public schools for 40 years, it
39 is very important that we also understand that the schools already collect data in grades and conduct
40 which are highly relevant, and that we need to somehow see how this data and the No Child Gets
41 Left Behind kinds of data we are spending many dollars on can inform where we put our resources.

42 I am not opposed to giving some token or some encouragement to local
43 communities so that they don't feel left out of the scene, but I do believe that we need to be needs
44 based, and that is a very different way for our infrastructure to go than it has been going. We have
45 not used our data in any way to solve problems, whether they are violence or whatever they are.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 DR. HINGSON: If I could just make a suggestion, too, sort of for heuristic
2 purposes. If I think about areas where we have made progress in terms of improving public health,
3 one is in reductions in tobacco use, and the other is in the area of reducing drinking and driving.

4 I'm a little bit more familiar with the latter. So let me offer some suggestion about
5 that.

6 The Mothers Against Drunk Driving has a very interesting program called Rating
7 the States where every two or three -- about every three or four years, rather, they give each state a
8 report card, and the nation a report card on how well they are doing in reducing alcohol related
9 traffic deaths.

10 It turns out that over the last two decades, alcohol related traffic deaths in the
11 United States have been cut in half on a per population basis, and even more so on a per miles driven
12 basis.

13 So one of the things that they try to do is to say not only where is the need, and I
14 think need, of course, is important in determining how money is spent, but also where is progress
15 being made.

16 There has to be some level of consensus about what are the objectives that we are
17 trying to achieve from an epidemiologic point of view. They set targets. They say, look, we are
18 going to try and reduce alcohol related traffic deaths. Their initial goal was 20 percent by the year
19 2000. They surpassed that.

20 So I think that one thing we need to do is we need to develop some consensus on
21 what are the objectives of this program? What would we call success? And then what evidence do
22 we have that certain types of programs or certain types of initiatives can help us achieve that? Then
23 are those programs being put in place?

24 One of the things that Mothers Against Drunk Driving does is they base part of
25 their grade for each state on what is the proportion of fatal crashes that are alcohol related, and since
26 the last report card has that proportion gone down. And they look at what laws are there where we
27 have evidence that, if you pass that law, it will reduce alcohol related traffic deaths, like raising the
28 drinking age or lowering legal blood alcohol levels or administrative license revocation or primary
29 enforcement safety belt laws.

30 Then they look at what proportion of those laws have been passed in a given state
31 and, of the unpassed laws, what proportion were passed from the last time the report card went out.
32 So they set sort of an agenda.

33 Now that is not to say that every state has to follow in lock step fashion the
34 agenda. Most of the grade that they put out is based on are you making progress? Have you been
35 bringing the problems that you have targeted down? Less of it is based on the specifics of these
36 different laws, but what they try to do is make sure that each objective has a data measure to it, and it
37 is objective, so that it is not just sort of we don't like this particular party that happens to be in power
38 or this particular effort that these people in this particular administration are doing something. But it
39 is objective, and you can really chart whether or not progress is being made.

40 I think maybe part of our charge here ought to be to try and identify, well, what
41 are the objectives that we think ought to be the ruler by which we are measuring whether or not we
42 are making any progress and offer that to the states. Not to say to the states, you know, there is only
43 one way to skin a cat, but rather to say, look, if you are not making progress in reducing these
44 problems, then maybe you are going to have to go back to the drawing board and come up with a
45 different plan and come up with a different application.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 DR. MADRAS: I would like to echo both of the two previous comments. Data is
2 what drives policy, but the second component is efficacy of outcomes measures, and I think both are
3 needed, and both have to be part of any policy decisions.

4 DR. JONES: I agree totally. Again, I think that goes back to the questions of
5 infrastructure of the program, the relationship of data to outcome and how that impacts policy.

6 CHAIRMAN LONG: I have to -- this is housekeeping. I'm getting agita, and it
7 has nothing to do with you. Is there a possibility to get like a big black felt tip or something with big
8 letters, which is a great segue into what I am talking about.

9 I think that we are getting to the nuts and bolts of this, and I am hearing it over
10 and over. Here is where the recommendation will come out, I'm sure, and that's why I appreciate,
11 Susan, you getting that up in front of us there.

12 Data driven and that that becomes the evaluation tool, and that recommendation --
13 and these things are really already up there, I think; just trying to put them together -- that then it
14 goes to areas of greatest need, and that the evaluation system has to be looked at, revamped,
15 improved from what it is right now.

16 The other thing that -- and I have to say this. It is up to the committee how you
17 want to -- \$100 million? Are we going to say anything about the money or are we just going to
18 leave it at 100 million? That's up to you. I think that is a cruel joke. I think we -- and I'm just going
19 to say this, and I hesitate to say it. I mentioned it when we were having coffee.

20 I just had a conversation last week with the Governor and a few of -- and with the
21 CTA, which was very large in our state, the union; and the discussion was based around where do
22 we spend the \$3 billion, B as in Billion, this year for Title I and II schools to improve achievement?

23 As I sat there, I have to tell you what I was thinking about. I was thinking about
24 us. I was thinking about this committee, that we are sitting here talking about \$100 million to spread
25 across the United States of America for this important endeavor that we are all sitting here for.

26 If that is a reflection of what is thought about the children of the United States of
27 America with substance abuse, we need to say it, and to talk about \$100 million, I think, is an
28 embarrassment.

29 I suppose this will all be recorded now. All for the want of a felt tip. I just throw
30 that out, because if we are going to -- We also want to throw that -- I didn't see it up there. That's the
31 only reason say it, and it's up to you.

32 If the amount is okay, but if not, we need to say it, and I think we have to have
33 strong language that says think about the children of the United States.

34 DR. JONES: Man, I love the way you said it. Hear, hear. I mean, that's right on,
35 and I think it goes back to that discussion that we had and one of the statements that Shep made, just
36 in terms of a bold approach and some Secretarial level discussion.

37 I don't know if any of you guys were able to capture -- to see C-SPAN last week
38 where the Secretary was discussing the No Child Left Behind program, but, boy, did she get
39 slammed. I mean, it was just -- I don't think anyone in the room was pleased with what the No Child
40 Left Behind Program was doing.

41 No, no, I shouldn't say that. Not what it was doing, but the level of funding, and I
42 think you are right on. I mean, that's why I said earlier on trying to put square data in round holes,
43 and boy, I think it really -- It raises the issue of where do we go from here.

44 MS. TAFT: One hundred million dollars is not very much, but it might be
45 enough to get the door open in some of the communities, but one way that \$100 million might go

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 farther is if some of the extraneous things that are in that bill that this money can be used for were
2 narrowed down or eliminated so that the \$100 million was more targeted, keeping kids away from
3 alcohol and drugs and keeping that interpersonal safety that is so important to helping them learn,
4 and we could make a list of those, I'm sure, of things that we could eliminate.

5 DR. MADRAS: One of the most obvious questions that I have asked since
6 coming to this position is does every school poll the use of drugs in their children, and they don't, not
7 to the best of my knowledge, because I have been to the Baltimore school district, the L.A. school
8 district, and have asked whether or not those data are available.

9 They say they don't have them. So there are gaps either in my knowledge or
10 transfer of information to me or they don't exist. I don't know. But from my vantage, this is a very
11 simple task that can be done, that can be used to drive implementation of prevention and intervention
12 programs.

13 Hope, you say that every school does the polling. I don't know. Debbie, do you
14 know?

15 MS. PRICE: I don't believe they do, because I think in many cases it takes time,
16 and it takes money, and they do not see themselves as having either the time or the money to do it.
17 And it is an issue of priorities.

18 DR. MADRAS: Well, in terms of taking time, it is a -- For self-reporting, it is a
19 simple questionnaire that can be handed to every child in the school and completed in one hour; and
20 even if it is not electronic, that information can be shifted to an electronic database readily. And
21 with that kind of information, you can begin to address what are really specific and local needs.

22 In some of the school districts that I have visited, the superintendents and/or the
23 principals have said they don't want to know, and that, to me, is part of the problem. We have to
24 have that data on a school-by-school basis, and we should have it every single year.

25 MS. TAFT: Well, all I can talk about is Ohio, because I am very familiar with it.
26 We have more census surveys done in Ohio of their school population than you can shake a stick at,
27 and I would bet that every school district has data, maybe not on a yearly basis but on a two or three-
28 year basis.

29 Many of those are done by community coalitions, so that the coalition keeps the
30 data, so that the schools don't have to answer those difficult questions that the principal doesn't want
31 to answer, but the data is there for schools to use.

32 I can't believe that L.A. and Baltimore don't do surveys.

33 DR. MADRAS: Well, I won't specifically mention any schools that have not
34 done it, but I can assure you that in some of the areas that I have been, it is not done. That, at the
35 Federal level, should be obviously a policy decision.

36 DR. HINGSON: I think that that is a very good example of the type of thing that
37 I was trying to get at earlier, is that if we know that having these data are important, that should be a
38 condition for funding, and being able to track over time should be a condition for funding, if schools
39 are not willing to take those steps to do that.

40 Now may be that will give an advantage to Ohio where they are doing that
41 already, but the other states may then look to Ohio and say, well, gee, why are they doing better than
42 we are, and what can we do to come up to snuff.

43 So I think that that is a very good suggestion, that we should -- that should be a
44 condition of receiving funds, is that schools be willing, and communities be willing, and we should,
45 when we get into our data section later today, set up what we consider to be the most important

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 sources of data that need to be collected, and that is part of -- that communities will be more likely --
2 part of the criteria for funding.

3 The more of these data the communities are able to access, the more -- the greater
4 the likelihood that they will be able to receive some funding.

5 DR. MADRAS: Well, and precisely because in any scientific survey it is pre/post
6 data that counts in terms of efficacy outcomes. If you don't have pre data, you have no idea whether
7 or not what you are doing works, and without the pre data you can't possibly assign a value of
8 efficacy to the post data.

9 So I more than second that. I think that that begins the development of a rational
10 approach to what is missing in these programs.

11 MR. LEDBETTER: I am stunned. We have come up with at least two
12 recommendations: More money -- are we agreed on that, that one recommendation needs to be that
13 there is more funding? I see the arrows up and down on the 100 million. So let's start with that, just
14 a nod of the head or anything, more, more money. Is that --Okay, that's one recommendation. All
15 right.

16 Now the second one is the data. Lord, if there is anything we have talked more
17 about than the State Grants Program, it has been data. I can only speak for Alabama. I know that
18 we survey -- Sometimes I think we survey to death, but we survey there.

19 I agree that you have to have data to begin with. If you don't have your pre data,
20 you don't -- there is no way of measuring your outcomes. So are we agreed that a recommendation
21 needs to be data, that the data -- You have to have the data. You have to be able to survey to receive
22 any state grants money. Could we agree on that?

23 DR. MADRAS: I would like to modify that. I think that in order for Federal
24 funding to be allocated to programs such as this, the kind of data that is collected on a state by state
25 basis should, in fact, be a national dataset and should be uniform; because if every state establishes
26 their own questionnaires, they may or may not be validated forms of questionnaires.

27 What we need is a national consensus on the type of information that we gather so
28 that we can look at it from a global perspective.

29 DR. HINGSON: If I could offer, I agree that there ought to be a common core,
30 but I think there ought to be some flexibility state by state so that they can measure particular and
31 special initiatives that they want to pursue. That is the only way we are going to learn, because it is
32 not going to be one size fits all in terms of what will work.

33 What will work in Massachusetts may not necessarily work in New Mexico. So I
34 think -- But there should be a common core of questions that are asked and a certain minimal
35 standard for sampling and response rates.

36 We ought to have certain basic methodologic criteria that have to be met, but then
37 allows the flexibility.

38 DR. SIMS: Right. Thank you. I was going to bring that up, that we have been
39 discussing this over time, and it seems to me, when we had one of our panels of the -- I don't know --
40 the contractor who did the initial part, a lot of it was around the accountability, but it was unclear to
41 me if that was the state level accountability.

42 It seemed like it was, not necessarily at the local level of what was actually being
43 done. So that is something to think about. What are going to be -- What will the recommendations
44 be, specific recommendations, to the states around these core questions, core data questions, that
45 should be captured as part of the Safe and Drug Free Schools state grants program?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 I don't think we have talked about that in terms of what the specific
2 recommendations would be for that core dataset, if what is there is adequate or if other things need
3 to be added to that.

4 The other thing was around the actual programs themselves that were
5 implemented. From what I recall, on the local level there was a lot of evaluation going on just based
6 on the panels that were here. However, because there was this uniform management information
7 system, there became sort of a mismatch.

8 You know, they have to input certain data for the overall evaluation of the
9 program, but what is in that dataset doesn't really capture what they have documented as the
10 outcomes of the programs that have been implemented.

11 So somehow we can maybe think about what recommendations would we make
12 about reducing that mismatch between what local level evaluators might be doing and how it is
13 being captured at the state level.

14 Then the other thing is one of the other comments made by the initial part
15 evaluation about the program is they may be effective, but we don't know why.

16 I think another issue that was brought up that we should consider making some
17 recommendations about was around how the programs are being implemented and whether or not
18 we could be sure they were being implemented with fidelity. The researchers who presented talked
19 about that a little bit.

20 So maybe one of our recommendations would be around not only documenting
21 what programs are implemented, but also ensuring or recommending that at those local levels they
22 are actually using some kind of process measures to documented how the program is being
23 implemented.

24 CHAIRMAN LONG: I apologize. We had -- About three or four hands went up,
25 not simultaneously but close, and I think, Shep, you had -- and I think I missed you. That was not
26 intentional, I assure you.

27 DR. KELLAM: I'm glad to hear that, Dave. I have nothing but confidence. I just
28 wanted to make a couple of points.

29 One is that I like the way our recommendations are moving. They are talking
30 about infrastructure for Safe and Drug Free Schools and including information as a way of guiding
31 policy and practice.

32 The second thing I think that it is very important for us to emphasize is the nature
33 of multiple levels of partnerships. At the local community level, we are talking at the minimum of
34 bringing the health department and the school district into one place, which is traditionally a huge
35 problem, in addition to which we have child welfare agencies and the like who need to be
36 partnering, and we have local community organizations that can enhance or inhibit the political
37 support at the local and state and national levels for this kind of work.

38 I wanted to say my second point is that, as we think about data, we shouldn't
39 forget the public school records that we already collect on every child. The fact is we collect
40 academic records and behavioral conduct reports in every school and every child quarterly or in
41 some systematic fashion over time.

42 The two biggest important antecedents, aside from poverty and more global
43 issues, for drug abuse in the adolescent and later years are poor academic performance early on and
44 conduct problems early on. Those are very important antecedents replicated many, many times.

45 So we have, in fact, an opportunity by connecting the information on adolescent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 drug use to the developmental records the schools are already collecting. That is an extremely
2 important understanding. We are not talking about creating whole -- necessarily, whole new
3 information systems yet again.

4 A lot of it can be integrated into the developmental records we are currently
5 collecting on each child, again with proper partnering and proper safeguards for parental roles and
6 the like, which is a very important part of what we can build on, we already have.

7 CHAIRMAN LONG: Could I go, so that I catch him, and I apologize for this -- I
8 think it was -- You decide. Who was it here first?

9 DR. JONES: It was me.

10 CHAIRMAN LONG: I knew you were going to say that. Okay, Russell, Hope
11 and Susan.

12 DR. JONES: Yes, I'll be brief. But I echo Shep's comments. I like the direction
13 that we are moving. You know, we are really talking about bringing our science to the table,
14 understanding and appreciating the benefits of methodology, critically evaluating what we are doing,
15 and letting that inform intervention and inform decisions that are being made.

16 I had a process question. These recommendations will be made to the Secretary.
17 To what extent will this committee be involved in the discussion of those recommendations and the
18 forward movement of those recommendations?

19 MS. PRICE: You mean once the recommendations go forward?

20 DR. JONES: Yes. Right.

21 MS. PRICE: What will your involvement be? It will be whatever she asks of
22 you. Any advisory committee provides recommendations on whatever the subject is, and that is the
23 function of the advisory committee, is to provide findings and recommendations.

24 If the Secretary chooses to ask for additional information or additional
25 involvement, that is supplementary to what a role of an advisory committee is. An advisory
26 committee reviews and provides information.

27 CHAIRMAN LONG: Could I ask a piggyback question on that, Debbie. With
28 the tremendous movement in the last two or three weeks by four or five states moving primaries
29 back to now a Super Tuesday which will be February 5, what that has done -- and here comes my
30 question. Politically, what that has done is pulled everything back to about ten months from now.

31 What effect does that have on conjecture, on reauthorization and what will happen
32 with this committee and the recommendations; because all of a sudden, things went like this. As
33 soon as I saw that in the paper, I thought, whoops. But I just thought about that when you asked that
34 question.

35 MS. PRICE: I'm not sure I exactly understand your question, but because the
36 primary season is moving forward at a greater rate than before and --

37 CHAIRMAN LONG: Lame ducks have shorter time to be lame ducks.

38 MS. PRICE: Well, that is true. I mean, if you asked the Secretary, and our
39 organizational assessment of which the entire Department is assessed is one of those standards that
40 we will be measured by is reauthorization of No Child Left Behind, and there are different levels of
41 that depending on the principles that the Secretary is put forward and the blueprint that you all saw.

42 That is the goal of the Department, to have reauthorization done by September 30
43 of this year, and they are all -- The Secretary and the Secretary's staff are working on that.

44 Reauthorization is in the hands of Congress, and Congress is the one who will
45 determine when that will be done. I mean, I could sit here, because we've spent 16 years in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Senate -- I can sit here and speculate about what I think Congress is going to do. That is not my role,
2 and it is not appropriate for me to do at this point. But reauthorization is in the hands of Congress.

3 The Secretary will certainly answer questions that they have about
4 reauthorization, but we do not write legislation. The Hill writes legislation, and they will ask
5 questions. They have the President's budget he put forward. They have the blueprint that we put
6 forward, and they will do the business of the legislature.

7 It may be done this year. It may not be done this year. It may be done next year.
8 It may not be done next year. It may be done the third year. If you look at the timeline on the
9 current No Child Left Behind, we did not reauthorize elementary/secondary education Act in the
10 year it was to be reauthorized. We reauthorized it, I believe, three years later, and reauthorizations
11 can happen in the year they are supposed to happen. There is no mandate that they have to, but it is
12 the goal of the Department to have it reauthorized by September 30th.

13 CHAIRMAN LONG: I think we were -- Let's see now. Hope, Susan. Is that
14 right?

15 MS. TAFT: I would like to put forth a recommendation based on what I have
16 heard around the table, that the local school -- the LEAs be required to institute local advisory
17 councils like they had before No Child Left Behind, because that local advisory council brings in the
18 community, brings in the hierarchy of all that we have been talking about to get those partnerships
19 going.

20 If I remember reading No Child Left Behind correctly, it requires all the LEAs to
21 do a principles of effectiveness process which gets in the survey process. It requires a core dataset.
22 It requires the U.S. Department of Education to come up with a uniform information management
23 system.

24 If that was implemented, we wouldn't be having a lot of this discussion. So
25 maybe we ought to recommend that the law that is in place now be implemented as it was intended.

26 CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you. Susan.

27 DR. KEYS: I just wanted to clarify, when we talk about using data. So often
28 when we see grant applications come in, the communities -- you know, they have all kinds of data,
29 but they don't use that data to make decisions. They don't use that data to connect and justify why
30 they are doing the programs that they are doing.

31 There is often not a linkage, and I think we are talking about really using data to
32 connect what it is you end up doing and to prioritize what you are doing.

33 We have a really excellent example, I think, of what we are talking about in
34 Montgomery County Public Schools where our superintendent there, when he came in, he really
35 looked at what was going on in the county, and he recognized that there was a pathway of very high
36 need that extended in a very definite geographic area. And he used dollars to target that area and
37 those needs, recognizing that if he could improve achievement for those kids, he could make a
38 significant impact on the overall outcomes for his system.

39 I think that we have to get away from the idea of everybody gets something. I
40 think we have to recommend that the grant program support a process where priorities are set from
41 state to local communities where the needs are the highest and that those needs get mapped to the
42 programs that are actually put in place.

43 DR. HINGSON: I would like to say that I agree with that. I think that there's
44 multiple levels at which the data needs to be used. One, certainly, is the state has to have an overall
45 plan and an overall yardstick that they have set up on how they are measuring progress, and then

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 communities can respond to that and say, well, this is what we are going to do to reach X, Y and Z
2 goal and change the number from time one from A to B at time two.

3 The other thing that I wanted to mention is that, as we have talked about what
4 types of data should be collected, there certainly was initially consensus around the notion of doing
5 surveys in every community that wants to be eligible to receive funding.

6 Surveys can tell you about the individual use behaviors of the student, and that
7 can be linked to academic performance, and you can have questions on the surveys about academic
8 performance. But there also are things that the communities need to be doing, and we shouldn't be
9 putting all of the onus on the students. We need to be talking about what can communities
10 collectively do.

11 So when Hope, for example, talked about having advisory councils, well, there is
12 certain representation that needs to be at the table, and that ought to be part of the criteria.

13 If the communities don't have the school department, the health department, social
14 services, the police department meeting on a regular and meaningful way and all of those different
15 systems collecting data that are being put into a collective effort to try and deal with this, that is part
16 of the data that we need to have some standardizing on.

17 CHAIRMAN LONG: Howell, before you go, Debbie wanted to clarify.

18 MS. PRICE: I just wanted to clarify. When Dr. Madras asked me the question
19 about surveys, I really -- Why it wasn't on my mind, I don't know. But the Department -- All school
20 districts have to do the consolidated report.

21 I'm sorry. These questions -- There are elements of Safe and Drug Free Schools
22 as part of the consolidated report. I was thinking of a separate survey. So I gave a shortsighted
23 answer, and I apologize.

24 There are a lot of questions that people would like to see in a report on drugs and
25 alcohol. They are not all in the consolidated report, because of multiple reasons, trying to figure out
26 which questions are the most appropriate questions to have in there on all the segments of the
27 Department, to keep a manageable tool for school districts to use.

28 So you know, there are a limited number of questions as part of the consolidated
29 report, but, yes -- and those go to every public school district.

30 I'm sorry. It just like over the head, and thought of it later. So I apologize.

31 DR. WECHSLER: If we are talking about data to assess the effectiveness of the
32 state grants program, I think we have to be very careful and not -- Even if we quintupled this budget,
33 it would be very unrealistic to hold this program accountable for all these changes that have been put
34 on the table in terms of substance use, behaviors, in terms of academic performance and so forth.

35 So we need to -- While looking at that bigger picture, a lot of the data that needs
36 to be collected relates to whether they are implementing what the science shows us are the best
37 practices.

38 So the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools programs need to bring the experts
39 together and identify a long menu of what they consider to be the best practices from which states
40 can choose.

41 Now while it is nice where we have gotten so far, I think we are still avoiding the
42 two fundamental issues that have been there from the get-go: Number one, what is the best delivery
43 mechanism?

44 It seems to me that the people around the table talking about the public health
45 approach seem to be leaning toward something fairly similar to what the Department has proposed,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealgross.com

1 and that is giving -- pooling the money together, letting the states decide from their perspective of
2 the needs of how to disseminate it, while there are still others at the table who feel that we need to
3 preserve the existing infrastructure, in essence the entitlement program where every district gets
4 some.

5 I think we have to address that, once and for all.

6 Then secondly, Hope put a bombshell on the table that I don't think anyone has
7 addressed, and that is -- and correct me if I'm wrong, but it seemed to me you were suggesting that
8 we go back to make this the Drug Free Schools program. That is a concrete issue.

9 How can we have the resources to keep this going to every district? Well, that's
10 one way to do it. That is what she has put forward, and I think it merits a debate. Should we narrow
11 dramatically the scope of the program?

12 MS. QUIGG: To come back to both of those comments, I have been doing this
13 work from the community perspective since the inception of the Safe and Drug Free Schools
14 Program. One of the things that we said when this program was created in the beginning, looking at
15 school principals, school board members, school teachers who were standing there begging don't put
16 the burden of this problem onto the schools -- we'll do our part, but we can't be-all, do-all,
17 everything, and yet we continue to come back with this program and put the burden back on this
18 program and back on schools when, in fact, this is the most complex problem that we have that can
19 only be addressed from a community perspective, and the schools taking responsibility of their piece
20 of this.

21 You know, I agree with you. How do we narrow the scope and put back in
22 perspective what is realistic, what the schools' role for this program is within a larger context? I
23 think all the things that we are talking about are needed pieces. We need data, but what is the data
24 telling us, and what do we expect it to tell us?

25 The data should not be used against the schools in any way, shape or form, or be
26 targeted to show that the school's program is succeeding or failing.

27 We need data at the programmatic level to talk about whether the program is in
28 place or performing well. We need surveillance data to tell us where our problems are, and we need
29 to look at this program of what do we expect it to do in terms of needs.

30 We talk in our world about universal, selected and indicated programs, targeted
31 audiences. I have always personally seen this program as being the best universal program that we
32 have in place, and I think back to our heritage and roots of this program.

33 The design was we needed basic substance abuse education and lessons in our
34 schools as part of the school's response to this, not the be-all, end-all, and that we have other targeted
35 programs that are coming down, not only through education but through public health, through
36 safety and other places to look at problems.

37 Then lastly, in my own state I argued for a long time with our policy makes about
38 our discretionary dollars were targeted to go out to do a community enhancement piece to the Safe
39 and Drug Free Schools Programs. when they looked at shutting those down because we were
40 funding communities at a \$5-\$10,000 level and having this same argument -- we couldn't show
41 outcomes and couldn't prove that those dollars were of any value; so let's just close that down,
42 reallocate those dollars -- the argument came back to we were funding about 150 communities to do
43 that, and oh, by the way, in those 150 communities our problems were not getting worse.

44 Methamphetamine was not coming to those communities in a state where
45 methamphetamine was running rampant, because we had enough dollars and enough attention in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 small communities with these minimal dollars to hold the line.

2 Where we needed more dollars was targeted dollars at an increased level in places
3 where we had the problem. So when we talk about surveillance data, it is knowing what we are
4 trying to do. Are we trying to prevent? Are we trying to reduce? The answer is we are trying to do
5 both, and we need to be very strategic and very targeted at doing it.

6 I think we do need to look at this program, as we do anything, what is the
7 expectation that a single sector of our community can do with a single section of dollars that makes
8 sense, and bring this back to that kind of perspective, back to our roots and our heritage.

9 MS. DUDE: I agree so much with everything everybody said that my list of what
10 to do talk about is significantly decreased.

11 I think Peggy made an excellent point when she talked about the prevention
12 aspect of it, because I think when we put so much emphasis on data, it is very hard to measure what
13 you have prevented from happening, because it didn't happen. So I think we have to be very, very
14 sensitive to that issue.

15 I guess the main thing I would add that hasn't already been exactly said is that I
16 think, when we do have -- like I would love to have the power to decide who gets money and who
17 doesn't. I mean, I think that would be such an awesome responsibility, because I think that can guide
18 so much of what the efforts actually are.

19 I think data -- I think, for us to be able to say this is how much money we have,
20 here is a grant application, here are the things you minimally have to do -- you have to collect data;
21 you have to have an advisory committee or a coalition or something like that, but you also have
22 support from the top. The principal has to say absolutely, I believe totally in what we are going to
23 do here, and I'm going to be behind it.

24 So I just feel sorry for this poor little prevention person that I have made reference
25 to before, that this is like one-eighth of their job responsibilities, and they suddenly have to write the
26 grant. They have to implement the grant. They have to collect the data. It is an impossible situation
27 that we are putting them into.

28 So I think, if we can show that there is a collaborative response to utilizing
29 whatever money they are given so that we can show that there is going to be curriculum infusion, so
30 we can show that there is going to be partnerships, and we can be guaranteed that parents were being
31 involved and that we get data not only from the students themselves but, as others have said, from
32 the community, police data and all those kinds of -- all that other information that is out there, and
33 academic data, all those kinds of things together. But I think, for us to make either principles of
34 effectiveness to say you have to do these guidelines in order to have access to this money would be a
35 smart way to go.

36 I absolutely believe in going back to Drug Free Schools as opposed to Safe and
37 Drug Free Schools. So I agree with much of what has already been said and, obviously, a lot more
38 money than 100 million.

39 DR. MADRAS: A few comments. With regard to the much used word data now,
40 your comments on making this a public health issue where it should go into the records of the child:
41 I think we should divide data into two components. One is an anonymous survey of each school,
42 and then a different component which is a public health approach; because I am quite aware of
43 scientific data that indicates that, if it is not anonymous, we are going to get vast underreporting from
44 children.

45 So if we put a survey that is broadly based, we will -- and anonymous, we will not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 get into reporting. Another survey which is a public health approach, which could involve
2 screening, brief intervention, either verbal or biometric testing. That would go into a more linkage
3 to an identifier for an individual child.

4 With regard to whether or not drugs are going to help improve academic
5 performance, there is very strong information that a reduction in drug use reduces absenteeism,
6 increases grades, increases completion of homework, reduces violence. There are so many
7 indicators that are associated with drugs that I think, if you reduce drugs in schools, you are going to
8 de facto reduce a lot -- a shopping list of adverse consequences for the individual.

9 Even college graduation rates are associated with drug use in high schools. So
10 that children who abstain from marijuana are twice as likely to graduate from college, if they abstain
11 during high school.

12 So I think we have to -- And then we talk about perhaps five to ten thousand
13 dollars; what can we possibly get out of this? In schools that have implemented random student
14 drug testing for three to five thousand dollars, their positive tests have gone from, in some cases,
15 down to two percent positive tests. That is a huge return on an investment in some schools.

16 I do completely echo what Hope said in terms of community involvement. One
17 of the things that every community could do is find out whether or not the schools, are in fact, giving
18 prevention programs and parental involvement; because we are aware, again data driven, that drug
19 use amongst children whose parents do not condemn use can be as high as five to seven times
20 greater than in homes in which parents have a very strong negative opinion about drug use. So
21 communities are critical. Families are critical in driving and helping the system.

22 CHAIRMAN LONG: I would like to propose that we take approximately a 10-
23 minute break, which will allow us to put -- to codify some of the -- put some big bullets up here so
24 that we can start to pull this together for not just a recommendation but a series of recommendations
25 based on some of these large areas that we are talking about, and then if we have left something out.
26 Would that be acceptable?

27 Then we will come back, and then everyone will have a chance to throw in other
28 comments, but I think now it is time to start bringing this together for these recommendations, and
29 we are starting to hear some of the things over and over, which is a good thing, because now that
30 means we are starting to pull information out.

31 Before we break, did you have -- I'm sorry.

32 DR. HINGSON: Thank you. I'd like to raise two points. The first one I am
33 going to be making stronger. The second one is one for -- The first one I am recommending. The
34 second one will be something that I would like us to think about. I would like to hear the
35 committee's thoughts on it as a whole.

36 The first one is: I don't want us to fall in the trap of just talking about drugs. We
37 must leave alcohol on the table. The younger people are -- When they start to drink, the greater the
38 likelihood that they will develop not only alcohol dependence, they get heavily involved in the use
39 of other drugs and all of the sequelae that go along with that.

40 So I want to make sure that we don't -- that the word alcohol be included in
41 whatever the name of this program is.

42 The second thought that I had was that, you know, a lot of what has happened in
43 the past has been that the Department of Education has given monies to schools, and that SAMHSA
44 has given monies to the single state agencies, maybe through the health department, whatever, that
45 the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has given monies to the Governors Highway

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Safety bureau. Yet all of those different agencies share common goals in terms of reducing
2 substance use and share common goals in terms of a particular focus on youth.

3 Perhaps what we ought to be thinking about is whether or not there should be
4 some sort of not just school application to Department of Education or single state agency
5 department to SAMHSA or Governors Highway Safety through NHTSA, but rather some collective
6 community application that goes into a collective body that gets integration across different Federal
7 agencies, so that we can really get the various people at the table at different levels, at the
8 community level, at the state level and at the Federal level.

9 So I just want to toss that one out as a possible thing for us to discuss.

10 CHAIRMAN LONG: Let's take that approximately ten minutes to give us a
11 chance to put some bullets up there, and we will come back and pull these together.

12 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 9:50 a.m. and went back
13 on the record at 10:11 a.m.)

14 CHAIRMAN LONG: As we get started, in case some of you missed, I am going
15 to use this to segue into our beginning. If you didn't notice -- and Seth, I want to congratulate you --
16 Seth was over there reading the minutes from the booklets over there that I was describing.

17 As a way to start to synthesize some of this information and come to
18 recommendations regarding the first area, State Grants, the areas that were discussed -- and not
19 implying that this would be a list of all of them, but that's why you will have an opportunity to say,
20 whoa, wait a minute, we missed one big area there -- there is an opportunity to put those up there.
21 This is just an attempt to start to pull our conversation together.

22 Some of the bullets that were heard over and over: That would be data driven,
23 dollars, access thresholds, and mentioned two or three or four things under that, scope, the delivery
24 system, whether or not it continues to be universal, community or community involvement and
25 collaborations, and a spinoff, integration of agencies that could help all of those things.

26 First of all, is there a big area that was just simply left off? I'm sorry, go ahead,
27 Susan.

28 DR. KEYS: I think the basic question that Howell raised -- I'm not sure, unless it
29 is under scope, whether we should be recommending that funding go through states to local
30 communities based on need versus funding all school systems. Is that what you mean by scope?

31 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry. Yes, scope as to whether or not it would be just
32 --

33 DR. KEYS: As it is now or changing the -- Okay.

34 CHAIRMAN LONG: And we might put in parentheses to illustrate that. I'm
35 sorry. I said scope. It would be delivery systems.

36 DR. KEYS: The other question that he raised and that Hope raised, I think, was a
37 scope question, whether it should be drug and alcohol free or safe and drug.

38 CHAIRMAN LONG: That was the intent of the scope. When the discussion
39 turned to when Howell said a very important was just raised, that's where the word scope came in.
40 Yes.

41 DR. KELLAM: Yes. Two points. One is I think that we have to continue to
42 think developmentally, and we are just learning, I think, as a group to do that.

43 This came up very briefly, but the early risk factors for later drug abuse, violence,
44 tobacco, alcohol, really come out of -- and there are huge gender differences in this in the research.
45 But for males they come out of a lot of data on early aggressive, disruptive behavior in classrooms.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Aggressive, disruptive behavior in classrooms coupled with poor achievement
2 have been developmentally the early antecedents. A lot of the prevention programs have been
3 directed at various stages along that developmental trajectory.

4 So in a sense, we have to recognize the separateness, but at the same time we have
5 to recognize their developmentally important integrating origins. So by separating, in a sense, we
6 perpetuate one of our major problems, which is what do we mean by partnerships, and I don't see
7 partnerships up there as importantly as it needs to be up there.

8 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry. If we put community/partnerships?

9 DR. KELLAM: Well, let me elaborate that a little bit, because the Safe and Drug
10 Free Schools is one program. The Safe Schools, Healthy Students is another, and they are
11 dramatically different in the degree to which they go across agencies at the Federal level.

12 So we are talking about partnerships at multiple levels. I don't mean to be vague
13 about that. At the local community level you need community participation in terms of community
14 organizational leaders, along with child welfare, public health and the school district, recognizing
15 their common interests in supporting kids growing.

16 At the state level, on the other hand, we need coordination with state departments
17 of like sort, and we have a lot of work to do at the Federal level. The Healthy Student, Safe School -
18 - what's it called, Healthy Schools -- Safe Schools, Healthy Students -- You know, it took a
19 tremendous amount of effort to bring those, Justice, CMHS and Education together.

20 So we have to recognize that the kids we are talking about don't come in these
21 boxes and that every time we make these distinctions we make a problem at the community level,
22 and it is perpetuated by problems at the funding at the Federal level, and so on.

23 So part of our need is to bring these into a focus, and multiple levels is an
24 extremely important part of that, not just a level. So we are talking about community, state, and
25 Federal level partnerships that bring together potentials for integrating resources and services and
26 evaluating impact.

27 CHAIRMAN LONG: Perhaps the sixth bullet, community and partnerships, the
28 last one, the integration of agencies, and perhaps just pull those together that talks about multi-level
29 of partnerships, what those two bullets would indicate.

30 MS. KELLAM: Yes.

31 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. I think we had Hope, Fred, Kim.

32 MS. TAFT: If I could talk about the scope one, I think we could be more specific
33 in that. I sometimes feel like the Safe and Drug Free School Program has become a Christmas tree
34 with a lot of big, heavy branches and its same original little bitty trunk, and that the trunk is not big
35 enough to hold up all the branches, such as pandemic flu, preparedness, homeland security, crisis
36 intervention things, transportation from unsafe schools, just to mention a few of the things that have
37 been attached to this program that the \$100 million is not going to fund in any way, shape or form.

38 So I think that, if we could narrow down the scope of Safe and Drug Free and
39 Alcohol Free Schools, we would be more in line with the original intent of the legislation from the
40 1980s, and help us with the delivery system; because in 1980s the original delivery system was that
41 all kids are at risk, and all kids are still at risk, and that we needed to do something about that, and
42 that, to me, it is not an either/or, but it is a both/and.

43 We need to have a base for every -- so that every child has a chance to get some
44 prevention activity, but that base could be enhanced in a number of ways through additional funding
45 or through this funding, but it is not -- It shouldn't be a competition between this school gets a whole

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealgross.com

1 bunch, and most of these schools get nothing, but something that there is a base and that can be built
2 on through -- whether it is through local funding or match or through money from other departments
3 or from a universal community-wide application that goes to a lot of different departments. There's
4 just a lot of different -- or a range of funding options. It's just a lot of different ways you
5 could do that, but if you don't have that base, you have no way for that school to be part of the
6 community that they need to be part of.

7 MS. PRICE: I think it is important, because the overall legislation that addresses
8 my office is for the Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools, of which a piece of that is the state
9 formula grants program that has a very similar name, State Safe and Drug Free Schools and
10 Community State Grants, that we -- You know, in talking about the two, it is so easy to use the term
11 and not know which of the two you are talking about.

12 Are you talking about both? Are you talking just about state grants? I could not
13 disagree more that focusing in the entirety of the office strictly on drugs and alcohol, I think, is
14 narrowing it down so much that we are missing massive need that, in the long run, gets into drugs
15 and alcohol.

16 So I just would -- The Safe Schools, Healthy Students is part of my office. I
17 mean, it is not separate from Safe and Drug Free Schools. It happens to be a discretionary grant
18 program, and many of the discretionary grant programs that we have are focused on specific aspects
19 of safe and drug free, and drug free includes alcohol, you know, mentoring, character education,
20 Safe Schools, Healthy Students, multiple programs.

21 Depending on the year, we can have between 13 and 19, depending on what
22 Congress gives us dollars for.

23 So I really caution us to be clear in what we are talking about so that we don't --
24 You know, are we talking about the overall program or are we talking about the state grants
25 program?

26 Even in the state grants program, it is -- you know, there is a stipulation in the
27 state grants program that says, in order for an LEA to receive these dollars, they have to have a crisis
28 plan in place. They have to address the issue of safety in the school.

29 At the younger age -- I think Shep was stating this a little bit, that in the younger
30 years in school, it is those issues about students feeling safe and secure and those issues being
31 addressed that is a preventive for the drugs and alcohol at the later years.

32 So pulling drugs and alcohol out exclusively, I think, is shortsighted in addressing
33 the issue. I know that the issue of pandemic is getting a lot of play these days, but it really is a piece
34 that we ask people as they are developing their crisis plan, make sure that you are addressing that,
35 and not to get just into pandemic, but a pandemic will happen. They happen every 10 to 40 years. It
36 will happen. The magnitude of it, we have no idea what it would be.

37 Should you be prepared for it? Probably so.

38 MS. TAFT: But should that money come out of here or should it come out of
39 Health and Human Services?

40 MS. PRICE: We are schools. I can honestly say -- and this will be my
41 experience in my office. They no more have any idea how a school functions than the man in the
42 moon. I cannot tell you, not just in this idea, but I cannot tell you how many times they come over
43 and say we are going to do this; we are going to have this program, and we are going to do this, and
44 this is what we are going to have schools do. And we say, schools don't work that way.

45 They do not know the community they are working in. We have had that with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealgross.com

1 Homeland Security. We have had that with the EPA. We have had that with Department of Health
2 and Human Services. I cannot tell you, schools are a unique environment in and of themselves.

3 The other thing I will caution you is every time there is something, a need -- I
4 mean, I'll pick on the EPA -- or I'll pick on Transportation right now, because the National Highway
5 Safety Transportation Board mandated in law that they must work with Education in developing a
6 driver's education program.

7 Well, schools don't have driver's education programs. So now we have been
8 asked to draw ourselves into that, to investor -- because we are mandated by Congress to do that.
9 We have no role in that.

10 So what we can say to them is, you know, we would be happy to get that
11 information out to schools for you; we can help you in our understanding of how students learn, but
12 you know, one way of keeping things within the Department is protecting schools from having to do
13 every ding dong thing that people think is a nice thing for schools to do.

14 You all know -- I mean, how many times -- you know, because somebody has a
15 great new idea, well, let's just do it in schools. You know, I think that one of the issues that directly
16 affects us, and in anything, I'm sure, are the emerging needs that are developing as things and
17 circumstances change.

18 In the 1980s there were certain things that we were addressing, and some of those
19 are the same. Some of those have varied in those years, and you have to have good judgment about
20 what emerging needs that you invest your time and dollars on, because some of them are fads, some
21 of them are significant. But you have to be able to address the emerging needs that are occurring so
22 that you are really meeting the needs of students and teachers and parents.

23 So from the standpoint of scope, I think to just educe the overall program down to
24 just drugs and alcohol is too narrow. I think that we can articulate the significance of drugs and
25 alcohol in what we are doing without making it an exclusive program addressing drugs and alcohol.

26 I think, as we have discretionary grant programs that address many subjects as a
27 supplement to this state grants program -- and that's kind of how I look at them, they are
28 supplementary -- drugs and alcohol can be addressed in those same ways as well, to give clear
29 articulate dollars.

30 Anyway, I'm rambling now. I should stop.

31 MR. ELLIS: Maybe it's just me in terms of my regimented personality, but I feel
32 obligated to bring us back to my original point when we started this morning, was that the
33 committee, at least in my opinion, is charged with answering some very specific questions.

34 I realize we have had some great discussion, and I think that we are coming up
35 with -- we are developing answers to some of these questions, but some of them, we have not. We
36 haven't addressed. Are we going to ignore them?

37 My feeling is that we owe the Secretary a response to every one of the questions
38 she asked us about. Unless we make some progress on that, we are not going to get far through this
39 matrix, which again I think is an important obligation of this committee.

40 I would echo Deborah's comment about how much we want, for instance,
41 Homeland Security being the only Federal entity dealing with issues such as emergency
42 management at the school level -- refer to the FEMA document and many of the DHS
43 recommendations for schools.

44 Just one that comes to mind is that all schools should be equipping their exterior
45 window glass with films of bomb resistant coating at a cost of \$20-\$60 a square foot. I'll tell you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 that we have over 25 million square feet. That is more than four Pentagons. So unless they are
2 going to come up with that money, it ain't going to happen, and I even question the absurdity of it.

3 So anyway, I think the Department of Ed. does speak well for schools, because
4 they know schools. They know SEAs. They know LEAs. So I think that is an important piece to
5 keep in mind.

6 So anyway, my point is, unless I am the only one that feels this way, I really feel
7 obligated that we should be answering some of these specific questions, and again I think we've got
8 a good start on some of them.

9 MS. PRICE: Let me just complement. We have no option other than to answer --
10 We can't pick and choose from the questions. These are the questions the Secretary asked us to
11 answer.

12 I was mentioning to Dave during the break, I think a lot of these answers are the
13 kind of finding things and then, therefore, the recommendations come at the conclusion sort of
14 answering them. But we do need to provide some response to the questions -- each of the questions
15 that we have been asked.

16 It is not the maximum of what the report will have. It is the minimum of what the
17 report will have.

18 CHAIRMAN LONG: Now I am confused here now, because I'll be honest with
19 you. We can answer these questions, and many of the things we have talked about up there -- I
20 thought that is what the discussion was about.

21 If it isn't, we can sure answer these in about three minutes. What I am saying is, I
22 think that the important part of this is to get recommendations down, and I think you've got the
23 bullets, the backbone of them, up there.

24 Two things. One, we can go back through and do that, Debbie, if that is what you
25 would like, and we can do that very quickly. But to me, this is really the important part with the
26 recommendations, and I am guessing about 80 to 90 percent of the answers are on those -- I think
27 that is what Fred was getting to, too - right there and up on those bullets.

28 The other part of this is that, with all three of these areas, not just with the one we
29 are on now with state grants, we aren't going to get all the recommendations down. That's the
30 attempt to put the bullets up so Bill can then come up with the recommendation, so that when we
31 have our conference call, that then we can start to hash these out. So this is to put the meat on some
32 potential recommendations.

33 I didn't frame that previously.

34 MR. LEDBETTER: I asked David right before we broke if we could just poll the
35 committee to see how we feel about the state grants money leaving it where every LEA gets some
36 versus a grants program within the State Grants Program where you would have to apply for that
37 money and submit a proposal.

38 I would just like to see -- I mean, we have talked around it and around it. I would
39 like to see where our feelings are with that so that we could move on past that.

40 DR. HINGSON: I think that this is a difficult question in the sense that it sort of
41 draws values into conflict. On the one hand, everybody wants everyone to have an opportunity. On
42 the other hand, we don't want to create sort of an entitlement where money just gets frittered away.

43 So I think the challenge here is for us to figure out a way that people -- that
44 everyone can have an initial opportunity to have access and can have repeated opportunity to have
45 access, but at the same time we don't just let it be there's a certain percentage of money or a certain

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 amount of money that is funneled to every school district automatically. That is, I think, the
2 challenges in front of us.

3 MR. HERRMANN: One of the things I wanted to bring up, because trust me,
4 I've been giving this a lot of thought, and I think one of the things that we talked about earlier was
5 low hanging fruit, and we talked about things that, really, universally every school district should be
6 doing.

7 Part of -- I think, when we think about structuring the grants, in my mind there are
8 some fundamental things that every school district ought to be doing, particularly as it relates to the
9 whole issue of planning for safety and being involved with community groups. In my mind, that is a
10 foundation thing.

11 If a school is willing to do those things, does those things well, then I think they
12 should receive funding. I think the issue is we have not held people accountable, and I think it is at
13 the local level. It is at the state level. It is at the national level. We have simply not followed
14 through on, really, what is already in the legislation.

15 So I think there is that piece of it, but then I think beyond that, some districts are
16 not going to be willing to go beyond that. They are not going to be willing to invest the energy that
17 it takes to do anything more than that, and I think that is where another level of funding ought to be
18 in place; because we do have communities that are doing tremendous things with very small
19 amounts of money, and I think we need to be very cautious that we don't lose the opportunity to
20 support those programs.

21 So I guess kind of what I am suggesting is that we look at kind of a two-phased
22 model, neither of which would be entitlements, because I think at any level there should be
23 expectations about who gets the dollars and things that have to be done to get the dollars.

24 So I think, you know, as opposed to a straight yes or no, I wanted to throw out
25 some more kind of structural ideas, because I think that is important.

26 I think the other structural piece is you've really got to consider the State Grants
27 Program in the context of the larger Safe and Drug Free Schools Program and the national grants
28 piece, and really look at what are you trying to do with each pot of money, because if you don't do
29 that, you are missing the boat, and I just think we've got to do that.

30 MS. PRICE: Just let me jump in and add one more element to that, that we
31 haven't really touched on, but is something that I think needs to be viewed.

32 Currently, the State Grants Program is divided into two pots of money. Twenty
33 percent goes to the Governor for their use; eighty percent goes -- divided to the LEAs.

34 You know, if you make a recommendation to still have something where the
35 dollars are going to the LEA in some form or fashion, do you want to keep that 20 percent to the
36 Governors? Do you want that possibly for state activities?

37 So we have not mentioned those dollar breakdowns, but if we talk about
38 similarity in the current program, that is an element and should be brought into the mix.

39 CHAIRMAN LONG: If we could start down that line, because we can answer
40 some of these questions. So let's start with that one. With the State Grants Program currently, 20
41 percent and 80 percent, anyone wish -- How many wish to -- and I am going to ask on these, because
42 we do have to -- If we are going to -- and I want to ask you, Debbie, do you want us to answer all
43 these questions. We can do that, but I'm going to make it --

44 MS. PRICE: I should say, in our dialogue we have answered many of them.

45 CHAIRMAN LONG: Right. Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 MS. PRICE: But what I was trying to say is that, yes, we do have to answer these
2 questions.

3 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. We will do that for you right now.

4 Twenty percent, 80 percent -- how many wish it to -- No, no. I've said let's just
5 start with that, since Debbie asked that question. This is the model.

6 So how many wish to have it stay 20/80, if that is the only question? I want to see
7 your hands. Twenty/eighty, stay the same?

8 DR. KEYS: I think it is hard to vote on that until we know what it is we want to
9 fund. I mean, are we talking about the funds going to local communities? Are we talking about the
10 funds going through the states to local communities? I mean, we haven't answered Mike's question
11 first to know how we want the money then divided.

12 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry. I was using that as an example of how we are
13 going to do it. Then I will take that example off.

14 DR. KEYS: Okay. I'm sorry.

15 CHAIRMAN LONG: That is why I characterized it that way, yes.

16 MS. JACKSON: And, David, one other piece. If we use that as more than just an
17 example, explaining what the 20 percent at the Governor's level, would actually -- would the scope
18 of that particular funding change to provide something different than what it currently -- how it is
19 currently being administered, disseminated?

20 CHAIRMAN LONG: That was a poor example of using.

21 MS. PRICE: But it is one of the questions. It is the second question on the
22 second page.

23 CHAIRMAN LONG: To answer the question, I am going to start and then,
24 Debbie, I am going to need your suggestions here. If we start right at the top on the first page, what
25 are the strengths of Safe and Drug Free Schools -- excuse me, the State Grants Program. Is there
26 anything -- addition there that is needed? I am talking about just specifically to answer these
27 questions, because then I want to get back to the recommendations, because there is quite a bit there.

28 If the committee has anything, just jump right in.

29 MR. ELLIS: Frankly, I don't think much of the stuff in the right-hand column
30 actually answers the question. What are the strengths of the program? We heard from panelists that
31 talked about the collaboration that the programs -- that these grants provide, the leveraging of those,
32 infrastructure.

33 All those kinds of things, I think, should be included as findings and, like you say,
34 Dave, I think we've got some recommendations up there, and I would suggest that these first two
35 questions are, in fact, one and the same.

36 CHAIRMAN LONG: I want to be clear that in asking now are there other things
37 that should go in here. My concern as we sit here is, if we now -- We have been doing this for an
38 hour and a half, and if we now are going to answer each one of these and spend another hour and a
39 half to two and a half on those -- So I am going to need some help here as to how much time we
40 spend on these, so as we go through these how much can be derived from what we have already
41 talked about and how much needs to be added.

42 I see a lot of heads shaking that I think we would agree that there has been very
43 good discussion and that a lot of the answers are in here.

44 I hate to lay this on you, Bill, but with many of the things that are here -- and I
45 was just listening to what Fred was saying -- can be derived from some of the things that we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 talked about from the minutes. But I would also like to give any committee member an opportunity
2 on any of these to say hold it, I think we need to make sure that that is in there to answer the question
3 for the Secretary. Does that make sense?

4 So having said that and what said Fred -- what Fred said -- excuse me, just
5 renamed you, Fred -- and the additions -- and, Bill, if you would also jump in and say I hear what
6 you are saying, but on some of these as we go through and say I'm not sure I have enough, I need
7 some more direction. So you jump right in also.

8 So having said that, can you put number one together or do you need to hear
9 more? Okay.

10 On the second one, the elements of the State Grants Program that are working,
11 addressing the needs of students and schools today. Now I see that's a blank.

12 MS. TAFT: Well, in the testimony we heard from General Dean, he had answers
13 to all these questions that I don't see anywhere. One of the ones that he commented on in that area is
14 that the principles of effectiveness, the core data system, the things that are outlined in the law give
15 the schools a -- are elements that are working, if the schools go by them.

16 So I think we -- You know, there is information in our testimony that we received
17 in the past that could fill that in.

18 CHAIRMAN LONG: Did you make the comment for all of them or did you
19 mean for that one and the next one? I wasn't clear on that.

20 MS. TAFT: Well, he went right down the list of questions and answered each of
21 them. So there is information for all of them, but I pulled out a few things in specific that we can
22 mention as we go down.

23 MS. JACKSON: And I just wanted to agree with Hope, that I believe that it is
24 already written in the legislation. On the principles of effectiveness, the activities that are there, I
25 think it is all there, and it answers all of those questions. So I would say yes.

26 CHAIRMAN LONG: Next --

27 MS. DUNCAN: Dr. Long, let me just -- The reason we didn't include a particular
28 person's testimony in the recommendations is that they are not a member of the committee. This has
29 to be the answers from the committee. So if there is something someone said in testimony, that
30 needs to be repeated by this group or it won't go in.

31 CHAIRMAN LONG: Good point.

32 MR. DUNCAN: So if we like something -- I shouldn't say we. If you like
33 something that someone said, it needs to -- You need to say it. Then it will be included, but
34 otherwise it wouldn't be. And of course, everyone has to agree.

35 CHAIRMAN LONG: Right. Hope, hearing that, do you want to read?

36 MS. TAFT: Well, some of them are things that we mentioned in the first
37 question.

38 DR. JONES: Just a question. So who are these from? I need a context, please. I
39 think it is moving us along, but I just need a context.

40 MS. PRICE: Well, they are from General Dean, who is the head, president or
41 CEO -- I forget his exact title -- of CADCA, which is a coalition, Community Anti-Drug Coalition
42 of America, CADCA, which is an outstanding group and, you know, we do have the transcript over
43 here that you can look through.

44 Nothing against General Dean -- I think he is a fabulous person, and I am very
45 supportive of CADCA -- but to just blanketly take somebody else's answers, I don't think is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 appropriate.

2 So you know, I think pulling out those pieces of the answers that you think are
3 significant and apply, I agree that is appropriate, yes.

4 MS. TAFT: He just happened to be the only one that answered all the questions
5 in a logical, laid out order. That is why, when I was going through my past information over the
6 weekend, that is what I pulled out because I thought, oh, yeah, this is what we are needing and where
7 the gaps are.

8 CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes, Shep?

9 DR. KELLAM: The question is how to proceed, and I think that we are doing a
10 little bit what we did with the money a few minutes ago, until Dave caught us up when we were
11 talking about ten cents per kid is enough or what do we think about money.

12 If you looked at these questions and you said, currently as implemented what are
13 the strengths, the only strength, I think, that we all agree about is that a beginning has been made in
14 addressing a problem, and that if we don't go much further to elaborating how to do it right, we are
15 going to be continuing to flunk; and just the initial groundbreaking -- we ain't there, by any stretch of
16 the imagination.

17 I want to change the question a little bit, I guess, which of course, is illegal. I
18 want to say that, in fact, there ain't no strengths if we don't go any further than where we have got;
19 and I would say that is true for the first three questions, and the difficulties in determining
20 effectiveness, a lot of what we said about accountability, data driven, you know, setting goals and so
21 forth -- all of that, in fact is up there on the board in terms of what we have been saying.

22 So I guess what I am proposing is that we say very pointedly that Stage 1 is
23 groundbreaking, but is a failure in terms of if we don't go further, and what we want to do is go
24 further, not just get rid of it.

25 That brings us down to measuring effectiveness. I think we have answered that
26 very beautifully. I was surprised and pleased at the degree to which we have come to understand
27 that we could be data driven in regard to policy and program.

28 The mechanisms that we proposed, I think we have addressed. There are -- All
29 those issues on the white board have addressed them.

30 Are there emerging issues? Yes. Schools are overburdened. We have talked
31 about the fact that you can't put everything as a dumping ground on the school, but on the other
32 hand, school is the place where children either succeed or don't and, therefore, we have to integrate
33 strengths around schooling as a way of understanding what the next stage would look like.

34 You can't have child psychiatry, which I know intimately about, people trained in
35 child psychiatry have never been a classroom. That is a bad idea.

36 So the integrating of child welfare, public health, mental health, with schooling
37 with the idea of aiding and supplementing and responding to coherent, integrated programs is a good
38 thing. And I think we have talked about that.

39 So I mean, I think we have done pretty well as long as we -- Well, I don't know. I
40 guess that's what I think.

41 CHAIRMAN LONG: Keep going, Shep.

42 DR. KELLAM: Well, I am on the next page. You know, what we have talked
43 about in terms of focus on safety: We've had a heck of a lot, including a site visit that really talks
44 about safety. I don't think that we -- Maybe we haven't really picked up the single elements.

45 Violence is, in fact, a product of a developmental trajectory that starts with failing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 and continues to elaborate as a consequence of failing. Again, the issue is how to get the academic
2 performance up and the behavior appropriate.

3 We had said that drug abuse -- reducing drug abuse and alcohol and the like
4 improves academic achievement. It is also the case developmentally that poor academic
5 achievement in the first few days of schooling sets a track that leads toward drug abuse and violence.
6 Kids who fail don't feel good, and they don't behave right, and there are huge gender differences
7 again.

8 So there is, in fact, something we can say about these are intimately related to
9 each other. The problems of violence and safety in schools is a problem that is intimately involved
10 with a whole set of issues that kids experience in success and failure in the context of broader issues
11 like poverty and the child welfare issues, racism and so forth.

12 So I think that, in a sense, we have touched on these things. I don't know what
13 Bill thinks about all this that we have done.

14 The State Grants Program: We have talked about needing to bring the State
15 Grants Program and the local areas and the Federal program into a partnership, a set of partnerships,
16 interrelated.

17 That's up there, and that we think that that is intimately or importantly related to
18 kids' progress, and we have examples in Safe Schools, Healthy Students where we have gone cross-
19 departmentally and, in fact, we need to follow up and pursue that strategy, because at the local level,
20 that really required partnerships and indeed evaluation.

21 The one partnership, by the way, we have not addressed is a very important one,
22 and that is the partnership between the research groups and the public institutions. It is the
23 case, we still train people to do research who have never been in a school or who go into school
24 under very special circumstances and really don't understand, let alone schooling, but even public
25 health agencies or child welfare agencies.

26 Our research has been too removed from the missions of these public institutions,
27 and the collaboration between research groups and the institutions we are talking about, particularly
28 in schooling, is a fundamentally new structure for science, which shouldn't get off scot free. It is too
29 free floating in space and needs to be anchored in the missions of public institutions. That is indeed
30 a very important issue, and we have not discussed that, I think, sufficiently.

31 I don't know. I mean, I feel embarrassed.

32 CHAIRMAN LONG: I will just -- I want people to get involved and keep talking
33 here, but the balance between flexibility and accountability contained in the statute working? The
34 way that question is being asked -- I am not trying to be facetious here -- no.

35 DR. KELLAM: Well, the issue that Ralph addressed interestingly this morning --
36 I haven't sat in the committee with Ralph for a few years, but the fact of the matter is that the data
37 that drives policy and program tells you where the hot spots are and the problems are and directs
38 your attention there, and then sets goals for how you know if things got better.

39 That integration of data for policy and program and accountability having goals
40 that you can measure is something we have discussed, and I think is very important.

41 CHAIRMAN LONG: And that is the part that -- and we did not talk, but that --
42 and I'm talking with you, Bill. It is no, and the reason -- The part that could make it better was just
43 mentioned.

44 MR. LED BETTER: Could we back up a second? The state grants -- The
45 breakdown of the state grants, the 80/20 breakdown -- can we discuss that for just a second, because

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 this 20 percent that goes to the Governor -- I'm just one member of the committee, but I'm opposed
2 to that.

3 The reason I am opposed to it is because sometimes that can become political
4 money. I don't see that from the money that comes from the state departments of education, but
5 since the inception of this program I don't personally know of anyone who received the state grants
6 money, that 20 percent, that their school -- that that money would come down to a school.

7 Now I know that some of that money goes to civic organizations and so forth that
8 are working in that area, but as far as the money actually coming to the school, I don't see it in my
9 state. It just doesn't happen, and I think that the intent of the law is schools. It is not necessarily
10 community groups.

11 I agree, we need to have these partnerships and so forth with the community
12 groups, but I can only speak from my perception of how that money is handled within my own
13 personal state. So with that said, I know that -- and I'm not trying to create controversy with that, but
14 I just don't believe that that money, that 20 percent -- I think it should all be lumped into the state
15 money with the state grants, because all the way through this whole report we keep going back and
16 forth to the fact that there is not enough money, and then we are cutting 20 percent out right off of
17 the top.

18 CHAIRMAN LONG: But if we could stay to that point just for a second so we
19 can get an answer to that. So if the comments could stay to that point.

20 MR. HERRMANN: I think you bring up a great point, and what I will say about
21 that is I think any program that is 20 years old, part of the challenge is you've got to trim off the dead
22 weight.

23 When a program gets 20 years old, you start to have funding that is kind of
24 institutionalized, and people get the money because they have always got the money.

25 I think, by changing the funding formula that we are talking about, I think you
26 have an opportunity to trim that dead weight. Part of what I was talking about in terms of trying to
27 look at sort of a two-tier thing would be kind of a replacement of the SEA Governors sort of process
28 to where potentially all of those funds could go to the SEA as opposed to the Governor's share or
29 some other mechanism within the state that ensures that you've got a more data driven decision
30 being made about how the funds are being used.

31 I think it is important that the Chief Executive continue to play a role, if for no
32 other reason than to ensure that -- The reason the Governors funds are in there is to try and ensure
33 that there is cooperation across state departments, and the original intent of the Governors funds was
34 to serve students that are not served through -- normally served through school based programs. I
35 mean, that is what is in the legislative intent.

36 So I think there needs to be a mechanism to ensure that that coordination occurs at
37 the state level, but mandating 20 percent funds to the Governor's office may not be the best way to
38 do that.

39 In Tennessee, you know, that 20 percent is actually administered by the
40 Department of Education anyway. So I mean, the Governor has the authority to determine where
41 that money goes, but personally I wouldn't object to that being changed.

42 MS. DUDE: I guess I don't feel like we have enough information to make that
43 decision, because I don't think we know how that 20 percent is spent in the various states. So I feel a
44 little uncomfortable jumping to the conclusion that it is not used correctly.

45 I believe in my state often the money is used to do statewide data collection, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 so if that money wasn't there, I'm not sure that would happen. I'm pretty sure -- and, Peggy, you
2 probably remember from your days in Missouri that -- It went to the Missouri Division of Alcohol
3 and Drug Abuse, and I feel pretty confident it is used for minimally data collection.

4 So I don't feel like I have enough information to vote on whether or not I think it
5 should be a 20/80, because we have learned a little bit from all of our panels about what that 80 goes
6 to, but I don't think any of us have been informed on what that 20 percent. goes to. So I feel a little
7 uncomfortable making that decision.

8 DR. JONES: Yes. You know what, that was my issue exactly. The monitoring
9 of what happens to that money is a more initial question, because I am not sure what happens with it.

10 MS. TAFT: I can tell you what happens in Ohio. From there, it goes to
11 community treatment programs almost that send people into the schools to help kids that are in
12 special needs. So it is add-on money to those areas that we have been talking about of how to
13 increase funding to special populations.

14 The two are kind of tied together in the discussion with question number four,
15 which is what are the difficulties of determining the effectiveness of the program. A lot of that, to
16 me, is -- from what the people in Ohio are telling me, is that there is really -- The guidelines aren't
17 clear enough from levels above them on what are really effective prevention strategies and what they
18 really should be doing with their money.

19 So somehow another, we need to encourage the Federal level and then the state
20 level to give the local level some clearer guidelines on what are bona fide, effective strategies,
21 prevention strategies.

22 CHAIRMAN LONG: Would it be appropriate to -- Hearing different comments,
23 would it be appropriate to plug it into some of the things we have already discussed and ask that the
24 money -- Now we are talking about the 20/80 -- that there also be access thresholds with that, and
25 that it be data driven, and evaluated so that -- And then if it doesn't work out -- but that could be the
26 recommendation. That way, 100 percent is going to be held accountable.

27 Then I think that might -- because I hear your comments, and I also hear
28 Tommy's. I think that might be the way to solve that.

29 MS. TAFT: And going back to Mike's comment, if you don't have that base with
30 outlined things for the schools to do, how are they going to get the data? We keep talking about data
31 and wanting them to get data and everything they do has to be based on data, but if you don't get
32 them any money to collect the data, they are not going to be able to get into the system at all.

33 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry?

34 MS. JACKSON: I just wanted to say, are we making an assumption that the
35 evaluated piece is not place for the Governors funds? Are we making a blanket statement? I'm like
36 Kim. I don't have enough information.

37 CHAIRMAN LONG: I would never say that.

38 MS. JACKSON: Okay. That's why I wanted to ask that question, because again
39 how do we know that is not already in place for many of our -- for our Governors funds, that they
40 are not already evaluating the best use of it, because I have heard different individuals say how those
41 funds are used.

42 I know in my state some of it is used for data collection, but I also know there is a
43 Governor's grants program where they disseminate some of the monies out to the LEAs or out to
44 communities with LEAs partnering with other community groups.

45 So again, I think maybe there might already be some of those.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN LONG: Therein was my point. I think, if we as school people are
2 going to be held accountable and it is going to be data driven, it's going to have access thresholds, I
3 don't think there is anything wrong, since we don't know, because as we sit here, we talked about the
4 varying states. They would all be different, a little different.

5 So if we have a common thread here that it be data driven, there be evaluation and
6 have access thresholds, I don't think there is anything wrong with that. Governors should be held to
7 the same accountability level, quite frankly, that the schools should.

8 MS. PRICE: And in all honesty, they actually are held slightly to a higher
9 accountability, because where the 80 percent of the dollars that go to the LEAs, they are required to
10 be using effective programs that they are implementing with those dollars. They can receive a
11 waiver from the Governor, allowing them to use a program.

12 So, say in a little town they have managed to develop some program that just
13 really works for them, but it is not a scientifically based program but it does work for them. They
14 can continue to use that program, because they get a waiver from the Governor to allow them to use
15 it.

16 That is not an option in the Governor's pot of money, although he has a variety of
17 ways -- he or she has a variety of ways they can use that.

18 As Montean mentioned, they can do their own grant program, and a lot of times
19 those will go out to community based organizations similar to what Hope was saying, and they
20 provide services to schools or they can go to an agency within the state government, but they are
21 held responsible to be using those dollars for proven, scientifically based programs. They do not
22 have the waiver option.

23 We do monitor them, just as we monitor the LEAs. You know, we go out and we
24 monitor the State Grants Program. We monitor it from the state level, look at the Governor's office,
25 look at the SEA, and then have -- because we don't have the ability to go to every LEA. There's too
26 many.

27 You know, there's always some governors that do it better, some governors that
28 the same old/same old programs get the dollars ever year kind of blanket. So there is some
29 accountability. But as you were looking at some of the -- I see here some of the thoughts you are
30 having about how can the program be better, and there have been a variety of ways that we have
31 touched on that, that in each one, you know, dollars going to an SEA.

32 There is a need, I think, a significant need, for -- you could refer to it as state
33 activities dollars, dollars for training, dollars for whatever, that could be identified in that pot. So it
34 could be restructured so that you are giving those dollars rather than for them to do the grants to
35 different things. So that's a thought as you are developing your thoughts.

36 MS. TAFT: Debbie, what you just said triggered a thought in me, is that now the
37 administrative costs are very small. Is there any way that we could increase the percentage of the
38 administrative costs and suggest or require, whatever you do, that the states do some of those things
39 that some states are doing but other states don't feel like they have enough money for?

40 MS. PRICE: And just -- Even though I know that some of you aren't particularly
41 fond of the President's proposal, that is what was proposed. That \$100 million is for state activities,
42 not dollars going down to the LEA but to use for data collection for a variety of state activities,
43 including potentially providing dollars to those school districts that have been found to be
44 persistently dangerous, to help them meet those needs, but it would be state activity dollars is what
45 that was designed for, you know, and articulating what those activities are, kind of a next step.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN LONG: Mike, were you going to say something? I didn't want to -

2 -
3 MR. HERRMANN: Yes. I guess, you know, again we've got this challenge
4 between structural issues within the legislation, so to speak, and really administrative issues, I think,
5 in terms of -- There's a lot of stuff in the existing law that addresses a lot of these issues, and it gets
6 to be a question of will at the Federal and state level to follow through and hold people accountable
7 to these things.

8 So I think it is important to at least include some sort of a statement about the
9 administrative side of it so that we don't lose sight of that. I think that your statement, Mr.
10 Chairman, about the funding is sort of a piece of that, but beyond structural changes, I think we've
11 got to sort of get to the commitment level of the Federal government and states to push these
12 changes.

13 CHAIRMAN LONG: I am not sure where we are with the 80/20. In closing this
14 one out so we can move on to the last two questions and get right back to these on the
15 recommendations, I hear what everyone is saying. I still think it would always be nice for the
16 community at large out there to hear that everyone is being held to the same standards.

17 I hear what is being said about it, but I think Governors should be held to the
18 same standards as elementary schools and districts. That would be put in maybe just that way, but I
19 think the message -- and I heard you saying that right there, Mike, that the message and the things
20 that we say will also be important. I mean how we say it, so that people receive it out there.

21 So for right now, Bill, if we could leave that in there, because remembering -- and
22 I say for right now, because all of this, as I had indicated earlier, will be put in recommendations,
23 will be coming out to you so that we can react together. Many times it looks different when it is in
24 black and white.

25 I'm sorry.

26 DR. HINGSON: Yes. I have a comment that really is just a nuance on what you
27 just said, but I think it is quite important. You used the term that the Governors should be held to the
28 same standards as the schools.

29 I think that there need to be clear standards and that Governors need to be held to
30 the standards for the Governors, that the schools need to be held to standards for the schools, and
31 one of the things we haven't discussed yet, but I think we should, is do we want to have different
32 standards for different types of schools and school systems.

33 So, for example, should we be expecting the same kinds of changes and
34 performances and standards from rural schools where there are small numbers of students as we do
35 from large urban school systems?

36 I think, to me, the answer is probably we need to set a different set of standards,
37 but the important thing is that they are clear from the outset, so that people know what performance
38 they have to achieve in order to receive their funding.

39 CHAIRMAN LONG: Good point. Maybe for the same, as we started, and I
40 mean this sincerely because the words we put in will be very important, to say clear standards, and
41 that leaves the door open to come back and then insert definitions later. Good point.

42 The last two questions that are relative to the State Grants Program on page 3:
43 Could state and local flexibility be balanced with additional core requirements that would encourage
44 LEAs to address specific issues?

45 Quite frankly, we have talked about -- I'm asking you -- have talked about quite a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 few of those, and it gets over into what we have discussed to some length with varying levels of
2 partnerships. Anything else on that?

3 The last: How can the tension between the principles of effectiveness provisions
4 that require that funds be spent on research based activities and a broad list of authorized activities,
5 many of which lack a strong research base, be resolved?

6 For right now, we have a blank on the right of that one.

7 DR. KELLAM: Yes, and that is a -- It is a fundamental conundrum in the
8 prevention science field. There are many studies now and a whole field of prevention science and
9 randomized trials and partnerships with school districts and so forth.

10 The real problem the prevention field faces is how do you replicate and
11 disseminate programs effectively across school districts and communities? It is an area of study, but
12 it underlines the vital importance of understanding how research groups that develop programs and
13 test them in exquisite, rigorous trials and the like -- how do they relate to school districts to move
14 them out?

15 In Baltimore, for example, a current trial moving from 12 schools to 113 -- how
16 do you do it in another school district altogether separate?

17 Those problems require research and school district and community partnerships
18 of a far more extensive sort than we have had, in addition to which there really is not a funding
19 institution that brings NIDA and the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention into one place.

20 There are partnerships beginning to form, but we don't have the institutional
21 structure at the Federal level for funding that kind of rollout, and to expect, for example, a school
22 district to implement an effective program like Gil Botvin's, for example, you know, social skills
23 training and the like, in middle school. That program, to be done effectively, would require an
24 ongoing partnership at this point with the researchers, and we just don't know how to do that
25 extensively.

26 We have programs like David Olds' program in prenatal care, the home visitation
27 and so forth. Those programs also require fidelity.

28 So we have to recognize here that we need some structuring of research funding
29 that is tied to policy and program in a way that we have not done before. In fact, the bug in that
30 ointment is that most of us were trained by NIH or Department of Ed. research money, and those
31 institutions are not in this business.

32 The Federal government has tried periodically with ADAMHA and the like and
33 SAMHSA, but generally speaking it is the researchers who have shied away from getting too close.
34 So there has been this continuing struggle over the separation of the research groups from the public
35 institutions.

36 I think we need to come down strong that this partnership is vitally important, that
37 we need to have ongoing ways of monitoring fidelity and, not only monitoring but also mentoring, to
38 maintain at multiple levels of a school district a teacher's confidence in classroom behavior
39 management, to use our own experience. At the same time the principal is buying in, and the school
40 district is buying it at multiple levels, and the school board understands.

41 That is really a major for us here that we are going to have to deal with across the
42 board, certainly in the programs that we are talking about now. There is a frontier that we all share,
43 and that's it. If it works, what the hell do you do?

44 MR. HERRMANN: In terms of the specific questionnaire thing that we do, and I
45 think it is a simple answer, is to say that the principles of effectiveness trumps the list of authorized

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 activities. You know, they are on the authorized list, but above and beyond that, you have to
2 demonstrate that they address the principles of effectiveness.

3 So I think that is kind of the short answer to that particular issue.

4 MS. KELLAM: I buy that. I think that is a fundamental first step.

5 CHAIRMAN LONG: Susan?

6 DR. KEYS: I have one question, and that is how we are defining safe. I just want
7 to make sure that we are all clear that that is the definition we want.

8 The definition of safe for purposes of the grant program should be interpersonal
9 safety, and that, to me, suggests my safety and my interactions with others. There is also personal
10 safety that isn't necessarily interpersonal, and there is safety in terms of the environment. There is
11 safety in terms of my own decision making about my use or not use of substances, as well as my
12 physical safety, as well as being safe in my interactions with others.

13 So I don't know. We had discussed that previously, and I just want to make sure
14 we are not looking at safety too narrowly.

15 CHAIRMAN LONG: That's a good point. If we could stay to that point, other
16 comments relative to Susan's comments? I think you are right on the button. You are exactly right.

17
18 MS. JACKSON: David, I was just going to say she is on page 2, and I guess it is
19 the third bullet down. So we are just talking about expanding that third bullet. Is that correct,
20 Susan?

21 DR. KEYS: Well, I just want to make sure, if we are going to define safety -- I
22 just wanted to make sure that that is how we wanted to define it. I'm not sure we want to narrow the
23 scope of the program in that way. I would suggest that we define it as personal and interpersonal
24 safety.

25 MS. PRICE: It is interesting, because when we had the White House Conference
26 on School Safety after the three shootings, obviously, we planned that conference in six or seven
27 days, which is an expedited process, to say the least. But over and over again, the term that came out
28 as we were developing the conference and in the conference were that, in order for students to learn,
29 they need to be safe, secure and healthy.

30 So that can address the drugs, alcohol issue and the healthy as well as -- you
31 know, healthy to come to school, but safe and secure seemed similar. But when you really thought
32 through the two ones, it was sort of interpersonal and personal or interpersonal and -- what was the
33 term here? It's personal safety.

34 So it is the environment as well as the child feeling that, you know, I can go to
35 school and feel safe, as well as the environment being safe. I thought that that encompassed -- That
36 really grasped it.

37 MR. ELLIS: I would just throw out the terms that we like to use once again. I
38 talked briefly about this when we did the site visit, was the terms safe, having to do with
39 unintentional harm issues, security having to do with intentional harm issues.

40 That, for us, works well. So when we talk about it in this perspective, we would
41 be talking about safe, secure and drug free schools.

42 MS. TAFT: If you did it that way, then you could legitimately be including some
43 school climate issues.

44 MS. PRICE: Absolutely.

45 MS. TAFT: Like bullying and harassments and stuff.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealgross.com

1 MS. PRICE: Climate would be -- Secure would really encompass some of those.
2 They are broad terms, and we are not measuring on those specific terms, but the element -- you get
3 down to the elements of -- that provide that. So you know, bullying, if a school has a bullying issue,
4 and then as you address those bullying issues, those are measurable things that you do.

5 DR. WECHSLER: I'm just getting a little confused. Are we talking about only
6 intentional acts or violence, whether inflicted by others or self-inflicted, or are we also talking about
7 safety which would include things like making sure the school playground does not cause harm?

8 CHAIRMAN LONG: Let's, before we move on, just stay right to that point. That
9 is legitimate.

10 MS. PRICE: Well, just talking from practical of what we deal with, we do not do
11 anything with the structure of the school, like buildings, buildings and facilities. That is a total state
12 and local issue. So playgrounds are total state issues.

13 Now EPA and some other agency may have some elements in which they address
14 that, but our office, Department of Education, doesn't mandate anything about playgrounds. But
15 when you said self-imposed, one of the issues that we have come face to face with in dealing
16 particularly -- and you are all familiar the SERV grant, those grant dollars that we get out after.

17 There have been some school communities that have rashes of suicides, and I
18 mean one student came out of the front door as school was coming out, one of the most popular
19 students in school, and killed himself in front of the students coming out of school. Had a huge
20 impact on the school.

21 So there are some destructive behavior for the individuals that affect the schools,
22 and we address those issues.

23 MR. ELLIS: If I can just maybe push back just a tad, Deborah, maybe you guys
24 don't know you do, but you actually do end up dealing with issues in terms of building and the safety
25 in terms of the way I think of it, in terms of unintentional harm issues.

26 For instance, in the crisis management plans that we require, the Department of
27 Ed. requires, you know, a component of that is -- for instance, give the example of weather safety,
28 tornado drills, fire drills, fire prevention, chemical hygiene.

29 All those kinds of things are unintentional harm issues that are very important for
30 a school in the sense that they do provide a safe environment. Again, for us, it just makes sense for
31 us to divide those into those two terms. It just makes it very clear when we talk about it. It is easy to
32 explain. It is easy, I think, for audiences to understand.

33 So we have safe, secure, drug free schools, and then we have the emergency
34 management component piece.

35 DR. HINGSON: I wanted to come back to the question about the tension
36 between principles of effectiveness and requiring funds be spent on research based activities.

37 It strikes me that, of course, it is unrealistic to expect every school district to be
38 conducting research that is going to identify what are new evidence based activities that can make a
39 difference. I think that there are, and we have discussed this already -- There are minimal standards
40 of data collection that we feel all school systems should -- that all communities and all schools
41 should have to collect certain types of data that meet a certain standard in their collection. But I
42 think that what I would not like to see lost in this discussion is how do we create an environment
43 where new ideas that go above and beyond the already evidence based program list can get
44 identified and piloted and tested and worked through.

45 It may be that what we need to do is to think about establishing some sort of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 ongoing framework or committee between the different agencies that fund this type of research -- I
2 know that NIDA does some, that NIAAA does some, CDC does some, that NIMH does some -- so
3 that schools and people who are actually in the schools can have some opportunity to put forward
4 ideas that the scientists can then help to test.

5 A lot of times the discussion seems to come from, you know, if we could only
6 teach the people in the school systems what the scientists know. Well, it is actually the other way
7 around, and a lot of the -- I have sat on studies or review groups for many years, and a lot of the
8 investigators really don't come from the education community and don't have firsthand -- how shall I
9 put it? -- Have not been in the trenches.

10 So their ideas have a certain kind of intellectual cache to them sometimes, but
11 aren't really grounded in what needs to be done on a day-to-day basis. I think we need to develop a
12 better way of creating this collaboration.

13 Related to this -- and I don't know exactly how to describe it, but when our
14 institute went through an exercise looking at college drinking problems and what could be done
15 about it, and we set of tiers of evidence, and we got good, solid evidence that these types of
16 programs can make a difference with college students.

17 Then there was another set that these kinds of programs work in the general
18 population at the college age, but we don't know if they work necessarily with college students, and
19 we got some things that are promising. Then we had some things that we said, and these things
20 clearly don't work.

21 Then what happened -- this was back in 2002 -- is I think there has been a
22 tremendous increase in activity around preventing college drinking problems, but a phenomenal
23 amount of it has to do with supporting programs where there is no evidence whatsoever that they
24 make any difference, and a lot of times the things where there is some evidence get left by the
25 wayside.

26 So I think that there are some issues here that we need to maybe focus more
27 attention on. I don't know that I've got the solution for it, but I do think developing some sort of
28 ongoing, established working group between the people who actually are in the field, educators in
29 the field so that their ideas can be offered up and be developed into rigorously designed research
30 projects is something that, I think, would be worthwhile.

31 It doesn't have to be a big expense, but I think a mechanism needs to be put into
32 place to allow that to happen.

33 DR. JONES: I like that suggestion very well. I think that ties in very nicely with
34 what Shep is saying and others around the table have said, to a solid recommendation of that
35 working group to really look at some of these issues to tie the research to what folks are actually
36 doing.

37 CHAIRMAN LONG: Which actually could be an outgrowth of what we are
38 talking here about the varying levels, multiplicity of levels. Howell?

39 DR. WECHSLER: I just want to ask Susan if she got her question answered
40 about the definition of safe. I am more confused than ever.

41 DR. KEYS: We have had different answers, and I don't know if we want to go
42 with safe, secure and healthy, if that is agreeable. I am not quite sure what. It appears that
43 interpersonal safety is not -- does not include a sufficient amount of information.

44 CHAIRMAN LONG: If we say self-secure and healthy, is there any -- I'm just
45 trying to set it, because I am hearing that three or four times. Let's just -- then safe, secure and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 healthy.

2 DR. WECHSLER: That is a nice slogan. It doesn't answer anything. Healthy --
3 are we talking about physical activity with these dollars? I mean, what does that mean?

4 DR. KEYS: Safe and secure schools and healthy students?

5 DR. WECHSLER: No, I think we have to say what does safe mean.

6 DR. KEYS: Yes.

7 DR. WECHSLER: You were on the right track. You asked about is it just -- No,
8 clearly, I don't think we think it is just interpersonal. It also involves self-inflicted violence. But
9 then the issue is broader. Safety means a lot more than just violence prevention, whether it is
10 interpersonal or self-inflicted. So that whole gamut of things that are safety or hazards to the safety
11 of our children in schools that are not intentionally inflicted. Do these dollars address that or not?

12 CHAIRMAN LONG: Let's start then -- Thanks for the vision again -- that we get
13 some bullets down so we can start to see and hear the different parts of what you feel should go into
14 the definition.

15 DR. WECHSLER: Yes. I mean, I don't know if we are going to be able to
16 answer that question, and I am wondering if the same kind of proposal that was made before of a
17 working group to talk about how do you actually define it. Yes, I know we have limited time, but
18 again that is a very difficult issue to grapple with.

19 I know that there are 30 to 40 years of research in the area of safety in the
20 behavioral sciences. That is also true in the developmental literature, but individuals define that
21 differently. Depending upon how you define it, it is going to dictate how you study and evaluate it.

22 DR. HINGSON: This may be muddying the waters or complicating it, but it
23 strikes me that, whatever definition of safety we finally accept, that it shouldn't apply only to the
24 school, that if young people are -- Maybe there is a low likelihood of violence or problem inside the
25 school itself, but if they are scared going home from school or if they are scared when they get home
26 and experience trauma at both of those levels, it can be just every bit as damaging to their
27 performance in school as problems inside the school walls themselves.

28 So I would hope that we would take a broader definition, and I think that that
29 would be in keeping with the notion of needing collaboration across different agencies at the local,
30 state and Federal level.

31 This is a bigger problem than just within the schools, and if we very narrowly
32 define what safety is as just being inside school property, I think that we will have missed the boat.

33 DR. KEYS: I characterize it as personal and interpersonal safety and that
34 interventions for this grant program can be interventions that are targeted toward environments, to
35 create a safe environment that leads to personal or interpersonal safety, or you could also have
36 interventions that target the self so that you are developing healthy persons. So that is -- If that helps
37 at all.

38 CHAIRMAN LONG: Sitting here listening, I must tell you, if I asked Tommy
39 Ledbetter what his definition of safety was so he would get it down a high school level, I bet he
40 could tell me. I think that, as long as we keep it broad so that we can pull as many things into it as
41 possible to serve as many children as we can, we will serve all of us.

42 I hear -- Everyone makes a very valid point, but if we get too much specificity in
43 here, I just worry that we are going to get buried in it, and I was thinking -- I must say again, I was
44 thinking of Tommy sitting here as a high school principal out there with what safety is.

45 It is important to what we are talking about and the conversation that you are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 having, because that is what we are talking about as one of the nexus for receiving money for the
2 state grant.

3 MR. LEDBETTER: One of the problems I have with safety is how do we
4 measure it, because the big problem right now with this whole program is how do you measure the
5 outcomes? That is why we are here. That is why this committee is here, basically, is because of the
6 evaluations that the program has had and so forth.

7 Whatever the definition is of safety, if we can't measure that, all we have done is
8 muddied the waters worse, because there will always be someone who will be saying that the
9 schools are not safe, unless there is some way of measuring or outcome here.

10 We can call a school safe, but that doesn't necessarily mean it is safe. We have to
11 be able to prove, one way or the other, that the school is safe to justify the money that we are talking
12 about spending.

13 I go back to the funding. We want more money. To get more money, we are
14 going to have to justify the program. So I guess I am confused as to how we have a big, broad
15 definition of safe and have measurable objectives there as how we can report that the schools are
16 safe.

17 DR. KELLAM: Yes. Let me try to answer that, because it comes back to
18 Russell's point, and I guess a number of us have been saying that we need to get an ongoing
19 partnership between researchers and program leaders and policy.

20 There is absolutely no problem in how to measure it, Tommy. There are two
21 ways of measuring it. Both require a map and sampling. But you ask kids how they feel about
22 school climate, and that includes issues like we are talking about, and you do event recording as to
23 where things are happening and what kind of things are happening, and both are countable.

24 I was just reading in US News and World Report this morning. There is a poll
25 that ABC and BBC have done together with a bunch of other people on safety in Iraq. In fact, 2,200
26 people responded. You can do measurement there or calculations, and you can find out what people
27 think is the likelihood of them being safe over the next period of time.

28 In a school climate, we have discussed how that can be an informing piece of
29 information for school building administrators as well as the community and the different levels that
30 need to know.

31 So I think that the research issues are easily doable. The question is how to use
32 the research and integrate it into program and policy. I believe we have really done a damn good
33 job, actually, of bringing these altogether in one place.

34 The issues you guys are discussing are fundamentally important, but I think they
35 are solvable.

36 CHAIRMAN LONG: I don't want to -- I'm sorry.

37 MS. PRICE: I was going to say, I do think the definition that Susan offered was
38 quite good, and I do think -- Following up on what Shep said, I do think some of those issues of
39 safety are, probably not as much in the State Grants Program but clearly in discretionary grant
40 program, targeted at specific subject matters that, therefore then, that subject matter and its
41 relationship to safety.

42 I just think that that was quite good, if you want to maybe repeat it.

43 DR. KEYS: I think I just took your Safe, Secure and Healthy and said, if we are
44 looking at safety, if we wanted to think of it as personal and interpersonal, but the safe and secure
45 aspect would be looking at creating an environment that is safe and secure, and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 personal/interpersonal what happens within the person would be the healthy aspect where you have
2 your programs to develop decision making skills and interpersonal skills and communication skills,
3 so that you would have both the environmental piece as well as the personal/interpersonal piece,
4 both pieces important to safety.

5 CHAIRMAN LONG: If we say that that is the acceptable definition, if there
6 could be response to that. This is a critical -- and Howell was bringing it back in, which is
7 important, because this is kind of, as I said earlier, a nexus or a little hook point here for this whole
8 program. So is that an acceptable definition? Okay. I saw a lot of heads nodding there.

9 As we close on the questions, then if we go back to that page 1, I think we can
10 wrap this up. If I could repeat what we had mentioned earlier -- and, Bill, this is going to be on you
11 again. But after hearing all this information and then answering the questions, that discussion,
12 putting it back with -- or in conjunction with the discussion we have had on the bulleted points,
13 which was a synthesis of the first hour and a half, if we could just quickly --

14 I just saw one or two up there that -- I mean with the data driven, and we have
15 heard a lot of information on that, the dollars. And Howell and I were talking earlier. It is always
16 that it means more money, but I think we have to say that, and he was right. I think we have to say
17 that, and shame on those that are making some of those decisions.

18 I think we have to be strong about some of that language. The access thresholds -
19 - again, several people mentioned at least three or four different access. For example, one that I
20 remember was that they must take the survey or the money won't flow anyway.

21 The scope, we've talked about, and the community partnerships and the
22 interaction of agencies, both in state and Federal, that multiplicity, that level, multiple level we've
23 talked about. But I am still not sure that we have answered or come to any kind of thought on the
24 delivery system. Is it universal or not?

25 The other things, I was starting to hear some of this. Haven't heard that. I'm just
26 trying to draw it together, and I'm seeing people go like that. There isn't a lot of consensus yet on --
27 Well, maybe there is, and we just haven't measured it.

28 DR. KEYS: I think I am hearing consensus that people want dollars to flow to
29 local communities directly. Is that a consensus point?

30 CHAIRMAN LONG: Just to local communities directly or everyone gets some?

31 DR. KEYS: Well, I don't know. I'm not getting any nods that they want it to flow
32 to local communities.

33 CHAIRMAN LONG: Because I don't think there is consensus on that.

34 DR. KEYS: I think I get a lot of -- if I said, oh, so we want it flow to states? We
35 want money to flow to local communities. We want money to go to all communities. We want
36 money to go to some communities on a competitive basis. I mean, those are the things we have
37 discussed. Do we have any agreement on any of those?

38 CHAIRMAN LONG: That's why I was raising the question. I am not sure -- Just
39 in listening to all the different conversations, I am not sure that we do have. If I just ask the
40 question, should money flow to everyone, as it is now, or should there be a competition or should
41 there be a base? But I'm not sure we have a consensus on that.

42 MS. PRICE: I think a couple of things, and I'm just throwing them out. One, you
43 know, how much money -- One question I would have is how much money -- You know, what's the
44 minimum number of dollars we would have to have to have an adequate of money go to every LEA?
45 What would that look like? Realistically, while the Hill may fund us at something greater

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 than \$100 million, but are they going to fund us at the level that we would want? So that is a
2 question, but let me ask another question.

3 If we were to say send the dollars to the states and have the state run -- have a
4 minimum and a maximum, have the states run internally and provide funds for them to be able to run
5 the state activities to do it, but a discretionary grant program to provide, based on need, those
6 communities that have need, and that the -- you know, and provide a significant number of dollars
7 for them to implement a program, and then have some kind of system so that the same school
8 districts over and over and over don't get the same dollars because they have good grant writers, but
9 that they get distributed down community-wide, so that you can give a greater dollar for impact in a
10 community to address a need.

11 I have a very crass image in my head of sometimes the State Grants Program, and
12 I realize it is kind of a crass image. But you know, we have all the homeless people here in D.C.,
13 and you pass them. You walk down the same streets all the time, and you actually end up kind of
14 getting semi-familiar with them.

15 Sometimes I feel like our State Grants Program is the equivalent of giving
16 everybody you pass on the street who is homeless a dollar, and you know, I mean, did it change their
17 life? No. If I would have given them my month's salary, maybe.

18 That is my own little thing of how I -- I don't think there is any issue about the
19 value of every child, but I will say, in general, Federal dollars are meant for disadvantaged students.
20 That is why we have Title I programs. We have No Child Left Behind, holding them accountable.
21 We are supplementary dollars to the state and local.

22 So it's just a thought that maybe we want those dollars to be spread in a larger pot,
23 maybe a discretionary grant, if we don't have enough dollars to give a significant amount of money
24 to every LEA.

25 MS. TAFT: If what I hear you saying is what I think I hear you say, then I think
26 you've got a good outline, that the Feds would give the money to the SEAs who would in turn give it
27 to the LEAs under a formula that every LEA would get a base amount so they could do their data
28 collection, etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. Then they could add onto that base amount.

29 MS. PRICE: Either/or, not both.

30 MS. TAFT: Within a range, and it seems to me that the other money besides the
31 state grants portion of the Safe and Drug Free Schools Money that you have been talking about--

32 MS. PRICE: The discretionary programs.

33 MS. TAFT: -- the discretionary programs, could be used to target or to enhance
34 those districts that have special needs, which is basically the way it is done now.

35 MS. PRICE: Basically, the way it is done now, but what I would -- If you had a
36 minimum and a maximum and you spread the dollars out to every LEA, I think you are still going to
37 end up with the minimum being pretty low and the maximum being brought down, and those very
38 large school districts who have the large numbers actually have a lot of need.

39 So the dollars for the program would have to be bumped up quite, quite
40 significantly. I don't know that you are going to get that from Congress.

41 MS. TAFT: Well, I don't know either, but if you don't ask, you don't get.

42 MS. PRICE: Well, but I think what would be an alternative is in the State Grants
43 Program, totally separate from the discretionary grant and the national program, that those dollars go
44 to the LEA and the LEA run grant competition for the --

45 MS. TAFT: You mean the SEA.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 MS. PRICE: I mean the SEA. What did I say? Oh, yes, I'm sorry. The SEA has
2 a discretionary grant program targeted on need and provides those -- Instead of dollars being given
3 by formula, they give dollars by their own state discretionary grant program targeted at need,
4 addressing -- and those needs can be a variety, you know, like drugs, alcohol.

5 MS. TAFT: Okay. So I am a small LEA. I don't have much money. I don't have
6 any big groups in my community that can help me out. I don't write a good grant proposal, because I
7 don't have any data, and so I don't get any funding that first year. But then the next year I am
8 supposed to reapply again, and I still have the same situations, because I don't have any money to do
9 any data. How am I ever going to get in the system?

10 MS. PRICE: Well --

11 MS. TAFT: How am I ever going to get over that first threshold that you have set
12 so high I can't meet to get into the system?

13 MS. PRICE: Well, you know, one is the design of the state's program. The other
14 is, you know, you would -- I mean, I'm just off the cuff saying all this, and you would have to think
15 it through. I mean, do you want to have a limit where an LEA can only receive grant dollars for two
16 years and then they have to develop a sustaining program, and they develop these programs. They
17 implement something. Their need -- You know, while they are receiving these state -- the Federal
18 funneled through the state dollars, they are developing partnerships so that at the end of their grant
19 when these dollars are ending, they have developed a sustainable program, and then those dollars are
20 available to the other LEAs.

21 So they are excluded from the grant competition, the ones who have received
22 grant dollars, and more --

23 MS. TAFT: That all sounds very nice, but if you look at the Drug Free
24 Communities Act, which was designed to be that very same way, it has not worked out that way.
25 Once people get money, they will do everything in their power to keep that money.

26 MS. PRICE: That is an entitlement, and I don't know that we wouldn't encourage
27 entitlement.

28 MS. TAFT: That is why I would go for a base plus, and if you want to make it so
29 that to get the base, you need to do X, Y and Z, that's fine. But you got to have that base in there.

30 MR. LEDBETTER: How about that 20 percent? How about that 20 percent of
31 the Governor's money being the base?

32 MS. TAFT: It could be. You could do it any way you want. You could combine
33 those two, but you need some kind of a base so that everyone can have the opportunity to participate
34 in the expansion.

35 MR. ELLIS: I think that perhaps part of the issue that we are kind of talking
36 about is that the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, its strength and its weakness is the gamut of
37 issues that it seeks to address in terms of the legislation.

38 Perhaps the thought -- I like the way Debbie described her dilemmas in terms of
39 funding on the personal level, and I hear what Hope is saying, too. Perhaps we could craft some
40 language to take kind of the hard line approach in terms of getting the most bang for your buck, if
41 this funding level is what is received, you know, and what would it look like.

42 This is what we would be forced to do. We would be forced to cut back on the
43 wide gamut of programs and seek the most impact for the very few dollars that Congress is going to
44 give us. Then also to suggest that, with X number of dollars funding, here's the kind of things that
45 we could do. We could a base program for all LEAs for them to do at least data collection in order

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 to identify -- do a kind of a needs assessment, and then do other discretionary.

2 So give them some options. So if you give us \$100 million, this is what you are
3 getting. Every LEA in the country is not going to get money, that we are going to set up the state
4 grants and require them to do -- you know, put some requirements on it and get your most bang for
5 your very few bucks, versus, you know, hey, if you give us this much, look what more we can do,
6 something along those lines.

7 DR. KELLAM: I guess I am -- I have been around for a while. It reminds me
8 very much of the debate that went on maybe 30 years ago. Edith Green came up with a community
9 action program many years ago, and it was a direct funding program to local communities.

10 It drove Richard J. Daley, for whom I worked at the time as well as being at the
11 University of Chicago, up a tree. He couldn't stand it, because in fact politically it was suicide for
12 patronage in the city of Chicago, among other things. It created a huge, in fact, mess by direct
13 funding local communities.

14 On the other hand, it was a great idea. But politically, it was unworkable, given
15 the Federal structure of the government that we live with. In some sense, in other words, we are
16 trying to promote a partnership between the Feds, the state, the cities and local school buildings and
17 local school interests, sometimes local school districts within cities.

18 The question is how do you put the money in such a place that it enhances the
19 likelihood that they will all, in fact, be working together in the ways that we want them to work
20 together?

21 We have to be extremely careful that this is not a solution we come up that is hard
22 and fast, but the basic principles we come up with are those that could be striven for and part of the
23 negotiation that would go on when one considers how do you legislate across these different levels,
24 which at times are politically at odds with each other: Republican Governor in a state or a city
25 Democratic Mayor and the like who use the school districts as a fighting mechanism.

26 So we are talking about the principle, and the principle is how do we put the
27 money where it will enhance them working together in partnership around programs which have
28 accountability on one hand, community support, strong participation, school building understanding
29 what goes on, can't compete with reading when you got programs coming in, and such things as that.

30 So we need to enunciate the basic principle of what we think the money should be
31 doing. It should be stimulating money. It should make partnerships happen. It should develop
32 connections to accountability, not necessarily buying whole new information systems but building
33 on the ones that exist and integrating them.

34 So we should be interested in the guidelines for what we are aiming for. I think
35 that the political negotiation of how much goes to the state or how much to the locals really is a
36 negotiating issue that we need to, in fact, understand that this is not our function to solve a political
37 issue, but rather to point up the guidelines of what they should negotiate to achieve.

38 CHAIRMAN LONG: Howell?

39 DR. WECHSLER: It is just not enough money to give to every school district.
40 Now whether we continue to give every school district or not, there is a key component that I don't
41 think has been articulated. It was articulated in the President's budget, but hasn't been so much
42 today.

43 That is this program desperately needs a radically strengthened program at the
44 state level. The state education agency needs to be able to retain a greater proportion of the
45 resources than it has been getting to date so that it can do data collection, evaluation, and provide a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealgross.com

1 much more profound level of technical assistance.

2 Hope raises the question of how do these districts that haven't been able to break
3 into the system get into it. Well, that should be the responsibility of the state education agency
4 program, to go out there and work the huskings and provide the technical assistance, that they should
5 be able to identify schools that are high -- districts that are at high need but are not competing well,
6 and provide the hands-on technical assistance to get them into the system.

7 CHAIRMAN LONG: Belinda?

8 DR. SIMS: Yes. I agree. I just wanted to say that I would not -- I don't think we
9 should even entertain the \$100 million, you know, what we might get, what the program might look
10 like with that; because we all know that is just very insufficient.

11 The evidence that we do have is what can be done with the funding that was used
12 last year. You know, the panels all presented their programs based on the \$300 million model, and
13 our recommendations about how the program could be improved should be based on that.

14 It may come out that it is somewhere in between \$100 million and \$300 million
15 when the authorization actually happens. But I think we can only make recommendations on
16 restructuring the program, I think, based on what we've seen in terms of how the program can really
17 function at that level.

18 If it is \$100 million, I think that will just be so radically different that it would
19 almost be conjecture to say, you know, how the programs might function.

20 CHAIRMAN LONG: Susan and Shep.

21 DR. KEYS: I would like to concur with what Howell said, and I would like to
22 ask that we ask for a show of hands to see if we have consensus on that recommendation, because I
23 think it is an important one.

24 CHAIRMAN LONG: If Howell would repeat it. I'm seeing some blurriness
25 here.

26 DR. WECHSLER: The point was that a much larger proportion of resources
27 should be retained at the state education agency level so that they can play a much stronger
28 leadership role in terms of data collection, evaluation, performance measurement, holding grantees
29 accountable, and providing a very profoundly increased level of technical assistance.

30 DR. KELLAM: Can I --

31 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry. Tommy was asking a question relative to the
32 definition or the point that Howell was just making. Would you repeat that? I don't think the mike
33 was on.

34 MR. LEDBETTER: The question was: What percent do the states now have at
35 their discretion to do those things, and the answer was only five percent. So I think it was important
36 that we know what that is before we start increasing it, so we can make some determination as to
37 what it needs to be.

38 DR. KELLAM: Okay. Here is my problem. I don't have any problem with the
39 idea that the state is in a position to furnish certain kinds of oversight, planning, policy, helping local
40 communities and the like. But I also work at the other end of this funnel.

41 Typically, we get our funding from NIH, on one hand, and local community
42 support is critical to doing the kind of work we do. I think across the nation the number of school
43 districts, particularly in large metropolitan areas, that are in court, fighting with states over funding,
44 is not small.

45 States and local communities are often at odds over the amount of resources spent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 at the local level, particularly when there are political issues involved. So we have to be extremely
2 careful that, in fact, our money is being spent in the direction of accountability that we have
3 discussed and not just that the states take the lead in the program.

4 I think, if we specify that they would allocate the funding and the programming in
5 line with the data on need, expressed needs, and honor the express needs and indeed are rewarded
6 for working for partnerships between the states and the local LEAs, that we are in the okay position.
7 But we have to be aware that it is very likely this will be a politicized process.

8 That is okay, as long as there are guidelines and we know what the end goals are,
9 and if states don't perform, they get less money, if any.

10 CHAIRMAN LONG: I think that is a very point and, as you were speaking,
11 heads were nodding. We understand that, but I think it is a point well taken.

12 Now to get back to the delivery system question that Howell had brought up and
13 defined and then re-articulated, and to Susan's point, hands up, how many are comfortable with that
14 as the recommendation regarding the delivery system? Could I see a show of hands. I'm sorry. I
15 did not mean the. I mean one of. I apologize. A recommendation. What, Howell just -- Seth just
16 went, what? You were just counted right there, sir. Okay.

17 What we were just talking about relative to Howell's definition and suggestion
18 with the delivery system, when I asked the question about universal. So that will be -- and I
19 apologize. I said "the." I mean "a" recommendation.

20 DR. KELLAM: I thought I was modifying and adding to it.

21 CHAIRMAN LONG: No. That's why I was saying you were clarifying it,
22 because I didn't want to ask you to repeat that.

23 DR. HINGSON: Maybe it would be helpful just to have it articulated one more
24 time before we take a vote, just so everybody is absolutely sure what they are voting on.

25 CHAIRMAN LONG: Howell? This is a test.

26 DR. WECHSLER: That a substantially larger proportion of resources should be
27 reserved for the state education agency to provide data collection, evaluation, and a much more
28 profound level of technical assistance across the state, and that is going to be really critical to
29 making sure that this program has the impact that it can have.

30 MS. KELLAM: Now I made a notation to that, and I would like to make sure
31 that is part of the vote.

32 The modification is -- It's an elaboration, really. Under the condition that the state
33 be held accountable for the development of partnerships, allocation of resources in accord with need,
34 and that the negotiations include -- the work include the local LEAs in the process of designing and
35 planning programs.

36 DR. HINGSON: If I could only add one other word in there: In accordance with
37 need and performance.

38 DR. KELLAM: Yes, absolutely.

39 MR. HERRMANN: This is really to support, I think, the U.S. Department of Ed.,
40 the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. I think one of the things that we have not talked about is
41 the fact that under NCLB, you've got these consolidated applications, and you've got flexibility
42 provisions and all sorts of other things that actually end up sort of trumping what is determined at the
43 program level.

44 I think one of the things that really needs to be looked at is pulling the Title IV
45 portion, the State Grants Program, out of that consolidated application, because I am afraid what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 ends up happening a lot of times is the small amount of money that goes to the Title IV program gets
2 lost in the larger negotiations between the state and Federal government.

3 So I think it would be good to pull the Title IV piece out of that consolidated
4 application that the state makes to the Feds.

5 MS. PRICE: I think that is an appropriate recommendation. We will get a little
6 pushback, because it then requires more work on the state part in applying for the funds.

7 MS. TAFT: People at our state level would really like that.

8 DR. JONES: I like this recommendation, and support it. But I think it is going to
9 be so important that the state really understands and appreciates the nuances within this
10 recommendation, the accountability piece, the partnershiping, and etcetera. So I don't know if there
11 are going to be a formula spelled out for these folks. But again, just so they understand and
12 appreciate what this recommendation is all about.

13 CHAIRMAN LONG: If I can pull this together now, with Howell's definition,
14 Shep's amendment, Ralph's word which I think is important, and Mike, with your addendum. I'm
15 just trying to put them all in sequence.

16 With that, how many would be in favor? Opposed? Okay, thank you very much.

17 Then I will ask this. Bill, I will ask this question of you. Again now, that was the
18 one that we pulled out. With all of this discussion, with the answering of the questions, with the
19 revisiting on the bullets that were put up there after the first hour and a half discussion, do you now
20 have enough from the committee to pull together recommendations in preparation for our conference
21 call next month? Okay. Yes?

22 MS. JACKSON: I just wanted to add to what Russell was stating. Again, I think
23 something needs to be added along with the increase in funding that would go to the SEA with
24 regard to what our expectations are for the SEA, leveling the playing field, ensuring that we are
25 addressing the issues of LEAs that typically have not had access to come to the table and participate,
26 them going out and seeking those LEAs, again taking a look across individual states and their rural
27 communities, the urban areas and the suburban areas, and definitely ensuring that there are
28 established guidelines for each of those entities so that funding is provided on a needs basis, but also
29 taking a look at those particular areas; because again, some of our areas that are least addressed, and
30 as we look at the overarching mission of No Child Left Behind, I am fearful that we will have not
31 only children but cultures and generations continued to be left behind.

32 So definitely spelling the criteria out and what our expectations and hopes are of
33 the SEA, I think, is important.

34 CHAIRMAN LONG: And that would be parallel with and correlate with other
35 aspects of No Child Left Behind, such as the teacher quality aspect as it relates to remote areas and
36 underfunded. So then there would be that thread of consistency.

37 MR. LEDBETTER: The motion was pretty open-ended when it comes to an
38 amount, talking about increasing it. Do you think we need to be a little more specific than that?
39 Presently, it is five percent, because we are talking about reallocation of funds now.

40 So I don't think we need to make a recommendation that is so open-ended that one
41 state interprets that to be three times that five percent, and another state interprets that to be five
42 times that five percent. I think we are going to have to be a little more specific than that.

43 DR. HINGSON: I would like to propose that we take a percentage and say it
44 could be up to, but the states are going to have to apply to get that, so that we can see that there is
45 really a program that they've got in mind, so that we are not just sort of doling it out X percent to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 every state.

2 MR. LEDBETTER: Some of you that are working at the state level, what will it
3 take?

4 MR. HERRMANN: Well, obviously, part of it depends on how hard Hal drops
5 the hammer on the -- what was it? -- profoundly enhanced or something like that.

6 I would think at least two and a half to three times what we are receiving now. So
7 10, 15 percent, I think, in order to provide -- I think part of what you are talking about is we are
8 talking about a lot of districts that aren't going to be receiving anything.

9 We have not really addressed that question yet, but I think the way the scenario
10 seems to be playing out is we are going to have a significant number of districts that don't receive
11 anything. So I think the burden of helping LEAs identify need, develop plans, those sorts of things,
12 are going to fall on the SEA.

13 DR. WECHSLER: I think it is almost premature. I think we need to decide, first
14 of all, what our vision is for the LEAs. We have, I think, two extreme models, neither of which, I
15 think, is going to get a consensus here.

16 As I understand the current proposal in the President's budget, it is basically
17 putting all of the dollars in the SEAs. Now they may then do grants, but that is really at their
18 discretion. So that is 100 percent.

19 I think, based on the membership of this panel, we are not going to get a
20 consensus in favor of that. At the other extreme, I heard some members of the panel suggest this
21 business of everyone has -- every district has a base. I don't think we will get a consensus on that
22 either.

23 So it's got to be somewhere in between. I don't know that we get a percentage that
24 goes to the state until we decide what we want the mechanism to be for funding the districts.

25 MR. LEDBETTER: Howell, that is where I was going with my question. You
26 know, if we've got 20 percent set aside for the Governor, and then we take another 10-15 percent off
27 the top, that makes less for the local schools, and we were more or less split on do we do it all
28 through a state grants program to the LEAs or do we leave some money to everyone.

29 That brings me back to the question I brought up about the Governor's money a
30 while ago, about if we are going to take up to 15 percent of the money to go to the states, well, then
31 can we still afford to give the Governor 20 percent that is discretionary, because that profoundly
32 impacts the amount of money that will actually get to the LEAs?

33 MR. ELLIS: Personally, I am kind of hesitant to talk about specific percentages.
34 In my mind, what we are doing as a committee is making broad and sometimes rather specific
35 recommendations on program changes to the Secretary.

36 My thought is that the Department would then take that -- You know, I think the
37 language Howell had was significant increases to the state, and they would take that and then
38 decipher it, interpret it, negotiate, and make some decisions about what the right percentage might
39 be. The same with the Governor.

40 I would kind of like to stay away from the percentages. I agree. We are not going
41 to get a consensus here, and I think, to a large extent, it will come down to a political issue, as it
42 probably should be.

43 DR. HINGSON: When we think about what proportion goes to the state and
44 what proportion goes to the Governor, we ought to think a bit about, well, what can the Governor
45 uniquely do.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 It strikes me that the tasks that they can do better than state education agencies is
2 to convene these multiple groups from the health department and the police department and
3 concerned private citizens to work with the education department, and they can also play a role in
4 improving the quality of data collection across these different spheres.

5 So it may be that we should be making some sort of recommendation that there be
6 a certain amount of money, that we don't necessarily change the amount of money that is going to
7 Governors' offices, but that those monies be spent on these types of activities that Governors can do
8 better, or that there be a pool that comes not just from Department of Education legislation but
9 legislation that pertains to these other agencies -- you know, the CDC money that goes to local
10 health department or SAMHSA that goes to single state agencies or DOT money that goes to
11 highway safety bureaus.

12 It is not a matter of trying to take money out of the Governor's hands, but I think
13 there is an issue of what proportion of this particular education legislation should go to the
14 governors. I think that we have to recognize that, if we are expanding what is going to the state
15 education departments, that some of that money -- we may want to not give the governors a free ride
16 on the 20 percent unless they are changing, really, the nature of what it is that they are doing.

17 CHAIRMAN LONG: Are we far enough -- I'm going to ask you now. Are we
18 far enough along with what we have said and what you can glean from this, Bill, so that we can have
19 that ready for that conference call? And again, we can -- Think about what has happened here and
20 how you have gotten down to these, and you will be able to put these recommendations together.

21 I will tell you in advance, I think you have done an excellent job of pulling this
22 down, down, down, down until we will start to get this list of recommendations. Then you can react
23 to it when we see it in black and white and when we have the opportunity to be together on the
24 conference call.

25 With that -- Think about those comments. Then with that, we will break for lunch
26 right now, and that is for 45 minutes. This was a recommendation -- a suggestion from both
27 Shep and -- I don't know how you got in between Howell and Hope. They were dropping things off
28 that table. But a suggestion from both Shep and Russell that we will come back right afterwards and
29 do the school choice option, but that we just handle the data piece right over lunch. Isn't that what
30 you said?

31 We'll come back and do the choice piece, I'm sure, and then get to the data.
32 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 12:14 p.m.)

33 - - -
34
35
36
37
38

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Time: 1:02 p.m.

CHAIRMAN LONG: As we go into the second area, if we could follow the process that we did toward the last few hours, and that was to answer -- Next we will be on unsafe school choice option, and if we could first make sure that we have answered the questions and then, secondly, to come up with the same process that we did before with some recommendations.

So first -- and this starts, by the way, in the middle of page 3. So in the middle of page 3 starting with Unsafe School Choice Option, the first question --

MS. PRICE: I would just do USCO. You can do it however you like.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay, the USCO provision or provisions with a similar purpose, ensuring that no child is required to attend an unsafe school, adequately provide the authority, direction and clarity for schools to identify it is persistently dangerous.

No, but then the rest of the answer. Then on these -- and we will note a difference with this particular general category, that there will be a number of findings and recommendations from our discussion and from the panels that we heard from.

So in regard to that first question, anything else to be added to that? Remember, first we are going to go through to answer and then, secondly, we are going to delve into the recommendations, even though there are some recommendations within the individual sheets right now. Questions relative to question 1, yes, Hope?

MS. TAFT: In that first bullet, do we need to be more specific in suggesting other things than just violence in determining? I mean, I have had some comments about bullying relationships and those kind of things. So do those get automatically included or do we need to make a little list?

CHAIRMAN LONG: I just heard Deb out of my right ear, and I think she is right. The appropriate "such as," and then give some examples to broaden the topic.

MS. TAFT: Put bullying in that "such as" list. Yes.

MR. DUNCAN: Dr. Long, can I -- It would help -- If you want something specifically in the report, though, it would be helpful to say that. For instance, I put bullying in, because you said that. But if people want other things, just say that.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Kim?

MS. DUDE: My recollection is that we also talked in terms of students' perception of safety. So I was going to bring it up later on when we talk about data, but I think on the data we do collect, we need to find out if students feel safe in school, and maybe -- Well, I guess that is all I'll say for now. Yes, I think the perception of safety was also important.

CHAIRMAN LONG: We can do this simultaneously. Bullying, and then secondly, perception of safety. Okay.

DR. KELLAM: Well, the problem we are having with our strategy today is that we have recommendations for gathering data here, and there are two issues with that. One is it is an extremely expensive proposition to collect data, and we have to be careful not just to multiply the number of data collection activities.

So ultimately, to prejudge where we are going, we are going to have to integrate these data collection activities so that they are integrated data systems that are time and staff efficient. And they are not now, nor are they, of course, as we have said before repeatedly -- nor are they related sufficiently to policies and practices as accountability either for state measuring needs or measuring outcomes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 So we have to be aware that, when we are talking about collecting these
2 measures, that ultimately we have to do something about that.

3 The other thing is that, as you all no doubt recall as much as I do, there are huge
4 problems with this data collection. If in fact, the schools report what they are supposed to report,
5 they get branded as terrible places, you know, kicked out of the good guy club, and you end up with,
6 in fact, a counterincentive for reporting.

7 You remember that the amount of missing data and erroneous data was huge and
8 skewed in the direction of the worst places being reporting less. So we talked about changing the
9 name and the orientation of this program as a result.

10 My recollection is, or at least maybe I am making this up, not only changing the
11 name but changing the thrust of it toward prevention and enhancement as opposed to damning and
12 pillory of all principals who don't report data that would otherwise get them fired.

13 Anyway, those were some of the considerations, I think, that we need to remind
14 ourselves of. They are not somehow included in these findings and recommendations. I think --
15 The next page has them all?

16 CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes, question 3.

17 DR. KELLAM: Okay. Well, I guess the question is we've still got these bullets
18 on page 3, and I don't see sufficient -- I don't know how we handle the fact. We called for a
19 renaming, and I don't -- Is that in here?

20 CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes, that is question 3, bullet number 2.

21 DR. KELLAM: Page 3?

22 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry. Question 3 on page 4: What changes to USCO
23 in bullet 2, change to terminology.

24 DR. KELLAM: Well, I am not -- I guess what I am really saying is I am not clear
25 what we do with -- The bullets don't seem to quite pull it together in terms of the issues we were
26 dealing with.

27 This is a program which, by and large, has the good news of protecting families
28 against sending their kids to a bad place, and maybe doing some counseling with victimizers. But
29 basically, it is a -- I mean, in my perspective it is a very misguided program.

30 That is, the whole program is misconceived in the sense that it aims toward a very
31 negative reporting, and it doesn't have anything that is in it in the way of intervention or that moves
32 schools in a positive or kids' experiences in a positive direction.

33 So -- and you know, we struggled with that. So the question, I guess, I am
34 thinking that we need to take account of what goes wrong with this program in terms of missing
35 data, pejorative, not being curative, being interested in giving parents rights which I believe we
36 should protect and, on the other hand, you know, a program which is not going to get us out of the
37 woods, nor is it connected to any of the other programs we have talked about in terms of prevention.

38 CHAIRMAN LONG: Howell.

39 DR. WECHSLER: I think we had an incredibly strong consensus in this area, and
40 it would be nice to see it really reflected. What we have is a list of recommendations, and they are
41 all good, but I would like to see a couple of findings right at the top.

42 The findings are -- from what I remember of our consensus, are absolutely no, and
43 for two primary reasons. One, the extreme flexibility given to states in defining their own measures
44 has completely sabotaged the direction and clarity of what a persistently dangerous school means;
45 and secondly, we just weren't satisfied with the current measures being used, and a lot of these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealgross.com

1 bullets have suggestions for alternatives.

2 I think it is really important just to state at the top that the answer is no, and there
3 are two fundamental reasons.

4 CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much for that, Howell, and I think that is
5 right. In this whole area, it seemed to me we were quite clear with almost a clear consensus,
6 complete consensus. So let's stay with the word that we start with, absolutely no, and then if we
7 could take a look.

8 I am going back to what was mentioned over this first section, and let me ask you,
9 Debbie, before I go down through these, is there sufficient information? Whereas, with the others --
10 in the first one, State Grants, many of them were blank. Here, however, we have a preponderance of
11 --

12 MS. PRICE: I do think there is a lot of information here to answer these
13 questions.

14 Following up from Howell's findings, one thing that we heard over and over is
15 that there is a disincentive for schools to report this information, and the result of that is that those
16 schools who do report, who do take significant action to address this then, end up being penalized
17 because of it.

18 I think one point Fred made back then was that those schools that -- I think the
19 example he used of stopping any kind of weapon coming into school, they caught them. They kept
20 them from being in school. It was reported, and so now they are reported as persistently dangerous,
21 when actually they are a safer school.

22 So there is a real -- Not only is it a disincentive to report, but then there is -- The
23 information can make good schools look bad and bad schools look good. So I think that should be
24 part of our findings.

25 One thing in the recommendations that I think should really be highlighted is that
26 -- Obviously, the term "persistently dangerous school," while I have yet to meet anyone who can
27 figure out a name for what it should be called, we know it shouldn't be called that. But rather than,
28 you know, to provide -- To give -- To request information from schools about those issues that they
29 are looking at that would fall into this category, so that for the academic achievement, we identify
30 schools in need of improvement.

31 So that there would be an equivalent of that, that schools that are having difficulty
32 with issues related to these safety issues that we are talking about can be put on a watch list or
33 looked at, and possibly a use for those state grant dollars could be that they set aside a portion of
34 those dollars to provide specific technical assistance and assistance to those schools that are looking
35 -- because we heard several people say we need to address this, but we are not sure how. So that
36 they can use those dollars to address that need, to get off the watch list, so to speak, so that they can
37 address those issues of safety or violence or whatever.

38 So that would be a suggestion to go along with the findings.

39 CHAIRMAN LONG: Let's go Kim and Susan.

40 MS. DUDE: Mine will just take a second. If we do just what you are suggesting,
41 that would really actually be an incentive to report that information as opposed to a disincentive,
42 because they figure, well, if I really do do this and address these issues, I increase my likelihood of
43 getting funding. So I think it is a good idea.

44 DR. KEYS: I have just a couple of comments. On page 3, the second to the last
45 bullet: Ensure that victims know of their rights to remain at their current school.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 I think we should amend that to say "and other movement options." We talked
2 about the promotion of choices for students, that it just isn't staying, but it could be something else.

3 We also, I thought, had a fair amount of consensus that, if the victim does not
4 want to transfer, we wanted to recommend that the district require the perpetrator to transfer. I didn't
5 see that showing up anywhere. So I don't know if we want to say that or not.

6 CHAIRMAN LONG: That was the discussion. If we could stay on target on that
7 one, that was part of the discussion. Let's take a look at that now as a potential recommendation or
8 add-on to that.

9 DR. JONES: Yes. I have a question. How are we defining perpetrator here? I
10 mean, how bad does it have to be in order for this person to be labeled a perpetrator, because I think
11 that definition has implications on whether or not that student should be asked to leave?

12 CHAIRMAN LONG: Well -- Go ahead.

13 MS. PRICE: Currently, persistently dangerous -- there is a category of issues that
14 have to occur for persistently dangerous to kick in, and maybe those categories would still stay the
15 same. We might want to broaden that a bit, because they are somewhat narrow.

16 So is it just general -- not to take lightly bullying, but just some general kid to kid
17 -- whatever the right term is -- Low key bullying wouldn't be --

18 DR. JONES: Well, I guess I am putting on my clinical hat as a clinical
19 psychologist. You know, I don't know if we want to make a blanket statement that, if the victim --
20 and, boy, I don't like the term victim; I think it ought to be survivor. But anyway, if the victim
21 doesn't choose to leave, then it is mandatory that the perpetrator leave.

22 I think that can have some very, very negative consequences, because you are
23 talking about loss across multiple sources. So I guess what I'm saying is I don't think that that should
24 be a unequivocal decision that is made without some kind of clinical intervention, some kind of
25 clinical processing of the situation.

26 MS. PRICE: And let me throw something out here. It doesn't just apply here, but
27 here I think it applies, because as I said referring to the name, we know what it shouldn't be called.
28 We don't know what it should be called.

29 When we write our report, some of these things may be presented as serious
30 issues that need to be addressed and, while we don't have resolution to them, we should look toward
31 resolving them.

32 One of them is what do you do with the perpetrator when there is no other school
33 in the area to send them to? I mean, there is a big issue, and it is not an easy issue to answer, and I
34 don't know that we need to provide the answer. But I do think saying this needs serious thought;
35 these are serious problems that aren't addressed currently that need to be taken into consideration as
36 they move forward.

37 I think the name -- I don't think we need to figure out the name, but I do think we
38 need to tell them they can't continue with the name they currently have.

39 DR. KEYS: We have a name. I have a name from our notes, the Safe School
40 Choice Option was what we had suggested as an alternative name.

41 MS. PRICE: It's a good name.

42 DR. KEYS: It was something we had on the table.

43 CHAIRMAN LONG: That was discussed, right.

44 DR. KELLAM: I want to go back to the question of do we really want to -- How
45 does this turn out to be a constructive program? How does this turn out to be in some sense

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 addressing a problem of violence? What we've got is a single solution, namely, the parent has the
2 right to move the kid who is a victim, and that's it.

3 Meantime, what we all know, and those of us who do research at schools and live
4 in schools all the time anyway, we know that in fact it is not likely that it is a kid. A kid doesn't
5 make a violent school.

6 It is more likely to be a general revolting behavior by large groups of kids, by the
7 zeitgeist of the school, and it is in the face of failure, poverty, racism, all the rest, particularly
8 personal failure to learn and to succeed, and it begins early on, and you can see it emerging in first
9 grade after the first few weeks of school when kids are falling behind in reading.

10 So we are talking about a problem which is highly correlated with poor
11 achievement, and we are again talking about a solution which is not, in fact, helping the school teach
12 better or socialize kids better or make them feel better about their environment. None of those are
13 coming up in this program so far as we recommended.

14 So I would recommend that we, in fact, call for a program closely related to other
15 academic programs but which does emphasize the socializing of kids in the school to perform as
16 citizens in proper fashion, and which is not solely limited to kicking perpetrators out or saving one
17 child at a time.

18 I think that the program is not well developed in that sense.

19 DR. SIMS: I agree. I think that, when we had the panels on this -- and I always
20 go back to the panels, because for me that is our information -- you know, one of the things that sort
21 of came out of that is that there is not a lot of coordination around sort of some of the safety
22 functions and the program, State Grants Program type activities.

23 So if there were more coordination across these different areas, then maybe that is
24 where you would have some spillover. If you are doing programming that is going to target a broad
25 set of skills and outcomes for kids, then maybe you would see that some of the safety issues in the
26 schools are actually going down as well.

27 So this might be a place to also recommend better coordination of creating safe
28 environments that map onto overall programming within the school related to safe and drug free
29 schools, something like that.

30 CHAIRMAN LONG: Other comments?

31 MS. PRICE: Just a clarification comment. One reason why this piece is in No
32 Child Left Behind is, when No Child Left Behind was being developed and written, there was a lot
33 of concern for kids stuck in underperforming schools or unsafe schools. That is why the child is --
34 you know, the one who has been picked on or whatever -- given a choice option.

35 So there is a real -- and that is a focus of it, and I think it was good. But we have
36 learned, I think, a lot since then that we could make that a better thing. But that was why. So it is
37 one of many choice options, but it is just -- this piece is just tucked away in Safe and Drug Free
38 Schools, but it really does partner with the ones that are in the underachieving -- the academic, the
39 failing schools. I mean, there is a lot of relationship there with that as well.

40 MS. LeBOEUF: I agree with Shep about how to handle the young person who
41 was bullying someone else or teasing him into gangs or whatever kind of harassment or teen dating
42 or any kind of thing that they are doing untoward towards another, and putting the child that is the
43 perpetrator, for lack of a better word, somewhere else doesn't mean they are not going to run into
44 that person at the mall, at a school dance or wherever, and we are not giving both the young person
45 who is the victim an opportunity to be comfortable in that situation and go through a program with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 getting rehabilitated as far as the perpetrator being held accountable for their actions and helping
2 them grow and move beyond, for the very reasons you mentioned, that they are not doing well in
3 school, that they exhibit all these other risk factors, and they need to be helped.

4 Moving the victim to another school, while that seems on the surface, as Deborah
5 said, to be a great idea, they are losing their social network and their neighborhood school or
6 whatever. So if we can get a program that works to help both of them, that would be the best of all
7 worlds.

8 One of them that I could recommend -- there's many, but our office funds the
9 school based youth courts and community based youth courts and, depending on the severity of the
10 outcome, it could be heard in a school based or community based youth courts where they are then
11 assigned to appropriate sanction by their peers, and their peers are not, so to speak, all the A students
12 and the popular ones.

13 They are a range of students that are trained in how to serve on a jury, what are
14 appropriate sanctions for the different types of cases that can come before them, and then, in
15 addition, they also try and bring into account, you know, the fact that they might write a letter of
16 apology to the person that they harmed.

17 So there's a lot of options that might be come to play. So I agree.

18 DR. JONES: You stated it very well, and I think that is captured in the third point
19 from the bottom just in terms of providing guidelines and training for assisting students who are
20 victimized -- who victimize others and those that are victimized.

21 There needs to be some form of clinical intervention. We don't just throw them
22 out and take them to another school as a way of doing those things.

23 MR. LEDBETTER: Russell, when you talk about clinical intervention, who is
24 going to pay for this?

25 DR. JONES: I think that there are -- Well, I know in our community that
26 oftentimes these children are referred to a psychological service center, and many of those
27 individuals can be seen free of charge.

28 So there are community -- You know, there are individuals in the community.
29 We have a free clinic also in our community where individuals are often referred to. So there are a
30 number of different mechanisms within the community where that is taking place.

31 What typically happens: Counselors will refer those students to us. We will then
32 follow up, and they are dealt with quite nicely. But you know, to go with the way that is stated here,
33 that you don't provide these kids with any kind of counseling, you don't provide these children with
34 any kind of assessment or whatever -- that is not going to provide the problem in any way
35 whatsoever.

36 You take a child that bullies out of his school and put him into another school, not
37 only is he dealing with many issues of loss, he is now in an environment where no one knows him.
38 That is going to increase the likelihood of him bullying again. That is just not the solution.

39 I think about the school that I grew up in. If you removed the bullies, there
40 probably wouldn't be anybody left in the school.

41 MR. LEDBETTER: Well, I don't disagree. I don't necessarily disagree with what
42 you are saying, but the dilemma -- if we are not careful, the dilemma that you create for the schools
43 is such that, when you identify this perpetrator, then you are going to have to take some money to
44 help rehabilitate this perpetrator. Okay? And where does that money come from?

45 All we have talked about is the fact that we don't have much money.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 DR. JONES: But some of these things, it really doesn't take money. The
2 structures are already in the community. I think that is a fundamental problem. Many times the
3 schools feel that, if they don't do it, it is not going to get done.

4 MR. LEDBETTER: You are making an assumption. When we are talking about
5 rural areas, those services may not be readily available.

6 DR. JONES: Given, and I think that is why the point was made earlier that more
7 monies would be given to those school districts, I believe it was, to create the partnerships and the
8 kind of capacity so that those kind of issues could be dealt with. But again, it doesn't go all -- You
9 know, it's easy for me to say. I am not a principal. I mean, I am not there on the ground. But I am a
10 part of a network whereby students who have difficulties can be triaged, if you will, to different
11 community groups, different community facilities where they can be assisted, which will then afford
12 them greater success at school.

13 DR. SIMS: So I think, for me, this would be a good time to get some clarification
14 around resources related to this specific topic area; because we just finished the State Grants
15 Program which had a specific dollar figure. Is this part of that pot of money as well, or is this just
16 part of a reporting system?

17 So maybe some dollars -- a recommendation about resources should be made.

18 Also, this was an area where, when we did the summary report, one of my
19 questions was could we be more specific about who is doing what related to the different
20 recommendations. So provide guidelines and training: Who would be providing that? Would that
21 be coming technical assistance from the state level?

22 Then if you do have something like provide guidelines, should you also have
23 something in here where schools need to specifically state what things they are putting in place or
24 have in place for providing services or working through these kinds of issues as these kinds of
25 incidents come up in the schools setting?

26 MR. HERRMANN: Just in terms of resources, there is a provision -- I assume it
27 is a mandate -- that if a student is a victim of a violent crime, that Title IV funds could be used to
28 transport the student to another school. I believe that is an expectation.

29 I think it is important to remember under this -- and I apologize if I missed this
30 somewhere in our conversation just now. But there are actually two pieces to this. There is the
31 persistently dangerous schools element, and then there is also the victims of a violent crime element,
32 which are really kind of two distinct pieces to this.

33 The victims of violent crime piece, I think, is something that is fairly
34 straightforward and is not necessarily subject to a lot of hocus pocus with states in terms of
35 definitions and that sort of thing; whereas, the definition of persistently dangerous is something that
36 is much harder to sort of get a handle on.

37 CHAIRMAN LONG: We -- I'm sorry, Shep, go ahead.

38 DR. KELLAM: I am just trying to think about how to pull some of this together.
39 I think that what many of us are saying, and maybe most of us, is that, in fact, this program in its
40 next stage needs to be proactive in the sense that it analyzes school needs, as we do with academics,
41 and that it provides guidelines for programmatic interventions to improve the condition of children,
42 both victims and perpetrators.

43 We talked about student-run courts, for example. We can think about universal
44 interventions. Classroom behavior management, in terms of that, has an enormously important
45 impact on the behavior we are talking about reducing.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 We know that, in fact, early interventions of the kind we have been doing and
2 others have and systematic studies show impact all the way into incarceration and prison by first and
3 second grade improvements in socializing kids to the proper behaviors of being a student, so they are
4 successful in their behavior.

5 So at the universal level, we are talking about it being very clear that we need to
6 be doing interventions which promote the school environment and the success experience of kids.
7 That is the great prevention of the problem we are talking about.

8 Then we come to a selective level, the second level of intervention where student
9 courts become important. When a kid does something, structured student courts have been shown to
10 be effective, and indeed they become interventions that could be available.

11 Then when Russell talks about the third level, we get back to the whole question
12 of a partnership again. Where is the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Public
13 Health? Where are the mental health services, and how do they relate to backing up schools?

14 So a three-level system of universal interventions early on, selected interventions
15 when kids show signs of problems like student court, conflict resolutions, a whole bunch of them
16 that have been done with rigorous study, and then the third level of getting the Department of Health
17 and Mental Health to be close partners and easy and quick referral.

18 Whether it is rural or otherwise, the system needs to be connected to the process
19 and progress of kids, and that is a positive program. That is not blaming a school. That is, in fact,
20 moving in with prevention, early intervention, and treatment as needed.

21 Some of the treatment could be just plain family social services. It could be anti-
22 gang programs in the community and the like. So putting this in context with what is going on and
23 protecting that part of the law which stimulated it in the first place should be our game.

24 MS. JACKSON: I would like to add one piece onto what Shep was stating with
25 regard to stage one. I don't see on here providing specific measures or guidance of training of the
26 LEA and all of the staff within to the precursors that would lead up to some of our incidents of
27 violence, what things that we need to provide education and training in, what to look out for on the
28 prevention and awareness end of things.

29 So again, instead of being reactionary as we look as our safe schools choice
30 option that all of a sudden bullying is an issue and it is the new game in town, and focusing on
31 substance abuse and how all of these things are linked together, sometimes in violence, etcetera.

32 So again training with regard to our school based staff, what to look out for in
33 advance.

34 MS. LeBOEUF: I just wanted to add one thing with the list that Shep mentioned.
35 Also mentoring -- if there is local mentoring programs that you could also initiate, both for the
36 victim and the perpetrator, might also help. It might be available as another option the community
37 can provide through partnership.

38 DR. JONES: You know, another thing we use is Big Brothers and Big Sisters
39 and all of that. Those things are very helpful also. Some faith-based groups have been very helpful
40 in helping us with lots of kids who have gone awry.

41 CHAIRMAN LONG: You know, we all have different thought processes when
42 we listen to this. We are doing a lot of these things now, and we are hearing some of those things.

43 I think that -- and Debbie mentioned it here, but I think -- I think -- the premise
44 for this in No Child Left Behind was really for choice. So that that child and the parents of that child
45 could have them go someplace else, and we won't get into degrees, but whatever happened, so that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 they could go someplace else.

2 We do a lot of that now, and then too -- I am looking at another one of our
3 recommendations here. Talked about the states believe the current program produced an unfunded
4 mandate. So here we are talking about all these things. We are doing a lot of good things now, and
5 this is another unfunded mandate on top of a school and a school system.

6 So we are talking about changing the name. It is not funded. It is for parental
7 choice, and I know some of you -- and then some of the things that were mentioned to mirror or
8 parallel what is a good thing, and that is with academic problems in a particular site or district, and
9 that is to analyze the needs and come up with a program and help them, make it a positive type
10 thing.

11 What I am hearing is we are offering up help for something as a part of this that I
12 am hearing that most of you feel has a negative connotation, from the name on down. And we
13 already have -- I was also listening about some -- whatever we call them -- perpetrators, but in the
14 world that I work in, as our intermediate agency we -- I mean on the site level and district level they
15 already have suspensions and expulsions. So that is in place.

16 Then when they get to a certain level, we have community schools and juvenile
17 halls. So we've got a whole system here that we are talking about, but as I listen, you are offering up
18 very positive things, and I know the judge has some very powerful intervention systems for the
19 youngsters in Tennessee.

20 I guess what I am asking is could we codify that. I think, Shep, you got at it right
21 out of the gate. What is our overall recommendation going to be on this? It might be an interesting
22 one. Why is it there?

23 MS. TAFT: It has got a worthy goal, and I agree with it. But why is it placed
24 here? You know, why isn't it placed over with the other choice items, and why is money allowed
25 out of this pot's limited funds to transport kids to other places? Why isn't that in the transportation
26 part of the budget?

27 MS. PRICE: Whether it is a great answer or what, I mean, it is because the
28 subject matter is the subject matter dealt with in our office. It is issues of violence and safety, Guns
29 Free School Act, and all of these different things are implemented from office, and so the choice
30 option is part of our office.

31 The transportation costs for those children that make those choice options for
32 these issues are paid for out of the State Grants dollars that go to the states for state grants.

33 Logically, it makes sense, you know, when you write legislation that that was the
34 way they decided to do it. If we think there is a better way, we should tell them.

35 MR. HERRMANN: Well, I think the bottom line -- correct me if I'm wrong, but I
36 think the overwhelming sense of the committee is that the concept of defining and identifying
37 persistently dangerous schools is not something that has worked to date with existing resources and
38 existing guidance.

39 So it is broken, if you will, or never worked from the beginning. Really, the
40 fundamental question is whether or not there are any steps that could be taken to make it work, and
41 we seem to be coming up short on steps that would make it work.

42 MR. ELLIS: It seemed to me that the intent of this part of the law was to do just
43 two things. We have talked about it. One is identify those schools that are having significant,
44 inordinate amounts of disruptive behavior. So the kids can't learn in this environment.

45 The other one is to give parents and their student an opportunity to move to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 another school. You know, those of us that have enough money that, if we don't like a neighborhood
2 and our community school, we can pick up and move.

3 Not everyone has that opportunity, and I think that was part of the intent of this,
4 was to force schools to give kids a better environment if their schools are not addressing the issues of
5 violence and disruptive behavior that impacts the school's education and the student's opportunity to
6 learn.

7 So I think that that intent is good, and why it doesn't work, I think we heard very
8 clearly, that the definitions are all wishy-washy and the states report different stuff. There was a lot
9 of stuff on data reporting. Remember, there was a lot of information about the inconsistent nature of
10 the data requirements and the abilities of states to play fast and loose with the "persistently
11 dangerous."

12 I think that is a piece of it, and it is in here, as I recall. It is a bullet, at least
13 several bullets in there about tightening up on the definitions.

14 So my thought is that we shouldn't recommend kind of throwing the baby out
15 with the bath water, if you will, that the general intent of this piece is legitimate and it is good, but it
16 is broken.

17 The terms are bad, and it creates a disincentive. The data reporting piece is bad,
18 because you end up getting nothing, as Mike says, that is worth a darn, but the intent, I think, is
19 good.

20 I would suggest that one of our findings be just that, that the intent -- To give
21 people and students a choice of moving out of whatever we term it, a persistently dangerous or some
22 other term school, so that they can have a chance at education is a good one.

23 CHAIRMAN LONG: Sorry, I thought I saw another hand. Susan?

24 DR. KEYS: As I understand it then, this program is about a very limited program
25 or it is just about the ability to exercise that option to move elsewhere, if you are a victim. Okay.

26 One of the recommendations I said that I thought we had made earlier was that it
27 shouldn't be -- We had said it shouldn't be the person who has been victimized that has to move. It
28 should be that they have a choice, to move or to stay, but that the person who had perpetrated might
29 not have that choice.

30 The other thing that I think we are saying, and we said, even though keeping in
31 mind this very narrow focus for this program, that we wanted the language and the emphasis to shift
32 away from this negative toward a recommendation for what are the things that contribute to a safe
33 school. What is it that is positive?

34 I had one thing that I don't feel was our recommendation that is listed here as a
35 recommendation, and that is move the focus of school safety toward prevention of incidents, because
36 I have in my notes that we said that incident data does not tell us what we want to know.

37 I think we will probably have more discussion about incidents, but I think if we
38 are only thinking about prevention of incidents, we are missing that bigger picture that we wanted to
39 convey about creating safer school climates, and I have other things in my notes about what some of
40 those things were.

41 So I would like to just recommend that we not think in terms of just collecting
42 incident data. Here, these were school climate factors that we talked about: Looking at bullying,
43 harassment, intimidation, disorderly common areas, lack of emotional connection to school,
44 inconsistent discipline practices. Those are more things than just incident data.

45 DR. HINGSON: Maybe a way to bring together some of what people have been

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 saying is to turn this thing on its head and not talk about unsafe schools but talk about model
2 schools, and how do we disseminate what goes on -- First, how do we identify what goes on in
3 model schools, the ones where there is the least level of violence, the ones where there is the greatest
4 proportion of kids who are performing well, going on to higher education and so on; and then how
5 do we take those components, what needs to be done to take the things that make those schools work
6 well and disseminate them to the rest of the schools.

7 Seems to me that that would be a far more productive way to proceed, rather than
8 trying to identify and focus on the negative. You could take it even from the point of view of you
9 may talk about options of where kids go to school. Maybe as much emphasis should be given on
10 letting students go to the model schools than it is moving them away from the ones where there
11 seems to have been a problem.

12 MR. ELLIS: Just a couple of thoughts, too. One of the other things we need to
13 keep in mind and make sure everyone understands, it is not just that victims of these violent acts get
14 an opportunity to move. If a school has been designated as persistently dangerous, then every parent
15 has a right to move. So it is not just victims. I just wanted to clarify that.

16 The other piece that I thought was a recommendation and it is in here as a bullet.
17 I just wanted to mention it briefly. We did have quite a bit of discussion about parents' rights for
18 information, particularly disaggregated data identifying specific schools and their associated data.

19 We hear that a lot. At least I do, in terms of parents want information, and they
20 value the information, and they have a hard getting the information. Remember, we had a principal
21 sit before us and tell us that he would absolutely not release that kind of discipline data, which to me
22 was quite troubling.

23 So the transparency issue, you know, I think, is a legitimate one, that parents and
24 the community have a right to know what is going on in the schools.

25 The other thing I was thinking was that perhaps one additional way of turning the
26 negative into a positive is to provide funding priorities for the other grant programs that the
27 office does for those schools identified on the watch list.

28 So if your school is persistently dangerous or whatever it turns out to be or you
29 are on a watch list, that you, that school, gets a higher priority, a mandatory higher priority to get
30 grants.

31 So again, kind of turning a negative thing into a positive thing, and ultimately to
32 make some real difference, an incentive for the school to make a difference in the lives of the kids
33 there.

34 CHAIRMAN LONG: This is quite different from the first section that we were
35 on with state grants, because we were filling in the blanks. On this one, we have a preponderance of
36 recommendations. So maybe we could -- let me just throw this out -- flip what we did the first time.

37 We have all of these recommendations, after literally months of hearing from
38 panels and discussion. So I will just ask this question. Any additions or deletions just from the list,
39 not going through them individually.

40 Then I would turn to Bill again, as I have with the other -- I'm sure that your
41 answer will be, yes, you do have enough to come up with some recommendations on this, since we
42 have, I think, 24 of them listed right here from our previous engagement.

43 So that could we do the same thing with those recommendations so that it be
44 down in black and white so we would get them along with the state grant recommendations ahead of
45 our next conference call? I just throw that out, and then you react to it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Okay. Then I take it, that means agreement. With that then, that will bring a
2 close to the choice section of this. Yes?

3 MS. TAFT: I didn't know where to put this, because I couldn't find anything
4 related to any of the bullets about crisis management or crisis plans.

5 I have been talking to the people in Ohio that do those, help schools do those
6 crisis plans, and they see a real need to not only have -- having the language not only to develop a
7 crisis plan, but to practice it.

8 If that little practice could be inserted wherever it needs to be inserted, it would be
9 helpful, because a lot of the schools have plans, but they have never used them, and everything goes
10 haywire when they first try to use it under a crisis situation.

11 DR. JONES: I would like to echo that. We have done 30 year of research
12 teaching children how to deal with traumatic situations, and if children aren't trained and if in that
13 training it does not encourage maintenance and generalization that is practiced, it won't happen. So I
14 echo that, yes, 100 percent.

15 MS. PRICE: And I totally agree, and would add even a third element besides
16 having it in place and practicing it, but revising it continually and updating it, that it is a living
17 document that goes on. Absolutely, those three elements need to be -- They need to be doing all
18 three of those with whatever they have.

19 CHAIRMAN LONG: Shep?

20 DR. KELLAM: I just wanted to ask. I'm not sure -- I mean, I like the process of
21 this conversation. I just wanted to be a little more concrete about it.

22 I think that, if we take the view -- What I was saying before was that a lot of the
23 interventions that we can do that make this positive can be done early on, universal interventions,
24 classroom behavior management. What we know about the origins and development of
25 violent behavior in schools and on the streets is that this begins early on with the lack of
26 socialization, and some kids are more at risk than others, and that it is possible to intervene early on
27 and do something at the universal level. There are tested programs, and we recommend they be
28 applied

29 Secondly, that at the selective level -- and I am using these terms deliberately in
30 the sense that prevention science uses them these days. At the selective level, there are interventions
31 in later elementary and in middle school that have to do with effective programs that can be applied,
32 and that we recommend they be applied: Student courts, a number of the ones we have been talking
33 about.

34 The third issue is the partnership one, and that is we recommend strongly that, in
35 fact, there be an important public health, mental health and child welfare community based
36 partnership, the same one that would qualify for applying for the Safe Schools, Healthy Students -- I
37 mean, excuse me, the program we were talking about this morning, the State Grant and Aid, that that
38 partnership be thought of as important back-up, third level back-up, indicated for kids who need
39 special attention or families that need special attention or family/school kinds of collaborations and
40 solutions.

41 It is the case that there are positive things that could bring this into the broader
42 programs that we have been talking about, and I think we should recommend that they be thought of
43 in that context, and at the same time recognizing that there are reasons politically and, in fact, in
44 reality for this provision, namely that we protect families' rights to move the kids, and that we
45 protect the schools and their focus on remedial as well as responsive behavior on their parts.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Recognizing that, we think the next generation of this program should include these kinds of
2 suggestions -- more than suggestions, guidelines for how to proceed.

3 CHAIRMAN LONG: Belinda, Montean.

4 DR. SIMS: So maybe help me a little bit again here. When an LEA is applying
5 for resources currently, as part of their application I guess now they get it all though a formula, but in
6 the future they still have to write an application. Do they have a section in there that talks about
7 unsafe school choice options and what they are doing in their schools? Is that part of the
8 application?

9 MR. HERRMANN: The way that the unsafe school choice is implemented in
10 Tennessee is we passed a state board policy. So when we monitor on Title IV compliance, we
11 monitor that they have, in fact, implemented this policy. So we check records to make for sure that
12 principals have been informed, that parents have received notification, all those sorts of things.

13 DR. SIMS: then in order to sort of expand it in the way that we have been talking
14 here in a more positive way, it seems like an application then would want to have a criterion where
15 the LEA needs to sort of think about how what they are doing in state grants is going to help them
16 achieve this part of the NCLB, the unsafe school choice option, so to really draw the links between
17 the kind of programming that they are doing and how they think it is going to have an impact on this
18 particular aspect of what we are talking about; because this is really about documenting and
19 reporting and making -- you know, really showing that when things happen, these other things occur,
20 and we are starting to expand it a little bit.

21 So you really have to be able to see that the LEAs or wherever it is going to come
22 from -- and that they are getting technical assistance from the SEAs to really incorporate this in a
23 more integrative way in their application.

24 CHAIRMAN LONG: Montean?

25 MS. JACKSON: And I just wanted to flip back to the previous page. I believe it
26 was where Hope added to the first bullet on page 3. She added bullying, factors in determining
27 whether a school is safe or not, and considering issues such as substance abuse. Bill stated, if we
28 wanted it added, we needed to tell him.

29 Would everybody be in agreement that we possibly add gang activity as well as
30 racism, issues of racism, to that? It is on page 3, bullet number one, if you flip back to the previous
31 page. The first thing is bullying -- or second one is bullying, and I wanted to add gang activity as
32 well as racism issues.

33 CHAIRMAN LONG: As we bring this section to a close, any other comments
34 regarding the section of school choice?

35 MS. LeBOEUF: To that same section, would we add sexual harassment? It's a
36 form of bullying. Okay, if it's covered by bullying.

37 DR. KELLAM: As we move toward -- I assume the answer was yes. Violence is
38 violence, right? Anyway, what I was going to raise is there are some issues we are talking about that
39 typically do not, in fact, involve teachers and teacher training.

40 One of the things that comes up across the board is what are we doing about the
41 pre-service training of teachers? For example, with what experience do teachers enter a first grade
42 classroom with a mandate to teach kids to read? How are they trained to deal with classroom
43 behavior management? Putting it another way, how are they dealing with the question of socializing
44 children to the role of student, which is a fundamental to how you teach?

45 NCATE, for example, never comes up for conversation, and I sit in all kinds of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 meetings, and half of us, at least the researchy crowd, you know, go to meetings; nobody ever talks
2 about pre-service training.

3 The fact of the matter is that it took me 12 years or something to be trained to be a
4 psychiatrist, another two or three to be a public health psychiatrist, and we send teachers out to teach
5 first graders in about six months of actual field training in how you do it, which is part of the
6 abomination we are dealing with.

7 One of the things we notice is that the intervention programs that we have
8 developed are not really integrated into the teaching of children. They are kind of competitive for
9 reading time, reading instruction time and the like. So we sort of leave the teachers' background and
10 what we are giving young women and men preparation out of the model, and it doesn't show up
11 here.

12 I think it is important that we somehow get that into our consideration, because
13 about half the teachers -- and I know this epidemiologically. About half the teachers in first grade in
14 Baltimore are not very good at classroom behavior management, 50 percent of them, and therefore,
15 their kids by the first quarter in first grade show real signs of disarray in classroom behavior. The
16 other half are doing fairly well.

17 AIR did a study nationally with ESSE and found out that the biggest reason for
18 teacher burnout and teachers leaving and the traffic in teaching has to do with the absence of
19 classroom behavior management. But NCATE, the National Accreditation for Teaching, doesn't
20 come up in any of these considerations that I sit in.

21 I suggest that, somehow or other, we make some background, backdrop points
22 about some of the things that underlie schooling that we don't address typically.

23 CHAIRMAN LONG: Any other closing comments on choice. If not, I applaud
24 you. After six and a half hours, it calls for a break at two o'clock. It is not two o'clock. So you are
25 again right on schedule.

26 We will take a 15 minute break, and come right back with data.

27 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 2:04 p.m. and went back
28 on the record at 2:19 p.m.)

29 CHAIRMAN LONG: If we could hurry up, please. Shep and Russell are not
30 here. So we are going to talk about data. I'm sorry. Their chairs were both empty. I just wanted
31 you to know that. Boy, that's the quickest you guys have gotten back to the table, I'll tell you.

32 The third section, as we indicated, would be the requirements for data under
33 NCLB. Again, if we could first look at the questions. The reason I am going to ask that, on this one
34 we have one blank area here.

35 The first question: Is the amount of information being collected appropriate?
36 Again, we will follow the same venue. I would ask Debbie if the questions are answered
37 sufficiently, with the exception of the second one on page 6 which we have no answers to right now.

38 MS. PRICE: No, I think that's fine.

39 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. So if we could, as we go through these -- Now
40 there's just a few on this one. The first is: Is the amount of information being collected appropriate?
41 No recommendations on that, but some findings. Any comments on the first question? A lot of
42 this, of course, we have talked through with that discussion this morning relative to the State Grants
43 Program, but anything on Number 1?

44 Number 2: Is the information being collected the right information to help the --
45 I'm sorry, mine is cut off here -- assess where it stands on issues related to youth drug use and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 violence prevention? Information to help the nation -- I'm sorry, I had the first two letters cut off.

2 DR. KELLAM: Are you going to go through each one?

3 CHAIRMAN LONG: yes. I was going through each one to see if there is
4 anything additional.

5 DR. KELLAM: I think that where we got this morning bears repeating, namely
6 that there are two issues we need to consider. One is that the data need to be integrated that are now
7 being brought in from a variety of sources, so that all of the data being collected is both economical
8 in terms of collection, utility, efficiency and the like, whether it is retrievable, as it should be, but
9 maybe more importantly, whether it provides an information system about child growth and
10 development and, in the aggregate, school building, school district growth and development and
11 efficiency in raising kids, but whether it is being applied to policy and practices.

12 If there is anything wrong with information systems in the United States, and it is
13 not uniformly this way around the world, but in the United States we have many kinds of
14 information systems. They cost a great deal of money, but they are seriously disconnected from
15 each other and almost entirely disconnected from policy and program baseline development and
16 outcomes.

17 So that, basically, we are spending a huge amount of money without the ultimate
18 payoff in policy and programs, and indeed we need to distinguish between management information
19 systems of the kind we heard about from Howell and others who are expert and lead such
20 information systems from the kind of information systems that school districts collect, which is very
21 much individual child developmental oriented.

22 You collect grades over time in the same child. You don't take an average of the
23 kids' grades typically when you are looking at kids' progress.

24 We need to do both. We need to understand the utility of both management
25 information as well as the utility of following the developmental trajectories of kids in regard to their
26 academic achievement, their behavior, as well as related matters of a kind we have talked about
27 periodically, including their psychological and social condition over time.

28 So when the Secretary raised this issue of whether it is possible, because there has
29 been a growing understanding of the need for this kind of integrated information, she raised the
30 question about is it politically possible.

31 Technologically, it is quite easily possible. Politically, is it possible? The answer
32 is that we have all of these systems independently, and with proper structure of protecting parent
33 roles, privacy of kids and individuals and the like, it should be possible to bring these together,
34 particularly when they can be functionally extremely important in the way that Ralph was talking
35 about earlier today, namely setting the start point for kids over time, measuring their developmental
36 progress at appropriate levels and periods of time, and looking at the outcomes that can be used then
37 to hold institutions accountable and to guide institutional development over the future of the
38 institution's development, whether schools are improving, school districts are improving and the like,
39 as well as whether teachers are doing well at the classroom level over time.

40 So I think those are some of the important guidelines about data. When she asked
41 that question, she turned to me and kind of capriciously said, why don't you write me a two-pager.
42 My sense is that, no, that is not appropriate for me to do, but it is appropriate for this group, in fact,
43 to take a stand on what should the information systems be like that will monitor kids' development in
44 the individual and in the aggregate, and that can be aggregated at various appropriate levels, in the
45 school building or even the classroom upward, and that can be used for these purposes of integrating

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 programs and services when needed.

2 CHAIRMAN LONG: Kim?

3 MS. DUDE: Go ahead.

4 CHAIRMAN LONG: No, go ahead.

5 MS. DUDE: It seems to me that, at least in the school districts I am familiar with,
6 they ask a lot of questions about what drug are students using, how often, what the consequences
7 are, and maybe when they started. I think that information is very valuable, but I think, from being a
8 prevention person, a practitioner, that only gives you so much direction.

9 If you were to find out that 20 percent of your students have used marijuana in the
10 last 30 days, that tells you, okay, perhaps I should do some marijuana education programs.
11 Certainly, those are of debatable significance as far as having an impact.

12 I think what I would strongly suggest is that we add quite a few additional
13 questions that will give the practitioners guidance on how to do their programs. I've brought this up,
14 but some examples might be the protective behaviors that our students are using.

15 Maybe how many hours do you spend in extracurricular activities or sports, for
16 example, because if you were to discover that your lowest using group were your student leaders,
17 which doesn't happen to be the case on college campuses, but it might be the case in high school,
18 junior high, then you might think, okay, well, the more I get students involved in extracurricular
19 activities, maybe the less likely they would be to partake in alcohol and other drugs.

20 So you try to draw some correlations. Who are my most at risk group, and what
21 are some of the things they are participating in versus my lowest risk group. So I can increase the
22 protective behaviors that may exist, or ask questions about how often have you talked to your
23 parents about alcohol and drugs. So that might give you some guidance on how to educate your
24 parents about things.

25 We ask -- On our campus we ask things like what do you value? We ask what do
26 you do for fun? How do you relieve your stress? What makes a party fun?

27 What we find is it is not at all what you would think it was. They value friends,
28 family, their faith, their future. Partying is way, way, way down the list, and that's college. So I can
29 imagine, if you have high school kids, that it might even be better stats than that.

30 We ask them what do you do for fun? Drinking is way down the list, but the issue
31 is students perceive that everybody thinks drinking is what they do for fun. So if you find out that
32 information, school specific, building specific information, and feed it back to the students, then in
33 fact they are going to want to mimic the behavior they think their peers are doing, but it is a more
34 accurate behavior. It is the whole socio-norming idea.

35 You can even ask injunctive norms like what do you think of somebody who gets
36 drunk? You may find that they think it is stupid or they think it is -- We ask -- and I have said this
37 before.

38 We ask questions about not only drinking but smoking, and find out the vast
39 majority of our students think smoking is gross. So we make posters saying 78 percent of M.U.
40 students think smoking is gross or 88 percent of M.U. students would rather kiss a nonsmoker.

41 If you gather that kind of information, that is something that the prevention
42 specialists can then turn around and feed back to the students and use as part of their prevention
43 programming.

44 So I really want to make a recommendation that we go beyond just asking
45 incident data or asking usage patterns and consequences, that we try to find out some of the good

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 behaviors our students are doing.

2 We can also learn -- like we ask our students how do you like to get your health
3 information? Most of them want to get it over the Internet. Most of them don't want to sit down
4 and hear a speaker. So that is important for us to know.

5 So now we do mass e-mails every other week of good information for students to
6 know, because we know that is how they want to get their information.

7 So I want us to use our data to not only tell us where the problems are, but also to
8 tell us where some of the solutions are. I think the data can do that, if we ask the right questions.

9 CHAIRMAN LONG: Montean?

10 MS. JACKSON: I would like to add another piece to that, and I think our last
11 presenters at the last meeting -- One gentleman spoke about the Pride and whether people use the
12 Pride survey or not, I think the other piece of data that needs to be included with the student piece is
13 parental surveying and parental input, so that we understand what the needs of the community are.

14 As part of our authorization and our legislative activities that we can do, it also
15 involves prevention within our community. So parent surveys, I think, are important, and also the
16 school climate surveys. That includes staff, teachers and administrators, etcetera.

17 So as well as determining what the needs of the students are and how to promote
18 those efforts, I think we also need to take a look at what staff information and other education and
19 activities need to be considered as well.

20 DR. HINGSON: The first I wanted to say is I think that we should use whatever
21 data we collect to set goals. I think that it is a very powerful tool to say we want to take a look at
22 alcohol and drug use and violence and reduce it by a certain percentage by a certain point in time.
23 We shouldn't set an unrealistic goal, but we should try and come up with our best estimates of what
24 would work.

25 I would recommend one thing that we all ought to -- or the Department of
26 Education ought to look at is goals in Healthy People 2010. Many of them deal with alcohol and
27 drug and violence and injury objectives for high school and middle school age students, and we
28 should take a look and see whether or not we agree with those goals. Are they reasonable?

29 This is what the Department of Health and Human Services has set as its standard.
30 I think the Department of Education ought to take a good look at that.

31 I think, in addition, the notion that we talked about briefly this morning of
32 standardization across communities is very important. That is how we can learn and make
33 comparisons between different communities and states.

34 The more local the data is collected, the more powerful it is in terms of
35 persuading people in a given community or in a given neighborhood to work on an issue and to
36 monitor how well they are addressing those issues.

37 There have been recommendations recently made about a week ago -- I know
38 Hope was there at the unveiling of the Surgeon General's call to action about reducing underage
39 drinking, and there were a number of data collection recommendations that they have that I think it
40 is worth incorporating every one of these into our list of things that we think need to be collected.
41 But I would mention a couple of them in particular that I am particularly keen on.

42 One of them is testing all injury deaths for alcohol use for people under the age of
43 21, and collecting data on secondhand effects of drinking and drug use.

44 Some of the National Crime Victimization Survey does collect information about
45 whether or not people have been assaulted in the last year and the age of the assailant and whether or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 not they thought the assailant had been drinking or taking drugs. We should make sure that the
2 school information is included in that, not necessarily what individual school but were they a student
3 themselves and do they think that the people who perpetrated these things were students.

4 The Youth Risk Behavior Survey certainly, I think, needs to include questions
5 about whether or not people were assaulted or experienced sexual assaults perpetrated by people
6 who had been either drinking or find out whether or not they had been taking drugs.

7 In addition, I think that there are some environmental data that may be available
8 that should be taken into consideration, because these can influence the alcohol use and drug use and
9 safety within the schools.

10 So we know, for example, there is a rather sizable literature on alcohol outlet
11 density and its impact on violence and crime. The more outlets there are within a given geographic
12 area, the greater the likelihood that there will be drinking and driving incidents and violence
13 incidents and so on. It is also something that communities can control through zoning and through
14 the practices -- that they can control through zoning and ordinances.

15 I think that another thing in the tobacco area -- I mentioned tobacco as an area
16 where we have had substantial progress in reducing use. One of the powerful tools that was used
17 there were the compliance check surveys where they found out how many buy attempts by
18 somebody under the age of 21 resulted in sales.

19 Well, there's actually a literature in the alcohol area that shows that, if you have
20 compliance check surveys and you give feedback to the merchants of how they behaved when the
21 people who were under age 21 attempted to purchase alcohol and what the penalties are if they don't
22 comply with the existing laws and regulations and provide information that there are going to be
23 repeat compliance check surveys, that you can get the proportion of buy attempts that result in sales
24 to go down, and reduce a myriad of alcohol related problems that go along with that.

25 We know there is a relationship between price of alcohol and some of these
26 consequences. So we should, in my view, be monitoring what it costs to purchase alcohol in its
27 various forms, and probably the same thing -- it may be more complicated to do, but with regard to
28 drugs.

29 I should mention that there are a number of policy information systems that would
30 be very valuable to look at. We have one at National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism
31 called the Alcohol Policy Information System where we track 36 different alcohol policies and look
32 at the year that they were passed, and it is done at a state by state level so that we can compare states
33 that enact certain policies with those that don't.

34 With regard to the goals of this particular program, there are many loopholes in
35 the age 21 law. Although it is illegal to sell alcohol to people under the age of 21 in every state, in
36 most states it is not illegal for young people to consume alcohol.

37 There are certain circumstances where they can consume, and in most states
38 people who are under the age of 21 can work in bars and restaurants and sell alcohol, which may be
39 an undue temptation to give it to their -- or allow their peers to have alcohol.

40 So we, it seems to me, should be looking at those policies in the Alcohol Policy
41 Information System. We also have information about insurance policies. We know that most young
42 people who meet alcohol use disorder criteria are not being screened and are not being offered
43 counseling by providers.

44 One of the reasons, we think, is because they are not -- providers are not being
45 reimbursed for providing services and counseling to young people. We should have questions about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 -- that we asked young people: Have you seen a doctor in the last year, and did the doctor ask you,
2 or a health care provider -- did the health care provider ask you about your drinking and drug use or
3 whether or not you had experienced violence, and did they offer you any counseling about what
4 level of consumption poses a risk, and did they offer you any suggestion about where you might go
5 to get help if you wanted to get help?

6 My concern is that, at least in studies I have done in Massachusetts, that if we
7 look at high school students, 75 to 85 percent have seen a physician in a given year, but are very
8 rarely asked about their alcohol. Well, that conveys a message if you go to a health care provider
9 and you are not asked about what is a major contributor to injuries, which are the leading cause of
10 death among that age group.

11 So I think that we could include that information as well in our surveys. I would
12 want us to look at the data that are collected in the Alcohol Policy Information System, and we
13 should probably also take a look. There are parallel systems. CDC keeps a tobacco policy
14 information system, and NIDA, I know, has been doing some work on drugs and driving.

15 All of these things may interrelate. It may very well be that policies around
16 alcohol have an impact on tobacco use, and policies around tobacco use may have an impact on
17 alcohol. Now that is information that is out there, and it is already being collected. I think,
18 unfortunately, it is just not being used.

19 Then finally, I think there is a question about whether or not young people are
20 aware of existing alcohol policies. I remember I was heavily involved in research regarding the laws
21 that are called zero tolerance laws that make it illegal if you are under 21 to drive after any drinking.

22 Yet we found that, even after all states had adopted those laws, a very substantial
23 proportion of young people were unaware that they existed. So when we looked at the college
24 alcohol survey that Henry Wexlar was conducting of people -- this is two or three years after the
25 fiftieth state adopted this law.

26 When we asked college students under 21 how much could they drink and drive
27 legally, in order a third of the states they thought they could have three or four drinks and still drive
28 legally if they were under 21, even though it was illegal in every state. Not surprisingly, those who
29 thought that they could drive after a few drinks were the ones most likely to report that they did so.

30 So we should find out are students aware of their school's policies or their
31 community's policies or their state's policies around alcohol and drug use, and what do they think of
32 it? Do they support or do they oppose?

33 One of the most interesting things, if one looks at the college population -- Henry
34 Wexlar, Bill DeYoung have both done surveys of this -- a majority of college students actually favor
35 more enforcement of alcohol regulation. That's like the best kept secret in America. Even a
36 majority of them even want more enforcement of the age 21 law.

37 Well, unless we let other students become aware that there is this kind of popular
38 support for these things, the voices of those who favor supporting these things will never be heard,
39 and we will never change the -- or we will have much more difficulty changing the norms.

40 So those are a few suggestions that I have around this area.

41 DR. WECHSLER: I want to make two general points about data. First, we have
42 heard great ideas for very useful data, and there is a very good process to throw all the ideas out
43 there, but I keep on hearing Tommy's voice saying how schools are being surveyed to death, and we
44 need to keep that in mind.

45 I am wondering if we need to look at two levels of data, one being that which

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 really needs to be nationally uniform, and then a bunch of optional modules, items, things that could
2 be added on.

3 Maybe a state might do it once every five years instead of on an ongoing basis or
4 they could just pick and choose, and with their strength and programs at the state education agency
5 they can provide the technical assistance to help them choose. But we can't do all these things. It's
6 too much. Schools are already overburdened.

7 So we have to pick that which is absolutely essential to be done uniformly, and
8 then lots of other great ideas that should be put before people, and they can pick and choose.

9 The second point is that so far, to the best of my recollection, all we have talked
10 about so far are really outcome measures, and that is really, really important, but it is only a small
11 part of the picture, especially if we are talking about value adding state and local programs.

12 We really need to also focus on the importance of process and practices. Process
13 -- I don't know, and correct me if I am wrong, but I don't know if I have seen that there is any
14 existing standardized data collection system in place so that we can talk intelligently about what a
15 state is doing in terms of safe and drug free schools, or a district.

16 That is really, really critical, because it is going to be hard to say whether
17 Tennessee is doing better than Arkansas if we don't have a way of describing what Tennessee and
18 Arkansas are doing. So the process measures, what they are doing with the dollars received from
19 Safe and Drug Free Schools, is very important.

20 In my mind, still the most important thing of all is can our programs move the dial
21 in terms of practices? Can we come together as a field and identify what is a list, a menu of effective
22 policies and practices that we want to see schools implement, and then can we identify ways to
23 measure that. Those are the things that we really ought to be holding our programs accountable for
24 setting smart objectives for and moving the dial on getting more schools to implement more of the
25 effective practices.

26 MR. HERRMANN: Howell, I think you are really on target. I agree with
27 everything you said.

28 I do think there is a section that relates to programs being implemented and that
29 sort of thing that could be developed to address a lot of those issues.

30 I think it is really important that predominantly we have been talking about data
31 that helps policy makers and the nation. I think we've talked a little bit, Kim, about data that is going
32 to help people decide what programs to do, which I think is really the important piece.

33 I think we've got to do that. At the same time -- and I think it was you, Tommy,
34 who said this the last time we met. We have really got to -- If we are going to be collecting this data
35 and having people collect it, we've got to help schools use the data in a way that makes it
36 meaningful. Otherwise, it is just a burden.

37 CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes, Belinda?

38 DR. SIMS: I think a lot of schools, based on the panel presentations -- they were
39 selecting programs from the various lists of evidence based programs, such as the NREPP or the
40 blueprints, and maybe then using some of the principles that are discussed in the NIDA red book and
41 things like that. But I know recently NREPP just revamped itself, and there is a new NREPP that is
42 up on the web and available.

43 So similar to other things, I think there needs to be some ongoing updating around
44 how you recommend that people utilize those lists as changes are being made to the list; because I
45 think the SAMHSA list has really changed. Right?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 So someone might inadvertently select a program maybe that is really only
2 promising and not really truly evidenced based, meaning it has been independently replicated or
3 however you would want to quality that.

4 CHAIRMAN LONG: Why don't we go to Kim and Shep.

5 MS. DUDE: I think we also have to help practitioners figure out what outcome --
6 like how to measure the success of whatever they are doing, and I think so often we look at -- and it
7 always hits the national news -- you know, binge drinking rate goes up, binge drinking rate
8 continues to skyrocket or whatever, and for one thing I hate the binge drinking question in the first
9 place. Secondly, it is like we are putting -- and I kind of mentioned this last time. We are putting all
10 of our eggs in the binge drinking basket and, if we don't change that, then we are somehow not
11 successful.

12 That is so totally unrealistic to be able to show success in that. As I said last time,
13 I think we need to look at the fact that what we want to do is move these students down the stages of
14 change so that they eventually make the right choices, but that doesn't just happen overnight or with
15 one program or with one intervention or with one change of laws.

16 They have spent all their lives up to the point that they are 16 or 17 or 18 or 20,
17 however old they are, with so many messages, the environment telling them one thing, their role
18 models telling them one thing, the media telling them something, and then we as educators are
19 supposed to change that behavior. I mean, we are setting ourselves up for failure if we put all of our
20 -- if we determine whether something is successful based on strictly the data that talks about usage.

21 So that is why I think we have to be so careful how we do that, and especially if
22 we tie funding to that, that if you tie funding to the fact that you haven't decreased your binge
23 drinking rate by two or three or five percent, man, you're screwed. I'm sorry. There is no it is going
24 to happen, because I have been at this for 20-some-odd years, and the binge drinking rate on my
25 campus has barely moved, but a lot of other positive things have happened. It has gone down, but
26 not as much as I would like it to, but a lot of other very positive changes have happened.

27 So I just want to put one final plug in for us being careful how we use data to
28 determine our success or lack of success.

29 DR. KELLAM: Well, I feel like we are sort of getting into the conversation
30 rather than what I thought about earlier. We were coming up with kind of a strong understanding of
31 shared vision in the first two parts of our three-question day.

32 The idea that NREPP has different criteria now than it did before and that the
33 various agencies are collecting information that overlaps dramatically from one mission to the next
34 and Federal institutions -- the multiple numbers of data collection efforts is astonishing. It is only
35 surpassed by the variation in what people called prevention programs or how to handle variation
36 from one clinician to another and so on.

37 We live in a culture of small grocery stores, and each one of us sort of runs our
38 shop in the way that we think it should, and sometimes these are collectives, as in school districts
39 and school buildings, but by and large, fractionation is a huge part of our problem.

40 I was talking to Steve Gardner who runs NREPP the other day. He is in charge, I
41 guess, of coming up with new criteria. So I asked him how come the intervention we have been
42 testing for 20-some-odd years, one of the interventions, wasn't on their list. It suddenly disappeared.
43 He said, oh, the old list is not part of the new list yet; we got a new list, and the old list is now being
44 reviewed, but it hasn't been integrated with the new list.

45 Just to give you some idea of the scope of the problem, there is nobody here in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 our group, in this committee, for example, that I think, when they think of information system,
2 thinks about the school building and the school district information system, which is about unique
3 kids -- you know, a child over time and over years -- and how that information system could
4 somehow be integrated with different levels of aggregation about school building and classroom
5 effectiveness, school building, school district effectiveness and so on and how these relate to each
6 other.

7 If there ever was a problem that needed some kind of real attention to what we
8 mean by data and how to make it work for child development and for education, which is the core of
9 child development in many ways, how that can be brought into happening is an amazing challenge
10 for us.

11 I think that we are very much remiss if we don't start with the idea that we are
12 gathering an enormous amount of information and, by and large, it is not standardized in any form or
13 fashion. It is certainly not across agencies and at different levels, Federal and local, and that we
14 really need to study how you would make this information, even the stuff that is being gathered, let
15 alone things you need to know about programs that might work or not and so on -- I think that we
16 have to understand the cultural problem we've got.

17 It has been tried before. In the 1930s the delinquency program, Chicago area plan
18 in Chicago, all of the social service agencies decided that anybody who would connect up with a
19 child would circulate a data card to every other child agency so that the child -- there was a common
20 registry of kid problems, and it did involve the schools and so on.

21 Of course, it fell on its face, because out of it the only thing that really happened
22 was that the social service agencies came together once a month for coffee rather than really
23 systematically seeing how all this data was going to work.

24 We've got a daunting task. If we want kids to grow and we want to monitor their
25 growth, and we want to in fact standardize and use the best practices to have that happen, we need to
26 bring in the other institutions that collect data. We need to sit down and systematically design and
27 integrate a data system that pulls all of the data together.

28 There are both management information system kinds of data, but there is also the
29 kind the school buildings develop that have to do with following kids over time, the unique identifier
30 that allows you to track kids over time and see what trajectories, which way they are going.

31 So I think the data issue is one of those issues where we have to recommend
32 something much bigger than the standard practice. Getting together and saying we should collect a
33 little more of this and a little more of that -- it is the case that we need to fill in gaps, but I think the
34 first job is not only to fill in the gaps, but to understand the basic principle that three-quarters of the
35 money we spend gathering data is overly expensive in terms of time, staff, all kinds of issues,
36 including money.

37 We are collecting far too many information databases and not integrating them so
38 that they could be done much more efficiently and effectively than they are being done, and applied
39 to measuring need as well as measuring outcomes in a more systematic way.

40 We need a group of policy makers, researchers, and others who have this
41 integrating focus who come together and say what kinds of information do you want over time with
42 the same kids, and what kind do you want to understand management information systems, which
43 are not the same kids over time, just summary data.

44 If you take Lloyd Johnson's data on drugs nationally and that group, and you ask
45 what does it tell us about Peoria, Illinois, the answer is zero, because it is aggregated for the nation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 It's sort of like the binge drinking rates, you know. It doesn't tell you a hell of a lot about a school
2 and whether it is generating a contagion of binge drinking or other kinds of problems.

3 So these data have to be brought together under a common vision that monitors
4 kids over time and tells us what the local or different levels are doing, and we have an enormous
5 investment in No Kid Gets Left Behind. We are collecting huge amounts of data and education on
6 kids.

7 Some of the states are promoting following kids over time. Others are just
8 satisfied with the management information side. That is going to go away. We did this in mental
9 health many years ago. If it doesn't get connected to services and program evaluation, it is going to
10 drift away. Politically, it is untenable to collect all that data and not have it apply to real serious
11 practice and policy.

12 So I think we need to underline that as a theme in this part of our response to the
13 Secretary.

14 MS. TAFT: Some of the things that I heard Shep say that I think we talked about
15 last time but I don't see reflected in the dots is that the Department should work to develop a bottom
16 up information -- uniform information system so that the LEAs get information that is useful to
17 them, that can be -- and is also useful to the state and also useful to the Federal level.

18 It might be part of the one that talked about coming up with common definitions,
19 but I didn't think that really touched on our discussion of last time.

20 Another thing that we discussed that I think might influence Shep's -- or expand
21 on Shep's comments were that there are a lot of Federal departments represented at this table, and
22 they fund a lot of programs in the communities and the schools. It would really be nice if there was a
23 commonality between them so that the same data was required for all grants so that the schools and
24 the communities could have one collection process that would satisfy all of the needs of people up
25 here in Washington.

26 DR. HINGSON: I like to echo that comment. I think that is a really great idea,
27 and I think that, sure, we as a committee have been charged with taking a look at this, but I think it is
28 an ongoing process, and I think there would be great value in having an ongoing committee,
29 including Federal agencies, including people from state agencies, the LEAs, and including local
30 school administrators so that we are sure that we are getting the right pieces of information.

31 Again, I agree with Shep that we need to make sure that whatever data is
32 collected, it is not just collected so that we get national estimates, but the community, the local -- the
33 more local the data, the more powerful it is in terms of mobilizing communities to do something
34 about their own issues.

35 Then finally, I just would like to say I don't want us to -- I hope we can come
36 away from this exercise not pessimistic but optimistic. Actually, we have made a great deal of
37 progress in reducing binge drinking in the United States.

38 When the drinking ages were raised, the proportion of high school seniors that
39 went from bingeing dropped by about a quarter, and we are starting to see a little bit of progress in the
40 last two or three years on those national surveys.

41 If we look at the United States relative to Europe, for example, there is a study
42 called the SPAD survey that takes the same data that we -- the same questions that we use about
43 consumption and frequency of binge drinking and applies them in samples in 35 different European
44 countries.

45 In every country but Turkey there is a greater proportion of 15-year-olds who

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 drink than here in the United States, and in all but about four or five of them, there is a greater
2 proportion who are engaging in binge drinking and drinking to intoxication.

3 So in a certain sense we, in our efforts to want to do better here, keep pushing
4 ourselves and pushing ourselves, which I think is appropriate, but I don't think we should lose sight
5 of what has been accomplished.

6 When we raised the drinking age, it made a big difference, and we have lots of
7 community level studies that show that if those laws are actively enforced and if you have
8 comprehensive community programs that include efforts by the school department, the health
9 department, the police department and so on, that we can further bring those numbers down.

10 So I would hope that we would not get discouraged by -- The data are not our
11 enemy. The data can be our friend and can be used to help us mobilize and see where we need to
12 make progress. It can help us assess whether we are making progress, and maybe can help us make
13 mid-course corrections if there are areas where we aren't. So I want us to come away from this
14 exercise not daunted but rather optimistic that we can make a difference.

15 DR. JONES: Yes. If it hasn't been recommended, I would like to recommend
16 that there actually be a study group to look at this whole notion of data and to take into account the
17 many points that have been raised. I mean, I am looking at page 6 and the number of the
18 recommendations that we have already made: Critical review of whether data collection is affecting
19 practice; the need to ensure that existing gaps between research and actual practice of local
20 educational associations are closed; states should use the same measures for data gathering; need to
21 research how to roll out and test the projects in school districts and schools.

22 These are issues that, I think, can only be dealt with in a format where the key
23 players are at the table, and I don't think it should be done in a piecemeal fashion.

24 I raised a question last time in terms of some of the thinking that went into issues
25 that related to data and the extent to which the data drives what the No Child Left Behind initiative
26 were related. It may have been related then, but we are seeing that thinking has not resulted in a
27 passing grade.

28 So again, I am recommending that there be a task force or a group of strategic
29 thinkers to really grapple with this issue, to not only grapple with the issue, but to come to a
30 consensus in terms of developing a framework or modifying the existing framework so that data are
31 indeed connected with intervention and outcomes as well as process.

32 CHAIRMAN LONG: Kim?

33 MS. DUDE: Just short. I just want to make sure if there a study group that is
34 created that it not just have researchers on there, but there be a practitioner on there as well.

35 DR. JONES: I object to that. I object.

36 MS. DUDE: I mean, I love researchers. Don't get me wrong. But there needs to
37 be somebody from a high school prevention program that knows what kind of questions that are
38 really needed there.

39 DR. JONES: And related to that -- Could I jump in just real quick? -- and that
40 there be individuals that are sensitive to different cultures, that there be a cultural competence aspect
41 to that committee. Very important. I could give you a lot more on that, but I won't.

42 CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you, Russell. I just want to say -- I want to make
43 sure I am understanding this, that this study group or task force be a part of the recommendation to
44 the Secretary. I thought for an instance there you were suggesting -- I already had two names.
45 Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 DR. JONES: Oh, but you know, I don't see that recommendation on the --

2 CHAIRMAN LONG: I just wanted to clarify that, because that is how I interpret
3 it, to be a recommendation for -- Okay. I just wanted to clarify that. I'm sorry, Belinda.

4 DR. SIMS: I was just going to say, over lunch we were talking about what kind
5 of interagency efforts there might be, but this seems like one where it could be interagency, and it
6 should include the YRBS folks as well as the Lloyd Johnstons and maybe the Pride and the relevant
7 players, as well as the researchers and the practitioners.

8 CHAIRMAN LONG: Other comments?

9 DR. KELLAM: One other quick thing. Just like teacher colleges or schools of
10 education, you know, the most data collected in the country is no doubt school building data on
11 individual kids over years, over time.

12 I just want to make sure we understand that it is that basic measure of kids'
13 progress which (a) needs work itself in terms of standardizing across different tracks and the like,
14 but also that is the fundamental data against which we can connect up with the data that we are
15 talking about in terms of school atmosphere, data relevant to mental health, data relevant to
16 prevalence and incidence of drug abuse and the like, alcohol practices, and so on, so that we are not,
17 in fact, omitting in the vision of bringing data together and connecting it to policy and program -- we
18 are not omitting the core data that we often ignore, namely the data that is collected on Charlie over
19 his career in schooling.

20 I'm talking about now we have to couch all this with proper safeguards for the
21 privacy and individual character of data. Confidentiality becomes a huge issue in this debate, and
22 will be, no doubt, as soon as it comes up to another group other than this one.

23 CHAIRMAN LONG: I will again turn to Bill with -- There's approximately a
24 dozen recommendations from our previous panels and discussions, coupled with all of the
25 information and suggestions up here. Is it again -- Is that enough to then put that together for our --
26 or do you have questions or clarifications?

27 MR. DUNCAN: You're welcome to keep going. I added 22 recommendations
28 based on this discussion.

29 CHAIRMAN LONG: This discussion. So it would be 34 so far. Okay.

30 DR. KELLAM: Are they organized hierarchically? I hope it's not just a laundry
31 list, though.

32 DR. WECHSLER: It will be a laundry list, and I think it is important to set some
33 priority. I think there is one that is truly global and rises above the rest. I would hope that you can
34 emphasize it a great deal, and that is the one that says states should use the same measures for data
35 gathering.

36 I think we can strongly agree on that, that the current system of everyone doing as
37 they please just does not do the job and, if that can be sort of the pillar and everything flow from
38 that, that would be good.

39 MR. HERRMANN: I think that would be good. I think states would agree with
40 that if the measures can also be the same across funding streams so that what we collect for CDC we
41 collect for CSAP, etcetera, etcetera.

42 DR. JONES: Yes, a process question. In terms of prioritizing these various
43 recommendations, I think it is important to chunk them in meaningful conceptual ways.

44 When will we have the opportunity to do that? Will that be over the conference
45 call and then will that be followed by another meeting in June?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealgross.com

1 CHAIRMAN LONG: We have a conference call, and I don't have the calendar in
2 front of me, in April; and we have a conference call in May, and we have a meeting--

3 MS. DAVIS: It is behind Tab 2.

4 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. And a meeting here in June for the report.

5 DR. JONES: So will we come together again as a group before the final? We
6 won't?

7 CHAIRMAN LONG: No.

8 DR. JONES: So we are going to do the chunking and the conceptualizing via
9 conference call. Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN LONG: Well, that was really -- It was my understanding the
11 purpose for today, so we could cull this down so that this could be sent out, and I think you have
12 done a very fine job of pulling that together, bearing in mind when we -- I've said this several times.
13 When we see this in black and white, it might look a little different, and then that will be -- That's
14 why those calls are going to be so important.

15 MS. PRICE: Regarding the June -- June is listed here as a day and half thing. The
16 June is really to present the report to the Secretary. It most likely will not take a day and a half to
17 present a report to the Secretary.

18 DR. JONES: Will she be here?

19 MS. PRICE: I don't know.

20 DR. JONES: What does that mean?

21 MS. PRICE: It means I have to find out from her schedule. We don't --

22 DR. JONES: Oh, no, no, no. No, I wasn't being facetious. You say it is to
23 present. So what does that mean?

24 MS. PRICE: It can mean anything from David -- if David doesn't want to do me
25 and he asks me to do, to hand it to her, or a meeting. But that's when the report to the Secretary is
26 due, is probably a better way of saying it.

27 DR. JONES: So then we won't be meeting with her?

28 MS. PRICE: Maybe we will; maybe we won't. But it probably won't take a day
29 and a half, whatever we do.

30 DR. HINGSON: It looks, believe it or not, as though we are actually a bit ahead
31 of schedule in terms of the data, and maybe one thing we could think about doing, if we are
32 concerned about not having enough time when we have our telephone call -- I personally find these
33 meetings much more constructive than the phone calls, frankly -- is to try and take a pass at creating
34 those groupings of the different types of data or priority comments about that.

35 It might be we want to take a little bit of a break before we do that, but I think
36 there still is enough time to -- while it is all still fresh in our heads, to refine things a little bit more
37 than we have.

38 CHAIRMAN LONG: What is the wish of the committee here? I want to be
39 careful here that we -- You know, we have had two other groups here, and I want to try to keep them
40 about the same and would be happy to do that. I just want to hear what you have to say. I just heard
41 from Howell about the Pillar, and I think I saw all the heads shaking.

42 Do you want to do the same thing we did with the first group and bullet a few of
43 these and come back? I'm seeing heads shake. Let's take 10 minutes. We will bullet, come back
44 and discuss so that we can pull those together, which is a way of prioritizing.

45 Ten-minute break.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 3:13 p.m. and went back
2 on the record at 3:26 p.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN LONG: In talking with Bill as we were putting these up, he also
4 indicated that, just like you did with the other two, that he's got a lot of information back here that he
5 can put some of these recommendations together for the telephone calls.

6 We started, Howell, with your Pillar, if that is stated correctly: Uniform state
7 measures. Okay. Uniform measures.

8 Then I am just going to go through these and then ask, like we did with the others,
9 for anything that isn't there.

10 Bullet Number 2: Consistency in Federal agency questions. That will be an
11 interesting process. Add questions to assist practitioners and implement programs. This is where we
12 were talking about there are many different discussions with Kim, with Ralph, about different things
13 to ask for different solutions and outcomes. So that was an attempt to put those together.

14 Task force, study group, which would be a recommendation, and what is the last
15 one? I'm sorry. Use existing -- Okay.

16 DR. KELLAM: Yes. I think that Howell's picking up the consistency in Federal
17 agency questions in general across the information systems is a fundamental one. But I also think --
18 and I don't know where we stand on it. My suspicion is that there is a fair amount of agreement,
19 although the shared vision may be kind of vague -- that we really do need to recommend that we
20 reduce the fractionation of information systems, that as every agency, Federal agency, local agency
21 having its own information to an integrated information system enables us to track child
22 development with schooling as its core over time, as well as information systems which give us
23 management data. That is what the rate at any given time across communities or across the nation
24 is.

25 Both those information systems need to be very much better integrated. That is
26 one point, emphasis on integrating and reducing the number of information systems out there.

27 For example, reducing the number of agencies doing evaluations of what's
28 effective programming. There must be a half a dozen, including the latest one, the Helping
29 America's Youth, which has 13 agencies collaborating in trying to make a list of what is effective.

30 There needs to be, in fact, a common perspective that allows people to look one
31 place, and that was supposed to be the goal of a Helping America's Youth information system, that
32 effectiveness. But we've got similar problems about how many people are collecting data on
33 delinquency, on drug abuse, on academic achievement and the like, how many agencies, and can we
34 bring them all into one place so that we could in fact relate them to policy and program.

35 So the purpose of integrating is to reduce the costs in terms of manpower and
36 other kinds of capital and money, and then the second purpose is more to the point. It is to do with
37 what Ralph was talking about earlier, which is to, in fact, establish a framework of measurement
38 which lays out the targets and progress toward meeting the targets and measures periodically the
39 endpoints that are being aimed at.

40 That is where this task force coming together of practitioners, policy people and
41 researchers comes in. That is to design it, first to discover the information systems locally, state-
42 wise and Federal, secondly bring together in an economic fashion, and to understand the principles
43 of -- The information system doesn't have to all be one big thing, but it could be multiply layered so
44 that at one level you get a lot of information altogether, but for specialty purposes you may get
45 special information. But again that could be shared across institutions.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 That is dramatically different than the current practice, and the current practice
2 has been pervasive for the history of the country, I think.

3 CHAIRMAN LONG: Let me illustrate that with a 30-second. This morning
4 when I was coming over, there was a gentleman in the lobby at the Holiday, and I went over. He
5 had a cup of coffee, and I had a cup of coffee, and I introduced myself and we started talking.

6 He said, are you here for the same meeting? And I said, I don't know; what is
7 your meeting? And he said, well, we are going to be talking about safety in all kinds of public
8 entities and pandemic flu and how you communicate. I'm thinking, we must have a new committee
9 member. Wrong. He is meeting, and then they all met in the lobby, and he introduced me to all of
10 them from Homeland Security and HHS, and they are going to be here for a week talking about this
11 subject.

12 I said, do you have anyone from Education at the table? That's a very good idea.

13 Now the reason -- That happened this morning about seven o'clock, and it really
14 illustrates what we are talking about here, that we've got those silos. That's why when I heard,
15 Howell, you said something to the tune of good luck. I think that is the reason, and that is why I --
16 But that just happened a few hours ago.

17 DR. WECHSLER: Keeping with Ralph's theme of being optimistic, you know,
18 we have made considerable progress. We at CDC, we are about to launch a new system to identify
19 effective programs, and we said wait a minute, SAMHSA has NREPP. We just piled on, and we
20 actually are a member of that system now, and you go to our website. That's where you are going to
21 get referred to for registries of effective programs.

22 When we heard talk about how so many of the Safe and Drug Free School
23 programs are evaluating themselves, so many of them use YRBS. It's another great example of
24 going across Federal agency to use that which works best. So we are making some progress.

25 CHAIRMAN LONG: I agree with you, and that is the second chapter of that.
26 We are making a lot of progress, and especially the people sitting around this table; because I know
27 some of you are talking and involving programs.

28 Fred and I are certainly having conversations, and we are going to be setting up
29 some things together. So it is working.

30 MS. TAFT: And that probably should be highlighted in the opening part of this
31 document so that the Secretary realizes that there are some very good things that are working and
32 that we need to build on those, so that she doesn't get a very negative idea about this.

33 CHAIRMAN LONG: That's a very good point.

34 MS. TAFT: And if there was some way in the beginning of the report we could
35 talk about the Surgeon General's call to action and how a lot of what we are trying to do ties right
36 into that, that the main point it makes is that it is everybody's problem and everybody's
37 responsibility. So we are trying to be responsible in our recommendations.

38 CHAIRMAN LONG: I just wanted to make sure that that was captured. That's
39 why I looked over at you there, Bill.

40 Any other -- Now I'll ask again. Are we getting there so that this can be put down
41 in black and white for that first conference call? Okay.

42 Okay. Then we will bring a close to the section on data, and we have two other --
43 If you look on the last page, on page 7, we have two additional issues. I am just going to say it, and
44 then some reaction from the committee.

45 These were not -- As we know, these were not questions from the Secretary.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 These were just as is indicated, additional issues, and there were two.

2 One way to approach this is to not have a number of specific recommendations,
3 just a few, with an opening statement or some statements about them, because it was not, as we all
4 know, a part of the questions that the Secretary was asking.

5 The first one deals with non-public schools, and that was from a -- I think, was
6 derived from a panel.

7 MR. DUNCAN: These were raised by the Secretary when she was here in
8 person. Some of the things she said fit in the existing questions or some of the questions. So that is
9 why they were included.

10 CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Thank you for that clarification, Bill.

11 On non-public there are a couple of recommendations there, I think, three of
12 them. I will ask you if it is okay to just go with those recommendations on that additional issue or is
13 there something else that you wish to add or clarify?

14 MR. HERRMANN: I think it is fine.

15 CHAIRMAN LONG: With all the representatives from public institutions, I
16 think that would be --

17 DR. KEYS: Under the non-public schools I have something in my notes about
18 developing monitoring protocols to address equitable consultation, and that guidance on this needed
19 to come from the Federal government.

20 CHAIRMAN LONG: Would you say that again, Sue? Did you say equitable
21 monitoring?

22 DR. KEYS: Well, greater clarification and clear guidelines are needed regarding
23 the consultation requirement. That is one of the bulleted items. My notes went a step further to
24 suggest that monitoring protocols be developed. So it's not just clarification, but that there would
25 actually be a product developed.

26 I don't know whether we want to say that or not, but I have that in my notes.

27 The other thing I just wanted to mention was that we had a third additional issue
28 area that didn't show up here, and that had to do with factoring in differences of school type, urban,
29 suburban and rural, and the challenges proposed by those differences. That was another special
30 issue that the Secretary asked us to consider, in addition to the non-public school and trauma.

31 Actually, I don't see that trauma was on here at all.

32 MS. JACKSON: Is it on page 20?

33 DR. KEYS: Well, this is what we have in our notes that the Secretary requested:
34 Promoting the discussion of school safety issues and dissemination of best practices; better
35 coordination with private and parochial schools; data sharing between law enforcement, school
36 officials and mental health professionals; and factoring the differences in school types.

37 CHAIRMAN LONG: Belinda?

38 DR. SIMS: For the non-public schools, one of the presentations, I think, focused
39 on some of the issues around how the non-public schools are included in the process, and one of the
40 gaps seemed to be that they weren't part of the surveys, the needs assessments.

41 Am I recalling that correctly, that one of the issues that came up is at some point
42 they were left out of one of the loops in terms of being able to match programs to what their specific
43 needs were.

44 So when they are asked to be a part of Safe and Drug Free Schools, sometimes
45 what is offered doesn't really fit with what they need, because they were not included in the needs

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 assessment.

2 CHAIRMAN LONG: Was it that they were not included or that there was
3 somehow a breakdown in communication after the fact? Maybe I misunderstood.

4 DR. SIMS: Maybe some of both, but I thought I remember them -- one of the
5 gentlemen saying that they were not actually included in the needs assessment phase. So the risk
6 factors and things that are identified are not necessarily the issues that they are dealing with.

7 CHAIRMAN LONG: I took part of that -- and this was interesting, because I
8 think some of that -- I am just posing this -- might be regional. As I listened to that panel, quite
9 honestly, I have not experienced that in our area, and I see Montean -- So I thought there were some
10 regional issues coming up there that were foreign to me.

11 If that is true, even if it is one region, then I would say they might want to
12 communicate to straighten that out.

13 DR. SIMS: Right. And if there were a policy -- an informative policy
14 implementation brief that was developed, it would include some specific examples such as making
15 sure to include non-public schools in needs assessments.

16 CHAIRMAN LONG: You're looking at that second to last bullet there? Yes,
17 okay, good.

18 DR. KEYS: This was in testimony from the Archdiocesan representative. I kind
19 of flagged that. This is just a quote from his testimony. He said, "Does the LEA a 'same service'
20 approach to Title IV surveying public school children without offering to complete an assessment of
21 the non-public schools' needs." So he is suggesting the question.

22 CHAIRMAN LONG: I would say go ahead. Again, it might be a regional
23 situation, but even if it is one region, it is worth putting in the recommendations. So okay. Anything
24 else on non-public?

25 Then on the second --

26 DR. KEYS: Just one other thing. There was also mention that the non-public
27 school often does not receive information about what the allocation is, that they receive information
28 that they can participate in this program but not what the overall allocation actually is.

29 So I don't know if we want to say anything about that.

30 CHAIRMAN LONG: Could that -- This is a question with that point. Could it
31 also be a part of the bullet that was just mentioned here by Belinda on the implementation brief that
32 would help the LEAs to know what is required in terms of working with non-public schools, and
33 vice versa? Okay.

34 MS. TAFT: It is a breakdown in communication.

35 CHAIRMAN LONG: That's how I took it, as a breakdown in communication.
36 Anything else on non-public?

37 Then on the trauma, which was the other additional issue, we have about -- There
38 were eight or nine recommendations there. Anything else to be added to that or any comments
39 regarding that additional item?

40 DR. JONES: Yes, just two points. One was on point number 5, it says there is
41 little science widely available about what kinds of interventions help children with trauma.

42 That is not correct. There are a number of interventions that have been found to
43 be effective with children and trauma. In fact, I sent out a number of review articles and that kind of
44 thing, and there is just a wealth of data from the National Child Traumatic Stress Network that is
45 being funded by SAMHSA, I think, upwards of \$90 million where a lot of good folks are doing a lot

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

(202) 234-4433

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

www.nealrgross.com

1 of good things, and there is good evidence to support a number of empirically based as well as
2 empirically informed treatment interventions strategies.

3 Just one other thing, that one of the things that we have not talked a lot about in
4 this committee, even though we've talked about a number of great things, we have not talked a lot
5 about Katrina and the impact of Katrina. I just wanted to make one recommendation regarding the
6 children impacted by Katrina.

7 I have been there 10 or 11 times, one of those times, as I said before, met with
8 Deborah and the Secretary during one visit. But again, I think it is important that there be some kind
9 of a tracking system to find out how those kids are doing, at least academically, those in New
10 Orleans as well as states other than Louisiana.

11 In many, many discussions that I have had with the parents, teachers, not so much
12 teachers but crisis counselors, I am getting very mixed messages. Some kids are doing a lot better,
13 because they have moved from what has been a very underfunded school system to good school
14 systems. But again, the actual tracking of how those kids are doing, I think, would be a very
15 important initiative.

16 I had an opportunity to talk to Bill just a little bit about this, but again I just
17 wanted to go on record that that should be a recommendation.

18 CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm not going to ask the question for Tommy, but it made
19 me think about it. So this would be it. How much would that cost, and where would that come
20 from?

21 The reason I am saying that is because -- A follow-up question. I don't know how
22 many youngsters were displaced by Katrina. I don't know if it was 15,000 or 30,000 or 40,000. I'm
23 sorry.

24 DR. JONES: Is that question to me?

25 CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes. I didn't know, because as related to what we are
26 talking about here, because -- Well, do you know?

27 DR. JONES: I'm not necessarily saying that the Department of Education is
28 going to fund that particular initiative.

29 CHAIRMAN LONG: No. The reason I -- Because if that is a recommendation
30 to the Secretary, and that is how I heard it, then that is -- Sometime, somehow, that would have to
31 equate to dollars and cents.

32 DR. JONES: Well, then, Bill, can you help me with this one? I didn't mean how
33 much money. I meant more in terms of how to move this -- put that recommendation within this
34 context.

35 MR. MODZELESKI: I don't know whether it is a recommendation for the
36 reauthorization or not.

37 DR. JONES: Oh, no, no, not at all.

38 MR. MODZELESKI: I think it is a separate and apart issue.

39 MS. PRICE: And I think that there is a lot of things going on regarding Katrina
40 and response to things regarding Katrina, and it would be more a part of that package. But I think, if
41 you wanted to have kind of a statement that we think this is a significant thing that should be done, it
42 is certainly appropriate to put that in the report to the Secretary, because then that just moves it to an
43 -- from an awareness standpoint.

44 MS. JACKSON: Also, already as one of our activities we already have
45 emergency intervention services following traumatic crisis events such as shootings, major

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

1 accidents, etcetera, etcetera, that impede the learning environment.

2 So that is already a component of it, and we did get the booklets that were handed
3 out at the last meeting regarding traumatic stressful events and how to effectively deal with those.

4 Something that I passed out and that I am concerned about adding and would like
5 to recommend is that we have early identification and intervention services provided early on to
6 adolescents that come into our school systems already with traumatic events that they faced in their
7 homes, in their communities, etcetera.

8 I am talking about historical and/or environmental trauma. As we look at kids
9 again, they come from families that may be experiencing -- They may have some symptoms of
10 FASD. We have domestic violence that occurs in homes. That affects children learning, successful
11 learning.

12 So again, the early identification of those students and again referral, and again I
13 am kind of talking about training and education and information of what those issues might look like
14 as we are looking at children, and again try to look at the whole child and use a systems approach to
15 working with our children.

16 CHAIRMAN LONG: Help me out. For clarification purposes, are you talking
17 about an additional item or are you talking about --

18 MS. JACKSON: Additional item, not just looking at emergency interventions
19 services following a traumatic event, but looking at trauma as it relates as an onset early on with
20 children.

21 CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you.

22 DR. KELLAM: The difficulty with both these add-ons, and particularly trauma,
23 is that they seem to come out of a separateness. It is as if, you know, we are kind of addressing a
24 new topic, and it is really different.

25 The problem is that we need to understand how this would work if, in fact, we had
26 ongoing information systems that were monitoring kids over time at local and state levels and
27 nationally, regionally and so on, those information systems would tell us how the kids are doing in
28 New Orleans over time in the aggregate on measures which had some standard codes, so we could
29 understand how they compared to kids elsewhere, different communities.

30 We could monitor them over time, and we would have then a system for
31 integrating services at the universal, selective, indicated levels with partnerships with the proper
32 agencies.

33 It's the lack of the information systems and the connection to services as
34 appropriate inside and beyond the school which comes together, and one of the problems -- Ralph
35 was sitting on scientific review committees. I'm sure Russell has many times. One of
36 the difficulties with trauma research is that it is very hard to recreate after the fact what the
37 monitoring needs to be in order to figure out whether the kids are indeed suffering from trauma or,
38 more importantly, which kids are suffering how much and in what way.

39 Information systems that in fact monitors kids uniformly over time, that has some
40 national characteristic, really is an opportunity to see how many things are being affected,
41 everything from flue to diabetes to obesity to academic achievement. In some sense, you have a
42 system which allows you to tap into sampling kids for special identification of problems, the
43 evaluation of interventions.

44 Trauma becomes a kind of a way of seeing how that kind of integrated system
45 might help you know what is going on with kids in New Orleans. Imagine the exodus of those kids

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 to many, many places, but suppose all of those places had its own local information systems, and
2 they do. They are just in pieces. Every school they are going to has grades and achievement and
3 behavior.

4 You can, in fact, elaborate minimally on that kind of profile and understand how
5 an information system could be tied to policy and programs. That is what we've somehow got to
6 create a vision about.

7 CHAIRMAN LONG: Any other comments on trauma? Recommendations?

8 Then going to -- Susan brought up the fact that there was a third add-on. I want to
9 make sure I am getting this correct, and that was the factors, if I recall, rural and urban. What is the
10 will of the committee regarding that?

11 DR. JONES: Looking through my notes, I didn't see it, but I do remember
12 discussing it.

13 CHAIRMAN LONG: I am not sure. I'm going to have to ask this question,
14 because I'm not sure where that fits in as far as recommendations that Susan asked about additional
15 add-on relative to rural/urban.

16 DR. KEYS: When Secretary Spellings came and met with us, she asked us to
17 deliberate on four additional questions, and that last one, I'm not sure that we really addressed.

18 MS. PRICE: We talked about it a little bit in issues related to the State Grants
19 Program. I think one of the questions incorporates the rural and the urban looking at -- I was just
20 looking for the question. There we go. Yes, is it working effectively in those variety of
21 circumstances?

22 You know, we heard from some on the urban and rural. We heard some of the
23 needs of the urban that were specifically related to violence, but I don't know that we have specific
24 recommendations regarding what we heard that were unique to those environments.

25 I think that what we talk about is applied to those school districts in a unique way.
26 Bill?

27 MR. DUNCAN: At that meeting, I had one or two notes of recommendations,
28 but I put those in -- For instance, one was one you mentioned earlier, and that is paying attention to
29 districts where there is only one school, because the district is small. So that is actually included on
30 page -- I'm not finding it, but I promise it's there -- 5 in the first box, the very bottom.

31 So if there are additional things, of course, we can add those, but anything that we
32 took notes on that day are included somewhere else in here. I think there were only two. So if there
33 are additional recommendations, of course, we will add a box for that.

34 CHAIRMAN LONG: Hearing that, then I will ask again, because I want to make
35 sure that everything is heard. Is that sufficient or what is the wish? Should we proceed? Debbie,
36 Susan?

37 MS. PRICE: Well, a couple of issues rose to the surface as we had our urban and
38 rural conversation, and persistently dangerous was one. In those communities where there is only
39 one school, how do you deal with the choice issue?

40 Then there was the dollar issue, primarily dollar, but the issue of State Grants as it
41 relates to urban and rural. But so much of what we are dealing with, we are dealing with specific
42 communities and applying -- I can think what I'm thinking, but I don't know that I can verbalize
43 what I'm thinking.

44 It is part of the addressing of the individual schools that we -- school districts and
45 issues related to those that we do. I don't know that we have a specific category of questions.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 We could make a kind of summary statement that we heard from rural and urban
2 and talked to their needs and those issues, and just kind of identify where we have placed those
3 recommendations related to that in the report. But if you all remember something that is specific
4 that we didn't capture, we would be happy to add that.

5 CHAIRMAN LONG: I just wanted to make sure that we weren't passing over
6 something. That is why I was asking.

7 DR. KEYS: As was I. When I read the transcript from that session, I didn't feel
8 that we really addressed the issue in what was talked about, and I wasn't sure what the issue was. So
9 I'm just asking, have we adequately done what we were supposed to, and it all depends on what the
10 final report looks like also.

11 Are we going to take each of those four questions that the Secretary asked and
12 look at them separately or will they be integrated into the other three pieces?

13 If we have to look at all four of those questions separately, I just think the last
14 question is going to get a weak treatment.

15 MS. LeBOEUF: When you talk about urban and rural, are you also including
16 Native American? Is that included as a category to be looked at, those schools?

17 MS. PRICE: We didn't pull Native American out uniquely, no.

18 CHAIRMAN LONG: Getting back to what Bill said, I am just throwing this out.
19 As you went through this, it is my understanding that you put that idea into two of the other areas.
20 If that is sufficient, we can leave it. If not, we need to go after it. What is your pleasure?

21 MS. PRICE: I am happy to broach this with some folks in the Secretary's office
22 to make sure that we have addressed it and we haven't dropped the ball on this one, which I don't
23 think we did. But I would be happy to do that.

24 The reason I haven't popped up with a responsive answer is I was trying to think
25 the best way to approach it, but I would be happy to pursue that. If we have to do something to
26 supplement what we have already done, we will figure that out. I think we will be all right.

27 CHAIRMAN LONG: Any other items for the good of the order? As we bring
28 this to a close, and if there's any other comments, but first of all we mentioned many times with
29 these three areas now go to Bill to get them out to us for information as we see them in black and
30 white for the first conference call in April.

31 MS. JONES: Are we going to actually get out of here early? That's great. I've
32 just got two things to say.

33 One, first of all, I want to really thank Bill for putting this together. I thought you
34 did a great job calling together a lot of information. So very thankful for that.

35 Just one other thing. I just wanted to -- 45 seconds. Give you an update. I was in
36 Baton Rouge a week ago, and anyway I met with a group of crisis counselors -- and my phone is
37 ringing. Anyway, I met with a group of crisis counselors. They are part of Louisiana Spirit. This is
38 a FEMA funded initiative, and these folks have been on the ground since Day One, and they are
39 working very hard just doing a Herculean task in terms of helping individuals.

40 I asked them, given that I am interested in children and adolescents, to give me a
41 list of different problems that they saw or things that could be done to help children and adolescents,
42 because many of them are doing very poorly.

43 What they did, they gave me approximately -- I don't know -- 150, 200, 250 lists
44 of different things of various needs, and I just want to quickly just give you what some of those
45 categories are, just a couple of things.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 One was teachers and educators. Many of the good teachers, unfortunately, are
2 leaving or have already left the area. So you've got teachers who aren't the best in some instances.

3 Advocacy for mentoring, help with parents. Programs was another area, and
4 under programs more summer programs, summer educational support in math and science, extensive
5 specialized counseling.

6 In schools, caring truancy programs, individual family group therapy sessions,
7 etcetera. But again, just a lot of information, and I just want to share this with the group to let you
8 know. Don't forget about Katrina, and continue to support the children of the Gulf Coast.

9 CHAIRMAN LONG: Well, just so you know that Riverside County, California,
10 cares, Russell, we had 1200 people land at March Air Force Base in eight days, and over 400
11 youngsters were enrolled in our schools from there, and about two percent of the children and
12 parents have gone back. They have stayed which I am sure that you are -- and we have hired many
13 teachers and administrators.

14 DR. JONES: Yes, I think many great things are being done. I really do.

15 CHAIRMAN LONG: In closing, I really want to say this. Think about what you
16 have done in eight or nine hours, tremendously rich conversation and, most importantly, synthesized
17 the information into a very useful form so that we can come up with these recommendations.

18 I have been around a lot of groups. You are very passionate about what you do.
19 You have a depth of expertise and experience, and you expressed it, and it all came together.

20 I was trying to think about it through the day. We all work with many groups.
21 This is a very good one. So thank you very much for the day.

22 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 4:03 p.m.)

23 - - -

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.