# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION + + + + + +

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

+ + + + +

## Thursday

April 19, 2007

+++++

The meeting was convened at 2:00 p.m. via teleconference. Mr. David Long, Chairman, presiding.

# **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

DAVID LONG, Chairman KIM DUDE FREDERICK ELLIS MIKE HERRMANN RALPH HINGSON MONTEAN JACKSON RUSSELL JONES SUSAN KEYS TOMMY LEDBETTER BERTHA MADRAS DEBORAH PRICE MICHAEL PIMENTEL DENNIS ROMERO BELINDA SIMS HOPE TAFT

# **STAFF PRESENT**:

HOWELL WECHSLER

CATHERINE DAVIS WILLIAM DUNCAN WILLIAM MODZELESKI

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

2:09 p.m.

MS. PRICE: We will start with Catherine doing a role just to make sure we've

got everyone.

MS. DAVIS: Dr. Long? CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes. MS. DAVIS: Kim Dude? (No audible response.) MS. DAVIS: Fred Ellis?

(No audible response.

MS. DAVIS: Fred?

MR. ELLIS: Yes, I'm here.

MS. DAVIS: Montean Jackson?

MS. JACKSON: I'm present.

MS. DAVIS: Russell Jones?

MR. JONES: I'm here.

MS. DAVIS: Shep Kellam?

(No audible response.)

MS. DAVIS: Tommy Ledbetter?

(No audible response.)

MS. DAVIS: Seth Norman?

(No audible response.)

MS. DAVIS: Mike Pimentel?

MR. PIMENTEL: Yes.

MS. DAVIS: Hope Taft?

MS. TAFT: Here.

MS. DAVIS: Bob Flores?

(No audible response.)

MS. DAVIS: Ralph Hingson?

(No audible response.)

MS. DAVIS: Susan Keys?

MS. KEYS: I'm here.

MS. DAVIS: Dennis Romero?

MR. ROMERO: I'm here.

MS. DAVIS: Belinda Sims?

MS. SIMS: Here.

MS. DAVIS: Bertha Madras?

MS. MADRAS: Here.

MS. DAVIS: Howell Wechsler?

(No audible response.)

MS. DAVIS: Mike Herrmann?

(No audible response.)

MS. DAVIS: And we also have Bill Duncan and Bill Modzeleski on the line.

MS. DAVIS: And we'll turn it over to David.

CHAIRMAN LONG: I heard Russell. You're there?

MR. JONES: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN LONG: As we start this, our thoughts and prayers are with all of you in that area understanding -- no, not understanding. I can't understand that -- the things -- the horrific things that have gone on. So I just want you to know from all of us to all of you out there that indeed our thoughts and prayers are with you.

MR. JONES: Thank you so much. Thank you so much. And thanks for all your e-mails.

CHAIRMAN LONG: As we get started, first of all, is Bill -- I know Bill Modzeleski is on, I think. Is that correct, Bill? You're on?

MR. MODZELESKI: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. The papers that we received on the drafts, I want to thank our other Bill. I thought that was an excellent job. I was wondering how that was going to be accomplished. And I want you to know up front that this is deeply appreciated so that we have not just a framework, but really what I think is an excellent start as we start to wade through this in preparation for the presentation to the Secretary in June. So that's a big thank you from all of us.

And Debbie, let me ask you this as we start. The outcome for today, we didn't have a chance to talk on this, so this is just my thought or question to you. The outcome for today, what would you hope to have accomplished?

MS. PRICE: Well, I think that if we could kind of walk quickly through what we have here as the draft and address any concerns or questions or kind of walk through it to make sure it is reflective of the Committee's understanding. And if we've missed points, just make sure that this accurately reflects the thoughts of the Committee.

I do want to see -- I think we've mentioned this before -- if each of us individually wrote the report, it might be quite different than what we go forward with in a Committee's report, that the important part is to get consensus of the Committee that this is -- without repeating the word -- the consensus of the Committee going forward to the Secretary. So we won't all have exactly what we think it should say in there, but to have the consensus of the Advisory Committee going forward I think is the important thing.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Then I just wanted, as I said, since we didn't have a chance to talk beforehand, I just wanted to make sure that we're on the same wavelength.

As the information that we received, we're well aware of going clear back to the start of the Committee that the three areas -- the Safe and Drug-free Schools and communities State Grant Program, the Unsafe Schools Option, and the data requirements, and then as indicated in the introduction at the end of that first paragraph, additional issues that came out of the October meeting. As we start down this road, unless there are those that would prefer to do it otherwise, let's think about this. Instead of starting right at the top with number 1, Safe and Drug-free schools, the State Grant Program, let's go to page 9 and the Unsafe Schools Option.

The reason I'm suggesting that, I think that's the most straight forward and it's just like warming up for a race. I think if we take one where we can really warm up on first, as we get into these other two, it might be helpful. So if that's okay, if we could turn to page 9 from the notes that you got, and about two thirds of the way down, it says, "Unsafe School Choice Option." If we could go through --

MR. HINGSON: Hi. This is Ralph Hingson. MS. PRICE: Oh great. Hi, Ralph.

MR. HINGSON: Hi.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Is that okay?

MR. HINGSON: Yes. That sounds good.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Now there are many ways that we can approach this. But maybe the easiest is to take it section by section.

And as you note there are questions that came up, and then after each one of those, there is dialogue. And looking back to what Debbie just said, and I think that's an important point to keep in mind as we go through these that we all have on some of these issues, we'll have different opinions, but the report, of course, if we can come up with consensus.

So with that in mind, looking on page 9 on the Unsafe School Choice Option, and I thought it would be easy to start with this one because that opening sentence really says it. Of all the sections, this one likely garnered the most consensus and concern among members. And I think the most pointed recommendations were here. So if we could just walk through this first to see how it goes. And then suggestions along the way if you want to change the process.

That first question, "Does the U.S. provision of a similar purpose adequately provide the authority, direction and target for schools to be identified as persistently dangerous?" Now, rather than reading through this, we've all had the notes. If you would take a look at that first question and -- the end of page 9 and halfway down page 10 -- if we could address that question first. It takes a page and a half. So --

MS. PRICE: I have one comment that I think needs further clarification.

On page 10, the first sentence, "In terms of specific students who are the victims of violence, the Committee believes the Department should provide guidance and training." And I thought we should say guidance -- guidelines and training for whom? Because we're not going to provide them to the students. So could provide guidance and training for school officials, school administrators, teachers? I thought it would help to say who.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay with that clarification. Any --

MS. KEYS: Yes. I would just agree. I would think all of the above.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay.

MS. KEYS: Administration, teachers.

CHAIRMAN LONG: More inclusive?

MS. KEYS: Rather than leaving it hanging.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Right. Good point.

MS. PRICE: This is Debbie. Don't forget we've got a transcriber. So if you can, identify who you are when you're speaking.

MS. KEYS: That was Susan Keys.

And then I had one other thing just further down that paragraph. "If the victim doesn't want to transfer, the district may be required" -- I think maybe we want to say our recommendation is that the district consider moving the perpetrator. That "may be required," seemed a little -- again, ambiguous.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Susan, this is Dave.

I also have that circled to talk about or recommend something. Because many school districts across the country already have school board policies in place where it will say under certain circumstances will be expelled. So by using your language, that would incorporate all of those policies across the country also.

MS. KEYS: Okay.

MS. JACKSON: Hello. This is Montean. And I'd like to add in the paragraph before the one Susan was speaking about referencing along with incident reports. It talks about using multiple information sources like administrators, students, teachers. I'd like to include staff -- school staff.

MS. PRICE: Okay. Okay.

MS. JACKSON: Okay. I just wanted to add that other group in there.

MS. PRICE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay.

MS. PRICE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Any others regarding that question number 1 that we're

on?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Hearing none, then let's go to the bottom of page 10, the second area. "Considering that there are over 100,000 schools in the United States, the data reflects more than 150,000 serious violent crimes committed in schools annually. Do the numbers accurately reflect the numbers of schools identified as persistently dangerous?" and so forth. That section at the bottom of page 10 that goes right to the top of 11, any comments regarding that?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Then moving to the next -- which would be about a third of the way down on page 11. "What changes would be necessary to address the underlying purpose of the provisions?" That goes down page 11 to the middle of page 12.

MS. KEYS: It says -- I think this might be a typo, or else it's a word I'm not familiar with. In the middle, it says, "for instance, schools that show indicia." Maybe we want schools that show indicators, or indication.

MS. PRICE: It's an actual word. Phil Duncan typed that.

And I was not familiar with it, so I actually looked it up in Webster's, and it does mean indicator. So that's why I left it.

MS. KEYS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Any other?

MR. HERRMANN: Dave? CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes.

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike Herrmann. I think I wasn't fully in on the call just a second ago. But I did have a comment on the Unsafe School Choice option.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay.

MR. HERRMANN: Are we still on there?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes.

MR. HERRMANN: In the draft that was presented, it's not clear to me what we are presenting as findings and what we're presenting as recommendations. And just a suggestion, I think it would be good if there were some way from some sort of a format standpoint that we could get that accomplished. Because I think, specifically on the Unsafe School Choice option, I mean, clearly we had a finding that the provision wasn't doing what we had said that it --

CHAIRMAN LONG: You're referring to the chart?

MR. HERRMANN: Right. Right.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. I think that's a good observation. We're sort of on the same page literally.

What we're doing, Mike, is we're starting with the --

MR. HERRMANN: On page 10?

CHAIRMAN LONG: -- the option. We started on page 9, and we're going through that question by question to make any additions or recommendations by the Committee.

But the point that you made had also been incorporated, because I think that's an important one on that chart.

MR. HERRMANN: Okay. I was actually able to hear, but I wasn't able to speak. So, I had to hang up and try again.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Sorry about that.

MS. TAFT: This is Hope Taft. I've just come on board.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Hi, Hope.

MS. TAFT: Hi.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Did you hear what I was just saying with Mike?

MS. TAFT: That we're on page 10 -- or 9?

CHAIRMAN LONG: No. We started on the Unsafe School Choice Option part of the draft report. And we're going through it question by question asking the Committee for any suggestions or changes or points of discussion.

And we are now over on page 11. Help me out here, folks, because I turned the pages when I was talking here. Over on page 11, I think it's like question 3 or so.

MS. TAFT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LONG: So, to bring us back on task, any other points of clarification on changes necessary to address the underlying purpose? We're over on page 12 now. It's goes over to the middle of page 12.

MS. DUDE: Kim Dude just joined.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Hi, Kim.

MS. DUDE: Hi.

CHAIRMAN LONG: In the middle of page 12 and going on to the next question. "There are adequate guidance that enable schools. The school district should know what's expected

of them -- dangerous identification."

Any points or clarification there?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: At the bottom of page 12, "Are there actions that the Department of Education can currently take to improve the effectiveness, operation or management of the provisions?"

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Hearing none --

MR. HERRMANN: I'm sorry, Dave. CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry.

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike. I have one.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay.

MR. HERRMANN: That the Unsafe School Choice Option provisions be linked with the State Grants Program, and the data collection requirements under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program.

I think we've sort of talked about it in different places, but I think specifically to link those three areas is something that's important on the Unsafe School Choice Option.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. A statement to the effect that the linkage of the areas?

MR. HERRMANN: Right.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. I'm not sure -- this is just a housekeeping. I'm not sure if others are getting it. I'm getting feedback from some phone with other people talking or -- is anyone else getting that?

MR. JONES: I am. This is Russell. It sounds like someone's making a reservation with Delta Airlines.

CHAIRMAN LONG: I wanted to bring that up because if someone is at a station where there's something going on where we're picking that up.

Okay. Now I have taken a look at the section on the Unsafe School Choice Option. But before we leave that --

MR. LEDBETTER: David? David, can you hear me now? This is Tommy Ledbetter. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes, we can.

MR. LEDBETTER: Okay. I tried to speak awhile ago when you were on page 11, and I didn't go through. So I had to call back and register back in.

But I hate to bring you back to there because while I was off-line you may have addressed this. But the one thing that we did agree on was we didn't like "persistently dangerous." We didn't like that terminology for various reasons, one being that a school identified as persistently dangerous in one state might not be identified as persistently dangerous in another and so forth. But I did not recall us coming up with Unsafe School Choice Option. Was that something that we came up with -- the terminology? Or is that something that was just substituted in there for an example using that?

MS. KEYS: I think I can speak to that.

I brought it up at the last meeting as something we had suggested when we originally talked about it as a possible term to use in place of "persistently dangerous."

This is Susan Keys.

We did talk about it last meeting.

MS. PRICE: This is Debbie.

The way I read that, I was thinking it was just used as an example, not as that it's our recommendation that that be the name. But that is an example of let's make this a stigmatizing name.

MR. LEDBETTER: Well, that's why I asked the question. I'm not sure that I like

But that's why I asked if that was just something that was just an example, or if that was the terminology we were going to use. So if that's not necessarily something that's written in stone there, well then, I'm fine. But pass on and go to something else.

But if it's something that's written in stone that that's the terminology that we'll use from now on, I would like to talk about that more.

CHAIRMAN LONG: This is Dave, Tommy. I took it the same way as the other two that it was just an example of, and that the point was that most definitely there needs to be a name change so that it is not misleading or stigmatizing.

MR. LEDBETTER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And that that was just an example. That's how I took it

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that either.

also.

MR. LEDBETTER: Okay. Well, let's not spend anymore time on that.

Where were you, so that I can catch up?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. We're now done with the Unsafe School Choice Option segment. We started with that one first.

MR. LEDBETTER: Yes. I was here when you -- thanks.

CHAIRMAN LONG: So if we could then move back to the first one, going clear back to page 3 right at the top, "State Grants Program." And if we could do it the same way, that seemed to work.

Are there any -- the first question there. I'm sorry. "Currently as implemented, one of the strengths of the State Grants Program." And that is on page 3, and goes over to the top of page 4. Any comments on that?

MS. KEYS: This is Susan Keys.

I have a couple of comments. One is a very minor thing.

On page 3, the last sentence of the first paragraph, I would say the Committee also notes that problems related to school safety are -- and I would insert the word "often" related.

MS. PRICE: And this is how over and over again it talks about the safety effort without any reference to the alcohol and drug prevention efforts, or about the public health nature of alcohol and drug use. And I think it needs to be stated somehow so that it's seems to be broader than just safety effort.

MS. KEYS: I would concur. Susan Keys.

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike. I would concur too.

MS. DUDE: So would Kim.

MS. JACKSON: Ditto. Montean.

MR. HINGSON: Yes. Ralph.

MS. SIMS: And Belinda.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Then moving on to the -- or is there anything else?

I'm sorry. Before we leave that section.

MS. PRICE: The whole section, or just that one question?

CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry. Just that -- I'm sorry. I misspoke. That one

question.

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Then at the top of page 4, the next question, "Is the State Grants Program working effectively to promote safe and drug-free schools across the country, specifically in rural, urban and suburban settings?" Comments? Was there a comment on that? It sounded like someone started to ask, and then --

MS. KEYS: I was going to say something, but my comment's in the next section.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. So the next section or question, "What are the difficulties in determining the effectiveness of the program?"

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike.

I think one difficulty is there's no consensus at the federal level or from state to state about the nature of desired outcomes for the program so that we encompass the lack of consensus at the federal level, as well as kind of going beyond safety problems to sort of a general desired outcome for the State Grants Program.

CHAIRMAN LONG: So, Mike, you're suggesting -- as I read that second

sentence is that there's no consensus --

MR. HERRMANN: At the federal level --

CHAIRMAN LONG: At --

MR. HERRMANN: -- or state to state. MS. TAFT: I would agree with that. MS. KEYS: This is Susan Keys.

And I would just say, I'm not sure that it's the nature of the problem, but it's the definition of the problem. There's no consensus about definitions. I don't know. Maybe people don't agree with that.

MS. TAFT: This is Hope.

No, I would agree with that.

MR. HINGSON: This is Ralph Hingson.

I think that what's interesting here is the phrase, "when a school is safe."

It seems to me that if the school grounds themselves may be safe, but it's imbedded into a community that where young people have to go back and forth in that community to get home that isn't safe, that that's a big problem. And it seems to me --

MS. DAVIS: I agree with you.

MR. HINGSON: -- that we need to work on that as well as just making sure that within the territorial boundaries of the school it's safe.

MS. TAFT: That's right. It's safe and drug-free schools and communities. We can't leave the community part out of it.

MS. PRICE: But that's also beyond the realm of the Department of Education's ability to address. I mean --

PARTICIPANT: It's beyond the scope.

MS. PRICE: Yes. It's beyond the scope, and while it certainly may be an element of concern, we have no role beyond the school grounds and the school facilities.

So, I mean, we should word that in a way that's reflective of that.

MS. JACKSON: And I would definitely agree with that, Deborah. This is

Montean.

Again, our schools doing all they can do to provide prevention and effective intervention regarding students that do come into their school that are self-medicating and using substances, I think was the main focus of this grant.

And then we also have spoke many times in our meetings about the collaborative efforts that need to happen with this particular program in reaching out into other organizations and providers and the other systems that we have in place to address the surrounding communities and any other efforts. So, I definitely like the way you phrased it. So I would agree.

MR. LEDBETTER: This is Tommy. I agree with Montean.

I'm not sure though that I would be receptive to even asking for any money, or any program from the Department that meant that I had to go out into the community and be a part of making the community safe. I think that's such a large scope there that those of us in education don't have the training for that type of thing. And I think that's way too far-reaching.

MS. MADRAS: The other thing that I think -- I agree with one of the previous comments on the difficulties and definitions. Because in order to look at outcome measures and effectiveness, you have to know -- you have to define what the issue is and what the goals are. And without clear definitions, it becomes very difficult to assign a goal. And then it becomes doubly

more difficult to determine effectiveness. So, for example, the terminology "drug-free" is a problem. Because that implies that the schools themselves should have no drugs in them, that the children themselves should have no drugs in them. They can usually notify the school and then come in either after a three-day hiatus in which they are still compromised in terms of cognitive function.

I'm not sure what the word "drug free" means in this situation. And that really goes to the whole component of student drug testing.

MR. HERRMANN: This is Michael.

And I'm going to have to agree wholeheartedly with her. I've had a problem with this term "drug-free," which is not realistic. I can see drug prevention, drug reduction. But drug-free is just something, folks, we're not going to accomplish.

MS. MADRAS: I'm not sure in terms of whether or not that should be a goal --zero or what have you. But just the term, what does drug-free mean? I think we have to step back one step before we even define what the goal should be.

Does that imply that one defies the school and comes into school. Does it imply a residue in their body, or in their lockers. It's not clean. Just the word itself does not have associated with it clear terminology.

MR. ROMERO: This is Dennis.

If I understand the last part of --

MS. PRICE: Dennis, you need to speak closer to the mike. We can't hear you.

MR. ROMERO: Is this better?

MS. PRICE: No.

MR. ROMERO: Boy. Is this better?

MS. PRICE: Okay.

MR. ROMERO: Goodness.

If I understand the last caller's comments, I'm in somewhat of agreement. What I don't understand is it was mentioned awhile back the whole question -- the whole ambiguity -- the definition in general. And that creates a lot of confusion across the country.

The term "safe and drug-free school" I agree is a goal, as I see it, where we want to go. But if we're going to carve -- yes, it's true that we're not going to completely be drug-free. But I think at the same time we are aiming towards that. We don't have safe schools, but we're aiming for that.

So it's really important that we understand the correlation between those two. Just look at the epidemiological data that's out there already.

So, however we come to terms with that, we have to keep in mind that the two are interconnected.

MS. MADRAS: They are very highly correlated. The question is do we actually mean drug-free schools? Or do we mean drug-free students?

MS. TAFT: Well, I think that the name was decided on by Congress, and that we can recommend something if we want to. But it's probably not going to change.

And that's not where the real definition is important. The real definition is important in the data collection and those areas that are more -- that have to do with what's been implemented and what's being tracked. And it's very easily defined.

There's a whole lot of words that need to be defined from safe to drug-free, to prevalence, to definitions of binge drinking, to whatever. There's just tons of things that need to be defined.

MS. JACKSON: And this is Montean. Also to the person that said do we mean drug-free schools or drug-free students, I think we mean both. And the reason why I say this is when we go back to the activities -- if there are any activities that fall in the guidelines of safe and drug-free schools and Title IV, it talks about prevention and intervention and the safe piece.

So all of those things, as somebody else stated, are interrelated and connected.

So many of the programs that are being implemented across the country address not only students, they also address school. They also address education. So all of those things are part of the program.

MR. HINGSON: This is Ralph.

PARTICIPANT: And that is under the teachers too.

PARTICIPANT: Absolutely.

MR. HINGSON: This is Ralph Hingson. Earlier I made a comment about needing -- not just restricted to the school property, but to think about the community as a whole. And this is just another example of that.

Now, it may be that we need to put language into the report that says that the Department of Education can't do this alone. But the objective has to be reducing alcohol use and drug use and increasing safety in the schools and in the communities in which the schools are located. Because if you just focus on the school only, the problems are just going to keep -- the waves are just going to keep washing up on the shore. All of these --

MS. TAFT: Right.

MR. HINGSON: -- problems won't go away.

MS. TAFT: I agree with you Ralph. This is Hope.

You just keep reinfecting the same people if you don't do something about the environment.

MR. HINGSON: So I think we can put language in here that it's not realistic to expect the Department of Education alone to do that. But that they need to work with other players in the community, and other key actors in the community need to receive resources to do this as well.

MS. JACKSON: And again -- this is Montean.

That is one of the activities. And the community partnerships to where the school -- the LEA -- does not take the onus all upon themselves.

With the small amount of resources that we currently are receiving -- it dwindles every year -- again we talked about this at many of our meetings about collaboration and partnerships so that those actual things actually get accomplished.

MR. HINGSON: Very good point.

MS. TAFT: Yes. Schools cannot do it alone. But if you don't somehow or another bring in the community, the schools are never going to get accomplished.

MR. ROMERO: This is Dennis.

I wholeheartedly agree with Montean and with the last few people's comments. It's got to be done collaboratively and collectively, both with the federal level, but also probably at the community level and at the state level to forge the sense of collaboration.

CHAIRMAN LONG: If I could -- listening to this -- this is Dave. And again a reminder, it'd be helpful for the person who is taking the minutes if we could each time identify ourselves. Then they could get that attached to the person's comments.

But if I could just -- I think it's been a good discussion. If I'm hearing it right, and

2

then you can react to this, that we add that it is not the sole -- it can be wordsmithed -- not the sole responsibility of the Department or the local district, but rather an emphasis on the collaborative effort between and among entities involving the whole community to attack the problem.

MS. TAFT: That sums it up.

MR. HERRMANN: Sounds good to me. This is Mike.

MR. HINGSON: This is Ralph Hingson. That's what I was trying to get at. Yes.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LONG: You really said it. You said it well.

Any other on this section now? And we are again on the question from mid-page 4 where the difficulty in determining the effectiveness of the program, over to a third of the way down on page 5. Anything else on that section?

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike. Just a couple of suggestions on the third paragraph. "The Committee believes that it's LEAs do not first" -- can we say "assess" instead of "identify" to emphasize the needs assessment process?

And also, "They will be unlikely to develop effective responses," instead of "figure out what is effective." Just a style thing, to try and bring in more of the needs assessment part of all this.

CHAIRMAN LONG: That was on the first sentence, third paragraph. Right?

MR. HERRMANN: Right. Right.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Folks okay with the change of word "identify" to "assess?"

(All indicate agreement.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Then Mike, help me out. Will you continue in there, instead of saying "figure out what works?"

MR. HERRMANN: Right.

CHAIRMAN LONG: "Likely to develop" --

MR. HERRMANN: "Develop effective responses."

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. The Committee okay with the change of "figure out what works" to "develop effective response?"

(All indicate agreement.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Thank you.

Anything else on that question?

MS. MADRAS: This is Bertha Madras. Follow up on this final component.

Department of Education measurable objectives for outcome measures, are they -- is there a consensus that this would go throughout all schools?

What I'm trying to understand is if there's no uniformity in these questions, or if there is, how can we draw national and draw conclusions if we don't -- if each -- is each school in a position to determine what their own problems are, and how widely disparate are there in terms of -- not necessarily specifics -- but terms of certain issues?

MS. PRICE: Bertha, let me see if I'm understanding your question.

You're talking about the different measures that we received because the definitions and the terminologies are different from state to state. And so that makes it difficult to compare them?

MS. MADRAS: That's right.

MS. PRICE: Well, that is the nature of the program at this point.

We ask states to do that. States have definitions, and they identify those

measures. And that's the way it statutorily is set up.

But we've done some work in the office to try and get comparable data for states and get some information on that, and encourage states to use particular definitions. But it's still their choice to do that.

MR. HERRMANN: And this is Mike.

But I think one of the recommendations going back in the data is that there would be some uniform definitions adopted.

MS. PRICE: Absolutely. Yes, I think that's right. I mean, I was just talking about current structure, not desired structure.

Yes, I think that's right, Mike.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Any other comments on that question?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: If not then, moving to the next, which is a third of the way down on page 5 under, "Mechanisms that could be proposed that would help determine the programs being supported by State Grants Program funds are effective and meeting program purposes."

Any comments on that section? It goes down to the bottom of page 5 where the next question starts.

MS. TAFT: There again, in the first one that's listed on page 5 -- this is Hope -- it says, "Key indicators of safety." Is there any way we could use alcohol and drug use in there as well as safety? Am I --

PARTICIPANT: I agree.

MS. TAFT: Before there is the legislation talks about the five core indicators which are not all safety-related. They're incidents, prevalence, perception of harm, perception of social disapproval, and things like that that had to do with alcohol and drug use, and not necessarily with safety.

MR. HINGSON: This is Ralph Hingson. I agree with Hope that those alcohol and drug measures should be in there.

MR. DUNCAN: Dr. Long, this is Bill Duncan.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Everyone else okay with that?

(All indicate agreement.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Thank you.

MR. DUNCAN: Dr. Long? This is Bill Duncan. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN LONG: No.

MR. DUNCAN: Sorry. Is that better?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes. There you go.

MR. DUNCAN: Okay. I've made a note already based on the earlier comments to go through the whole report and just look every time it's says safety but not alcohol and drug use.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay.

MS. PRICE: Okay.

MR. DUNCAN: But that may help. As we go on, you might just know that I'm planning to do that.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you.

MS. PRICE: Great.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Then next question, "Are there emerging issues facing

students that School State Grant Program does not address, and should be?" That's right at the bottom third of page 5.

MS. TAFT: I like your first sentence. I think we need to reduce the things that have to look at, and increase the things we don't have to look at.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And then the next question, right at the bottom of page 5.

MR. WECHSLER: Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes.

MR. WECHSLER: Thank you. That's wonderful. This is the third time I've called in to be able to be heard.

I'm sorry, but I had some comments way back on page 4. Do you want to do that at the very end?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Why don't we do it now, because we'll be marching through the rest of these. Yes, please.

MR. WECHSLER: There was a question about specifically in rural, urban and suburban settings near the top of page 4.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes.

MR. WECHSLER: The last sentence said, "The Committee recommends the Department create different but clear standards for different types of schools." And I don't know if you discussed this when I was hanging up and calling back.

But I really don't remember much of that conversation. And I'm not sure if I were at the Department of Education what I would do with that recommendation. So I'm wondering if there's some way to add a little more clarity to that as to what types of standards are we talking about, and how might they differ by the urbanicity of the setting.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Any comments regarding Howell --

MS. JACKSON: I think one of the things that came up -- this is Montean. I'm

sorry.

One of the things that cropped up was that definitely with the data collection and the evaluation, we needed to take a look at infrastructure and what was available for some of our rural areas.

We also spoke a little bit about -- and I think this ties back into the Safe School/ Unsafe School Option, and again what's available for a victim and/or an offender moving locales, that sometimes that may not always be an option that's available because of the region.

So there were many areas that were addressed when we had our rural presentation. And what was available to comply with all the requirements that maybe an urban setting might have in place. So, am I kind of on target? Does everybody kind of somewhat remember some of that conversation?

MR. WECHSLER: This is Howell. I have absolutely no objection. That sounds great. I just think for the people who will be trying to implement this, it would be very helpful if we gave a couple of examples.

MS. JACKSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Then if we could go back to -- we're at the bottom of page 5. It continues on to page 6, the last sentence, "Considering the nation's focus on emergency response and crisis planning, is this language sufficient to address concern for crisis management in our schools?"

I was looking at the last two words there. Any comments?

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike.

And this is more a general comment. I'm not sure how to really answer this. But I think it's related to the question in front of it in terms of the increasing tension between really kind of security and preparedness concerns and the traditional preventive focus of the Title IV program.

And it seems to me it's important to acknowledge that really I think since the enactment of NCLB that this focus on preparedness and security has really kind of -- I don't want to say it's emerged since then -- but the prominence of that has certainly been more pronounced, at least from my perspective.

I think somewhere in the language of the report, we need to be sure that that gets acknowledged, and that there's really kind of a competition for very scarce resources at this point.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Any comments regarding Mike?

MS. TAFT: I agree. I think -- this is Hope.

There's been a big ramp up and that's a change in the definition of safe or safety in the traditional sense to what has happened since 911. And that it's unfair to ask this safe and drug-free school budget to encompass all of the new definition and desires.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Anyone else?

MS. SIMS: This is Belinda.

I was just wondering if in that paragraph where it talks about there's a possibility for tension between school efforts to discourage substance use, and their need to provide for responses to other safety concerns, it seems like this is talking about the tension around the use of resources to do these things. Not that schools wouldn't want to in an ideal world have all these issues addressed, but it does take resources and personnel and that part seems like the tension.

It's not that this doesn't need to be done, it's just that this little pot of money can't fund them all.

MS. JACKSON: Exactly. This is Montean.

And just what Belinda said can also happen in reverse where the presenting issue becomes one of safety or violence and then we forego taking a look at the substance use issues that is also linked sometimes to the other. And then we rob Peter, so to speak, to pay Paul, or we take resources from one area and don't address all the things that are important.

MS. MADRAS: Isn't there a -- this is Bertha Madras.

Is there not a mechanism for doing a cost benefit equation for -- in other words, what is the frequency of an emergency with regard to school safety that is unrelated to alcohol and other drugs.

In other words, one can develop a hierarchy of where one sets resources depending on the data that drives the association between the two. And of course, when one school has a Columbine, then everyone focuses on it. And I understand the burden and the national attention it receives.

But those kind of occurrences are fortunately rare indeed, whereas the violence and the delinquency and the disciplinary problems associated with alcohol and other drugs in school is a chronic and quite highly prevalent problem. And somehow, a document such as this should have some form of statistical base to sustain some of these claims in the sentences.

MS. TAFT: Agreed.

MS. MADRAS: Unfortunately, I have another conference call that comes up, and I have to be briefed on it this second. So I'm going to have to sign off.

If I have any further comments, is there a mechanism to get them through to you? CHAIRMAN LONG: I think to send them to Catherine --

MS. DAVIS: You can just reply to the e-mail I sent yesterday with the call information.

MS. MADRAS: Thank you much.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you so much.

Anything else on that question -- top of 6 to two thirds of the way down?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Then the next question, bottom third of page 6, "Structures to make the advanced program the most effective mechanism for the use of these funds." It continues over to page 7.

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike.

Let me make a suggestion. Because I really think fundamentally there our discussion boiled down to either universal versus some sort of a competitive or needs-based process for distributing funds under the State Grants Program. And would it be possible to use some sort of a table or a chart that would sort of lay out those two options and the strengths and weaknesses of both.

Because it seems like in the language that's being used here, a lot of stuff gets repeated, and fundamentally I think the question really boils down to does everybody get something or do you have some sort of other process for determining who's going to get money. Does that make sense?

CHAIRMAN LONG: I think it makes good -- this is Dave.

I think it makes good sense, and it might be -- especially for -- and I agree, there is some repetitive nature here. But it'd be a good visual for comparison and then after that's done, have the further conversation in the next conference call.

MR. HERRMANN: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Everyone okay with that, to put that in table form to see it as a visual and then carry that discussion -- this aspect -- this question on to the next conference call?

MR. JONES: Yes. This is Russell. Fine with me.

(All indicate agreement.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Then moving on, I don't want to go too fast. Is there anything else in that section, or will that wrap that up?

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike again. I'm sorry to keep chiming in here.

But on my page 8, probably I think at about the top of everybody else's, there's a paragraph about "The Committee recommends removing the Title IV money from the consolidated application." Everybody find that?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Yes.

MR. HERRMANN: Just to elaborate though, I really -- the Committee recommends separating the Title IV application and reporting process from the larger consolidated application that states and some LEAs submit for federal funding.

I think when you put the application and the reporting processing into this big bundle of -- with Title I, that Title IV just gets lost. And --

CHAIRMAN LONG: I think your dialogue there Mike -- at least I had listened to -- I can only speak for myself -- was a clarifier.

But how does everyone else feel?

MS. TAFT: This is Hope.

Back on page 7 in the second paragraph, I think the second sentence, the "or" is

that?

1

supposed to be "of." Just a minor thing.

But then at the bottom of the page, "Other significant recommendations," I think 1 and 2 -- are those some of the things we're going to be discussing next week -- or next conference call?

CHAIRMAN LONG: That's a good question, Hope.

If we could break that into the table and make that a part of the discussion.

MS. TAFT: Because they're not very clear on what their differences are there.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Right.

MR. WECHSLER: This is Howell.

I'm not sure we nailed this one down.

But I seem to recall that there was pretty strong sentiment among at least some panelists that we might recommend removing the governors' offices from the whole process, and rather that that money should be devoted to the state education agency for professional development and data collection purposes.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Howell, this is Dave. In the last 14 days, I've changed my viewpoint on that.

MS. JACKSON: This is Montean.

And Howell, I totally agree. When Mike brought that question up, I looked and said did we really say just that? And I think it was a little bit more evolved than that.

MR. WECHSLER: I think Tommy had a lot of views on that.

MR. LEDBETTER: I did. You're exactly right.

I strongly -- very strongly felt like that governors' money could strengthen the entire program if it was all lumped together.

MR. WECHSLER: Besides our esteemed Chairman, does anyone else object to

MS. TAFT: This is Hope.

As the wife of a former governor, it was that money that was used in community services that were brought into the school. And I don't know if the money was given to the school, would the school have the impetus to reach out to bring in the services that they needed.

MR. LEDBETTER: Hope, this is Tommy.

I'm not sure how it works in every state. I know that in the State of Alabama, the governor sits on the State Board of Education, and he oversees a lot of that. So his --

MS. TAFT: Okay.

MR. LEDBETTER: -- his influence there would be much the same. But it would all bring it under the umbrella of one organization.

MR. WECHSLER: My perspective is the money is just shrinking and shrinking. And something's got to give. You just can't go on doing things the same way.

And particularly for those who want to make sure that as many school districts as possible get resources, something's got to give. And this is one thing that a lot of people had concerns about.

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike. I think the important thing, and I think part of what's been proposed is that there would be an expansion of the state-level activities funds.

The important thing, I think, is to keep some reasonably significant amount of money available that the state can use to address state-wide priorities. Now whether you do that through the state level, state-wide activities funds, or the governors' funds, I think is six and one, half

a dozen of another. I think just calling something governors' funds raises all sorts of red flags.

CHAIRMAN LONG: And we roll that into that -- as we wrap this one up -- the table and make that a part of that same conversation on the next one.

MS. JACKSON: I would agree. This is Montean. I would agree with that.

CHAIRMAN LONG: That way we'll consolidate everything. Then we'll have that one pure discussion based on that table.

MR. HERRMANN: Sounds good to me.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. MR. HERRMANN: Mike.

CHAIRMAN LONG: On page 8 then, very brief. It's a one sentence. In the middle of the page, "Is the balance between flexibility and accountability contained in the statute working?"

And then the next question is, "Could state and local flexibility be balance with additional core requirements that would encourage LEAs to address specific issues?"

Any comments?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Then the question at the bottom of page 8, "How can the tension between the principles of effectiveness provisions require the funds be spent on research-based activities and a broad list of authorized activities be resolved?" It continues over to page 9. Any comments on that section? Hello? Is someone -- someone's fading in and out there. I didn't know if there was a comment.

MS. PRICE: Hope, is that you trying to speak? I think you're cutting out.

MS. TAFT: (inaudible).

MS. PRICE: We still can't understand you.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Did we lose --

MS. PRICE: Hope?

MS. TAFT: I've been hearing -- I'm in a car on a cell phone, and we're in a tunnel in New York City. So I suspect you can't hear me.

PARTICIPANT: We got you now, Hope.

MS. TAFT: And I can't see what I had written here. Who's talking?

CHAIRMAN LONG: Hope, this is Dave. We're now on the section on nonpublic schools. I didn't know how long that tunnel was.

MS. TAFT: It still is.

CHAIRMAN LONG: I'll tell you what. We'll go ahead and then --

MS. TAFT: Yes. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN LONG: -- then when you come out on the other side, just jump

MS. TAFT: Sounds good.

CHAIRMAN LONG: We'll move on in the meantime, then we'll come back when Hope gets out of that.

On page 14, then we're moving on to the third section, which is "Data."

And the first question, about a third of the way down on page 14, "Is the amount of information being collected appropriate?" Comments on that?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: The next question, just about three lines up from the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

right back in.

bottom of page 14, "Is there other data that could be collected that would be more useful or fill higher priority needs?"

MS. DUDE: This is Kim.

And I don't know if this is the appropriate place to mention this, but I remember mentioning that there's -- I mean, I don't know if it would make it more clear here or whatever, that there should be other data other than just usage patterns. There should be like protective behaviors they may be doing, or those kinds of questions in there too.

I don't know if that's where this is appropriate, or not. But if we're going to talk about different kinds of data to collect, I just think it's important to ask questions besides just usage patterns.

MR. HERRMANN: This is Mike. I agree with Kim. We're really needing to get data that folks at the school level, at the building level, can use to make decisions about where to put resources. And that's not necessarily usage data.

MS. JACKSON: And I think on page 15, the second paragraph, it speaks a little bit to some of those things that we recommended.

This is Montean.

MS. DUDE: Oh, yes. You're right. Sorry.

MS. JACKSON: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Maybe, and I hear what you're saying, Montean. This is Dave. Go ahead. That does explain some, but also take a look at if that doesn't capture everything, an expansion of information collected. And then have Bill take a look at that and put some other things in there.

Anything else on that question on page, all the way down to 15?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Then at the top of page 16, talking about --

MS. KEYS: I'm sorry. I have some things on page 15. I thought --

CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry.

MS. KEYS: -- you were asking about 14.

Did we finish 15? I'm sorry. This is Susan Keys.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Go ahead, Susan. I'm sorry.

MS. KEYS: Okay. On the first paragraph on 15, midway down. It starts, "The Department could also stress training of how success in school safety can be determined." I just think that reads awkward.

Are we wanting to train people? Do we want to figure out how best to measure school safety? I'm not sure what the sentence is trying to convey. So I just -- we need to clarify that.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Other comments regarding that sentence clarification?

I don't know if we're getting tired.

MR. LEDBETTER: I agree with Susan.

MS. KEYS: And I think further along, just an issue of, is our recommendation that the Department task states with creating training opportunities? Does the Department want to create those opportunities? Do we want to just create guidelines or recommendations? To just stress training or promote training, I think we have to be a little more clear about what we mean by that.

MR. JONES: Yes. This is Russell.

I agree. But there's always those budgetary constraints.

MS. KEYS: Well, I'm not saying -- it could be just guidelines. But what is --

anyway. And then in the next paragraph down, "Information about protective behaviors for students." I think that gets into more what we talked about as protective factors, which would be more than just behaviors.

PARTICIPANT: Agreed.

MR. HINGSON: This is Ralph Hingson. Going back up to that, "The Department could also stress training on how success in school safety can be determined." When I read that, I thought really what's important here is for there to be a clear assessment of what data is needed and why. And the rationale for why data collection is going on needs to be --

MS. KEYS: Exactly.

MR. HINGSON: -- it needs to be explainable to people. And we need input from people who are in the schools as well about what they think needs to be measured.

So, I think that whole section could be elaborated.

MS. KEYS: I agree. Susan Keys.

(All indicate agreement.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Debbie, can you work like with Bill on that, or Catherine -

MS. PRICE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN LONG: -- on our conversation with -- elaborate on that.

MS. PRICE: Sure. We'd be happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you.

Anything else on all of 15 as we head to the top of 16?

MS. KEYS: I think just to reiterate that we expand the idea of protective factors, rather than just protective behavior.

And then the last sentence in the middle paragraph, "Additionally the Committee notes the value of school climate surveys." I would say, "including reports by at least students, teachers and staff."

CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry, Susan. Where --

MS. KEYS: The last sentence in the middle paragraph.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Data.

MS. KEYS: It says, "including at least students." I would just say, "including reports by." Or "self reports by students, teachers and staff."

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay.

(All indicate agreement.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Agreement? Okay. Thank you.

Anything else on all of 15?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: As we head to the top of 16 then, "Should the MRIS be collected using standard definitions by greater clarity and by direction of the schools and school districts? And if so, which terms should be defined in a standard way?"

Then the next question, "Other activities it would take to address concerns about the cost and burdens associated with data collection."

MS. TAFT: This is Hope.

In the second paragraph, it says, "To be most helpful, the Department should coordinate related data gathering across federal agencies." Well, at some of the agencies they're already doing things that they can participate in, but not necessarily coordinate.

So I didn't know whether we wanted to put the Department in charge of gathering everybody together or whether we wanted to say participate when asked. Maybe we want them to do both.

MS. DUDE: Hope, I'm a little confused by what you mean by participate.

MS. TAFT: Well, I mean, coordinate to me just sounds like you're supposed to be the person convening it. Participate sounds to me like if SAMSHA is doing something that is working on definitions and asks the Department of Education to join in that you all would.

MS. DUDE: That's what we do.

MS. TAFT: I think it's what you do. I just didn't know whether you wanted to be in the driver's seat of gathering all the Departments together all the time.

MR. HINGSON: Ralph Hingson.

I don't think that any single Department can sort of determine what every other Department related department that collects data that's useful to these questions can do, or should do. But on the other hand, I think the Department ought to have a clear vision of what types of data it feels are necessary to best assess its programs and its responsibilities.

And in that sense, if there is a coordinating and a convening role, they can invite the various agencies that collect these data to be at the same table and present their perspective about what's important.

Now, that's not to say that two other departments might not have some common interests that are quite different and will go on and do their own thing in other areas. But I think if the Department of Education doesn't have a convening role and sort of try to determine the agenda themselves, it'll never get done in a way that will be most beneficial to them.

MS. TAFT: That's a good explanation of what I was trying to say. So --

CHAIRMAN LONG: Any other comments on that section? Good point.

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Then the next question is -- well, that is the last question on that section.

Any other comments on the whole section -- anything that we missed, as we move on to the additional issues?

MR. WECHSLER: Yes. This is Howell. It's a minor point. But the very last sentence in that last section, it needs to identify the call to action. It's the Surgeon General's call to action to prevent and reduce underage drinking.

MS. TAFT: I think that's a very good point, and that it is to be perceived as a public health issue and not just a safety issue.

MS. KEYS: I think Hope's point is something that I'd like to see as an introduction to the report. Because I think -- and my bias is showing a bit here, so others please react.

But I think one of the themes that pervaded our discussion was the interest in shifting the closest towards prevention as a more global activity than just responding to the issue of safety per se. And it might be nice to frame the report in that larger view.

MS. TAFT: Agreed.

MR. WECHSLER: Yes, that's a good suggestion.

CHAIRMAN LONG: I hear two agreements.

(All indicate agreement.)

MR. HINGSON: This is Ralph Hingson. I agree. And I think that the one sort of additional spinoff I would put on this is if a situation can be created that reduces alcohol use and

reduces drug use and enhances safety, there will be payoffs in terms of academic performance and attendance in school.

MS. TAFT: That should be right up there in front.

MS. JACKSON: Yes. Exactly. Ditto. Montean agrees.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay. Good point. Thank you.

MR. HINGSON: Elephant in the room.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay then. Moving on to the additional issues, we have three of them. The first of which is nonpublic. Any comment on that?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: The second one, urban-rural. Any comment on that?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: And the third additional one was trauma. Any comments?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: You guys are good. Debbie, I'll ask you again, if this can then be re-worked with all these suggestions from the Committee, sent back out and then we'll have that -- and I take it with our May 14th conference call, that will be the clean-up before the trip in June.

MS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HERRMANN: Before we get there, may I make a general request? This is

Mike.

I think it's important to remember that a lot of folks reading this report are not going to have any background information on the State Grants Program, the Unsafe School Choice Option, the data requirements.

Would it be possible at the start of each of those sections to have a paragraph about sort of what that thing is and maybe what sort of use these are, so that people reading it who may not have any background in this issue will have a little of context in which to read the document?

MS. PRICE: Yes. We were planning on doing a background or definition piece in addition to this, that just gives -- identifies and articulates what those elements are. Because you're right. A lot of people won't have a clue. So certainly that will be included.

It might be better to do it as a separate entity rather than just -- because you have more opportunity to show the relationships that they have to each other and give a little bit more explanation than just a short paragraph. But certainly, you're right. In the document needs to be clarification and definition of what these terms are and what they do, and absolutely.

MR. HERRMANN: Okay. The other general comment I just wanted to make is we've sure put a lot on the Department of Education to do. So, I know you guys are ready to jump right in there with both feet and do that.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Mike, you make a point that -- this is Dave -- that as I read through this, if quite honestly -- I've thought about this -- if I was a member of the Department that I would have a concern about the many things that are on the plate in addition to what they're already doing.

And I'm sure as we're thinking about this, we might want to think about with some of these areas whatever the Committee comes up with, but some of these things can go to intermediate agencies across the country for help -- the AEAs or the AESAs, the national organization, or to run pilot programs in various places. But I had that same feeling when I read

that. But something to keep in mind.

MR. HERRMANN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Any other comments?

(No audible response.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: As I said, you guys are good. As you look, you did a tremendous amount of work in 80 minutes.

And we look forward to the May 14th conference call. And again, as we close, Russell, we'll continue to keep at the top of our prayer chain.

MR. JONES: Thanks so much. Your support is so appreciated.

CHAIRMAN LONG: With that, we'll close. And thank you so much, folks.

Have a good one, now.

(Whereupon, at 3:23 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)