U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, AUGUST 22, 2006

+ + + + +

The above-entitled matter convened at 8:30 a.m. in the Barnard Auditorium, 400 Maryland Avenue, Southwest, Washington, D.C., David Long, Chair, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair DAVID LONG KIM DUDE Member Member MONTEAN JACKSON RUSSELL JONES Member Member SHEPPARD KELLAM TOMMY LEDBETTER Member Member SETH NORMAN Member MICHAEL PIMENTEL DEBORAH PRICE Member Member DENNIS ROMERO BELINDA SIMS Member MARY ANN SOLBERG Member HOPE TAFT Member HOWELL WECHSLER Member

NEAL R. GROSS

MEMBER REPRESENTATIVES:

DONNI LeBOEUF Representing J. Robert Flores,

Department of Justice

MEMBERS UNABLE TO ATTEND:

FREDERICK ELLIS RALPH HINGSON

OFFICE OF SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS:

CATHERINE DAVIS Designated Federal Officer

WILLIAM MODZELESKI

NEAL R. GROSS

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

Call to Order	4
Opening Statement Deborah Price	6
Public Comments	31
Discussion by Advisory Committee Members	37
Closing Comments	133

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

8:39 a.m.

in, we will go ahead and get started. The others will be here shortly, but we are going to go ahead and get started.

First of all, I would remind you, if you

CHAIRMAN LONG: Folks, if we could come on

will take a look at the schedule for the day, this is a rough outline, especially keeping in mind the time.

Actually, that is a little off. The breakfast actually went off from 8:00 to 8:40. So there is a misprint up there.

Then, just as we are doing now, we are getting started. Public comment will be from 8:40 to 9:15, no longer than that. Then discussion for an hour, 9:15-10:15, by the Advisory Committee, break, then more discussions and closing, and with adjournment no later than 11:30.

I have already had two or three of you remind me that you have flights to catch at times that will mean that you will be moving rather quickly as soon as we are done here.

NEAL R. GROSS

As we get started today, I think it important that we give some framing so that we have at least an idea of where we might be going. So as we start that, we all understand from our previous conversations and the emails that we have received as a Committee that, if we go out, we have a timeline out there, and that is September 8, I do believe. indicated Debbie, at the close of business on September 8th, we need to have something in writing so that we can put that forward.

We also, as we know, have a conference call that is scheduled on September 5th. So I am just going clear out to the end for what we are talking about here and then going backwards. Then we are going to talk about some of the things that happened yesterday, just as a backdrop.

But before we even get to that, I talked with Debbie last night. If we could start out with Debbie giving us some thoughts, ideas, concepts, or any direction, that would be helpful for the Committee from the standpoint of the Department, and at the same time if you could incorporate in that your feelings

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

about what, just like a reminder, what the objective is for this Committee.

MS. focus in PRICE: Let me on an objective for the Committee. Objective for the Committee for the September 8th interim report would be to give the Secretary -- and when I the Secretary, it means that senior level who does process of making the decisions about programs and budget and looking at issues -- information regarding the State Grants Program, regarding, you know, how it is working, what it is doing, but also to give her insight into what we believe about the future of the I think that is kind of the best way to say it.

Because when Holly talked on our conference call, they are beginning that process for looking at, believe it or not, the 2008 budget because all of that starts to play. So these are important pieces of information that need to be taken in as they go through that process and they look at this.

So I don't know that they are looking for specific, in-depth this is what we do, you know, all

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of that at this point, but more an overall look at the program. It is not the 30,000 view, which my old boss always -- I always thought, do you ever get off the 30,000-foot view? -- but it is more just kind of the view of the program and the understanding and where we think it should go in the future.

But then we have a report due a year -well, next June is the final report to address all
three questions that would be more specific with
specific recommendations and findings.

So this is more of an interim. It is not as specific. It would be unfair for us to have to -
I mean we would all be here from now until September

8th figuring all those details out. So that is not what they are looking for the 8th, but to have a good understanding of it.

With that in mind, I thought it might be helpful to give some departmental perspective on all of this, if that is helpful. I have had the privilege, as I have had my various jobs in my adult life, that I have never had a job that my heart wasn't deeply involved in. It just happens that I lucked

NEAL R. GROSS

Ι don't know that that is the but I very much feel tied to what the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools does, to those elements that make the school the climate for education to happen, that kids can go there; they feel safe; they feel secure. That is just so essential to all of the rest of what the Department does.

I mean my own little two cents, I always say I feel like we are the most significant office here at the Department, because if we don't work well, then the rest of the Department can't work well. If kids go to school and feel threatened, they are not healthy; they are not safe; they can't achieve to their maximum achievement. For those few kids who do it in spite of that, they get a lot of kudos for that.

But, also, I know that one thing we heard repeated over and over yesterday is the issue of more dollars. There's just a basic focus on dollars that we should be very aware of.

Let me just draw on a piece of paper to emphasize a point. It is unusual for Congress -- all of our dollars come from Congress -- it is unusual for

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Congress to really plus-up the overall education dollar. They might increase it a little bit. They might increase it 5 percent or something like that, but they are not going to really increase that pot of money.

So if you think of Education's pot of money as being this big, and we will say that right here is the dollars for Safe and Drug-Free Schools. Now there wants to be a focus on some new initiatives at the Department. It isn't as if those dollars are Those dollars come from within added to this pot. The way you get those dollars is you look this pot. those programs that haven't been necessarily effective, or whatever, and have a large amount of money, and you can draw money from that to fund this new initiative.

My concern is that whatever we present to the Secretary on the 8th highlights the significance of the role of what this program does, so that the value is seen here and dollars aren't moved out of it to fund another initiative. Does that make sense?

So it isn't that all of these new

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

initiatives get "X" millions of dollars or billions of dollars, whatever it is, plunked down on top of what we have. We basically have a pie, and that pie gets split up. It is just kind of a logical discussion, not discussion, but comments that I am making, but that is sort of the nature of the beast of the federal government.

One thing I think is important that we reflect in what we present to the Secretary is how this program is tied to the goals of this Department.

The Secretary, basically, has three -- you know, we've got kind of the five pillars of the President's Education Agenda, but the Secretary often will talk about the three goals or the three priorities of the Department.

The first is implementing No Child Left
Behind and proficiency by 2014. So educational
achievement. We need to reach proficiency in 2014.

If what we are working on doesn't aim towards doing
that, then it is not addressing those primary goals.

The same is with the American Competitive

Initiative that our children come out of school

NEAL R. GROSS

1	competitive; they can go into college; they can get a
2	job. They are prepared. That we offer rigorous
3	coursework, so that kids are prepared and they don't
4	come out of school and then have to learn how to study
5	in college. They come out of school prepared.
6	Another priority of the Secretary is data.
7	If you want your program funded, give me the data to
8	show me it works.
9	So those are three areas that are central
10	to the Secretary. I clearly see how this program
11	falls in line with all of them, but we should reflect
12	that in what we say to the Secretary and give a clear
13	articulation of that. Does that make sense?
14	Do you have any questions about that?
15	DR. JONES: I have a question.
16	MS. PRICE: Okay.
17	DR. JONES: So are we saying that we can't
18	request funding, additional funding?
19	MS. PRICE: No, I am not saying that. I
20	am not saying that. I am not saying that at all.
21	They talked about this some yesterday, but
22	the dollars that have been provided for the State

Grants Program have consistently been going down, and they have been zeroed out by the Department because they have received an ineffective rating from OMB.

There is a difference between surveys and scientifically-based research, and the PART is based on scientifically-based research. There isn't anything we can do about that, because they ask the same PART questions to every program that they review. The questions do not vary from program to program. All programs are held accountable for that set of questions.

But, currently, I seriously doubt that the Labor/HHS appropriation bill will get out of Congress this year. It will probably be rolled over into an omnibus.

But at this point, the House has reduced the dollars from 347 to 310, and the Senate has matched that. It is very unlikely that that number, when it goes into conference, when they are matching, is going to change. So that is not good news for this program.

We heard yesterday that the dollars have

NEAL R. GROSS

1	gotten smaller. So it calls for people to be more
2	collaborative for sure, and that is the initiative of
3	those people and those communities that have done
4	that, and they get a lot of credit for that. I
5	applaud them for that.
6	But I see great value in the program. We
7	need to be able to reflect that, so that there is an
8	understanding of the value of the program, so that
9	those dollars I don't know how else to say it so
10	it gives the backdrop for those dollars to not be
11	reduced or to be increased.
12	MS. SOLBERG: You know, there is a lot of
13	scientific research that shows the connection between
14	drug use and poor standardized test scores, for
15	example, the Kids Count Survey from the State of
16	Washington.
17	MS. PRICE: You need to use your
18	microphone.
19	MS. SOLBERG: There is a lot of scientific
20	research that connects low standardized test scores,
21	the inability to learn, with drug use in a school

building. That is a backdrop that certainly we can

1 build on. I don't think that we need to --2 MS. PRICE: And I don't think that is in 3 The question that is asked is, is this question. 4 specific program the cause of reduction of drug use? 5 MS. SOLBERG: I would think the question 6 would be more --7 MS. PRICE: And I agree --8 MS. SOLBERG: It's not let's find 9 Let's improve the program, so that, in fact, 10 program affects drug use. I don't think that we have 11 to talk about, which seemed to be implied, do we need 12 this program. 13 I think we need the MS. PRICE: Yes, I don't think it is saying anything 14 program though. 15 negative about the program when you say let's make the 16 program be even better. It is not eliminating the 17 program. It is, what about this program needs to --18 that's one reason why I was so pleased to see the 19 question about the strengths of the program in there, 20 in what we are answering, because that is significant 21 focus on what are those strengths

communicate those.

1	But what about it needs to be even better?
2	I don't think the answer to being even better is just
3	dollars, but what is the most effective way that we
4	can use these dollars to get the most effective
5	outcome that students are reaching their educational
6	that brings them in line with reaching their
7	educational achievement?
8	DR. WECHSLER: There are three bullets
9	listed explaining why the PART score was ineffective.
10	The first two relate to performance measures. Since
11	then, a lot of work appears to have been done.
12	MS. PRICE: A lot of work.
13	DR. WECHSLER: Is there any communication
14	with OMB? Do you have a sense whether this is
15	satisfactory to them, whether these first two bullets
16	have been appropriately addressed in their eyes?
17	MS. PRICE: Well, the OMB is looking at
18	the program again. It is in the process of what is
19	referred to as re-PARTing, because we have done some
20	very significant things regarding performance
21	standards. We have implemented many elements that
22	give it an opportunity to reflect what the program is

1	doing, so addressing those data issues, addressing
2	some research issues. So it is in the process of
3	being re-PARTed.
4	When you develop your performance
5	standards, you develop them in relationship with OMB.
6	I mean you can't just make a performance standard and
7	then OMB says, "That one really stinks. We're not
8	using it." I mean that is done in a collaborative
9	way.
10	So we have worked with OMB. We have
11	developed performance standards that we believe are
12	significant and can show that the program is meeting
13	those standards. But it is still OMB that is you
14	know, our hands are off of it when OMB is doing the
15	re-PART.
16	But, Bill, go ahead.
17	MR. MODZELESKI: Debbie, one of the major
18	issues we face here is the cause and effect. It is
19	something which we struggled with and, to be honest
20	with you, we don't have the answer for it.
21	Yesterday you heard from, whether it was
22	Clarence or the state people, about how they have data

showing that basically their programs have been effective. We do have data showing that over the course of the past several years drug use has gone down, and in places where there was a Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, drug use has gone down.

The problem is that we don't know whether or not drug use has gone down because of that Safe and Drug-Free Schools intervention or whether it is a new principal that came in or whether parents got onboard and they started to come to school. So there could be a whole other group of variables that have come into play that basically have caused that to go down.

The flip side of that is that you may have the same program, and three or four years from now — and Mary Ann knows this — basically, if you look at monitoring the future or any other data, you see it is a cycle. It goes up; it goes down; it goes up; it goes down, sometimes over a 10-year period, a 15-year period.

So at a certain point in time we could expect drug use to begin to increase again. I mean, again, that is the social science of up-and-down

NEAL R. GROSS

figures.

At that time, if we are not careful, then we could flip that around and say that the reason it is going up is because of, again, the Safe and Drug-Free School Programs, whatever it is.

What we have not been able to do is to tease out that program, whether it is a \$1500 program, a \$15,000 program, or a \$15 million program, because there are so many other things going on in schools.

Even yesterday, I forget which one of the presenters was talking about the difficulty in getting control schools because control schools now are also doing all of these various things.

So that is one of the major problems that we face, is trying to get that. If you begin to talk about evaluation of that data, you are beginning to talk about very, very, very high cost.

Now I just want to correct one thing. That is that the data that went over to OMB was not only our data, but it was the state data. So OMB had the opportunity to review our data, the state data, and the local data. All of that was reviewed and

NEAL R. GROSS

basically found not to be sufficient to their standards to basically say that this program is the cause and effect.

So this is not us not sending the data over. I mean all the data that has been collected has gone over to OMB for their review.

DR. KELLAM: Yes, I just wanted to make the following thought: In a sense, Safe and Drug-Free Schools is a likely pigeon for a question about, anything working? All of the services we have in health and human welfare, welfare systems, suffer from the lack of are, same real understanding of whether they are working, for whom they are working, under what circumstances, with how much fidelity, and so on.

The fact of the matter is that we are on the edge of being able to really define a whole new structure of how research and services can interrelate so that they have something to do with each other. Part of the problem we have is we have some tools that, if we don't take advantage of, will disappear, like information systems disappeared in public health.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

They went away because antibiotics came along; you didn't need to have information systems about who had syphilis. There are all kinds of histories in the back of mental health registries that went away.

There is an enormous investment now in the of kids learning. fact, assessment In those information systems make enormously powerful an sampling frame for communities, for planning, for all Adding a few elements about data on kinds of things. drug abuse would enlarge that information system.

From that framework, we can make partnerships that have not existed between researchers and educators and people who are concerned about community programs of various kinds, including drugs.

So it seems to me that if it hadn't been for OMB, we would still be in need of sitting here, and we could be pioneering a whole restructuring of how we find out what works for which kids under what circumstances in the real world.

It strikes me that that is really what we are facing. There are some really very concrete things to do. Thank goodness there ain't enough money

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

because money ain't the answer to that problem. It is restructuring how, when I, as a researcher, go to work, who are my partners; who determines the research questions; how do we set up information systems and buy into information systems that really already are being paid for?

So I think we've got a very important opportunity here. I think we should take advantage of it and shouldn't be defensive at all, but, rather, in fact, you can say that nothing has been proven to work. What we are going to do is take a bull by the horns.

I could keep going. The Dutch government put \$14 million into -- Euros rather, which is \$20 million -- into putting together public health research/institute partnerships. Fourteen million bucks just to get it going.

So I happen to sit in on the reviews of those applications, and people began coming in really designing how they would work, how often they would be. I was struck by one of the people who said yesterday that he meets once a year with some research

NEAL R. GROSS

group that he is partnering with. How about once a week, folks? You know, we are talking about how we can really restructure the way we do research, its relevance to practice, and how that needs to be institutionalized. I think this is an opportunity to do that.

I don't think it is money. I think there are some basic things we could advise Ms. Spellings on about what might, in fact, be worth debating.

MS. DUDE: I find this whole discussion so frustrating from a practitioner's point of view because I am one of those people out there talking with students every day and doing presentations many times a week, trying to get them to make better choices on a college campus, but I also work with the local public schools.

The problem is, in my opinion, my humble opinion, is that we need to change our paradigm in what we determine, how we define effectiveness. If we put all of our eggs in the cause-and-effect basket, we are going to fail because, no, I can't prove that my at-risk youths have gone down because of me. I can't

NEAL R. GROSS

prove that, and I will never be able to prove that.

I don't care how great a researcher is, they can't prove that -- because it isn't just one program that does it or one particular presentation. It is the combination. It is the little aha moments that are created throughout the year that these practitioners are creating for these students. So it is very difficult to create a cause-and-effect.

The problem is, within education, for example, we have test scores; we have all those kinds of things that are very measurable. You either got an "A", you got a "B", or you got a "C". Or on your ACT, you got a 30 or you got a 28. Those are fairly measurable.

But when it comes to prevention, how do you prove what you prevented from happening because it didn't happen? So the problem is we are trying to create an apples-to-apples comparison when they aren't apples to apples, in my opinion.

The way of measuring whether or not you have had an impact on a student are the very things that we heard yesterday, like increased class

NEAL R. GROSS

attendance, decrease in marijuana use, decrease in alcohol use. We heard that.

But then we hear the researchers say, oh, we're not effective. That just makes my blood boil. I can't tell you how much it makes me angry.

NIAAA did the college same thing on campuses where it said most of what all we are doing is ineffective, and yet many of us -- we've got a ton of students not using and we have some students who occasionally screw up, and then we've significant problems. All students who have some those students need to be dealt with in totally different ways, and a good, comprehensive program will help make that happen, but you can't expect a school to have a good, comprehensive program on \$1500.

Yet, we throw them \$1500 and expect them to show cause-and-effect relationships? That is an unrealistic expectation, but it doesn't mean that we then take away that \$1500, because with that \$1500, then comes at least something has happened.

We need to do what we can with what we have at the time. It bothers me that we will have to

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

deal with these same criteria that a math class is having to deal with, and a math class it is so easy to determine. You either know how to do it or you don't.

You either know how to solve this problem or you don't.

I would say even to that -- and I know I'm rambling because I haven't talked yet (laughter) -- even when we were just saying that it could be because of a new principal, you know, maybe the fact that their drug use went down was because of a new principal, well, I would say math scores depend on the quality of the teacher. So you can have all the appropriate instructions and all this kind of stuff, but if the teacher doesn't connect with the students, then they are not going to learn.

So I mean there are so many variables that I would say, even your ACT score, even your grade point average, I don't know that you can absolutely show a cause-and-effect relationship.

So I would like us to -- I mean I do research all the time or at least I hire grad students who can, because I don't know how to. I hire grad

NEAL R. GROSS

students who know how to do this research all the time, and yet, still, I have people say, "Yes, but can you prove that you were the reason that happened?"

No, I can't. So then money is taken away or money is not given because I can't show a cause-and-effect that I would venture to say nobody can do.

So I would like us to consider changing the paradigm on can we fit into the same category as everybody else. Maybe we have no choice, but then we have to figure out a way to either help other people understand that nobody can live up to those expectations or figure out a different way to package it, so we show that we have a way of showing that we are making an impact.

All sorts of people yesterday showed how they are having an impact. I felt great after hearing that, but then when the three researchers talked about it being ineffective, it just, as I said, made my blood boil because, how can both of those things be true, unless we are looking at things in a totally different way?

CHAIRMAN LONG: We will go to Hope, and

NEAL R. GROSS

then I am going to shut this down because what we are doing is Debbie has just indicated to me that she is done with her opening statement.

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Then we will get to the communication, public comment, and then we will come back to -- I think we are getting into really the first segment. We just kind of spilled over a little bit. So if we will bear with Hope and then we will go to public comment and then get back to the discussion.

Two quick things: MS. TAFT: Sometimes I feel like the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program is different standard of evaluation held to effectiveness than other programs are. One of the things that feeds into that is a recent statement that I read by James Towey, who is the former person in the White House who dealt with faith-based initiatives. He said that his blood would boil when he thought about the federal grants to recipients such as the National Head Start Association and the Catholic Charities, who had no ability to show programs that they implemented really worked.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	I know for a fact that every Head Start
2	facility in the country doesn't send in data; it
3	doesn't evaluate what they do. So why does every
4	little Safe and Drug-Free School Program have to do
5	that?
6	The other is maybe we are trying to
7	evaluate the wrong thing in a micromanaged way. I
8	think back to the National Adolescent Longitudinal
9	Study that was released a couple of years ago that had
10	some very important findings on what kept kids from
11	using alcohol and drugs or help them succeed as adults
12	over a long term, one of which was connectedness to
13	school and connectedness to family. Maybe it is those
14	kinds of things that we should be measuring instead of
15	what the researchers seem to be focused on.
16	MS. PRICE: Let me just respond real
17	quickly.
18	I think that is a good point. It really
19	is the PART/re-PART/OMB process is in concrete. There
20	are processes in concrete. This is how they are

But those performance standards that you

reviewed.

21

develop really can be crucial in developing those standards so that you allow the program to meet the standard, not that you skew it so that you get a standard so low that it meets it, but that it legitimately can address it. We have tried working very hard with OMB to develop those standards.

But the comment about the Head Start, that is an example, and it is a very good example, that even when programs don't show that they're -- and now I honestly can't say that I know whether Head Start is, you know, what their status is, but I will use them as an example just out of the blue.

But they may be ineffective, but Congress thinks something about Head Start, so they put the money in. It isn't the agency that implements that program that identifies the dollars; it is Congress.

Congress has funded the State Grants

Program even after the PART review showed it to be ineffective. So there is an example that the odd process that we have for dollars is there. Congress gives it to them; we implement them. They decide how much we get to implement.

NEAL R. GROSS

1 It is one of the beauties of our nation. 2 It is one of the frustrations of our nation. 3 We have a few what is called earmarks that 4 we have to implement all the time, that if I could sit 5 here and list them, you would just be in stitches laughing at, what on earth is Education implementing 6 7 these for? But we just get to do it because that's 8 what we get to do. The dollar process, it is not the best. 9 10 It is not the ideal, but I do think in the overall 11 that trying to provide dollars and to be a good 12 stewards of those dollars, that the structure sets it 13 up to be able to do that as much as possible with all the flaws that are there. 14 15 CHAIRMAN LONG: Public comment? 16 I have a question now, so I will have to 17 ask. That might be a moot point until I ask this 18 first question. 19 there anyone from the public that 20 wishes to comment? Okay, you've already got the answer. 21 22 didn't see the microphone. So I didn't know how we

1	were going to do that. So Catherine has a microphone
2	over here.
3	Would you please this is being recorded
4	if you would give your name, where you are from,
5	and if you have any written remarks, after you are
6	done, if Catherine could have a copy of that, please?
7	MS. JOHNSON: Mona Johnson from Washington
8	State, Office of the Superintendent of Public
9	Instruction. These comments are not from me. They
10	were actually given to me by Dr. Ellen Morehouse
11	yesterday. Many of you saw her reaction after the
12	research presentation, so she had some comments that
13	she wanted to share.
14	So I don't know if I need to take the time
15	to read them, but I will give them to you, Dr. Long,
16	and ask that you share them, unless you would like me
17	to read them.
18	Okay, this is from Ellen Morehouse on
19	behalf of her comments related to the research
20	presentation.
21	"I would like to provide a response to the
22	question that Mr. Ellis asked the Research Evaluation

Panel as to why there was a discrepancy between the positive findings presented by the state and local panels and this panel.

"Ellen Morehouse's findings were based on 51 secondary schools, 18 middle schools, and 33 high If Chris Ringwalt's questionnaire had been schools. sent to the 18 middle schools, it is possible that it may have been answered by an experienced health teacher in the building or the chairperson of the physical education and health committee. these individuals may have indicated that they are not using one of the programs that is on the list, even though 5 of the 18 are in buildings where there is a full-time or part-time staff person implementing Project Success, which is on the list.

"In addition, the other 13 middle schools and 27 of the 33 high schools are using the Westchester Student Assistance Program, which was a National Institute of Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse Model Program in 1984 and is the prototype or big sister of Project Success and the Residential SAP. While many Student Assistance Programs nationally are

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	converting to Project Success, they are still referred
2	to as SAPs.
3	"Finally, Chris Ringwalt's study was
4	limited to middle schools, and many LEAs use the Safe
5	and Drug-Free Schools for evidence-based programs. In
6	the elementary and high schools, for example, life
7	skills training is one of the most researched and
8	widely-replicated effective universal prevention
9	programs. It is usually implemented in sixth grade,
LO	and in many LEAs the sixth grade is still in the
L1	elementary school."
L2	So those are Ellen's comments for the
L3	Advisory Committee.
L4	CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much.
L5	Is there anyone else from the public who
L6	wishes to make a comment? Yes?
L7	MS. TRAYWICK: Good morning. My name is
L8	Penny Deevers Traywick. I represent, I guess, a lot
L9	of hats at this point in my life.
20	I started out with Safe and Drug-Free when
21	it began back in the eighties and I was a local
) 2	coordinator in the State of Alahama Can you tell?

(Laughter.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I live here. I live in northern Virginia at this point.

But through that experience of coordinating that Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program in the State of Alabama for many years the Department of Education, I learned a lot. I learned a Retired there in the year 2000 and began to work in a lot of different areas. I have most recently been working with the Southeast CAP that you heard a little bit about yesterday that is funded under CSAP, the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. I am the Governor's Rep for Safe and Drug-Free in the State of Alabama.

As I listened yesterday, though -- and what I am here today as is the Vice President of the National Student Assistance Association. You heard those terms yesterday a lot. You heard the words "student assistance." You've heard from Mona again this morning. I know some of you may not realize or know anything about Student Assistance Programs.

I think I just wanted to make a

NEAL R. GROSS

clarification. We hard about components yesterday of a Student Assistance Program, different components. We want you to know that Student Assistance Programs is just a framework. It is a framework for the continuum of services for social and academic problems in our schools. It is a school-site-based program that we, as a national association, promote non-components of, not just one or two that you may have heard yesterday. So I think that is my clarification.

I would like to just run over those non-components real quick. I brought them because I would probably forget one or two if I stood up here and tried to remember them.

The non-components, beginning with school board policy; staff development awareness, which you heard a lot about yesterday; internal referral process; problem-solving team and student assistance evaluation, case management; major component; educational student support groups; cooperation and collaboration of community agencies -you heard a lot about that yesterday also -- and the integration of other school-based programs.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 I will send you to your email addresses a 2 information about that from our little bit more 3 We had our Executive Director here Association. 4 vesterday. Lou Rush was here. He could not be with 5 us today, but in place I am here and thought I would 6 just share that with you. I wanted to clarify a 7 little bit for you. 8 Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN LONG: Thank you very much. 10 Is there anyone else that wishes to make 11 public comment? Anyone else? 12 (No response.) 13 No? Okay, thank you very much. We will then go back to the next area on 14 15 the agenda, and then we will start to get back into 16 discussion, but I want to frame it a little bit. Think about this: 17 We have talked about 18 the September 8th and the September 5th. So we can 19 only accomplish so much this morning, but we will be 20 and also getting back together by writing email through a conference call on September 5th, as was 21

mentioned earlier.

So we are certainly not trying to finish up this morning, but we want to get as many thoughts out there as possible, so we can start to put a framework together for that 8th. So I would like to have you think about it from this standpoint:

To think about what the function -- first, just two things -- first of all, what is the function -- I'm just going to go through the outline and then we can go backwards -- what is the function of the school? What are we trying to do in education? Then to prioritize those things.

Then the second thing would be then, after we do that, let's talk about how is that delivered. How do we deliver that?

Then we can even ask questions in that segment like, should this be for everyone? Should we take a look at the formula? So we can ask all kinds of questions. I am just trying to give some general areas. So if we start with the functions of those schools or those roles, I am just going to go one step further and then we can get into the dialog.

We heard a lot of things yesterday. We

NEAL R. GROSS

have heard a lot of comment, of course, from folks on this Committee. It boils down to things like this: that we want environments where our students are connected, where they respect each other. Then we heard other people say yesterday that the thing that we have to really pound away at would be achievement, and that is our single goal or objective.

I am going to submit this, and then only for the sake of starting the conversation. My background is curriculum instruction. We do a tremendous amount of work in achievement. We are very successful at it. As I said, we work very hard at it.

But having said that, that is not our No.

1 objective because we can't get at that in our schools in our county, in our State, unless those children are connected and are respected and they feel safe.

So we heard different things yesterday, but just for the sake of this discussion again, I am going to submit that the first priority would be that those children be safe and that we have safe places for those youngsters to go, a safe and nurturing

NEAL R. GROSS

environment. We hear that all the time, but where they can go, so that we can get to the achievement.

So having said that, I am going to stop. Let's try to focus for right now -- and I know, because there is a lot of interest in different things on the Committee, we will weave in and out and that is fine, but I am just trying to give some structure to what the first part of the discussion will be. We can talk about what you feel the function of the school is in priority order. I just mentioned one or two. That is up to you. I just wanted to start it off.

Does that make sense?

DR. JONES: Yes. Yes, that is a tough question. But, yes, I think safety is important because we know that children that are not safe and children that are traumatized are at greater risk for academic, social, as well as many other problems.

In fact, we've got tons of data to actually demonstrate that. Bill knows this firsthand. The National Child Traumatic Stress Network has produced tons of data saying that children who are traumatized, can, in fact, incur great distress. In

NEAL R. GROSS

fact, we know that children that are sexually abused, for example, not only have lower IQs, but it has been shown that they have smaller brains. So we know that trauma has a very massive impact.

I just came back last week from a week in New Orleans working with crisis workers, talking with parents, et cetera. We know how distressing that has been and how it is going to continue for some time.

So I think that, indeed, safety is a No. 1 priority. But, given that, I just want to piggyback on something that Shep was saying before. Thank God for OMB because I think it is holding us accountable for monies that are being spent, energies that are being put into activities, and children whose lives may or may not be changing, aspects of their lives changing.

Kim, I can appreciate where you are coming from because I don't think you can always demonstrate cause-effect relationships. But I don't think it has to be an either/or. I think that there is some gray there.

You made kind of a joke yesterday: Is it

NEAL R. GROSS

light or particle? That was a question that Einstein had asked in terms of how light moves, and it wasn't either/or, but it was both. Sometimes I think it can be both.

I think one way of kind of getting at that is it is kind of a paradigm shift, but maybe looking at kind of a tiered system where there are different types of evaluation done, different criteria for different programs that are being carried out. Maybe at the top of that would be empirical research. Then maybe at another level it would simply be evaluation.

In fact, Bill, it is kind of similar to what we are doing within the Network, the National Child Traumatic Stress Network. You might want to speak to that. But it is kind of a tiered system that being evaluated with is the evervone same standard. There are researchers. There are There are people, grassroots things going clinicians. on, all of which are playing a very important role in assisting children prior to, during, and following traumatic events. So it is kind of a tiered system.

It is really an epistemological question.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

It is, how do you measure knowledge? Does it have to be all research-based? Does it have to be pre/post tests, et cetera? It really depends on how you measure that. I think there are different ways of looking at that.

Kind of going back to what Shep said, it is not all about money. I had an opportunity to serve on an Advisory Committee at the CDC for five, six, seven, eight years and also was Chair of the Science and Program Subcommittee. That is the group where we evaluated all of the grants that came into the CDC, et cetera.

We raised a question in terms of how to enhance the quality of research that is being funded.

We talked about a system. It is called Consort.

In fact, that is the system that is used to evaluate clinical trial studies. It looks at internal-related, the external-related. It really gets to cause-effect. That is still being worked on.

Again, that can be very effective. But I think that we are talking about a paradigm shift where I think research plays a very important role, where I

NEAL R. GROSS

think that what is being done can be evaluated. I think that one way of really moving this thing forward is partnering.

We always talk about silos and that kind of thing. Well, I just heard a number of very good things from folks yesterday in terms of the benefit of partnering. I have got some specific suggestions that we can talk about at some point.

Again, I don't think it is all about money. I think that it does require a paradigm shift. I think that the tier system may be appropriate here. Some things can be measured using solid research, and maybe some things can't. But I think those kinds of things need to be talked about in detail.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Again, let me try to frame this. If we can talk first about the function of our schools, then we will start to put all these things underneath. But if we can get to that point and then you can arrive at an agreement on that, then we will start to lay out "then what are those things?" under each of those headings that you think are most important. That will start to give us some meat to

NEAL R. GROSS

the structure.

I'm sorry, we had Michael and then Tommy.

MR. PIMENTEL: Thank you, Doctor.

Again, if you all remember, the last time we got together I did not speak until the last day, and I am doing so once again with you. I want to apologize ahead of time in that I may not have all the doctorates and things like that. My title is "Chief." If you go back into what a chief is, and that is that you are kind of overseeing the tribe, and I mentioned to you all that, whenever I served on this Committee, that a light went on that I need to accept each of these children in our schools as my own. I take that to heart.

I have a daughter, a biological daughter, who has MS. It appalls me when people treat her like a statistic because to me she is my life; she is a smile; she is everything in the world.

I want to piggyback on Dude. Okay, cool.

I applaud you. I think we need to start understanding that the standards need to be held at those community levels.

NEAL R. GROSS

There are things that are working in little, bitty Brownsville, Texas that have whole different values than what I am experiencing in San Antonio or you are experiencing in California.

The question that is before us is, how do we, as a Committee that is serving in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of Education, look at the future of state grants and not cloud the issues with the details of the operational aspects of these programs, because those need to be left with the communities?

I don't know where I am going with that other than to say we have a challenge ahead of us. I don't want it to get so far out of scope that we have lost sight of what it is about. What it is about is not a statistical set of data. It is about a living, breathing child in our classroom who needs to be safe in order to learn.

Thank you.

MR. LEDBETTER: When we look at the Committee itself, we are challenged to look at Safe and Drug-Free Schools, and how do you separate the

NEAL R. GROSS

two? I find it difficult to separate the two if we try to find a definition of a safe school, and is there such a thing as a drug-free school? Those are tough questions.

I am not certain that there is such a thing as a drug-free school anymore. I am not sure that one exists. I am realistic enough because I deal with it on a daily basis. And how bad is the drug problem? If you have one student who is using drugs, you have a bad problem. But just how bad is the problem nationwide? In my community, it may not be as bad as it is somewhere else.

What is the nature of the problem? When we look at drugs, 10 years ago, 15 years ago, at the beginning of my career, we looked at alcohol and we looked at marijuana and that was it. But today it is cocaine; it is heroin; it is you name it. I mean it is prescription drugs. It is every type of drug that is out there. What will be there 10 years from now will be different than what is there today.

I think that there are problems. I sat here yesterday and I listened to -- I sort of got

NEAL R. GROSS

mixed signals sometimes because there was some very strong advocates of the program who were saying that we had great statistics to show that the program worked. Then we had the researchers who came in who said that the statistics didn't show that the program worked.

I wanted to ask Chris Ringwalt a question and we ran out of time. So I went and I talked to him afterward. One of the comments he made was that -- he talked about the list, which was referred to here a moment ago by the young lady from Washington.

But he said that the list would be changing. So I felt like there was more to it. So I went and approached him afterward and asked him, and he said that, yes, the list will be changing.

I told him, I said, "Did I understand that some of the programs that you threw out and did not consider were programs that were not on the list?"

And he said that's correct.

I said, "Well, if the list is changing, will some of those programs that were thrown out in your research be considered and be put on the list

NEAL R. GROSS

later?" He said that's exactly right.

So I asked him, I said, "Does that mean that some of those programs that were not considered were more effective than some of the programs on the list?" He said that, yes, that's why some programs that were on the list will be coming off and some other programs will be added to the list.

Well, I shared that with Deborah. I got mixed signals.

We are looking at statistics, and you mentioned accountability. Those of us involved in education, accountability is not a new word to us. It is something that we have had to deal with for years.

I think that my concern is, how can this program be fairly evaluated and how can we hold all the programs accountable in a fair manner? To me, that is the biggest issue that we are looking at.

I don't hear anyone saying that the program needs to just be thrown away, or I haven't heard that. What I am hearing is that the program has some problems and we need to look at the program or we need to try to find ways to deal with those problems.

NEAL R. GROSS

But I am like Dave; if a school is not safe, whatever learning takes place in that building is not the type of learning that the mothers and the fathers of those communities send their children to school for. I think the safety is a very big issue.

I heard about programs yesterday that have great results with safety. I heard about concerns. The gentleman from Los Angeles, the gentleman from Denver, they talked about the concerns they have about safety.

I think that we need to look at this program and we need to find a way to fairly evaluate the program where OMB will be happy with the results.

I heard about the programs where there was a lot of matching money yesterday that went into the programs. Maybe that is an avenue that would be good to look at with the program also, because if the programs are important, if the programs are making the kind of successes, if they are creating the successes that we are hearing about within the schools, maybe they are important enough that all of the schools across the United States can start finding that

NEAL R. GROSS

matching money to go with those programs, so that those programs can grow.

I am not sure what the solution is, but I am convinced that the programs are beneficial. Can we say that it is because of the programs? In part. How can we measure that? I don't know. I don't think that is possible to say that it is strictly this program that causes the changes.

If the drug program is not increasing within the schools, that is a measure of success. In today's world, that is a measure of success. If safety within the schools remains the way it is now, and we don't have an increase in violence within the schools, that is a measure of success. I mean we are making headway there.

Now to say that schools need to show a 5 percent decline per year or a 10 percent decline over a period of years, I don't know if any program can guarantee that. I really don't. I don't know if it is possible.

But a combination of programs is the best way for us to go. It appears to me that this program

NEAL R. GROSS

has created some combinations of some programs. Now how can we get all the departments working together?

I have no clue. That is why we have people at this table who have backgrounds in other areas.

But I know that the schools in this nation are at peril. They are. Statistics -- we talk about No Child Left Behind. As a building administrator, on a daily basis, the academics and the instructional programs are what come first. If we are to meet our accountability goals in the academic arena, then we have to have a safe environment; we have to have a drug-free environment, and forth, so to do Without it, we will never reach 100 percent by 2014. It will never happen.

So all of these things fit together. How does it all fit in the big picture? You know, this is one piece of the puzzle, but it is an important piece. I think that we need to find a way to be able to say that this program is fairly evaluated and that it is accountable for the tax dollars that go into it.

MS. PRICE: I just want to insert one thought, and I agree. I think whatever that term of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

what we believe the school should be, and we have been saying, "safe," when I think of that term, it means much more than the word "safety". It means drugs are not in the schools -- that makes a child unsafe -- and alcohol. So it is a comprehensive word.

If that is the case, we may need to reflect that somehow in there. Because with all of the focus on Homeland Security and the different things, I sometimes say, "preparedness"; schools need to be prepared, and then everyone focuses on just the disaster or crisis.

So, as I am thinking of the word "safe," I really think of it as a comprehensive word. If we all do that, then we should reflect that in what we send forward. Because I think we could spend a lot of time identifying all of the issues that make that environment the correct environment for students to attend school and to learn.

MS. TAFT: Sometimes I think that we maybe even ought to go a little bit further on the definition of what, a little broader on the definition of what schools are in the business of doing. To me,

NEAL R. GROSS

it is schools are in the business of working with parents and communities to make sure that our children become responsible, caring, competent, capable adults. There's a whole lot of components into that, but that is really the essence of a lot of longitudinal research on how you get people to adulthood safely and capably, and the resiliency research.

Maybe we ought to be looking at the components of this research that has been done by the federal government on a longitudinal basis that tells us what goes into raising that child to become a competent and caring and responsible adult, such as resiliency research will tell you time and time again that it is not the program that makes the difference; it is the person who implements the program.

Yet, we are so focused on the program, the pieces, that we have missed the piece that is most important to the child, which is that caring adult in their lives. I don't want us to lose fact of that.

Maybe we need to think about the definition of safety because there is no way that the Safe and Drug-Free School Program is going to be able

NEAL R. GROSS

to fund every Homeland Security issue that comes up. Maybe we need to work on defining that safety as the interpersonal safety of the children and adults that are in that school or some other definition that carves out the piece that we feel like we can impact with a little bit of reasonableness.

DR. SIMS: I just wanted to put a couple of points out there, following up on some of the comments made yesterday. I guess in Dr. Reuter's presentation, when he was giving the summary of the findings of their research in terms of effectiveness of the programs that were in place, in his slide he said that they coded that as positive, meaning that there was some potential there of the programs, the actual programs that were being implemented within the schools, but there were a number of different criteria that were being looked at.

When you looked at the overall set of criteria, the program was deemed ineffective because it was falling down in some areas, one being the administrative aspects of the program and insignificant findings on the targeting of resources,

NEAL R. GROSS

and the capacity, improving program capacity.

It seems like if you are thinking about having some reassurance that what you are doing is working, if you can show positive things on all the different criteria, then that is going to help to triangulate the overall set of information around this one outcome of, are we making a difference for these kids?

So one of my questions is, since these initial findings came out all those years ago, and now that the rePART is going on, what things have been put in place to help the programs improve specific areas that were showing some of the problems? Specifically, have there been efforts to provide technical specific assistance to the program participants? Has a website been set up with best practices? Tips for setting up partnerships and collaborations?

A lot of the presentations we heard yesterday, the success was around partnerships and the leveraging of funds. Some communities may know how to do that very well. Some communities may not be doing

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

it that well, and they could learn from each other if there were venues for them to interact and exchange their specific ideas.

The gentleman from CADCA talked about how that is one resource available, but that is just one. What is the role of the Office in providing specific resources to the programs around those kinds of things?

Then the other issue that was mentioned a couple of times yesterday, but we didn't delve into it, was around sort of the transfer of funds across different title programs with these different numbers. A couple of people mentioned how, when that was done, that allowed the program to choose, the participating state agency or local agency to choose a program that was not on the list kind of thing, not one of the effective programs.

So it seems that when resources are moved around to the different programs, what should take precedent should be the one that has actual principles of effectiveness tied to it. So Safe and Drug-Free Schools, if they are a specific criteria, maybe that

NEAL R. GROSS

should trump a choice that you might make if you lump your money somewhere else.

I don't know. We didn't really talk about that yesterday, but it seems like we should at least have it out on the table as something to consider for specific kinds of recommendations we could give to the overall program.

MS. PRICE: Regarding the transferability of funds, when No Child Left Behind was developed, there was a real focus on flexibility and allowing schools and community to use dollars to address the specific needs of their school, of their school districts. So flexibility has been incorporated throughout No Child Left Behind.

One of the areas that it is is in Title IV, which is in the State Grants Program. A school district can choose to move up to 50 percent -- am I correct? -- 50 percent of their Title IV dollars, so their State Grants dollars, from Title IV into another title, into Title I, into Title V.

When those dollars transfer into that program, that specific program, its function is

NEAL R. GROSS

different than Safe and Drug-Free Schools. It has its own criteria for how those dollars, then, can be spent.

So, also, a school district does not need to ask permission from the Department of Education to transfer those dollars. That is a right that they have. They get to do that if they deem that appropriate.

They are not accountable to the Department to identify that they did it. Often, we do know that it is not a requirement. Is that correct? Okay, I just want to make sure I am saying it correctly.

So one of the beauties of the State Grants Program is its flexibility, but also inherent in that flexibility comes complications with those dollars are still, you know, the 100 percent of the dollar still has to comply with those principles of effectiveness.

So there are some complications that came with the legislation in showing the effectiveness of the program that are just inherent in that legislation. Transferability is one of them. So it has both its strengths and its weaknesses.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	DR. SIMS: It seems like, then, when you
2	are trying to judge the overall program, at least if
3	you had a better understanding of the full landscape
4	of where those resources went, you can then try to
5	make better sense out of what is going on.
6	MR. MODZELESKI: Debbie, Belinda, there is
7	a very small amount of money that is actually
8	transferred. It is a very small percentage.
9	I mean while Debbie is right, the law
10	permits the waiving out and utilizing it, we are
11	talking about a fraction of these dollars. We thought
12	that there might be a lot, but there is not.
13	That is the good news, is that whatever
14	goes out has no impact on the total, whether it is
15	\$300 million, \$500 million, \$600 million. So it has
16	not been a large percentage of funds.
17	DR. JONES: Yes, I was going to say, how
18	about the first part of her question, which I thought
19	was very good, the feedback loop?
20	MS. PRICE: Right. I mentioned it
21	yesterday, that in that piece that we gave you on kind
22	of information regarding the State Grants Program,

1 final page does talk about those improvements 2 that specifically worked regarding rePARTing We can go into more information about that. 3 address. 4 Bill? 5 MR. MODZELESKI: You could probably take a 6 half a day, Russell, to go over the changes over the 7 last, say, five years that the Office has taken to 8 improve -- it is not only the quality of the State Grants Programs, but the delivery of services overall. 9 10 Training/technical assistance, we spend, 11 oh, probably \$10 million a year on various training 12 technical assistance efforts. 13 dedicated merely discretionary grant program provide funds to states to improve their overall data 14 15 collection and analysis system. 16 We do a conference every year, every other year, where we bring in over 1,000 people to help get 17 18 this out. We have listservs. We have newsletters. 19 Best practices is part of what we do. Ιt 20 is an everyday way of life, is promoting best 21 practices.

NEAL R. GROSS

Just

as

a point of clarification,

correct Chris, who, unfortunately, is not here, is that we have said repeatedly there is no list. We don't subscribe to any list.

do sav is that there What we are agency, basically, -- Donni's has worked with Del Elliott in Colorado on the Blueprint Series. have the Blueprint Series. Belinda's organization, as Zili said yesterday, had the Red Book with grants in the Red Book. CSAP has, unfortunately, a list is the best way to talk about it. Howell's organization has listing of groups and programs that work. The Executive Branch with Helping America's Youth another grouping of programs.

So, rather than say just go to this list, what we say is that all of these programs have a degree of research behind them that shows that they have been effective if implemented to a degree of fidelity, to a high degree of fidelity. So adopt those programs, not any one list.

I mean, basically, if you have something that we know that works and you can show/demonstrate that it worked, that is what we want you to engage in.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We are in a process right now of looking at, conducting research to see, unlike, well, in some ways the list, but we want to expand beyond that. Because what we recognize is that the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, what occurs at the local level is not just about curricula.

I think that Hope Taft is right. I mean this is about mentoring. This is about connections. This is about changing the culture and climate at school. This is about linking kids with adults.

You are never going to find on any list a program that says let's link kids with adults. I mean so we need to find a way to get beyond just a curricula-type program because we also are cognizant of the fact that this is not only about money; this is about time.

As teachers and principals find that there is less time to do these things, we can't just get them off the table. We need to replace them with activities that really work.

By the way, what we do believe is that connections and mentoring programs and programs that

NEAL R. GROSS

basically teach kids trust, respect, character, all of those things have an impact not only on the individual, but also on the school. They trickle down and they affect alcohol use; they affect drug use; they affect violent behavior.

So part of the trick here is to move away just from the silos of programs which historically have just dealt with drug prevention or just dealt with violence prevention and begin to look at broader-based programs that tend to address a whole range of problems that kids face.

I would be willing to bet that Tommy, the kids that come into his Dean's Office, or whatever the case may be, come in with a whole host of problems. You know, the kids are manifesting -- you know in your practice -- the kids are coming forward with a whole host of problems.

If we continue to just put bandaids on these problems and try to fix one problem at a time, we are never going to be successful. So we are looking at a broad-based, comprehensive approach in programs and activities.

NEAL R. GROSS

In some ways, I think -- and this is the difficult part -- I think schools are ahead of the researchers. As a matter of fact, I know schools are ahead of the researchers. We are far ahead of the researchers because we recognize the problems and we are struggling to fix them. Researchers are still years behind in trying to come up with some answers for basically: Is what they are doing working?

If we had to merely -- and this is the trick here -- if we merely had to follow where the researchers are, we are going to be stuck in five years or ten years. So there is a time lag here, and it is an unfortunate time lag. So part of it is also trying to figure out, how do we bring the researchers along with us to make sure the researchers are doing what we want, what is important to us?

I have talked to some people around the table about Chris' research. To some extent, it is that, you know, that is not of particular interest to us. If it is not, then part of the message is that we -- I mean not "we," but all of us, Debbie and ourselves -- we need to be sending a message to

NEAL R. GROSS

1 researchers as to what is important to us to make sure 2 that Tommy has a school that is effective and that 3 basically operates smoothly and freely and safely in a 4 climate and culture that really is conducive 5 learning. 6 CHAIRMAN LONG: Shep has been patiently 7 waiting over here. 8 DR. KELLAM: Ι have been actually listening. 9 10 (Laughter.) 11 I have to say I feel like two or three of us maybe feel like we should come at this conversation 12 13 from a how-do-we-connect-up perspective. The research that we heard was probably --14 15 and these are friends of mine; at least two out of the 16 three of them are very close friends -- they didn't connect with us. 17 18 Everybody in the morning was really 19 talking about evaluation and how important it is, how 20 important even at the local level. How do you know what you are doing when you go to work matters? 21 22 Should you be doing something else that would matter

more?

With all of the interest in evaluation, it seems as if the research panel -- I had some skepticism in the first place about how that was going to work in our group. Certainly, the rest of the panels I thought were incredibly informative, but the research panel illustrated how far away the research that they described was from the practice that we go and do every day.

I say "we" because we have a partnership with Baltimore City Public Schools where we go and sit down with the Board and School Commissioners and the Superintendent, and they say, "What research questions are you paying attention to? How can we help you do your mission?" That is what a partnership could be like.

Our research establishment is nowhere near that. I can tell you we get a lot of research grants because review committees aren't -- scientific review committees are aware that that is needed, that you have to have a partnership in order to do randomized trials.

NEAL R. GROSS

We have 95 percent of the parents agreeing to have kids randomized, and school districts, you know, everybody is behind it, because we are asking questions they want us to answer.

"How do you make reading scores go up?" is a very important question. Whether you teach phonemic awareness or every kid is different is really a very important question.

The question is, how close can the researchers come in a new stage of work to the people doing practice? We have tools, incredibly expensive tools. No Kid Gets Left Behind has an whole assessment system, information system, which tells you where things are problematic or where they are not so problematic.

What we have not learned, and need to, is how to use these assessment systems, develop these partnerships between researchers and practitioners such that the practice is driving the research. It is asking the questions that need to be answered in order to function.

In some crazy way, the Food and Drug

NEAL R. GROSS

1 Administration does that. It is goofy because it ends 2 up taking money from the drug companies and doing, requiring -- I mean it is all complicated. 3 4 opportunity, I think, to have an 5 develop a whole new structure. I think that what we need to do is to say to people, "Safe and Drug-Free 6 7 Schools is fundamentally important to the school's 8 mission. Socializing kids and mastery of the basic educational tasks that includes behavior is the way 9 10 you get the self-esteem; it is the way you protect 11 against drug abuse." 12 this, by the way, comes 13 epidemiologically-based longitudinal studies. to focus on the developmental trajectories and say: 14 15 What are the early issues? How could you get in 16 early? 17 You can't do that from an ivory tower. 18 You have really got to understand and sit in with the 19 school district people. 20 By the way, child welfare should be better

should be better connected to school districts.

connected

to school

21

22

We

districts, and public health

are talking about restructuring the way research, which is highly funded, needs to be less isolated and more integratable into the practice process.

Now I have got down here about five things
I think we could do, none of which would cost a hell
of a lot of money, if any. I hope we all have lists
of stuff like that. I think that there are plenty of
things that we could do.

It is not going to be inside Safe and Drug-Free Schools, inside the program. It is going to have to do with: What is IES? What are the links between IES and Safe and Drug-Free Schools at the community level?

Should we not be stimulating researchers like we did with land grant colleges or something? Should we not be stimulating some research groups to sit inside Tommy's office and his school district and say, "How can we help you understand what is working and for whom?"

That kind of partnership is part of a new structure because we are not getting the bang for the buck out of the research dollar. We are not getting

NEAL R. GROSS

1	the bang for the buck. We don't know what we are
2	getting out of many of the program areas. We need to
3	know more, and we need to bring this new structure to
4	bear. It is really designing a whole new structure
5	for a lot of things, not just Safe and Drug-Free
6	Schools.
7	DR. JONES: Yes, am I next?
8	MS. SOLBERG: I couldn't agree with you
9	more, absolutely.
10	I have a question, first of all. If you
11	have already said this, I apologize, but I missed it.
12	When did the PART material go in for
13	rePARTing?
14	MS. PRICE: It is in the process of being
15	rePARTed right now.
16	MS. SOLBERG: So they are working on it?
17	When do you expect the results of score?
18	MS. PRICE: February.
19	MS. SOLBERG: In February? So that is
20	significant for this group.
21	Secondly, both Kim and Tommy sparked this
22	comment. Cause and effect and cooperation there

are a number of federal programs, not as large in scope, but similar in function that I think we need to consider, Weed and Seed, the Drug-Free Communities Program, a number of Justice programs, that attempt to change not only the individual, but also the community in which the program operates.

There are some rather clever evaluations in the process looking of that are at stages development and expecting different results at different stages -- giving a school district decides to launch a meth program two years to actually report on the results of the meth prevention that they are working on.

Those programs so far have some pretty decent PART scores. I wonder if it might not be worth our while to invite either an administrator or an evaluator or a team of evaluators who are working on creating these out-of-the-box, new programs to come and present to us, because there are some ways of linking cause and effect or linking a number of causes and effects, of which you are a part that equals the total result.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	So I would really recommend that we
2	consider speaking with some of the other agencies in
3	town and inviting at least comments from them on how
4	they are dealing with the exact same problem. Because
5	everybody is reinventing the wheel. If we put all of
6	our heads together and all of our very small pots of
7	money together, we might come up with a system.
8	No. 3, those programs are also, several of
9	them are also using online evaluation tools. Those
10	tools allow the local and, you know, we are talking
11	about the local control, the local cause and effect
12	to somehow have an effect on the larger entity.
13	If, in fact, an online system could be
14	created where there was a whole menu of things to
15	report on, then we would capture, first of all, what
16	everyone is doing. I don't believe that currently we
17	are capturing that.
18	Ohio is a wonderful State. The State of
19	Washington is doing a fabulous job. But I talk with
20	states that are really having trouble getting their
21	arms around what to do.

We would hear from all states. You would

better be able to target the technical assistance, et cetera, that you do. I think that we would see some rather significant overall results.

So I would recommend that we consider also some kind of a reporting tool, so that we don't have individual states creating what they think is a significant evaluation, but everybody works for the same goals that will allow individuality. So that the state can define their problems; the community is able to define their problems, but they fit in in some way with a rather flexible menu that we have created.

DR. JONES: Yes, Mary, I second that. I think that is an excellent idea.

As I listen to comments around the table, I really hear this whole concept of we have to think outside of the box, I mean as partnering. We are not going to get the job done without partnering and going beyond the walls of the Department of Education. It just ain't going happen because there are limited funds.

But just a couple of just basic ideas:

One, we are talking about evaluation and

NEAL R. GROSS

that kind of thing. There are graduate programs in every state around this nation with very competent, bright researchers, graduate students that would love to work on these kinds of projects, that would love to do the kind of evaluations that need to be done, that would love to sit in principals' offices, for example, to determine what is it that they are doing that is working, et cetera. A relationship with the American Psychological Association, for example, would be wonderful.

There are students that would love to do research who can't gain access to target populations.

I am at a land grant university, Virginia Tech University. I was educated at a land grant university, Penn State. Those universities are out in the middle of nowhere, literally. In terms of getting clients, it is very difficult.

It is difficult to get these kids to come into our clinics to do the kinds of things that need to be done. Even more so, what we know -- that was 30 years ago -- what we know now is most people don't come to our clinics. The people who need help don't

NEAL R. GROSS

come to our clinics. But where do they come? They come to school; they have to come to school.

Partnering the American Psychological Association with many of the initiatives that are being done here, many of the schools where this is being done, I think it is a wonderful idea. I think the APA would jump at it. Graduate students would jump at it.

Master's theses, dissertations, they have to be done. What an excellent opportunity. It is no cost to school systems. It is not taking time away from administrators, et cetera. That is just one suggestion.

Another just real quick suggestion: We had an excellent panel talking about safety and that kind of thing in the afternoon, partnering with Homeland Security, partnering with FEMA. Our group, we have gotten over approximately half a million dollars from FEMA to do research looking at the impact of children and fire. Those kinds of monies, those kinds of dollars are there. There is millions of dollars in Homeland Security and in FEMA. In fact, I

NEAL R. GROSS

1 have even heard the term "billions of dollars." 2 Why not develop partnerships to move the mission of this initiative forward? It is partnering. 3 4 It is gimbling, as we talked about yesterday. 5 Maybe it is a naive question, MS. DUDE: 6 but it seems to me that over the period of time that 7 this funding has occurred that the scope of what we 8 are expected to deal with has broadened. Yet, the pie 9 that you describe has certainly not gotten any bigger. Yet, some of the issues we 10 It has gotten smaller. 11 are supposed to deal with, like safety, whether it be 12 terrorism, whether it be hurricanes, or whatever, 13 seems to me that there are other departments that should be funding those efforts, as opposed to Safe 14 and Drug-Free Schools. 15 16 So it is a naive question. Why do we need -- I don't know why I'm including myself in this "we" 17 18 -- but why does the Safe and Drug-Free Schools budget 19 have to accommodate those needs, instead of FEMA or 20 someone else? I don't know that I can answer 21 MS. PRICE: 22 articulately as would be needed,

legislation, the Title IV legislation, that articulates this grant is our dictate to what we do. It talks about drug, alcohol, violence reduction. In there, it says we should have a crisis plan; every school should have a crisis plan to get their dollars.

Even though drug, alcohol, and violence reduction are specific terms, in a sense, they are also very broad terms. So these are what those dollars should be used for.

Now FEMA, that is a whole other pot of money and whole other agency that is funded under a whole other program. As much as we would like to see, and I think as much as the federal government trying to focus in on, instead of pockets of agencies doing their thing and not collaborating together, but collaborating -and we've got some great collaboration going on with the folks at this table. ONDCP we work with all the time, HHS, Justice. know, our Safe Schools/Healthy Students is a joint collaboration of those three.

But some of it is what the legislation provides. We have this pot of money to address these

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

issues in the specific manner in which the 20 to the state, the 80 percent to the LEAs, distributed to the LEAs, is in this fashion. Individual school districts can work toward collaborating and getting other dollars in, but it is not a function of this program to do that. It doesn't mean it wouldn't be a good idea, but we work within the legislation that we are given and the parameters around that.

One thing I might just want to offer, I think that we have gotten some specific suggestions that I think are very good. I think for the long-term report to the Secretary next June, that putting some the rubber to road on those would be really significant. I don't know that that is what they are looking for in September, but more of an understanding of the value of the program, of what are some areas that need to be addressed.

Reauthorization of No Child Left Behind comes up next year. If you look at this program, what about this program could be better in legislation that makes it a better program? If we could get some broad understanding, broad concepts with some focuses on it,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I think it would be really helpful for the September 8th report, if that is helpful.

MS. JACKSON: Yes. We have been talking a lot about the function of schools and No Child Left Behind. Again, when we take a look at the public school model, it was meant and built to serve the public.

As we heard a lot of presentations yesterday discuss the challenge of teachers doing more, of classrooms, schools, and districts trying to ensure that we have highly-qualified and trained teachers to do the academics, to deliver the academics to our children, as well as keeping our schools safe — and, again, safe is a very broad term — and drugfree.

So the Office of Drug-Free Schools for me for well over a decade has been a major player with the Department of Education in providing that additional support that schools have needed to address and assess and provide a link between services to schools and to students and their families and the community. So there has been a lot of partnering that

NEAL R. GROSS

has been going on for years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The Student Assistance Program, which we heard spoken about briefly this morning and some yesterday, has been also a component that the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools for many of our districts have picked up and have been providing services to our school districts and our schools to assist children and keeping those students in schools.

For every student, we all know, that we lose from schools, that is funding for that school and that district, as well as it is an increase to my partner here next to me, the Department of Juvenile Justice often, where our students have nowhere else to go.

of our students, coming many to schools and feeling safe, sometimes it is the only place that they have to come and feel safe. Student Assistance Programs has been а way of providing students that return to school with that opportunity to be reconnected and re-engaged.

So I think the functions of our schools has broadened and has changed, as well as over time it

NEAL R. GROSS

has had a restructuring in and of itself to take a look beyond just the school and really link with the community. I think that is challenging when we don't have Student Assistance Programs and other opportunities to do that. I don't think our teachers and our principals always have that opportunity to take on that role.

Student Assistance Programs provided an opportunity and a mechanism for bringing to the table to teachers and schools and school boards and administrators some of the things and the going presenting problems that are on communities. So that has been another component that often some of our teachers and our administrators aren't aware of what is going on with our students.

So I think it is important that we not forget that the functions of the schools, and, again, with NCLB, that without Title IV, I am not sure how any of the other components could be carried out if our schools were not safe and if they weren't drugfree and we weren't addressing dropout and truancy and many of the other issues that affect most of our

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

students.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Perfect timing. It is now 10:15, and we will be taking a break. We will come back and start right at 10:30.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 10:18 a.m. and went back on the record at 10:37 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN LONG: Okay, if we could please come back together, we have, let's say, about 50 minutes and then we will pull it together for about, I was going to say five minutes, and as I thought, that might take an hour.

(Laughter.)

As we said earlier, the point now is not to come to conclusions. It is to lay things out, which you have been doing.

I talked to several people at the break. If we look at it this way: Try not to put those in neat little categories, but two or three people said to me, you know, things were laid out there; some of them I hadn't thought about. Now some of the things are starting to fold together. If we can just

NEAL R. GROSS

continue to do that, so that when we get together for our conference call, that then there will be some semblance of order.

Along with that, I had mentioned earlier, and then I was talking with Hope here, but I thought, when we started, two things about the function of schools and then, secondly, about the delivery system.

All of a sudden, those minutes turned into hours, and we've got about 45 or 50 minutes left.

If we could, for the sake of the discussion of the delivery system, I had even mentioned to Hope maybe we can get to it now. As I thought about that, I am not sure we can because I think we have to continue what we are talking about.

So in preparation for that conference call and the delivery system aspect of it, if we could send something out like we did before with some ideas from the Department, and then if any Committee members have any additions to it, which I thought worked well last time, then you can just add it to the basic structure of the discussion on the delivery system. Then that will be for the second part.

NEAL R. GROSS

For the first part, we will have to tie this all together, too. That is going to take -- we are all going to get on airplanes here in about an hour -- so that is going to take some time together, as you know, from the standpoint of staff, so that there is some coherence at that conference call also, which is coming up very soon. Here we are on the 22nd, and that is the 5th. So that is going to come right to us.

I just want, as we start, to just mention something. It is just rhetorical. But the other part of this, I was sitting listening. We all come from different areas of the country and different jobs. One of the things, the elephant that just kept -- oh, good Lord, I just gave away my party affiliation (laughter) -- the elephant in the room is, I think a lot of this is political. Let's lay it out there, that the things that we are talking about are going to be voted on by Members of Congress.

So some of the things that we are going to be presenting in the way of creation or creativity is going to be to have the representatives from Congress

NEAL R. GROSS

from your areas, wherever that happens to be, that there are some things that are said in a way that will allow them to get off some of their thought process right now, whatever it might be, and vote yes. That is the way it is.

So some of the things we are going to talk about, yes, it has to be created from the standpoint of the approach and differences. Some of it will have to be even how it is said, even though some of those outcomes might still then be the same, if that makes sense.

But I think we have to also remember that as we are putting all of these things together, because they are political animals. In a discussion last night, I was talking to somebody who said, "We've got five Members of Congress from our County, just because of the size, and they are all up for reelection." That also has to be a part of the formula.

So we don't have to beat that to death, but we all know it and we have to think about that as we start to put all these things together. Okay, enough said on that.

NEAL R. GROSS

If I could well, why don't we do that
in the wrapup? Maybe if we take about, let's take
about another 30-35 minutes of discussion and then I
am going to ask you for some consensus on just a few
of the items. I don't think it is going to be very
difficult. I have been just writing things down as
you have been talking and just trying to see if we can
pull some of this together, but I will do that way at
the end.
So if we can continue the discussion, we

So if we can continue the discussion, we will stop at about a quarter after and then try to tie some of these things together with consensus. Okay?

Does anyone remember where we were? Hope?

MS. TAFT: I just over break thought of a couple of things. Maybe what we really need to do is kind of go back to basics.

I remember in the late eighties when the Drug-Free School Program was first started, and it was just the Drug-Free School Program. Then, all of a sudden, it became the Safe and Drug-Free Program because I think Congress was aware of the influence of drugs and alcohol use on safety, and that is what they

NEAL R. GROSS

meant by safety, sort of that interpersonal safety that related to either a parent's alcohol and drug use or a child's alcohol and drug use on the rest of that school environment.

So I really think helping us come to some sort of a definition of what "safe" means in the Safe and Drug-Free School Program might be helpful in our goals of getting back to the basics of what the program is all about.

One of the things that I also think is really important, and I heard it yesterday, I know that we are all around the table because of our passion for this program. If we undermine the passion at the local level, if we don't reinforce that passion, if we don't continue to validate what the local people are doing, it doesn't matter how much money you have given them; they are not going to do anything. They are going to burn out, and then there is going to be nothing.

So somehow or another, we need to show support in a strong way for local efforts and how they tie into academic achievement.

NEAL R. GROSS

Then if we could change the formula or the funding system in some way, because we know that actions follow money, and tie just a little bit of an incentive into what we want to see what happens, which may be to reflect collaboration or getting matching money or in-kind services or tying in the local university or having a Student Assistance Program, or doing joint evaluations with other activities going on in the community that affect people, such as the Drug-Free Communities Grants or the Strategic Prevention Framework Grants, or the Weed and Seed Grants.

I mean all of these grants are reinforcing to each other in a community. Local people get really kind of distressed when they are doing five different reports for the same amount of money, and it is the same five people around the table all the time.

So how can, at the federal level, we look at collaborating and having one set of criteria do for all of the programs and save people some time and money in the process that could be better used in making those connections, in getting those caring adults into people lives, into kids' lives,

NEAL R. GROSS

1 particularly that we really know make a difference? 2 So that is kind of where I am now. Yes, I agree also. The notion 3 DR. JONES: 4 of safety, how broadly defined it is, I think that is 5 important. 6 DR. WECHSLER: Ι think there is an 7 incredibly fundamental issue that this group must 8 discuss, debate, and soon come to a conclusion of its 9 opinion on. Yesterday we heard a spirited debate in 10 which two different sides were presented. researchers sided with the folks who did the PART. 11 The third objection they had was the funds are spread 12 13 too thinly to support quality interventions. know where I stand on that, but I think we need to 14 15 come up with our opinion on whether the status quo of 16 getting grants to every LEA in the country, whether that is something that could be maintained, given the 17

CHAIRMAN LONG: And I think that is an excellent point, Howell. I think that that should be one of the basic tenets that we talk about on that delivery system because then it starts to get into

NEAL R. GROSS

ongoing funding cuts.

18

19

20

21

that, but that might even be the first question that we approach on that subject.

MR. LEDBETTER: Since the initial meeting we had, some of the discussion at the initial meeting was about the fact there was very little money and it was spread so thinly with the program as it now exists that it was very difficult to achieve the results that they were looking for.

Yesterday nearly everyone who came in, in one way or another, said that they needed more money to make the programs work better. I asked Deborah if the legislation would require or would allow -- we are looking at ways to improve the program and one of the problems is the funding. Now if the money from the federal government is shrinking, and you look at what inflation has done to the dollar, it has shrunk more.

One of the ideas that I have kicked around with a couple of people is redesigning the State Grants Program where the money that goes to the states, that it not be any flowthrough money, where it flows from here, from the federal government, to the state, and then it flows directly through the state to

NEAL R. GROSS

the LEAs; that there be some requirement on the part of the LEAs to participate in the program, that they have to be able to leverage some money or provide some matching money to take part in the program.

Yesterday I heard about school systems that received \$1500, was all they received. If that school system knew that they could come up with another \$1500 to get that \$1500, then they have \$3,000, we have doubled the amount of money in the program.

I know that there are three school systems in the Huntsville, Madison County, Alabama area that participate in the program. I believe the Huntsville, Madison County, Chamber of Commerce, we could build a relationship with them, a partnership with them, and we could come up with the money to participate in the program. I believe that other communities throughout the United States could do the same thing.

If the federal government will not provide us more money, why can we not look at requiring some form of leveraging to participate in the program to get that money? So I thought I would just throw that

NEAL R. GROSS

out there and see how anyone else felt about it, but if the program is as good as we have heard that it is, then let's use the program for seed money to make the program grow. If the program is good, we will find the money for it out there some way.

DR. JONES: I concur.

MS. DUDE: Well, I think, theoretically, that sounds like a great idea, but, practically speaking, I think there would be a lot of school systems that absolutely wouldn't come up with the money. So they wouldn't even apply for the grants.

Speaking even at a university, and we have a statewide coalition of other campuses, so we work with 12 State colleges, and I am telling you, the administration just does not want to give money toward prevention unless there is a student death or something horrible happens, and then they react. Like somebody was talking yesterday about people are more reactive than using prevention.

So I think in a perfect world, yes, that would be good, but if they had to have matching funds and they had a \$15,000 grant, well, the school system

NEAL R. GROSS

1	may not be able to come up with \$15,000.
2	DR. JONES: Well, but I don't think he is
3	saying the school system, but other community
4	agencies, the Chamber of Commerce, universities,
5	Kiwanis, et cetera.
6	MS. DUDE: But what that is doing to
7	DR. JONES: The Better Business Bureau.
8	MS. DUDE: Again, I think in a perfect
9	world that is true, but you are talking about somebody
10	whose prevention is probably one-eighth of their job
11	title in that public school. They are now not only
12	having to write the grant, but they are having to meet
13	with all these other people to get them. I just think
14	it is setting them up for a very, very difficult
15	situation.
16	CHAIRMAN LONG: Can I address that, Kim?
17	I think that is all about leadership. Then I would
18	say if you have a problem at your university with
19	that, I would say shame on your president. I think
20	that is the responsibility of a superintendent.
21	I mean if you say that we will give you

\$500,000 for a particular program, and I get that call

or we fill out that application, then I see that as my personal responsibility to make sure that that community -- and I am not talking about just one area, what Tommy and what Russell are talking about, but all of the foundations, all of the businesses, all of the contractors -- we would get \$500,000; I mean we would break our backs to get that \$500,000.

I am just going to use myself. I see that as my responsibility to match that. I think that is about leadership, and I don't think it should be the responsibility -- I heard what you said about one-Ι don't think should ___ that your responsibility. Ι think that is the leader's responsibility.

MS. DUDE: But, in response, I would say you are absolutely right, but my point is that leadership does not necessarily exist for probably a pretty significant number of school districts out there.

If we require matching funds, I think that is going to eliminate a lot of the school systems that really need this. You are talking about leadership

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

among a group -- I mean, obviously, you folks are highly-selected people who are very passionate about this. Not everybody has got the luxury of having a superintendent, a president, or a principal who -- because they have so many other priorities.

It is not like they don't think it is important, but they have so many other priorities, to suddenly have to come up with \$15,000 for matching funds, I would be afraid that, if we mandated that, I would be afraid that there would be a lot of school systems that would do without.

There is a difference between MS. TAFT: dollars hand having the in and having in-kind Ιf contributions. we could allow for in-kind contributions, I think that most of the schools would make it already because of how they partner in that work with people in the community to get the supplies and the services that they need that they can't afford to pay for.

DR. JONES: Yes, I just think it is very doable. I mean if people would take their passion to the local Wal-Mart, to the local Target -- we have

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 done it and we have gotten thousands of dollars from 2 I mean it can be done. our local Wal-Marts. it is all about 3 think empowerment, 4 teaching people to market their passion. But one response, and I don't 5 MS. DUDE: 6 mean to debate, but just speaking from experience, I 7 spend most of my time trying to find money as opposed 8 to most of my time implementing the program, and I am full-time doing what I do. 9 There was a time when I 10 wasn't full-time doing what I am doing, and it took an 11 inordinate amount of my time to try to find it. 12 So I am just saying the nice part about a 13 grant is that often you write the grant, you turn it 14 in, and you implement the grant. The in-kind helps. 15 That would help a lot because you could probably 16 rationalize that a chunk of my time, my office space, and my paper, my copier, and all of that, is in-kind. 17 18 I am just saying I feel I just want to be 19 the voice for the small prevention program out there 20 in a small town, in a small school. They may not even have a Wal-Mart, or that this person, this is one 21 22 fraction of their time. They may be the full-time

counselor. They may be a teacher. They may be a variety of different -- they are wearing all these hats, and then on top of this, they are suddenly supposed to go out there and find money from all these places in what could be not the most supportive environment.

I guarantee you, if they have a student death, they will have plenty of leadership behind them, but if there isn't something horrible like that happening, I just have too often witnessed the poor person who just can't get help from anybody. So we are asking them to do just one more thing.

MS. TAFT: Maybe that is another thing we need to include in our back-to-basics package. There was a time when every Drug-Free School was required to have a community advisory committee that would be the perfect vehicle for getting that local match in one way or another. That was taken out under, I think, No Child Left Behind, but it might be something that we could recommend would be put back in or reward community schools who did that in some way.

Because research in Ohio has shown that

NEAL R. GROSS

those schools that still have that advisory committee in place or are closely connected with a community coalition get much better results in their schools than those schools that are not connected to the community in some way.

MS. JACKSON: I just wanted to say some of us have kept and maintained with the principles of effectiveness from Drug-Free Schools all the way through to be changed to Safe and Drug-Free Schools. I would like to ditto -- and I'm not sure, the lady here down on the end, what her name is.

But my State is primarily rural more than it is urban. I live in the heart of Alaska, Fairbanks. We received our first Wal-Mart two years ago.

So when we talk about Wal-Mart and many of the other stores, they don't exist. So finding matching funds, I think the in-kind money is really pretty much already there, but to find the matching funds for many of our villages and our communities would really push people out of the water.

More than 50 percent of my districts in

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

our State of Alaska actually receive Title IV funding. The district that received the least amount of money was \$78, and I am really not sure what they did was \$78. But, again, it ranged from that end of the continuum to over \$600,000 last year. So there is quite a variety.

urban areas were able to tap in perhaps and receive the matching, but I would hate to see any of the smaller districts not have any type of to at least accomplish one of elements that are found under Title IV. If they are doing nothing more than providing an opportunity for parents to come into the schools and have potlatches and be a part of and understand the need for parental or grandparent involvement, those things are needed.

Again, I am not sure how we evaluate those things, but is the little bit of money and accomplishing one thing better than getting no money and accomplishing nothing? Well, okay, that's fine.

DR. JONES: She is looking directly at me. So can I respond to that?

Yes, it is about empowering people. I

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	mean so you go to that Wal-Mart, even though it has
2	only been there you know, you go to that Wal-Mart,
3	whatever. We've got to empower people. People have
4	got to do what they can do.
5	I think the matching idea is an excellent
6	one because you can do a whole lot more with \$164 than
7	you can \$78.
8	MS. JACKSON: It is just living, though,
9	and living off the land, you are not going to get it.
10	MS. TAFT: But you've got those people. I
11	mean if you valued volunteer time, you could meet your
12	match in
13	DR. JONES: Exactly. Yes, it can be done.
14	Yes, it can be done. People have to be empowered.
15	MR. MODZELESKI: If I could just give you
16	a couple of minutes about our experience with match,
17	our experience with match has not been good. I think
18	it reflects what Montean and Kim have said.
19	Now there is a way to get there without
20	asking for the financial match. That is, basically,
21	maybe asking, as we do in the Safe Schools, Healthy
22	Students, and others, for the partnerships. So rather

than require the money, which is, by the way, very difficult to get in a lot of parts of the country, what every town has are businesses. They have public health. They have mental health. They have so forth and so on.

So you are getting to the same point, but you get to it a little bit differently. It is a lot easier for me to go to a mental health provider or a health provider or to the Chamber of Commerce and say, "Help us." It may result in money, but it also may result in people. It may result in services, or whatever the case may be.

So that may be another way you want to take a look at it rather than just the money side, rather than just in-kind, new services.

MR. LEDBETTER: Kim commented that she spends most of her time trying to find money. What can I say? I spend a lot of time. I won't say most of it, but I spend a lot of time trying to find money.

But I am just a principal. I am not an expert at all of these things we have been talking about. I describe myself as a change agent. I mean

NEAL R. GROSS

1	that is the nature of my job. That is what I do. I
2	am a change agent. I try to change the way teachers
3	think, change the way students think.
4	I think that we are at a point that we
5	will have to change the way we view this program. I
6	think that we are going to have to do something.
7	Anytime anyone offers me some money and
8	they say, "If you can match it," I'll find it. I'll
9	find it. If it is important to me, I will find it.
10	If it is not important to me, then I will not.
11	There may be superintendents that think
12	that this program is not important. Well, if this
13	program is not important, then those are the places
14	that are skewing the statistics away from what this
15	program is about.
16	Whatever is important to me on a daily
17	basis, I will accomplish that. Some days when I come
18	in the door, I will have a list of things that I want
19	to accomplish that day, and I may not get one of them
20	done that day because other things jump to the top of
21	the list.

But if it is important to us, if the

program is important to us, we can find ways to match the money. I don't know if it is in-kind type of services, partnerships, whatever. But I can assure you that if you offered me \$200,000 today if I could find the money to match it, I would find the money someplace. I would find it.

I might have to work at it to do it, but I would find it because that is 200,000 free dollars that I am getting along with the money that I have raised. That gives me \$400,000, and I can create a pretty nice program.

Now it may be that in some of those outlying areas, it may be that some of those state legislatures have to get involved and they have to provide some money. I don't know. But I still believe that we could expand the program; we could get more people involved in the program if we put some requirement on it.

The committees, the advisory committees, they would be great, but we need to build some partnerships. That is the one thing that has come out all the way through this discussion yesterday, is that

NEAL R. GROSS

we need to build some partnerships.

In these places where they have built good partnerships, they have very successful programs. In those places that have no partnerships, I wonder about the success of the programs there.

MS. SOLBERG: Kim, I can really identify with you because I have been there. I have experienced that over and over.

But I would like to talk about a statistic that I am now experiencing. One of my programs is the Drug-Free Communities Program. It requires a \$100,000 match for \$100,000. We have grantees in rural communities -- we have many grantees in Alaska -- in every type of community.

What we found was in the beginning the match was all in-kind. Volunteers are now -- what? -- \$40 an hour. So volunteers galore, desks, computers, et cetera.

What we are finding is, as the partnership develops and as the coalition matures, we are seeing that match decrease in in-kind and increase in dollars because they are changing. You know, Safe and Drug-

NEAL R. GROSS

Free Schools not only changes the school, it changes the environment that the school operates in. It changes the community.

As the community begins to understand the value of what is going on in the school, more money comes into the community. It might be a simple fundraiser that the Safe and Drug-Free Coordinators hold, you know, a donut sale in school. But that money begins to build.

As people see the results -- and this is why our results are so important. Where does money come? Money follows people that are successful. When they see outcomes from the programs, money begins to build.

In Alaska, maybe State legislators could be involved or the power companies or the oil, for heaven's sake. I mean think big. Go after the big guys.

But, statistically, I can document that the Drug-Free Communities Program has morphed into, as the coalitions mature, programs with dollar matches rather than in-kind matches. But I sympathize with

NEAL R. GROSS

you because I have been there.

One other point that we have to consider that I think is essential, addiction is everywhere. It is in schools. Why doesn't a principal favor this program? Because somebody may uncover what he is doing or she.

It is a fact that we must consider. It is not only children who use drugs. Adults use drugs. Adults drink.

When we are looking at ways to reprogram this, we have to consider addiction as a powerful enemy and consider that when we reformulate. I think that addiction is one of the reasons that you experience what you are.

DR. WECHSLER: It is very impressive when you have a \$100,000 grant and matching fund brings it up to \$200,000. But what I am hearing is a lot of the districts are getting \$1,000 from this program. You get a matching to that and, wow, you are up to \$2,000, which is probably where the program was when OMB concluded the funds were spread too thinly to support quality interventions.

NEAL R. GROSS

So matching is powerful in the context of your program. I don't know how powerful it is in the context of this program. Again, we need to come up to it.

Now the local people, and Montean just did, said there is an incredible value to having \$1500 in that district. That is a very valid point. OMB and the researchers are strongly disagreeing. We need to figure out where we stand.

MS. TAFT: In Ohio, we did a study that found that those schools who got the least amount of money had the most amount of local match and were really getting better numbers than those schools that had a large amount of money and didn't have to go out and collaborate with outside players.

CHAIRMAN LONG: Bearing in mind -- and this is, I think, an excellent discussion because this is what our challenge is, that it cannot and must not be same-old/same-old. So if we just take the concept and talk about matching, and then bearing in mind what our two colleagues said, I think that could be taken into account by some of the other things that were

NEAL R. GROSS

said, like in-kind. So those things can be figured out.

But I think Howell really touched on something that, as we know we have to create -- one thing, the \$310 million becomes whatever that matches; it could become \$400 million. If it was a complete match, it would be \$620 million, but you could figure that out.

But the point is it magnifies the amount of money that is available. It involves those that need it most, however that involvement is worked out.

Then let me get back, just to close this, to the political point: Congress is going to be voting on this. Congress loves to have involvement with companies, corporations. This is the kind of thing I think that we have to think about putting in there as a recommendation to the Secretary. It can be pushed and pulled, but to take to Congress. So that when they see that, they would be inclined to go for something.

These are the kinds of things, the ideas, I think, that need to be fleshed out. So I applaud

NEAL R. GROSS

you. This was a positive discussion.

I'm sorry, Shep.

DR. KELLAM: I want to try to enlarge on the delivery system issue and the partnerships and the funding because I think that we are on focus. Dave, you are right that what a school is about and what the delivery system is all about is what we need to somehow come up and be inventive about.

I want to make a comment about the nature of partnerships. It is kind of glib to say let's get the old Interagency Service Council together at the community level and we will all have coffee once a month.

Partnerships have a lot depending on how they are structured, how they define their mission, what is the mutual self-interest of the participants. The partnership that I think is most missing probably worldwide, and certainly in the U.S., is the partnership that brings research to practice.

The NIH has recognized that. Most of the federal government has now recognized that. The problem is how you do that.

NEAL R. GROSS

I would like to make the illustration that, for example, in the current grants we have from NIDA that Belinda is actually Program Officer for, the co-PI on the grants is the superintendent, the CEO of the Baltimore City Public School System, the co-principal investigator. With me and our team of researchers, there is a core team involving us, but also the core team involves people in charge of curriculum and instruction and other aspects of the school district.

By the way, speaking of the developmental epidemiology, which Hope referred to earlier, the two most important predictors of violence and drug abuse are school failure and aggressive, disruptive behavior as early as first grade. In fact, the prevention issue has been for 35 years, since we learned that, can you influence early aggressive, disruptive behavior and/or learning in first grade and reduce the prevalence of drug abuse and anti-social personality disorder? The answer is yes, and dramatically.

However, it doesn't work for girls and it only works at the higher end of high-risk first-

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

graders as they grow old, because, apparently, their alienation continues and they are the folks that cause us a lot of trouble and themselves.

partnership is all The about getting inside the vision of a school district on the part of a research group, understanding the mission of school district, and then working to help accomplish that mission, and doing what we can to bring to bear the research that has been done, so that it is informing how they can actually realize the mission.

of the part master Baltimore City Public Schools, what we do, and current research. As the five years of this third generation of work has progressed, the school district is now \$350,000 \$400,000 picking to the up а vear intervention budget and, in fact, integrating that into their own budget because we are trying to figure out how to go from this research-based funding to community-based funding, school-district-based funding.

So when we are talking about partnerships,

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

we are talking about a reorienting of what NIH review committees consider, and they should never consider prevention research grants without a partnership. It has to be part of what research grants are all about.

don't Ιf you have the access to institutions and understand the vision of the institution, then the relevance of the research is suspect. That is not true at the molecular level, but it is amazingly true at almost all of the levels of research.

The least-taught aspect of graduate education in any of the human services is how to make partnerships. It is just not taught.

You know, you send people at the most senior level in to work out a partnership with a school district. They come in with a snake oil that they try to impose on an otherwise overwhelmed district mission.

So what we need to do is to understand that the opportunity here is to take a really broad-based make the school better, including achievement and the related issues of behavior, mastery, sense of

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

self-esteem, and the rest, and move the research into the service of that mission.

How do you do it? You don't increase the line budget of Safe and Drug-Free Schools because that ain't in the cards anyway.

What we want to do is to say, look, form partnerships with NIDA; make this, in fact, a way of — part of the package is that when you get a research group tied in with a local school district or local entities, you then go and get research money because you are stronger and can compete for it in Education or in NIH or in most places, in Justice. So you sell the package.

It is important that you get in-kind and contributions at the local level. But at the federal level, it helps restructure the science.

Ultimately, the cry for evaluation is not going to go away and probably shouldn't. It doesn't mean you have to evaluate every damn thing you do, like how many men's rooms you have in the building or something.

What you do have to do, together with the

NEAL R. GROSS

people who run these institutions like school districts, is figure out what the highest to priorities are and what they really need to learn more about how to do.

Classroom behavior, management, by the way, has resonated with a lot of people in the education business. It just isn't there. That is one of the great generators of all the problems we are trying to solve.

So I would say that the focus is on partnerships.

I did want to mention quickly, and I won't go into the details, but we are now investing in information systems that are worth their weight in gold. These systems assessment that now statewide, and particularly the that have ones individual identifiers, so you can follow kids over time and not just the size of the problem over time, they are incredibly important for sampling frames to understand progress.

Not everything is a randomized trial. If you could show progress from the randomized trial

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

stage to the stage of rollout, and even do wait-list kinds of designs, where in fact every school district doesn't have to get the snake oil next year -- they can't anyway because you do not have the training, and so on. So you stagger the rollout stages.

In fact, you can see whether this is rolling out with more effectiveness than that at each stage. You have some schools getting it and some don't. You can stratify the sampling.

By the way, one of the things that is interesting about the assessment systems is that some of the school districts don't even have assessment. They can't follow kids over time from one school to another. Anne Arundel County, No. 1, right around the corner, they can't tell whether a kid is in the school district or not if they change schools.

So a lot of the byproducts of all this are you do get information systems that can, in fact, be used to deliver. That integration of assessment systems with delivery for mentoring and monitoring, for example, the progress within schools is incredibly important, and progress from programs.

NEAL R. GROSS

So it is a big thing we are talking about, but it is really a matter of pulling pieces into a coherent picture. I think that we have an opportunity to do an incredibly important thing.

The Safe Schools/Healthy Student Program began to do that, as you know, Bill. The whole community base-building, it is not like stage one hasn't been informative. By the way, that was the first time federal programs had cut across Justice, Mental Health, and Education.

I was struck by the fact that we have now got information that is helping America's youth. Eleven departments contributed to that information system on what works. All kinds of things are going on which are exemplaries of where we have got to go next.

I think we ought to be taking the initiative. You know, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, yes, we have been through stage one. We have had lots of experiences, pioneering experiences. Point out the pioneering experiences and say, "Where in the hell do we go from here?" It is going to involve other folks,

NEAL R. GROSS

1 folks. It is not just Safe and Drug-Free Schools in 2 isolation. I think that we've got something to say. Well, you touch on something 3 MS. DUDE: 4 that I have been thinking about. I don't know if it 5 is appropriate for this Committee or not. 6 there any way we could make recommendations as far as 7 teacher preparedness, things like classroom 8 management, creating a safe classroom --9 DR. KELLAM: Sure. 10 DUDE: -- detection, intervention, 11 referral of at-risk students or even some of the basic 12 information about alcohol and other drugs? 13 Because we wouldn't expect a math teacher 14 to teach history. Yet, we are expecting people who, 15 I'm thinking, have never been taught anything about 16 prevention to implement a prevention program in their 17 local school. It seems like we have all these -- I 18 don't know. 19 just seems like, if we are making 20 recommendations to the Department of Education, they could make a requirement or a recommendation to the 21 22 teacher preparedness education departments throughout

1	the country that are preparing our college students to
2	become teachers or administrators or counselors. It
3	seems to me there could be some coursework that would
4	teach them how to do that.
5	MS. SOLBERG: Could we not recommend an
6	integrated curriculum for prevention? I mean research
7	is showing that is what really makes the difference.
8	MS. PRICE: The Department of Education is
9	prohibited of doing anything on curriculum. It is a
10	state issue. We are prohibited.
11	MS. SOLBERG: But is this group prohibited
12	from possibly collecting the data that shows the
13	importance of integrated curriculum?
14	MS. PRICE: No. Honestly, I think that
15	the Advisory Committee, I think that would be in the
16	long-term report. You know, the findings and
17	recommendations of this Committee are very useful.
18	There are parameters around which the Department
19	functions. Curriculum, hands-off that is a state
20	issue and local issue is one element.
21	But if there is information regarding that
22	that the Advisory Committee thinks is significant, it

is certainly appropriate for the Advisory Committee to give their findings and recommendations to the Secretary on that.

I have a couple of questions I want to ask. They are really stirring-the-pot questions. I am asking them because I want us -- you know, maybe we can address them a little bit, but in this next week or two weeks, as we are putting all this in there, these are things that need to be addressed. We have talked a little bit about it, but it is like the elephant in the middle of the room; we haven't clearly articulated it.

When I look at the three issues regarding the initial PART that was done and the failure of the program -- I hate to say failure, but the lacking in the program -- one is funds are spread too thinly to support quality interventions. Since then, funds have gotten less. We haven't had an increase in funds. We have had a decrease, basically, every year in funds.

So considering the shrinking dollar, I have a question of, is it appropriate that every LEA gets dollars? Now Tommy's suggestion, and then we

NEAL R. GROSS

added some other levels to that suggestion, of requiring matching or a part that the LEA would have to give to get funds, that means some LEAs aren't getting funds. But I do think that, as we approach this, that that clearly needs to be addressed.

Would I desire for every LEA to be able to have some funds in my world, if I were Santa Claus and handing out the dollars? I would give everybody some money. But I am not Santa Claus. Well, I have the office, so I guess we do hand out the dollars.

But they are just questions, and I am not trying to answer the questions when I ask them. I am just trying to throw them out so that we address this.

Is the 20 percent to the state/80 percent to the LEA, is that something that we want to continue? Do we want to give all the money to the state and have them distribute all of it down to the LEAs? Is there a reason why we have the 20 percent for the Governors' program?

We need to think that through and have some -- we need to have thoughtfully thought through the issue, are funds being spread too thinly? If that

NEAL R. GROSS

is the case, how can we make that better? If matching is it, I think that is great. But, again, as Howell said, a \$1500 program now gets \$3,000. Still, is that an appropriate amount of money?

As Hope said, in Ohio, clearly, there are states that get small amounts of money -- I mean LEAs that get small amounts of money that have good programs that have made a difference in kids' lives. Is that true in all the other LEAs across the country that are getting a small amount of dollars? Unfortunately, it is not. That is one of the problems of the program.

We have a lot of great information about specific LEAs and states that are implementing programs, and we can talk about it. But in evaluating the federal program as a whole, every LEA, every state, all of them are compiled in that. That is where we have the question of, is this an effective program overall? So we have got to keep all those approaches to it as we are developing it.

Quite honestly, I am not trying to say we shouldn't fund the Governors. I am just saying this

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 is the nature of our beast that we are working with, 2 and what is the best initial proposal we can say -- or 3 not proposal, but what are our best thoughts on this? 4 It might just be a list of questions. 5 what are our best thoughts on this in making this the 6 best it can be? 7 Is that helpful? 8 CHAIRMAN LONG: Was that rhetorical? 9 MS. PRICE: That was just rhetorical. 10 CHAIRMAN LONG: The only reason I ask 11 that, we are down to our last four minutes. 12 think you bring up a good point. That gets right to 13 the heart of it, as we have with a lot of these 14 things. 15 Is there some mechanism that we can use --16 and, again, because we are really up against a wall 17 with time, all of us, and with the September 8th. by, 18 minutes have ticked these Ι keep 19 September 8th, September 8th. 20 Is there a way to have some of 21 things -- like you just brought up one with the issue

with 20/80, and so forth; that was just one of the

items -- whether it is a yes, no, or a Leikert scale, or however you want to do it, so that you can get some immediate feedback from the Committee members to help with some of that, and then from that we could have some discussion?

Because now we aren't going to be back together again. That really concerns me. Is there just some way that we could get that out by email? Catherine is shaking her head yes. By email and then compile those answers, maybe just four or five questions.

As you were talking, I was just writing some things down. Yes or no, Committee, does success go beyond curriculum? Yes. There might be one or two who would say, "I don't think so."

I am just using that as an example. "Does success go beyond curriculum?" Yes. "Should we recognize the inherent problems with evaluation, and should we set up a collaborative evaluation? Yes or no?" Yes. And then worry about how we are going to do it.

But I think we have got to come to some,

NEAL R. GROSS

1 we have got to have some mechanism to start getting 2 So if that makes sense, and you these ideas out. really triggered that when you brought that up --3 4 would that be okay, to compile a list of some of the 5 -- as I said, I have got quite a few questions here. We can talk back and forth, and then perhaps get those 6 7 to get some feedback from the Committee 8 preparation for that telephone call. 9 I'm sorry, Shep. 10 DR. KELLAM: Yes, I was going to suggest 11 Like I've got a list here, too, of things from 12 my weird perspective to look at. 13 CHAIRMAN LONG: You aren't on the list, 14 Shep. 15 (Laughter.) 16 No, I'm sorry. 17 DR. KELLAM: Right. But, anyway, if we 18 could somehow send you a list, and you've got a list, 19 and get Jim, is it, whoever, Bill, yes, the wonderful 20 writer. Well, anyway, whoever is going to compile this, we can have a two-way, 36-hour interaction to 21

create a list that is maybe a little more pointed.

1	CHAIRMAN LONG: Who would you like that to
2	go to?
3	MS. PRICE: A really good source for it to
4	go to is Catherine because she has everybody's email,
5	everybody's everything, and it is her job as
6	Executive; she gets to do that.
7	DR. KELLAM: I'm sorry.
8	MS. PRICE: No, no.
9	DR. KELLAM: You can imagine the kind of
10	administrator I am.
11	(Laughter.)
12	CHAIRMAN LONG: Howell?
13	DR. WECHSLER: I think whoever put
14	together this list of questions that the panelists
15	were asked to address did a great job. Hopefully, we
16	would come back and we heard sometimes contrasting
17	viewpoints. Certainly, the program people differed
18	from the research people, and the OMB tended to side
19	with the research people.
20	I think we have to come to conclusions on
21	these specific questions. They are great questions.
22	CHAIRMAN LONG: We now have 30 seconds.

MS. TAFT: I would like to put in a plug for the universality of the distribution of funds for Safe and Drug-Free Schools in some manner, because we know that addiction is a universal problem. Everyone is at risk. It doesn't matter what your socioeconomic background is.

There was new research that shows that every drink that a young person takes costs the nation \$3, and our young people are drinking a lot. So that comes up to \$62 billion a year.

We also know that the younger a person starts to drink, the more lasting the negative consequences.

Since everybody is at risk, I don't know how I am going to say that Tommy's school is the one that we cut out because we don't have enough money to go around.

I know that research has been halted in the longitudinal women's study because they found, and with other medical studies, because they found that they couldn't afford not to give the antidote to everyone.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	How can we say that we are going to give
2	prevention antidotes to some schools and not to other
3	schools and be ethical about it? I just don't think
4	we can do that.
5	So I hope that we will think about
6	rewarding people for doing the kinds of programs that
7	we know are successful and build it on a positive
8	scale and promote more schools for using their money
9	effectively, instead of eliminating a whole hunk of
10	kids that are just as much at risk as every other hunk
11	of kids.
12	MS. PRICE: I am asking this kind of as a
13	devil's advocate, because I have a lot of thoughts, as
14	I sit at my desk, about this program all the time. I
15	think the universal need, I couldn't agree more with
16	you. I think it is there.
17	I also wonder and, clearly, we had
18	people who are implementing good programs here talking
19	about the good programs. I wish it were true that
20	across the board that were the case, and it is not.
21	MS. TAFT: We could promote it.
22	MS. PRICE: We can promote it. But my

1	question is I mean, we talked about the cost of the
2	child having a drink of alcohol. The cost to the
3	program, if we give dollars to an LEA that doesn't use
4	them, kind of dwindles them, the dollar value there,
5	when they could go to another school district that is
6	implementing a program and using it. I have
7	frustrations at times about when the dollars are kind
8	of sent out there and we have to kind of beg and plead
9	with people to actually get them to use those dollars,
10	and they kind of get sat on.
11	So I would like to see as many LEAs as
12	possible get dollars, but maybe to have something like
13	the matching, or whatever
14	MS. TAFT: You could structure it a lot of
15	different ways and come up with the same result.
16	MS. PRICE: Yes.
17	MS. TAFT: But I just don't think you can
18	ethically say this kid in this school doesn't count,
19	so we're not going to give them any money.
20	CHAIRMAN LONG: I'm sorry, I am going to
21	bring this to a close. It is 11:30 and I see some of
22	you starting to push your chairs away as you head for

you starting to push your chairs away as you head for

those airports.

I have just a closing comment, and then where we go next. I think to address what you just said, Hope, we all agree with that. That is the difficulty in these discussions. It is difficult.

The other part of it is there is, as we know, the pie that Debbie drew. I was thinking about Tommy and really everybody, Michael, sitting around this table make those difficult budget decisions every day, and it deals with programs and children. Sometimes it is almost gut-wrenching just to make those decisions about what children will not receive in the way of services. So that is the difficulty of the discussion of this Committee.

But to that point, and just the mundane first, we will have that call on the 5th. Then it will be ready on the 8th.

But for you, I hope we step back when we have meetings like this. The dynamics of this group and how it was going right and left, and how it coalesced, I thought was really something to watch and be a part of. I think sometimes we miss that when we

NEAL R. GROSS

1 are so close to the microphones and we are involved. 2 But the other part, and I said this to the 3 panel, one of the panels yesterday, the fact the 4 passion showed, but they were like an elementary 5 school compared to the passion that I saw displayed 6 with this group, and that is why you are sitting at 7 this table. So you are deeply appreciated. The trick 8 now will be to put all this together and come out with 9 10 some great recommendations. 11 So thank you very much. 12 MR. PIMENTEL: I like that one of the last 13 people that spoke here was "Hope". Read between the lines, folks. 14 15 (Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the proceedings 16 were adjourned.) 17 18 19 20 21