

**ENHANCING ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFICIENCY
THROUGH SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS**

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee

**ENHANCING ACHIEVEMENT AND PROFICIENCY THROUGH SAFE AND
DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS**

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee

June 11, 2007

This report was produced under U.S. Department of Education Contract No. *** with ***. *** serving as the contracting officer's technical representative. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the Department of Education. No official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education of any product, commodity, service or enterprise mentioned in this publication is intended or should be inferred.

U.S. Department of Education

Margaret Spellings
Secretary

Catherine Davis
Executive Director

June 2007

This report is in the public domain. Authorization to reproduce it in whole or in part is granted. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, the citation should be: U.S. Department of Education, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee, *Enhancing Achievement and Proficiency Through Safe and Drug-Free Schools*, Washington, D.C., 20202.

To order copies of this report,

Write to: ED Pubs, Education Publications Center, U.S. Department of Education, P.O. Box 1398, Jessup, MD 20794-1398;

Or fax your request to: 301-470-1244;

Or email your request to: edpubs@inet.ed.gov;

Or call in your request toll-free: 877-433-7827 (877-4-ED-PUBS). If 877 service is not yet available in your area, call 800-872-5327 (800-USA-LEARN). Those who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) or a teletypewriter (TTY) should call 800-437-0833;

Or order online at: www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html;

This report is also available on the Department's Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/sdfscac/comment.html>;

On request, this publication is available in alternate formats, such as Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette. For more information, please contact the Department's Alternate Format Center at 202-260-9895 or 202-205-8113.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal	1
Executive Summary	2
Expert Voices	7
Background	12
Committee Findings and Recommendations	16
Appendix One: Glossary	36
Appendix Two: Committee Charter	38
Appendix Three: Committee Meetings	41
Appendix Four: Committee Members	45

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

June 11, 2007

The Honorable Margaret Spellings
U.S. Secretary of Education
400 Maryland Ave., S.W.
Washington, DC 20202

Dear Madame Secretary:

In June 2006, when you formed the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee, you encouraged us to play a vital role in ensuring safe and drug-free schools for American children. We have taken this charge seriously and today present to you our report, "Enhancing Achievement and Proficiency Through Safe and Drug-Free Schools."

This report reflects the consensus of members of the Committee, including findings and recommendations formulated in response to the questions you put to the Committee at the outset of our work and the additional considerations you raised, as that work was ongoing.

The report reflects not only the extensive discussion and experience of Committee members, but also information gained as we listened to invited panelists and members of the public at Committee meetings and through written submissions to the Committee. An underlying theme of testimony, submissions and discussion was the continued and heightened need to ensure our students are provided opportunities to excel in schools and learning environments that are safe and free of alcohol and drug use.

We, like you, remain firmly committed to the work of promoting safe and drug-free schools. We believe that many of the suggestions noted in this report will contribute to that effort.

Each of the members of the Committee thanks you for the opportunity to serve in this important endeavor and pledges our continued assistance.

Sincerely,

Dr. David Long
Chair

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee, an organization mandated by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 to consult with and assist the United States Department of Education, was organized in June 2006 by U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings. At that time, Secretary Spellings charged the Committee with providing this report in response to questions regarding the Department's Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants Program, the Unsafe School Choice Option and the data requirements of NCLB.

The Committee held six meetings and six conference calls to conduct its work. At four of the meetings, the Committee heard testimony from thirty-eight witnesses regarding the three areas of focus in this report plus three additional areas of concern outlined by the Secretary in her visit with the Committee in October 2006 (trauma, nonpublic schools and urban/rural challenges). The Committee's report addresses all of these issues. It recognizes that not all of the important work of providing safe and drug-free schools for America's students can be done by the U.S. Department of Education alone, but believes its findings and recommendations, coupled with a focus on prevention, may assist the Department in advancing this crucial effort.

The Committee report contains consensus findings and recommendations related to each area of concern identified for the Committee by the Secretary.

State Grants Program

In regards to the State Grants Program, the report notes that the Program has successfully created an infrastructure for State and local education agencies to work together on safety and drug and alcohol prevention activities and appropriately

emphasizes community efforts. It also notes that, with some reservations, there is significant support for allowing more money from the State Grants Program to be used by State agencies. The report urges greater cooperation between various Federal agencies providing funding for drug and alcohol prevention and safety efforts. The report also notes the unique challenges of urban and rural schools and urges separate guidelines for these different environments.

The Committee noted the difficulties presented by unclear and conflicting standards hamper alcohol and drug use prevention and safety efforts. This could be alleviated, the report suggests, if the Department provides clear measurable outcomes for determining success, encourages enhanced assessment mechanisms and identifies activities likely to contribute to success.

To better determine whether the State Grants Program is meeting its purpose, the report suggests requiring reports from grantees on key indicators, and the identification and dissemination of best practices for safety and alcohol and drug use prevention.

The report also notes some tension between the demands on schools to provide for the safety needs of students in a wide range of areas. The report makes a number of specific suggestions for enhancing school safety efforts including improved coordination between various Federal agencies that interact with schools and State education agencies on safety issues.

The report also addresses challenges related to the lack of adequate funding for schools safety and alcohol and drug prevention programs, suggesting a series of possible changes including a requirement that grantees foster partnerships with community members, an increase in the proportion of funding given to State education agencies, and

providing needs based grants to State and local education agencies. The emphasis on partnerships and collaboration is a consistent theme in the report.

Finally, the Committee noted the importance of funded activities utilizing the “Principles of Effectiveness” in Federal law and its report stresses improved data collection, school/researcher partnerships and identification of innovative ideas as helpful in this regard.

Unsafe School Choice Option

The Committee’s report stresses the importance of enhanced efforts to determine whether schools are truly safe through the use of specific safety measures including data collection beyond incidents of violence at schools. To assist both victims and perpetrators of school violence, the report outlines a series of possible interventions including movement options for both the victim and perpetrator, and counseling.

The report realistically notes problems caused by varying State criteria for identifying persistently dangerous schools and an undue stress on incident reporting. The report strongly urges a change in the terminology of “persistently dangerous schools” and a shift in focus towards providing help for potentially unsafe schools, perhaps by adding them to a “watch list.” For States with adequate measures currently in place to ensure students will not be trapped in unsafe school environments, the report notes the possibility of a waiver of USCO requirements.

The Committee repeatedly suggests utilizing additional measures such as school climate surveys to determine if schools are becoming safer. Recognizing that this might create additional burdens for some State and local education agencies, the report makes suggestions for helping these including the encouragement of partnerships among

organizations in the community. The report includes a discussion of possible Department efforts that might be helpful, such as identification of model schools and a variety of additional specific recommendations.

Data Requirements

In regard to data requirements, the report highlights two themes: the need for enhanced data gathering and the integration of data into practice.

The report notes a role for the Department in determining what data is reasonable to collect and in helping schools learn to integrate data collection and practice. The report also suggests a number of other Department initiatives in areas such as determining what data is necessary, using data to assess progress, using data in ongoing efforts and gathering data from various sources. Specifically, the report suggests the Department consider developing a set of questions for use by State and local education agencies.

Since data gathering and application efforts can be expensive and may be impeded by other obstacles, the report suggests cooperation among Federal agencies collecting data from schools, a cost analysis of data efforts and sponsored research on data collection and integration.

Nonpublic Schools

The Committee noted that current guidelines generally encourage appropriate involvement of nonpublic schools in the Department's safety efforts. The report suggests that explicit guidelines on the interaction between public and nonpublic schools would ensure better cooperation between them.

Urban/Rural

The Committee heard testimony about and recognizes the unique challenges faced by urban and rural schools. The report takes these challenges into consideration and makes relevant recommendations throughout.

Trauma

The report recognizes the effect of trauma on many students and encourages, where appropriate, screening and intervention efforts (from a prevention perspective) as an important response to student trauma. The report notes some possible roles for the Department in this regard.

There is much more in the Committee report that cannot be adequately captured in this summary, but we hope this provides an overview of the many things the report addresses.

The report concludes by noting the continued necessity of school safety and alcohol and drug use prevention efforts to enhanced achievement and performance by America's students and expressing the Committee's hope that the report will contribute to that crucial goal.

EXPERT VOICES

No public policy question is more important than how we ensure the safety and achievement of the nation's children and youth. Parents and countless others who have dedicated their lives to helping children, have worked and studied how best to make this happen. They provide a crucial resource in the effort to ensure learning environments free of alcohol and drug use, violence and other threats.

As it pursued its mission, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee heard from parents, teachers, administrators, government officials, and other professionals, all united in a desire to ensure that the students of America are provided a learning atmosphere that is safe and free from the dangers of alcohol and drug use. Regardless of their views on specific issues, all were anxious to secure the safety of children and to foster their achievement.

The presenters testifying before the Committee were also exceptionally well informed. Their presentations provided information and insight that was invaluable for members of the Committee, and by extension, anyone involved in education. To provide a sense of the tenor and content of these important presentations, this section includes illustrative excerpts from those who spoke to the Committee during its public meetings.

“The State Grants program is the only source of funding for alcohol and drug education, and violence prevention that reaches into virtually every school district in Tennessee. Without the State Grants program, the overwhelming majority of our schools simply would not be able to address these two issues in any kind of systematic or ongoing way.” **Mike Herrmann, Executive Director, Office of School Health, Safety and Learning Support, Tennessee Department of Education**

“The tension between Principles of Effectiveness and funds that we spend on research-based effectiveness, I think the reality with that is research-based effectiveness is a good idea, but I think we need to go from programs to strategies, identify those strategies, because again, there's not enough funding to fully fund programs and implement a program for fidelity if you're a small district.” **John Bynoe, Associate Commissioner, Center for Student Support, Massachusetts Department of Education**

“I haven't had anybody, even school systems who receive \$500, say they don't want it. And they have to fill out an application, they have to do all the same things that a school system that receives \$200,000 does. So if schools are willing to do that, school systems are willing to do that, to me, that says something. If they're willing to take the \$500, do all the work that comes with it, and implement programs to the best of their ability with that funding, there is a message there, I think, from the school systems.” **Jeff Barber, Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinator, Indiana Department of Education. President, Network Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinators**

“Our recommendation is increased funding. We've love to see that...Maintain an emphasis on the Principles of Effectiveness - I keep mentioning that, but the capacity building and understanding the science of prevention is so key to making this work.” **Mona Johnson, Program Supervisor, Washington State Department of Public Instruction. Vice President, Network Safe and Drug Free Schools Coordinators**

“What is ironic is the fact that the LEAs across this nation has followed the POE, the Principles of Effectiveness, and have the data to prove that the programs are making a difference, tons of data. They have that data, yet their voices are not heard as one in Washington. That is a problem.” **Clarence Jones, Coordinator, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Fairfax County Public Schools**

“I think the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, the State Grants portion, is terrific and it works.” **Ellen Morehouse, Executive Director, Student Assistance Services Corporation**

“We believe that currently, as implemented, there are already too many mandates on the program. Therefore, it should not be diluted by any further. No issues and mandates, we believe, would strengthen or would help the program; and, therefore, should not be added.” **General Arthur Dean, Chairman and CEO, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America**

“We have learned that in the area of school safety, our county Offices of Education need to lead.” **Gus Frias, Coordinator of School Safety Programs, Los Angeles County Department of Education**

“Too many school districts receive the grants, and the medium grant is too small to make a difference. The schools in general choose relatively weak projects, they lack guidance, they lack incentives, they lack monitoring to force them to do anything else.” **Peter Reuter, Professor, School of Public Policy, Department of Criminology, University of Maryland. Co-author, “Options for Restructuring the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.” Rand Drug Policy Research Center, 2001**

“Funding for prevention in the United States is decreasing tremendously now...However, I think the message is there now, and this may not be the right time to begin cutting funding for prevention. I think the feds have to really be the leaders in this area. I think the states are on board.” **Zili Sloboda, Senior Research Associate, Institute for Health and Social Policy, University of Akron**

“We also need to find out the extent to which content that is thought to be effective is being taught, and also, the extent to which teaching strategies thought to be effective are used. By the way, the strategies that we are modeling today we know are ineffective.” **Chris Ringwalt, Senior Research Scientist, Chapel Hill Center - Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation**

“We don't believe that the funds should come directly out of Washington, D.C. We don't believe that to be the most effective, and maybe the most unwieldy possibility, so we kind of

would like to see, at a minimum, keep it as it is.” **Edward Ray, Chief, Department of Safety and Security, Denver Public Schools**

“Collaboration is the key, because we could not do our job if we didn't collaborate with all the other state agencies, and also local education agencies, and our emergency management folks in our counties, et cetera, so we couldn't do it alone. And, also, the funding, we couldn't do it alone on just the funding that we do receive.” **Lorraine Allen, Director, Office of Safe Schools, Florida Department of Education**

“Prevention is a very difficult thing to put a measuring stick on. I just know what I've seen in the schools over the years, that these prevention activities have worked in anecdotal ways.” **Jon Akers, Executive Director, Kentucky Center for School Safety, Eastern Kentucky University**

“We also need to promote that good citizenship and character. I can tell you since I've started working with children of prisoners, they sometimes don't know what good citizenship is. They really haven't been taught that.” **Cynthia Timmons, Director, Children of Promise Mentors of Hope, University of Oklahoma OUreach**

“Assessing directly from students and young people and staff themselves about what they're feeling and what their perception of safety is in a school is a way to level out and balance what you're seeing in hard paper and sort of quantitative reports.” **Annie Salsich, Sr. Program Associate, Vera Institute of Justice**

“I think if we interview students, they would identify a persistently dangerous school by their perception of how they go to school. Where you might have very few instances of a fight, where people are hurt with their fist, there are hundreds of thousands of kids that go to school every day and are hurt by words.” **Bill Bond, School Safety Specialist, National Association of Secondary School Principals**

“If we attach a stigma like "persistently dangerous" to a school, that principal, like those of us in the school safety business, will spend an inordinate amount of time defending and responding to that, and it takes their eyes off the ball, and that is to educate our kids.” **Peter Pochowski, Midwest Director, National Association of School Safety and Law Enforcement Officers**

“We've already talked about the problems. We need more aggressive oversight by the Education Department. We need better procedures for data verification. We need effective and consistent training.” **Jerry Barber, Assistant Comptroller, New York State Comptroller's Office**

“We definitely consider this idea of victim transfer option to be very important, and the idea of information getting to parents as they need it.” **Rich Rasa, Director, State and Local Advisory and Assistance Services, Office of Inspector General, US Department of Education**

“Based on the issues identified through our audits and with the information we continue to gather from the states on USCO policy, it's imperative that statutory changes be considered to strengthen the USCO.” **Bernie Tadley, Regional Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, US Department of Education**

“We looked at the schools that have been deemed as persistently dangerous by all the states and then tried to go and find out where they were with their education progress, and we found -- and this probably isn't a surprising answer to the hypothesis -- that about 75, 80 percent of those schools who were persistently dangerous were also in need of adequate yearly progress, and they were having challenges there.” **Paul Kesner, Director, State Grants Program, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, US Department of Education**

“High incidence occurring in a school based upon the behavior of one or two students is also an issue that we're trying to deal with. Sometimes you have repeat offenders, and so the numbers go up in that school and it's one child, and that really is not a very good way to be identifying schools.” **Susan Martz, Director of the Office of Program Support Services, New Jersey Department of Education**

“Many districts feel that if they are really active in preventing school safety incidents that they're more likely to be identified as persistently dangerous schools.” **Cory Green, Senior Director of the NCLB Program Coordination Division, Texas State Education Agency**

“Reauthorization should mandate identification of high priority schools, not persistently dangerous schools, and should provide funds.” **Meredith Rolfe, Administrator of the Safe and Healthy Kids Program Office, California Department of Education**

“When we were looking at persistence and dangerous, we kept thinking you know what that implies, is that the situation is so bad that if you choose to continue attending the school, you are accepting a high risk, and it means that your child could very well become injured or something like that.” **Janelle Krueger, Principal Consultant for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, Colorado Department of Education**

“Local school districts are required as part of their Title IV application to identify risks and then to match to those risks strategies, so one of the things that we've tried to do [in Tennessee] to help local districts is consolidate all of the various data pieces that we have available at the state level for them so that they don't have to go out and do all that background work, which I think has helped a lot in terms of getting particularly some of our smaller districts more focused on addressing risk factors.” **Mike Herrmann, Executive Director, Office of School Health Safety And Learning Support, Tennessee Department of Education**

“There are many different policy applications for the YRBS data. It's used to present a picture of what's going on among youth, to create a lot of awareness among policymakers, media, the public...It's used all the time to support and tie the development of programs and policies by advocates to support health-related legislation, and it's in just about every funding application you could possibly imagine.” **Howell Wechsler, Director, Division of Adolescent and School Health Center for Disease Control**

“The Los Alamos, New Mexico schools has used the PRIDE survey since 1988, and using their data, school officials in Los Alamos were able to detect an abnormally high number of eighth grade girls -- there were only 250 altogether -- but an abnormally high number of those eighth grades who had seriously considered suicide. If it weren't for local data, not national or state data, the local officials in that school system in Los Alamos would not have been alerted to that problem, and it may have been too late before they took action.”

Doug Hall, Senior Vice Present, PRIDE Surveys

“I think that as we move forward what we want to do is try to tie the collection of data into the use of data and for decision-making, and how do we do that effectively?”

Deborah Rudy, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, U.S. Department of Education (presented by Bill Modzeleski)

“Signed consent is a wonderful thing because as you deal with families, if you are really doing in depth research and really going to deal with them, then that is why that consent provision is there to say, ‘Hey, they can give you access to anything.’”

LeRoy Rooker, Director, Family Policy Compliance Office, U.S. Department of Education

BACKGROUND

Introduction to the Committee

A Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee is provided for in statute, section 4124(a) of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). The legislation directs the Committee to consult with and provide information to the United States Secretary of Education regarding programs being carried out by the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools (OSDFS).

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee was formed June 12, 2006 by the U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings, as authorized by Section 4124 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, to provide advice to the Secretary for the programs carried out by the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools. Specifically, the Secretary charged the Committee with assessing three areas: (1) the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grant Program, (2) the Unsafe School Choice Option and identification of persistently dangerous schools and (3) the data requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. At the October 2006 meeting of the Committee, Secretary Spellings raised additional issues for the Committee's consideration: nonpublic schools, trauma and unique challenges for urban and rural schools.

The Committee is made up of nineteen members, including employees of federal agencies, state and local government representatives and expert practitioners in the fields of substance abuse and violence prevention. The Committee Chairman is Dr. David Long, the Secretary of Education for the State of California.

Work of the Committee

The Secretary charged the Committee to dedicate itself to playing “a vital role” in “ensuring that our students have safe and drug-free schools.” The Committee has taken this charge very seriously. To this end, the Committee held a series of meetings in 2006 and 2007. At these meetings, the Committee heard testimony from panels of invited experts and discussed potential findings and recommendations for this report. The Committee has also received valuable public input from interested groups on specific issues related to the Committee’s charge.

The Committee’s work began in June 2006. The Committee’s first Focus Group meeting was held on August 21-22, 2006 in Washington, D.C. That meeting focused on the Secretary’s questions related to the state grants program. At the Committee’s October 23-34 Focus Group meeting, the topic was the Unsafe School Choice Option. The Secretary also addressed the Committee during that meeting, and introduced additional issues for the Committee to review as a result of the White House Conference on School Safety. The January 16-17, 2007 working meeting of the Committee focused on these issues. The February 20-21 working meeting addressed the data questions included in the Secretary’s charge to the Committee and the final working meeting on March 19-20 allowed Committee members to finalize their findings and recommendations for this report. Throughout this process, the Committee has heard and received public comments; and held public meetings both in Washington, DC and via conference calls.

Information on Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools Programs

As noted above, the Secretary charged the Committee with addressing questions in three general areas in which the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools is involved.

These are the State Grants Program, Unsafe School Choice Option and data requirements of NCLB.

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants Program was established by statute. It provides funding to State Education Agencies (SEAs) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs), as well as governors, to support their work in preventing drug and alcohol use and violence among students. In the current program, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools provides funds to SEAs and governors. The SEAs, in turn, provide money to LEAs based on a formula provided in the statute. The governors use their funding to support community-based organizations and other entities that serve youth who are not normally served by the SEA or LEAs.

The Unsafe School Choice Option was also created by the NCLB legislation. It requires States to establish a policy for identifying schools that are "persistently dangerous." Students at schools designated as persistently dangerous must be given the option of transferring to a safe public school inside the district, including charter schools. Additionally, students who are the victims of a violent criminal offense must also be given the option of transferring schools.

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act creates a Uniform Management Information and Reporting System. The law requires information collection regarding (1) truancy rates, (2) frequency, seriousness and incidence of violence and drug related offenses resulting in suspension or expulsion, (3) curricula, programs and services provided by State Grants recipients and (4) incidence and prevalence (including age of onset, perception of health risk and social disapproval) of drug use and violence. The first two are reported at the school level.

Preliminary Comments

At the outset, the Committee notes that all that is necessary to make schools safe and drug and alcohol free cannot be done solely by the Department of Education, the State education agencies or the local school districts. Safety, and drug and alcohol use issues must be addressed not only in schools, but also in communities. Schools and communities must work together to address these issues.

The Committee also notes a need to shift the focus of safe and drug-free school efforts from merely responding to safety and drug and alcohol use problems to one that focuses primarily on prevention and early intervention efforts.

COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

"Students need a safe place to learn, and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee will play a vital role as we move forward in ensuring that our students have safe and drug-free schools," –U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings

Structure of the Report

The structure of this report follows the request of the Secretary for information from the Committee. Thus, it is divided into four main sections, each addressing one of the major areas of focus in the Secretary's initial charge and the additional issues raised in October 2006. Within these areas, the Secretary's questions are used to structure the Committee's responses. Where possible, the Committee's response to each question includes both findings (descriptions of what the Committee learned in its work) and recommendations (specific suggestions for improving the work of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities programs). These represent the consensus of the Committee members who have worked conscientiously to provide responses to the Secretary's questions that will be both helpful and constructive.

The SDFSCA State Grants Program

At the outset, the Committee notes that none of the witnesses testifying before the Committee or any of the Committee's members suggested that the State Grants Program is no longer necessary. Rather, the Committee believes the program is crucial because safe and drug-free schools are the foundation for improved learning. If students are using drugs or alcohol (or are surrounded by others that do) or are unable to attend school or learn because of threats to their personal safety (or to their school), there is a greatly diminished opportunity for them to benefit from educational instruction. The Committee

also notes that problems related to school safety are often related to problems with drug and alcohol use.

Currently as implemented, what are the strengths of the SDFSCA State Grants Program? What are the elements of the State Grants Program that are working and addressing the needs of students and schools today?

A key strength of the State Grants Program is that it has fostered the creation of an infrastructure for collaboration between different levels of government, all of which have a role to play in ensuring school safety. It ensures the involvement of both State and Local Education Agencies in the effort to keep schools safe and drug and alcohol-free. By allowing grants to go to local schools, it also allows communities to address specific needs in a way that would be lost if all decision-making regarding grant moneys were to take place at a higher level.

There was, however, some concern among Committee members about the program and recognition that the current structure of the program could be reworked. Specifically, although some Committee members favored maintenance of the current structure so each local education agency (LEA) would receive some funding, there was significant support for allowing the money to be used by State Education Agencies (SEAs) to target prioritized areas since the amount of money is limited. In any event, the Committee recommends greater collaboration among federal agencies that are currently involved in funding SEA and LEA efforts to make sure that adequate funding is available for the crucial work of creating safe and drug-free schools.

Is the SDFSCA State Grants Program working effectively to promote safe and drug-free schools across the country, specifically in rural, urban and suburban settings?

The Committee heard testimony from practitioners and experts about the unique challenges that face rural, urban and suburban schools. Noting the sometimes wide and

significant variation in needs among different kinds of schools (such as the prevalence of certain safety concerns in urban schools or the logistical challenges of rural schools), the Committee recommends that the Department create different and clear standards for different types of schools. For instance, standards about data collection practices, the unsafe school choice option and other programs that should be different based on the type of school.

What are the difficulties in determining the effectiveness of the program?

The Committee heard testimony from a variety of witnesses about outcomes from State and local programs. One difficulty in determining the effectiveness of the State Grants Program is that there is no consensus at the federal level or from state-to-state about the definition of safety and substance abuse program problems (i.e. what is an ideal outcome for the program). Coupled with this is the lack of clear guidelines about effective prevention strategies.

The Committee believes that the Department could provide measurable objectives for SEAs and LEAs in determining when a school is safe and drug and alcohol free. This would involve requesting a common core of data in schools and communities across the nation, with some flexibility for additional measures added at the state or local level. It would also involve identifying targets or objectives for the program.

The Committee believes that if LEAs cannot first assess where they are on safety and drug and alcohol use issues, they will be unlikely to develop effective responses. To this end, LEAs should use school climate surveys and incident reporting to identify current needs. For instance, not every school currently identifies alcohol or drug use among students, yet this information would be very helpful in determining local needs.

The Committee also suggests that the U.S. Department of Education can help identify the factors that are likely to contribute to progress towards the targets it sets for the State Grants Programs. This would also involve identifying effective prevention strategies for LEAs.

Are there mechanisms that could be proposed that would help determine if programs being supported with SDFSCA State Grants Program funds are effective in meeting program purposes?

The Committee is concerned that, at all levels, the current implementation of the State Grants Program has not required the use of data to determine needs. The Committee believes the Department should identify key indicators of safety and alcohol and drug use (beyond those identified by the No Child Left Behind legislation) to be reported on by all grant recipients. This should be combined with appropriate monitoring of existing usage of grant funds. Again, the safety and alcohol and drug use effort would be greatly aided by bringing together experts to determine best practices that can be communicated to LEAs. Once these best practices are implemented, the degree to which LEAs are applying them can be used when making funding decisions.

Are there emerging issues facing students and schools today that the SDFSCA State Grant Program does not address and should they be addressed in the SDFSCA State Grants Program?

The key emerging issue that increasingly faces schools is the threat of being overburdened by various demands. The early focus on preventing drug and alcohol use has necessarily been expanded to encompass emergency planning, school violence, external threats to school security and natural disasters (among other concerns).

The SDFSCA State Grants Program includes a focus on safety. Sec. 4114 (d)(7) states that recipients of the SDFSCA State Grants must have “a plan for keeping schools safe and drug-free” including, a “crisis management plan”. Considering the Nation’s focus on

emergency response and crisis planning is this language sufficient to address the concern for crisis management in our schools?

One danger of overburdening schools is that there is a possibility for tension between school efforts (and competition for resources) to discourage substance use and their (often expensive) need to provide responses to other safety concerns like significant acts of violence and natural disasters. Of course, since the enactment of NCLB, the prominence of preparedness and safety issues has appropriately become more pronounced with the terrorist attacks of 9/11, disasters like Hurricane Katrina and other similar events. Some of the challenges related to overburdening schools might be alleviated by clarifying the meaning of terms like “safety”. The Committee recommends that “safety” should refer to personal and interpersonal safety, with a focus on issues related to alcohol and drug use and violence. If this is too narrow, it could be replaced by a definition stressing healthy, safe, secure and alcohol and drug-free schools. For purposes of the State Grants Program, “safety” could mean the creation of an environment that is safe, secure (personal and interpersonal safety) and healthy (personal safety). Issues related to bullying and harassment would be included in this definition of safety.

Some additional specific recommendations would include: improved coordination of the various federal resources related to school safety (such as those provided by the Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Emergency Management Agency), a requirement that every school provide its floor plans to local law enforcement and a suggestion that every school and LEA practice their crisis plans and revise and update them consistently.

Is the structure of the SDCFCA State Grants Program (awarding funds to the State Education Agency and the Governor), the most effective mechanism for the use of these funds?

The Committee notes that the amount of money currently allocated to the State Grants Program is too small and the grant moneys may be spread too thinly. Some Committee members believed the only challenge related to funding is the need for more funds to be available to each LEA. Thus, some State and local education agencies (in testimony before the Committee) and Committee members stressed the value of providing at least some money to each LEA. Others, however, expressed concern that the money available in the State Grants Program is not enough to make a difference for many of these LEAs.

The Committee found merit in a number of possible recommendations to improve the current State Grants Program structure. The first set of recommendations related to expectations on which funding could be made contingent. These include: (1) providing more money to grantees on condition that the LEA demonstrates school effort and utilization of research-based programs, (2) making grants contingent on partnerships with the local community (to leverage the grant amount), (3) making the Governor's 20% contingent on data collection on school safety and drug use. In regards to this second point, the Committee suggested consideration of requiring LEAs to re-institute Local Advisory Committees to involve communities in school drug use prevention and safety efforts.

The next set of recommendations is related to the role of SEAs in the grant process. The Committee recommendation in this area was to give the SEAs more of the grant money so they can provide technical assistance and data collection assistance to

LEAs. Under this recommendation, the Department would create accountability with guidelines for SEAs to be held accountable to encourage partnerships between LEAs and communities and to provide funding based on needs and performance. Some Committee members also feel that the governor's portion of the money should be removed so that the money could be used by SEAs or LEAs for professional development and other activities.

Other significant recommendations included: (1) developing a competitive process that allows a more limited set of local education agencies to get larger grants from States, or (2) providing a smaller number of needs-based grants to schools selected based on high prevalence of specified issues related to substance use and safety (so that the grants program is linked to actual need).

The Committee also recommends separating the Title IV application and reporting processes by LEAs and SEAs from the consolidated application for federal funding.

Underlying all of the Committee's recommendations is the need for clearer standards for all recipients of grant funds, including the Governors portion of the program.

Is the balance between flexibility and accountability contained in the statute working?

The Committee believes there is significant need for improvement in this area and integrating data collection, goal setting and identification of best practices would advance such improvement.

Could State and local flexibility be balanced with additional core requirements that would encourage LEAs to address specific issues?

The Committee believes the State Grants Program money should be used on basic needs such as the development of emergency or security plans. In addition, the Committee strongly suggests promotion of partnerships between LEAs and local communities, possibly through the requirement of a community match of grant funds to the LEA (i.e. of monetary or in-kind contributions). The Department could sponsor research into the current extent of partnering by grant recipients and provide technical assistance to grantees for development of partnerships. Similarly, the Department could encourage or even sponsor an initiative to foster ongoing partnerships between local education agencies and research groups as well as public health and safety agencies.

How can the tension between the “Principles of Effectiveness” provisions that require that funds be spent on research-based activities and the broad list of authorized activities (many of which lack a strong research base) be resolved?

This is an important question because the concepts underlying the “Principles of Effectiveness” require ongoing monitoring and mentoring, which ensures that effective programs are implemented with fidelity. Currently, there is no specific funding source dedicated for use in rolling out effective programs. As already noted, the lack of data collection hampers determinations of effectiveness, so the Committee recommends at least minimal data collections be required of grant recipients.

The Committee believes the “Principles of Effectiveness” should trump the authorized list of activities found in sec. 4114 of NCLB. To find further effective activities, the Committee suggests an ongoing working group involving the various agencies funding school safety and alcohol and drug use prevention activities, where LEAs can raise ideas for innovation that can then be subjected to testing. The implementation of research-based activities could also be advanced by the

recommendation (noted in the last section) of encouraging partnerships between researchers and schools.

Unsafe School Choice Option and identification of Persistently Dangerous Schools

Of all the sections of the Committee's report, this one likely garnered the most consensus and concern among members. The Committee notes that improvement in determining whether schools are persistently dangerous is related to improvement in data collection gathering, and in the functioning of the State Grants Programs.

Do the USCO provision, or provisions with a similar purpose (ensuring that no child is required to attend an unsafe school) adequately provide the authority, direction, and clarity for schools to be identified as persistently dangerous?

The USCO provision has not been as effective as the need it addresses requires. The Committee noted a number of recommendations that might go far towards allowing the provision to advance the purpose of keeping children in dangerous schools. First, the provision could be adjusted to allow for a consideration of incidents of violence as only one (not the only) factor in determining whether a school is safe. For instance, a school could be assessed by considering issues such as substance abuse, bullying, gang activity, racism, etc. Along with incident reports and other means, school climate surveys (gathered using multiple information sources like administrators, students, teachers, school staff and parents) could be used to assess safety, and student perception of safety, in schools. The U.S. Department of Education could provide a specific measure for determining school safety that would be uniform across States (although States would also be free to add criteria unique to the State). It would be most helpful if information were reported about individual schools rather than at the district level.

In terms of specific students who are the victims of violence, the Committee believes the Department could provide guidelines and, if possible training, for administrators, teachers, etc. about assisting students who victimize others and those who are victims in order to prevent further incidents. Schools should ensure that victims know of their rights to remain at their current school, as well as other transfer options. If the victim doesn't wish to transfer, our recommendation is that the district should consider moving the perpetrator (in circumstances where that is appropriate). Where possible, the perpetrator should receive counseling and appropriate interventions, as indicated by an assessment. This could involve, school-based youth courts or similar interventions, such as mentoring. Schools might also be encouraged to partner with local mental health providers for referrals for victimized and victimizers. LEAs and SEAs should examine possible funding streams for these efforts.

Considering that there are over 100,000 schools in the United States and data reflects more than 150,000 serious violent crimes committed in schools annually, do [the reported] numbers accurately reflect the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous accurately reflect the safety of our nation's schools?

State criteria for determining what schools are "persistently dangerous" vary widely and many are nearly impossible to meet. As a result, although State officials may know which individual schools have problems, the current designation process is not always identifying these schools. School reporting of incidents may also be misleading since the number of incidents that occur at a school do not necessarily reflect a school's climate or the overall level of safety within a school.

What changes to USCO would be necessary to address the underlying purpose of the USCO provisions?

The Committee notes that the term “persistently dangerous” is not helpful because it stigmatizes schools, may be misleading and may even penalize schools that accurately report incidents and are trying to address problems that are occurring. Standards for reporting vary from state-to-state and some schools may not even be reporting. As a result, schools that are accurately reporting incidents are being penalized for doing what they ought to. Thus, the Committee urges a modification to the legislation that would change the terminology “persistently dangerous” to different nomenclature (as an example, “safe school choice option”) that is not misleading or stigmatizing.

Combined with this change of name should be a change in focus towards the creation of safer school climates over time, rather than merely determining unsafe schools at any single point in time. For instance, schools that show indicia of becoming dangerous could be placed on a “watch list” indicating a need for assistance. In any event, parents should have access to safety data of schools their children attend, not only the schools deemed “persistently dangerous.”

To better help schools with safety problems, the Department might consider asking LEAs in required reports to link the use of State Grants funds to their work on USCO (i.e. describing how safety programs prevent dangerous school conditions). If the State Grants Program is adjusted to allow for this, schools on a “watch list” could be given a higher priority for funding. The Department should also consider performing a methodological study of the effectiveness of the USCO.

Some States are already working diligently to advance the goals of the USCO provision. These States should be granted a waiver from the USCO requirement if they

can show they have existing programs and that these programs meet minimal standards and requirements for providing parent choice of schools.

Some additional recommendations that might be found useful in promoting help for potentially unsafe schools include a stress on classroom management in pre-service teacher training; better education and training of school-based staff about indicators of potential violence and early preventive interventions; and within the limits of federal law and respecting privacy concerns, building an integrated information system that might include school records of individual students.

Is there adequate guidance that enables schools and school districts to know what is expected of them regarding USCO and Persistently Dangerous identification?

The Committee believes that the effort to identify unsafe schools would be advanced by looking at factors other than just incidents of violence such as bullying, disorderly common areas, etc. Perhaps the Department could identify model schools in this area and elements of those schools' efforts that could be implemented in other schools. There is also a need for clarification and basic guidance about how school safety information can be shared across community, state and national agencies, as well as between schools and law enforcement. The Department might also consider seeking funding for the identification effort.

Because reporting requirements may sometimes create logistical problems for State and local education officials, the Department should also consider allowing school officials to certify the accuracy of their reports while noting that there may be weaknesses or holes in the data.

Are there actions that the Department of Education can currently take to improve the effectiveness, operation, or management of the USCO provisions?

The Committee notes that there is a continuing need for parents to be made aware of safety issues at schools. The States have a fundamental role in promoting partnerships among the relevant State and local education agencies to help schools solve their problems at the school building level. The States also have a major role in helping leverage resources to support evidence-based programs and conditions to accomplish this goal. Some States, however, believe the current USCO provision creates an unfunded mandate by requiring States to develop processes for identifying unsafe schools without providing any funding to assist the States in that effort.

The Committee notes that there are a number of things that the Department might do to aid states in their responsibilities. For instance, the Department might create guidelines for school improvement when a school is identified as unsafe or of concern. The Department could also create a program modeled after the National Blue Ribbon Schools effort that would focus on school safety and the positive aspect of that effort. This could allow the Department to provide examples of safe schools and their best practices, including ways to address issues like substance abuse, truancy, dropouts and transient populations. The Department can also continue to provide support and technical assistance to schools with safety issues.

Additionally, the Department may want to provide guidance for implementing the transfer option in districts with one high school, middle school or elementary school. Also, the Department could reiterate to schools the importance of ensuring that accurate information on the transfer option is readily available to parents of victims of school violence. Finally, the Department could encourage schools to collaborate with local community prevention programs on safety issues.

Requirements for Data Under No Child Left Behind

The Committee notes that significant progress has been made in coordinating various federal agency efforts in data collection involving schools. The Committee, in responding to the questions related to data collection, also noted a number of possible opportunities for improvement.

Is the amount of information being collected appropriate?

The Committee notes that while many State and local education agencies have been very serious about evaluation issues, data collection at the U.S. Department of Education has not kept up with the expanded scope of Department programs. In addition, even where there are good ongoing data collection activities, they are not always integrated into practice.

Is the information being collected the “right” information to help the nation assess where it stands on issues related to youth drug use and violence prevention? Is the information being collected the “right” information to help Federal, State and local officials manage youth drug use and violence prevention programs?

The Committee suggests the Department determine what data is reasonable for States to collect. The Department could then help SEAs and LEAs understand how data collected can be used to create and accomplish safety and drug and alcohol use related goals. The Department should also consider sponsoring a critical review of whether data collection is affecting practice at the various levels of government.

Is there other data that could be collected that would be more useful or fill higher priority needs?

The Committee believes that data collection efforts must be preceded by decisions about what data is crucial and what is possible to collect (and at what intervals). In addition, whatever data are collected, the Department should encourage aggregation of

data at a local level so communities will know about local problems. Since using outcome measures alone to determine whether a school is safe and drug-free could lead to unwise goals and thus make data collection efforts counterproductive, the Department could also provide guidance in determining when a school is achieving success in its efforts to provide a safe and drug-free environment. Finally, the Department ought to consider providing guidelines for the use of data collected by LEAs.

The Committee noted a number of other kinds of data that could be collected and used by schools in determining where to put resources, other than just usage patterns. First is information about protective factors students are engaged in (i.e. extracurricular activities, discussions with parents) or other questions that can help determine solutions to drug use and safety concerns. Second is information about the practices and processes SEAs and LEAs are using in their school safety and alcohol and drug use prevention efforts. This would allow for the creation of a list of successful programs and practices that can be used to determine goals. An update of lists of effective programs could be disseminated regularly. Third, the Committee notes that there would be value in surveying parents to assess needs of communities. Additionally, the Committee notes the value of school climate surveys including self-reports by at least students, teachers and staff.

Safe and drug-free school efforts can join with community and government organizations to work towards the goal of collecting information on a number of issues for data collection related to alcohol and drug use and related problems. Thus, data regarding assaults perpetrated by those drinking or taking drugs, environmental data (like density of alcohol outlets), testing of all injury deaths under the age of 21 for alcohol use,

compliance check surveys of merchants (are they selling to minors?) regarding alcohol and monitoring costs of alcohol and drugs might be helpful. The Committee also felt there would be value in asking whether service providers are providing information to students and asking about alcohol use.

Would a requirement that UMIRS be collected using standard definitions provide greater clarity and direction to schools and school districts? If so, which terms should be defined in a standard way?

The Committee recommends the Department explore the possibility of developing a set of questions that can be used by State and local education agencies in their evaluation efforts. In this effort, they can consider data collected by other federal agencies (for instance, Centers for Disease Control information on tobacco policing) that might be helpful in evaluating school safety and drug and alcohol use. Other agency standards of evaluation might also be productively borrowed from.

Are there activities that we can undertake to address concerns about the costs and burdens associated with data collection?

The Committee notes that data collection efforts can be extremely expensive, in terms of time, manpower, etc. Some State and local programs need assistance in the development of appropriate evaluation criteria. In the future, a shortage of school administrators will create serious challenges for training personnel in gathering and interpreting data. There is also a continuing need to ensure that existing gaps between research and actual practices of Local education agencies are closed.

To be most helpful, the Department should participate in efforts to coordinate related data gathering across federal agencies and between State and local governments. Federal agencies should coordinate efforts so that only one set of data is being collected. This will require reducing the fractionation of data gathering systems by reducing the

number of agencies asking for the same information. This will also require an ongoing discussion between federal agencies, SEAs and LEAs about the data needed. States should also use the same measures in gathering data. The Department could profitably organize a task force to design information gathering that can be shared across institutions. Additionally, it might consider a study group to explore data gathering and implementation issues. The group would ideally include practitioners and those associated with the YRBS and PRIDE surveys.

Given justifiable concerns with expense, it might be helpful to have a cost analysis of data gathering efforts. It might also be useful to sponsor research on how to implement tested projects in school districts and schools. This could include research on adopting strategies common to prevention programs rather than a specific program in its entirety, as well as issues of tailoring programs to meet local needs.

Finally, in the spirit of federal agency coordination, the Committee endorses the Surgeon General's "Call to Action to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking" recommendations.

Additional Issues

In the Committee's October 2006 meeting, Secretary Spellings asked for additional information related to three areas not outlined in the questions originally posed to the Committee. These related to coordination between public and nonpublic schools, the unique challenges of urban and rural schools and the effects of trauma on affected students.

Nonpublic Schools

The Committee notes that current law provides for nonpublic schools to be entitled to “equitable participation” in federal school safety programs. The Committee also notes that nonpublic schools have a responsibility to work with LEAs. Current law and policy provides suitable processes to ensure sharing and cooperation between public and nonpublic schools in regards to administering federal school safety services. These processes, however, are not always utilized in every district, resulting in a perception in those districts that the nonpublic school perspective is being excluded from the needs assessment and overall allocation decisional processes.

The Committee recommends greater clarification and clearer guidelines regarding the consultation requirement; also, the development of monitoring protocols. Specifically, the Department could create a short, informative policy implementation brief that would help LEAs to know what is required in terms of working with nonpublic schools. A submission to the Committee noted the unique challenges stemming from the possibility of terrorist attacks for Jewish educational institutions, and the Committee believes these concerns could appropriately be addressed in any additional guidance given by the Department. Regional interdepartmental summits would help all schools, both public and nonpublic, prepare for large-scale crises. These summits would include more federal agencies than just the U.S. Department of Education.

Urban/Rural

As noted above, the Committee, in response to the Secretary’s request, listened to helpful testimony about the special needs of urban and rural schools. The Committee noted the significant challenges, both logistical and in terms of safety problems faced by

many of these schools. As appropriate, the Committee has included findings and recommendations related to these unique challenges in the sections above.

Trauma

Just prior to and during the Committee's deliberations, a number of schools in the United States experienced severe tragedies. The Committee's work was made more pressing by such things as Hurricane Katrina and school shootings that took place in Colorado, Wisconsin and Pennsylvania.

The Committee notes that many students are affected by trauma. The impact varies considerably. Some students will recover from trauma with little or no involvement of a professional; others—a small number—may need professional care. Counselors, teachers and other personnel need to understand how trauma can affect students and their ability to learn (i.e. warning signs). When traumatic events occur, steps must be taken to provide screening and intervention where appropriate, but screening decisions need to be local decisions. Schools will benefit from a prevention perspective focused on building resilience in students.

The Committee believes the Department may be able to document and communicate to policymakers the effects of trauma on educational outcomes. The Department should also identify best practices in dealing with trauma and make those available to LEAs. The Department might also assist in providing training on early identification and referral of students involved in traumatic events.

Conclusion

The Department's efforts in assisting schools and other education officials to enhance achievement and proficiency by ensuring that students are in a learning

environment that is safe and unmarred by alcohol and drug use has been extremely important. The Committee also believes it continues to be necessary. With the continued commitment of the Department and a good working relationship between the Department, other federal agencies, State and local education agencies; much progress can be made. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee hopes its recommendations can advance that progress.

APPENDIX 1: SHORT GLOSSARY OF TERMS AS USED IN THIS REPORT

Call to Action to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking. On March 6, 2007, the Office of the United States Surgeon General made this appeal to the American people to prevent underage drinking and stop minors who are now using alcohol. The Call identifies six goals for changing attitudes toward drinking alcohol in the United States.

National Blue Ribbon Schools. A program of the No Child Left Behind Act in which the United States Department of Education honors private and public primary and secondary schools for significant accomplishment in academic superiority and demonstrated dramatic gains in student achievement.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB). In 2001, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was reauthorized and amended as the No Child Left Behind Act. NCLB is a sweeping overhaul of federal efforts to support elementary and secondary education in the United States. It is built on four pillars: accountability for results, an emphasis on doing what works based on scientific research, expanded parental options, and expanded local control and flexibility.

Persistently Dangerous Schools. The No Child Left Behind Act includes a provision requiring states to create criteria for determining when a school is “persistently dangerous.” Students who attend schools so designated are to be given the option of transferring to a safe school within the school district, including public charter schools.

Pride Survey. Pride Surveys were created by a private organization to measure adolescent alcohol, tobacco and drug use but now also include measures of student behavior of other factors that affect student learning. Pride Surveys have been designated by federal law as an official measure of student drug use in the United States.

Principles of Effectiveness. Recipients of State Grants Program funding from Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools at the U.S. Department of Education must use the provided funds according to Principles of Effectiveness described in federal law. The Principles require state and local education agency efforts related to creating safe and drug-free schools to (1) be based on objective data regarding incidents of violence and drug use, (2) be based on established performance measures, (2) be based on scientifically based research indicating the activity will have an effect on drug use and violence, (4) be based on an analysis of data on the prevalence of risk factors, and (5) include input from parents.

State Grants Program. This program provides financial support from the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools to state education agencies for a variety of drug- and violence-prevention activities focused primarily on school-age youths. The State education agencies are required to distribute the vast majority of the funds to local education agencies to be used in drug and violence prevention activities including development of programs, personnel training and other activities.

Title IV. The subpart of The No Child Left Behind legislation related to the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools. Title IV authorizes the various activities, including providing funding, undertaken by the Office.

Unsafe School Choice Option. Every state receiving funding from the U.S. Department of Education must implement the Unsafe School Choice Option by creating criteria for determining if a school is unsafe and allowing students of the unsafe school to choose to be transferred to another public school in the district. The option is also available to a student victimized while at school.

YRBS Survey. The Centers for Disease Control administers the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance survey to random samples of adolescents at the national and state levels biennially. The survey measures incidence of violence, tobacco, alcohol and drug use, unhealthy dietary behavior, unsafe sexual behavior and physical inactivity. The survey is also used to assess trends in these behaviors.

APPENDIX 2: COMMITTEE CHARTER

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee

AUTHORITY

Section 4124 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, authorizes the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Committee (Committee). Additionally, the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), which establishes the standards for the formation and use of advisory committees, governs this Committee.

As provided for by FACA, the Committee will carry out the responsibilities outlined in 4124(a). The Secretary has interpreted this law to mean that each of these responsibilities will be carried out as advisory functions to the Secretary, who may accept, decline to accept, or modify any of the Committee's recommendations as she determines to be appropriate. As determined by the Secretary, the Committee may provide recommendations on the activities carried out by the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools (OSDFS) in section 4124(b). The Committee, however, will not carry out any operational functions.

PURPOSE AND FUNCTIONS

The Committee will provide advice to the Secretary on federal, state and local programs designed to create safe and drug-free schools, and on issues related to crisis planning. As outlined in section 4124(a), the Committee will consult with, and provide advice to, the Secretary for the programs listed in section 4124(b) that are already carried out by the OSDFS. As requested by the Secretary, the Committee will submit a report to reflect its advice.

STRUCTURE

The Committee will consist of up to 19 voting members. The Secretary, in consultation with the heads of the Federal agencies listed below, will designate full-time Federal employees from the following agencies to serve on the Committee:

- The Department of Education;
- The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;
- The National Institute on Drug Abuse;
- The National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse;
- The Center for Substance Abuse Prevention;

- The Center for Mental Health Services;
- The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; and
- The Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The Secretary will appoint the Committee's remaining members (up to eleven) from organizations or entities working in the following areas -- state and local government representatives, and researchers and expert practitioners in the fields of school- and community-based substance abuse and violence prevention. These appointees will serve as Special Government Employees (SGEs). As such, the members will be chosen by the Secretary for their individual knowledge and expertise, and will provide independent advice to the Secretary.

The initial appointments will be for staggered terms to retain an experienced core of non-federal members. Three members will serve for one year, four members will serve for two years, and four members will serve for three years. Subsequent terms will be three years for all members.

The Secretary will appoint the Committee's Chairperson, and the Assistant Deputy Secretary for Safe and Drug-Free Schools will appoint a staff member to serve as the Designated Federal Officer (DFO). The OSDFS will provide staff and administrative services to the Committee. While the DFO will ensure that all FACA requirements are met and attend all Committee meetings, no Department official will supervise or provide oversight over the substantive work of the Committee.

MEETINGS

The DFO, in consultation with the Committee Chairperson, will schedule meetings on an as-needed basis. A majority of the Committee, ten members, will constitute a quorum. Meetings will be open to the public, except when the Assistant Deputy Secretary for Safe and Drug-Free Schools determines otherwise, in accordance with Section 10(d) of FACA and with the concurrence of the Office of the General Counsel.

Meetings will be conducted and records of the proceedings kept according to applicable laws and departmental regulations.

ESTIMATED COSTS

Members who are not full-time Federal employees will be paid at a rate determined by the Secretary to attend Committee meetings plus per diem and reimbursement for travel expenses in accordance with Federal Travel Regulations.

Annual operating costs associated with supporting the Committee's functions, including direct and indirect expenses, will be approximately \$100,000. Staff support will be approximately .2 full-time equivalents.

TERMINATION DATE

The Committee is hereby chartered in accordance with section 14(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. This charter expires two years from the date of filing.

Approved:

/s/

Date

Secretary

Filing date: August 28, 2006

APPENDIX 3: COMMITTEE MEETINGS

June 12-13, 2006: Committee Meeting

U.S. Department of Education
Barnard Auditorium
400 Maryland Avenue SW
Washington, D.C.
Chair: Dr. David Long

July 10, 2006: Committee Conference Call

August 21-22, 2006: Committee Meeting

U.S. Department of Education
Barnard Auditorium
400 Maryland Avenue SW
Washington, DC
Chair: Dr. David Long

Presentations:

- Jon Akers, Executive Director Kentucky Center for School Safety, Eastern Kentucky University
- Lorraine Allen, Director Office of Safe Schools, Florida Department of Education
- Jeff Barber, Safe and Drug-Free Schools Coordinator Indiana Department of Education, President, Network Safe and Drug-Free Schools Coordinator
- John Bynoe, Associate Commissioner, Center for Student Support Massachusetts Department of Education
- General Arthur Dean, Chairman and CEO, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America
- Gus Frias, Coordinator of School Safety Programs Los Angeles County Department of Education
- Mike Herman, Executive Director Office of School Health, Safety and Learning Support
- Mona Johnson, Program Supervisor Washington State Department of Public Instruction, Vice President, Network Safe and Drug-Free Schools Coordinators
- Clarence Jones, Coordinator Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Fairfax County Public Schools
- Ellen Morehouse, Executive Director Student Assistance Services Corporation
- Edward Ray, Chief, Department of Security, Denver Public Schools
- Peter Reuter, Professor, School of Public Policy, Department of Criminology, University of Maryland
- Chris Ringwalt, Senior Research Scientist, Chapel Hill Center, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
- Zili Sloboda, Senior Research Associate, Institute for Health and Social Policy, University of Akron
- Cynthia Timmons, Director, Children of Promise Mentors of Hope, University of Oklahoma Outreach

September 5, 2006: Committee Conference Call

October 23-34, 2006: Committee Meeting

U.S. Department of Education
Barnard Auditorium
400 Maryland Avenue SW
Washington, DC
Chair: Dr. David Long

Presentations:

- Jerry Barber, CPA, CISA, CGFM, Assistant Comptroller, Office of the State Comptroller, New York State
- Bill Bond, School Safety Specialist, National Association of Secondary School Principals
- Cory Green, Senior Director of the NCLB Program Coordination Division, Texas State Education Agency
- Paul Kesner, Director, State Grants Program, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, US Department of Education
- Janelle Krueger, Principal Consultant for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, Colorado Department of Education
- Susan Martz, Director of the Office of Program Support Services, New Jersey Department of Education
- Peter P. Pochowski, Midwest Director, National Association of School Safety and Law Enforcement Officers
- Richard T. Rasa, Director, State and Local Advisory and Assistance Services, Office of Inspector General, US Department of Education
- Meredith Rolfe, Administrator of the Safe and Healthy Kids Program Office, California Department of Education
- Annie Salsich, Sr. Program Associate, the Vera Institute of Justice
- Bernie Tadley, Regional Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, US Department of Education

November 20, 2006: Committee Conference Call

December 18, 2006: Committee Conference Call

January 16-17, 2007: Committee Meeting

U.S. Department of Education
Barnard Auditorium
400 Maryland Avenue SW
Washington, DC
Chair: Dr. David Long

Presentations:

- Maureen Dowling, Education Program Specialist for the Office of Non-Public Education
- Joe McTighe, Executive Director of the Council for American Private Education
- Patrick Bassett, President of the National Association of Independent Schools
- Jack Clark, Director of Technology and Nonpublic School Services for the Colonial Intermediate Unit in Pennsylvania
- Michael Caruso, Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Schools and Government Relations for the Archdiocese of Washington, DC
- Dr. Steven Marans, Professor of Child Psychiatry at Yale University and Director of the National Center for Children Exposed to Violence
- Dr. Marleen Wong, Director of Crisis Counseling and Intervention Services for the Los Angeles Unified School District and Director of the Trauma Services Adaptation Center for Schools and Communities
- Dr. Lisa Jaycox, Senior Behavioral Scientist at RAND Corporation and a Clinical Psychologist
- Liz Redmon, Federal Projects Director for McNairy County Schools, Tennessee
- Doug Swanson, Former Federal Projects Director for Gage County Schools, Nebraska
- Melissa Thompson, Project Director for Garfield-Heights Public Schools in Cleveland, Ohio
- Lynne Krehbiel-Breneman, Project Director for Minneapolis Public Schools in Minnesota

February 20-21, 2007: Committee Meeting

U.S. Department of Education
 Barnard Auditorium
 400 Maryland Avenue SW
 Washington, DC
 Chair: Dr. David Long

Presentations:

- Mike Herrmann, Executive Director of the Office of School Health Safety and Learning Support, Tennessee Department of Education
- Howell Wechsler, Director of Division of Adolescent and School Health, Centers for Disease Control
- Doug Hall, Senior Vice President, PRIDE Surveys
- Deborah Rudy, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, U.S. Department of Education
- LeRoy Rooker, Director of the Family Policy Compliance Office, U.S. Department of Education

March 19, 2007: Committee Meeting

U.S. Department of Education
 Barnard Auditorium
 400 Maryland Avenue SW
 Washington, DC

Chair: Dr. David Long

April 19, 2007: Committee Conference Call

May 14, 2007: Committee Conference Call

APPENDIX 4: COMMITTEE MEMBERS

David Long, *Chairman*

Dr. David Long is California's Secretary of Education. Long has more than 40 years of experience in the field of education, ranging from 21 years of classroom teaching to his current position Secretary of Education. He is past President of the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA) and has been honored as California Administrator of the Year by the National Organization of Partners in Education, Superintendent of the Year, and received the Governor's Award for school leadership.

Kim Dude

Kim Dude is the Director of the Wellness Resource Center at the University of Missouri-Columbia. She has worked at the University of Missouri-Columbia for the past 24 years. Dude has been the recipient of numerous awards, including the "Outstanding Contribution to the Field" award by the Network Addressing Collegiate Alcohol and Other Drug Issues, as well as the Buck Buchanan Lifetime Service Award by Phoenix Programs in Columbia. The Inter-Association Task Force on Alcohol and Substance Abuse Issues, a national coalition of organizations that collaborate on issues related to substance abuse within the higher education community, identified the university's Wellness Resource Center as one of the top 10 prevention programs in the country; in 2003 and 2005, it was chosen one of the top three programs in the nation.

Frederick E. Ellis

Fred Ellis is the Director of Safety and Security for Fairfax County Public Schools, the twelfth largest school system in the country with more than 165,000 students, 22,000 employees and approximately 247 facilities. He has served the Fairfax County Public School system since 2000. Ellis was directly involved with managing the school response for September 11, 2001, the sniper shootings of 2002, small pox inoculation center plans, hurricane Isabel, anthrax and other assorted challenges. Previously, he served the Fairfax County Police Department for 23 years.

Michael J. Herrmann

Mike Herrmann serves as the Executive Director of the Office of School Health, Safety and Learning Support within the Tennessee Department of Education. His background in the prevention field began more than twenty years ago when he was hired to help implement the recommendations of then-Governor Lamar Alexander's Task Force on Youth Alcohol and Drug Abuse. He later served for five years as the Coordinator of the Governor's Alliance for a Drug-Free Tennessee. He currently oversees all activities within the state department related to health and safety as well as after-school and extended learning

Montean R. Jackson

Montean R. Jackson, is a licensed Social Worker, Clinical Supervisor and Clinical Administrator with the State of Alaska, and is the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Coordinator for the Fairbanks North Star Borough School. She has worked in the field of

adult and adolescent substance use prevention, intervention and treatment, as well as, social work with focus on child/spouse neglect and abuse issues for almost 10 years. Jackson has strong experience in the successful implementation and sustainability of SAMHSA model programs in treatment and school settings. Jackson is an advocate and passionate about reclaiming our youth, reconnecting and strengthening the family, and empowering our nation to believe in the possibilities.

Russell T. Jones

Dr. Russell T. Jones is a Professor of Psychology at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University who specializes in clinical child psychology, community psychology and issues related to disaster and terrorism, and is an expert in the behavioral sciences. Jones is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association (APA), and has served as a member of the Board of Directors for Division 12; as well as a past member of the Board of Directors of the International Society of Traumatic Stress Studies, CDC's Advisory Committee for Injury Prevention and Control (ACIPC), and ACIPC's Scientific and Program Review Subcommittee. Jones is also the founder and director of REACT (Recovery Effort After Child Trauma), a program that works in conjunction with the Yale Child Study Center designed to assist children and their families following fire trauma. Jones is also a member of the Hurricane Katrina Community Advisory Group administered by the Department of Health Care Policy at the Harvard Medical School.

Sheppard Kellam

Dr. Sheppard Kellam is the Director of the Center for Integrating Education and Prevention Research in Schools at the American Institutes for Research. Kellam is a public health psychiatrist who has played a major role in establishing concepts and methods for prevention science, as well as contributing to knowledge about early risk factors and their malleability. His theoretical, methodological, and substantive contributions began with the early intervention studies in Woodlawn, an African American community on the South Side of Chicago, from 1963 through 1982. From 1982-1993 Kellam was Chair of the Department of Mental Hygiene in the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health and is now Professor Emeritus. In 1996 he was awarded the Rema Lapouse Award for lifetime contributions to public health and prevention science by the Mental Health, Epidemiology, and Statistics Sections of the American Public Health Association. In 1999 the World Federation for Mental Health presented him their Distinguished Public Mental Health Award for his work in advancing the science for prevention of mental and behavioral disorders. He was President of the Society for Prevention Research from 1998-2001. In 2004 he was elected to be a Fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology.

Tommy Ledbetter

Tommy Ledbetter has been the Principal of Buckhorn High School in Alabama for over twenty years. Prior to becoming Principal, he was also a teacher and Assistant Principal at area schools. Since Ledbetter's tenure began, Buckhorn has been awarded the U.S. Department of Education's National Blue Ribbon School of Excellence Award, and he has been honored with as the Alabama Association of Secondary School's Principal of the Year and the Alabama Reading Initiative Principal Leadership Award. He is currently

vice-president of the Alabama Association of Secondary School Principals and serves on its Board of Directors. Ledbetter also sits on the executive committee of the Council for Leaders of Alabama Schools and on both the Governor's Task Force on School Leadership and the Governor's Implementation Committee for School Leadership.

Seth Norman

Judge Seth Norman is currently the Judge of Division IV Criminal Court in Davidson County, Tennessee and served as Presiding Judge of the 20th Judicial District for the years 1998 and 1999. Elected to the bench in 1990, Judge Norman was reelected without opposition in 1998. He practiced law in Nashville for 28 years in the law office of Jack Norman, Sr., and served as member of the General Assembly, the State Democratic Executive Committee and as a Delegate to the 1968 Democratic National Convention. Norman is the founder and Presiding Judge of the Davidson County Drug Court, and the founder and Chairman of the Nashville Drug Court Support Foundation, Inc. In 2003, the Tennessee Association of Drug Court Professionals recognized Judge Norman as the "Pioneer of Tennessee Drug Courts" for his exhausting efforts in making Drug Courts a crucial and instrumental part of Tennessee's Criminal Justice System.

Michael Pimentel

Michael Pimentel is the Chief of the San Antonio Independent School District Police Department. Pimentel has also served on the Corpus Christi Police Department and the Austin Police Department. Prior to his current position, he was selected to serve the Brownsville Independent School District as the first Administrator of Security Services. In addition to the many duties performed with the Austin Police Department, Pimentel served as a co-developer of the first Crime Stoppers Program in the State of Texas and was a co-founder of the first Interagency Council on Sexual Abuse in the City of Austin.

Hope Taft

Hope Taft is a co-founder of [Drug-Free Action Alliance](#) and the [Ohio Alcohol and Drug Policy Alliance](#), and first lady emeritus of Ohio. She is a spokesperson for several state initiatives focusing on children, and is an Ohio Certified Prevention Specialist II. Taft serves on the President's Council on Service and Civic Participation, the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, and the National Conference of State Legislatures' Advisory Committee on the Treatment of Alcoholism and Drug Addiction. She is a past member of the President's Commission for Drug-Free Communities and the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment's national advisory council. She co-chairs [Leadership to Keep Children Alcohol Free](#), an initiative supported by many other governors' spouses to prevent underage drinking; targeting children ages 9 to 15. To support this initiative, she has developed a campaign called [Smart and Sober](#) to help reduce childhood use of alcohol. As a part of this effort, the first lady created two underage drinking prevention videos, one of which received a prestigious Telly Award.

Federal Members

Deborah A. Price

Deborah A. Price was appointed assistant deputy secretary of the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools in February of 2004. Price oversees the Department's activities related

to safe schools, crisis response, alcohol and drug prevention, the health and well being of students, and building strong character and citizenship. Prior to this appointment, Price served as chief of staff of the Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA), a liaison with other key Department of Education principal offices, including the Office of the Secretary, Office of the Deputy Secretary, Office of Postsecondary Education, Office of Management and the Chief Financial Officer.

J. Robert Flores

J. Robert Flores is the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention at the U.S. Department of Justice, and previously served in the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, where he worked on issues related to child exploitation and obscenity. Flores is an experienced lawyer and former prosecutor with expertise in Internet crime, child abuse and exploitation, and juvenile justice issues. Before his OJJDP appointment, Mr. Flores was the Vice President and Senior Counsel for the National Law Center for Children and Families. From 1989 to 1997, Mr. Flores was Senior Trial Attorney and Acting Deputy Chief in the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, Criminal Division, of the U.S. Department of Justice. Mr. Flores prosecuted *United States v. Kimbrough*, the first federal case involving computer child pornography to go to trial. He successfully argued the appeal to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals

Ralph Hingson

Dr. Ralph Hingson, Director of Epidemiology and Prevention Research at the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), came to NIAAA from the Boston University School of Public Health (BUSPH) where he served since 2001 as Associate Dean for Research. From 1986-2000, Hingson served as Professor and Chair of the BUSPH Social and Behavioral Sciences Department. An expert on drunk driving legislation, Hingson conducted research that helped to stimulate passage of federal legislation providing incentives for all states to make it illegal for drivers under 21 to drive after any drinking. By 1998 all states had adopted this law. More recently, his research on the relationship between blood alcohol levels and automobile accidents has stirred many states to propose legislation to lower their legal blood alcohol limit to 0.08%. Currently, 47 states have adopted the 0.08% limit.

Susan Keys

Dr. Susan Keys is the Branch Chief of the Prevention Initiatives and Priority Programs Development Branch in the Division of Prevention, Traumatic Stress and Special Programs, Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Previously, she was an Associate Professor of Counseling and Human Services and former Department Chair at Johns Hopkins University. Keys has more than thirty years of experience in teaching, consultation and management. Prior to moving to SAMHSA, she was Co Principal investigator of a National Institute of Mental Health R01 research grant on school violence prevention in 37 schools and five school districts in Maryland and Associate Director of Education at the Johns Hopkins Center for the Prevention of Youth Violence, a center funded by the federal Centers for Disease Control.

Bertha Madras

Dr. Bertha Madras is the Deputy Director for Demand Reduction White House Office of National Drug Control Policy. Prior to her appointment, Madras was a professor of Psychobiology in the Department of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School and chair of the Division of Neurochemistry at the New England Primate Research Center. Madras has also served on several National and government advisory boards, including the Molecular Neuropharmacology and Signaling Review Committee on the National Institutes of Health and the Medications Development Scientific Advisory Board at the National Institute of Drug Abuse. Furthermore, Madras has traveled the United States and abroad presenting prevention lectures on how drugs affect the brain and has conducted research on cocaine, Ecstasy, and cannabinoids.

Dennis Romero

Dennis O. Romero is the Acting Director for the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Service (DHHS). Romero has extensive experience in the fields of mental health, chemical addiction, prevention, and program development, among others. Prior to his current position, he served as Deputy Director of the Alcoholism Council of New York (ACNY), in New York City. Romero has served on the board of many professional committees, advisory boards, and commissions (at the state and local levels) that address both local and regional issues related to the field of alcohol and substance abuse and prevention, as well as allied social and educational issues. In 1997, he received the prestigious appointment to the New York State Board of Regents to the Committee of Professional Assistance Program under the Office of the Professions where he served in many capacities including Chair of the Committee.

Belinda E. Sims

Dr. Belinda Sims joined the Division of Epidemiology, Services and Prevention Research's Prevention Research Branch at the National Institutes of Health as a Health Scientist Administrator for the prevention services and early childhood programs. Sims is a developmental psychologist, and came to NIDA from NIMH where she was the chief of the child and adolescent preventive intervention program. Prior to joining NIH, Sims was a faculty research associate at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of Mental Hygiene (now Mental Health), where she conducted children's mental health services research.

Howell Wechsler

Dr. Howell Wechsler has served as Acting Director of the Division of Adolescent and School Health (DASH) at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention since April 12, 2004. Prior to this appointment, Wechsler served for two years as the Chief of the Research Application Branch in DASH. Prior to joining CDC in 1995, Wechsler served for six years as Project Director of the Washington Heights-Inwood Healthy Heart Program in New York City. This community-based cardiovascular disease prevention program was affiliated with Columbia University, where Dr. Wechsler taught courses in health communication. Dr. Wechsler has also directed a community-based health-

screening program serving the New York City metropolitan area and has worked as a health educator for the New York City Department of Health. He entered the field of public health during his service as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Zaire.