

National Network
for Safe and Drug-Free Schools
and Communities (SDFSC)

Westin Grand Hotel

June 13, &14, 1999

Members present:

Cathleen Olson – Chair –	LEA-Arizona
Judy Airhart – Vice-Chair-	SEA-Ohio
Chelley Barnes	Mississippi Office of Highway Safety
Deb Chambers	Gov. Office Ohio
Arlene Cunditt	SEA-Virginia
Penny Deavers	SEA-Alabama
Gus Dalis	Southern CA Comprehensive Assistance Center
Pati Gaopoa	American Samoa, Safe and Drug Free Schools
Sandy Gardiner	SEA-Louisiana
Alan G. Green	New York Univ. Metrocenter SDFS Data Project
Claudia Hasselquist	SEA-Idaho
John Hughes	DEA, Washington, D.C.
Dan Iser	SEA-Pennsylvania
Elizabeth Warner Jones	SDFSC for Cobb County Marietta, Georgia
Gerald H. Kilbert	SEA-California
Dorothy Knight	Star Center, University of Texas
Janelle Krueger	SEA-Colorado
Leroy Lutu	American Samoa, Safe and Drug Free Schools
Sue Mahoney	SEA-Vermont
Ian Neuhard	SEA-Florida
Mary Q. Oliver	SEA-Georgia
Julie Peterson	CHEF, Washington
Lawrence Piper	Gov. Office-Oregon
Spencer Sartorius	SEA-Montana
Jilma Shackelford	North Carolina Substance Abuse Services
Paul O.Soumokil	SEA-Wyoming
KayBeth Stavely –	SEA-Texas
Karen Stevens	SEA-Nebraska
Sue Thau	Community Anti-Drug Coalitions – Wash. D.C.
Cynthia Timmons	Region VII Comprehensive Assistance Center
Ronda Turner	SEA-North Carolina
Ronald Williams	Dept. of Services to Children, Washington, D.C.

Cathleen Olson called the meeting to order

A roll call of introductions identified all participants

John D. Hughes, Senior Prevention Programs Manager, Demand Reduction Section, Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Congressional and Public Affairs.

John commented that since demand and reduction efforts are coming together more so now than ever before, he is extending the hand of cooperation to all of the prevention and intervention community. John committed to updating all of us on the initiative with which he is familiar. He fully expects a rural initiative to come from Congress this session. He is our network contact person and wants to work with us from the D.C. office and through their regional offices.

MINUTES FROM JANUARY MEETING

USDE Outstanding Programs

There were nine programs recommended for the Recognition Program. Because of input from the Network, the SEAs received copies of the application. We requested that SEAs be informed if there were to be site visitations. That request was acknowledged. The reviewers of the programs noticed that the principles of effectiveness were not evident in most of the applicants.

Spencer recommended that the Recognition Program continue. This year there were nine winners and 52 losers. Spencer recommends that it be converted to a win-win program. The SEA should receive all the applications and the comments from the reviewers. Perhaps the comments could be used in the state monitoring process. It was also recommended that the Governor's programs be allowed to apply for a similar award. Lynn Johnson at the USDE has the list of applicants by state.

The list of exemplary programs from the USDE is being used by many vendors to advertise their products. The USDE representatives said that SEAs should send to Bill Modzeleski copies of letter that vendors are sending out citing that Bill recommends or that the USDE recommends because they are on the list.

Cathleen Olson and Judy Airhart distributed an Administrative Tool/Resources list to identify products available. How those products will be made available to all SEAs is under discussion.

David Quinlan of the USDE asked for comments on the listserv that he edits. The comments were favorable and his more informal use of language appreciated.

The web site of USDE on Middle School Coordinators had the due date as the date the application was being sent out. As a result many schools were confused as to whether the application process was already over or could they still apply. It seems as if the national program office is not very responsive to the needs of the field.

Communications Committee (Carolyn Clement of Kansas and Leticia of Texas Governor's office) has not been very active. But, we have a new listserv sponsored by CADCCA. SDSFC Network is the name of the listserv. Cathleen Olson encouraged the committee to begin meeting.

Technical Assistance Committee has Cathleen and Spencer as members. The Administrative Tools idea is a result of this committee's actions. The Network has recommended that a coordinator mentor program be implemented.

Judy Airhart discussed the regional fall conferences scheduled for October 6-8 in Tampa, November 8-10 in Salt Lake City, and December 15-17 in Chicago. The USDE has scheduled the meetings fully on all three days. Network meetings will be scheduled for Sunday November 7 for Salt Lake City. The Tampa meeting and the Chicago meetings will be before the conference on October 5 and December 14 respectively. The new coordinators will meet first from 9 a.m. to 12 noon on that day followed by the Network meeting. The Network meeting will begin at 1:30 p.m. until 4:30 p.m. The Network committees will meet in the morning during the time the new coordinators are meeting.

Cathleen Olson began a discussion on whether there should be a larger state annual membership fee. Such a fee could cover costs of having a representative in D.C. to represent the organization. Jerry Kilbert will serve as chair to investigate options for a dues structure that could be built upon Title VI, Title I, Vocational Education, or Adult Education and other health related national organizations.

State of Montana missing from the contact list.

Janelle Krueger, Colorado, reported on Columbine High School in Jefferson County. It is in an unincorporated area. The security person on the campus was nearby in a coffee shop. He is having trouble that he was not there, but he got there quickly and did exchange fire with the two students. There were 15 victims including the two killers. There were 52 bombs found. The investigators, found explosives that were in the wheel well of the car which, had they exploded, would have caused great damage. But, the bomb did not go off because the hands on the clock were not coated with magnetic material or it would have gone off. The propane tank in the cafeteria did not explode either or that too would have caused much more property and perhaps personnel damage.

The investigators no longer think others were involved. There were 80 investigators, now 30; 2000 interviews were conducted; and, 800 pieces of evidence. There were 700 rounds fired in the buildings. The initial SWAT teams said the explosives set off the fire sprinklers so the SWAT teams were crawling through ice water. This contributed to the time delay in getting to the victims. Since 200 service people were on site, they could not coordinate over the radio. The dispatchers often repeated radio traffic of those on site. This repeating was stronger and took over the communications. Therefore, there were delays and some confusion in on-site communication. But, overall they did well and did the best they could.

The school district has done a great job doing what the kids and school staff did. They are trying to address the needs of all. The kids went to Chatwood high school campus in the morning and Columbine in the p.m. The Chatwood kids were great in welcoming their rivals to use the campus. The school held the graduation on schedule.

The district has a PR firm and set up a web site. The metropolitan area is high tech and somewhat affluent so most of the parents have e-mail and web access. This proved to be a great communication tool.

August 15 is scheduled for reopening the campus. The explosives created a fine residue on carpets and furniture. All carpeting will be replaced. The district will remodel the library and the cafeteria to give it a new look to relieve the trauma on the students.

A healing fund was set up for the community. They raised \$3.5 million. Colorado has the 4th best economy in the nation so the people of the state do contribute to needy causes. The total collected is \$4-5 million in various funds. The district has 30 kids in the average class. This district's average class size is the highest in the state. 21 kids were hospitalized and some were under insured. Some have spinal injuries. One of the girls is paralyzed and the media is not reporting the details. The state legislature was considering more possession of fire arms to be legal. Because of this event, they had to drop the discussions.

The professional sport teams cancelled all games for the week. There was a memorial service in down town area. It was multi cultural, many religions and about 5000 people. The governor's office expected 30,000 people at another memorial service and 70,000 people showed up. There are four major TV stations with a 5 p.m. news broadcast in the area. All radio stations opened formats to talk shows and the DJs took calls. The DJs who may have been sport broadcasters, handled the calls similar to regular talk show types. This provided a great outlet for the general public to discuss. The public TV station ran panel discussion forums with local and national experts.

The blue and silver ribbon campaign is being supported through out the state. Everyone is to wear them all year long. Janelle showed all of us the ribbon that she wears.

A judge ruled that all autopsy reports be sealed. He felt the publication of the victims would do no good. In fact, many people are very thankful for the judge's decision. The details of the death of the victims should not be published.

The state department. of education was able to give them state expulsion money from unencumbered funds. The USDE went to the state to help. But, the state people would rather have had the USDE give the money to the state so the state could meet their needs as they best know how. It is not that the visit was not appreciated, rather it is more directed at letting the state put together the plan they need without federal intervention.

The state department of education put together a packet on crisis planning and post traumatic stress. All 1800 sites got copies. Officers will be getting more training this summer. The Governor, on June 19, 1999, is putting together a summit in which the

Department of Education has no role. It seems as though this will be panels and presentations and a strong political theme.

The most immediate concern is what type of services should be offered during the summer. It seems that the staff is the problem because they have nothing for support. We need to care for the care-taker. The kids will have a drop in center available all summer.

There is a significant lawsuit by the Isiah Sholl family. The parents initiated the suit against the family of the two boys who committed the crime. There is very little out about the two boys. There is little being done about teen suicide. Most kids don't become homicidal until they have become suicidal first. It is hope that at the violence summit this issue of youth suicide will be raised. Comments from other directors said that we are dealing with youth mental health depression.

MINUTES FROM EMERGENCY MEETING – MAY 7, 1999

Cathleen Olson played the video of the various state directors who provided testimony at this meeting. She also played excerpts from the Los Angeles County Office of Education video provided by Gus Dalis on success stories from Los Angeles County.

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT

Tomorrow morning Bill Modzeleski will meet with us for an hour. At the briefing for staffers, USDE will probably not be present.

Tomorrow afternoon the Network will meet in the Russel Senate Office Building, Room 385 from 3-4:30 p.m. Greg Williamson staff to Senator Murry will be in attendance as well as Senator Dodd's office. There may be a maximum of 10 people present. Ice Tea and cookies will be available. The activity is merely to provide information to the staffers from the Network's point of view regarding the administration's proposal and the Murry bill. Kathleen Olson will field questions and may ask for support from Network members in answering questions.

Sue Thau began by saying that Sue Mahoney from Vermont is very important because her Senator Jeffords staffer may decide what goes into the bill or what is removed from the bill. Sue thinks she can live with the administration's bill including the competitive grant process.

Allocation of funding – general consensus of the Network is that states should have the option to use their funds for either an entitlement process or a competitive grant process.

Total funding – There is general consensus that total funding must be increased to assure that there is at least \$10.00 behind every student in the nation whether a small or large state. The bill says, "such sums as may be necessary." Therefore, there is no ceiling or floor.

The legislation requires schools to report school related suicides. The Network’s position is that reporting while at school or on school property might be appropriate, language on the way to or from school is inappropriate. Youth could stop at a park and commit suicide after dealing with parents or friends and since on the way home from school, it would be a school related suicide. Yet, totally separate and unknown to the school.

Technical Assistance – Taking money from a base program to provide technical assistance to districts which do not receive any funding is a question on the table, said Sue. The administration’s bill requires the state to explain how a district, which does not receive funding through the competitive grant process of SDFSCA, will get services.

Physical Education – There is consensus that the physical education program should not be funded with the SDFSCA. SDFSCA are part of the Coordinated School Health Program and there are other components of the program with which SDFSCA coordinate to contribute to a healthy body and healthy mind of students.

Two Years To Demonstrate Success – There is general consensus that demonstrating success within two years is not possible or useful. Furthermore, if a district does not demonstrate improvement, but because more and more districts apply and the competition increases, there might not be enough money to be able to support the program.

DARE – The language removes DARE from the list of affordable programs. There is consensus that the research does not show long term effects from the DARE program.

ED Flex – A state can’t “flex” anything that deals with the allocation of funds.

The Administrations Reauthorization proposal:

Requires Need-Based Distribution of Funds to No more than 50% of the LEAs in the state. - The Network’s position is that all districts should be **adequately** funded for Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities. The Network want more money in the program so that whether the funds are allocated through a competitive basis or on an entitlement, there must be enough money in a district to pay for developing plans and offering some level of program to all students.

An adequate increase in the SDFSC funding appropriation could enhance support of communities as well as allow for a basic allocation to all school districts for implementation of an effective violence and substance abuse prevention program.

Requires that most funds be distributed competitively to local education agencies. – The Network’s position is that every state is different therefore, states should be given the flexibility to determine how to distribute their funds based upon their unique characteristics to ensure that all students attend and live in safe and drug free schools and communities.

Requires an Evaluation Plan – The Administration’s proposal says they will give us a list to select and the states will tell the districts what their targets will be.

Requires Governor’s Portion funds to be distributed competitively. The Network’s position is the Governor’s funds should allow for flexibility.

Requires Governor’s portion of funded programs to directly complement local education agency efforts. The Network’s position is requiring formal linkage to local educational agencies, in some cases, creates unnecessary restraints in implementing the Governor’s portion.

Requires effective programs based on a risk reduction model. The Network’s position is that programs based on Youth Development, including resiliency skills and asset building in students, can be a powerful measure of effectiveness. The administration’s language reflects a risk reduction model and the Network language reflects youth development, asset development and resiliency.

Requires that 50% of the school districts must be funded. - An adequate increase in the SDFSC funding could enhance support of communities as well as allow for a basic allocation to all school districts for implementation of an effective violence and substance abuse prevention program.

Requires physical activity programs as an authorized expenditure of SDFSC funds – The Network’s position is that the violence and substance abuse prevention focus of the legislation is diminished by the emphasis placed on physical activity.

Requires the use of SDFSC funds for National Programs - The Network’s position is that the federalizing of SDFSC funds duplicates state efforts, discourages cooperation, reduces per pupil allocation, and fragments prevention efforts. All programs should be operated with funds distributed to the states from the USDE.

Monday, June 14, 1999

Members present:

Cathleen Olson – Chair –	LEA-Arizona
Judy Airhart – Vice-Chair-	SEA-Ohio
Philip Bensley	Office of Prevention Youth Services – D.C.
Deb Chambers	Gov. Office Ohio
Arlene Cunditt	SEA-Virginia
Penny Deavers	SEA-Alabama
Gus Dalis	Southern CA Comprehensive Assistance Center
Sandy Gardiner	SEA-Louisiana
Alan G. Green	New York Univ. Metrocenter SDFS Data Project

Claudia Hasselquist	SEA-Idaho
John Hughes	DEA, Washington, D.C.
Dan Iser	SEA-Pennsylvania
Elizabeth Warner Jones	SDFSC for Cobb County Marietta, Georgia
Gerald H. Kilbert	SEA-California
Dorothy Knight	Star Center, University of Texas
Janelle Krueger	SEA-Colorado
Sue Mahoney	SEA-Vermont
Ian Neuhard	SEA-Florida
Mary Q. Oliver	SEA-Georgia
Julie Peterson	CHEF, Washington
Lawrence Piper	Gov. Office-Oregon
Susie Roberts	Gov. Office-Washington
Jilma Shackelford	North Carolina Substance Abuse Services
Paul O.Soumokil	SEA-Wyoming
KayBeth Stavely –	SEA-Texas
Karen Stevens	SEA-Nebraska
Sue Thau	Community Anti-Drug Coalitions – Wash. D.C.
I. D. Thompson	SEA-Mississippi
Cynthia Timmons	Region VII Comprehensive Assistance Center
Ronda Turner	SEA-North Carolina
Ronald Williams	Dept. of Services to Children, Washington, D.C.
Denise Fitch	Washington State Department of Instruction

Cathleen Olson introduced Allan Green from New York University who explained how he and his staff are helping local districts collect data to assist in assessing district needs. They are also identifying “threats or supports” of safe and drug free schools. For example, they are identifying the indicators of parent involvement, helping the districts identify how many of the indicators they have and then working with the districts to use that data to develop their programs. Allan Green encouraged all to go to his website that is nyu.edu and look under academic centers. Allan is one of the centers titled MetroCenters. At this site you will find all of the information including “best practices.”

Bill Modzeleski and Debbie Rudy from the USDE were introduced and asked to respond to a number of questions including:

1. Recognition Program - The Principles of Effectiveness are not implemented because of the short time since they were introduced and districts. The short time frame did not allow for adequate preparation of an application. More importantly, the timing of the grant was a problem because they were due on June 1 that is near the end of the school year. The quality of applications is not good. The Governor’s portions should be included. Positive incentives are needed. Thanks are expressed to USDE for notifying SEAs of site visitations and sending applications to states.

It was recommended that SEAs be involved in the process and in fact have them do the review and then send a select recommended list to the USDE. It was further recommended that the template used in the application be given to all districts for planning purposes.

Bill Modzeleski is having serious considerations about putting more money into this effort. The purpose of the recognition program is to identify schools that have implemented research-based programs and support the Principles of Effectiveness throughout the district. He is disappointed with the program. He still thinks the districts are not implementing the kinds of programs they should be. He wants some feed back to find out what the USDE needs to do. The points noted above will not fix the problem. There is miscommunication in that where the USDE is, the schools and communities are not there.

Bill thinks the Safe Schools and Student involvement program looks really good. There has been a quick review, and they look good. There are 450 applications at USDE and most are looking at a comprehensive approach involving schools, communities, parents, law enforcement, and other interested stakeholders.

Exemplary Programs

Districts /school had information before states.

Bill said that the purpose of exemplary programs is to identify research based programs. Now, many of the people on the panel have interests in programs in which they were involved doing the research. So, USDE met with lawyers and tried to not make the process beyond reproach regarding conflict of interest.

It is recognized that programs not on the list will be viewed as not of the same level of quality as those that make the list. The entire process was set up to look at programs. At the same time, the USDE is looking at strategies rather than programs. That is, how can we link up the schools and communities.

The research is in programs. The USDE wants researchers to look toward strategies. So, what are the strategies that work? The USDE thinks there are communities doing the right thing but there is little research supporting this. Some sites such as Boston and San Diego are frequently cited as being research based, but they probably have been mentioned by accident rather than design.

This will be announced in the fall.

There have been discussions with members of Congress and other federal agencies directed toward strategies. The USDE is talking with several federal agencies to really look at the broad issues including child development.

3. Early Warning

Mass mailing from USDE to SEAs, went to administrators and not SDFSCA coordinators. So, SEAs had to send again to LEAs. Furthermore, the mailing to SEAs came after the fact.

An expressed concern from the Network members was that this document is becoming, in some locations, a check-list of what must be done. Bill responded that the information must be taken as a whole and not as a checklist. In fact, the USDE is preparing a “tool kit” to accompany the publication to help schools address the issue.

Bill said there will be another early warning guide which will go out in Early August. The USDE is working the Association of School Psychologists in review the materials to be included. From the White House conference it was agreed that it is good to identify the children with mental health problems. But, the problem is what do we do with the kids who are kicked out school. The fact is, in the USA, we have scrapped the mental health system in this system due in large part to the managed care system. We now seem to prescribe drugs to modify the behavior of the kids and not deal with the underlying causes. Some schools want to put the psychologists in the schools and other say they should be in the community.

The Juvenile Justice bill will focus on gun control. But, this bill will have significant amendments. The most significant will be the Martinez amendment that will provide for 100,000 counselors (\$1.6 Billion cost) in schools. These counselors may end up having the requirements that more likely will emphasize psychology skills. This will bypass the usual hearing process and move right to the floor. Bill mentioned that at a town hall meeting at which VP Gore asked the students if they ever had contemplated suicide, nearly 80% of the students raised their hands.

The large number of Special Education kids are not being considered misdiagnosed because they came from

In Juvenile Justice bill as part of First and Ashcroft amendment it modifies the gun free schools act by saying that every kid should be treated the same when it comes to gun free schools even if a IDH child. So a child could be expelled for a year without any provision for education services. The amendment passed the Senate and will be on the floor of the house. So, this may be a dramatic over haul of the IDEA. That is school systems can expell any kid for up to a year without any provision of educational services. The amendment is for guns, including bombs.

There is a growing movement supported by VP Gore on Second Chance Schools. That is kids who bring guns or who are disciplinary problems, those kids would go to these schools. Bill noted that we have not done, in general, well with alternative schools. We have placed the poorest kids, teachers and material in those schools.

4. National Programs / Middle School Coordinators Safe Schools/Healthy Students

The web site gave wrong dates, phones busy, calls not returned, and rudeness. Bill apologized for the rudeness and will take care of being sure people will get their calls answered.

It was difficult to access the web site to download the application. David's listserv is of great help to us. Bill said David can get information out on his listserv immediately, but Bill has to go to his contractor to put information on the web page. For nearly three weeks, the phone box was full and we could not get answers to the RFA. There was no backup.

Districts knew they could not continue the program after the funding died. Debbie Rury said that many still applied and stated that they could continue the funding. Bill said that his is really a "hiring program."

The timing of the grants is really difficult for schools. Bill said, "that is the way it is." We are dependent upon the appropriation committee actions. Right now the appropriations committee is working and probably will not finish by the end of September. So, we will probably continue to operate on continuing resolutions.

There are 16,000 districts who say that unless the legislation requires them to apply through the state, they don't want to do so. Bill said, at the SEA level, there are fewer and fewer people to do more and more work. There are about 2 people at the SEA to layer on work.

Reauthorization Discussion

Bill was at a hearing with Congressman Micca. Bill's view is that for many years the SDFSCA at the local level was the "back water of programs." That is, LEAs has ten time so much money in other programs that SDFSCA programs were merely taking the money and hiring a coordinator and that was it. There wasn't much interest by the school leadership in drug prevention or violence prevention. That attitude has changed in large and small districts. LEA administrators are waking up to the fact that they must create environments to be supportive of learning.

Bill thinks we will see significant changes in school systems over the next few years. What schools are doing in drug prevention, violence prevention etc. will be put under a microscope.

Bill thinks this will lead to a better assessment of the problems existing in schools. Bill also thinks this will have a significant impact on drug prevention. Educators are telling Bill that creating a safe environment for learning will take priority and drug prevention will be squeezed out. Congresswoman Mink said she did not think there was a connection between drug prevention and violence prevention. Bill tried to express the link to her.

Bill thinks we will be seeing a whole new variety of programs because schools know they must do something so they are doing anything. Some proposals on the Hill are to take away the 20% cap on using SDFSCA money for security. Changes are being made yearly by attaching amendments to many other bills and not just through the reauthorization. Bill says we need to do both, that is, drug and violence prevention. Another factor is that schools themselves are changing. As schools are being pushed higher standards for all students, if there was fifteen minutes left in the day, most schools will not do drugs and alcohol prevention, they will do academics.

The Administrations bill is on the Hill. The House will be the first to have hearings on this bill. There continues to be discussions on pulling any title out and having hearing on that title by itself. The Administration bill is the key bill from which others will be generated. Informally, nearly every member of the House and Senate is having town hall meetings and is discussing the bill. What has changed in Congress this year is that nearly every Congressman knows something about this bill. There is a tremendous awareness about the bill. Bill thinks there are some misconceptions and perceptions. The L.A. Times article did not do us much good. The May follow up article was on the Rand study and sort of lead to the conclusion that it will take 40 years to get results.

The SDFSCA program does not need to address every child. Education reform must be linked to what SDFSCA is doing. Yet other funds should be used to reach every child.

There will be increased focus on the culture of athletics. This leads to how do we deal with the culture of schools. That is, the kid on the debate team should held to the same level of recognition as the quarterback.

There will never be enough money in SDFSCA to reach every kid. All schools will need to decide how they can use other money to reach every kid and use SDFSCA money to meet the particular needs.

Debbie Rury from the USDE remained to respond to questions regarding Reauthorization of the SDFSCA

Where did the physical activity portion come from? Debbie said the point is to transform the physical activity (traditional physical education class) to activities which you can do for the rest of your life. Physical education classes should include life long types of activities. This would be done in conjunction with CDC Division of Adolescent Health.

Why did we single out physical activity when there are seven or eight others? Because we were asked to do it and it needed to find a home. The language came from CDC. There was minimal interest in creating new programs so the physical activity provision was included. Another similar provision was the training to teachers put into Title II.

Please discuss the competitive grant versus the allocation process. There was a lot of discussing on the fact that USDE is requiring research based programs, more assessment, more evaluation and demonstration of results. So, to do that the Congress could enlarge

the authorization. But, many members of Congress are not that supportive of the program. Similarly the Office of Management and Budget think the program is not that accountable. So, to get an increase in the allocation is not likely.

The most palatable option is to do a competitive grant and limit it to up to half of the LEAs in the state. There is a waiver provision that would allow a state to come in and ask to provide funding to more than half. But, this would require the state to submit considerable evidence of the need for this.

Why not let the states decide whether they want to do an allocation versus competitive or a blend? The USDE felt that everyone would have difficulty in changing programs to a research base if they could be pressured to continue the allocation process. The 50% requirement is an increasingly popular approach for federal programs. Need and quality of program should be about equally weighted in determining the competitive funding process.

The options were not perfect. If we kept funding the same, those who criticize the program would continue with the same criticisms.

The USDE prepares a performance report compiled from all the states. The data is not comparable. There is no base data and often no current data.

What was the thinking behind the increase from 15% to 15% to 20% for technical assistance? Wanted to enhance the pool to increase the technical assistance to districts.

The increase from 4-5% for state administration at the SEA may not hold. It appears there is a challenge to the 5% from the Office of Management and Budget. The USDE allows the state to use the money to serve the 50% they fund and the 50% the state does not fund. Or, the state can decide not to provide services to those they do not fund.

We are hearing that there will be a string of continuing resolutions. Congress will be debating all the issues and options. Since they will not agree rapidly, continuing resolutions will be the way for the immediate future.

Debbie thinks that there were limited options. The Administration's proposal was written as a result of many discussions.

States can give multiple year funding. In fact, funding can go for up to three years.

Network member presented the problem of funding being up at one time and down another. This gradually forces those schools that receive no funding, will eventually stop serving students. Debbie agrees that the bill does not meet every need. It is the result of compromise.

Is the allocation process waivable? No, the distribution of funds, even in EdFlex states is not subject to waiver provisions.

The SEA application requires states to select from a list of performance measures. Does every state need to select from the indicators or can they use their own? Debbie said that the states will need to select from a list so the USDE can have an aggregated response data base. However, states can have their own as well.

Network members urged Debbie to work with them as the USDE develops a list of performance indicators. Debbie said that is really helpful. In fact, this is the only provision that states the performance indicators should be established “in consultation with...”

Do states need to collect data from funded sites as well as non-funded programs? Debbie said, states would probably be required to link data collection to funded sites only. The problem Network members brought up is that if we gather data from funded sites and the emphasis is upon districts with need, the final results could end up reporting that those receiving funds are doing a worse job.

SEAs remain in the consolidated plan in spite of distributing funds by a competitive process.

When the USDE sends materials to districts, they buy lists that include site principals or other administrators. They do not have a list of local district SDFSCA coordinators. Network members urged using the title SDFSCA Coordinators on mailings to local districts.

The USDE is willing to meet with new coordinators on the day before the IASA conference. Loretta Riggins is the IASA conference coordinator who could work with the Network to plan the day. Judy Airhart from Ohio will represent the Network in this coordination effort.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:00 noon to be reconvened for the staffing briefing in the Russell Building.

Respectfully Submitted

Gerald H. Kilbert (CA)