

National Network for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

January 24, 1999

One Washington Circle Hotel

Those in attendance:

Denise Fitch, Secretary, Washington SEA
Cathleen Olson, Chair, Arizona, SEA
Kay Beth Stavley, Texas, SEA
Gus Dalis, California, SEA
Lawrence Piper, Oregon, Gov
Susie Roberts, Gov. Portion, Washington State
Spencer Sartorius, SEA Montana
Penny Deavers, Alabama SEA
Jeanelle Krueger, Colorado, SEA
Mary Weaver, SEA, California
Judy Airhart, SEA, Ohio
Wade Bynelson, SEA, California
Leticia Martinez, Gov, Texas
Carolyn Clement, Kansas, SEA
James Ashton, Virginia, SEA
Kathleen Sheehan, NASADAD
Carl Tacy, NASASDAD

Old Business:

Reports on Gov and SEA programs

There are still some states that do not have their information in. The information was provided to Appropriations Committee, prior to the passage of the budget bill for the upcoming year. Cathy needs information to do an executive summary. Mary Weaver, California will get the remaining information on the SEA's and Susie Roberts will get the information for the Gov portions. Sue Thau, CADCA, will have her staff put together an executive summary from the reports. This is a very important document for the upcoming reauthorization.

There is a need to update the program coordinator contact list. If you were unable to attend the meeting, please contact Cathy Olson with changes.

Gus shared that Eva Kobinski has done a really nice job of providing information to those on her list serve. It was suggested that perhaps her information be provided to the WESTAT list-serve. We also need to be on the CAPT Center list serve in order to get information pertinent to Title IV.

Committee Reports: Committees in need of reorganization

Kay Beth Stavley – Recognition Program.

As part of the committee, it was recommended that the SEA be notified prior to the visitation by the committee of the schools recommended for the Recognition Program. The schools were asked for things that were not on the application, and it was not a very good situation. Mary Weaver asked how many of the National network members were going to be reviewers. She said that it would be possible for the reviewers to follow up on some of the anomalies. School superintendents were sent applications directly from WESTAT, as well as the SEA. Applications are due March 5. Janelle shared that she found out indirectly that the application was sent to the LEA's. She said that when she called, that it had already been mailed. She had copied and sent to her program contacts. Spencer shared that there is a lack of coordination and information between USDE and WESTAT in this process. Kay Beth shared that she had called to see what the responsibility is of the SEA with regard to verification of the legitimacy of the school district.

Denise recommended that WESTAT and USDE have representation at the Network meetings in order to close the loop on some of the information gaps. Gus recommended that there be a committee formed to develop the lines of communication. He also said that each state has to let WESTAT and USDE know what is the best communication system. KayBeth shared her concern regarding the upcoming discretionary grants. Who is getting the information and what is the responsibility for communication to us.

There was a discussion regarding the provision of technical assistance to those states that may have a new coordinator, or be struggling. Mary talked about hourly conference calls regionally. Gus talked about representation from each of the Regional Labs. If they are not involved, then there is another gap in the information centers. We also need to make sure that we use technology as appropriate to communicate.

Susie talked about re-authorization. Greg Williamson, Admin. Assistant, for Senator Murray, WA. Sue Thau, CADCA added information about community coalitions. Greg covers education issues for Senator Murray. Dodd, Kennedy Spector, are the senior members of the committees. Their goal is to say that there are people in the school and Gov's office who know what they are doing, and they have a clearer picture of what is needed to improve the integrity of the program. Sen. Murray knows that the thoughts from the field are the ones that are meaningful and will make sense. He talked about the fact that there are people who sit on these committees that may not have all of the information, and have a personal view of how things should be.

Spencer shared that there are many different versions of the reauthorization language. Greg shared that there needs to be flexibility as well as consistency in programs. It is good that there is debate on the hill regarding this program. It makes it possible to shape some of the negotiations and end up with something that is workable at the local level.

What he knows now: What happens this year will be a discussion in the appropriations and labor committee (health education , labor and pension committee). Chairman

Jeffords ® on the senate side, Goodling on the house side (policy). Jeffords understands a lot of the education stuff. Coverall, Gorton are the ones who have the power behind the scenes.

Chairman Spector ® (Senate), Chairman Porter ®. If the impeachment stuff gets done soon, then the reauthorization could take place quickly. August could see the vote for reauthorization. He thinks it may take two sessions in order to be finalized. May see another appropriations discussion, with the authorization discussion occurring later.

Ed Flex bill could be passed this week. That would increase the ability of states to apply for waivers to allow for flexibility of the program dollars. It would exempt you from many of the rules and regulations for IASA funds.

Greg cannot give us any specific timeline so far. We have our Network Draft for reauthorization; there is a CCSSO proposal; USDE proposal (yet unseen). Spencer asked who carries the bill for the USDE – Kennedy. When the dept. draft comes to the hill it will be either a Kennedy or a Dodd bill representing the democratic side. Senator Dodd sees himself as the father of SDFSC program. Senator Murray will propose a bill, the language of the Network draft for reauthorization. Chair Spector is interested in SDFSC and may have a funding draft. Senator Harkin may also be involved in the discussion with Spector. On the labor side Jeffords, Gorton, ® have ideas regarding this program as well. If we don't want our version to get lost, there are things that we need to do.

If our goal is to move ahead, people need to know about the network proposal. He figures that deals are being cut right now on some of the other proposals. There needs to be a way to impact the program dollars. The bigger discussion is on ESEA and the Federal role in education in all areas. It is not that fundamental change is a good or bad thing. People who work the program at the local level, must have a means to provide information regarding what the program looks like at the local level. We need to make sure that we don't disrespect the programs at the local level and the information on implementation. There was also concern regarding the disconnect between the funding being provided directly to the LEA and bypassing the SEA. Concerns were voiced about the USDE creating a reason for their existence and directing funds through grants directly to districts. At this point they have neither the staff nor the local connection to manage a program effectively. The SEA is essentially out of the loop regarding these grants.

We have to make the case about why drug-use is going up and why we need to do prevention. At a policy level, we need to let people know that this discussion is going on at the national level. Murray's office can say that they support the network proposal because it is from the practitioners. In congress changes can happen in a weekend. If we can get people to coalesce around this draft, then they may be able to impact legislation. We need letters of support from the national organizations. We need to show a lot of support for our idea within the next month. It was stated that we are not allowed to lobby, however we can respond to requests for information. So if the legislators were to contact states, then information can be shared about the proposals.

Support for legislation MUST come from the grass roots as well as the state and national organizations. There must be a consistent message. There needs to be anecdotes and information from unlikely partners shared with legislators.

Greg will get back to us a draft of the bill. He will want comments from as many of the LEA's regarding the language of the bill and what should and shouldn't be there.

NASADAD - They have had some conversation with Jeffords office to talk about prevention and treatment initiative for kids.

Greg's office phone number is 202-224-2621. Call him if you have any questions. Gus and Leticia will work with Greg on the letter.

Kathleen Sheehan, NASADAD - funded through SAMHSA. They have not had the opportunity to be involved in the reauthorization. They would appreciate any info we could give them regarding our programs, how they work and who's in charge. They were concerned about the funding cut we experienced for this year. How does this program (SDFSC) work with programs at NASADAD. National Academy of Science produced a book of performance measures for health programs – a 2 year study through NASADAD. They want to help us come up with some performance measures that make sense for our programs.

They have been trying to make contact with the Dept of Ed SDFSC program staff, and have yet to receive a response. They are willing to be a partner and coordinate with other Federal agencies, if they are willing. Their goal is restoration of cuts as well as reauthorization. They may make the reach to Tipper Gore regarding this program based upon her interest in youth violence prevention. Carl thinks that the information is there but there is just a need to pull it all together. Mr. Dewey Cornell, at UVA might be a contact who has done research in the area of substance abuse prevention. The University of Colorado might be able to provide some information about (Dell Elliott) the continuum. Alan Lescher has information on the level of funding and reductions and the increase in substance use. Need a Gov. who would be the spokesperson for the issue. Oregon Gov. was mentioned.

David Quinlan shared with us that he is working with EDC to develop a list or rather to compile a list of research based programs which people can work with at the local level. They are also developing the "how to" manual as well as one that deals with strategies. They need to look to this group (network). It would really be helpful and ownership of the process and the outcome. California emphasized that there is a need to evaluate these programs over time. There is a concern voiced that the USDE and the Principles of Effectiveness don't understand the implications. We have 2 years to show results. POE is law, non-regulations are policy. With the 17% cuts, and the expectations of data collection and program evaluation, David said we need to look at the middle school coordinators as a piece of process. Cathy shared that we don't know how these cuts are going to look. If the middle school coordinator is hired, it will take them at least 1 year to get up to speed.

We need fact sheets on programs that we do within the states. It would be a good idea for each state to put these together based upon programs that are showing results. Things such as after school programs, 5 or 6 categories or models of things that may be working. Our main problems are accountability and nobody knows what we do. We need to put a face on what we do in each state. There needs to be a two tiered approach. Perhaps have parents or kids testify on reauthorization.

Denise shared a report generated by the University of Washington Kids Count that provided a secondary analysis of data sets within the state to look at the relationship between substance use and violence. It was suggested that WESTAT compile the information – Mary Weaver will contact Westat to see what they could do for us. Does Modzeleski have any objection in asking Westat to aggregate the data. If they have a task ordered contract, we could do that. Debbie Rudy will be here tomorrow so we can ask her.

Janelle talked about the fact that people may not want anecdotes. It depends on your audience and message and be strategic about it. The balance between process and outcome, and where each of the states are.

Spencer said that the department needs to hear this too. His fear is that all of the reports have gone in to a state file and nothing's done with them. There could be some generalizations made based upon the data. It could help both WESTAT and USDE.

Cathy Gireauard and the List Serve: In your last list serve a question about what you are doing with other programs and agencies with regard to collaboration. Please get the information to her ASAP. Bill wants to know the level of collaboration that is going on in the states. Whatever it is that you are doing. Let her know what it is that you are doing and who you are doing it with regarding safe and drug-free schools program, Her fax number is (202)260-7767 or you can email it to her at cathy_girouard@ed.gov. Cathy is working closely with special education and this information will be very valuable.

Vice Chair elections: The election will be finalized at the end of the meeting tomorrow. Cathy thanked Mary Vanderwall for all of her assistance and will be sending her flowers on behalf of the network.

Committee Reports:

Administrative tools: Judy Airhart was the chair and they compiled a list of information that is available. Perhaps bring apps and year's end reports to the next agenda of the meeting. Judy will send our list to people to review and check. For those unable to attend, they can send their applications and reports to Cathleen Olson.

The Data Collection Committee met once and it was determined that there was no need for this committee because there has already been a designed evaluation by the contractor – WESTAT. Perhaps if we need to have a national effort like that Bill could lead it. If we could influence the triennial report, perhaps we could meet.

Reauthorization committee—ongoing with the language moving forward through Senator Murray's office.

Technical Assistance Committee: Denise, Spencer, Judy, Penny (co-lead) Cathy (co-lead) and Kay. It would be logical if a group of state and federal coordinators went to provide TA to a new state director. The Federal Project Officer would know the rules and regulations. The state coordinators could provide forms and written information that they could use. This is an issue of consistency and quality of program implementation of SDFSC. This would be an efficient team that could provide a broad range of assistance to new coordinators. Mary recommended that the USDE bring together all of the new coordinators and bring in some of the state coordinators to share information. Spencer suggested that a day be added to the network meetings. Gus recommended that the day be added to the front end of the schedule so the new coordinators would have a context from which to work. It was also recommended that we talk to Bill about this tomorrow. The state would then act as a mentor for the new coordinator.

Research project – white paper to look at the relationship between violence/substance use and abuse/student achievement. Spencer shared information regarding SSDHPER is going to look at health risk behaviors and student achievement. We need to collect all of the information related to all of the data and research that may be out there. Gus is going to see if they can find someone to pull the information together. Denise will help. Send the research papers to Gus by the end of February. He will see if he can get some funding for this synthesis. He will talk to Adelman to see if they have a graduate student that may be in need of a project. Gus (coordinator), James, Denise, and Penny. Also need to look at the impact of funding changes and use rates.

The next issue was the development of a 1 page fact sheet that could be used to share information with legislators. What are we paying for? What activity, program or strategy are you using to support your data .What difference is it making?

Communication Committee – Gus and Lawrence , Leticia and Carolyn (chair). Identify a system and strengthen and make it known to people what the information system will provide.

Spencer would like to be on a committee on consolidated review. He would like to see state people in addition to the federal review team that goes to the states.

Date for the next meeting is June 13-14, 1999 at One Washington Circle.

Monday, January 25, 1999

Additional Members Present:

Leroy Lutu, SEA Samoa
Elayne McCarthy, USDE

Benjamin Tili, Gov., Samoa
Loretta Riggins USDE

Meeting called to order by Cathy Olson.

Introductions

Congratulations to Judy Airhart elected Vice-Chair

Cathy's term as Chair is ending next year. People need to be thinking about who would be interested in the next year to run.

IASA Conference Dates:

October 6-8, Tampa Florida, Penny Deavers, Judy Airhart, meeting co-chairs

November 8-10, 1999, Salt Lake City, UT, Cathleen Olson, Denise Fitch, meeting co-chairs

December 15-17, 1999, Chicago IL., Carolyn Clement, Janelle Krueger, meeting co-chairs

There will be a National Network meeting attached to each of these conferences. The meeting co-chairs are listed above.

Mary Weaver talked about a potential change to the reauthorization language proposed by the National Network. Her concern is regarding the level of funding for all districts and the flexibility regarding funding. They are proposing two choices in language. (Pg. 7) The proposal includes the language currently in the text for section A I, ii, iii, and B.

Section 2: Distribution – Of the amount located under paragraph (I), a state educational agency shall distribute a minimum of 70% of such amount to local educational agencies based on the relative enrollments in public and private non-profit elementary and secondary schools within the boundaries of such agencies, and

(i) delete as written previously, replace with the following:

Up to 30 % of its remaining funds for a baseline allocation to all local educational agencies at an amount established by the state educational agency, or

(ii) Up to 30% of its remaining funds to local educational agencies that the SEA determines have the greatest need for additional funds to carry out drug and violence prevention programs authorized by this subpart, or

(iii) Up to 30% of its remaining funds allocated according to the provisions in subdivisions (I) and (ii).

B. A SEA shall distribute a minimum of 70% of such amount to local educational agencies that it determines have the greatest need for additional funds to carry out drug and violence programs, according to criteria established by the SEA and authorized by

this subpart, and up to 30% of such amount to Lea's that it determines have need for additional funds to carry out the programs authorized by this subpart.

B. could change the program to a competitive program from the entitlement model.

Additional language needs to be added to the text to link the program with the educational outcomes for students.

There was also a recommendation to add an advisory council for the USDE that would consist of SEA and Gov. representatives.

There was also discussion regarding the SEA and Gov. portion be required to have an advisory board to assist in making decisions such as funding distribution.

Any and all changes will be sent to the entire network for comment with a quick turn around.

Additional guests:

Bill Modzeleski and Debbie Rudy and Cathy Gireoard USDE

Bill shared:

Reauthorization – the administration ONDCP and USDE and Domestic Violence council are supporting the USDE draft of the reauthorization of SDFSC. He is meeting with ONDCP on Friday regarding the USDE draft. There are specs for each section and look at how it would look at keeping things the same or different. They are still looking at revisions in the specs. After their meetings with the Senate and the House, they will have something to send to the hill. They have a small window – between the end of Feb and March. They are planning to get the entire IASA package to the hill as the administration's proposal. The House has put education on the front burner-both R's and D's. There will be something moving out of the house by the end of November. Bill feels that there is some philosophical differences between R's and D's regarding education. Debate regarding Title 1 and its effectiveness. There is going to be a lot of jockeying around. This is high on everyone's priority list regarding education. President and Secretary very interested in making education a priority. There will be a willingness to discuss and compromise a bill to get it out of the house. The house is in a different place than the Senate. The House is looking at it from a parochial perspective, what's good for my community, and the Senate looks at the issue more globally.

The process: They will drop an administrative bill. Their bill will not be like ours. Rep. Kilby will have a bill, as well as others. Bill would like our input after the bill goes up to the hill. Bill says we should become active regarding this issue. The way to do this is to dialogue with our local congressional representatives regarding this issue. This is not about what we think as SDFSC coordinators, but also what Supt. and locals think. Our voices should be heard.

The Bill is going to be changed significantly from what it is now. If there is one thing that we have heard, not from us, but from ONDCP and the hill, that unless there changes made to the bill that it would be DOA. There are people on the hill that would be supportive of the bill, not many though. What happened in the last year, regarding the shootings, has initiated the changes. If it is to move and have money, accountability, targeting, and sharpening the focus of the program is needed

Targeting – not all schools will be able to access the money based upon the new criteria. It is not going to be 100%. Spreading the money to all districts does not facilitate significant and appropriate programming based upon the low level of funding that some schools get. A percentage of LEA's will be eligible for funding based on needs and quality of the program. This will be a SEA responsibility to make the determination and decision. This may look like a competitive grant.

Development of a SDFSC plan. Balancing the needs of drug and violence prevention and safe environment. District plan ties the local plans together. This will be the basis of who will be funded and who will not. This will be a decision SEA's will have to make. Healthy kids, safe schools will be the focus.

Gov.'s portion of funds. There is concern regarding these funds. There is discussion regarding the effectiveness of the Gov.'s plan. The new language supports the SEA program by the Gov.'s. Looking at the state plan jointly.

May look at an increase in funding of the SEA. May also look at holding back funding for the SEA to provide training and technical assistance – also the Gov.'s portion. This is to help the states receiving money make sure they have programs that meet the principles of effectiveness. Also add a small part of the Lea funds – for those LEA's that need additional funding – discretionary funding for districts that have an emergent need and don't fit within the criteria.

Asking for a modification of the Gun Free Schools Act – requiring those children expelled continuous educational services.

Prohibiting tobacco use

Taking project Serve – it will be discretionary to provide services to areas that may have a shooting. This will also coordinate services of other agencies who are responding.

Reporting requirement–SEA's would be required to report any school –related violent death within 30 days to the USDE.

Principles of Effectiveness will be codified as part of the law.

Working with Title 1 to develop a school report card – a public accounting of federal dollars that go to LEA's. Link it to educational reform. There will be some outcome measures to determine the effectiveness of the school programs.

SEA's would be required to compete for funds to go out. Admin funding could be used for TA and hold back some funding for emergencies.

Safe schools plans would be required and the legislation and language will link the program with education reform.

Cathy asked how the plan relates to the consolidated plan? Bill said the language regarding this is still being worked on.

Bill talked about the 5 point plan of the President – referring to discipline. Between now and the time the legislation moves forward more will have to determine more succinct policies regarding violent behaviors. Spencer asked regarding the consolidated plans. Title 14 information is currently under development so that it makes sense for the LEA. Things are on parallel tracks and adjustments will need to be made.

Cathy asked a question regarding the Gov.'s plan and the SEA plan – that is currently under development and the language is not yet finalized. Title 1 (Mary Jean) attended a briefing on neglected and delinquent funding. The incarcerated rate continues to increase – and for those young people who may or may not be served.

Clarification 100 % of the states will be eligible for funding, and the SEA will have to allocate a percentage to be distributed via competition to LEA's.

Mary Weaver shared that the language regarding “to and from school” varies from state to state with regard to the reporting of deaths. Many states require school districts to be responsible for students from “portal to portal”. Bill has a committee with CDC that will look at the definition before they go into a research study.

Advisory committees: will still be required to have an advisory committee that would be of assistance in the development and approval at the local level of the safe schools plan. School buildings may have to have their own safe schools plan. The SEA in their language is not required to have an advisory, however the group shared that many of the SEA's already have advisory committees. Bill said it was an interesting idea. Wade brought up whether the SDFSC Federal leaders would be required to have an advisory committee of practitioners. Debbie said that they re looking to have fewer advisory committees, so it is not likely.

Bill will put on the list serve information regarding a committee being formed by ONDCP that is looking for parents.

Bill shared a chart he received from Gen. McCaffery. Also shared information about 2 discretionary grants

Gus asked whether the discretionary grants would be included in the SDFSC plan. Bill will provide more information later.

The budget will be released for FY 2000 by the end of February. It will be on the list serve as well as the home page. Mary asked whether Title 4 funding will be up or down and Bill said he did not know.

Spencer and the group shared with Bill that the list serve is a wonderful tool for the program coordinators. They are setting up a list serve with the school security officers at the larger school districts. If there is additional information that you would like to see on the list-serve, let Bill know.

James shared his appreciation to Bill on our behalf regarding his efforts.

Bill said that there is a lot of misunderstanding about the SDFSC program among legislators. Bill said the one thing that we could do, is to bring legislators out to see both the good and the bad side of the program. This is not lobbying, but it is sharing information. Many legislators do not have any idea of what the program does or the impact.

Debbie Rudy:

Denise asked that the policy requirements for Drug-Free Workplace, Drug-Free Schools and Gun-Free Schools be included in the SDFSC language.

Wade asked that the linkage of educational success and the SDFSC program be included. Add it to findings – is this part of the learning and teaching piece or provision of a safe environment and prevention be linked or attached as part of a consolidated plan.

Debbie said that it currently is part of the consolidated plans for some districts, but there is little language in the state plans related to SDFSC. Perhaps it may be included in the Title 14 plans. Maybe some application requirements in the Title 14 or consolidated plan. They hoped that people would describe comprehensively what they are doing – additional information could be added. Mary said that it might work to add language in Title I and VI that talks about learning environment and student and achievement. Debbie said that it may appear as the language is developed. Cathy said that Title IV has always been viewed as an add on. Gus shared that he has viewed several school improvement plans and found the linkage between SDFSC and educational outcomes for young people. And that the beginning is to get it in writing, in the plan; then work to operationalize it. Debbie agreed that it will take some time and effort to get people thinking in a different way.

Cathy asked about the practicality/details—how does ED work that? Ed.'s process position is that a bill must be cleared by OMB and ONDCP and cannot be released or made public until those clearances are obtained. ED tries to talk with people informally and provide hints, in a major way, in the meantime. ED must live within these constraints. Decisions being made now are about how much should be said in statute and how much should be in regulation. For example, if several options would be available, those would more likely be put in regulation than in statute. I.e., “a consolidated state plan will have information as the secretary deems necessary” vs. more explicit language. ED tries to have a sense of the regulatory environment. For example, ED argued for more explicitness in the last consolidated plan but they didn't get in there.

Spencer asked about school-wides and Title IV funds being used. Does that mean that the Principles of Effectiveness rules null and void? Debbie said that their test in this area is probably more rigorous than in other areas. Part of the school wide plan would have to contain elements of a SDFSC plan, if schools choose to include Title IV dollars. Debbie is planning to work with the Title I folks in their reauthorization language to include Title IV guidance in school wide programs. They will be working on it.

Discretionary grants: Bill passed out current fact sheets regarding the discretionary grants. The middle school application is at OMB for review. It will probably be the end of February and will be available on the USDE SDFSC web site. The web site will be quicker. The timeline for the grants will be at least 45 day turnaround.

The large interagency grant is still in the process of figuring out whose processes will be used in the application development and selection criteria. Within the next 2 weeks there will be information in the Fed. Register regarding the early application information. Funds could be around 100 million dollars, including community mental health. The application process may have more time attached because there are more agencies that the locals will have to collaborate with and this will be more time consuming.

Mary shared that California has tried to have their applications on line, but they are not able to complete it on line and send it back. Denise shared that Washington state has their application on line, and to contact her office and she will put you in touch with the person in her agency who is in the know.

Susie asked about the Mental Health portion of the Safe Schools /Healthy Students Initiative. Debbie shared that they would like the services to be as seamless as possible for the LEA with regard to applications and documentation requirements.

Cathy asked if consortium applications would be accepted for the Middle School Coordinator grant. These consortium would serve more than one school district or building, perhaps looking at a county model. Debbie said that the Secretary has the authority to approve applications out of order if there is not geographic equity. Educational service districts would be allowed to apply on behalf of the county school districts within their boundaries. The question was asked regarding SEA support of these grantees. Debbie said that there is not funding available or earmarked for states to provide TA to these grantees in their state. We (states) will not have any monitoring function. They will have interim monitoring report. USDE did not receive any additional funding to hire staff to work on these grants. They will manage these grants with their existing 30 staff. The personnel costs as well as funding to the LEA to provide training activities. Not a lot of money for direct services. These will be 3 year grants – grantees will have to provide to USDE information that indicates that they are making progress toward their measurable goals and objectives to determine whether or not they will continue to receive funding. It is their goal in reauthorization is to have this integrated into the overall state plan. Cathy asked about rural schools and equity – they have the authority to reach down and fund schools that may not have scored very high, in order to make sure that rural and schools with diverse populations also receive funds.

The application will be available on line. SEA's can get the application off of the internet, have it copied at the local level and mail it to your LEA's. USDE will also be in need of a large number of readers for the middle school coordinator grants. Give them a call if you are interested.

Recognition Committee – Debbie is not involved with this program, but will talk with Charlotte and Lynn. Some of the states were not notified when the site visit occurred and the site visit did not follow the guidelines and the criteria that was established in the application. Schools were not notified when they were visited or that they were recognized. The 3 or 4 schools from this year will be included in the recognition ceremony for this year.

Westat – Looking at one comprehensive report for congress. The incident and prevalence data is part of the problem. They are having major problems from LEA's data. Spencer asked about the data collected and see if there is a way to have it put together in a useful way for states to use. Whomever is going to be the contractor in the future, it would be good if more of the SEA coordinators are involved in the development of a collection system. The consolidated reporting form is now at the SEA. Debbie was very clear in the discussion that SDFSC would not change their reporting for the rest of this authorization. At the front-end of the reauthorization, we can start fresh from a consolidated perspective. Denise asked if they were looking to include Special Ed. Spencer shared that the application was confusing and included the Gov.'s portion. Debbie will send us some further information regarding the upcoming reporting. Spencer shared that we hope that the information is useful to the SEA's and the Feds. The same people who should be writing the non-regulatory guidance are the same people that need to be writing reports. What needs to be happening is that the development of the reporting piece be developed at the same time – this may not happen. Denise shared that there is a committee among the National Network that has this as a priority and is willing to help develop some of the reporting requirements.

Cathy asked that Westat send one set of year-end reports to Cathy Olson.

Lawrence asked about the POE and the outcomes and what we are required to report. USDE was unable to figure out any way to have states report on their progress toward identified outcomes. The LEA survey is looking at that issue. The reporting form will remain the same until reauthorization.

Janelle asked for a copy of the LEA survey and also the list of schools in each state. Debbie said they guaranteed that those that participate will be anonymous.

Janelle also said that there is a problem collecting data using surveys. Right now it is a statutory requirement to collect data. She emphasized that we may have an unattainable expectation by congress. We want to support SDFSC federal staff, but for legislators to have information, they ask USDE, they go to WESTAT, they go to the SEA/Gov. Seems really disconnected.

Spencer asked about the GPRA requirements and whether USDE will be held to those. Debbie said it is a giant challenge. These are basically student behavior outcomes. Because of the flexible nature of the program, it is difficult to say to the LEA, since they have based their program on a targeted behavior, it is difficult to hold them accountable to the indicators. There is another approach that they could take, by telling SEA's what they are responsible for. It would be nice if they were interlocking, but it would be difficult.

New Coordinator Training – We would like to offer our services to the department to assist them in training of new coordinators throughout the nation. When a new coordinator takes the job, it is questionable what training or knowledge they bring to the program. Members of the national network in addition to their Federal project officer would visit and share forms and how the system works, what data to collect, etc.

Technical Assistance Team – When teams from the USDE go out to do an integrated review, that representatives from other states be included as part of the team. We would be welcome to take on that role to assist with the review.

Debbie thought these were both good ideas. They are making some modifications to the review process this summer – looking at how to include SEA's in the review as part of the team. It probably won't happen until summer. Some of the issues include how to integrate that person in to the team. Also interested in finding consultants and researchers be included in the team. Spencer shared that there are advantages to having a person from a state that has already been reviewed and perhaps one from a state that might be having an upcoming review.

Thanks to Debbie for attending today's meeting.

Spencer recommended that we (network) send a letter to Bill regarding the meeting and the information that was shared at the meeting. Secretary Reilly should receive a cc of the letter. Information in the letter should include:

- New coordinator training
- Team review
- Westat Information – copies to Cathy O.
- Forms- help and input on development
- SEA input into establishing and aligning performance indicators at national, state and local level (reauthorization) Follow-up – all states-all indicators? Choice? Some?
- Notification of recognition program sites to state coordinators. Site visits and
- Let Bill know that we are available to help with reauthorization
- Glad he is supporting the reauthorization of the Gov.'s portion
- Encourage the inclusion of the SDFSC program in the education reform outcomes.
- Look at the linkage with low performing schools and emphasis on SDFSC
- We had questions regarding the Consolidated Plan and the SDFSC plan – are they linked are they separate? Or any other plans?

- Perhaps USDE could provide us information regarding who to invite from the other federal agencies to share their viewpoints with regard to SDFSC reauthorization.
-

Spencer shared information on the SCASS Comprehensive Health Project. He explained that the CD contains 3,000 pages of information. The CD also connects through the CD additional information that has been developed since the CD was developed. There are classroom based assessment, rubric' for scoring portfolio's and portfolio assessment criteria. They used the 10 health related areas and looked at the national health standards and linked it with the YRBS criteria. The CD was developed by a group of practitioners and funded by CDC. We should be able too impact what happens in the classroom relative to drug and alcohol information and developing the skills that develop attitudes and behavior. Phase 2 is developing the skills and the framework for item development and linking it to the national health standard. The name of the CD is Health Help and is available to the member states. If you do not know of this, contact your comprehensive health education coordinator or HIV/AIDS coordinator to see if you are a member state. They are currently in the item development of phase 2, which would fill the gaps that were identified.

Gus shared CCSSO developed a set of outcome indicators for health. It is titled "Incorporating Health Related Indicators in Education Accountability Systems". This is a spin-off of the SCASS project.

Wade talked about the fact that we are taking on staff work as a network and that we don't have a presence here in Washington at this critical time. Does anyone know of an agency or other program that has staff that may be available to do some of the work that is needed here in Washington related to reauthorization or for the greater good. We need to have a capacity larger than what is around the table. Gus recommended that a contact be made to AAHE, which is part of the American Alliance for Health Education. Gus will talk with Becky, the executive director to see if they have any staff to help with some of this work. There was discussion

June meeting agenda items:

Reauthorization
Federal Grant Update
Other Federal Agency Presentations
Greg Williamson, update
Grant Review Issues
CADCA/NASASDAD
Bill/Debbie update
Discussion of membership and dues.
