



April 4

Dear Jose:

I thought you would be interested in the enclosed concept paper.

It was sent to Bill Modzeleski of the Department of Education regarding the recently enacted Safe Schools Act. I also sent it to Rev. Johnson-Cooke.

I hope you find this material helpful. Best regards.

Sincerely,

Model School Security-Law Enforcement Program on School Crime and Violence

Concept Paper Submitted Jointly by:

Police Executive Research Forum

National Alliance for Safe Schools*

March 1994

*** Research, training, and technical assistance arm of the
National Association of School Security and Law Enforcement
Officers**

Background

The incidence of violence in and around our neighborhood schools continues to grow in raw numbers that are transformed sadly into escalating annual rates. Unquestionably, freely available firearms and other weapons contribute to and compound problems posed by gangs, drugs, and interpersonal conflicts. Popular remedies range from costly investments in physical security to the ever popular cry for "more police!". However, lasting and thus truly effective solutions to school violence and other forms of serious crime remain elusive.

Underlying Philosophy

The Safe Schools Act initiative has passed the Congress as part of the comprehensive Goals 2000 legislative package. Modest but reasonable amounts of funding can now be made available to develop and demonstrate the effectiveness of models of crime prevention, reduction and control. Furthermore, it appears that the Department of Education will require, as part of the grant application process, that applicants document the nature and extent of crime problems facing the school or broader school district. This anticipated information gathering requirement poses a critical problem for all those who will collect and use the information for remedial purposes.

Very few school districts now are able to validate--even in the most general quantitative terms--how much or even what is going wrong within schools. This state of affairs can be traced to several reasons. Most important, school districts do not define or classify criminal and disciplinary behavior even in remotely uniform terms. Theft is often mixed with burglary and vandalism; assaults and battery are often mixed with fights. Also, few school districts have been exposed to the simple operations through which behavioral data can be used to help design and monitor behavior-improvement programs.

Cost-Effective Solutions

The above points considered, the Department of Education now has a challenging opportunity. At the outset of this major initiative, it is possible to provide essential guidance to schools through the vehicle of a modest national pilot project. Its purpose would be to provide school districts with the capability to assess the quality and completeness of existing school board policies, modify and revise them in keeping with generally accepted national standards, and provide an array of stand-alone resources and technical assistance media to facilitate this process.

The project would also address prominent Department of Education themes, such as: (1) data collection coupled with geographically based crime analysis (PERF is now completing several projects on

gang-related drug market analysis); and (2) vital school safety links to community/team and problem-oriented policing.

Specific Approach

The key factor in the solution-building process is to develop a framework that defines the problem(s) in way(s) that lend themselves to a framework of cooperation. Here, the task is to involve school administrators, school security, and police officials in the exercise of defining, at the grassroots, the full dimensions of the school crime and violence problem. As the core of this relationship, school security and police officials must work together more closely, first to identify problems of common concern early enough to facilitate prevention and early intervention.

This foundation can be used to build the next step of broader cooperation among prosecutors, social service agencies and other community support institutions.

The Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) proposes to collaborate with the National Alliance for Safe Schools. Working under the guidance and policy direction of the Department of Education, the proposed collaboration would:

- o Develop self-assessment instruments that schools can implement to gauge the nature and extent of their crime and violence problems. Instruments would focus both on underlying crime problems and reporting procedures to ensure that more accurate tallies would be kept--and assign relative weights to problems with different levels of severity. Simply put, we do not have a uniform process for gauging the nature and extent of the problem--an unfortunate situation that definitely obstructs the search for solutions.
- o Effective prevention and early containment of school crime problems begin with model protocols. These protocols direct and guide interactions between local agency officials and operational personnel who need to work together. At the core are school officials and school security personnel, with local police not far away. We need to place a premium on the steps responsible for early problem identification, so that the process leads to prevention and intervention programs tailored to the problem.

- o Drawn from selected jurisdictions around the country, working programs should be analyzed for the factors contributing to success. All of this information can, within a fairly short time frame, be prepared in a variety of low-cost media for nationwide adoption. The national membership bases of PERF and NASSLEO are designed to facilitate the process of disseminating standards and data on model programs. Information would include, at a minimum, model policies and procedures, crime prevention and early intervention in schools, and strategies for effecting closer (and ongoing) police-school security relationships.
- o In a follow-up phase, the model protocols, policies, procedures, and resource materials could be communicated through regional (or local) training conferences. Audiences could include policymaking executives and, most important, the operational personnel who have to make the innovations work on a day-to-day basis.

U.S. Department of Education



Michele Cavataio

Office of the Deputy Secretary

400 Maryland Ave., SW • Washington, D.C. • 20202-0500



(202)401-1000



(202)401-3093

INET michele_cavataio@ed.gov

Date:

1/4

Total # of pages including cover sheet:

4

To:

José

Recipient Fax:

456 7028

Memo:

SAFE SCHOOLS:

Some \$ has gone out but not all.

To: CHARISTA

Re: JOSE'

SAFE SCHOOL CITIES
IF RAIMON THINKS WE

SHOULD DO SOMETHING
W/ THEM.

MEMORANDUM

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202-_____

TO: Sherlyn Tayler, Director
Grants Division
Grants and Contracts Service

FROM: Thomas W. Paysant
Assistant Secretary
Elementary and Secondary Education

SUBJECT: Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program/Safe School Program,
Approved Slate for FY 1995 Grants,
Schedule No. 84.277A, CAN E004624

The purpose of this memorandum is to transmit an approved slate for new grants for fiscal year 1995 under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Title VII, Safe Schools Act of 1994.

Fiscal year 1995 funds for the Safe Schools Grants Program have been appropriated in the amount of \$18,000,000. All of this amount is available for new awards, pending final negotiations by the Grants and Contracts Service. The awards on this slate total \$18,000,000. If additional funds become available as a result of negotiations, additional projects may be funded. Please advise us of any funds realized as a result of negotiations.

If there are any questions, contact John Mathews, Discretionary Programs Branch, on 260-2657.

Attachments

**Schedule No. 84.277A
FY 1995 Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program
Safe Schools Grants Program**

<u>Applicant Name/Location</u>	<u>PR Number</u>	<u>Amount Requested</u>	<u>Amount Recommended</u>
Savannah-Chatham County P.S. Savannah GA	S277A50007	\$ 431,238	\$ 400,911
Tucson Unified SD Tucson AZ	S277A50018	\$ 902,985	\$ 902,985
Santa Ana Unified SD Santa Ana CA	S277A50021	\$1,315,578	\$1,135,578
Starkville School District Starkville MS	S277A50029	\$ 494,716	\$ 471,919
Norfolk Public Schools Norfolk VA	S277A50030	\$ 559,769	\$ 508,238
Wayne Cty Reg'l Ed. Serv. Ctr Wayne MI	S277A50041	\$1,710,271	\$1,602,444
Houston Independent SD Houston TX	S277A50050	\$1,000,000	\$ 903,346
New York CSD#18 New York NY	S277A50066	\$1,000,000	\$ 845,625
Prince William Cty PS Manassas VA	S277A50079	\$ 669,102	\$ 550,000
Butte Cty Office of Education Oroville CA	S277A50107	\$ 567,589	\$ 456,850
Boston Public Schools Boston MA	S277A50123	\$ 1,164,878	\$1,000,000
Educational Serv. District 123 Pasco WA	S277A50130	\$ 419,931	\$ 419,589
Sweetwater Union HSD Chula Vista CA	S277A50169	\$ 593,652	\$ 570,616
Oregon School District #1 Portland OR	S277A50177	\$1,217,547	\$1,196,339
Chicago Public Schools Chicago IL	S277A50187	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000

Stockton Unified SD Stockton CA	8277A50240	\$ 649,320	\$ 638,023
Tulsa County ISD #1 Tulsa OK	8277A50251	\$1,713,503	\$ 885,092
San Diego Unified SD San Diego CA	8277A50254	\$2,357,595	\$1,595,216
St. Louis Public Schools St. Louis MO	8277A50257	\$ 963,675	\$ 917,209
Totals		\$19,681,349	\$18,000,000

E X E C U T I V E O F F I C E O F T H E P R E S I D E N T

13-Apr-1994 01:47pm

TO: Jose Cerda, III
FROM: Bruce N. Reed
 Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: fyi..safe schools

go for it. i'll tell galston to lay off.

E X E C U T I V E O F F I C E O F T H E P R E S I D E N T

13-Apr-1994 01:31pm

TO: William A. Galston

FROM: Carol H. Rasco
 Economic and Domestic Policy

CC: Patrick W. Lester
CC: Bruce N. Reed

SUBJECT: Safe Schools

The President in my briefing time with him today initiated a conversation on Safe Schools and how this is a program we can be out there talking about now that the money is passed. His questions were: When will the money go out? How will it go out? What kinds of things will it be used for? What kind of monitoring/evaluation program will there be for the dollars?

He also talked about possibly doing some kind of event at one of these schools...

Anyway, I think the next step is to have Education prepare a briefing memo for him on this program that answers the questions in paragraph one and any other information Ed. wants to include. I wouldn't even breathe to them the matter of a possible event at this point.

If you agree please proceed with requesting the memo...let me know if this is the step you feel should be taken or your different thoughts. Thanks.

Safe Schools Act of 1994

Signed into law on March 31, 1994 as part of the Goals 2000 legislative package, the Safe Schools Act authorizes the Secretary of Education to make competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) to enable them to carry out projects and activities designed to achieve Goal Six of the National Education Goals by helping to ensure that all schools are safe and free of violence.

Under the programs, grants may be made for a period of up to two years and may not exceed \$3,000,000. Grants may be used to support a variety of activities, including identifying and assessing school violence and discipline problems, conducting school safety reviews, planning for comprehensive and long-term violence prevention strategies, training of school personnel, involving parents in efforts to prevent school violence, developing and implementing violence prevention activities and materials, coordinating violence prevention efforts with related efforts in the community, counseling for victims and witnesses of school crime and violence, supporting safe zones of passage to school, acquiring metal detectors, or hiring security personnel. (Not more than 5% of grant funds may be used for safe passage programs, acquiring metal detectors, and hiring security personnel.)

To receive a grant, LEAs must demonstrate that they serve an area in which there is a high rate of:

- homicides committed by youth;
- referrals of youth to juvenile court;
- youth under court supervision;
- expulsions and suspensions of students from school;
- referrals of youth for disciplinary reasons to alternative schools;
- victimization of youth by violence, crime, or other forms of abuse; and
- serious crime, violence, and discipline problems, as indicated by other appropriate data.

Priority will be given to LEAs that submit applications that assure a strong local commitment to the activities to be funded by a Safe Schools Act grant.

The Act also authorizes the Secretary to conduct a variety of national activities, including research, program development and evaluation, data collection, and training and technical assistance. The statute also requires that the Secretary designate the District of Columbia as a national model city and provide funding to a local educational agency serving the District of Columbia to carry out a comprehensive program to address school and youth violence.

The Congress appropriated \$20 million for the program in Fiscal Year 1994. Approximately \$18 million will be devoted to grants to LEAs. Applications for grants under the program

are not yet available. For additional information about the Safe Schools Act, or to request an application package, please contact the Drug Planning and Outreach Staff by calling (202) 260-3054 or writing to:

Drug Planning and Outreach Staff
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
US Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
The Portals, Room 4011 B
Washington, DC 20202-6123



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM

To: Jose Sereda

From: Anita Estell

Date: April 2, 1993

For your information, enclosed are materials on our Safe Schools initiative. We are in the process of revising Safe Schools legislation, although we have not considered a final version for submission to OMB. Let's discuss it soon. Please share this information with Rana Sampson.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to contact me.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

March 26, 1993

NOTE TO JOSE CERDA:

Anita Estell of the Office of the Secretary asked me to transmit the attached information regarding the Safe Schools program to you. It is our intention to incorporate this program into the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act when it is reauthorized. If you have any additional questions regarding school violence issues or desire any additional information please feel free to contact either Anita or myself. I can be reached at 401-3030.

Bill Modzeleski, Director
Drug Planning and Outreach Staff

Post-It™ brand fax transmittal memo 7671		# of pages > 3
To Jose Cerdá	From Bill Modzeleski	
Co.	Co.	
Dept. 456-2568	Phone # 401-3030	
Fax # 456-7739	Fax #	

School Improvement Programs

Safe schools initiative (Proposed legislation)

1994 Authorization: \$75,000,000

Budget Authority (Investment):

<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>Increase or Decrease</u>
---	\$75,000,000	+\$75,000,000

PURPOSE AND METHOD OF OPERATION

The Safe Schools program is an investment initiative in the President's 1994 budget designed to address the unacceptable incidence of violence in our Nation's schools. Under proposed legislation, competitive grants would be awarded to local educational agencies with serious school crime, violence, and discipline problems for projects designed to combat those problems and thereby enhance school safety and promote better access to learning.

To be eligible for a Safe Schools grant, a school district would need to:

- (1) have a significant number or concentration of Chapter 1-eligible children;
- (2) serve an area in which there is a high rate of homicides among youth, referrals of youth to juvenile court, youth under the supervision of the courts, expulsions and suspensions of students from schools, referrals of youth (for disciplinary reasons) to alternative schools, or victimization of youth by violence, crime, or other forms of abuse; and (3) have serious school crime, violence, and discipline problems, as indicated by other appropriate data. Grants would be for up to two years in duration and up to \$3 million per year.

School districts would have the flexibility to design their own programs, which could include planning and implementation of comprehensive, community-wide strategies, developing and implementing violence prevention activities such as conflict resolution and peer mediation, and (subject to a cap of 25 percent of the grant) the installation of metal detectors and hiring of security guards to keep dangerous weapons out of schools. LEAs that receive funds under Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the Administration's school reform legislation, would be required to coordinate the assistance they receive under that Act with the funds they receive under the Safe Schools program.

The Secretary would be authorized to reserve up to 5 percent of the total appropriation for national leadership activities such as research, program evaluation, data collection, public awareness activities, training and technical assistance, and cooperative efforts with other Federal agencies. The remaining funds would be used for grants to LEAs.

School Improvement Programs

Safe schools initiative

1994 BUDGET PROPOSAL

The Department's 1994 budget request includes an investment of \$75,000,000 for the President's Safe Schools Initiative. The entire \$75 million request for this initiative is contingent upon enactment of a deficit reduction program.

This program is designed to help local school systems achieve the National Education Goal that by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning. While the Federal Government -- through the Department of Education -- already supports substantial efforts toward attainment of this goal through the drug prevention and education programs authorized by the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, there currently is no program of targeted Federal assistance to local school districts to address the crisis of violence in our Nation's schools. Federal leadership in this area is desperately needed.

Violence in our Nation's schools is indeed reaching epidemic proportions. The Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that approximately 3 million thefts and violent crimes occur on or near school campuses every year. This equates to nearly 16,000 incidents per school day, or an incident every six seconds. In a 1991 survey sponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services, 16 percent of high school seniors reported being threatened with a weapon at school and 7 percent reported being injured with a weapon. In another 1991 survey, conducted by the Department of Education, 8 percent of public school teachers reported being physically threatened, while 2 percent reported being physically attacked during the previous year. Data from the Centers for Disease Control also indicate that approximately one of every five high school students now carries a firearm, knife, or club on a regular basis. Clearly, we can do better to stem this tide of violence and once again make our schools safe and conducive to learning for all children.

IMPACT DATA

	1994 Investment Request
Number of grants	50
Field reader costs	\$70,000

Honorable Thomas S. Foley
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Enclosed for the consideration of the Congress is a bill, entitled the Safe Schools Act of 1993, to implement the Safe Schools Initiative proposed by President Clinton in his fiscal year 1994 budget. Also enclosed is a section-by-section analysis summarizing the contents of the bill. An identical letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

The bill is designed to help local school systems achieve Goal Six of the National Education Goals, which provides that by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning. Violence in our Nation's schools is reaching epidemic proportions. The Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that approximately 3 million thefts and violent crimes occur on or near school campuses every year. This equates to nearly 16,000 incidents per school day, or an incident every six seconds. In a 1991 survey sponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services, 16 percent of high school seniors reported being threatened with a weapon at school and 7 percent reported being injured with a weapon. In a 1991 survey conducted by my own Department, 8 percent of public school teachers reported being physically threatened and 2 percent reported being physically attacked during the previous year. Youth risk behavior data from the Centers for Disease Control also indicate that approximately one of every five high school students now carries a firearm, knife, or club on a regular basis.

While the Federal Government -- through the Department of Education -- already supports substantial efforts toward attainment of Goal Six through the drug prevention and education programs authorized by the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, there currently is no program of targeted Federal assistance to local school districts to address the unacceptable and increasing incidence of violence in our Nation's schools. The proposed Act would respond to this crisis by: (1) establishing a program of competitive grants to local educational agencies with serious school crime, violence, and discipline problems for projects designed to combat those problems and thereby enhance school safety and promote better access to learning, and (2) authorizing the Secretary of Education to conduct national leadership activities such as research, program development and evaluation, data collection, public awareness activities, and training and technical assistance.

To be eligible for a grant, a local educational agency (LEA) would need to be receiving assistance -- or meet the eligibility criteria -- under section 1006 of the Elementary and Secondary Education of 1985 (Chapter 1 concentration

grants) and serve an area in which there is a high rate of school crime, violence, and discipline problems. Grants would be for up to two years in duration and up to \$3 million per year. However, in order for a grantee to receive funds under the Act for a second year, a grantee would need to develop a comprehensive, long-term, community-wide plan for combatting and preventing school safety, violence, and discipline problems. School districts would have the flexibility to design their own programs, which could include planning and implementation of comprehensive, community-wide strategies, developing and implementing violence prevention activities such as conflict resolution and peer mediation, and the installation of metal detectors and hiring of security guards to help keep dangerous weapons out of schools. To ensure that the emphasis of the program is on prevention and not just intervention, no more than 25 percent of a grant could be expended on metal detectors and security personnel. LEAs that receive funds under Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the Administration's school reform legislation, would be required to coordinate the assistance they receive under that Act with the funds they receive under the Safe Schools Act.

The bill would authorize \$75 million for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995 through 1998. The Secretary would be allowed to reserve up to 5 percent of each year's appropriation for National leadership activities; the remaining funds would be used for grants to LEAs.

As you know, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which authorizes the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, expires at the end of 1993. While the Safe Schools Act is proposed for a five-year authorization, it is our intention that the Safe Schools Act be incorporated with the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act in reauthorization to create a more coordinated and comprehensive Federal effort in support of National Education Goal Number Six. I will be sharing my specific proposals regarding reauthorization with you later this spring.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that Congress act favorably and expeditiously on the enclosed proposal. Better efforts are desperately needed to stem the tide of violence in our Nation's schools and once again make them safe and conducive to learning for all children.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress, and that its enactment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

Richard W. Riley

Enclosures

DRAFT

A BILL

To help local school systems achieve Goal Six of the National Education Goals, which provides that by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning, by ensuring that all schools are safe and free of violence.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that this Act may be cited as the "Safe Schools Act of 1993".

SAFE SCHOOLS PROGRAM AUTHORIZED

SEC. 2. (a) With funds appropriated under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall make competitive grants to eligible local educational agencies to carry out projects designed to achieve Goal Six of the National Education Goals by helping to ensure that all schools are safe and free of violence.

(b)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$75,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995 and each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

(2) The Secretary is authorized each fiscal year to reserve no more than five percent of the amount appropriated under subsection (b)(1) to carry out national leadership activities described in section 6.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

SEC. 3. (a) To be eligible to receive a grant under this Act, a local educational agency shall demonstrate in its application under section 4(a) that it--

(1) receives assistance under section 1006 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (hereinafter referred to as the "ESEA") or meets the criteria of clauses (i) and (ii) of section 1006(a)(1)(A);

(2) serves an area in which there is a high rate of--

(A) homicides among persons between the ages 5 to 18, inclusive;

(B) referrals of youth to juvenile court;

(C) youth under the supervision of the courts;

(D) expulsions and suspensions of students from school;

(E) referrals of youth, for disciplinary reasons, to alternative schools; or

(F) victimization of youth by violence, crime, or other forms of abuse; and

(3) has serious school crime, violence, and discipline problems, as indicated by other appropriate data.

(b) For the purpose of this Act--

(1) "the term local educational agency" has the same meaning given in section 1471(12) of the ESEA;

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

APPLICATIONS AND PLANS

SEC. 4. (a) In order to receive a grant under this Act, an eligible local educational agency shall submit to the Secretary an application that includes--

(1) an assessment of the current violence, safety, and crime problems in the community served by the applicant and in the schools to be served by the grant;

(2) an assurance that the applicant has written policies regarding school safety, student discipline, and the appropriate handling of violent or disruptive acts and consistently enforces those policies;

(3) a description of the schools and communities to be served by the grant, and the activities and projects to be carried out with grant funds;

(4) if the local educational agency receives funds under Goals 2000: Educate America Act, an explanation of how activities assisted under this Act will be coordinated with and support its systemic education improvement plan prepared under that Act;

(5) the applicant's plan to establish school-level advisory committees, which include faculty, parents, staff, and students, for each school to be served by the grant and a description of how each committee will assist in assessing that

school's violence, safety, and discipline problems as well as in designing appropriate programs, policies, and practices to combat those problems;

(6) the applicant's plan for collecting baseline and future data, by individual schools, to measure its progress in achieving the purpose of this Act;

(7) procedures for monitoring, throughout the project, the violence and safety problems in the schools served by the grant;

(8) an assurance that grant funds under this Act will be used to supplement and not to supplant State and local funds that would, in the absence of funds under this Act, be made available by the applicant for the purposes of the grant;

(9) an assurance that the applicant will cooperate with, and provide assistance to, the Secretary in gathering statistics and other data the Secretary determines are necessary to determine the effectiveness of projects and activities under this Act or the extent of school violence, safety, and discipline problems throughout the Nation; and

(10) such other information as the Secretary may require.

(b) In order to receive funds under this Act for the second year of a project, a grantee shall submit to the Secretary a comprehensive, long-term, community-wide plan for combating and preventing school safety, violence, and discipline problems. Such plan must contain--

(1) a description of how the grantee will coordinate its school crime and violence prevention efforts with education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social service, and other appropriate agencies and organizations serving the community; and

(2) if the grantee receives funds under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, an explanation of how the grantee's comprehensive plan under this subsection is consistent with and supports its systemic education improvement plan prepared under that Act.

GRANTS AND USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. (a) Grants under this Act may not exceed--

- (1) two years in duration; and
- (2) \$3 million for each year.

(b)(1) A local educational agency may use funds awarded under section 2(a) for one or more of the following activities--

(A) identifying and assessing school violence, safety, and discipline problems, including coordinating needs assessment activities with education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social service, and other appropriate agencies and organizations;

(B) conducting school safety or violence prevention reviews of programs, policies, practices, and facilities to determine what changes are needed to reduce or prevent violence and promote safety and discipline;

(C) planning for comprehensive, long-term, community-wide strategies for combating and preventing school

violence and discipline problems through the involvement and coordination of education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social service, and other appropriate agencies and organizations;

(D) community education programs involving parents, businesses, local government, the media, and other appropriate entities about the local educational agency's plan to reduce and prevent school violence, safety, and discipline problems and the need for community support;

(E) coordination of school-based activities designed to reduce or prevent school violence, safety, and discipline problems with related efforts of education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social service, and other appropriate agencies and organizations;

(F) developing and implementing violence prevention activities, including--

(i) conflict resolution and social skills development for students, teachers, aides, other school personnel, and parents;

(ii) disciplinary alternatives to expulsion and suspension of students who exhibit violent or anti-social behavior;

(iii) student-led activities such as peer mediation, peer counseling, and student courts; or

(iv) alternative after-school programs that provide "safe havens" for students, which may include cultural, recreational, and educational and instructional activities;

(G) educating students and parents about the dangers of guns and other weapons and the consequences of their misuse;

(H) developing and implementing innovative curricula to prevent violence in schools and training staff how to stop disruptive or violent behavior if it occurs;

(I) supporting "safe zones of passage" for students between home and school through such measures as Drug- and Weapon-Free School Zones, enhanced law enforcement, and neighborhood patrols;

(J) counseling programs for victims and witnesses of school violence and crime;

(K) minor remodeling to promote security and reduce the risk of violence, such as removing lockers, installing better lights, and upgrading locks;

(L) acquiring and installing metal detectors and hiring security personnel;

(M) evaluating its project under this Act;

(N) the cost of administering its project under this Act; and

(O) other activities that meet the purposes of this Act.

(2) A local educational agency may use no more than--

(A) a total of 25 percent of its grant for activities described in paragraphs (1)(K) and (1)(L); and

(B) 5 percent of its grant for activities described in paragraph (1)(N).

(3) A local educational agency may not use funds under this Act for construction.

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

SEC. 6. To carry out the purpose of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to use funds reserved under section 2(b)(2) to conduct national leadership activities such as research, program development and evaluation, data collection, public awareness activities, training and technical assistance, and peer review of applications under this Act. The Secretary may carry out such activities directly, through interagency agreements, or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 7. This Act shall take effect upon enactment.

DRAFT

SAFE SCHOOLS ACT OF 1993

Section-by-Section Analysis

Section 2. Section 2(a) of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Education ("the Secretary") to make competitive grants to eligible local educational agencies (LEAs) to carry out projects designed to achieve Goal Six of the National Education Goals by helping to ensure that schools are safe and free of violence. (Goal Six states that by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.) Section 2(b) of the bill would authorize to be appropriated \$75 million for fiscal year 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995 and the three succeeding fiscal years, to carry out the Act. Section 2(b) would also authorize the Secretary to reserve no more than five percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year to carry out National leadership activities described in section 6.

Section 3. Section 3 of the bill describes those LEAs that would be eligible to receive a grant under the Act. Such LEAs must demonstrate in their application that they: (1) receive assistance under section 1006 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (concentration grants) or satisfy the eligibility criteria for such assistance in section 1006(a)(1)(A); (2) serve an area in which there is a high rate of homicides among persons between the ages 5 to 18 (inclusive), referrals of youth to juvenile court, youth under the supervision of the courts, expulsions and suspensions of students from school, referrals of youth (for disciplinary reasons) to alternative schools, or victimization of youth by violence, crime, or other forms of abuse; and (3) have serious school crime, violence, and discipline problems, as indicated by other appropriate data.

Section 4. Section 4(a) of the bill would require eligible LEAs that desire to receive a grant to submit to the Secretary an application that includes: (1) an assessment of the current school-related violence, safety, and crime problems in the community served by the applicant and in the schools to be served by the grant; (2) an assurance that the applicant has written policies regarding school safety, student discipline, and the appropriate handling of violent or disruptive acts and consistently enforces those policies; (3) a description of the schools and communities to be served by the grant as well as the activities and projects to be carried out with grant funds; (4) if the LEA receives funds under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, an explanation of how activities assisted under the Safe Schools Act of 1993 are coordinated with and support the LEA's improvement plan prepared under the Educate America Act; (5) the applicant's plan to establish school-level advisory committees, including faculty, parents, staff, and students, for each school

to be served by the grant and a description of how each committee will assist in assessing that school's violence, safety, and discipline problems as well as in designing appropriate programs, policies, and practices to combat these problems; (6) the applicant's plan for collecting baseline and future data, by individual schools, to measure its progress in achieving the purpose of this Act; (7) procedures for monitoring, throughout the project, the violence and safety problems in the schools served by the grant; (8) an assurance that grant funds will be used to supplement and not to supplant State and local funds that would, in the absence of funds under the Act, be made available by the applicant for the purposes of the grant; (9) an assurance that the applicant will cooperate with, and provide assistance to, the Secretary in gathering statistics and other data the Secretary determines are necessary to determine the effectiveness of projects and activities under this Act or the extent of school violence, safety, and discipline problems throughout the Nation; and (10) other information the Secretary may require.

Section 4(b) of the bill would require that in order for a grantee to receive funds under the Act for a second year, a grantee must submit to the Secretary a comprehensive, long-term, community-wide plan for combating and preventing school safety, violence, and discipline problems. The plan must contain a description of how the grantee will coordinate its efforts with education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social service, and other appropriate agencies and organizations serving the community and, if the grantee receives funds under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the plan must also explain how the grantee's comprehensive plan under this Act is consistent with and supports its systemic education improvement plan prepared under that Act.

Section 5. Section 5(a) of the bill would limit grants under this Act to two years in duration and to no more than \$3 million for each year. Section 5(b) of the bill would lists the purposes for which LEAs could use their grant funds. These purposes include: identifying and assessing school violence, safety, and discipline problems (including coordinating needs assessment activities with education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social service, and other appropriate agencies and organizations); conducting school safety or violence prevention reviews of programs, policies, practices, and facilities to determine what changes are needed to reduce or prevent violence and promote safety and discipline; planning for comprehensive, long-term, community-wide strategies for combating and preventing school violence and discipline problems through the involvement and cooperation of education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social service, and other appropriate agencies and organizations; community education programs involving parents, businesses, local government, the media, and other appropriate entities about the LEA's plan to reduce and prevent school violence, safety, and

discipline problems and the need for community support; coordination of school-based activities designed to reduce or prevent school violence, safety, and discipline problems with related efforts of education, law-enforcement, judicial, health, social service, and other appropriate agencies and organizations; developing and implementing violence prevention activities; educating students and parents about the dangers of guns and other weapons as well as the consequences of their misuse; developing and implementing innovative curricula to prevent violence in schools and training staff how to stop disruptive or violent behavior if it occurs; supporting "safe zones of passage" for students between home and school through such measures as Drug-and Weapon-Free School Zones, enhanced law enforcement, and neighborhood patrols; counseling programs for victims and witnesses of school violence and crime; minor remodeling to promote security and reduce the risk of violence, such as removing lockers, installing better lights, and upgrading locks; acquiring and installing metal detectors and hiring security personnel; project evaluation and administration; and other activities that meet the purpose of the Act. An LEA could not use more than a total of 25 percent of its grant for minor remodeling and to acquire and install metal detectors and hire security personnel or more than 5 percent of its grant for administrative costs. Further, no grant funds could be used for construction.

Section 6. Section 6 of the Act would authorize the Secretary to use funds reserved under section 2(b)(2) to carry out the purpose of the Act by supporting national leadership activities such as research, program development and evaluation, data collection, public awareness activities, training and technical assistance, and peer review of applications under this Act. The Secretary would be authorized to carry out such activities directly, through interagency agreements, or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements.

Section 7. Section 7 of the Act provides that the bill would be effective on enactment.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE MADELEINE M. KUNIN
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION AND CIVIL RIGHTS
MARCH 31, 1993

MR. CHAIRMAN, THANK YOU AND THE MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION AND CIVIL RIGHTS FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY BEFORE YOU ABOUT REAUTHORIZATION OF THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT. PRESIDENT CLINTON AND SECRETARY RILEY SHARE YOUR COMMITMENT TO CREATING A HEALTHY AND SAFE ENVIRONMENT FOR OUR CHILDREN THAT WILL ENABLE THEM TO LEARN WITHOUT FEAR.

BEFORE GOING INTO THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT, LET ME TRY TO CONVEY TO YOU THE SENSE OF EXCITEMENT AND POSSIBILITY I FEEL TODAY AT THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. THE DEPARTMENT IS NOW ON THE MOVE WITH NEW INSPIRATION, DETERMINATION, AND LEADERSHIP. OUR MISSION IS CLEAR--TO PROVIDE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO ACHIEVE AN EXCELLENT EDUCATION FOR ALL THE CHILDREN IN AMERICA. FULFILLING THAT MISSION, AS WE ALL KNOW, WILL NOT BE EASY, BUT WE MUST BEGIN--AND THIS HEARING IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF THAT BEGINNING.

AS A PRELUDE TO A DISCUSSION ABOUT REAUTHORIZATION, I'D LIKE TO PRESENT SOME OF THE CONSIDERATIONS THAT HAVE SHAPED OUR THINKING.

THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT WAS PASSED IN 1986 TO SUPPORT PROGRAMS AND POLICIES DESIGNED TO DETER YOUTHS--IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, AND TO A LESSER DEGREE, POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS--FROM USING ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND OTHER DRUGS. SINCE THAT TIME, MORE THAN \$2.5 BILLION HAS BEEN DISTRIBUTED TO GOVERNORS, STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AND NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS TO SUPPORT A WIDE RANGE OF PREVENTION ACTIVITIES AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

SOME SIGNIFICANT SUCCESSES HAVE OCCURRED SINCE PASSAGE OF THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT. AMONG THEM ARE:

- O AN INCREASED PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND OTHER DRUGS.
- O AN EXPANSION OF DRUG EDUCATION AND PREVENTION PROGRAMMING TO ALMOST ALL STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES.
- O AN ENCOURAGING DECREASE IN THE USE OF MOST DRUGS BY STUDENTS.
- O INCREASED TRAINING OF TEACHERS, ADMINISTRATORS AND OTHER

FACULTY IN DRUG PREVENTION.

- O DRUG PREVENTION PROGRAMS AND POLICIES INSTITUTIONALIZED IN SCHOOLS.

BUT WE MUST DO MORE TO CREATE A SAFE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT FOR OUR CHILDREN. THE ATTAINMENT OF NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL GOAL SIX -- THAT ALL SCHOOLS WILL BE FREE OF DRUGS AND VIOLENCE BY THE YEAR 2000 AND WILL MAINTAIN DISCIPLINED ENVIRONMENTS CONDUCIVE TO LEARNING -- IS KEY TO THE SUCCESS OF ALL OF OUR EDUCATION REFORM PLANS AND PRINCIPLES. STUDENTS CANNOT LEARN, TEACHERS CANNOT TEACH, AND ADMINISTRATORS CANNOT SUCCEED IF STUDENTS ARE USING ALCOHOL OR OTHER DRUGS, AND ARE DISRUPTIVE, OR ARE THREATENED WITH VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION.

WE ARE, IN EFFECT, ENTERING A NEW PHASE OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION--ONE THAT GOES BEYOND SLOGANS AND RECOGNIZES THE

WE HAVE BEEN ACTIVELY SOLICITING THE VIEWS OF INTERESTED ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS AS WE DEVELOP OUR PROPOSAL FOR THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT. IT WILL BE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE LARGER ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION. MANY DECISIONS REMAIN ABOUT THE SHAPE AND SCOPE OF THE VARIOUS PIECES OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION. NEVERTHELESS, OUR GOAL IS TO SUBMIT THAT COMPREHENSIVE PROPOSAL TO YOU IN MID-MAY. TODAY, I WANT TO GIVE YOU A PREVIEW OF OUR CURRENT THINKING ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF DFSCA.

WE ARE ALSO AWARE OF STUDIES CONDUCTED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE. I NOTE THAT STAFF FROM THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE WILL BE TESTIFYING HERE TODAY TO SHARE THEIR THOUGHTS ABOUT MODIFICATIONS TO THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT. I LOOK FORWARD TO REVIEWING THAT TESTIMONY, AND I ASSURE YOU THAT THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS WILL BE CAREFULLY CONSIDERED DURING OUR DELIBERATIONS. OUR GOALS ARE SIMILAR--TO PROVIDE THE TAXPAYER WITH COST EFFECTIVE, WELL ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS THAT WORK.

CONNECTION BETWEEN DRUGS AND VIOLENCE AND THE IMPORTANCE OF STRENGTHENING FAMILY, THE COMMUNITY AND THE SCHOOL.

IF WE ARE TO IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS AND QUALITY OF ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG PREVENTION EFFORTS, WE MUST PLACE THEM IN THIS LARGER CONTEXT:

- O ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS THAT ATTACK THE CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG USE;
- O LINK SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND DRUG PREVENTION STRATEGIES WITH ACTIVITIES AND STRATEGIES IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY BECAUSE THAT IS WHERE BEHAVIOR PATTERNS ARE FORMED;
- O ENCOURAGE PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN PREVENTION;
- O ENCOURAGE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS THAT ARE BASED ON RESEARCH AND EFFECTIVE PRACTICES AND THAT PRODUCE POSITIVE RESULTS;
- O TARGET AREAS OF HIGHEST NEED MORE EFFECTIVELY;
- O DEVELOP NEW WAYS TO REACH YOUTH WHO DROP OUT OF SCHOOL OR WHO DON'T FOLLOW A TRADITIONAL EDUCATIONAL PATH;
- O PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW STRATEGIES THAT REDUCE THE USE OF ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO;

O ADDRESS PROBLEMS RELATED TO SCHOOL VIOLENCE.

ONE EXAMPLE OF A PROGRAM THAT IS BASED ON MANY OF THESE PRINCIPLES IS THE "SAFE HAVEN" PROGRAM. THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION HAS WORKED WITH THE DEPARTMENTS OF JUSTICE AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF "SAFE HAVENS" IN TWENTY CITIES AROUND THE COUNTRY. "SAFE HAVENS" PROVIDE YOUNG PEOPLE WITH A VARIETY OF AFTER-SCHOOL OPPORTUNITIES: EDUCATIONAL, CULTURAL, RECREATIONAL, AND HEALTH-RELATED ACTIVITIES. THESE ACTIVITIES ARE SUPERVISED BY TRAINED ADULTS AND ARE CONDUCTED IN A SAFE AND SECURE ENVIRONMENT.

THE ADMINISTRATION IS DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE PROBLEM OF SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND CRIME. I'D LIKE TO TAKE A MINUTE TO MENTION SOME STATISTICS THAT ARE VERY ALARMING.

O APPROXIMATELY 3 MILLION THEFTS AND VIOLENT CRIMES OCCUR ON OR NEAR SCHOOL CAMPUSES EVERY YEAR. THIS EQUATES TO NEARLY 16,000 INCIDENTS PER SCHOOL DAY, OR AN INCIDENT EVERY SIX SECONDS.

O THE RATE OF DEATHS CAUSED BY FIREARMS AMONG PEOPLE AGED 15 - 19 HAS CLIMBED TO THE HIGHEST LEVEL EVER RECORDED IN THIS COUNTRY. THE RATE OF THESE DEATHS ROSE GRADUALLY THROUGH THE 60'S, 70'S AND EARLY 80'S, BUT HAS JUMPED FROM 13.3

DEATHS PER 100,000 IN 1985 TO 23.5 DEATHS PER 100,000 IN 1990.

- O IN 1991, 16 PERCENT OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS REPORTED BEING THREATENED WITH A WEAPON AT SCHOOL AND 7 PERCENT REPORTED BEING INJURED WITH A WEAPON.
- O APPROXIMATELY ONE OF EVERY FIVE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS NOW CARRIES A FIREARM, KNIFE, OR CLUB ON A REGULAR BASIS [THOUGH NOT NECESSARILY TO SCHOOL].
- O EIGHT PERCENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS REPORTED BEING PHYSICALLY THREATENED AND 2 PERCENT REPORTED BEING PHYSICALLY ATTACKED DURING THE PREVIOUS YEAR.

THESE DATA, AS WELL AS DATA ON ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG USE, POINT TO THE NEED FOR A SIGNIFICANT CONTINUED FEDERAL COMMITMENT TO PROGRAMS THAT PREVENT DRUG USE AND VIOLENCE AMONG YOUTH.

- O MORE THAN HALF (52.7%) OF HIGH SCHOOLS SENIORS, 40% OF TENTH GRADERS, AND 17% OF EIGHTH GRADERS ENGAGE IN "BINGE" DRINKING OF ALCOHOL (FIVE OR MORE CONSECUTIVE DRINKS IN ONE SITTING).
- O NEARLY THREE SENIORS IN TEN ARE CURRENT CIGARETTE SMOKERS; 20% OF 10TH GRADERS SMOKE, AS DO 15% OF EIGHTH GRADERS.

O NEARLY ONE-QUARTER (23.9%) OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS USED MARIJUANA AT SOME TIME DURING THE YEAR.

NONE OF THESE STATISTICS TELL US ABOUT THE EFFECT OF ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG USE ON THE NEXT GENERATION--INFANT MORTALITY, LOW BIRTH WEIGHT, MENTAL RETARDATION (PARTICULARLY WITH ALCOHOL ABUSE), DELAYS IN DEVELOPMENT OF SPEECH AND LANGUAGE SKILLS THAT CAN AFFECT CHILDREN'S LEARNING, AND ENVIRONMENTS OF ABUSE THAT AFFECT WHOLE COMMUNITIES AS WELL AS FAMILIES.

CLEARLY, OUR PROPOSALS FOR REAUTHORIZATION OF THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT PROGRAMS WILL NOT MEAN "BUSINESS AS USUAL." IT WILL MEAN STRENGTHENING THESE PROGRAMS TO MEET THE NEEDS OF AMERICAN YOUNG PEOPLE AND THEIR FAMILIES AND RELATING THOSE NEEDS TO OUR EDUCATION GOALS. WE WILL PROPOSE REVISIONS THAT REFLECT OUR OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES FOR REAUTHORIZATION, WHICH ARE:

1. PROMOTE COHERENT, SYSTEMIC EDUCATION REFORM ACROSS THE NATION.
2. DEFINE APPROPRIATE AND COHERENT FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR EDUCATION REFORM.
3. PROMOTE THE ADOPTION OF HIGH QUALITY, INTERNATIONALLY COMPETITIVE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT MEASURES.

4. PROMOTE EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE AND EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY BY ESTABLISHING THE PRINCIPLE THAT ALL CHILDREN CAN AND SHOULD BE HELD TO HIGH ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS.

5. PROMOTE FAIR OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL CHILDREN TO ACHIEVE HIGH STANDARDS.

6. PROMOTE FLEXIBILITY IN THE USE OF FEDERAL RESOURCES IN RETURN FOR ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RESULTS.

7. IN DEFINING PROGRAMMATIC SUCCESS, EMPHASIZE ACHIEVEMENT GAINS AND PUT LESS EMPHASIS ON PROCESS REQUIREMENTS AND MEASURING INPUTS.

THE ADMINISTRATION IS EXAMINING OPTIONS TO REVISE THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT IN FIVE MAJOR AREAS:

- O THE SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM;
- O BETTER TARGETING OF RESOURCES;
- O SIMPLIFICATION OF THE PROGRAM;
- O DEVELOPMENT OF MORE COMPREHENSIVE TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE EFFORT, AND;

O DEVELOPMENT OF A MORE EFFECTIVE EVALUATION SYSTEM.

LET ME BRIEFLY OUTLINE SOME OF THE ISSUES THAT WE FEEL NEED TO BE ADDRESSED IN EACH OF THESE AREAS.

SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM

SCHOOL VIOLENCE MUST BE STEMMED. WE INTEND TO CONTRIBUTE TO THIS GOAL IN TWO WAYS: FIRST, TO MEET THE IMMEDIATE NEED FOR EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE, THE ADMINISTRATION WILL SOON TRANSMIT A SAFE SCHOOLS BILL FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.

SECOND, AS PART OF THE REAUTHORIZATION PROCESS, WE ARE ALSO CONSIDERING ALLOWING SCHOOLS GREATER FLEXIBILITY IN USING FUNDS FROM THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT TO SUPPORT VIOLENCE PREVENTION AS WELL AS ALCOHOL AND DRUG PREVENTION. MANY OF THE RISK FACTORS THAT DRAW STUDENTS TO ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE MAY BE THE SAME RISK FACTORS THAT DRAW THEM TO VIOLENT BEHAVIOR. THE MOST EFFECTIVE MEANS OF ADDRESSING BOTH OF THESE PROBLEMS--DRUGS AND VIOLENCE--MAY BE THROUGH AN EXPANDED PROGRAM THAT WOULD PERMIT SCHOOLS TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS THAT ADDRESS BOTH IN A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO ACHIEVING NATIONAL EDUCATION GOAL 6.

ANOTHER ISSUE RELATED TO SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM IS THE TYPE OF PREVENTION ACTIVITIES THAT SHOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR FUNDING. CURRENTLY, ALL PROGRAMMING HAS TO BE RELATED DIRECTLY TO DRUG AND ALCOHOL EDUCATION AND PREVENTION.

WHILE THIS APPROACH ENSURES THAT THERE IS A STRONG FOCUS ON ALCOHOL AND DRUG PREVENTION, IT MAY NOT ALWAYS BE THE MOST EFFECTIVE APPROACH. RESEARCHERS, RECENT COMMISSIONS, AND THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE POINT OUT THAT COMPREHENSIVE DRUG PREVENTION PROGRAMS APPEAR TO BE THE MOST EFFECTIVE MEANS OF ENABLING STUDENTS TO BE DRUG FREE AND PREPARED TO LEARN. WE ARE EXAMINING WAYS IN WHICH WE CAN ENSURE THAT STUDENTS RECEIVE INFORMATION ABOUT ALCOHOL AND DRUGS, WHILE AT THE SAME TIME ENCOURAGING SCHOOLS TO DEVELOP A MORE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH.

BETTER TARGETING OF RESOURCES

CURRENTLY STATE GRANT FUNDS ARE ALLOCATED TO STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES BASED ON A FORMULA THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THE STATE'S SCHOOL-AGED POPULATION AND SHARE OF CHAPTER 1 COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FUNDS. WE ARE CONCERNED THAT THIS FORMULA, AND THE INTRA-STATE ALLOCATION PROCESS, MAY NOT CONCENTRATE FUNDS IN THOSE LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES WHOSE CHILDREN ARE AT HIGHEST RISK OF DRUG OR ALCOHOL USE OR EXPOSURE TO SCHOOL VIOLENCE, THOSE CHILDREN WHO MAKE UP THE TRAGIC STATISTICS I CITED EARLIER.

WHILE ALL AREAS OF OUR NATION ARE EXPERIENCING SOME LEVEL OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE AS WELL AS INCIDENTS OF VIOLENCE, WE RECOGNIZE THAT THE PROBLEMS ARE NOT THE SAME IN EACH COMMUNITY; NOR DO ALL AREAS HAVE THE SAME CAPACITY TO DEAL WITH THESE PROBLEMS. WE ARE EXPLORING WAYS TO REVISE THE ALLOCATION MECHANISM TO ENSURE THAT AREAS OF "HIGHEST NEED" RECEIVE GREATER

FUNDING LEVELS.

SIMPLIFICATION OF THE PROGRAM

AS A RESULT OF FREQUENT AMENDMENTS, THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT HAS BECOME A PATCHWORK OF DUPLICATIVE DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAMS. THE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM IS SADDLED WITH SET-ASIDES AND RESTRICTIONS THAT LIMIT LOCAL FLEXIBILITY OFTEN BLOCKING PREVENTION INITIATIVES THAT BEST FIT COMMUNITY NEEDS. DESPITE THIS PROFUSION OF PROGRAMS AND SET-ASIDES, THE DEPARTMENT IS NOT CURRENTLY AUTHORIZED TO PURSUE A

NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES THAT WOULD LEAD TO IMPROVED PREVENTION EFFORTS IN SCHOOLS ACROSS THE COUNTRY.

WE ARE LOOKING FOR WAYS TO STREAMLINE THE PROGRAM AND PROVIDE NECESSARY FLEXIBILITY TO THE STATES, WHILE MAINTAINING STRONG ACCOUNTABILITY.

DEVELOPMENT OF MORE COMPREHENSIVE TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

CURRENTLY, STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES PROCURE TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES THROUGH SEVERAL DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT PROGRAMS--THE STATE AND LOCAL GRANT PROGRAM, THE REGIONAL CENTERS PROGRAM, AND TWO SEPARATE DISCRETIONARY GRANT COMPETITIONS FOR TRAINING. WHILE THESE COMBINED EFFORTS HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON TRAINING TEACHERS, COUNSELORS, AND OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL, WE BELIEVE THAT THE IMPACT AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THESE ACTIVITIES CAN BE IMPROVED.

WE ARE EXPLORING WAYS TO PROVIDE TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES THAT WILL BUILD SIGNIFICANT TRAINING CAPACITY AND INTEGRATE TRAINING EFFORTS UNDER THE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT PROGRAMS WITH OTHER TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES IN OUR REAUTHORIZATION PROPOSAL LATER THIS YEAR FOR THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT.

DEVELOPMENT OF A MORE EFFECTIVE EVALUATION SYSTEM

THE CURRENT STATUTE CONTAINS DUPLICATIVE EVALUATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AT THE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LEVELS FOR ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PART B STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER THIS ACT. EXPERIENCE HAS SHOWN THAT THESE REQUIREMENTS ARE BURDENSOME AND COSTLY, AND DO NOT NECESSARILY SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HIGH-QUALITY PROGRAMS, OR GENERATE MEANINGFUL MEASURES OF PROGRAM OUTCOMES OR IMPACT.

WE ARE CURRENTLY EXAMINING WAYS IN WHICH WE CAN STRENGTHEN THE QUALITY OF OUR EVALUATION EFFORTS WHILE REDUCING THE BURDEN ON STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES. WE RECOGNIZE THAT THE EVALUATION OF PREVENTION PROGRAMS IS A VERY COMPLEX MATTER THAT REQUIRES A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF EXPERTISE AND RESOURCES-- EXPERTISE AND RESOURCES THAT ARE NOT ALWAYS AVAILABLE AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS.

CONSEQUENTLY WE ARE EXPLORING WAYS TO MODIFY THE CURRENT EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS THAT ASSIGN CLEAR AND APPROPRIATE ROLES FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS WELL AS FOR STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAM.

MR. CHAIRMAN, WE LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING CLOSELY WITH YOU TO SHAPE FEDERAL POLICIES THAT SUPPORT THE GROWTH OF HEALTHIER, SAFER, AND BETTER EDUCATED CHILDREN. WE CANNOT ACCEPT THE STATUS

QUO. NEITHER CAN WE SIMPLY SHAKE OUR HEADS IN DESPAIR. ALL PARENTS, OF ALL ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS, RICH OR POOR, WHO LIVE IN BURLINGTON, VERMONT OR BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, WANT THE BEST FOR THEIR CHILDREN. ALL OUR CHILDREN SHOULD HAVE A CHILDHOOD THAT IS SAFE AND CAREFREE AND SHOULD BE ABLE TO LOOK FORWARD TO BEING PRODUCTIVE AND HAPPY ADULTS. THIS IS NOT THE CASE FOR MANY OF OUR CHILDREN TODAY. I BELIEVE, THAT WITH A JOINT COMMITMENT, WE CAN CHANGE THIS, AND PROVIDE FRESH HOPE AND NEW OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR CHILDREN. THANK YOU FOR GIVING ME THIS CHANCE TO EXPRESS THE COMMITMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO THIS CHALLENGE.

DRAFT

SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON OF SAFE SCHOOLS INITIATIVES

Department of Education

Council of the Great City Schools

H.R. 538

MAJORITY MEMBERS

ACK BROOKS, TEXAS, CHAIRMAN
DON EDWARDS, CALIFORNIA
JOHN CONYERS, JR., MICHIGAN
ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, KENTUCKY
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, NEW JERSEY
MIKE SYNAR, OKLAHOMA
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, COLORADO
DAN GLICKMAN, KANSAS
BARNEY FRANK, MASSACHUSETTS
CHARLES E. SCHUMER, NEW YORK
EDWARD F. FEIGHAN, OHIO
HOWARD L. BERMAN, CALIFORNIA
RICK BOUCHER, VIRGINIA
HARLEY O. STAGGERS, JR., WEST VIRGINIA
JOHN BRYANT, TEXAS
MEL LEVINE, CALIFORNIA
GEORGE E. SANGMEISTER, ILLINOIS
CRAIG A. WASHINGTON, TEXAS
PETER HOAGLAND, NEBRASKA
MICHAEL J. KOPETSKI, OREGON
JOHN F. REED, RHODE ISLAND

ONE HUNDRED SECOND CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

2138 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-8218

MINORITY MEMBERS

HAMILTON FISH, JR., NEW YORK
CARLOS J. MOORHEAD, CALIFORNIA
HENRY J. HYDE, ILLINOIS
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., WISCONSIN
BILL MCCOLLUM, FLORIDA
GEORGE W. GEKAS, PENNSYLVANIA
HOWARD COBLE, NORTH CAROLINA
D. FRENCH SLAUGHTER, JR., VIRGINIA
LAMAR S. SMITH, TEXAS
CRAIG T. JAMES, FLORIDA
TOM CAMPBELL, CALIFORNIA
STEVEN SCHIFF, NEW MEXICO
JIM RAMSTAD, MINNESOTA

MAJORITY—225-3951

MINORITY—225-6906

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Members of the Subcommittee
on Crime and Criminal Justice

FROM: Charles E. Schumer, Chairman
Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice

DATE: July 16, 1991

RE: Safe Schools Hearing

On July 17, 1991, at 10:00 a.m. in Rayburn 2227 the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice will hold a hearing entitled "Safe Schools: Drawing the Line on Crime." The hearing will address the problems of crime, violence and drugs in our nation's elementary, junior and senior high schools. Witnesses will include a variety of victims of crime in schools, school officials and administrators and nationally recognized experts in the field. We will also be hearing about some promising approaches and programs to deal with crime, drugs and violence in our schools.

Nothing is more important than the safety of school children. There are 40.5 million elementary and secondary students in the nation's public and private schools today. They are taught by 2.3 million teachers. These students and teachers, however, are not safe from the reach of crime. There are approximately 16,000 crimes committed in schools every day - or about one every six seconds.

It seems like every day the news reports one or more incidents of serious crime in schools. On January 17, 1989, five elementary school students in Stockton, California were killed in a schoolyard by a gunman wielding an assault rifle. On May 16, 1986, all the staff and students of the Cokeville, Wyoming elementary school were held hostage by a bomb-wielding couple resulting in the death of the couple and several injuries when the bomb is detonated. A 13-year-old in Clearwater, Florida threatened to torture and kill his social studies teacher after receiving a bad grade and when he was taken into custody he was carrying two pistols, bullets and a switchblade. A high school student in Buffalo exploded a pipe bomb in a locker injuring several students. In April of 1989 in Fairfax County, Virginia, a nine-year-old girl was sexually assaulted in a

school bathroom by an adult. In May of 1988 an eight-year-old girl was shot and killed by a woman in Winnetka, Illinois. In January of 1989 a Bronx teacher took a loaded semi-automatic pistol away from a five-year-old student in school. These are just some of the examples of the extent of the crime problem in schools.

While the more serious ones make the news, the everyday ones may not but are no less disturbing. Crime and terror in schools is a harsh condition facing children, teachers and parents at all levels of the educational sector: elementary schools, middle schools and high schools. Crimes in schools include drug dealing among students or from adults to students, weapons violations (both guns and knives), murders, assaults, aggravated assaults, sexual assaults, thefts, robberies and destruction of property crimes. Many crimes are gang related. Although precise figures are difficult to determine, the National Crime Survey reported that nearly three million attempted or completed crimes (such as assault, rape, robbery or theft) took place inside schools or on school property during 1987. These included 75,900 aggravated assaults and 350,000 simple assaults. Every year approximately 70,000 weapons offenses are committed in schools or on school grounds and every day approximately 135,000 youths enter schools carrying guns. Polls report that students admit having access to weapons and carrying weapons in the schools. They also show that students are afraid of being victimized and that this fear impacts upon their ability to learn.

Gunfights are replacing fistfights, and bullet and drive-by shooting drills are replacing fire drills, on many school campuses. Some parents have even taken to sending their children to school wearing bullet-proof vests and carrying bullet-proof school bags and clip boards. Superintendents and security officials from the largest urban school districts listed weapons in the schools as one of their top five concerns in a survey conducted by the National School Safety Center in 1988. Students bring a variety of weapons to schools, ranging from guns and knives to explosive devices. Between July 1, 1987, and June 30, 1988, California school officials confiscated 8,539 weapons including 789 guns, 4,408 knives, and 2,216 explosives. Small school districts experience similar problems with weapons. In Duvall County, Florida and Nashville, Tennessee incidents of weapons in the schools tripled between 1986 and 1987.

A number of school districts and individual schools are taking steps to both prevent and deal with incidents of crime in the schools. These measures often include physical facilities such as safer school design, metal detectors, safety doors, video surveillance equipment and the like. Many schools have established security offices and employ professional security personnel. Others utilize parents and others to monitor hallways and restrict access to schools to those with legitimate business. Some schools prepare for disaster with crisis intervention plans and bullet and

drive-by shooting drills. It is important for all schools to become more aware of school crime, deal with the problems as crimes rather than as strictly internal disciplinary matters and increase cooperation with local police departments and prosecutors' offices. Many schools have also adopted anti-violence and anti-drug curricula. Some have student mediation programs as well as victim counseling services for both students and teachers.

The witnesses at today's hearing will include a number of victims of school crime. We will hear from the principal of the Cokeville, Wyoming school and his daughter who, along with the rest of the school, were held hostage by a couple wielding a bomb. Cokeville, Wyoming has a population of under 500 people and illustrates the point that this is a national problem not limited in scope to urban or high crime areas. We will also hear from a youngster who was shot by an assault weapon at the Cleveland School in Stockton, California and his mother. The problem of teacher victimization will be illustrated by a New York City teacher who was a victim of a serious crime in the school.

The hearing will also feature some specific and promising anti-crime programs such as the Adopt-A-School program run by the Kings County, New York District Attorney's Office. Under this program, ADA's and other staff visit elementary schools on a regular basis and offer education and training designed to prevent crime and drug abuse. We will hear from a student mediator who is trained to mediate disputes between students to achieve non-violent conflict resolution. We will also hear from a D.C. drug detective who takes a compelling message into local District of Columbia schools.

Finally, the hearing will also include testimony from the Executive Director of the National School Safety Center, a leading institution in the study of school-related crime. We will hear from a nationally-recognized school safety expert - the director of school safety for the Prince George's County, Maryland schools. The school safety director of the United Federation of Teachers will also offer testimony from the teachers' perspective.

It is important to ascertain the exact nature and scope of the school crime problem and to investigate successful techniques for dealing with it. This information and these approaches should be made available to all schools that need them and can make use of them. The Federal government can and should help with this work and this hearing is a first step in that effort.

I look forward to your participation in tomorrow's hearing.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Jose -
PMT
BR

April 19, 1993

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
CAROL RASCO
BERNARD NUSSBAUM

FROM: HOWARD PASTER *HP*
SUBJECT: SAFE SCHOOLS LEGISLATION

We should be very sensitive to the fact that this "education" proposal being championed by Representative Jose Serrano was originally part of crime legislation advocated by Representative Chuck Schumer. Our interest is making certain any Administration effort embracing this concept provides equal recognition to these gentlemen. This would include any press conference, any joint statement, any testimony, etc.

Thank you very much for being alert to this sensitive issue and for asking your policy and legislative people to keep track of this.

cc: Bill Galston
Bruce Reed ✓

TO: Bill Galston
FROM: Jose Cerda III
RE: Safe Schools
DATE: April 8, 1993

Here are my suggestions on how Secretary Riley's proposed Safe School's Initiative can be improved -- and made to be more consistent with the President's other crime-related initiatives.

1. Modify the Limitation on Crime Prevention Equipment

The proposed draft prohibits grant recipients from using more than 25% of their funds to install metal detectors and to acquire security personnel. These are the most tangible elements of a Safe Schools program and are no less important than the other violence prevention activities listed in the legislation (i.e., violence prevention curriculum, peer mediation, conflict resolution, etc.). Moreover, metal detectors and security personnel are the only aspects of a Safe Schools initiative that help to provide for the immediate physical safety of students. Why should they be the only activities arbitrarily capped?

To be more in line with the President's balanced approach to crime (prevention and punishment), I recommend increasing the 25% limitation to 50%. As such, local education authorities (LEAs) will have the discretion to decide what suits their schools best -- and the option to use 50% of their funds for metal detectors and security personnel.

2. Add "Community Policing"

As currently drafted, the legislation does not allow for Safe Schools monies to be used for "sworn" police officers, only professional security personnel. Hiring security personnel is cheaper than paying for "sworn" officers, and many LEAs will favor this more economical option. LEAs, however, should have the flexibility to hire real police officers. While it may prove too expensive to use police officers in the same round-the-clock manner as security guards, they can be used more cost-effectively in community policing (problem solving) roles. For example, one or two officers can be scheduled to "patrol" a certain school or schools at regular time intervals. The officers would get to know the schools, their students, and they would better understand the crime-related problems likely to arise.

Adding community policing serves two important purposes. First, it is consistent with our intent to tie as much of the new police monies as possible to community policing (i.e., new hire grants, Police Corps, HUD crime initiative). And second, it allows us to credibly point to the Safe Schools initiative when tallying up the 100,000 new police officers. HUD's proposed crime initiative allows public housing authorities to use their grants to hire security personnel or police officers, and it encourages the use of funds for community-based policing.

E X E C U T I V E O F F I C E O F T H E P R E S I D E N T

21-Jun-1993 03:04pm

TO: William Galston
TO: Jose Cerda, III

FROM: Constance J. Bowers
Office of Mgmt and Budget, LRD

SUBJECT: Education's testimony on Safe Schools

I did not hear back from you on this testimony. I will assume you have no problems with it unless I hear back from you shortly.

Thanks.

U.S. Department of Education

Michele Cavataio

Office of the Deputy Secretary

400 Maryland Ave., SW • Washington, D.C. • 20202-0500



(202)401-1000



(202)401-3093

INET michele_cavataio@ed.gov

Date: _____

Total # of pages including cover sheet: _____

To: José

Recipient Fax: 456 7028

Memo:

FYI -

an update (and useful summary)
of all the good stuff we're doing
to prevent violence.

(100)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ACTIVITIES IN SCHOOL VIOLENCE PREVENTION

The Department of Education is involved in several activities in the area of violence prevention. Summary of the Department's activities are as follows:

- o Safe Schools Act: The Department of Education is in the process of awarding grants (\$18m) to local educational agencies for the development of violence prevention programs. It is anticipated that the awards will be made by December 1994.

- o Washington D.C. Safe Schools Model: The Department of Education is developing a model safe schools program cooperatively with the District of Columbia Public Schools. The Safe Schools Act requires that \$1m be transferred to the DC Schools.

- o Reauthorization of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act: The Department of Education has submitted a reauthorization package which calls for expansion of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program into the area of violence prevention. It is anticipated that States and local educational agencies will be permitted to use funds they receive under the DFSCA for a wide variety of violence prevention activities.

- o Violence Prevention Conference: The Department of Education joined with the departments of Justice, Health and Human Services, and Housing and Urban Development and three other agencies to sponsor a conference on violence prevention. The conference focused on effective violence prevention models and strategies and on demonstrating that effective programming is contingent upon the development of a comprehensive collaborative approach (all elements of the community working together). This was the second violence prevention conference sponsored by ED.

- o Safe Havens: The Department of Education has transferred \$3.5m (over two years) to the Department of Justice for the development of Safe Havens in 20 cities. The Department of Education and Justice funds have been combined with funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to keep schools and other locations within the community open after school hours. The schools are known as "Safe Havens" as they provide youth with a safe and secure place to stay while not in school. The safe havens provide a variety of activities including tutoring, various form of recreation, and health services.

- o National School Safety Center: Along with the Department of Justice we support the National School Safety Center (NSSC). The NSSC is the only private non-profit

organization in the country designed to provide schools with information, training, and technical assistance on issues related to school violence.

- o Project SMART: Project SMART (School Management and Resource Teams) is supported by the Department of Education and the Department of Justice. The project is designed to help schools collect and analyze data on incidents of school crime, drug use, and disciplinary infractions. The Project is operating in various schools in Virginia, California, Maryland, Illinois, Wisconsin.

- o Early Childhood Education Training: This program is administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education authorizes grants to institutions of higher education to enable them to establish innovative programs to recruit and train students for careers in counseling for young children (0-6) that have been affected by violence. (This program is funded at \$15m in FY 94).

- o Interdepartmental Working Group on Violence: The Department of Education has played a leading role in creating and participating in the Interdepartmental Working Group on Violence. The Working Group has developed several groups and subgroups to examine various forms of violence, e.g., youth violence, guns, media, family violence, and to develop recommendations for policy development over the course of the next several years.

- o Conflict Resolution: The Department of Education is working with the Department of Justice to develop a guide for the selection of an effective conflict resolution program.

- o Ameri-Corps: The Department of Education has joined with the Department of Justice in the development and submission of an application to Ameri-Corps to obtain funds for volunteers to work in five Safe Haven programs. The volunteers will perform activities related to conflict resolution, peer mediation, and community-team policing.

- o NIJ Automation Project: The Department of Education is working with the National Institute of Justice and several other Federal agencies in the development of an automated system to provide local communities with information on effective violence prevention strategies and programs.

- o Research on Violence Prevention: The Department of Education is working with the National Institute of Justice to identify mechanisms for expanding the knowledge base in the area of school violence.

- o School-Related Homicide Study: The Department of Education has initiated a study on school-related homicides.

The study is being conducted by the Centers for Disease Control.