

33. The New Orleans Times-Picayune

05/13/97; Edition: THIRD; Section: NATIONAL; Page A1

School Safety

TEACHERS BECOME VICTIMS OF SCHOOLYARD BRAWLERS: EDUCATORS' INJURIES ARE MORE FREQUENT

By RHONDA NABONNE

Staff writer

Julida Barard's passion for teaching was shattered a year ago by an unlikely weapon.

In her classroom at Edward Livingston Middle School, she was attacked with a textbook, hurled from the back of the class by a belligerent, 14-year-old sixth-grader.

Hit in the back of the head and knocked unconscious, Barard 60, was treated at Pendleton Memorial Methodist Hospital for a concussion, bruising and acute neck strain, and she has been described by her doctor as "too fragile" to return to work.

"I love teaching but I never want to see a classroom again as long as I live," Barard said recently, trembling and dissolving into tears as she recollected stressful months of physical therapy and dealing with school and insurance matters.

What happened to Barard was not so unusual.

The 19-year veteran teacher was one of 136 Orleans Parish public school employees assaulted by students in the 1995-96 school year, more than double the number of assaults reported four years earlier, according to information supplied by the school system's student hearing office.

A recent statewide survey released by the Louisiana Federation of Teachers shows that for the first time, disruptive students top the list of why teachers would consider leaving the profession. The most frequently given answer 10 years ago was low pay, which came in second this time.

Thirty-two percent of 400 teachers surveyed said they had been physically threatened or struck by a student.

The problem is most acute in Orleans Parish. Jefferson Parish, with about two thirds as many students as Orleans, has recorded 20 attacks on school employees this school year.

Officials from other school systems in

the New Orleans area said the number of assaults on employees was not readily available.

Nationwide, 112,000 teachers reported being assaulted in 1994, according to a survey that year by the U.S. Department of Education.

Teachers complain that the problem is not being taken seriously enough.

Indeed, in Orleans Parish the 1995-96 annual report from Superintendent Morris Holmes stated that there were no major injuries incurred by students or district employees because of acts of violence and that more and more schools are viewed as safe havens.

Holmes said it's not his intention to downplay what he recognizes as the "trauma of being attacked by someone you are supposed to be responsible for."

"The impact is both psychological and physical, and together that can be devastating, excruciating," he said.

Assaulted teachers and their families have access to counseling through an employee assistance program, he said, but more is needed, such as helping assaulted teachers recover and cut through red tape.

At Livingston Middle School, where two teachers were injured in attempts to break up a fight earlier this school year, administrators have beefed up security and added hall monitors and a teacher-disciplinarian to help keep order.

**** Paying for students' wrath ****

Aside from what it exacts in terms of teacher morale, the incidence of teachers being punched, choked, kicked, shoved and worse is costly to school systems.

In 1982, the Legislature set up a special pay category, referred to as "assault pay," for teachers attacked in the line of duty.

Louisiana teachers injured or disabled as a result of an assault or battery on school grounds are awarded full pay for as long as a doctor determines they are unable to return to work. Another category, physical assistance pay, provides up to 90 days of full pay for

teachers hurt while breaking up a fight.

In Orleans Parish, figures from the risk management department show that 31 employees have drawn either assault pay or physical-assistance pay this school year.

Barard is one of 19 Orleans Parish school employees being paid under either of the two categories, interim personnel director Judith Gahr said.

One Orleans Parish teacher has been collecting assault pay since 1983 when he was seriously injured after being stuffed into a trash can and thrown out of a classroom window, Gahr said.

Since 1989, almost 600 Orleans school employees have been attacked by students, said Judy Tate, after a review of the expulsion recommendations that must be filed whenever a student attacks an employee. In some cases, the injuries are not serious enough to keep the teachers off the job.

In Jefferson Parish, 1996 figures from January to November show that 32 public school employees were eligible for either assault pay or physical assistance pay, teacher union President Joe Potts said.

In 1982, Potts himself was attacked by a student when a fight broke out at an athletic event at West Jefferson High School.

"A student in the stands jumped, like Batman, on my back," said Potts, who suffered a neck injury and missed six weeks of school.

**** Fight fright ****

One of the teachers' complaints about the pay system is that it treats assault injuries differently from injuries incurred in breaking up fights.

Gloria Boseman, a teacher for 23 years, was limited to 90 days of physical assistance pay but is still under the care of a psychiatrist and orthopedic specialist after being attacked in her classroom at L.B. Landry High School on Jan. 6, 1994.

Boseman, who recently underwent knee surgery related to the attack, said

she was injured when two girls attacked her from behind to keep her from breaking up a fight.

Although she gets worker's compensation plus the difference between her salary and the amount paid to a substitute, she is getting about \$450 a month less than what she used to make, or about a 15 percent cut in her salary.

Boseman has filed a lawsuit contending she is entitled to full pay.

Louisiana Federation of Teachers President Fred Skelton said the union believes the limitation on full pay for teachers injured while trying to stop fights is unfair.

"Teachers who intervene to protect other children jeopardize their health and their livelihood and should not be penalized," he said.

There were many chances for teachers to break up fights last year.

During the 1995-96 school year, Orleans schools recorded 806 fights

involving three or more students, and there were 9,117 suspensions, most involving students accused of fighting or showing disrespect to teachers. Administrators said "group fighting" accounted for most of the 2,164 expulsions recommended.

Horror stories told by assaulted teachers have left some of their colleagues wondering whether they should turn their backs instead of intervening in fights.

In 1986 Beryl Tregre, a special education teacher with almost 15 years of experience, chose to step in to protect a student and paid a grave price.

Tregre underwent 13 surgeries resulting from a torn rotator cuff and dislocated shoulder, after she tried to restrain a special education student who was fighting another student. The incident left her without use of her left arm.

She received 90 days of

physical-assistance pay, but she was never able to return to the classroom.

In 1994, she retired from the school system on disability and settled a worker's compensation claim for \$80,000, which was quickly eaten up by medical bills.

Tregre now has no medical insurance and at 46 is too young for Medicare.

As a result of her injuries, she says, she was addicted to pain medications and suffers depression every time a new school year rolls around.

"In August, teachers are preparing their classrooms and it's instant depression because I know that's where I'm supposed to be," Tregre said.

"I'm disfigured," said Tregre, who is left-handed. "I can't play tennis, golf or bowl. If this had happened in a car wreck I would have been compensated.

"I wish I had missed school that day."



34. Miami Herald

May 16, 1997

State drops one rape charge in UM fraternity house case

By FRANK DAVIES

Herald Staff Writer

A rape charge was dropped Thursday against one of two University of Miami sophomores accused of sexually assaulting two other UM students at a campus fraternity party.

Investigators said they found no evidence that an alcohol punch at the party was spiked with illegal drugs.

"You're a very lucky man today," Dade Circuit Judge Robert Pineiro told Lucas Folse, 19, in his courtroom, after Assistant State Attorney Joshua Weintraub said: "There was not sufficient evidence to go forward with this case."

At Weintraub's request, Pineiro asked Folse to stay away from the alleged victims in the case.

Michael Schoepner, one of Folse's Sigma Chi fraternity brothers, still faces a charge of sexual battery. Weintraub would not comment on the status of that case or other investigations into the fraternity party.

The two freshman students who accused the frat brothers of rape said they

attended a raucous party Nov. 2 at Sigma Chi, 6100 San Amaro Dr. One told Coral Gables Police the next day that she passed out after drinking punch. The other said she woke up at 5 a.m. in a fraternity brother's bedroom feeling ill at ease.

The two men were accused of having sex with the women who were "physically helpless to resist" because they were drunk or possibly under the influence of Rohypnol, known as "roofies."

But Greg Denaro, the attorney for Folse, said an analysis of some of the punch spilled on clothing showed alcohol, but no illegal drugs. Weintraub also said that Rohypnol was not found.

Rohypnol is a prescription sleeping aid illegal in the United States, but increasingly is available on the streets. Taken with alcohol, it can cause severe blackouts. It has been called the "date-rape drug" because in several cases attackers used "roofies" to render their

victims defenseless.

Denaro said he interviewed dozens of people at the party and concluded that early reports — that many women there were unconscious — were not accurate.

The rape investigation and reports of widespread alcohol at fraternity parties have put pressure on the university to closely regulate the parties. Fariss Samarrai, a UM spokesman, said a police officer is supposed to attend each party, and students are carded to try to prevent underage drinking.

All four students in this case were under 21.

UM suspended all social activities at Sigma Chi after the Nov. 2 party, and Samarrai said the university will review the fraternity's status on Aug. 1.

After charges were dropped against him, Folse, a high-school valedictorian from Raceland, La., said, "I'm looking forward to not having to worry about this all the time."

"Now he has a future," Denaro said. ■

Schedule my up 7

ED Parks
Safe / Drug Free

3. The Dallas Morning News

05/13/97; Edition: HOME FINAL; Section: EDUCATION EXTRA; Page 20A

BAD HABITS: School anti-drug programs sometimes fall short-and may even increase abuse

By Deborah Saathoff

Special Contributor to The Dallas Morning News

Schools have spent a pile of money over the past decade for drug use prevention programs that just don't work, a study commissioned by the U.S. Department of Education shows.

"Most schools are trying to do a good job, so they're responsible in their intent," said Dr. Lloyd D. Johnston, social psychologist and principal investigator of the Monitoring the Future studies at the University of Michigan. "The alternatives they {schools} knew about and that were effectively marketed to them were the least effective ones."

"Many schools adopted things which may not have been evaluated at the time and now have been evaluated, and they're not very effective."

The most recent study followed 10,000 fifth- and sixth-grade students in 19 school districts for four years. It tracked their drug use habits and the types of drug prevention programs in their schools.

"None of the programs approached the comprehensives or extensiveness of those found by other researchers . . . to be effective in preventing alcohol and other drug use among youth," the researchers wrote.

The programs are so ineffective that other research has found that drug use is again on the upswing. For 22 years, the University of Michigan conducted a national survey called Monitoring the Future. It found that in 1996 the number of eighth-graders using any illicit drug in the 12 months before the survey has more than doubled since 1991 from 11 percent to 24 percent. Since 1992 it has nearly doubled among 10th-graders from 20 percent to 38 percent.

These figures hit close to home as well. Annual surveys of the Dallas school district by Texas A&M University indicate that the percentage of Dallas middle and high school students reporting having used illicit drugs is up from 26 percent in 1994 to 31 percent in 1996.

The problem is moving downward as

well. Younger children are using drugs, according to the 1996 Partnership Attitude Tracking Study issued by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America. Trial use of marijuana doubled among children ages 9 to 12, from 2 percent in 1995 to 4 percent in 1996.

Although the percentages seem small, they account for an increase from 230,000 children experimenting in 1995 to 460,000 in 1996.

The Dallas survey found that the number of fourth-, fifth- and sixth-grade students reporting having used marijuana increased from 2.9 percent in 1994 to 3.7 percent in 1996. Of those students, 1.9 percent had used it within the previous school year in 1994, 2.8 percent had in 1996.

How can this be? It seems as if children are getting the anti-drug message everywhere, especially at school.

That's a misperception, researchers say. Schools are still hitting the don't-do-drugs-message hard, but the programs they use aren't working.

The most widely used drug abuse prevention program in the nation is D.A.R.E. (Drug Abuse Resistance Education). It was started in Los Angeles in 1983 by the Los Angeles Police Department and the Los Angeles school district and is used in more than 70 percent of the nation's schools. Police officers present 17 sessions to fifth- or sixth-graders on specific drugs, resisting peer pressure and the dangers of drugs, alcohol and gangs.

Many schools use the program, even though several research studies have shown it to be ineffective, because they believed that's what the federal government wanted. A 1989 bill and a 1994 law replacing it, mentioned drug abuse resistance education, small letters.

But many school districts saw that as a commandment to use D.A.R.E., according to Bill Modzeleski, director of the federal Safe and Drug Free Schools Program director, but that was not the intent.

Some researchers have suggested that D.A.R.E doesn't work because it depends

heavily on lectures, and children practiced refusal skills on police officers, rather than on their peers.

D.A.R.E. publications say the program's curriculum changed in 1994 and is more effective.

Mr. Modzeleski did not say that schools shouldn't use D.A.R.E., but that districts should carefully evaluate effectiveness.

"The question schools need to ask is, 'Is what we're doing working?'" Mr. Modzeleski said. "We're going to ask every school district in this country to set out measurable goals and objectives. What we want schools to do is not necessarily throw the baby out with the bath water."

"If it is working, let's promote it, let's enhance it, let's expand it. If it's not working, either let's change it or let's get rid of it," he said.

Education Department officials bristle at the suggestion that the increase in drug use is related to a failure of school drug programs.

"It shows a poor understanding of the drug problem to say we're putting money to drug education and drug use is going up, and therefore it's not working," Mr. Modzeleski said. "This is a huge complex problem that's going to take a lot of people working on it. Schools are one part of it, but they're not the entire part."

Dr. Johnston, with Monitoring the Future, agrees that drug use is a complex issue.

"There are a lot of different sectors that influence how young people view drugs, ranging from the media and entertainment industries to public role models in leadership positions, to parents and, of course, the school," he said.

Drug use decreased annually in the late 1980s until 1991 when the current increase began.

"Essentially you had the country with a whole movement in the 1980s that was sending a unified message that was working the message was, 'Drugs mess you up,'" said Ginna Marston, executive vice president for Partnership for a Drug-Free America. "It was expressed any number of different ways from

different vantage points."

That unified message fragmented in the early 1990s after the Persian Gulf War knocked out the drug issue, along with most other domestic issues, for media coverage, and it did not return, Dr. Johnston said.

"The kids who've grown up in the last five or six years haven't been exposed to that much coverage form a credible source about drugs," he said.

In addition, competitive messages glorifying drugs came in with the 1990s. Various rock, grunge and rap groups sang the praise of drugs and their effects. The marijuana leaf again became a fashion symbol and fashion photographers began using a look known as "junkie chic" or "heroin addict aesthetic." They use ultrathin models with matted hair and dark makeup.

Public service ads, such as the famous egg-in-a-frying-pan "this is your brain on drugs" placed by the Partnership for a

Drug-Free America, decreased dramatically in the 1990s as volunteer numbers and donated media space and time dwindled, Ms. Marston said.

Government funds, which had increased annually from 1987 to 1991, began decreasing in 1992 and continued until this year when the budget request for 1998 included \$620 million for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program. That's an increase of \$64 million over the 1997 appropriation.

The Monitoring the Future study showed that the number of parents talking to their children about drug use also decreased. Children whose parents have talked to them about drugs are half as likely to try them as children whose parents have not discussed it, according to the Partnership study.

The Dallas school district survey found that in 1996, 23 percent of secondary students felt that their parents

neither approved or disapproved of youth smoking marijuana or they didn't know what their parents' attitudes toward it were.

Programs in place in most of the nation's schools were not effective enough to counter the erosion of society's support for a strong anti-drug message, the researchers said.

Officials with the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program want districts to re-evaluate their drug prevention programs. A proposal to link federal funds to the use of research-based approaches to drug prevention is being discussed.

"There are programs out there that have been demonstrated to be effective," Dr. Johnston said. "It's not that we can't do the job, it's just that in most school systems we're not doing the job."

Oran Saathoff is a Plano free-lance writer. ■

4. Richmond Times-Dispatch

05/15/97; Edition: City; Section: AREA/STATE; Page A-17

CONGRESS 'KOWTOWED' ON EDUCATION BILL, ALLEN SAYS

By Michael Hardy

Times-Dispatch Staff Writer

(Staff writer Peter Hardin contributed to this report.)

Gov. George Allen yesterday accused the Republican-dominated Congress of "kowtowing" to the White House in approving a bill that prohibits the expulsion of disabled students even for criminal misbehavior.

Allen, whose arguments were ignored by all but one of the state's congressional delegation, said some of the legislation's provisions were "absolutely ludicrous" and handcuff state and local efforts to ensure discipline and safety in public schools.

He said the law would send the wrong message by authorizing the expulsion of a normal student, but not a disabled pupil, for the same serious misconduct.

In those instances where the misconduct has no relation to the student's disability, Allen declared, expulsion should be an option.

Rep. Robert C. Scott, D-3rd, was one

of the drafters of the bill and had responded to Allen, "In reviewing this specific issue for two years . . . I have found little evidence of support for Virginia's position.

"I believe that no one is benefited from having any child out of school without educational services, while they are suspended or expelled.

"There is nothing to suggest that less education is needed when they have disciplinary problems. And this is especially true for children with disabilities."

Under the amended Individuals With Disabilities Education Act the disabled student could be suspended for 10 days without receiving educational services. For any suspension beyond 10 days, to a maximum of 45, the student must be placed in an alternative setting and still be educated.

The Virginia School Boards Association, which had clashed with Allen on his earlier refusal to accept federal school-reform funds, supported

his position on the expulsion of violent disabled students.

President Clinton said he is eager to sign the legislation, which in effect, overturns Virginia's court victory last winter against the U.S. Department of Education. The U.S. 4th Circuit Court of Appeals sided with the Allen administration's position that the agency could not condition Virginia's receipt of federal disabilities act money on the state's continuation of a free education for disabled students expelled for serious misbehavior unrelated to their handicap.

Allen had sent letters to members of the House delegation expressing his views, and it caught the attention of Rep. Herbert H. Bateman, R-1st.

Bateman was one of only three House members to vote against the measure. Only one senator did so.

Bateman aide Dan Scandling said the law allows disciplining a disabled student "as long as you continue to provide for their education. But there's no federal money to do that." ■



Safe / Drug Free Schools

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202- _____

APR - 8 1997

MEMORANDUM TO ADDRESSEES

Subject: Review of 3 reports for School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Longitudinal Study in Selected School Districts

Attached for your review are 3 draft reports from a study conducted under contract by Research Triangle Institute (RTI) of school-based drug prevention programs sponsored by the Drug-Free Schools and Communities program (now reauthorized as the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program).

These reports are:

- (1) School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Longitudinal Study in Selected School Districts. Final Report
- (2) Volume II: Technical Report
- (3) Local Education Agency Cross-Site Analysis: Final Report

This longitudinal study, which began in the fall of 1990, collected data annually from approximately 10,000 students in 19 school districts over 4 years, and also included case studies of the drug prevention programs in those districts.

Please note that the Executive Summary for this report was released to Congress on 2/20/97.

Also included for your review are a draft Congressional transmittal letter, a draft Dear Colleague letter, and an Analysis and Highlights (based on the transmittal letter that accompanied the Executive Summary).

I would appreciate your comments on the reports, the letters, and the Analysis and Highlights within 10 working days of the date of this memorandum.

If we do not hear from you by then, we will assume that you have no comments. Please indicate whether you have comments and sign in the appropriate space below. This memorandum as well as any written comments should be returned to Joanne Wiggins in room 4151, FOB 10 [fax: 401-4353]. If you have any questions, please contact her at 401-1958.

Thank you for your assistance.


Alan L. Ginsburg

Attachments

cc: Mike Smith
Jessica Levin
Michelle Cavataio

Addressees:

Thomas Bloom, OIG
Kay Casstevens, OLCA
Tom Skelly, BS
David Frank, OPA
Beverly Blondell, OPA
Philip Link, ES
Mario Moreno, OIIA
Acting Assistant Secretary, OERI
Gerald Tirozzi, OESE
Judith Winston, OGC

Review of: (1) School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Longitudinal Study in Selected School Districts: Final Report
(2) Volume II: Technical Report
(3) Local Education Agency Cross-Site Analysis

[] No comments.

Signature _____

Office _____ Date _____

[] Comments noted. See attached.

Signature _____

Office _____ Date _____

[Return to Joanne Wiggins, Room 4151, FOB-10B, Fax number 401-4353.]

Dear [Congressperson]:

Enclosed is a copy of School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Longitudinal Study in Selected School Districts: Final Report, along with two accompanying reports, Volume II: Technical Report, and Local Education Agency Cross-Site Analysis: Final Report, and an Analysis and Highlights. (Please note that the Executive Summary for this report was previously transmitted to you.)

This is the full final report presenting the findings from a study, conducted under contract by Research Triangle Institute (RTI), of school-based drug prevention programs sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's Drug-Free Schools and Communities program (now reauthorized as the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program).

The study collected data annually from approximately 10,000 students in 19 school districts over 4 years, and also included case studies of the drug prevention programs in those districts. The confidential student surveys covered student self-reported use of alcohol and other drugs, as well as related measures such as attitudes and beliefs towards drugs. Although the student responses derive from a nonrepresentative sample of districts, the responses are consistent with national trends. The case studies focused on implementation of the drug prevention programs and included interviews with program and school staff, reviews of program materials, and observations of prevention activities.

As stated in the transmittal letter that accompanied the Executive Summary, the Department takes the findings of this study very seriously and intends to use the data to improve the program.

We hope the information in the report will be of use to you and your staff. If you have any questions about the report, please call Val Plisko, Director of the Elementary and Secondary Education Division of the Planning and Evaluation Service, at (202) 401-1958. If you have questions about the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program, please call program director Bill Modzeleski at (202) 260-1856.

Sincerely,

Marshall S. Smith
Acting

Enclosure

Dear Colleague:

Enclosed is a copy of School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Longitudinal Study in Selected School Districts: Final Report, along with an Executive Summary and two accompanying reports, Volume II: Technical Report, and Local Education Agency Cross-Site Analysis: Final Report, and an Analysis and Highlights.

This is the full final report presenting the findings from a study, conducted under contract by Research Triangle Institute (RTI), of school-based drug prevention programs sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's Drug-Free Schools and Communities program (now reauthorized as the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program).

The study collected data annually from approximately 10,000 students in 19 school districts over 4 years, and also included case studies of the drug prevention programs in those districts. The confidential student surveys covered student self-reported use of alcohol and other drugs, as well as related measures such as attitudes and beliefs towards drugs. Although the student responses derive from a nonrepresentative sample of districts, the responses are consistent with national trends. The case studies focused on implementation of the drug prevention programs and included interviews with program and school staff, reviews of program materials, and observations of prevention activities.

The Department takes the findings of this study very seriously and intends to use the data to improve the program.

We hope the information in the report will be of use to you. If you have any questions about the report, please call the Planning and Evaluation Service at (202) 401-1958. For questions about the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program, please call the program office at (202) 260-3954.

Sincerely,

Alan L. Ginsburg
Director, Planning and Evaluation Service

Enclosure



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20202- _____

ANALYSIS AND HIGHLIGHTS

School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Longitudinal Study in Selected School Districts

Background

This report summarizes the findings from a study, conducted under contract by Research Triangle Institute (RTI), of school-based drug prevention programs sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's Drug-Free Schools and Communities program (now reauthorized as the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program).

The data collection for this longitudinal study, which began in the 1991-92 school year and ended in 1994-1995, predates the implementation of statutory changes made by the Improving America's Schools Act in Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The changes made in that Act, in addition to adding violence prevention to the program, focus more money at the local level and target 30 percent of the local educational agency (LEA) funds to LEAs with the greatest need for program services.

The study collected data annually from approximately 10,000 students in 19 school districts over 4 years, and also included case studies of the drug prevention programs in those districts. The confidential student surveys covered student self-reported use of alcohol and other drugs, as well as related measures such as attitudes and beliefs towards drugs. Although the student responses derive from a nonrepresentative sample of districts, the responses are consistent with national trends. The case studies focused on implementation of the drug prevention programs and included interviews with program and school staff, reviews of program materials, and observations of prevention activities.

Key Findings

Effects of District Programs

- *Some drug prevention programs improved student outcomes, but effects were small.*
 - Student outcomes were somewhat better in districts where the prevention programs had greater stability over time (in place for a long period, with continuity of staff, planning, and leadership), and in districts with more extensive program components (targeting both the general student population and high-risk students, and including student support services — such as student assistance programs, student support groups, individual and group counseling, mentoring projects, and conflict mediation).

Implementation

- *Few schools employed program approaches that have been found effective in previous research.*
 - Districts rarely implemented approaches that according to current research have the greatest potential for making a difference for students, such as those that teach children how to resist and deal with the powerful social influences for using drugs and those that correct the misperceptions of peer drug use. A likely reason is the higher cost of these approaches, particularly in terms of teacher training and staff time.
 - While all school districts conducted informal assessments of their programs periodically, fewer than half conducted and responded to the evidence of more formal evaluations in selecting or altering their programs.
- *Program delivery was variable and inconsistent, even within schools.*
 - The amount and content of prevention programming varied greatly from classroom to classroom and school to school, even within districts that were attempting to deliver consistent programs.
 - Inconsistent implementation resulted because teachers and counselors simply did not have enough time, support, training, or motivation to provide all the instruction or other activities that they had planned to provide.

Student Attitudes, Beliefs, and Behaviors

- *Student behaviors, beliefs, and attitudes about drugs mirrored national trends, showing increases over time in drug use and attitudes and beliefs favorable to drug use.*
 - Alcohol was the most widely used substance for students at any grade level, and it was also the first drug that most students tried. One-third of students surveyed had tried alcohol (more than just a sip) prior to or while in grade 5. Eighteen percent of 8th graders and 24 percent of 9th graders reported being heavy users of alcohol.
 - Students believed that their peers approved of drugs more than they themselves did (and more than the peers reported) and also held inflated beliefs about the amount of drugs their peers used.
 - The use of drugs was related to violent behavior in schools. A much larger percentage of current users of alcohol and other drugs (32 percent of them) reported being involved in school fights as the aggressors than did current

nonusers (14 percent of those students) or students who had never tried drugs (6 percent). Higher levels of reported gang activity and violence at school were significantly associated with greater drug use and more tolerant views toward drugs.

- Students who reported that they had positive school experiences were significantly less likely to use drugs than their peers who had negative experiences with school.
- Concerning student use of time, activities associated with lower drug use included sports and exercise, volunteer work, and spending more than two hours per day on homework; spending more time on video games or watching television was associated with greater drug use.

Conclusions

- *Larger social influences should be considered in any future research and in rethinking drug prevention efforts.*
 - Wide variations in student drug use in the different communities studied suggest that research should explore alternative models that can influence social norms affecting student behavior.

The study concludes that district programs need to be stable and extensive, and they need to provide prevention-related classroom instruction and school-wide special events. Given the myriad influences on students' lives, including media messages and peer behavior, school-based prevention programs face an uphill challenge.

School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Longitudinal Study in Selected School Districts includes 4 reports: Final Report; Executive Summary; Volume II: Technical Report; and Local Education Agency Cross-Site Analysis.

Copies are available from the Planning and Evaluation Service, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Ave., SW, Room 4162, Washington, DC 20202-8240 or (202) 401-0590. Please specify which of the 4 reports you would like.

Safe / Drug-Free

U.S. Department of Education

Michele Cavataio, Chief of Staff
Office of the Deputy Secretary

600 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington DC 20202-0500



Phone : (202) 401-1000
Fax : (202) 401-3095
E-mail : michele_cavataio@ed.gov

Date : 6/4/97 Total # of pages including cover sheet: 3
To : Bill Kincaid Recipient Fax: 456-7028

Schedule Proposal

Date _____

ACCEPT_____
REGRET_____
PENDING

TO: Stephanie Streett
Deputy Assistant to the President and
Director of Scheduling and Advance

FROM: Kitty Higgins
Assistant to the President and
Secretary to the Cabinet

REQUEST: Participation by the President

PURPOSE: To present a visible display of the President's commitment to
safety and drug prevention in schools and to motivate the people
engaged in these activities.

BACKGROUND: ED's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education is holding an
invitational conference that will demonstrate the existence of
effective mechanisms for preventing alcohol and drug use and
violent behavior, as well as for creating safe schools. Invitees will
include Governors' offices, Safe and Drug-Free School
Coordinators from each of the State Education Agencies (SEAs)
and 50-75 of the largest local educational agencies (LEAs).
Representatives from national education groups will also be
invited. In all, there will be approximately 300 participants.

The conference will highlight promising drug and violence
prevention strategies and programs, and make attendees aware of
the latest research and evaluation findings in the area of drug and
violence prevention. There will be break-out sessions of small
groups to talk about the different model programs.

This conference will be sponsored by ED; the Office of Juvenile
Justice and Delinquency Prevention; the Office of National Drug
Control Policy; the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;
the National Institute on Drug Abuse; the National Institute of
Justice; the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention; and the
National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

DATE & TIME: First Choice: June 16, 1997, morning, for opening of conference.
Second Choice: June 16, 1997, afternoon or evening. The conference will run from June 16-18.

DURATION: 30-45 minutes

LOCATION: Arlington, VA -- Crystal Gateway Marriott

PARTICIPANTS: The President; Secretary Riley; Assistant Secretary of Elementary and Secondary Education Gerald Tirozzi

OUTLINE OF EVENTS: Assistant Secretary Tirozzi will give a welcome and introduce Secretary Riley. Secretary Riley will give opening remarks and introduce the President. The President will speak on his commitment to violence and drug prevention among youth, and discuss the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program.

REMARKS REQUIRED: Talking Points

MEDIA COVERAGE: Open

FIRST LADY'S ATTENDANCE: Welcomed, not required

RECOMMENDED BY: Richard W. Riley, Secretary of Education

CONTACT: Michele Cavataio
Office of the Deputy Secretary
401-1000

Bill Modzeleski
Director, Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program
260-1856

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 22, 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

SUBJECT: Implementation of the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994, and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act

Our schools are increasingly plagued by violence and crime that is abhorrent to all law-abiding citizens. It is of paramount importance that this Nation's schools be safe, disciplined, and conducive to learning.

Several laws passed this year will promote our effort to make schools safe for learning. The Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994 provides that within one year, every State receiving Federal aid for elementary and secondary education must have a law requiring school districts to expel from school for at least one year any student who brings a gun to school, subject to certain exceptions. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act funds comprehensive violence prevention programs, including those that enhance school security.

To ensure vigorous enforcement, I am directing you to coordinate implementation of these anti-violence measures with appropriate local authorities to the maximum extent possible. Your collaborative efforts should include the States, school districts, law enforcement agencies, and educators. In the case of the Gun-Free Schools Act, enforcement should include termination of Federal assistance if you determine that a State is not in compliance.

You should report to me in writing by December 31 on the specific steps you have taken to implement these statutes.

William J. Clinton



FOR RELEASE
February 21, 1997

Contact: Jim Bradshaw
(202) 401-2310

**DEPARTMENT RELEASES NEW STUDY ON DRUG PREVENTION EFFORTS,
RILEY CALLS FOR INCREASED EFFORTS TO RID SCHOOLS OF DRUGS**

A four-year look at drug education programs running from the 1991-92 school year to 1994-95 found that there are promising approaches which can improve the effectiveness of drug prevention efforts. These approaches include: using prevention programs that are based on research; delivering programs with more consistency; and providing teachers with new techniques to reach students.

The study, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, followed 10,000 fifth- and sixth-graders in 19 school districts for four years, tracking their drug use habits and the types of drug prevention programs to which they were exposed.

In his State of American Education address Tuesday, Riley declared that making schools safe and drug-free was one of his highest priorities.

"Achievement can only occur if we have schools that are safe and drug-free," Riley said in his Atlanta speech. "An unsafe school is a failing school. Children cannot learn if they are surrounded by drugs and violence. Today, we are confronted by the fact that eighth-grade drug use is up for the fifth year in a row."

In response to the release of this report, Riley added, "We take these findings very seriously. Clearly the current effort is not enough. We must be more effective in reaching students. Parents, schools and the whole country must be involved."

-MORE-

Recognizing that these programs need to be implemented consistently in order to be effective, Secretary Riley has proposed special appropriations language that would require state grant funds from the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act be used according to principles of drug education effectiveness that will be published this spring in the *Federal Register* for public comment.

The principles are intended to ensure that all school districts implement programs that are designed according to tested, research-based drug prevention strategies with a solid assessment component for judging how well the projects are working.

"The strongest theme that emerged throughout our examination of the drug prevention programs in the participating districts was variability ... at least as much variation in the delivery of prevention program components within districts as among them," wrote researchers E. Suyapa Silvia and Judy Thorne of Research Triangle Institute, which conducted the work for the department.

"At all grade levels, teachers varied greatly in the amount of time they devoted to prevention instruction. ... Teachers in a given school did not always use a common set of prevention curriculum materials; but even when they did, they presented or omitted different sections or activities," Silvia and Thorne said in their report, *School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Longitudinal Study in Selected School Districts*.

They noted that drug education experts believe that inconsistent or incomplete delivery of the prevention curriculum is one of the main reasons even those approaches that have proven effective under test conditions may not show positive results when implemented elsewhere.

-MORE-

Other findings:

- Student results were somewhat better in districts where prevention programs had greater stability over time and in districts with more extensive program components, including support services, but effects were small.
- Few schools employed approaches that have been found effective in previous research (such as those that teach children how to resist or deal with the powerful social influences for using drugs and those that correct misperceptions of peer drug use) -- perhaps because of their cost in terms of teacher training and staff time.
- Attitudes among fifth- and sixth-graders toward illicit substances -- as well as their actual levels of drug use -- were highly predictive of their attitudes and drug use levels four years later.
- Students who reported positive school experiences were significantly less likely to use drugs than their peers who had negative experiences with school.
- Activities associated with lower drug use included sports and exercise, volunteer work, and spending more than two hours per day on homework. Spending more time on video games or watching television was associated with greater drug use.
- Alcohol was the most widely used illicit substance for students at any grade level, and it was also the first drug that most students tried.
- One-third of the students surveyed had drunk alcohol (more than just a sip) before or while in grade five. Eighteen percent of eighth-graders and 24 percent of ninth-graders reported being heavy users of alcohol.
- Given the small impact of programs reported in this study and the rise in student drug use nationally, larger social influences need to be addressed in rethinking drug prevention efforts. Wide variations in student drug use in the different communities studied suggest that research should explore alternative models that can influence social norms affecting student behavior.

NOTE TO EDITORS:

Copies of the executive summary of *School-Based Drug Prevention Programs: A Longitudinal Study in Selected School Districts* may be obtained from the Planning and Evaluation Service, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Ave., SW, Room 4162, Washington, DC 20202-8240 or (202) 401-0590.

The report will also be available online in the coming weeks at the department's Web site: www.ed.gov.

###