

Economic Planning Agency, about 17% of Japanese households had personal

computers. "If every household has a computer at home, we won't need this

kind of school anymore." Kitaoka added. ■

TRADE

13. Education Daily

June 25, 1997 Category: Trade

*Safe Drug Free/
Block grant*

MERGING SAFE SCHOOLS FUNDS INTO BLOCK GRANTS ENDORSED

A House panel chairman yesterday suggested he will support combining funding for schools' anti-drug efforts into new state block grants. Citing reports that dozens of anti-drug programs are managed by numerous federal agencies, Rep. Peter Hoekstra, R-Mich., said "it is this sort of duplication we should strive to eradicate." Hoekstra discussed the anti-drug efforts at a hearing by his House Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. Rep. Joe Barton, R-Texas, talked up a bill he hopes to introduce soon that would move the \$556 million annually from the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program out of the Education Department and into the Health and Human Services Department. The funds then would be sent to states as block grants. "We do not have a federal agency that deals specifically with education and treatment ... programs," Barton said. His bill also would consolidate anti-drug funding in HHS and the Housing and Urban Development

Department into the block grant. Barton said he would not specify funding levels in his legislation. GAO Cites Duplication Congress's watchdog agency, the General Accounting Office, released statistics yesterday indicating that in fiscal 1995, there were 70 federal programs+spread over 13 entities and costing \$2.4 billion+that could have funded substance abuse and violence prevention services for young people. Private-sector efforts and state and local government programs add to the patchwork, it said. "The system that has developed ... has created potential for inefficient service as well as difficulty for those trying to access the most appropriate services and funding sources," said Carlotta Joyner, GAO's director of education and employment issues, at the hearing. Barton's plan would require groups getting grants to collaborate with local schools. House Republicans have repeatedly attacked the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, one of President Clinton's pet projects. Last year, a GOP congressman

introduced legislation to roll the funding into a youth development block grant (ED, Sept. 20, 1996). Barton introduced a similar bill last summer, but Congress took no action on it. He said he will reintroduce it this year "at the right time."

Democrats argued that the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program should remain a separate funding stream. Rep. Patsy Mink of Hawaii, the panel's ranking Democrat, said the program is specific to school sites and, therefore, logically should be run by ED. "It has wide support" from local educators "and I see no reason why it should be part of HHS," Mink said. Rep. Bob Etheridge, D-N.C., a former school superintendent, read statements from local educators who feared funding would be diverted from drug-abuse prevention and toward drug treatment if programs are consolidated. The hearing was part of the House education committee's examination of allegedly wasteful programs. Hoekstra said more hearings are planned. +Laureen Lazarovici ■

14. Education Daily

June 25, 1997 Category: Trade

School to Work

ED OUTLINES FIVE-YEAR PUSH FOR SCHOOL-TO-WORK

The Education Department wants to integrate key components of school-to-work programs into 30 percent of the nation's high schools by decade's end. ED also aims to engage 2 million youths in school-to-work activities by 2000, when federal funding for the program expires. The five-year strategy also calls for expanding public school choice by 2001, and prodding states to set challenging performance

standards (ED, June 19). As of June 1996, about 23 percent of the nation's 111,500 elementary and secondary high schools were engaged in school-to-work, said J.D. Hoyer, director of the National School-to-Work Office, which is co-funded by ED and the Labor Department. More Involvement From 1995 to 1996, the proportion of elementary schools with school-to-work activities increased from 7 percent to 9

percent. Hoyer said last week at the semi-annual meeting of the two departments' Advisory Council for School-to-Work Opportunities, a coalition of private industry, labor and community advocates. The number of middle schools with school-to-work activities jumped 10 percentage points, to 28 percent, and high schools showed a 9-point gain, to 44 percent, during the same period. More than 2,300 high

schools with school-to-work programs report classes connect core academic coursework, career-related courses and work-based learning, the national office says. This involves more than 280,000 students, according to a plan on sustaining school-to-work programs the office circulated at the meeting. Postsecondary Push ED's plan also calls for boosting the percentage of students in school-to-work programs who complete high school and enter postsecondary education, although it doesn't specify a target. ED says that by this fall, the percentage of four-year colleges with admission policies that acknowledge academic credit for work-based learning should increase, but it doesn't specify a target. The National Center for Research in Vocational Education recently reported that college admission

restrictions may hamper high school students' willingness to embrace school-to-work activities (ED, April 17). Business Boom ED aims to have at least 600,000 employers providing at least one school-to-work activity by 2000. It also wants 70 percent of companies participating in the program to offer work-based learning slots. The plan notes the number of businesses involved in school-to-work increased by 50 percent between December 1995 and June 1996, to more than 200,000. About 86 percent of these firms were small businesses, with fewer than 50 employees. Several business representatives on the council questioned how the business community could meet those goals in three years. Council member Barbara Green, executive director of the Greater New York Hospital Foundation in New York

City, suggested the federal government first determine the "level of intensity" students need to achieve program goals. "Once you know that, then perhaps we can define the number of employers and the kinds of activities they would be involved in," she said. She also recommended businesses sign up with intermediaries, such as chambers of commerce, that can link them to schools and give technical assistance and professional development to employers and teachers. By decade's end, ED also wants to upgrade teachers' hands-on work skills by "significantly" boosting the number of internships offered to them, although it doesn't set a goal. ED's strategic plan says about 5,800 teachers now have internships, and nearly half are with small companies. — Matthew Dembicki ■

15. Education Daily

June 25, 1997 Category: Trade

HALF OF DSL SCHOOLS STILL DABBLING IN COMPETING FEL

Half of postsecondary institutions making direct loans also participate in the Family Education Loan (FEL) program, Education Department data shows. Of the 1,290 schools ED says are active in the Direct Student Loan (DSL) program, 633 make only direct loans, according to data from the 1996-97 academic year. Advocates of the competing programs are split on what the numbers mean. The National Council of Higher Education Loan Programs (NCHELP), which represents student loan guarantors, finds the numbers "damning." It says that out of all schools that participate in FEL and DSL, only 8 percent are solely in direct lending. "A lot of the schools said they weren't going to go 100 percent," said Lisa Ross, a senior advisor at NCHELP and former staffer for Sen. Nancy Kassebaum, R-Kan., who served as chairwoman of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. Kassebaum was one of many Republicans who pushed for strict limits on DSL volume when the program was created in 1993. But Joe McCormick, who heads ED's Direct Loan Task Force, said a number of schools have chosen to stay in both programs because of the

political uncertainty that has surrounded DSL, as Congress has tried to cap or abolish it. He said ED expects more schools to become sole DSL participants out of fiscal necessity. "It's easier to maintain one program instead of two," he said. "You can expect more to go 100 percent."

McCormick said the relatively low number of schools fully participating in DSL is not a reflection of the program's efficiency because schools were expected to hang on to FEL while they made the transition to DSL. "Throwing numbers around is a waste of time," he said. "It is misleading to say that DSL isn't doing as well because schools didn't go 100 percent off the bat."

McCormick said a number of schools have chosen to phase in the program starting with each new freshman class. He said professional programs, such as medical schools and law schools, have stayed in FEL because most of the students have those type loans from their undergraduate programs. Another reason, he said, is the marketplace. Schools are playing one program off the other to get a better deal for students. Congress, ED and the higher education community, including NCHELP, have agreed that

competition between both loan programs has improved services for schools and students (ED, May 21). And all sides have agreed to a truce during the Higher Education Act reauthorization, allowing DSL and FEL to continue on a competitive basis. Guarantee Agency Cuts But Ross said President Clinton's proposals to reclaim guarantors' federal reserves — used to cover the cost of defaulted student loans — and establish a performance-based system for compensating the agencies could destabilize the system. "You've got an awful lot of schools still participating in the FEL program and you've got the department wanting to get rid of guarantee agencies," she said. While Clinton's fiscal 1998 budget calls for using the entire \$2.5 billion in reserves to reduce student's loan fees, the House and Senate budget committees want to reclaim about half that money over five years to reduce the federal deficit. The congressional plans also would cap cost allowances to the agencies, a major source of income, at \$170 million for fiscal 1998 and 1999 and \$150 million for fiscal 2000 through 2002 (ED, June 23). The House and Senate hope to vote on their respective balanced budget plans

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

pressure, managing anxiety, and making healthy choices, and the program must be reinforced in subsequent years.

Another longitudinal study sponsored by NIDA is examining the effectiveness of Project STAR, a social influence prevention program being implemented in Kansas City (KS and MO), whose components include mass media programming, a school-based educational program for youths, parent education, and community organization. In the first two years of the project, 22,500 6th- and 7th-graders received prevention education, along with the other project components. Analysis of 42 schools indicates that use of cigarettes, alcohol, and marijuana was significantly lower one year after the prevention activities, compared to schools where this intervention was delayed; the net increase in drug use among intervention schools was half that in schools that had not yet received the intervention.

Improving Program Effectiveness

However, the DFSC longitudinal study also found that drug prevention approaches that have been shown to be effective are not widely used, while approaches that have not shown evidence of effectiveness or have not been evaluated properly are the most common approaches currently in use. In response, the budget request includes appropriations language that would improve the accountability of the program by requiring recipients of SDFSC State grants to use these funds for prevention strategies that meet principles of effectiveness to be published by the Secretary of Education. These principles, which would be published in the *Federal Register* for public comment, are along the following lines:

- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall base their programs on an assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in the schools and community served.
- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall design their activities to meet their measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention.
- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall base the design and implementation of their activities on research or evaluation that provides evidence that the strategies used prevent or reduce drug use, violence, or disruptive behavior among youth.
- SDFSC prevention programs may use prevention approaches that have not yet been proved effective if the programs are part of an evaluation-based demonstration designed to validate the effectiveness of the approach.
- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall evaluate their programs periodically to assess their progress toward achieving their goals and objectives.
- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall use their evaluation results to correct approaches that are not working, to strengthen approaches that are working, and to refine their goals and objectives.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Safe and drug-free schools and communities: State grants

The above principles are grounded in current research and designed to ensure that, within the very flexible framework of the SDFSC Act, States and school districts spend their SDFSC funds in the most effective manner possible. The authorizing statute currently is so flexible, that recipients of these funds may be using them to support activities that are the most popular or the easiest to implement, but not necessarily the most effective at reducing drug use and violence among youth. The new principles of effectiveness would preserve State and local flexibility but ensure that program funds are used in a manner most likely to result in positive outcomes.

Performance Indicators

In response to the requirements of the Government Performance Review Act and to help the Federal Government, States, and localities assess the performance of programs supported with SDFSC funds, the Department has developed a draft set of core indicators for the SDFSC State Grants program. The indicators will be implemented through a model data collection system, currently under development. The Department also will provide technical assistance to States in implementing this system. The indicators will attempt to measure program outcomes (e.g., use of alcohol and other drugs, and incidence of violence and other criminal acts in schools); types of services provided; participation in the program by school districts, schools, and students; and selected aspects of program administration. To help validate these indicators, and contribute to an assessment of the SDFSC program, in 1996 the Department contracted for a 5-year study on school violence and promising violence prevention programs. Additional SDFSC program evaluation efforts are in the planning stages.

Adequate Funding is Essential

Funding at the requested level is needed to help reverse the upward trend in drug use and stem the tide of crime and violence in our schools and communities. Toward this end, the SDFSC program provides significant resources to motivate America's youth to reject illegal drugs as well as the use of alcohol and tobacco, which is Goal Number 1 of the National Drug Control Strategy.

Causes for increased tolerance of drug use vary, but may largely result from recent teenagers receiving less information about drugs and fewer anti-drug messages than their predecessors. (Other factors include pro-drug messages from popular music and, for alcohol and cigarettes, from advertisements, as well as increased teen smoking, which is strongly correlated with marijuana use.) A decrease in drug use will likely depend on more anti-drug messages from parents, schools, and the mass media, a decrease in pro-drug messages in popular culture, a decline in the accessibility of drugs, and prevention programs that give students the information and skills they need to refuse drugs. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program plays a critical role in our Nation's effort to reduce drug use by supporting prevention programs in 97 percent of school districts. Increased funding at the 1998 request level will help provide resources for improving our Nation's effort to get the message across to each new generation of adolescents about the dangers of drugs and arm them with skills to decline drug use, as well as the effort to keep our schools safe and free of

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

Principles of Effectiveness

Question: How do the principles differ from what's already required of State and local grantees by the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities authorizing statute?

Answer: The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act provides an excellent framework for helping State and local educational agencies and community-based organizations plan and implement effective drug and violence prevention programs. For example, the Act requires local educational agencies (LEAs) to:

- Conduct an assessment of their drug and violence problems;
- Develop a comprehensive plan for drug and violence prevention, including measurable goals for drug and violence prevention, and a method for assessing and publicly reporting progress toward attaining those goals; and
- Design, implement, and evaluate their prevention programs in consultation with a local or substate regional advisory council that makes recommendations regarding program improvement.

However, the Act does not explicitly require LEAs to:

- Have clear and objective measurable goals and objectives that are tied to program outcomes, not just to program implementation;
- Base their prevention programs on their needs assessment (under current law, LEAs often do not do so); or
- Use their SDFSC funds on prevention strategies that research or evaluation has shown to be effective.

Question: How will the Department ensure that grantees operate their drug and violence prevention programs in a manner consistent with these principles of effectiveness?

Answer: The Department is considering various ways -- such as issuance of further guidance and provision of additional technical assistance and monitoring -- to ensure that the principles guide recipients' effective use of funds.

4000-01-P

DRAFT

AGENCY: Department of Education

MAR - 7 1997

ACTION: Notice of Request for Public Comment

SUMMARY: The Department requests public comment on draft Principles of Effectiveness that would govern recipients' use of Fiscal Year 1998 and future years' funds received under Title II-B, and Title IV-State and local programs, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act -- the Eisenhower Professional Development and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grant programs.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before (insert the 60th day after publication in the Federal Register).

ADDRESSES: All comments concerning this notice should be addressed to William Wooten, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education... [add mailing address, phone number, and Internet address.]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Contact Arthur Cole [or designee] regarding the proposed Principles of Effectiveness for the Title II-B Eisenhower Professional Development State Grant program, and William Modzeleski [or designee] regarding the proposed Principles of Effectiveness for the Title IV Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State and local programs. [add mailing addresses, phone numbers, and Internet addresses.] Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf [TDD] may call the Federal Information Relay Service [FIRS] at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. And 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The various programs that comprise the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as reauthorized in 1994 as part of the

Improving America's Schools Act (Pub. L. 103-382), are designed to work, individually and collectively, in support of State and local efforts to increase the academic achievement of all of the Nation's school children. Title II-B and Title IV-State and local programs - of the ESEA are the Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Act State Grants Program (Eisenhower) and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) State Grant program. These two programs are by far the largest Federal education programs supporting efforts of all States and school districts to ensure that an increasingly diverse student population can enjoy two particular conditions pivotal to their increased academic achievement -- highly skilled and trained teachers, and a safe, drug and violence-free school environment.

While identifying a number of elements that must be considered in how Title II-B and Title IV funds are used, both the Eisenhower Act and the SDFSCA offer States, schools, school districts, and other recipients wide latitude in determining the kinds of programs that they believe best serve their needs. However, as observers have watched how recipients have exercised this discretion, they have questioned whether further direction is needed to help ensure that the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated for each program are being spent as effectively as possible. Moreover, as local, State, and Federal partnerships strive to accomplish our National Education Goals and ensure that all students achieve to high standards of learning and development, there is an increasing need to clarify what recipients need to do to make sure that their Title II-B and Title IV strategies and activities are most likely to succeed.

Need for Eisenhower Principles of Effectiveness. We now know about the kinds of training, skills, knowledge, and support that will help those who will become teachers make

successful transitions to the classroom, and that will help those who are current teachers to teach more effectively. Traditional forms of professional development -- e.g., those lacking sufficient intensity, duration and follow-up to have likely impact on classroom performance, and those without clear connection to high standards and related curriculum or to diverse learning styles -- simply will not work. Throughout the nation States and school districts, teachers and administrators, increasingly are breaking old habits and implementing new forms of professional development practices that respond to what teachers really need. Still, the pace at which many States and school districts are implementing new practices, and establishing high-quality performance indicators that will inform them about whether Title II-B activities are succeeding, remains uneven. More needs to be done to ensure that all Title II-B recipients understand and implement the kinds of professional development that Congress, in enacting the program, determined is essential for a high-quality teaching force that is equipped to help students of all learning styles and needs increase their levels of achievement.

These problems largely are not statutory ones. The Eisenhower statute, unlike its predecessors, includes basic, research-driven, principles of quality professional development that recipients already are required to build into all of their Title II-B activities. For example, the law already highlights the need for performance indicators and other elements that reflect effective ways to plan, implement, and assess professional development activities. However, these statutory requirements lack a clear, succinct statement of the kind of learning environments in which high-quality professional development should exist. Therefore, what is needed to focus Title II-B is simply a clearer statement of the statutory principles that already are law. In this regard, the proposed Principles of Effectiveness for the Title II-B Eisenhower State Grant program are intended to clarify basic, existing program requirements.

Need for SDFSCA Principles of Effectiveness. For the SDFSCA, the problem is similar. Despite a significant commitment of Federal financial resources to support programs designed to prevent youth drug use and violence, recent National data reflect increased rates of drug use among school-aged youth and significant rates of school violence. While information about promising and effective drug and violence prevention programs and strategies is available, too often State and local decisions about which prevention approaches to implement are not guided by this research base. Schools and community organizations frequently initiate activities designed to prevent youth drug use or violence without conducting a high-quality needs assessment or establishing clear and objective measurable expectations about program outcomes. Lack of data and performance indicators for program efforts make it difficult to assess program success and revise or jettison ineffective activities.

Therefore, as one of a series of activities designed to improve the quality of drug and violence prevention programming being implemented with SDFSCA funds, the Secretary is proposing that SDFSCA State Grants program funds be used to implement drug and violence prevention strategies and programs in a manner consistent with the Principles of Effectiveness set forth in this Notice. These principles, in conjunction with existing statutory and regulatory provisions, would provide the missing portion of a framework for helping State and local educational agencies and community-based organizations plan and implement effective drug and violence prevention programs.

Proposed Principles of Effectiveness

In response to the concerns addressed above, the Department's fiscal year 1998 budget proposal includes appropriations language that would require all recipients of Eisenhower State Grant and SDFSCA State Grant funds to use their Title II-B and Title IV funds in a manner

consistent with the Department's final statement of these Principles of Effectiveness. In developing these principles, the Department has reviewed research findings and the best available exemplary practices related to professional development and making schools drug- and violence-free, and has initiated a number of informal discussions with members of the public and research community on how these principles might improve the outcome of programs supported with Eisenhower and SDFSCA funds.

The proposed principles are set forth in Appendix A and Appendix B to this notice. If Congress enacts the Department's proposed appropriations language for fiscal year 1998 and for subsequent fiscal years, these principles (once they are published in final in a future *Federal Register* notice) would apply, by law, for each of those years to all recipients of Eisenhower and SDFSCA State Grant program funds in designing, implementing, and assessing their programs in conjunction with existing statutory and regulatory requirements of the Eisenhower and SDFSCA programs.

Except as they refer to the Department's Mission and Principles of Professional Development, the Principles of Effectiveness for the Eisenhower program (Appendix A) synthesize important aspects of current law but create no new requirements. The Department is proposing one new requirement, that recipients tie their activities to a strategy for implementing the Mission and Principles of Professional Development, because the Department and the larger education community are in agreement that the Mission and Principles reflect professional development that represents best practices. In this regard, the Department published, for public comment, a draft Mission and Statement of Principles of Professional Development on December 9, 1994 (59 FR 63773), and issued the Mission and Principles in final form in July 1995.

Unlike the Eisenhower Principles of Effectiveness, the SDFSCA Principles of Effectiveness expand the breadth of existing statutory requirements in ways that are needed to make the SDFSCA substantially more effective. However, within the context of these principles, program recipients are free to determine for themselves the activities that best meet their needs.

The Department is considering various strategies -- such as issuance of further guidance and technical assistance and monitoring-- to ensure that recipients understand the final Principles and that, if given the force and effect of law, will know how to implement the Principles to promote the effective use of Eisenhower and SDFSCA funds. Between now and July 1, 1998 (when fiscal year 1998 Title II-B and Title IV fund become available for obligation), the Department will collaborate with recipients of Eisenhower and SDFSCA funds regarding the types of efforts the Department should take to ensure that recipients understand and can carry out their responsibilities with regard to these Principles of Effectiveness.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW:

This program is subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR Part 79. The objective of the Executive order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism by relying on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

In accordance with the order, this document is intended to provide early notification of the Department's specific plans and actions for this program.

INVITATION TO COMMENT:

Interested persons are invited to submit comments and recommendations regarding

these proposed Principles of Effectiveness. The Department also is interested in receiving comments and recommendations on activities that it should undertake to ensure that all recipients understand what they must do to design and implement their program activities in ways that are consistent with the principles once these principles are final and become supplemental requirements of the Eisenhower and SDFSCA programs.

All comments submitted in response to this notice will be available for public inspection, during and after the comment period, in [room?], Washington, D.C., between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday of each week except Federal holidays.

Program Authority:

Dated:

Gerald M. Tirozzi
Assistant Secretary
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

Appendix A and B - Principles of Effectiveness

APPENDIX A

STATEMENT OF PROPOSED PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR THE EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (TITLE II, ESEA)

High-quality professional development is at the core of a recipient's efforts to achieve educational excellence. To ensure that recipients use Title II-B funds in ways that have a positive and lasting effect on teaching and learning --

- Recipients will base their Title II-B programs on an assessment of objective data that, covering the entire spectrum of teacher recruitment, preservice, induction and inservice activities, as applicable, focuses on providing all current and future teachers the skills and knowledge they need to help all students achieve to high content and student performance standards.
- Recipients will establish measurable performance indicators for professional development, and will design their activities so as to meet those performance indicators.
- In designing and implementing their professional development activities, recipients will ensure that those activities are --
 - Aligned with challenging State and local content and performance standards, as available, and with curriculum used to help students meet these standards.

- Designed to focus on the diverse learning needs of students.
 - Based upon the best available research and practice in teaching and learning (e.g., activities that mirror how students learn, and that acknowledge parents as vital to student learning), and include strong academic content and pedagogical components to enable teachers to teach their subjects knowledgeably, in depth, and in ways that facilitate student learning.
 - Of sufficient intensity and duration to have a positive, lasting impact on classroom instruction.
 - Planned and implemented with the collaboration of the entire school community, including teachers, administrators, other school staff, and other appropriate parties.
 - Part of an overall strategy for implementing, maintaining, and supporting the Mission and Principles of Professional Development (see Appendix C).
-
- Recipients will assess their programs at least every three years to determine their progress toward achieving their goals and objectives for teacher effectiveness in improving student learning.
 - Recipients will use their assessment results to correct approaches that are not working, to strengthen approaches that are working, and to refine their goals and objectives.

APPENDIX B

STATEMENT OF PROPOSED PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR THE SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT STATE GRANTS PROGRAM (TITLE IV - STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS, ESEA)

Having safe and drug-free schools is one of our Nation's highest priorities. To ensure that grantees use Title IV funds in ways that preserve State and local flexibility but are most likely to reduce drug use and violence among youth --

- Local SDFSCA prevention programs shall base their programs on an assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in the schools and community served.
- Local SDFSCA prevention programs shall design their activities to meet their measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention.
- Local SDFSCA prevention programs shall base the design and implementation of their activities on research or evaluation that provides evidence that the strategies used prevent or reduce drug use, violence, or disruptive behavior among youth.
- SDFSCA prevention programs may use prevention approaches that have not yet been proved effective if the programs are part of an evaluation-based demonstration designed to validate the effectiveness of the approach.

- Local SDFSCA prevention programs shall evaluate their programs periodically to assess their progress toward achieving their goals and objectives.
- Local SDFSCA prevention programs shall use their evaluation results to correct approaches that are not working, to strengthen approaches that are working, and to refine their goals and objectives.
- Unless part of a larger, comprehensive program, SDFSCA funds may not be used for one-time events of short duration, approaches that provide only information about the characteristics and effects of drugs, or self esteem-building activities.

APPENDIX C

MISSION AND PRINCIPLES OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (July 5, 1995)

Professional development plays an essential role in successful education reform. Professional development serves as the bridge between where prospective and experienced educators are now and where they will need to be to meet the new challenges of guiding **all** students in achieving to higher standards of learning and development.

High-quality professional development as envisioned here refers to rigorous and relevant content, strategies, and organizational supports that ensure the preparation and career-long development of teachers and others whose competence, expectations and actions influence the teaching and learning environment. Both pre- and in-service professional development require partnerships among schools, higher education institutions and other appropriate entities to promote inclusive learning communities of everyone who impacts students and their learning. Those within and outside schools need to work together to bring to bear the ideas, commitment and other resources that will be necessary to address important and complex educational issues in a variety of settings and for a diverse student body.

Equitable access for all educators to such professional development opportunities is imperative. Moreover, professional development works best when it is part of a systemwide effort to improve and integrate the recruitment, selection, preparation, initial licensing, induction, ongoing development and support, and advanced certification of educators.

High-quality professional development should incorporate all of the principles stated below. Adequately addressing each of these principles is necessary for a full realization of the potential of individuals, school communities and institutions to improve and excel.

The mission of professional development is to prepare and support educators to help all students achieve to high standards of learning and development.

Professional Development:

- ... focuses on teachers as central to student learning, yet includes all other members of the school community;
- ... focuses on individual, collegial, and organizational improvement;
- ... respects and nurtures the intellectual and leadership capacity of teachers, principals, and others in the school community;
- ... reflects best available research and practice in teaching, learning, and leadership;
- ... enables teachers to develop further expertise in subject content, teaching strategies, uses of technologies, and other essential elements in teaching to high standards;
- ... promotes continuous inquiry and improvement embedded in the daily life of schools;

- ... is planned collaboratively by those who will participate in and facilitate that development;
- ... requires substantial time and other resources;
- ... is driven by a coherent long-term plan;
- ... is evaluated ultimately on the basis of its impact on teacher effectiveness and student learning; and this assessment guides subsequent professional development efforts.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by titles II, IV[-A-1], V-A and B, [VI], IX, X and XIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964; **[\$1,425,631,000] \$1,299,222,000**, of which **[\$1,202,478,000] \$977,000,000** shall become available on July 1, [1997] 1998, and remain available through September 30, [1998] 1999: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, **[\$310,000,000] \$360,000,000** shall be for Eisenhower professional development State grants under title II-B *of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*; **\$100,000,000** shall be for charter schools under title X, part C of such Act; and **[\$310,000,000]** shall be for innovative education program strategies State grants under title VI-A.] **\$750,000** shall be for an evaluation of comprehensive regional assistance centers under title XIII of such Act: *Provided further*, That funds under titles II-B and IV-A-1 shall be used only for programs that are consistent with principles of effectiveness to be published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of Education. (Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1997.)

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

Draft Principles of Effectiveness

The President's fiscal year 1998 budget includes appropriations language that would improve the accountability of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (SDFSC) program by requiring recipients of SDFSC State grants to use these funds for prevention strategies that meet principles of effectiveness to be published by the Secretary of Education. These principles, which would be published in the *Federal Register* for public comment, would be along the following lines:

- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall base their programs on an assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in the schools and community served.
- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall design their activities to meet their measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention.
- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall base the design and implementation of their activities on research or evaluation that provides evidence that the strategies used prevent or reduce drug use, violence, or disruptive behavior among youth.
- SDFSC prevention programs may use prevention approaches that have not yet been proved effective if the programs are part of an evaluation-based demonstration designed to validate the effectiveness of the approach.
- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall evaluate their programs periodically to assess their progress toward achieving their goals and objectives.
- Local SDFSC prevention programs shall use their evaluation results to correct approaches that are not working, to strengthen approaches that are working, and to refine their goals and objectives.
- Unless part of a larger, comprehensive program, SDFSC funds may not be used for one-time events of short duration, approaches that provide only information about the characteristics and effects of drugs, or self esteem-building activities.

The above principles are grounded in current research and designed to ensure that, within the very flexible framework of the SDFSC Act, States and school districts spend their SDFSC funds in the most effective manner possible. The authorizing statute currently is so flexible, that recipients of these funds may be using them to support activities that are the most popular or the easiest to implement, but not necessarily the most effective at reducing drug use and violence among youth. The new principles of effectiveness are intended to preserve State and local flexibility but ensure that program funds are used in a manner most likely to result in positive outcomes.



Michele_Cavataio @ ed.gov

03/26/97 04:02:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Dennis Burke, Michael Cohen, Elena Kagan, William R. Kincaid

cc:

Subject: Mtg follow up

Folks:

I wanted to follow up with some information from today's meeting. Below is the text that we are proposing to insert in appropriation's language. You'll note the last sentence says that the programs need to be consistent with the principles published in the federal register by the Secretary. This means that we do have some flexibility for their content, although we are expected to get significant outside input via the federal register. Our counsel's office is still assessing whether we would have to go back to the federal register if we wanted to make a change down the road. At this point, they believe that we would have to go through some formal rule-making procedures.

I am going to talk to Deputy Secretary Smith about whether he thinks we should pursue a stronger enforcement approach to the principles. He conceived of them initially, and I am not sure that this was what he had in mind, but we can look at some options.

I am also attaching the document I passed out which was missing a page. It lays out several strategies for responding to the RTI study. Please let me know if your computers can read it (it's in MS WORD.)

Thanks for your time this morning. We look forward to discussing these items further with you. (Bill/Dennis- I am not sure I have the right email address for Mike or Elena. Could you make sure they receive this note?)

Thanks,
Michele

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS **Appropriation's Language**

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by titles II, IV [A-1], V-A and B, [VI], IX, X and XIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964; [\$1,425,631,000] \$1,299,222,000, of which [\$1,202,478,000] \$977,000,000 shall become available on July 1, [1997] 1998, and remain available through September 30, [1998] 1999: Provided, That of the amount appropriated,

~~[\$310,000,000]~~ \$360,000,000 shall be for Eisenhower professional development State grants under title II-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; \$100,000,000 shall be for charter schools under title X, part C of such Act; and ~~[\$310,000,000]~~ shall be for innovative education program strategies State grants under title VI-A.] \$750,000 shall be for an evaluation of comprehensive regional assistance centers under title XIII of such Act: Provided further, That funds under titles II-B and IV-A-1 shall be used only for programs that are consistent with principles of effectiveness to be published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of Education.

NOTE: Text in brackets denotes proposed deletions from the (current fiscal year's) Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1997.

Response to issues raised on drug program effectiveness

The RTI study of drug prevention programs identified several problem areas in program implementation (as well as some positive areas.) The issues in this paper are intended to address the RTI study as well as information from the recent meeting with prevention researchers.

ED has at least four overarching objectives which could form the basis for our message on drug and violence prevention:

Schools need to use research-based approaches that have demonstrated effectiveness and eliminate or modify what doesn't work.

Schools need to set measureable goals and objectives to change behavior.

Schools, communities and families need to reinforce each other with zero tolerance messages and with messages of hope.

ED needs to do a better job of sharing information about what works.

In response to the study and conversations with researchers, the Department has identified seven areas for improvement:

1. Increase use of research-based prevention approaches

A. Improve effectiveness of prevention programming

FY98 appropriations language puts in place "principles of prevention" that will help strengthen the ability of ED to encourage the use of research-based approaches. ED will put the principles into the federal register for comments.

The Safe and Drug Free Schools (SDFS) program will spend \$2 million to replicate programs that have demonstrated success in smaller, controlled settings.

The SDFS program plans to implement a 5-year, \$15 million, demonstration project to identify broad-based strategies that work. A team has been put together to examine options for the design of this program. This program might take the form of a challenge grant.

- B.** The RTI study and other studies have stated that approaches to prevention other than curricular approaches can have positive impacts. The Department should consider approaches which will contribute to the improvement of the overall school climate. For example,
- Increase recognition opportunities by reinstating Safe and Drug Free schools recognition program
 - Focus on initiatives such as peer mediation, mentoring, student courts, class size, after school programs
 - Promote student compacts to stay drug free

2. Improve knowledge about what works among various customers

Planned activities:

SEAs

Meet in next 6 months with all SEA drug prevention coordinators and LEA coordinators from large districts to disseminate information and bring researchers together with practitioners

Teachers

Prepare three issues of Challenge Newsletter to teachers on effective programs (put this information into common media used by teachers)

General public

Put into federal register information about promising practices?

Create website with information about what works

Disseminate publication on what works and doesn't work

hold teleconference to promote effective programs

LEAs -- the Department does not do a good job in communicating with them

Develop listserve to share information and create dialogue among drug coordinators at local level

For consideration:

ED could establish an independent research organization or board responsible for determining what programs have demonstrated effectiveness OR ED could rely on research from peer reviewed journals.

The comprehensive assistance centers (CACs) do not provide assistance in the area of drug and violence prevention. The SDFS program hopes to continue funding for the National School Safety Center, but this center tends to have a crisis intervention approach rather than a strategic technical assistance approach because of its limited resources. ED will consider having some of the CACs specialize in the area of drug and violence prevention (in addition to their "comprehensive" duties.)

3. Improve consistency and effectiveness in the delivery of programs

Teachers often face competing priorities and drug and violence prevention often lose air time to more academic work. And when teachers do implement drug prevention programs, they often do not implement a program the way it was designed. In addition, they are often inexperienced with the kind of interactive teaching that works best for prevention programs. In response, ED is currently assessing the state of teacher training programs and exploring options for who, in addition to teachers, might successfully deliver prevention programs (outside folks, in-school health specialist, etc). The SDFS program has set aside \$2 million to respond to the information gathered, possibly through a grant program.

4. Consider targeting at district level

97 percent of schools receive some funds from the SDFS program which means as little as \$6-8 per child. States are already required to target extra 30 percent of funds to 10 percent of districts. But districts have no targeting requirements. Typically, districts spend a significant portion of money on a full or part time drug coordinator. The SDFS program will use some of its FY97 national programs money to examine the question of whether we should target at the district level. The results will be used to inform reauthorization.

5. Increase the amount of planning and evaluation by schools

Schools and/or districts are not doing a good job of using data to improve practice, and in some cases they don't do a good job of collecting the data. The SDFS program is planning a \$5

million demonstration program to help SEAs and LEAs collect and analyze information on drug use and violence in schools and use that information to improve practices.

The SEA/LEA conference hosted by the SDFS program is also designed to address this issue. It will have three components: 1) model needs assessment, 2) programs that have demonstrated success, 3) how to do evaluation.

6. Change attitudes of acceptance of drugs by youth and parents

Media campaign by Administration (ONDCP is leading this effort); ED will work to ensure our participation early on so that we can amplify the message in schools.

Parents guide "How to Raise Drug-free Kids" will be distributed to over 18 million people and advertised on ABC in March.

7. Improve research base

Several research organizations (NIDA, NIAAA, OJJDP, NAS, NIJ) are doing research related to drug and violence prevention. ED will meet with these groups to discuss a longer term research agenda. OERI and NCES will be brought into discussions to see how they can support research needs.

8. Help improve effectiveness of DARE program

Federal agencies who fund DARE are meeting to discuss how they can work together to make DARE a more effective program.

Safe and Drug-free Schools — DRAFT

Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
Outcomes			
1. Reduce alcohol and drug use and availability in schools.	1.1 Rates of alcohol and drug use (alcohol, marijuana, tobacco) in schools will decrease. 1.2 The number of students who are offered illegal drugs at school will decrease. <i>1992 levels were 10%, 18% and 23% for 8th, 10th, and 12th grades.</i>	1.1 Monitoring the Future (MTF), 1997 (8th, 10th, and 12th grade use of alcohol, marijuana, tobacco use measured.) 1.2 MTF, 1997	The strategies for working with schools are focused on helping schools to improve the quality of their drug and violence prevention programs. Components include: ● Bringing researchers together to assist in identifying elements of promising prevention programs. ● Developing set of "principles of prevention." ● Identifying promising prevention programs and strategies. ● Hosting conference for SEAs, Governors, and large SEAs to showcase promising programs. ● Collaborating with OJJDP on implementation of truancy initiative. ● Collaborating with OJJDP on support to provide assistance to schools in violence prevention activities. ● Develop plans for large scale demonstration program focusing on creating safe schools. ● Identify and provide support for programs, practices, that have proven effective in creating safe schools. ● Provide training and technical assistance, in collaboration with the Department of Justice, to SEAs and LEAs on effective violence prevention strategies.
2. Reduce number of criminal and violent incidents in schools.	2.1 The number of criminal and violent incidents in school (by students) will decrease. 2.2 The number of weapons and firearms carried to school will decrease. <i>12% of high school students carried weapon on school property.</i> 2.3 The number of physical fights resulting in injury will decrease. <i>1993 Baseline: 16%:</i> 2.4 The number of physical attacks, threats on teachers will decrease. <i>Teachers physically attacked was 2 percent; threatened was 8%.</i>	2.1 National Crime Survey, 1997; MTF, 1997 (threatened, injured, and theft.) 2.2 Center for Disease Control's (CDC) biennial Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), 1997; annual data on ED/Gun Free School Act, 1997 2.3 Biennial YRBS, 1997 2.4 MTF, 1997	

Safe and Drug-free Schools — DRAFT

Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
	2.5 The number of students who don't go to school because they feel unsafe will show decrease. <i>In 1991, 7% of 8th graders; 4% of 10th graders; and 3% of seniors did not go to school because they were afraid.</i> 2.6 The number of school-related homicides will decrease. <i>CDC/ED study: 85 school-associated homicides in 1992-1994</i> 2.7 The number of students whose learning is occasionally interfered with by misbehaving students will decrease. <i>In 1992: 53% of 8th and 10th graders had their learning occasionally interfered with by other misbehaving students.</i>	2.5 MTF, 1997 2.6 Study needs to be conducted for 1998/99 and interim, if possible. 2.7 MTF, 1997	
3. Reduce alcohol and drug use among school-aged youth.	3.1 Rates of alcohol and drug use among school-aged children will decrease. 3.2 Increasing percentages of students will report negative attitudes toward drug and alcohol use.	3.1 MTF, 1997 (marijuana, cocaine, LSD, heroin, meth, tobacco, and alcohol); National Household Education Survey, 1998 3.2 MTF, 1997	• In collaboration with the White House's Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP) and HHS, ED will assist in development of an Administration-wide media campaign to reduce youth drug use. • ED will host focus groups around country to help identify most effective message to send to youth, regarding drug use.
Quality programs and services			
4. Assist IHEs to implement effective drug and violence prevention programs.	4.1 To be determined	4.1 To be determined.	• Award discretionary grants for the development, implementation, validation, and dissemination of model programs and strategies. • Support a training and technical assistance center.

Safe and Drug-free Schools — DRAFT

Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
5. Assist LEAs to align their programs with ED's principles of effectiveness for prevention programs — Research-based — Tied to a needs assessment — Objectives are measurable — Goals are tied to outcomes — Periodic evaluation — Demonstrations are permitted	5.1 By 1999, all LEAs will use prevention programs that are based on the principles of effectiveness.	5.1 Survey, to be developed, 1998	● Develop and promulgate principles of effectiveness for prevention programs. ● Develop guidance and provide technical assistance to states and local education agencies in how to apply the principles. ● Work with HHS and the Office of National Drug Policy to identify and promote the most effective programs. ● Establishing a Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (SDFSP) Internet web page to make schools aware of promising practices. ● Hold a conference for all SEAs, governors' offices, and large LEAs on what works. ● Disseminate joint ED/Justice publication on conflict resolution. ● Reinstitute the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Recognition Program (this will provide models). ● Letter to be sent to all Chief State School Officers informing them of need to develop more effective prevention programs. ● Conduct a teleconference, in collaboration with the Department of Justice, on effective programs.

Safe and Drug-free Schools — DRAFT

Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
6. Ensure that LEAs enforce the Gun-Free Schools Act.	6.1 By 1997 all LEAs receiving ESEA funds will have a policy requiring notification of law enforcement of all incidents where a firearm is involved. 6.2 By 1997 all LEAs receiving ESEA funds will have policies requiring the expulsion for a year of students who bring firearms to school. 6.3 All LEAs have policies prohibiting smoking in school.	6.1 Annual performance reports from local programs, 1997, and ED staff monitoring, 1997 6.2 Gun Free Schools Act data collection, 1997 6.3 ED/LEA survey supplemented with data from HHS/CDC School Health Policies and Programs Report, 1997	- As part of monitoring activities LEAs will be asked to provide evidence that districts have policies related to these three issues. - ED will identify school districts not in compliance and will provide technical assistance in order to come into compliance.
7. Assist LEAs to set policies prohibiting the sale, distribution, and use of alcohol, drugs, and tobacco products at school or at school-sponsored functions.	7.1 By 1997, all LEAs will have policies prohibiting the sale, distribution, and use of alcohol, and other drugs at school or at school-sponsored functions and activities.	7.1 ED/LEA survey, supplemented with data from SHPPS Survey, 1997.	- ED will develop policy for ensuring "medical marijuana" is kept out of all schools, and will disseminate policy to all SEAs. - ED will identify school districts not in compliance and will provide technical assistance in order to come into compliance.
8. Improve the quality and use of state and local performance data.	8.1 All states will conduct statewide surveys or collect statewide data of alcohol and drug use of students and incidents of crime and violence in schools. 8.2 All LEAs will collect and report to SEA incidents that are in violation of the Gun Free Schools Act. 8.3 By July 1997, all SEA and Governor's programs will have acceptable performance indicators.	8.1 ED/SDFS Survey, 1998 8.2 ED Gun-Free Schools Act data collection, 1997 8.3 Review of ED files, 1997.	- Develop discretionary grant program to improve SEAs' capacity to collect and analyze data. - Include requirement to collect appropriate data for recognition under Recognition Program. - No state Plan to be approved without performance indicators. Those SEAs that are unable to develop appropriate indicators will be provided technical assistance.

Safe and Drug-free Schools — DRAFT

Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Objectives	Indicators	Source and Next Update	Strategies
	8.4 All states will use performance indicators to make decisions regarding approval of LEA application for FY 1997 funding. 8.5 By July 1997, all LEAs will have performance indicators for their SDFS programs. 8.6 LEAs will routinely use performance indicators to determine if activities should be continued or modified.	8.4 ED/SDFS Survey, 1998 8.5 ED/LEA Survey, 1998 8.6 ED/LEA Survey, 1998	ED will identify school districts not in compliance and will provide technical assistance in order to come into compliance.
Federal administration (Safe and Drug Free Schools office)			
9. Provide high-quality products and technical assistance that helps align local programs with principles of effectiveness.	9.1 A high proportion of persons responding to inquiries regarding use of products developed by SDFS will rate them as "high quality" or higher, and as "useful." or "very useful."	9.1 Approval needed from OMB to include feedback form on all SDFS products and materials.	SDFS will develop process for obtaining feedback on all of its products.
10 Maintain strong administrative and fiscal control over the state and discretionary grant programs.	10. All audit findings or issues identified by GAO, IG, or other auditors will be responded to within the time frame set by the agency conducting audit or report.	10 Relevant GAO, IG, and Audit Reports.	- All audits to be reviewed for identification of patterns of abuse or problems, remedial action to be taken once identified. - SEAs to be briefing in new audit procedures.

Information on Indicator Data Sets for Safe and Drug Free Schools Program		
Data Set	What Collected	When Collected
<i>Monitoring the Future (MTF)</i>	<i>National data (from selected nationally represented LEAs) on alcohol and drug usage, and on victimization in schools.</i>	<i>Annual (First collected in 1975)</i>
<i>School Health Policies and Programs Study (SHPPS)</i>	<i>State, district, and school level data on alcohol, drug, and violence policies and practices.</i>	<i>First collected in 1994, will be collected again in 2000.</i>
<i>NCES, Schools and Staffing Survey</i>	<i>Provides information on safety and victimization (including bullying, physical attack, robbery) and on classroom disruptions.</i>	<i>Conducted every two years. Information available for: 1987-88; 1990-91; 1993-94.</i>
<i>ED/OESE Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Survey</i>	<i>Provides a variety of information--process and outcome--related to alcohol and drug use, and violence in schools.</i>	<i>Initial survey to cover July 1993 through June 1995 (1993-94 and 1994-95 school years).</i>
<i>National Crime Victimization Survey</i>	<i>Provides a variety of information on crime and victimization.</i>	<i>Conducted annually by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. BJS prepared a special analysis of school crime in 1992; another is due to be released in 1997.</i>
<i>Gun-Free Schools Act Report</i>	<i>Number of violations of the GFSA, e.g., number of students who are caught with firearm in school.</i>	<i>Annual (First report due 1997.)</i>
<i>National Household Education Survey (NHES)</i>	<i>Provides information on school safety and discipline.</i>	<i>1993 NHES provided information on School Safety and Discipline.</i>
<i>School Associated Violent Deaths in the United States</i>	<i>Provides information on the number, nature, and circumstances surrounding school-associated violent deaths: homicides and suicides.</i>	<i>Initially conducted for 1992-93/1993-94 school years. Need to negotiate future study or to include questions regarding school associated violent deaths in another survey.</i>