SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS PROGRAM—STATE GRANTS PROGRAM AND NATIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives: Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants Program and National Programs support Objective 1.3 (schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free) by providing funds through formula and discretionary grants to states, governors' offices, and other grantees in support of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and services to create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly learning environments.
FY 2000—$600,000,000
FY 2001—$650,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: REDUCE THE USE AND AVAILABILITY OF ALCOHOL AND DRUGS IN SCHOOLS.

Indicator 1.1 Drug use in schools by 2001: Rates of annual alcohol use in schools will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders, and rates of annual marijuana use in school for the same time period will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders.

Targets and Performance Data

Rate of annual use of alcohol in school

Year	8th Graders		12th Graders	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	5%		8%	
1995:	5%		7%	
1996:	6%		8%	
1997:	5%		8%	
1998:	5%		8%	
1999:	**4%**	**5%**	**7%**	**8%**
2000:		5%		8%
2001:		4%		7%

Rate of annual use of marijuana and other drugs in school

Year	8th Graders*		12th Graders**	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	4%		8%	
1995:	5%		9%	
1996:	6%		10%	
1997:	5%		10%	
1998:	5%		8%	
1999:	**4%**	**5%**	**8%**	**10%**
2000:		4%		8%
2001:		3%		7%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Alcohol (8th grade)—target exceeded. Alcohol (12th grade)—target exceeded.

*Marijuana and other drugs (8th grade)—target exceeded. **Marijuana only (12th grade)—target exceeded.

Explanation: Rates of substance use in school generally parallel but are much lower than overall rates of substance use by youth. Rates of alcohol use for all grade levels have remained relatively steady for many years and are therefore unlikely to decline in the near future. Marijuana use rates increased in the midnineties but recently have been relatively steady and may have leveled off.

(Data for 10th graders are available but are not included because of space limitations. In general, 8th and 10th grade trends have been similar in recent years.)

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Monitoring the Future (MTF), 1999 (special analysis, 2000).
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000 (special analysis, 2001).

Validation Procedures: Data validated by University of Michigan Institute for Social Research and National Institute on Drug Abuse procedures.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: According to NCES calculations, the total response rate for this survey has varied between 46 percent and 67 percent since 1976. MTF does not release its data on in-school use; special runs for these data are generally not available until the spring of the year following the December release of other MTF data. MTF does not collect data for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders on drug use in school in a way that allows data to be compared across the three grades.

OBJECTIVE 2: REDUCE ALCOHOL AND DRUG USE AMONG SCHOOL-AGED YOUTH.

Indicator 2.1 Drug use by school-aged children by 2000: Rates of 30-day prevalence of alcohol use will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders, and rates of 30-day prevalence of illicit drug use will decline for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders.

Targets and Performance Data

Rate of 30-day alcohol use

Year	8th Graders		12th Graders	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	26%		50%	
1995:	25%		51%	
1996:	26%		51%	
1997:	25%		53%	
1998:	23%		52%	
1999:	**24%**	**23%**	**51%**	**45%**
2000:		21%		41%
2001:		No increase		No increase

Rate of 30-day illicit drug use

Year	8th Graders		12th Graders	
	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1994:	11%		22%	
1995:	12%		24%	
1996:	15%		25%	
1997:	13%		26%	
1998:	12%		26%	
1999:	**12%**	**13%**	**26%**	**23%**
2000:		12%		20%
2001:		No increase		No increase

Assessment of Progress

Status: Alcohol—no change. Illicit drugs—no change.

Explanation: Rates of alcohol use for all grade levels have remained relatively steady for many years. Drug use rates, which increased in the mid1990's, have recently been relatively steady and may have leveled off. Targets for 1999 and 2000 were established by ONDCP to reflect a desired 20 percent decline from 1996 rates; however, it is unlikely that the ambitious targets for 10th and 12th graders will be achieved. Youth rates of alcohol and drug use are affected by factors SDFS programs cannot always overcome, including social and cultural mores, parental attitudes, and advertising and other media images.

(Data for 10th graders are available but are not included because of space limitations. In general, 8th and 10th grade trends have been similar in recent years.)

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Monitoring the Future (MTF), 1999.
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 2000.

Validation Procedures: Data validated by University of Michigan Institute for Social Research and National Institute on Drug Abuse procedures.

Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: According to NECS calculations, the total response rate for this survey has varied between 46 percent and 67 percent since 1976.

OBJECTIVE 3: REDUCE NUMBER OF CRIMINAL AND VIOLENT INCIDENTS IN SCHOOLS.

Indicator 3.1 Violent incidents in schools by 2001: The proportion of high school students in a physical fight on school property will decrease, and the annual rate of students ages 12 to 18 who report experiencing serious violent crime, in school or going to and from school, will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data

Percentage of high school students who reported being involved in a physical fight on school property in the past year

Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets
1995:	16%	
1997:	15%	
1999:	**Data not yet available**	**14%**
2000:		No data collection
2001:		12%

Assessment of Progress

Status: Physical fights—no 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely.

Serious violent crime—no 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely.

Explanation: The percentage of students reporting being in a fight at school has declined since 1995, and overall juvenile crime and violence rates are down; it therefore appears likely that the percentage of students in a fight at school will continue to decline. For students reporting victimization by serious

Sources and Data Quality

Source: Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 1997.
Frequency: Biennially.
Next Update: 1999 data to be reported in 2000.

National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), 1997 (special analysis, 1999).
Frequency: Annually.
Next Update: 1998 data to be reported in 2000.

Validation Procedures: YRBS data validated by Westat and CDC procedures. NCVS data

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Rate of students ages 12 to 18 who reported experiencing serious violent crime in schools or going to and from school			violent crime, according to 1997 survey data released in 1999, the 1999 target has been met. Rates of violent crime victimization at school, like other measures of juvenile crime and violence, have been dropping in recent years and are likely to continue to decline.	validated by Census Bureau and Bureau of Justice Statistics procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** YRBS data are collected biennially and reported the year after collection; 1999 data will be reported in 2000. Most NCVS data are reported the year after collection, but in-school victimization data is a special analysis with a delayed release, so the 1998 data will be available in 2000 and the 1999 data will be available in 2001.
1994:	13 per 1,000			
1995:	9 per 1,000			
1996:	9 per 1,000			
1997:	8 per 1,000			
1998:	Data not available			
1999:	**Data not available**	**8 per 1,000**		
2000:		8 per 1,000		
2001:		7 per 1000		

Indicator 3.2 Weapons in schools: By 2001, the proportion of high school students carrying weapons (including firearms) to school will decrease.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Percentage of high school students who reported carrying a weapon on school property in the previous 30 days			**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The percentage of students reporting carrying a weapon at school has declined since 1995, and overall juvenile crime and violence rates are down; it therefore appears likely that the percentage of students carrying a weapon at school will continue to decline.	**Source:** Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 1997. *Frequency:* Biennially. *Next Update:* 1999 data to be reported in 2000. **Validation Procedures:** YRBS data validated by Westat and CDC procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** YRBS data are collected biennially and reported the year after collection; 1999 data will be reported in 2000.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1995:	10%			
1997:	9%			
1999:	**Data not available**	**7%**		
2000:		No data collection		
2001:		6%		

Indicator 3.3 School-related homicides: For school year 2000-01, the number of school-associated homicides will decline.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
School-associated homicides			**Status:** No 1999 data are available, but progress toward target is likely. **Explanation:** The number of school-associated homicides has declined in recent years, even though several events involving multiple victims have occurred. Overall juvenile crime and violence rates are also down. It is likely that the number of school-associated homicides will continue to decrease.	**Source:** Study by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and ED, 1999. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data validated by CDC procedures. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This is a special study using retrospective data collection. ED's reauthorization proposal would require states to report school-associated homicides to ED within 30 days of an incident.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1992-93:	55			
1997-98:	46			
1998-99:	Data not available	**Continuing decrease**		
1999-00:		Continuing decrease		
2000-01:		41		

OBJECTIVE 4: HELP SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES GRANTEES SELECT AND IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS THAT HAVE BEEN EVALUATED AND FOUND TO BE EFFECTIVE.

Indicator 4.1 Increase pool of promising and exemplary programs: By 2002, identify additional drug and violence prevention programs that have been rigorously evaluated and found to be either promising or exemplary, as defined by an expert panel.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
The SDFS Expert Panel has not yet announced its initial findings, so baseline has not been established.			**Status:** Unable to judge. **Explanation:** The SDFS Expert Panel has not yet announced its initial findings.	**Source:** Results of review process by SDFS Expert Panel, 2000. *Frequency:* Annually. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data verified by ED attestation process. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**Data not available**	**Continuing increase**		
2000:		Continuing increase		
2001:		Continuing increase		

Indicator 4.2 Coordinators: By 2001, all drug prevention and school safety coordinators funded by the middle-school coordinator initiative will have received training to implement effective, research-based programs.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Training has not yet begun. The first training session is scheduled for February 2000.			**Status:** Positive movement toward target. **Explanation:** Grants have been awarded under this initiative and coordinators are being hired. A training and technical assistance contract has been awarded and training sessions for all coordinators have been scheduled to begin in February 2000.	**Source:** Review of program files. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data verified by ED attestation process **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** The current wording of this indicator focuses on implementation of the initiative. ED has recently awarded a contract for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the initiative. Once the study is under way, the indicator will be revised to incorporate data from the study. Examples of measures that may be selected include professional development of teachers and other staff by coordinators in grantee sites, and use of research-based approaches implemented with fidelity.
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**Data not available**	**Continuing increase**		
2000:		65% of coordinators trained		
2001:		100% of coordinators trained		

Indicator 4.3 Grantee progress: By 2001, National Programs grantees will demonstrate substantial progress toward achieving their results-based goals and objectives established in their applications.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Requirements for measuring progress toward goals and objectives will be incorporated into all FY 2000 grant applications			**Status:** New indicator for FY 2001 budget cycle. **Explanation:** All applicants for National Programs direct grants from FY 2000 funds will be required to provide results-based goals and objectives for their projects.	**Source:** Review of program files. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next update:* Spring 2001. **Validation Procedures:** Data verified by ED attestation process. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**		
1999:	**Data not available**	**New indicator in 2000**		
2000:		No target set		
2001:		By the end of year one, all grantees will meet 75% of established measurable goals and objectives.		

OBJECTIVE 5: ENCOURAGE COMMUNITY-WIDE COLLABORATION IN THE CREATION OF SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS.

Indicator 5.1 Community-wide collaboration: By 2004, grantees receiving funds through the Safe Schools/Healthy Students interagency initiative will show progress in maintaining safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environments.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** New indicator for FY 2001 budget cycle. **Explanation:** Grants have been awarded under this initiative, and a cooperative agreement has been awarded for the national evaluation.	**Source:** Review of program files. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next Update:* 2000. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** This is an interagency initiative jointly supported by ED; DOJ; HHS; and, beginning in 2001, the Department of Labor. The agencies will collaborate to select specific measures and overall performance targets for the initiative. These measures and targets will be drawn from the national evaluation of the initiative, which is in its beginning stages. Once the study is fully underway, the indicator will be revised to incorporate baseline data and performance targets for specific measures. Examples of measures that may be selected include rates of student alcohol and drug use in grantee sites, rates of suspensions and expulsions in grantee sites, and rates of weapon carrying in schools in grantee sites.
1999:	**Data not available**	**New indicator in 2000**		
2000:		No target set		
2001:		Grantees overall will demonstrate progress on selected performance measures, common to all grantees, from the national evaluation of the initiative.		

OBJECTIVE 6: PROVIDE CRISIS INTERVENTION ASSISTANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Indicator 6.1 Crisis intervention: By 2001, the Department will implement policies and procedures necessary to ensure rapid response to school districts seriously affected by crises that interfere with learning.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	**Actual Performance**	**Performance Targets**	**Status:** No change. **Explanation:** No funding has been approved by Congress for this initiative. ED will continue to seek express statutory authority for this initiative in future years.	**Source:** Review of program files and organizational plans. *Frequency:* Ongoing. *Next Update:* 2000. **Validation Procedures:** Data verified by ED attestation process. **Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:** None.
1999:	**No data available**	**No target set**		
2000:		Policies and procedures developed		
2001:		ED will initiate response to all eligible requests for assistance within 48 hours.		

KEY STRATEGIES

Strategies Continued from 1999

- Encourage implementation of research-based programs through implementation of Principles of Effectiveness; the Expert Panel project, in coordination with the Department of Health and Human Services, to identify exemplary and promising prevention programs; the redesigned Recognition Program to identify schools implementing exemplary and promising strategies; middle school coordinators grants that will support the hiring of staff to select and implement research-based programs; and demonstration grants to test and identify programs suitable for replication in other school sites.
- Target resources by providing direct grants to local school districts with significant drug and violence problems that are being addressed in partnership with law enforcement and community mental health services providers (see discussion of Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative under "Coordination" section).
- Develop and disseminate information, including the Annual Report Card, in coordination with the U.S. Department of Justice, to enhance public awareness about the nature and character of school violence and to identify effective practices; Early Warning, Timely Response and its companion publication, Safeguarding Youth: A Guide to Implementing Early Warning, Timely Response; and Growing Up Drug-Free: A Parent's Guide to Prevention.
- Train middle school coordinators, hired with grant funds, to select and implement research-based drug and violence prevention programs.
- Continue to seek express statutory authority for the School Emergency Response to Violence (SERV) initiative to provide crisis intervention services to districts seriously affected by traumatic events that disrupt learning.
- Support the Higher Education Center for Campus-Based Drug and Violence Prevention Programs.

New or Strengthened Strategies

- Reauthorization proposal is designed to improve accountability for program funds and encourage adoption of comprehensive, research-based programs by (a) establishing core performance indicators; (b) targeting funds to LEAs with significant need and high-quality programs; (c) focusing Governor's Program on creation of safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments; (d) developing school safety plans; and (e) implementing SEA, LEA, and school report cards that include school safety items. The establishment of core program indicators is intended to result in more uniform information on program implementation and effectiveness; the proposal also requires annual submission of program performance reports. The proposal also requires that LEAs support comprehensive plans and report on their performance against established objectives; states would be required to consider the quality of LEA plans in awarding funds, and to consider performance as a criterion for continuation funding.
- Discretionary grantees will be required to measure and report their progress in reaching their measurable goals and objectives.

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

- Supports data collection activities carried out by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Justice, e.g., Monitoring the Future, Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance, Health Behaviors of School Children Study, School-Associated Violence Death Study, and National Crime Victimization Survey.
- Collaborates with other agencies to evaluate joint initiatives, e.g., National Study on School Violence (Department of Justice), National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools (Department of Justice); a national evaluation of the impact of the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative (Departments of Justice, Health and Human Services, and—in 2001—the Department of Labor); and School Health Policies and Program's Study (Department of Health and Human Services).

HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES (CONTINUED)

- Information dissemination and technical assistance: With Health and Human Services and Department of Justice engages in a variety of activities to provide information and training and technical assistance to the field, e.g., the Annual Report on School Safety, an implementation guide to Early Warning, Timely Response; National Center for Conflict Resolution, the National Resource Center for Safe Schools, and the Youth Court Training and Technical Assistance Program; technical assistance to Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative grantees, satellite training sessions on violence prevention strategies.
- Program improvement activities: Enhances the quality and rigor of prevention programs in schools and communities, through initiatives such as Safe Schools/Healthy Students; Fast Track (with the Department of Health and Human Services), an intervention for high-risk youth in grades 6 to 10 and their families; diffusion of risk/protective-factor-focused drug prevention for adolescents at the state and community level; one-to-one mentoring programs for youth at risk of education failure or involvement in delinquent activities (with the Department of Justice); and Project SHOUT (with the Office of National Drug Control Policy), which supports effective approaches to the prevention of youth substance abuse through public education.

CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL

- Lack of uniform information on program activities and effectiveness make Federal oversight difficult. (Reauthorization proposal includes development of common core of indicators and information requirements). [GAO Study, October 1997]
- Reporting required from states every 3 years may be insufficient for congressional oversight. (Reauthorization proposal requires annual reporting.) [GAO Study, October 1997]
- LEAs should report on actual performance against performance indicators and should submit comprehensive plans with detailed descriptions of programs and services that align with measurable goals. (Reauthorization proposal requires these elements.) [OIG Report, December 1998]
- States should consider effectiveness of LEA-completed activities as a criterion for awarding greatest need funds. (Reauthorization proposal requires states to award all funds based on combination of need and quality of plan.) [OIG Study, December 1998]
- States should consider LEA performance as a criterion for continuation funding. (Reauthorization proposal requires states to determine if LEAs have made "substantial progress" in order to receive continuation funding.) [OIG Study, December, 1998]

INDICATOR CHANGES

From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years old)

Adjusted

- Indicator 1.1 was modified so that a specific target was set for reduced drug and alcohol use in schools.
- Indicators 2.1 and 2.2 were modified from "number of" to "proportion of."
- Indicator 2.5 (this year's Indicator 2.3) was changed from an indicator to targets.
- Indicator 3.1 (this year's Indicator 3.1) was changed from an indicator to targets.

Dropped

- Indicators 1.2, 2.4, and 2.6 were dropped.
- Objectives 4 through 8 and their indicators were dropped.

From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)

Adjusted

- Indicator 2.1: The wording has been revised from "serious violent incidents in schools" to "violent incidents in schools" to more accurately describe the data the indicator is tracking.
- Indicator 2.1: In 1999, the Bureau of Justice Statistics revised its data on rates of serious violent crime victimization in schools, to correct a calculation error in previous reports. Indicator wording, performance data, and targets have been revised to reflect the corrected data.
- Indicator 2.3: New data provide information on school-associated homicides for individual school years rather than data for 2 combined years, so indicator wording, performance data, and target have been revised to reflect the updated data.
- Indicator 5.1: The wording has been revised to provide more information about activities planned.
- Objective 7 and Indicator 7.1 have been renumbered; they are now this year's Objective 5 and Indicator 5.1 (no change in wording).

Dropped

- Indicator 5.1 has been retained for internal management purposes and is no longer part of this report.
- Indicator 5.2 has been renumbered; it is now Indicator 4.2 (no change in wording).
- Indicator 6.1 has been retained for internal management purposes and is no longer part of this report.
- Indicator 6.2 has been retained for internal management purposes and is no longer part of this report.
- Indicator 6.3 has been retained for internal management purposes and is no longer part of this report.

New

- New indicator 4.3 has been added to strengthen indicators provided for national programs.