

**Substance Abuse Prevention Committee
Meeting 3
6:30 p.m. Wed., Dec. 7, 2011**

Attendees: Dr. Andy Koenigs, Keturah Austin, Carly Haynes, Buck Buchanan, Tom Audley, Linda Wells, Dale Graham, Hunter Weddington, Ryan Harshaw, Gary Merritt, Sue Coffman, Deb Regier, Brent Jones, Lori Moran, Craig Gray, Janelle Stallbaumer, Melinda Fritze, Doug Carr, Kellie Bamford

Notes:

Dr. Koenigs calls the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. He noted there were several people who would not be able to attend today. He also gave some handouts including an agenda and a copy of El Dorado's drug testing policy.

Dr. Koenigs went over some of the parking lot questions from the last meeting and shared the information he had gathered – it is in the handouts. Dr. Koenigs then shared the results of the climate survey (see PowerPoint presentation to see these detailed results). Parents, staff and students seemed to overwhelmingly be okay with random drug testing, and the percentages seemed to be somewhat close at the various buildings. A few members asked for those numbers to be broken out by building.

School Resource Officer Buchanan reviewed some Andover Police Department Data showing minors charged with drug and alcohol offenses in the area (see presentation for detailed data). He specifically discussed social hosting and how parents or others who supply alcohol to a group even at their own home may be charged with a misdemeanor. He also noted that drug dogs have made more sweeps in the schools this year, as well as sweeping bags prior to band trips.

Dr. Koenigs moved on to the substance abuse data by grade.

Cigarette use in general seems to be going down among students. SRO Buchanan noted that other, newer products are coming out more targeted to students – laced toothpicks, oral strips, etc.

Student use of alcohol appears to be trending down as well. Marijuana use, however, has trended significantly upward, and in some classes we are ahead of state and county averages for marijuana use. Mrs. Fritze asked if we could tell if the same kids using alcohol were also using marijuana, but we cannot. It's a completely anonymous survey. The group agreed marijuana was the biggest concern over alcohol and cigarettes, especially at the 10th grade level.

Dr. Koenigs reviewed the Maize school district's drug testing policy (see presentation for specific information). Some interesting information from the policy: no disciplinary action is taken. Students who test positive are suspended for

a time from only from whatever activity made them eligible to be tested, and they are required to go to counseling at their own expense. The district started testing 10 a week, but now test only 13 a month due to costs. Only 6 students tested positive during all of last year, and no middle school students tested positive. Also, those students who tested positive were randomly tested several times throughout the year. Only 8 students opted out this year, after 190 opted out the first year this started (five years ago). Data doesn't show a huge effect from the policy, and some students don't feel it's effective. It is costly as well. If students don't complete counseling, they won't be allowed back in the activity from which they were suspended.

It was pointed out that students who show signs of being under the influence would be tested under the drug policy, not the random drug testing policy. This would mean different circumstances and different actions depending on which policy is used.

Mrs. Haynes noted that an attorney at a KASB meeting mentioned in passing that if a student under 18 tests positive for drugs that SRS must be notified. Other districts don't seem to do this. We need to verify if this is a requirement.

Mr. Graham mentioned making drug testing part of a physical exam (these are required at the beginning of the year for many activities anyway). Dr. Koenigs said the KASB attorney attending the next meeting would be able to tell us if this would be possible. One question we need to answer: are we trying to catch students or help students.

The committee will break into groups following a brief recess and review policies that have been collected – things that may be good, things that may be issues, etc. Dr. Koenigs called a break at 7:32 p.m. The group broke briefly and then met in small groups to discuss and make lists of pros and cons from the policies.

The committee reconvened at 8:02 p.m.

The first group shared its pros: public perception, gives kids an out, voluntary placement, and cons: cost in money and time, group tested extremely limited, lack of hard evidence that it makes a difference, and it can't be a stand-alone program – must also have curriculum, parent education and more.

The next group shared pros: proactive, let public know we're addressing the issues, requiring counseling, follow-up for positive results (parents should pay), have an "out," could keep kids out of legal trouble, and cons: not a deterrent, release of parents responsibility, cost/logistics.

The third group shared pros: gives kids an excuse to say no, students know school is serious about stopping drug use, non-disciplinary and educational, gets users treated, parents and staff want it, and it may change behavior. Cons: not all

students treated consistently, cost – direct and indirect, parents – “not my kid,” employment and college apps will ask sometimes if you’ve been tested, and records can be subpoenaed, drug panel – how expensive, where does it stop, etc., and it may dampen participation in some things.

The next group shared pros: use deterrent, safety, increase awareness, community service, more effective impacting largest possible school population – all activities comprehensive, possible reduced peer pressure. Cons: cost-where do the funds come from, workload, not effective with only a few groups involved.

Mr. Audley noted that he served at Lord’s Diner with a young lady from KPC who was not only punished for drinking but also required to serve four weeks at the Lord’s Diner.

The next group shared pros: discourages student usage, student easy-out, community involvement/support. Cons: cost, is it hit or miss, possible legal expenses.

The next group shared pros: not just athletics, but most activities, subsequent testing is the parent responsibility, concern for safety of students in general and proactive. Cons: is 2 weeks enough for first offense (El Dorado) and with budget cuts, can we test enough to be effective?

In some schools, once you’re tested you’re not put back into the pool. In other schools, it’s completely random, and the pool remains the same, so the same student could potentially be tested multiple times.

Jan. 4 is the next scheduled meeting for this committee. An attorney from the Kansas Association of School Boards will be here at that time to discuss legalities with us.

The meeting was dismissed at 8:22 p.m.