

Assembly Select Committee on Youth and Drug Abuse Prevention

Transcript of Proceedings
Hearing on

HIGH RISK YOUTH: AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEMS

State Capitol
Sacramento, California

August 20, 1987

113842



Members of the Assembly Select Committee
on Youth and Drug Abuse Prevention

Assemblyman Steve Clute, Chairman

Assemblywoman Doris Allen
Assemblyman Tim Leslie
Assemblywoman Jackie Speier

Assemblyman Johan Klehs
Assemblyman Richard Polanco
Assemblyman Paul Zeltner

113842

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

California State Assembly

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Additional copies of this publication may be purchased for \$7.20 per copy from:

**Joint Publications Office
State Capitol, Box 942849
Sacramento, CA 94249-0001**

Please add 6% sales tax. Make checks payable to STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

Assembly Select Committee on Youth and Drug Abuse Prevention

Transcript of Proceedings

Hearing on

HIGH RISK YOUTH: AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEMS

State Capitol
Sacramento, California

August 20, 1987

NCJRS

OCT 13 1988

ACQUISITIONS

Members of the Assembly Select Committee
on Youth and Drug Abuse Prevention

Assemblyman Steve Clute, Chairman

Assemblywoman Doris Allen
Assemblyman Tim Leslie
Assemblywoman Jackie Speier

Assemblyman Johan Klehs
Assemblyman Richard Polanco
Assemblyman Paul Zeltner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Assemblyman Steve Clute 1

Assemblyman Paul Zeltner 3

Mr. David Crippen 4

Ms. Maria Chairez 4

Mr. Ray Eberhard 9

Assemblyman Tim Leslie 10

Mr. Milton Wilson 14

Mr. Ted Katida 30

Ms. Jan Davis 44

Ms. Sandra Watson 63

Ms. Marilyn Koenig 71

Ms. Laurie Leiber 76

Mr. Bob Mann 93

Ms. Susan Cohen 109

Dr. Deirdee Moriarity 115

Assembly Select Committee on Youth and Drug Abuse Prevention
HIGH RISK YOUTH: AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEMS
State Capitol
Sacramento, California
Thursday, August 20, 1987

CHAIRMAN STEVE CLUTE: I appreciate all the witnesses and interested persons for being here. We do have some Assemblymembers and we invited Senate members -- obviously it's get away day here. And of course the Senate is in session, the Assembly for the most part is checked out but we are expecting a few members to be coming by as we progress.

We've had several joint hearings throughout the state during the interim which Senator Seymour chaired, and we had our select committee represented too. I attended the last two in San Diego and Orange county and there was one prior to that -- in the San Francisco area I believe it was. In his hearings the subject area was primarily a master plan for the entire state on how to deal with substance abuse on a state basis.

This committee is very interested in information -- testimony that will help bring some answers and provide some kind of framework and, hopefully, some type of legislation that would assist in schools, in prevention, and in dealing with high-risk youth groups. I know today we'll be addressing truancy and dropouts in any relationship that may or may not be there due to drug use and abuse and also to teen suicide. And then, of course, substance abuse in itself and how that relates to the role of schools' education or what kind of assistance that can be.

I will read a brief statement in regard to one bill that we have been working on with the Attorney General as well as the Superintendent of Education, Assembly Bill 134. Although this hearing is not simply set up to provide information for this bill or to make it a better bill, anything that happens there is certainly positive. But this hearing is to address how the framework or vehicles can be improved in regards to the whole subject area out there. An alarming number of our young people are using and abusing alcohol and drugs. A recent study for example indicated that 41 percent of our 7th graders drink alcohol and 42 percent of our 11th graders use marijuana. A good portion of this usage occurs on a weekly basis. Substance abuse impacts all aspects of our society and the cost in lives and dollars is tremendous. In 1984 alone, substance abuse cost \$17.7 billion.

Assembly Bill 134 would supply guidelines to the state Superintendent of Schools for the spending of the federal anti-drug abuse funds. It would provide for the development in funding of comprehensive K through 12 drug and alcohol abuse prevention, education curricula and programs. It would also establish a statewide prevention resource center to provide technical and informational assistance, to train teachers, and to disseminate material on model programs.

Assembly Bill 134 would appropriate \$5 million of state funds to be utilized in conjunction with federal monies to fund these programs. This measure would also require that a three year study be done to evaluate the effectiveness of various

programs and it would utilize a state advisory council to ensure that these programs are coordinated with other prevention programs administered by other state and local agencies.

Assembly Bill 134 is based upon the recommendations of the Attorney General's Report on the prevention of drug and alcohol abuse. It is supported by the Attorney General, the Department of Education, PTA, California School Board Association, State Advisory Board on Drug Programs, and numerous other organizations

We've also been joined by Assemblyman Paul Zeltner, a member of the Committee, who was also present in the Orange County hearings. Paul, would you like to make any opening statements?

ASSEMBLYMAN PAUL ZELTNER: Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly pleased to see the turnout here today as an indication of some real interest in what we're doing. And, of course, having spent a career in law enforcement I can appreciate now some of the things that I see that are happening out there in the community and the schools. My only comment, at this point, is that it's long past due and let's get on with the work of the Committee and come up with some real solutions and put them in operation.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Because we are meeting in the afternoon and I'm sure there will be witnesses and perhaps legislators who need to catch planes out later today, I would ask that you try to keep your comments, hopefully, somewhere in the five- to eight-minute time-frame. That might be a little bit shorter than what you expected, but I think as we continue on and try not to

duplicate testimonies it will assist us all in getting the information that we need in the time span that we have. So I'd like to start, then, with an overview by Mr. Ray Eberhard, Program Administrator, High Risk Youth Unit, Department of Education.

MR. DAVID CRIPPEN: Thank you Mr. Chairman. David Crippen, Department of Education. We're going to coordinate the testimony of the staff from the Department of Education. Dr. Eberhard is here with me today, as is Dr. John Summerfield, to answer questions. The overview on high risk youth is going to be presented by Maria Chairez who is a consultant in the High Risk Youth Unit, and Dr. Milton Wilson who is a consultant in the People Support Unit will be here to discuss teen suicide. We've prepared copies of their testimony for you and ask the sergeants to distribute them. So, I'm going to introduce Ms. Chairez now.

MS. MARIA CHAIREZ: Mr. Chairman and Assemblymembers it's a pleasure of mine to be here this afternoon. It gives me a good opportunity to share with you some of the things that the Department has done, as well as what we see as some of the pressing problems.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Excuse me. Would you also repeat your name again and spell it?

MS. CHAIREZ: It's like a chair you sit on and you add E-Z.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay, that easy.

MS. CHAIREZ: Just like an easy chair.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Thank you.

MS. CHAIREZ: What we have prepared is a brief overview of factors that affect youth at risk. We've broken it up into three parts: truancy and dropouts, teen pregnancy, substance abuse and suicide. The suicide portion will be amplified by my colleague here to my left, who'll give you some more detail on the suicide aspect.

Time does not permit a comprehensive overview and, as such, I will briefly walk you through this extensive background documentation that we've prepared for you.

Dropouts -- Last year 88,000 youth dropped out of school. For some ethnic groups it was higher. Hispanics, for example, represented 21 percent of 10th through 12th graders and yet their dropout figure was 33.7 percent. Blacks represented 9.3 percent of 10th, 11th, and 12th graders and they represented 13 percent of the dropouts. White students represented 58 percent of 10th through 12th grade students and 45 percent of dropouts. So you can see that for Blacks and Hispanics it's proportionately higher. Attrition, which is the number of students who were enrolled in 9th grade and by the time they became 12th graders were no longer there, is higher overall, 31.7 percent but this is a small decline from last year.

Truancy -- Last year the Department collected data on attendance and we have a 2.6 percent unexcused absenteeism for grades K through 8; 7.5 percent for grades 9 through 12; and, of course, unexcused absenteeism leads to chronic truancy which then leads to enforcement of compulsory school law, etc.

Pregnancy -- Currently the Department operates programs for pregnant minors and school-age parenting classes. The Department of Health did collect data on the number of live births in 1984 and for the ages of 12 to 18 that was 28,854.

Substance Abuse -- As you mentioned in your opening statement, substance abuse is a substantial problem, especially for the younger students. Starting with the 11 year-olds, 50 percent of the students surveyed had tried alcohol. Weekly alcohol use was reported at 12 percent for 9th graders. Drugs: 36 percent by 14 year-olds. Marijuana: 7 percent by 11th graders -- they had tried it at least once. So as you mentioned, this is a substantial problem.

Violence and Gangs -- This is on the increase.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Assemblyman Tim Leslie who has been very active in some of the Governor's programs, state programs on drug and substance abuse. Yes, it's fine to ask questions, I think we'd like to get to the heart as much as we can as we go through the afternoon. But if you have something pressing, by all means ask the question.

MS. CHAIREZ: That was the Attorney General's report. Drugs and gangs: we see an increase. Youth gang membership has gone up, especially in Los Angeles -- it's been estimated to be 50,000 youths.

Suicide -- Every 90 minutes one youth commits suicide. And as I mentioned earlier, my colleague will go into more detail about suicide issues.

Alternative Education, Alternative Programs -- A growing number of youth need more alternatives. We see a middle stage bulge happening: ten percent of all high school students are now in continuation school, and in some counties 95 percent of those students are under the age of 16. More students are being referred to alternative programs at an earlier age and independent study is an example of this. As of April 1987 the Department reported an increase in independent study enrollment by 28 percent.

Support Services For Youth at Risk -- Another problem, counseling and guidance services, especially at the lower grades is especially lacking. We estimate the K through 8th grade counselor-to-student ratio from 2,000 to 1. It gets better as you go up to secondary, 328 to 1, but you can see, especially at the elementary level, what a high ratio that is.

The next sections go into research relating to factors which contribute to drug abuse. On Page 10 we highlighted some of the factors that deal with dropout, substance abuse, etc., and that is for your information. On Page 11, we give you a brief overview of what has been tried from a legislative standpoint -- six initiatives are highlighted. On Page 14, we highlighted six local initiatives that have occurred as a result of local concern. What I'd like to do now is focus on our recommendations, if you'll turn to Page 18.

First, we need to enforce the laws that currently exist regarding compulsory school attendance. Many law enforcement officials have other pressing problems to deal with and

compulsory school attendance especially for the 16 year-old is not a priority.

Second, we need to reform attendance accounting procedures. Many students who are referred to school attendance review boards fall through the cracks. There needs to be a reform on current attendance reporting procedures.

Third, we need to improve the school environment. Specifically, we need to intensify our efforts to bring truancy and dropouts back into the school, while at the same time providing guidance and counseling and aggressively improving curricula and the support service these students receive. We recommend an expansion of the guidance and counseling program.

Last, we recommend a strengthening of the safety net for these students who need alternative programs. Specifically, we need SB 65, which is California's dropout legislation, and earmarked as funding for an expansion of schools that have a high dropout rate. That funding was vetoed by the Governor and we're recommending restoration of that original funding which would enable us to serve more schools and consequently expand the alternatives for youth.

Second, teen pregnant parenting programs -- only a fraction of the students that need the services are getting it. So we recommend augmentation of funding there.

And third, on the last page, alternative school programs. We want to make sure there is enough alternatives for kids who need it, especially at that earlier age. I will stop, and I am open for questions.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I appreciate that work and the recommendations seem very close to the mark of some of the things that we've heard going around in some other sectors. I wanted to ask, one of the first ones was to enforce the laws we had to keep students in school. Are the laws we have not adequate if they are enforced or is there need for something else we're not doing in that part of it with the laws?

MS. CHAIREZ: There are two parts: you have laws on the books, but then there's the other part of implementation. And as we mentioned, many law enforcement officers are driven by other priorities -- crime being one of them. And so enforcing compulsory school attendance is not always given top priority. There are other aspects I'm sure that could be improved but it's essentially an implementation issue.

MR. RAY EBERHARD: I'm Ray Eberhard with the Department of Education. That's particularly true with the 601 status offender situation. It depends on courts, jurisdiction to jurisdiction, and how much effort time the court is willing to put in, in terms of bringing the family in with the youth when they are in truant status. So it's a real problem enforcing it, particularly from that viewpoint and the perspective of the courts.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: A good part of it is trying to work with the parents on it so that they understand what the importance of their responsibility is.

MR. EBERHARD: That's absolutely correct. Another issue in regard to that has to do with enforcement of the work

experience law in the state. Each youngster who is employed between the ages of 16 and 18 is required to have a work permit in order to guarantee that the combination of school attendance hours and work hours do not exceed the maximum. The Assembly Office of Research three years ago made a significant point that just enforcement of this particular statute would go a long way in deterring students into staying and attending school as opposed to working 50, 60, or 70 hours a week.

On school attendance we have one bill moving through the Senate now that would address the system where it would be based more on actual attendance of the students and not on excused absences. That would seem to be a better approach as far as incentives for the schools and districts to keep kids in.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Mr. Leslie.

ASSEMBLYMAN TIM LESLIE: Your name again?

MR. EBERHARD: Ray Eberhard.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: You said that students have to have a work permit to work right now if they're between the ages 16 and 18?

MR. EBERHARD: That is correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I never heard of that before. Who gives the permit?

MR. EBERHARD: The permits are issued by schools and in order, legally, for an employer to hire anybody under the age of 18 they must show evidence that a work permit had been issued. In essence, what the work permit guarantees is that the youngster is in fact enrolled in school and attending school for the

minimum amount of time. And I believe the combination of total hours between work and school is not to exceed 40 per week. We have a lot of incidences where the youngster is working 40 hours per week.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Are you aware of any permits being issued? I've never... my children have worked in... I don't think I ever knew that they needed to get a permit.

MR. EBERHARD: Yes, that may be part of the problem. It's very common, but it is the law that a youngster needs to have a work permit.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Do you feel that that is being aggressively pursued by school districts?

MR. EBERHARD: By the school district, but it must be requested on the part of youngster, and the control on that is the employer -- the one that is supposed to make certain that the youngster does have a valid and legal work permit.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: That's amazing.

MR. EBERHARD: And that's where the enforcement is a problem and the Assembly Office Of Research made a significant comment on that.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: What's your analysis of the product of that kind of a state law? I mean, the intention is obviously meritorious but is that really just so much bureaucratic paperwork, etc., on employers and on students and on schools that has no real tangible benefit? Or is there a tangible benefit? How do you record it? And what's the Department found about this program?

MR. EBERHARD: I think there is a very positive tangible benefit in terms of the enforcement of part of our compulsory school attendance laws in the state of California. Secondly, most...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I didn't understand that.

MR. EBERHARD: The compulsory school attendance laws which require our students in California to attend through the age of 18 or a high school diploma.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: School, okay.

MR. EBERHARD: So the work permit assures that a youngster is enrolled in school while they're still working. Secondly,...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Does it assure that, do you think? I mean in practice does it assure anything?

It has not assured that. That is part of the problem. That was one of the recommendations, that those are the types of strengthening with the existing laws that we have and enforcement of those would help improve school attendance for a lot of youngsters. Secondly, most of our high schools in the state have very qualitative work experience programs which give the youngster employability skills, employability training, while they're doing the work experience piece with the actual employer. So they link the work with academic programs, which is essential. Without the work permit, the school really does not know whether or not the youngster is employed and does not have the opportunity to put them in a work experience education program. So we feel that it's a valid point of existing statute that should be enforced.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: But right now, is your idea that it's working or not working?

MR. EBERHARD: It doesn't seem to be working for a great majority of our youngsters, particularly in the larger urban areas.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I'm still troubled by it. It just seems to me a student's motivation to be in school is going to be the thing that keeps him in school and not some sort of work permit. And you can have all the permits in the world but if a kid doesn't want to be in school I don't see a work permit doing anything, but maybe I'll learn more as these hearings go by over the months.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I think maybe one of the incentives (I think especially for young males) to drop out is for work. So maybe it addresses part of that. Who would enforce the work permits?

MR. EBERHARD: I'm not sure where the enforcement with that lies but the burden, I think, is on the employer: that they have in their possession the legal work permit that has been issued by the local school.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So they're not legally allowed to hire someone that doesn't have the permit?

MR. EBERHARD: That's my understanding, correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And so the idea would be, I assume, that the local county sheriff or police department would have to

spend their time not dealing with criminals but to go and try to find employers that are hiring kids over 20 hours a week or something.

MR. MILTON WILSON: I'm Milton Wilson from the Department of Education, Consultant in Pupil Personnel Services. I've formally been a district and a county director of pupil personnel services. In each district and each county school's office there is supposed to be appointed, by education code, a child welfare and attendance supervisor. Every district must have someone designated as a supervisor of child welfare and attendance, and in most school districts and county offices those are the people who enforce the work permit relations.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I see. So probably the way it would work is that if a student were in the process of dropping out of school or not attending properly, then this counselor you're talking about would look into the situation, find out that he had a job, and cause the employer to either reduce the hours or fire the student so that he would be more likely to be in school.

MR WILSON: That's one of the traditional functions of the child welfare attendance supervisor.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: You know I'm really pleased to see the Department of Education placing the emphasis that you are on school attendance. Because if we don't get through to the kids while they're there in school, the greatest drug prevention programs are not going to reach them. And I know that part of

the testimony in Orange county was by several high school kids who stated that probably the best reason for doing prevention programs in school was simply because that's where kids are spending a good deal of their time, if not most of their time. Sometimes I think it's unfair from an academic standpoint to expect the schools to have such a major role in this. But we're at that point, I would think, in the problem and in society that we have to address it where the kids are. Mr. Zeltner.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZELTNER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of Tim and some others, I certainly can appreciate the importance of a child welfare and attendance office in the school system. I know from personal experience in the past, law enforcement used to be able to pick up truant youngsters under the Welfare and Institutions Code. But in recent years that's no longer possible and that additional load has been dumped on child welfare and attendance people. So, in reality, they have also become the "hooky cop", if you will. And I know that the law enforcement prospective is that the more kids you have back in school the less residential burglaries that occur during the daytime and that's been a proven fact. The work permit thing goes a long way to ensuring that the youngsters who are out of school in the daytime will have a reasonable reason to be out. If they're not employed they should be in school or they're sick and whatever. But work permits go back a long way; I know that I had one and that's a long long time ago.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I know you have a lot of good information here. We won't get to talk about all of it here but

you give us a lot to work with. There's one more thing that I would like to ask about. You commented on the guidance and counseling programs, about the success of the 10th grade guidance counseling program made available through SB 813 and that it should be extended to elementary and middle grades. Would you comment about the 10th grade program and how that's going?

MR. WILSON: Yes, that was the requirement -- that every school district must come up with a plan to do a review of students before they reach the 10th grade or age 16, of what their programs were, and identify those students that were at risk of not being able to graduate by having insufficient credits or taking the wrong program and give them individual counseling, and talk with their parents about program planning, so that they could complete high school successfully. Every high school in the state participated in that program and it was funded at a rate of approximately \$20 per student. And we've just done a review of a random sampling of those and found that they were very effective in identifying students who are at risk of not graduating.

By the way, we do not have samples of very many of those programs; they're not required to file their programs with the state. They're required to have them adopted by their local governing boards and then just certified that they are following their board-approved program. But our random sample of 50 high schools, that we visited this last year, indicated that they are probably the best thing that's happened to high school counseling in the last ten years.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Thank you very much. Any closing comments you have.

MS. CHAIREZ: I'd like to give time to my colleague here to talk about the suicide issue.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Before you get into the suicide, in the presented testimony you mentioned local initiatives relating to the dropout program and there are several examples here. Are these examples of the things that those local boards did do to meet the compliance with the program that you were talking about?

MR. WILSON: Most of those programs did not deal directly with the problems, but in the schools where there was a large at-risk population identified, that was the main part of the program.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So these were extraordinary efforts taken by the local school boards to meet what they perceived to be their own particular problems, no state requirement or assistance in that.

MR. WILSON: Most of the schools we visited indicated that one of the biggest outcomes was getting parents involved in helping the students to plan programs so that they would be successful in school.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And these listed here are just programs relating to dropouts, not relating to drug abuse or other kinds of problems, although there's obviously some interrelationships, probably.

MR. WILSON: Again my name is Milton Wilson. I'm a consultant in pupil personnel services with the State Department

of Education. We have a lot of data and I'd just like to summarize some of the main highlights related to teen suicide nationwide and in California. I'll limit my remarks to a brief overview of the problem, what's happening in the field, and some recommendations.

Suicide is the third most prevalent cause of death among youths, ages 15 to 24, right after accidents and homicides. And I'm sure we're all aware that many accidents may indeed be suicides. Research indicates there are about 5,000 new suicides annually in the United States and that translates into about 14 to 18 per day as we know. There's been an increase of 300 -- some researchers say 200 depending upon the statistics -- but from 200 to 300 percent increase since 1950. There are four types of problems that have been identified that account for a majority of these: problems related to school failure, crisis situations, students who are loners, and depression. Recent research, by the way, just published, indicates that a large number of teenagers do not indicate depression so it's very difficult to identify them the way that has traditionally been successful with adults.

In an average high school of 2,000 you can expect 25 to 30 percent of the students to have suicidal thoughts, as many as 50 attempts at suicide per year, and about 1 completed suicide.

Some high-risk groups have been identified as being particularly susceptible to suicide: those who have previously attempted suicide, those students with little self-esteem, severely depressed students, those in trouble, students who are

abused or molested or neglected, alcohol and drug abusers, perfectionists, gay and lesbian youth, high-risk-takers, learning disabled youth, and loners.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Where did that list come from?

MR. WILSON: That comes from a compilation of research from all over the country and is reproduced in a curriculum guide for our awareness program.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Suicide attempts are prevalent among low achievers, students who have trouble in school. I'd like to come back to the next statement later. There is a notable lack of advocacy for suicide prevention programs in the public schools because administrators and school staff people are afraid that -- and as many of the general public are -- that if you talk about it you will maybe condone it or put ideas into students heads. Research has indicated that just the opposite is true, the more that it is discussed thoroughly in the classroom, the more incidences tend to go down.

Student's report that the major causes of youth suicide in California are family problems, depression, use of drugs and alcohol, school pressure, and pressure in general. Suicidal students, by the way, in Marin County, were surveyed by the Marin County PTA and they listed family problems and school problems as the largest sources of pressure in the school.

One-third of California high school students have personally known a suicidal youngster; almost half of all of the students have thought about suicide, and of these 62 percent of

them never told anyone about it; 13 percent have attempted suicides, some of them as many as 4 times;. and about 19 percent of the high schools in California have experienced youth suicide. We do not have accurate statistics on this, by the way, because they're not required to report this.

We did conduct a survey in the Department in 1984 of 1,249 high schools, including continuation schools. Of the 623 schools that reported, they reported 162 suicides and 1,351 attempts during a two-year period. During the two-year period some of these schools reported as many as 5 suicides and one school reported 43 attempts within a two-year period. Again, about 12 percent of California high school seniors admit to one or more suicide attempts during their lives.

We conducted a small survey in our pilot study last year among 57 high schools that had reported data in 1984 and again in 1986. The number of suicides in those schools, which were high-risk schools, was up 29 percent and the number of attempts had increased 27 percent. We found also in our pilot program that presenting suicide prevention curriculum material in high school is much too late. We aimed our efforts at the 10th grade because that's where we had most of the data and we believe now that it should start as early as the 6th or 7th grade.

Let me say a few things now about what is currently happening in the field. The state Department of Mental Health, as you know, is now in the middle of a mandated five-year, state-funded project to collect research data, produce and distribute public education material, and to develop training

programs for students, parents, teachers, school administrators, mental health professionals, local service agencies, juvenile justice representatives and others.

There are about 43 suicide prevention agencies and centers operating in California. We know of about 25 community school programs in California. Our survey indicates that about 109 high schools offer suicide prevention programs -- that was in 1984 and we haven't collected accurate data since. We have identified more than 200 high-priority schools -- in other words, high-risk schools in terms of suicide -- schools with reported suicides and attempts and no program. High school students in our pilot are known to have considerable knowledge already by the 10th grade about youth suicide and in relation to drug and alcohol abuse, which is part of the curriculum that I'm talking about.

I happen to be the coordinator of the three year project that was just finished on developing a youth suicide prevention curriculum for use in the public schools. Many of you are aware of that program. The final evaluation report, which is now being finally edited, indicated that it was very effective. It showed that after the three-year project -- actually it wasn't in operation for three years, it was only in operation in terms of field testing for one year -- they found that these materials resulted in a significant increase in a student's knowledge, skills, and feelings related to suicide. The staff reported an increase in their ability to present curriculum materials to students, staff and parents. And although we did a formal

analysis of the incidence of suicide to see if it had gone down within a six-month period, there was not adequate data to indicate that. But feedback from students that had participated in the program verify that they felt they had prevented at least 179 suicides in Los Angeles alone as a result of participating in this program. Another item of evidence regarding the effectiveness of this curriculum material, which is now being printed by the Department of Education, is that the Los Angeles Unified School District has adopted the program for use in its 10th grades in its 50 high schools.

I'd like to conclude with some recommendations based on our evaluation, our three year project, and some other research.

Suicide prevention programs should be developed and implemented within the school setting. The State Legislature should continue to appropriate funds to extend the implementation of youth suicide prevention programs in schools and communities. I believe this is the intent of Roberti's bill, but I believe there is no appropriation for that. The State Legislature should appropriate funds for the research and development necessary to improve the effectiveness of current suicide programs.

The Department of Education should vigorously promote the implementation of the suicide prevention program, which is currently being published, for California public schools. We're recommending that these should be implemented in all the high schools in the state, particularly high-priority schools. In addition, suicide prevention programs should be implemented in all junior high schools in the state and program material revised as necessary for students in grades 6 through 8.

School districts should be provided with the resources necessary for entire schools to participate in comprehensive program efforts including classroom instruction, policies and procedures, parent education, and staff in-service training. We believe that selected school personnel should receive more adequate training in primary prevention methods including workshops, preventive guidance screening, consultation, and research.

It is recommended that professional personnel from private practice, colleges and universities, community mental health, and suicide prevention agencies should be brought onto school campuses to train and work with school personnel. Again, I believe that is part of the Roberti bill.

Two other final recommendations. We recommend that the state and county departments of education, departments of mental health, and community agencies should provide direct assistance to schools and school districts to help them implement suicide prevention programs.

And one other item -- there is a need for uniform guidelines to be developed for collecting data on attempted and completed suicides, because we really do not have adequate data. And there are references for those recommendations.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Thank you, Mr. Wilson. You mentioned about the high-risk schools and one of the criteria being they have no prevention plans or education plans in regards to it, I believe, is that right? And it is very scary. I know it has happened near our area where a suicide happens and there might be

another attempt or two shortly thereafter. And I know it has happened around the country. It's very scary how it could catch fire. And I imagine, especially in areas where there are no programs addressing them.

MR. WILSON: Right.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: That must be a big concern.

MR. WILSON: Yes. In fact I just read recent research by the Center for Disease Control wherein they indicated that, nationwide, the flurry of increased suicides in 1984 seemed to be kind of a statistical fluke -- that really the rates had tended, over a ten year period, to go down a little bit. But just because of a variety of factors happening all at once there seemed to be kind of an epidemic but it didn't seem to hold up when they looked at their statistics that there really was an epidemic. And they felt that such things as publicity in the media, movies shown, and television, for example, that are not discussed thoroughly in class, or just presenting programs without thoroughly talking about them in school, may increase the likelihood of imitation.

But the thing that really seems to prevent that from happening is more open discussion in the classroom. And we were also recommending that every school as part of our implementation guide... that every school has some kind of policy and procedures on how to handle potential suicides or attempted suicides before they happen.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Yes, Mr. Zeltner.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZELTNER: Mr. Wilson, you say that currently there is not much research on suicides in general in relation to school youngsters. I know the same is true when it comes to adults. There has always been a problem in relation to gathering statistics on suicides versus attempted suicide to determine really what are the real bona fide attempts at suicides that don't succeed in relation to the overt act designed strictly to get sympathy or shift the feelings of the mate in, let's say, a domestic situation. When you look at the types of suicide -- someone jumps off a tall building, there's no doubt in your mind they intend to commit suicide -- they did it. Or scatter their head all over the ceiling and walls with a shot gun -- that's for sure. But so many of the slashing of the wrists or taking of the pills -- at the same time making a telephone call to notify someone that, "Hey I've done this"... Does the research that you're doing, now, look into that aspect to differentiate between the two so that it can be determined really what are we talking about in way of actual cases?

MR. WILSON: Yes, there has been some indication. Again, referring to this recent study by the Center for Disease Control, they seem to indicate that the kinds of evidence that make it pretty clear that there was a suicide is not the problem. It's the cases where, for example, the students do not leave a note. Only about ten percent of the students tend to leave notes. And we also think that because of publicity and other reasons, many homicides or many accidents, perhaps, are really suicides but they are not reported as such because the evidence is not clear.

One of the interesting bits that I've just run across is that -- of course you're probably familiar with a large discrepancy between males and females, particularly in attempts and completed suicides and the methods used. With the girls, of course, there are many more attempts than there are completions; with the boys there are many more completions. And two of the most recent things verified were that the methods used are part of the factors. Boys are using guns, more and more, and guns tend to work more than pills and overdoses. And the suicidologists who have studied this more thoroughly are indicating that perhaps (more so with girls than boys) it's a cry for help and that maybe it's a last desperation act. And so it's not that the girls are less adept, it's just that the methods they use seem less lethal.

MR. ZELTNER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Mr. Leslie.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Thank you. Mr. Wilson, what would a typical suicide prevention program include?

MR. WILSON: The suicide prevention program that we've just completed developing includes four classroom lessons for students and an implementation guide for school staff with directions for completing of policy and procedures for school and district in the case of a suspected suicide, an attempted suicide or a completed suicide. It includes some parent awareness training and staff awareness training and the main effort of the four classroom lessons is to train students to be aware of signs of suicide, to know how to listen, how to get help, how to be

honest, to find out about resources, and get a friend or themselves to some professional help.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So this would be in a typical school setting then for class periods during the course of maybe four in a row or maybe...

MR. WILSON: Yes, our pilot study, conducted over two years, seems to indicate that that's probably the most effective, without an overdose of, you know, the whole semester of suicide prevention 1A or something like that.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: It would, I suppose, be possible that -- this may sound a little nuts -- well, is it possible that by bringing up the subject of suicide and how to recognize it and prevent against it that you may actually get some people thinking about a subject that they wouldn't have otherwise?

MR. WILSON: That's one of the myths that is defused in the curriculum; it tends to be just the opposite, sir. They've found that talking about it, having somebody to talk to, someone to listen to, whether it be a parent or a counselor, is the thing that really seems to prevent things of that nature happening. The students indicated in two years of the pilot study that they felt that participating in the program actually helped them to save their own lives in many cases and the lives of their friends.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So, if I understand this right, the Department of Education, based upon some previous legislation before I arrived here, did a suicide prevention program.

MR. WILSON: Yes, it was a three-year project.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And you selected various schools that were high-risk schools.

MR. WILSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And there was funding with that I assume?

MR. WILSON: Yes, it was a three-year project authored by Senator Presley in 1983. The first year was spent on going over tons of curriculum material and developing the materials. The second year was spent in pilot testing of the materials. And the third year was in reevaluation of the revised material using a controlled group research design.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Now, there's other schools that, I assume, on their own account have taken up this subject, or were the schools doing suicide prevention work primarily just those involved in your study?

MR. WILSON: At the time we started, in 1984, there were only about 17 percent of the schools in the state high schools, and continuation schools hadn't any program of any kind.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: What is it now?

MR. WILSON: We don't know because we haven't collected that data this year.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: What percent, 17 percent?

MR. WILSON: About 17 percent.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: That was prior to '84?

MR. WILSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And now there's more than that but we don't know exactly what it is.

MR. WILSON: Most of them are still doing it on their own because these materials have not been disseminated; they're just now being printed for usage.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And that was my next question. As a result of all your research and fine work and, I assume, you feel it's a good, solid curriculum, now, that's available?

MR. WILSON: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And so the intent would be to distribute that to schools throughout the state, all high schools?

MR. WILSON: Yes, and also to provide training to the extent funding is available. To provide training using community mental health and suicide prevention professionals to train school staff in the use of these materials even though they can be used without any special training.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So, I'm just trying to get a handle on the cost and all that. Of course you develop the curriculum and then -- it needs to be revised and continuously reviewed -- but for the most part the development costs have already been had and now we've got the distribution. But the primary cost would be in training the people that would be using the curriculum?

MR. WILSON: Yes, that's correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And coordinating with the county mental health people?

MR. WILSON: That's right. However, we recommend that highly but we also know that, in some cases, it's not practical, so the material's sufficiently self-explanatory and it could be used without a great deal of extensive...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I assume that at least larger school districts would already have professionals on their staff that would be competent to review the material and understand how to use it and train their teachers within their district do that.

MR. WILSON: That's right; that's correct.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I know this is a very important area but we are going to have to keep moving on. Do you have any written testimony that you can leave with us?

MR. WILSON: I believe we had copies of this for everyone.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: That was part of this one, okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: No, I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Oh, okay.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I would like to receive my own, the secretary can make them available.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: And I want to thank all the witnesses from the Department of Education. I think you've brought some excellent testimony and ideas and thoughts for us to pursue further, too. I appreciate it. I think next up was Mr. Ted Katida, Coordinator of Child Welfare Attendance, Grant Joint Union High School District.

MR. TED KATIDA: Chairman Clute and Assemblymembers, I'm Ted Katida and I'm with the Grant Joint Union High School District and I am one of those coordinators of child welfare and attendance. I'd like to say, because I know I have some colleagues in the audience, that we are trying to shed the

"hooky cop" image. Because we are finding that there are a lot of things going on with both high school truants and the high-risk youth that go well beyond simply just picking the kids up and bringing them to school. I don't want to be redundant with what the state department has said so I'd like to focus my comments today on two issues in particular that I'm involved in. That is the area of actual attendance and actual attendance accounting more than just the ADA issue. Also the role of School Attendance Review Boards or SARBs in the whole process of truancy and what is working and what is not. I'll try to be as brief as possible.

In the issue of attendance accounting, Assemblyman Clute has mentioned that there is legislation now that's over in the Senate developing pilot projects so that we can begin to encourage schools to focus on the actual attendance -- bottoms on seats, warm seats -- rather than focusing on absences and excusing absences and using your phone calls in that regard. But I think it goes a little bit further than that and I'm going to make some recommendations that we are considering, not only in our district, but it has been tried or is being proposed in some of the other districts. That is using actual attendance to measure school performance. There are districts -- and we have brought this up as a recommendation in our school district -- to have principals do evaluations based upon actual attendance versus the ADA that the school collected -- how many seats were warm on any given day (not just the homeroom or attendance accounting period of the day) and to use that.

The other part is that in many staffs around the state there has been a trend for the teaching staff to be removed from attendance. It's either the attendance clerk's responsibility or the child welfare and attendance position's responsibility to look at school attendance. Trying to encourage staff to even make a phone call on an absent student has been difficult. I want to bring up an example of one school in our district -- and I know there are other school districts around -- where actual attendance has been made part of the teacher performance or teacher evaluation. I think this is part of the role of child welfare and attendance.

We consulted with one principal and encouraged her, just showed her, mathematically, that if you have a staff of 50 and each staff person is required to make 5 phone calls per week on attendance -- that's only one phone call per day. You'll have 250 calls going out per week on attendance alone; every month, you'll have 1,000; and after a ten month school year, you'll have had 10,000 phone calls going out on attendance. It's great PR plus it raised her actual attendance -- actual attendance -- not ADA or percentage points -- from 89 to 93 percent. So I think we should make a recommendation at the school site level -- and at that level, basically, we're at the front line -- that the amount of involvement in staff and also the way we're looking at attendance has to change.

I'm fortunate enough to participate in several transfer of knowledge workshops sponsored by the California Youth Authority. And out of those we got a consistent message from

students that one of the ways they could tell the teachers don't care was that "if we cut their class they don't call us." Maybe the Vice Principal did, maybe a computerized machine did, but "the teacher didn't care enough to call even after we cut the class 25 times." So that was a clear message to us and what we're trying to implement: that we do need to get the classroom teacher -- the person that student is bonded to -- make that call. We know that teachers have tremendous workloads but I think that just showing that -- at least in this one particular school -- that if we can get a minimum involvement of 5 calls per week that we did impact and we did get actual attendance to rise.

Now in support of the classroom teachers and school sites, many school districts, as well as county offices, have developed school attendance review boards. Part of the problems with school attendance review boards, as well as some of the things that work, is an issue I'd like to get into.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Excuse me, right before that Mr. Katida, Mr. Zeltner has a question.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZELTNER: Yes. You mentioned reporting of absenteeism by teachers to administration. Is that not a requirement in all school districts? If not, then how is the school districts supposed to keep good records of ADA?

MR. KATIDA: In most of the school districts that have now gone to main framework from computerized attendance or accounting systems. You have this site where this classroom teacher reports to the administration those students who are absent. There are still some schools who take attendance only one period a day for attendance accounting purposes.

It's incumbent upon that administration to encourage those teachers to get attendance from all of the periods, as teachers are required to keep a register. How well that's enforced throughout the state, at least I know in our district, varies from school to school.

The other aspect of that is that although the absence may be reported, what's done with that information is, again, something that varies from school to school. It's like there is an actual attendance reporting requirement, legislatively mandated, that each school district shall report their actual attendance but that's simply what it is -- it's a reporting requirement. It's to make it public knowledge, but merely reporting often varies to what's going to happen with that information from the administration office.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZELTNER: Thank you. I was very interested in your answer there because I may misunderstand what the actual practice is myself. In my area, particularly the city in which I live, I'm very familiar with the practices of notifying parents on truancy and that's done every day. If a kid doesn't show up, a parent receives a phone call and they say, "Where is your offspring?" What really causes me a problem with what you're saying is the fact that the basis of a lot of the school district funding is ADA. If it's run that loosely, some schools could be losing -- others could be getting more than their share because they're not paying attention whether the kids show up or not. Thank you.

MR. KATIDA: There is a truancy reporting requirement that truant students -- the parents shall be notified. And, again, it's -- some schools, to a great degree, follow strictly the legislative intent, to the letter of the law. But it varies, again, from school site to school site as to whether or not those truancy reporting requirements are being done. In that regard, at that point when students become habitually truant, the School Attendance Review Board has been designated as the entity by which those students will meet with the Board, will meet with community resources, and that community resource is given the responsibility, then, to determine what services or what law enforcement agencies will get involved with the student.

In some areas -- and I'm going to point out the improvements, especially here in Sacramento county since I sit on the Sacramento County School Attendance Review Board -- and I hope the next witness after me will be able to elaborate a little bit further on this -- we found that there is an enforcement aspect to school attendance and that is that parents who fail to follow the directives of the school attendance review board may be guilty of an infraction. The extent to which that is vigorously pressured by the District Attorney, who would get involved in the case, can really make a great difference as to the effectiveness attendance review board -- not the aspect of locking the kid up in juvenile hall, but any services recommended. Involvement by the District Attorney to compel the parents and the family (since we have to look at truancy as a family problem) to get involved with those services is critical.

We know here in this county, that after their involvement, we've had much more publicity that there is a compulsory education law. We've had better attendance at our hearings by families, and we've also had better followthrough since the involvement of the District Attorney and I think that is real critical in the functions of a school attendance review board.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Do district attorneys that are actively involved in this have one or more employees dedicated full-time to this function, or do they try to squeeze it in with other duties?

MR. KATIDA: They try to squeeze it with other duties. But what's been helpful to us is it doesn't go to a number of deputies but to one person who is designated to just follow school cases so that that person has a very good working relationship with the schools.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: The attendance review boards are countywide?

MR. KATIDA: Well, there is a county board and then each local district will have a board or can have a board.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So the county board of education has a board, and then the district would have their own board and do they just cooperate together or are they under that board?

MR. KATIDA: Okay, that's a good question. In some of your smaller counties, the county board can actually hear cases. In more of your urban counties, or your more populated counties, the county board is a policy-making and coordinating board. There is a real direct supervision of the local boards, although the local boards have membership on the county boards.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Is there authority or just advice?

MR. KATIDA: It's primarily policy-making and advice. Well, when you "authorize" -- to me it would also mean enforcement and there is really no kind of other than...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So this would be the policy of the county board of education, to give it to you to implement and we hope you would do it. Or if you don't do it, I guess then nothing happens, right?

MR. KATIDA: Since we've lost the mandate on the SARB (School Attendance Review Board) legislation. The SARB used to be mandated and since the lifting of the mandate it's permissive. I know Dr. Summerfield from...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: SARB used to be the county. I'm learning a new vocabulary here.

MR. KATIDA: Right, county SARBS used to be mandated.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: For each district or the county board of education?

MR. KATIDA: For each county.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Okay.

MR. KATIDA: Then each county SARB could then form district SARBS to hear cases. Now after lifting of the mandate, -- Dr. Summerfield from the State Department could let me know how many county SARBS are actually in attendance -- but the greater majority of the counties in the State of California maintain their school attendance review boards.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: You say that they can give an infraction.

MR. KATIDA: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: That would be like a traffic ticket, I guess, and the parent would have to pay a fine for not doing their job.

MR. KATIDA: With a maximum fine of a \$100.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: That has to be done through the District Attorney's office at the present time? Probably...maybe you can help me here. A lot of different people can give tickets for different things. I mean animal control officers give tickets for people who don't take care of their animals properly. Why does this have to be in the District Attorney's office? As important as it is to us here, such a low priority in the District Attorney's office with all of the crime, etc., that they have to deal with, and prosecutions and all, couldn't the Board of Education or the SARB or the somebody else be given the authority to issue citations in this? Someone with real expertise that just did that on a metropolitan... I assume that in Sacramento County, a county as big as this, there has got to be enough problems that it could keep one person busy full-time.

MR. KATIDA: Well, if not a whole building full. What most schools do, and school districts do, is that the School Attendance Review Board is the entity of, basically, "last resort" to get the parents and the student to work with the school. And at that point, if that doesn't work, then the referral to the District Attorney becomes the agency of last resort. For example, in Sacramento County, you know, a county of 17 school districts and a County Office of Education, we had 61

referrals go to the District Attorney's Office, which is not very much considering we're serving a large metropolitan community.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I mean, things have got to get pretty gross before you're going to refer to the DA, because it's not so overwhelmingly exaggerated that he's not going to take time on it anyway. But what I'm wondering is if the SARB had the authority to deal with it itself?

MR. KATIDA: Well, I guess there we end up with a philosophical conflict, in that...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Educators don't want to be policemen.

MR. KATIDA: That, and also the legislative intent of SARB was to coordinate community services to find out if there was a mental need, a health need, possibly social service need for this family and then to explore those with that family to see if that was impeding that family from being able to send their child to school.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So SARB has membership from the Mental Health Department and all these other agencies as well as the different school districts.

MR. KATIDA: That's right, it's a community board. A typical SARB would have the Welfare Department, Probation Department, Mental Health, possibly someone from the Drug Advisory Board, a parent representative, and a school representative, so its a community-based board.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So it wouldn't be an appropriate agency, probably, to issue a citation. But there might be

someone else, other than the District Attorney, that would be able to give attention to it.

MR KATIDA: Possibly, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZELTNER: If I might interject there, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZELTNER: From a practical point of view, the school officials are held responsible for the conduct of the youngsters. When you're talking about citing a parent for not having the child go to school, you're talking about dealing with the adult, and school district doesn't have jurisdiction over the adult. The only appropriate agency there, then, would be a prosecuting attorney. Most of the time those citations involve noting more than a counseling with the Deputy DA who says, "go forth and sin no more or you're in deep trouble." If it's a real aggravated situation it's not handled as an infraction, it's handled as contributing to the delinquency of the minor.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay, let's keep moving.

MR. KATIDA: Well, in summary, looking at school attendance and the problems of truancy, my major belief is that if we were able to support the School Attendance Review Boards -- looking at the ones that work and looking at the roles of the individual players and possibly looking at the ways we can better support the SARBs possibly through the enforcement aspect or even the development of more resources -- I see that we can use that as a means, in spite of the decriminalization of status offenders -- to work with our truant kids.

And going back, if we're going to look at truancy, I think we also need to look at it as a systemic problem as well, in the way we look at it, as not only an attendance accounting but making ourselves accountable for attendance -- and that's all staff including the administrators, child welfare, attendance, and teaching staff.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I want to go back to some of your very first ideas there, that I had not heard before and they sound very interesting, the principal and teacher evaluations and building in the attendance there and almost going to an enterprise attendance system. The principal's evaluation is done by the district administrators, right? So they are the ones that would hold that principal accountable, based on the attendance at that particular school. Among other aspects, I'm sure, in his or her performance, is that now going on?

MR. KATIDA: In some school districts it's going on but it's not practiced regularly. They may be held accountable for ADA -- we have to make that distinction. In fact that's practiced throughout the state, that site principals and site managers are considered accountable to how much money we're losing that's ADA. So, therefore, we do a lot to contact parents about excusing absences but the focus is on excusing absences versus challenging principals to come up with the strategies to raise actual attendance on a period-by-period basis, and that distinction is real critical. The principals now are held to ADA but not to actual attendance.

ASSEMBLYMAN ZELTNER: And then to take it a step further to the teachers. I have a great deal of respect for what teachers do and what they are challenged with, but I would guess that there are many where it is not of great importance to them whether the kids are going to, necessarily, be there or not. I mean, as long as there's enough to teach school, but others that they may not be that concerned about. Now this evaluation does sound like, perhaps, one way that that may be brought forth, but do you think we would have to get into a position in our actual teacher training programs to start getting into curriculum areas that would have something to do with attendance, interest there, and motivation, but which, somewhat, is not the role of a teacher? But, aren't we getting to that point? I wonder.

MR. KATIDA: I think we are. And I think in our teacher training program, especially when we're working with high-risk youths that we need to begin focusing on the familiar social school problems that these students are having so that in the teacher training they're aware, when they go out into the classroom, of the kind of baggage that these kids are coming with. At the same time, we should begin to focus on teachers when they make the contact to the home: how to make the contact to the home, how to have them work with parents, how to make the kind of phone calls, how to make the kind of home visits that will have some meaning for the students to come to their classes.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Or is there a more appropriate role for the district in their hiring process, their own acclamation, as they get the teachers ready for their own districts? Would it be

more appropriate for them to work with those teachers and the ones already on staff since they're ones that are really benefit the most?

MR. KATIDA: I think that it can be a shared responsibility but definitely the district needs to be involved since the district has some special needs to train their teachers in the problems of their risk for students and I think that that's a real appropriate place.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: It's probably more appropriate than some of the other places.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay. Mr. Katida, I appreciate your testimony; were you about rap it up there?

MR. KATIDA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I think it's a very good follow-up, too, to some of the other previous subjects we had. I know that it may appear at times that we're getting a little bit off the drug and prevention areas but really there has to be correlation there and we do want to keep focusing on those areas but certainly attendance is a key part of that area.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I have one further question. This idea of teachers calling to the homes, I think, is great because, number one, it let's the kid know that the teacher cares about them enough to make that call which you referred to. Would that be something that -- given our collective bargaining situation in schools now -- could you get away with being a principal telling your teachers, "you're going to start making phone calls," or do you have to negotiate that at the bargaining table?

MR. KATIDA: That would probably have to be a negotiated item. But one of the things that we've done in our district is convince the teachers that their salaries are directly tied to the attendance. If we're going to have something to bargain with -- that they need to be actively involved -- in being sure those resources are there to bargain with. But that is a very good point.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So local district persuasion could, maybe, go a long way here.

MR. KATIDA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay, thank you. We now have Ms. Jane Davis, Deputy District Attorney of San Juan County. Now we'll really get the law enforcement side.

MS. JANE DAVIS: Perhaps.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Perhaps.

MS. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to be here. I've been involved -- just to give you a thumbnail approach, my county more or less pioneered the idea of SARB back in 1972. Stockton Unified started a community approach through problem youth with truancy problems and it's kind of grown and the idea caught on as other counties heard it. Eventually it did end up as School Attendance Review Act and it's been going every since.

I've personally been involved with SARB as a Deputy District Attorney since 1975. I've been very much involved with child welfare attendance. I attend their conferences every year and I try to stay abreast of this. It is a good part of my duties and, in answer to your question Mr. Leslie, I am assigned

and designated by the offices as the SARB representative, and I do sit on two county SARBs. One is the county SARB, itself, which does hear cases in our county, and I also sit on Stockton Unified School District SARB, which is our largest district. There are several other local SARBs in other school districts that I do not sit on, but sit as an appeal processor, if you will, for a DA hearing.

We have a letter that, following SARB, if the family did not show up, or they've gotten no response or improvement, they'll send a reference to me and I'll set up a DA hearing (which amounts to a situation hearing as referred to by Mr. Zeltner earlier). I believe this has not been codified as well.

Once that information is received by me I'll send out a letter and set a date and time in my office, where I usually sit, also, with the county school child welfare attendant person from that office, and also a representative of the local school district; child welfare attendants usually will sit in. I'll usually have the parent and also on the letter direct them to bring the child that's having the attendance problem. When we have another session, where we talk with the parent, I advise them of what the laws are and what's available, and what could happen to that child and to the parent or to both if something hasn't happened. A lot of times we go with a lot of bluff and blunder because that's really all we have, but I find that, for the most part, improved attendance following SARB and following the DA hearing, is about 70 to 75 percent. This is improved -- not perfect, but improved. One of my biggest frustrations in law

enforcement, in general, has been that we don't have a real big bottom line and I'd like to see that changed.

First of all, addressing Section 48293 of the Education Code, which makes it an infraction for parents to not ensure their children's attendance at school, specifically provides for an infraction. It's treated as an infraction. There's no right to counsel; in fact, I was called to testify as a witness that we did ultimately file and so far it's not gone much of anywhere. It's not made much impact. The parent is on AFDC. So, I'm not sure if that's going to make a real impact and they'll end up, ultimately, not collecting any fine. It's being appealed right now and it's going to end up costing us a whole lot more than it's worth. But I think the bottom line is parents, number one, hate to be touched in the pocketbook no matter who they are. I think we should make all parents that don't ensure their child's attendance at school responsible for loss of ADA for that child.

I want to emphasize, particularly, truancy doesn't begin as an adolescent, truancy begins back in kindergarten. We have teachers who were accepting notes, who were accepting excuses from parents who ordinarily aren't seen by principals or the attendance office of an elementary school. The teacher is the one who is in the classroom making the decision to accept, or not, the excuse presented by a parent.

Often times a child isn't ill, it's just convenient for the parent not to have the kid there or be ready for that child. We need to make some accountability on attendance accounting in the sense of we aren't going to accept anymore excuses. There'll

be "X" amount of percentage and this is where I'm strictly in favor of the Senate Bill now going through national attendance accounting. Once we recognize that truancy begins, the pattern begins, as early as kindergarten or first grade and we attack the problem there, we're not going to be seeing the tremendous statistics you heard today later on in middle schools and in high schools because it's a behavior we've got stopped and changed early on.

I think that the focus up until now has been at the wrong end. We need to start early on making that change with young families and with youngsters so that it becomes a learned pattern to attend school and to make parents hold their kids accountable. Often times at that age the parent is the one who is setting the child up for failure and we need to make some determination that a change needs to be made there. Particularly not allow excuses to be made by parents or accepted by school personnel. There just has to be an end to that and it becomes too convenient. Any kid that misses more than a day a month has missed too many, there just aren't that many illnesses going around.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Ms. Davis, when you suggested parents paying for ADA, now is that attached to that Senate bill or is that something...?

MS. DAVIS: That's something that I personally feel. I don't think it's attached to anything at this point -- I felt it for a long time. Parents don't seem to hear unless you take away their freedom and you talk about their pocketbook being touched, then they listen.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: And you say starting in the earlier grades, which really makes sense in part of the learned behavior aspect and accountability. Concertedly, we have some parents that are probably just plain ignorant towards the value of school education and why their kids should be there.

MS. DAVIS: It's just never been a value period in some family systems. Dad sits back, "Look, I'm earning \$4.50 an hour and I never finished high school." And a kid identifies and looks up to that. We need to make it a priority through statutory definition because there are some family systems who for generations...and education is not valued and won't be valued, and a kid is going to adopt the values of their parents.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Will this Senate Bill do that? What is in that bill that you like? Is that this Senate...

MS. DAVIS: Well, in the past I've read the one that was not passed -- or I believe it was passed and not signed by the Governor a year or two ago. I haven't read the most recent one.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Torres' bill.

MS. DAVIS: That bill had a lot of positive things about it and I am fully in support of actual attendance accounting, but I think there needs to be something built-in that does away with any excuses whatsoever. I believe the idea behind actual attendance accounting is to actually count heads that are there and have a built-in percentage on a statewide basis of we'll accept 3 percent as going to be absent on any given day, I believe that's the way the bill has been drawn up -- I don't know about the current bill, I have not read it.

Going on and moving forward with children, I think that any efforts that we make at changing patterns and behavior patterns need to be made with the younger kids. Now, when you get into middle school and high school age, there's a set behavior already. All of a sudden you've got a kid who is out of control, he's not going to school, and it's not a high priority. Well, it was never made a high priority, usually, in earlier grades. If you look, you'll see there's been a pattern established in many, many cases and I've seen this over and over.

For instance, in one of our school districts they've gone out into the elementary schools, identified high-risk youths, and they're trying to really work with those families. I think that's really going to have an impact a few years down the road when these kids are growing up and going through the high schools.

But I think we need to make a clear statement of policy in this state that education is important, that our youth are important. I think we need to state that we don't want to have a whole generation of kids that are illiterate and it's scary to me. I'm not sure I want to be here when some of these kids, that we're talking about in the statistics, are going to be taking over this country and I'm going to be retiring -- it scares the hell out of me, frankly...excuse my French. These people aren't going to be good citizens, they're not going to be contributing citizens unless they're educated. Right now, with a lot of kids, education is not important. Getting their nearest fix, getting thrills are more important than being in school. Sometimes

schools aren't a very good place to be either. We need to make a safe environment, we need to make an interesting environment. Kids are turned off. We need to learn how to turn them on, and I think we need some bottom lines with some kids.

There's that hard core bunch of kids that I see that, no matter what I say or any DA is going to say, is not going to go to school. What are we going to do with them? I have another idea -- I think some counties are doing it -- I'm not sure I think Fresno, maybe one of them or Kern -- Riverside, I think, may be one. But I have an idea of a court school where there needs to be a change under 601.1; I believe it is now for truancy. Right now we've been limited to the probation officer who can take the child during school hours. What you're talking about is, basically, an out-of-control behavior, they're not abiding by authority.

You tell us this child has to go to school and we have laws we need to enforce but we have no teeth to enforce them. I think we need to realize it's not working; we need to do something about it. First of all, probation DAs, as you indicated, take truancy and truancy problems as a very low priority, which I think is "nuts" because you're talking about the richest resource we have, you're talking about the future of this state and this country.

We're taking millions and millions of dollars and we're pouring it into...I don't know, \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year per person to lock up criminals, to lock up people in detention facilities who all started out down the road in K through 6 as

truants. That's where it started and that's where we need to talk about prevention. If this state wants to end up saving money and quit opening prisons and quit building more jails, we need to attack where it begins at this end of the rainbow, not at that end where it's too late and too little. I think you know the whole system is upside down. I believe that we need to attack it at this end. Prevention is where it's going to be and it has to start with the youngest, right now, and work for it, because by the time we're talking 14, 15, 16 and behavior-set, we're not going to make a lot of changes. Yes, we'll make some, but there's that hard core we're never going to touch. They're the ones that we're going to be locking up next year, next generation. I really care about kids and I want to see a lot of these kids who are slipping through the cracks taken care of. Truancy is a low priority and it should be our highest priority, out-of-control is a low priority, it should be our highest priority.

Probation departments don't even want to touch it. When we refer a kid over there, they've actually called up and yelled at me because we did, and that's their job. Right now they have the responsibility of filing 601 petitions, not the DA, we file 602s. Well, I don't think that necessarily needs to change, it just needs to be stated as policy.

We want something done about the Probation Department and it should be made mandatory when they receive a referral from SARB. You have to understand that the SARB system has done everything they can. They have referred this family to many

community agencies. They have virtually gone in and tried to attack problems within the family system to help this family and if that's not working, probation needs to step in and something needs to be done. That's where I'd like to see 48293 changed from a mere infraction to straight misdemeanor at the least. I think a kid's life ought to be worth six months and/or a \$500 fine. When you're talking \$250 there's no threat of jail to some parents, they are otherwise law abiding people. But if you take them and caused them the embarrassment of possibly going to jail or hitting their pocket book for a large fine, I think that's important.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I agree with a lot of what you're saying, but I wonder about the situation. What do you do, given your solution -- the situation where the teenager can intimidate the parent?

MS. DAVIS: Okay. You put the blame where you should. You should put it with the kid, and I was going to get to that. I'm talking about truancy. We need to do something besides being able to take a kid away from the parents and to have a probation officer chasing them around to pick them up and take them to school. Okay, let's treat them like other out-of-control kids. You can't lock up the 601 kids that are out-of-control, or the parent, but you can place them away from the home in a structured facility somewhere. Maybe that's what we need, we need that, but I would also like to talk about a court school.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Well, before you mention court school, I was thinking of the fine where the parent would have to

make up the ADA, but the parent is physically unable to make their kid go to school, are there exceptions for that?

MS. DAVIS: Sure, you put the pressure on the kid. I'm talking about accessing the blame where it should be. If you've got a big strapping 15 or 16 year-old boy that says, "I ain't going to school and ain't nobody going to make me." Well, that's the kind of kid who needs to have a petition filed in juvenile court. That's the kind of kid that the system was intended to deal with, because I know there are a lot of parents and I've seen that frustration. We put the blame where it belongs, when you've got a kid, then they're responsible if the parents have done everything they can, fine.

But we need more teeth to deal with that kind of kid -- already we can't place the kid out of the home. Chances are if he is out-of-control with school, he's out-of-control in many other areas with that parent. The parent oftentimes is terrified of that kind of a kid -- usually he's into something else. These kids, if they are not in school, you know darn well they're out there ripping you off or ripping me off or thinking of something to do. If they're not using drugs or finding a place to use them, getting high together, they're going to be out. It's a known fact that when kids aren't in school, the crime rate as far as burglaries in your residences go up and when they're in school they go down. There is a direct relationship. We need to address that. We need to be able to do something with these kids and we should make it codified within the law if you're not going to allow us to lock...at least give the courts a stated policy

that they can enforce their rules with a five-day contempt (which the appellate courts have taken away from them). I think every court ought to have the ability to enforce its own orders, by detention if need be, and right now that's not so, because of the appellate court decision.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Isn't it true we get so crisis-oriented and reaction-oriented that we don't place a high priority on these areas, we don't get into the prevention of it, and it costs us all in the long run?

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Sounds as though your Board of Supervisors and your District Attorney, though, have, at least in San Joaquin County, made this a relatively high priority because they're letting you spend a lot of time being on SARBs and come to Sacramento and try to help us do a better job. So, in your county it is of more a priority. I don't know about any other county.

MS. DAVIS: Well, I've talked with other counties but there is a lot of counties in this state where their DAs do participate, but there are a lot of counties that they wouldn't touch with a ten-foot pole. I think something needs to be clarified there. I think it does help when a DA's office does get involved because we threaten people, we're good at that. Just something about the DA sending you a nasty little letter makes you stand up and take notice. All of a sudden something that wasn't too important to you becomes very important. Sometimes that letter from me is all that it takes because until then, to a parent who is harried, raising kids, trying to work,

it isn't important, and all of sudden it is, to make a few phone calls that will ensure their child is going to get to school and oftentimes that's what it takes.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: But isn't your operation rare as far as DAs go in that regard? Is it more unusual for a DA to be doing that type of work, yours?

MS. DAVIS: In this state, probably. I think there is more. I've talked personally to a lot of people. I think it has to involve a lot of personal interest on the individual DA and the individual deputy, but I understand that it kind of comes and goes with the personal interest. But, I think that needs to be something stated. We already have codified that we "may" participate in the SARB hearings and the DA hearings. That's strictly "may" but I think perhaps if it were "shall", it might be a little higher priority.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: How many SARBs have district attorneys on the SARB?

MS. DAVIS: I couldn't say out of the 58 counties. I'm aware of probably a handful anyway. In our county I sit on two.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Sacramento -- of the DA and the SARB?

MS. DAVIS: But our county SARB operates very differently than the Sacramento county. I think earlier, when you were talking to Mr. Katida, you had a misapprehension. The county SARB is a different entity than the county Board of Education. I think there was that misnomer earlier when Mr. Katida was up here. These are two different entities. the

county SARB, apparently, in Sacramento, was basically a policy-setting situation.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: A completely separate entity. It's not...

MS. DAVIS: It's not the county Board of Education.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: There's no tie or relationship to their county board other than it's the same boundary, coincidence...?

MS. DAVIS: Yes, it's different people. In our county, the county SARB actually hears cases at least twice a month during the school year, and we have a beginning and an organizational meeting at the beginning and the end. I also sit on Stockton Unified which meets every two weeks..

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Do they hold hearings also?

MS. DAVIS: They hold hearings also.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: The district SARB.

MS. DAVIS: The district SARB does.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And the county SARB does?

MS. DAVIS: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So, what hearings does the county SARB have?...After the district SARB didn't work?...Or are there other cases?

MS. DAVIS: We have several very small districts in the county and oftentimes we hear their cases. These are ones that may not have a SARB and oftentimes we'll hear -- like Stockton Unified might have had a case where either the parent didn't show or there hasn't been any cooperation. Once in a while we'll

filter those into the county SARB since it is a higher level and there's a little more participation as far as agencies on the county SARB than at the local school site. We have probably five or six other districts within the county that have their own SARBs. They feed from there, sometimes, through the county SARB into me as a kind of an appeal process that we've built-in, informally, within our county.

Following seeing me, if there's no improvement, depending on where the blame is to be accessed we make a referral to probation for a petition on the child or possibly to the adult division in my office for charges against the parent, or both, depending on what it may be. This is where I'd like to see the changes made.

I think we need to have a bottom line as far as -- number one, stating a policy that when we do make that referral, we've done a lot with that family, we've really worked with them, and something needs to be done. And this is true of probation departments throughout the state: it's the lowest priority they access, they don't file them, and they won't file them. I think we need to start making it clear that they should file them, and once filed we should have some teeth there. We should be allowed to place the child out of the home, if necessary, to a more structured facility, if need be, ...some group home or something.

We should be able to have an established court school which is for the kids that have been identified as problem attenders, truant problems. The ADA could go to a joint county school and probation-run schools and it would pay for itself. We

could staff it with teachers, with counselors, and some probation officer-aides to kind of watch these kids and make sure that they are, in fact, in school...perhaps let them stay there for a period of time and if they show improvement, they can work back to their home school. But there needs to be something done where these kids are monitored and I'm talking your basic hard-core kids -- the ones that you're talking about. We also need to state, statutorily, that if they don't do this the court could use its enforcement powers of contempt by giving them up to five days at a time for not going to school or not following the courts rules. Give us back some teeth to work with. I think your number of cases, which were referred in my county, that we've seen, you could count on one hand.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Do the juvenile halls run this school?

MS. DAVIS: We do have a county school run in our... but it's only for 602 wards, not 601 and the law says you cannot mix the two.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Right, but the idea of the court running a school wouldn't be unfamiliar because this court does that right now.

MS. DAVIS: They do that in a way, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: They'd just be somewhere in detention and they're going to school and some would be coming in on the bus and they'd be in the classroom next door, maybe.

MS. DAVIS: Correct. But that doesn't have to be at juvenile hall. It could be set up anywhere within the county.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Right.

MS. DAVIS: Let me review my notes.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Yeah, if we can rap it up in about a minute or two here.

MS. DAVIS: One other situation I would like to address is the real problem we have with AFDC parents -- you have parents who are basically at home, they're not working -- that may change -- but we do have a lot of parents who just don't want to get off their "duff" and make sure their kids are in school. They aren't doing anything, but they just don't seem to care. I think there needs to be some penalty built into receipt of AFDC funds to make sure they're sending their kids to school. The reason they're receiving that is to make sure their kids are getting an education or getting fed. Their getting necessities in school is a necessity. So I think we need to address something to make this a priority to AFDC parents, particularly when you've got little guys in K through 6 or younger. Then, when we get to the opposite of the rainbow, between 16 and 18, there's a lot of alternative programs. But for some reason a lot of school districts and the Welfare Department seem to think that as long as they sign up for job training they don't have to go to school any longer...that's not true. This is information that's being passed out by welfare departments across the state. We're trying to tell these kids, "no, the law says you have to be in school at least a minimum day between 16 and 18." They tell them that if they go enroll in some job training program, it doesn't qualify. We need to make that very clear and it needs to be cleared up.

These are the very kids who are your basic dropouts, and so they sign up for those but they never attend those either, oftentimes, so that's important.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Well, they're supposed to have a work permit and they couldn't get one...(laughter).

MS. DAVIS: I think a public education as far as sports on television, advertising, etc., needs to address truancy to make sure that the word gets out to the public. I mean look at AIDS for instance, nobody heard about it four or five years ago. All of a sudden it's the number one issue. We need to make truancy a number issue in this state. We need to talk to our kids and tell them how important they are to us, and I just can't stressed that enough. I like kids, but the way that the statutory scheme is set up now is not working. We need to revamp it, throw it out, and try something new. We really need to turn it upside down right now. The most important thing is that we throw money at it but it's too little, too late. These kids -- that are locked up and will probably fill our prisons the rest of their lives, off and on, on the installment plan -- we need to address these kids when they're young, from these high-risk families, so that hopefully that will be avoided and they'll be contributing member to society later on.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Who would make...if you had a provision whereby a welfare AFDC parent were to be penalized for not having, say a younger age child attend school when there is no excuse on the control side of things, at least in most cases, who would make the decision?

MS. DAVIS: I would assume it would have to be welfare and perhaps the school system. You have an eligibility worker that probably would be the first line to do that and some sort of appeal person. There should be something set up between the school...or some guidelines.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Between the attendance operation that we heard from.

MS. DAVIS: Yes, an eligibility worker that works with that mother month to month would probably be the best line of defense. There probably should be some guidelines set up to what would be the minimal requirements that parent must do to see that their child is in school. Again, the note writing just doesn't get it; we need to do away with note writing, period.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Is there any way to get a handle on the magnitude of that particular problem?

MS. DAVIS: I don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Would there be a way to get a handle on the magnitude of that problem in San Joaquin county, since we've got a county that's spent a little bit of effort into this area?

MS. DAVIS: Well, we're putting some effort into it, we're working at it, but as long as we have the Welfare Department, number one, that has to go by -- they have to run -- I believe it's monthly they turn in -- the schools are required to show the child was in school, that's one way to monitor it. If those referrals were sent to some collecting agency and some enforcement followed from there, I think it would probably be manageable.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I agree with you that parents should do that, it's just how many aren't doing it. Are we talking about a handful, or is it small problem?

MS. DAVIS: I think when you talk about the vast majority of parents out there, probably a handful.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: But it only takes a handful to create a big problem later on in law enforcement.

MS. DAVIS: This is true, and it only takes a very small handful to commit most of the crime in this state, too.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Right, exactly. Thank you.

MS. DAVIS: I want to thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Yes, thank you. I appreciate your excellent testimony. Some good ideas from your side of the fence.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Did you have your hand up for something, sir?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to answer part of the question if you would like. There is an attempt through statewide evaluation of SARB, which is going on right at this time, to get some kind of pretty firm estimate on how many of these people that go through the SARB process are indeed related to AFDC. We haven't finished that evaluation but it's due at the end of the year to report to the Legislature. But in going over the data that's coming in, almost all of the SARBs are reporting that a disproportionate number of their referrals are indeed AFDC-related, and so I think this is a significant area that does need to be looked at.

The way I understand it at this point is that the AFDCs are supposed to have their students enrolled in school -- it is required that they be enrolled. However, there is nothing that goes beyond enrollment to verification of attendance and therein lies the critical factor. There needs to be some tightening in that situation whereby the actual attendance occurs, not merely the enrollment occurs, and I think that's what this testimony was saying earlier. We'll have some better data on that at the end of the year when the statewide evaluation of SARB is published and presented to the Legislature.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay, thank you, appreciate it.

MS. DAVIS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay, Ms. Sandra Watson with the School Program of P.A.N.I.C. (Program for Adolescents Now in Crisis). Thank you for being here.

MS. SANDRA WATSON: Thank you for inviting me. I would like to reinforce some of the things that Dr. Wilson said, especially about the implementation of programs into schools, and that's what this program has been doing for the last two years. We do realize in talking to school districts the lack of a time factor, which is really one thing that I've picked up from most of the administrators as far as teachers and the burden. They say that you will not get a classroom teacher to implement this type of program simply because she does not have time. They're already overburdened and they don't want to add another subject to that already overburdened curriculum unless you're willing to take something out. So, therefore, the districts are not willing

to take something out, so they have to make some type of adjustments, and the adjustments have been that I have been working with the school districts allowing programs like P.A.N.I.C to come in and that we implement the school program. I have been doing it under health and education because it's for the well being of the student, so that's why I've been doing it under that particular type of program -- and we do a three day program. But before we do that, I do staff training because that's very important. The staff is the one that is with the child eight hours a day and, in a lot of instances, they observe a lot of behaviors that even parents are not aware of.

MR. LESLIE: I'm sorry to interrupt, but I don't understand who you are yet. I'm trying to get what you're saying and I like what you're saying but I get...

MS. WATSON: Sandra Watson.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Well, I knew that and I know you're a school program coordinator of P.A.N.I.C. Program but it doesn't say...

MS. WATSON: Oh, Suicide Prevention here in Sacramento County.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Who employs you?

MS. WATSON: Suicide Prevention.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Suicide Prevention. What's the nature -- is that a private thing?

MS. WATSON: No, it comes under Sacramento Mental Health.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So you're funded through the County Mental Health Department budget?

MS. WATSON: The Suicide Prevention services are, but the school program was privately funded by SIERRA Foundation.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So the Suicide Prevention Program of the Sacramento Mental Health Department works with some private people to create this P.A.N.I.C. Program that now helps the schools.

MS. WATSON: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Thank you, that's what I need to figure out.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: That helps us get there.

MS. WATSON: All right, I'm sorry that was not clear.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: And I should have mentioned teen suicide because I knew you were under that topic but I didn't know the specific agency.

MS. WATSON: What we do is to make sure that the staff -- as Mr. Wilson also stated -- there are a lot of skilled personnel within the school administrative faculty but in a lot of instances they are not fine-tuned to that one particular skill. They've had that training in school, just as I had when I went through college. But to really focus in one particular area and know what you're supposed to be looking for you have so many other requirements that are state required, district required, and everything else, that a lot of time your teachers really cannot fine-tune, nor your staff. So they need to have some kind of resource and know where to turn, what is available in the

communities, and how to act, instead of reacting, to certain situations in schools, which has happened in some cases by not even knowing how to establish a suicide school policy.

I implemented one for a school last year because there had been an instance in which there was a reaction because there was no policy set and there was a panic. As a result, the child did attempt suicide on the school grounds and it could have easily been avoided if they had known exactly what steps to take and what to do in certain situations. As a result, that school does know what to do now and it will not happen again because the staff is fully aware. They know what to do, what kind of actions to take, who to go to, and who is responsible for that kind of implementation, and, especially, who calls the parent and lets them know that this child has attempted suicide. You know, if you've got four people calling and all of sudden, you know, he says what's going on at this school, it only took one person; or when to call out an ambulance, or when to call 911 -- those kinds of things are a policy that needs to be established before the action takes place and that's the thing I do in staff training.

Sometimes it's only a matter of making teachers feel at ease, to let them know that it's just a matter of saying, "Are you thinking about suicide? Do you need somebody to talk to?" They observe these behaviors in school and they don't know what to do with them in a lot of cases because they're not really sure where their boundaries and their limitations are.

So, if they understand this, and know what can be done...Like one male teacher last year, he had a student in

question and it was just a simple matter of saying -- he said, "I don't really feel comfortable in a classroom with a female student." I said, "You've got a big beautiful campus out here, all you do is sit out under a tree and say you know I'm willing to listen to what's going on." He said, "Is it that simple?" It's that simple, but you've got questions and you need answers, and you want to help kids but you're not sure the avenue in which to go. So those kinds of things are brought out in staff training.

Certain behaviors that you observe and you don't know what to do about them -- you know, you observe this behavior and you're not sure, like I said. Sometimes parents are not even aware that these things are going on. Then they want to know when do I call the parents? Or who do I go to on my staff when I have observed this behavior? Do I call the parent or do I let the counselor know or do I tell my principal? Those are the kinds of issues that are cleared away when you do your staff training.

What we will be doing in September is implementing a full district where the school psychologists are already overburdened, and this is a factor that is well known within the district. What we will do is allow these psychologists a way to use suicide prevention in school programs where it can be implemented into their district and at an early age. We're fully aware that suicides don't start when you get to 10th grade. Children deal with feelings very early on, and we are realizing that you do need to do that at an early age. I did do junior

high school training last year and I asked the classroom children if they had been involved in suicide at any level. There was only 1 to 2 percent who had no relationship with it at all. So it is there whether they've had an aunt or uncle or a close friend, or whatever.

In elementary schools in another district last year it was very good that children had been taught how to be friends and how to understand feelings. There was a little five year-old who had a problem with his parents -- the parents were divorcing but the child took on the action. Because of a very bright teacher that understood that the child was having depression, she alerted the parents, but she called me and said, "Where do I turn?"

What we do is produce a resource guide, which we send out to all of the schools, that has a list of services and community information that is available in Sacramento. She said that's a very valuable tool because I can easily refer to that. I can tell this parent where she needs to go for help, and what kind of counseling is available, if she needs money, where to go, where it's located, if there's a transportation service near by. That resource guide is a very valuable tool, I've gotten that back from all of the schools that we service in the Sacramento county. That is one of the best things that we could do because a lot of times your staff does not have time to flip through a telephone book and find out what services are available. They can call suicide prevention and ask for a reference or referral, and it is readily available.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Ms. Watson do you have a particular emphasis or prevention towards the high-risk students whether it be in drug use, truants, teenage pregnancies, or is there anything that indicates that they are more susceptible or despondent, or fit the various profiles?

MS. WATSON: I came in contact with over 12,000 kids last year between January and May. The consensus was that all children are at risk because the primary factor, as they indicated, was a family problem and all children come in contact with family problems. So, therefore, we have certain children who are more at risk than others and we realize that factor. But all children are at risk simply because they're all going through an adolescent period which is very trying in itself, let alone the fact that you've got to deal with alcohol, drug abuse, pregnancy, school problems and all the other factors that are related to that. So you have all children that are at risk, but from working with the children that I have worked with, the indicating factor is that the family problems and the life style is a greater problem than anything. They turn to drugs and alcohol as a result of those problems because they see that as a way out, as a temporary "feeling good about myself" and I don't have to deal with the problems.

The problem comes in when the depression comes in, after the alcohol and drug abuse, and you also have the depression of the problem that you had before you took the alcohol and then you combine those two and that's where the suicidal feelings come in. And in our program that's what we do.

There's another part of the program that I would like to stress is the fact of coping skills. You'd be surprised at the number of kids who do not know what to do in case of these feelings. Sometimes they don't recognize them and that's another factor to point out -- factors, you know, that something is going on in your life and it seems to be controlling you and you don't know what to do. So, a simple teaching of coping skills or how to help that friend, how to listen to that friend and be there for them, what to do with the information once you have it, don't keep it a secret, tell a trusting adult, and always remember that you are important, also, and that you need to learn how to take care of yourself. All of those are done in the training that I do for students as well.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Mr. Leslie did you have any questions? Thank you very much for taking the time to come and share this program with us today and I especially like your emphasis on the interpersonal communication skills.

MS. WATSON: It's very important, and also that you get funding for these type of programs, too, that's very important. They are relying on nonprofit agencies -- agencies like SIERRA Foundation that fund that particular part of suicide prevention.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: What is SIERRA Foundation and what else do they do?

MS. WATSON: Well, they support all types of programs, you know, especially new programs. Because it was originally a health foundation and its the money that they have set aside, I guess, from all of the monies that they collect for insurance,

they had such an excess that they decided to put it back into the community and this is their way of servicing the community needs.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay, we're continuing under the topic of teen suicide, a parent, Ms. Marilyn Koenig. It's nice to have you here today and I think you're the first parent perspective. I'm sure we've had other people here who are parents but you're the one here, specifically, as a parent.

MS. MARILYN KOENIG: What a job. Well, you've heard quite a few statistics from Milton and Sandra, both persons that I have worked with in the past in different capacities. A statistic that I ran across just very recently that 10 percent of the teens in California that died, died by suicide. That's a lot and it's staggering.

In 1977 my oldest son Stephen was part of those statistics and that's how I got interested in this. He was just barely 18 years old, he was a senior at a parochial school here in Sacramento doing very well, was not into drugs, drinking, didn't even smoke cigarettes. He was a very high achiever, very sensitive, and obviously hid his depression and suicided with no prior attempts. The word suicide is still not mentioned in that school, and that is part of the problem of people still not wanting to mention the word suicide. It took me a few years, I spent probably about three or four years being almost paralyzed by all of this, then my brain started working and I decided that something needed to be done.

I did lobby for the legislation that called for the development of this suicide prevention program that Milt Wilson

has talked about, back in '81, '82, '83. I worked on that committee. I've worked with Suicide Prevention here in Sacramento, Los Angeles County and in San Mateo. So for the past 6 years I've been fairly active.

I also am the co-founder of a support group for survivors here in the Sacramento area, people who have been affected, either through their family or their friends, by a suicide death. We have a mailing list that is now approaching 500 in four or five years. We have close to twenty families that have had multiple suicides. It is really important that we dig in and do a lot more work than what we are doing.

There are a lot of local efforts, statewide efforts, and national efforts through the Department of Mental Health, through the Department of Education as you heard, and through our local suicide prevention agency right here in Sacramento. But if you go forty miles south of here to the city of Stockton, they do not even have a suicide prevention hot line. Not even a phone.

So our services and what we have in this state are very scattered and very haphazard. If you happen to be in a school district where Sandra's working you are going to get some suicide prevention, but if you're in a little high school some other place you may not get it. Why are some kids lucky enough to get that information and others aren't? I don't think that's fair. I think we all need it. As Sandra said, all kids are at risk, even if it seems like an attempt that's not serious. It is serious.

Two weeks ago, my granddaughter had a friend over, her best friend. The next morning, she'd stayed overnight, the mother thought, or my daughter thought, she was just sick with menstrual cramps. Upon talking and talking and talking, she found out that, indeed, the night before, when the girl was in her own home, she had taken an overdose and was trying to kill herself. The only person that knew that was my granddaughter, her best friend. No other adult knew that. So there's a lot of attempts going on that nobody knows about and you aren't going to find out about them. The kids cover them up. And that wasn't the first time she'd tried it.

So the area of attempters is really serious, because we really don't know what's happening. In a recent survey, done by Smith and Crawford, near the Meninger Clinic in Topeka, they surveyed seven high schools, one of them in California, and it was pretty much the same across the nation. Eleven percent of the kids in that anonymous survey said they had attempted suicide. It is so important that we get into the schools and other areas: foster homes, and any other risk areas where there are teenagers, and my recommendation is that we work together to develop a statewide office to coordinate the resources and the expertise and the knowledge that we have in California. It needs to be a statewide office of resource and training.

What happens when there's a suicide in the summertime? Who do you call? That's happened to us. I had someone call me in August. Who do you call when a teenager suicides in the summer? So we do need a statewide office. There is an office

that was started in Washington, D.C., on a national basis. There are plenty of studies, there is plenty of research,...Excuse me, yes?

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Excuse me, is your idea for a statewide office for suicide for all people? Or is this area related to youth that you're talking about a statewide office....

MS. KOENIG: On a personal basis, I would really prefer that. We have kids whose parents are suiciding and grandparents are suiciding. The suicide rate after 65 among males is horrendous. About four times the rate as it is among teenagers. That would be the optimum to have that..., where people could call no matter what age. We wouldn't limit it to teens but we certainly do need to start somewhere. Also, in one of the surveys recently done by the Department of Mental Health, 42 percent of the teenagers surveyed had witnessed suicidal behavior in a friend. The kids know what is happening. We need to include them in this planning, in this statewide office. They have a lot of information and can really help one another, so they need very much to be involved in it. I think we could come up with a plan on how to develop this kind of an office, perhaps, in about three months. California was the first state to legislate development of a suicide prevention program statewide, and we need to be the first state to open up a statewide office for suicide prevention. I would hope that California would continue to lead the nation in that.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Ms. Koenig, you became involved in this through a tragic family situation, your own family. You've stayed involved in it, which I think is very commendable.

MS. KOENIG: I will 'til I die. I am going to keep at it.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: What, in your experience, have you seen change? Have you seen any common links? Have you observed anything that could help or lead research into more productive areas?

MS. KOENIG: Okay. In 1977, my son's suicide...I never knew another person who had ever had this happen to them. We had never had a suicide in our family. My sister-in-law thought it had to have been murder, but my son left notes so we knew it was a suicide. People never talked about it. There are people who don't find out that there's a suicide in their family for, maybe, 25 years down the road. Now, People call me and will say, "We had a suicide in our family yesterday." I had an agency, a very big employer, call me yesterday in this city. They had an employee suicide yesterday. Our papers are filled with incidents where there are murders and then suicides. You read about it all the time. I think we are at the point where people are willing to really look at it, so we have a real advantage that we didn't have years ago. People are receptive to it because they realize that, perhaps, some of the shame is going away and we're realizing that it can be very much of a health problem. It is a problem we need to address because it's getting worse. It will continue as long as..., if we have kept it under the carpet. I think it's astounding, the number of people that are dying by suicide, and you really aren't aware of how many...217 teenagers died by suicide in 1985 in California.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. We have...the next three witnesses will be under the substance abuse category. Ms. Laurie Leiber, Associate Director of the Alcohol Policy Initiative Project at the San Francisco Trauma Foundation, who also has, I believe, a slide presentation.

What we'll do is take a five minute break here, to give us time to set up the slides and just stretch our legs and why don't we start back in here at about 3:45, okay?

BREAK.

We're going to get started. Ms. Laurie Leiber, Associate Director of the Alcohol Policy Initiative Project at the San Francisco Trauma Foundation. Thanks for being here.

MS. LAURIE LEIBER: Thank you. I got quite an education listening to the other testimony.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Excuse me. The question was, how long a presentation? About ten minutes?

MS. LEIBER: About, yes. Most of it not with the slides, although they help.

I'm here from the Alcohol Policy Initiative Project and also as Chair of the Council on Alcohol Policy, which advocates for policy reform that will reduce alcohol-related problems in California.

One of the concerns that I have is that as we talk about preventing alcohol-related problems among youth, among anyone but particularly among youth, there's a tendency to talk about

education as the sole strategy. One of my main objectives here today is to get across the point that education is necessary but it is not sufficient to prevent alcohol-related problems among youth. I tell a story about my trip last year to Japan. I was concerned that when I went there I wasn't going to understand the language. Everyone who had been there said, "Find school-aged children because they study English." I did that and it worked pretty well. I started asking myself a question, "why is it, if they all study English in school, that only the school children know English?" The fact is, there's very few opportunities to use what they have learned in school. The environment does not call for the use of English. Therefore, after they're out of school they don't use it. Indeed, we have seen in our evaluation of school-based education programs designed to prevent alcohol and other drug programs, that, indeed, we can see a change in attitudes, but we don't see a change in behavior, and probably the best answer to the question, "Why not? Why don't we see the change in behavior?" is because children, everybody in our society, lives in an environment that is not conducive to using what they know about the dangers of using alcohol. That's basically what I'm going to be talking about here.

Alcohol is California's number one drug problem among youth. Of course, we hear about alcohol-related motor vehicle fatalities as the number one killer of 15 to 24 year olds. We lost at least 1,000 young Californians last year to alcohol-related injuries of all kinds including drownings, suicides, violent assault and fires, and alcohol use contributes,

of course, to another staggering problem, that of adolescent pregnancy. Why is it, that when we look around -- you've seen it in the press recently, you've seen a decrease in alcohol consumption in the population at large -- why are the problems of alcohol use among youth so persistent, chronic, and apparently intractable?

I'd like to suggest that one of the reasons is that we have a very, very powerful influence in our environment that's contributing to that: youth has been identified by the alcohol beverage producers as an expansion market, sort of like an expansion team. Youth and women and minorities are now targeted and aggressively marketed by the alcohol beverage industry as never before in history. To give you an idea how effective that is, I want to cite a weekly reader survey that was conducted twice.

First, in 1983, the Weekly Reader asked over 100,000 readers -- it was not a random study but it was a very large sample, readers of their magazine -- what they considered a drug, and they found that roughly 34 percent of the 3rd through 5th graders considered alcohol, including wine, beer, and liquor, a drug.

In 1987, the Weekly Reader repeated their survey, basically, and the results fit into the trite "good news, bad news" format. The good news is awareness on the drug properties of alcoholic beverages is up to 45 percent among the same age school children. The bad news is that wine coolers, a new alcoholic beverage product introduced since 1983, when the first

survey was done, was perceived by only 20 percent of the 3rd through 5th graders as a drug. So apparently the marketing efforts of the industry to present wine coolers as a soft drink, as a refreshment beverage, not as an alcoholic beverage, is succeeding.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: (Inaudible question)

MS. LEIBER: Well, it's interesting you should ask. The Roper Organization did a study with the National Council on Alcoholism two years ago. It was an adult study. Interestingly, the children are, basically, reflecting awareness among adults. It's not very different. About 40 percent of the adults in the Roper study identified wine, beer, and liquor as a drug. It was somewhat higher when you looked at it individually, at distilled spirits as opposed to wine and beer, but your point is a good one.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So, and I agree with a lot of what you're saying, the argument that the alcohol industry has (inaudible), and you use the statistic that only 40 percent see evidence of that targeting. If adults haven't seen the basic attitude, I'm not so sure that (inaudible).

MS. LEIBER: Well, that's an interesting question. What I want to show you now are some examples of the efforts to target youth, just very quickly. This is from a slide show that I prepared at the Trauma Foundation, and it's usually about a 45 minute show. I've selected some of the juicier slides. What you do, if you are a producer of alcoholic beverages and you want to target youth is you mimic your competition, and your competition,

of course, is soft drinks, because the most successful beverage product in the youth market is cola, soft drink products, that sort. This is an excellent example. I didn't bring one with me, but many people actually looking at this product in their hands say, "Is Jim Beam selling cola?" This is a distilled spirits product with 5 percent alcohol by volume.

Another thing you do if you want to target youth is you make your product sweet. Sweet, light, refreshing tasting. Many of you who drink probably remember your first experience with alcohol not being that thrilled with the taste, and with youth you have to get past some resistance to the flavor of alcohol. That's being done very effectively with some of the new products. Then you go to your target. You promote your product where your potential consumer dwells. In this case there was a poster that was folded up in a college newspaper. Over 170 college newspapers in the country subscribe to a service that gives them national alcohol advertisements like this one. Also the copy in college newspapers. This is a full page ad. And it's very cheap to advertise to that market. They're very concentrated and the space in college papers is inexpensive.

Then you can also get to the young market by selling them products, in this case sportswear and sports equipment with your logo emblazoned on it. It's perfectly legal to sell light sweat shirts to people under 21 years of age, and you end up with walking billboards all over campus and all over town for months and months to come.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I guess there's some who could say that this could fall under the category of drug paraphernalia, then, wouldn't it?

MS. LEIBER: I wouldn't say that. But some might. It is an indirect promotion of the product in a population where it's illegal to use..., so yeah, I see the parallel. You also... if you want to sell to youth, you promote the events that they attend. This is an inter-collegiate boxing competition on the campus at U.C. Berkeley. I can assure you that most of the people in the audience are not of legal drinking age, but Budweiser sponsored this event and they got to put their banner up. Miller Music -- I think this is sideways but you can read it better this way -- Miller Music is a major force in the rock music world touring over 21 bands right now. If you go to these events the brochures that you get, the tickets the T-shirts, the posters, everything has the Miller logo all over it. Believe me, the kids know that beer has something to do with the fact that they are at this rock concert. Again, the population that goes to these concerts is usually not of drinking age.

Okay, and then you use themes, traditional themes, like sex, displayed here and then you work it into new themes. The newest theme that we see emerging in alcohol advertising is health. We won't leave this on much longer, but this young woman is soaking wet. She has not been swimming, she's been working out. She's been doing a heavy aerobics workout and the implication here is that the beverage of choice, after a heavy workout, if you're going to look as gorgeous as this woman, is a

California Cooler. This is another, slightly less provocative, example. Michelob Light advertising not one but two servings of beer in this woman's hand. She, again, is moist with perspiration having just finished her workout. A very strong association between health and alcohol. In fact, the exact opposite of the truth.

Okay, then, finally, you do all these promotions that are appropriate, you take it to where they are, you design products that suit them, and then you make darn sure that the price is right. This is one of the best examples that I have of targeting very price-sensitive young people. How to lower the cost of a college education. Now, the brewers are acutely aware of this issue because one of their biggest markets are young men, of course, and they say that beer is a price-sensitive market and brewers have recognized this fact by keeping the cost of their product as low as possible within economic bounds.

Many of you probably realize that one of the reasons that the price of alcoholic beverages has declined relative to other consumer products is because of our tax structure. Just to give you an idea of what a difference the price of alcoholic beverages can make to the prevalence of problems among youth, I'm going to just pick out one possible policy: indexing the tax on alcoholic beverages, which is now...

(BREAK IN RECORDING)

...that bottom number in the yellow box, 1,022 lives. We're talking about just 18 to 20 year olds in a one year period, could be saved by that policy. You need to hear more...

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Well, we don't have time today, but there are a lot more...

MS. LEIBER: Right. I can send you some materials.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: A lot more background as to your logic, to know how you've come to 25¢ would save that many lives. I'm not saying it doesn't, but...

MS. LEIBER: Okay. The researchers involved, Grossman and Safer at the New York Bureau of Economic Research, have been devoting many years of research to this whole question and I have a couple of their reports I'd be happy to provide to the committee.

So, some policies that would address some of the issues that I've pointed out here, of course, raising the excise tax on alcoholic beverages, that is something you, as legislators, can be involved in. The Attorney General's report recommended not only a better school-based curriculum but also addressing some of these environmental factors, including curbs on college promotions and some curbs on the sponsorship of youth-oriented events. It's also very important that we empower local communities to exert some control on alcohol availability in their neighborhoods.

Now, there's been a lot of initiative taken in local communities, including looking at concurrent sale of alcohol and gasoline, and we've had a bit of a setback there with this

session. Assemblymember Condit's bill, AB 937, essentially takes away the power that some communities were using to stop the establishment of new gasoline and alcohol outlets. Now, this is a big issue and has been where I live in Alameda County, a big issue related specifically to school-aged children, because many of the gas stations that are converting to mini-marts and putting in beer and wine sales are across the street from high schools. They have employees who are under the age of 21...

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Aren't there laws as to how close something can be to a high school and sell alcoholic beverages?

MS. LEIBER: The Alcoholic Beverage Control Code is such that if there's a zoning ordinance in place that restricts distance then they have to observe that, but there's nothing in the ABC Code that says you can't put an alcohol outlet across the street from a high school, and communities have felt they're in sort of a rock and a hard place situation, where they discover they don't have something on their books and the ABC can't intervene, so there's a lot of attention in local communities now to using conditional use permit zoning authority...

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Are you aware of specific examples of where alcohol is sold across the street from a high school?

MS. LEIBER: The PTA has been very involved in challenging those licensing applications and also Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: We challenged one in my neighborhood. It wasn't across the street, but it was..., it was beyond the distance, but it was still too close from our standpoint. We

challenged it and we were able to succeed, but I was just wondering if you were..., I mean, you said that this happens a lot and I was wondering if you specifically knew of cases or if that was just a generalization.

MS. LEIBER: Yeah, I was in Oakland yesterday addressing a group on similar issues, and a woman raised her hand. She's working in one of the Oakland District councils, and her community had just failed in an attempt to stop what was actually a fruit stand -- initially started out as a fruit stand across the street from a high school -- that subsequently became a little more established and then applied for a license and succeeded in getting a beer and wine license.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: So the way that it's taking place then is that it's..., I don't think you could open up a bar, liquor store, whatever, so close to a high school but they have an existing store that converts or changes their product line? Is that a loophole in the law somehow?

MS. LEIBER: There are also different requirements for on-sale versus off-sale establishments, and a beer and wine license is a very easy license to get.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Well, those kids still can't buy it, supposedly?

MS. LEIBER: Exactly, yes. Perhaps I wasn't responding to your question.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: No, you did, I just had another thought..., I mean we fought to keep Seven-Eleven from being able to sell liquor near our school, and we succeeded. But on the

other hand, kids aren't allowed to buy it anyway, supposedly, that doesn't mean it's not sold...

MS. LEIBER: Right. A few studies in California have identified the convenience stores, the "mini-mart" outlets, as prime locations where young people do go to attempt to buy and they're more often successful there than in other locations. I couldn't explain the reasons for that, but I know in sting operations, and so forth, it's apparently true that the smaller scale markets are having more problems with sales to minors.

I want to mention one more policy that I think would be responsive, directly and indirectly, to some of the problems that are being spoken of today. That's health and safety labels on all alcoholic beverages sold in California. I'm not going to take the time to belabor the whole labeling issue. I know most of you have heard at least parts of that debate, because there's some legislation sitting on the table right now in the Assembly and I want to mention Lloyd Connelly's language that would require a warning concerning alcohol related birth defects because I feel it almost would be dishonest of me to come before you, talk about preventing alcohol-related problems among youth and not acknowledge how difficult it is to get a very sound, well-supported piece of legislation like this through our legislative process. There are more than 70 health public welfare organizations -- the March of Dimes, the PTA, Right to Lifers and Planned Parenthood -- together on wanting a warning label on alcoholic beverages, but we have not even been able to succeed, so far, on getting a debate on the Assembly floor.

I commend you for having these meetings and establishing this committee, and I certainly hope, especially based on some of the testimony I heard earlier today, that some useful solutions come out of this committee, but I also beseech you to join some of your colleagues. Two members of this committee, Johan Klehs and Jackie Speier, have been supporters of the warning label, and I would ask both of you to consider joining them. It's an important piece of policy. I've worked with adolescent pregnancy prevention groups and teen advisors who go and talk to pregnant teens, and one of the things they say -- this is coming from young people -- that would help them in convincing their peers not to drink in pregnancy, is if there were a label on the package. Those are very high-risk young people, not only the teenage girls, women, who are pregnant, but the babies who are growing inside of them.

And with that, I thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I really appreciate your testimony and the slide presentation in which you're getting behind the psychology of the sales and who, obviously, is being attracted by it.

A point I have, and we've heard a little bit in some prior hearings, and of course it's very easy to make fun of or to criticize the liquor distributors and the beer and the wine people and what have you..., it seems like, in some way, that the public is reshaping, or changing, some approaches to how liquor is..., to the involvement. Let's say, Anheuser-Busch, in communities, and other things they do that..., well, sure, it may

be directly related to their promotions and their sales, but they do get in and do some positive things within the community. How is that looked upon, say, by you and your organization? Is that appreciated at all, or is that a positive step, or is it...?

MS. LEIBER: I think it is positive. I think that corporations, business people trying to be responsible neighbors is something that we want to support, and the efforts that the wine institute and the Licensed Beverage Industry's Council, and so on, are suggesting to educate Californians about alcohol-related birth defects, I certainly wouldn't want to discourage them, but we have to keep in mind that they are selling a product, a legal product, that we are not trying to get rid of, but a product that has inherent risk, and that while they are legally entitled to sell it and promote it, and so on, that those of us who are protecting the public interest have a responsibility to look at those inherent risks and to try to minimize them.

So, while I certainly wouldn't want to stop Anheuser Busch from making efforts to educate people about alcohol problems or some of the other programs they do to assist -- scholarships, and promotion of community activities, and so on -- I think it is a mistake to let them take care of alcohol problems. They are selling a product, and as I said before, it has inherent risk.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: You mentioned the labeling area and I know, I support labels on tobacco products. I don't support them on raw certified milk. I'm a health nut and I like raw milk.

And I didn't support the one on the alcohol labeling because I do believe in the education approach, and it seems to me an overextension of government trying to dictate a message which I really don't know if that works.

MS. LEIBER: Do you feel the same way about the cigarette warnings?

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Well, cigarettes, there's totally conclusive proof that even a little is bad. It's bad. It's unhealthy. There's no question in my mind on the cigarettes.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Mr. Chairman, I know about what's going to happen. We're going to get into a long dialogue on the labeling bill which is, I don't think, where we want to go, given the fact that we have a couple more witnesses, and I could give my reasons why I don't support it either, like you...

MS. LEIBER: Well, I would just ask both of you to request copies of the Health and Human Services Report that was transmitted to Congress on August 3rd, a report that's done a very thorough review of all the literature on warning labels, shows that they work, shows that if...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: There is something I would like to ask, though, if I can interrupt you -- so we don't get into all that more than we need to -- and that is, there's kind of a delicate balance in this alcohol advertising, a legal product in a free market system, or certainly in America we get to market our product. I'm all for that, and yet there are events where mostly breweries seem to kind of own certain events, like there's a certain Fair in my district that -- Coors owns that event, I

mean, they don't own that event but that's the only product, you know? Lots of children and so forth are there, and yet the evidence of the advertising of that particular product is just overwhelming. Chico State. There's a certain brand of beer that owns Chico State, I mean it's just..., and then you go to the tennis match, or the rodeo is Budweiser, and the stock car races, and the rock music is Miller. I don't know what you do about that -- maybe nothing, if it's the kind of events that everyone can go to and all that. I guess maybe we don't want to do anything, although it raises some concern.

But where I do have a concern is on the college campus, where there is a tremendous involvement of alcohol companies in being the preferred drink of a particular campus and the advertising that they do in the college newspapers and all that. I think I do have a problem with the heavy infusion of advertising at that college level because 90 percent of those kids are not 21 and yet they're being inundated and saturated with that type of advertising, and of course a lot of drinking goes on there. I assume it's at least as much as it was when I was in school, but the advertising is -- I think that's an area we could look into because that's related to youth. It's not getting into all the other labeling things, but it's certainly related to youth.

MS. LEIBER: There may be some useful resource for you. This past spring I was involved with some of my colleagues in a forum in San Diego that brought together representatives of several of the campuses down there, the university and some of

the private schools, and people from all different segments of the college community: the recreation directors, the health services, the academic people, security, the legal staff, risk managers, and so on. What they were doing is starting, for themselves, to identify some of the ways that they could begin to resolve some of those problems, and there was a very brief report that came out of that and some plans to try to have a broader forum and bring in more campuses, because apparently there is a lot of interest on campus about dealing with these problems.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: There are state-funded universities, right now, that sell beer on campus and then there are others where it's not allowed. I don't understand...

MS. LEIBER: ...pending right now that puts a lot of loopholes in what few restrictions there are on the ability of a college campus -- a state campus -- to actually be a licensee, and we see that as a big problem.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Well, I've been concerned about the wine cooler promotions, because the make-up of the drink and who they're attracting and what you portrayed. It gets you into -- it does get you into that soft drink mentality and you're really dealing with what can be a very addictive type of drink, and I do understand there are voluntary efforts now, through pressure put on the companies, to get away from that line of promotions that directs so much at the youth and the beach party scenes and that type of thing, but I emphasize it's voluntary, so it'll be interesting to see how much they really get into that.

MS. LEIBER: I understand the wine institute has released new standards, advertising standards, on wine coolers. Is that right?

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Well, somebody has. I guess that's who it would be, but it's voluntary, so it'll be interesting to see what they do.

MS. LEIBER: The wine institute represents wine producers, and some of the most popular wine coolers are produced by companies that primarily do distilled spirits and they're not members of the institute and they haven't even signed on to the voluntary guidelines, so there's still a lot to be done in that area.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I think one of the tough ways to address this from all of our angles is understanding that in alcohol abuse treatment, apparently, the practice and the research is that no drinking is acceptable, and then on the legislative side, we know there's going to be drinking out there; you know there's going to be drinking out there. How do we approach the reality of that, and the businesses that are going to go on and thrive and make money, and still how do we formulate something that deals with those realities? That just kind of -- and I think that concerns all of us, and yet I appreciate and am aware that alcohol problems have probably wreaked more havoc and ruined more families than any of the drugs we could be talking about.

MS. LEIBER: I just want to make one more comment, because it tends, sometimes, to sound as if I'm tarring and

feathering the alcohol producing industry -- and maybe sometimes that's accurate -- but I want to point out that many retailers of alcoholic beverages are involved in being part of the solution to the problem: looking at their serving practices, trying to prevent sales to minors, and a whole field called "server intervention" that is starting to open up and become standardized in the hospitality industry, and it's important, I think, for people involved in looking at alcohol problems to recognize that the retailer in the corner can be seen as an ally in addressing these problems.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay, Ms. Leiber, I really thank you for a most interesting and unique presentation. We have Mr. Bob Mann, Director of Teen House, and we'll give Ms. Leiber here a couple minutes just to clear that area, and also I had talked to Ms. Fletcher, earlier, the California State PTA, and she had been at the hearing in San Diego and had commented on how different the testimony is here and things to learn here today, and I feel the same way, and that there's such a wealth of information out there and people to bring it to, the human resources, that I think is very encouraging. I think it's going to send messages, I hope, to other people in the Legislature that this area is very right to get and deserves the attention it should have.

MR. BOB MANN: Okay. Thank you for the invitation to come. It's a pleasure. I'm coming from Teen House in Malibu as co-founder and executive director. I've been with Teen House for 5½ years. We are a nonprofit, full service, residential drug treatment program for adolescents and teenagers, drugs encompassing both drugs and alcohol.

We're a long-term program, which in this jargon means that, generally, a minimum of 4 to 6 months, preferably length of stays up in the 12 to 18 month range. We serve adolescents and teenagers, as I said, ages 12 through 18. Unfortunately, at this point we have to turn away the kids under 12. We have 30 beds and it represents 30 of a 170 beds in Los Angeles County that are available for residents for these kinds of services. I don't know if 170 beds sounds like a lot or not -- it's not from our perspective -- for Los Angeles County. We are the -- to make things a little more difficult, Teen House is the only agency that will also accept youngsters who don't have the fortune to have been arrested and made wards of the court, in that they may have been involved in criminal behavior; they might have been very active, they just aren't fortunate enough to have been arrested and sent to an institution. So, of those 170 beds, 140 of them are reserved only for criminal offenders, or abused children that also have drug abuse problems.

The other aspect is that we work in a small setting. We have individual 6 bed homes so that the youngsters live in some semblance of a family environment while still receiving full-service, professional treatment. By full-service, I can only say that the contrast between the halfway house setting, where kids might live but work out and go to school out or something along those lines.

To give you just an idea of the kind of youngster we deal with -- sort of a typical sample profile here, we have kids who come to us, they had their first exposure to drugs or alcohol

between the ages of 8 and 10; their first substance is usually alcohol, followed very closely by marijuana. Where do they get the drug? Generally, friends of their older brothers, sisters, or their parents.

Let's take a sort of progression of a typical resident -- at least that we see in Teen House. Johnny or Mary (sex is not too important at this point), age 9; first experimental use, again, at brother's party (friends turn them on; they have their first drink); for the next couple of years it progresses in that way, just occasionally -- once a week, every couple of weeks they happen to hit at a party or the parents are gone or they're at some friends house and they have some more beer; they start smoking "pot", maybe get into a little hard liquor as well. That might go on, we'll say about two years, until they're 11. At 11 they sort of cross the line, arbitrarily, but a line we might call regular use, meaning, virtually, every weekend. At that point they're drinking fairly steadily; marijuana is every weekend; they might even have gotten into speed, crystal "meth", any kind of amphetamine. Depending upon what part of town they're from, they're probably sniffing glue or doing PCP. Basically, your teenage partiers that you hear about.

Let's say that about age 13 they cross another kind of arbitrary line and they become what we might call a chronic user, daily, smoking "pot" every day, drinking at least every other day (if not even more so). The weekends then become a pretty big scene compared to very minimal to moderate use throughout the week...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: (inaudible question -- mike not on).

MR. MANN: The single drug user is a rarity these days. Also, in that chronic age between, roughly 13 to 15 years old, they've had their first police contact (generally for theft); frequently for theft or burglary from their own home, in addition to surrounding neighbors. At that point, in addition to marijuana, alcohol, speed and PCP, they've probably started into cocaine. Depending upon their first, second or third arrest, they then become the infamous 602. With that kind of arrest record, they may have had some incarcerations or detentions a couple of times in juvenile hall.

Then again, the final sort of arbitrary line becoming what we call dependent versus chronic, the marijuana, alcohol, speed, PCP, inhalants, your assorted cocaine and crack and all of that stuff you hear about, they probably, or may have, started to shoot up. By 17 our sample case here called either Johnny or Mary has then had about six months of heroin behind them, multiple arrests, and Johnny is 17 and has been arrested for burglary, under the influence, possession and dealing, while Mary has avoided all that and just been picked up for prostitution.

At about that age, 16 or 17, we find them on our doorstep, referred through the court system, probation departments as 602s (occasionally as 601s, those that have done all of this stuff and just never have been arrested and charges officially filed).

Some of the related issues that we see in this population I won't dwell on since you've covered just about all of them today: increased AIDS risks via either the injectables and needle use or at that age, more commonly, because of the promiscuity that is induced or heightened by alcohol and drug use, and along with that, less regard for safe sex practices so the whole ball puts them at a generally higher AIDS risk, serious academic deficiencies -- all of our residents are at least two years behind on, typically, four to five grade levels to where they should be at their age.

Truancy, of course, is rampant -- they haven't been to school in months and months.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Do they have a higher incidence of -- you mention the sex and the not using safe sex -- do they have a higher incidence of say, homosexual experimentation? Would you know that?

MR. MANN: The girls, typically. The guys, depending on what part of town they're from, but more often it is pretty common with girls that age in institutional settings, but not so much from the streets. Based on what we see, I wouldn't make much of a case for that.

Needless to say, the criminal involvement of all the kids, general health, smoking, poor nutrition, poor hygiene, those sorts of things, and of course, problems of pregnancies, abortions, related to, again, the sexual activity that is pretty common with the kids.

Okay, the problem we see in Los Angeles, at least, as I mentioned Teen House, we have 30 beds. We can admit one to two children a month on an average basis. The average referral is about 40 to 45 calls a month from individuals with kids to place so that puts us in the position of saying "no" to quite a few. Who are these people who are calling? These days, probation departments and county departments of children services or something like that from the Counties of Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, San Francisco, and Kern, -- recently, in the past six months, there's been a series of calls from the State of Nevada (I don't know why) -- but youth and parole boards and mental health departments, converging on Los Angeles resources, which then, of course, end up certain to be with us as well.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Excuse me, you don't then just house the L.A. County residents?

MR. MANN: No. We initially opened doors in L.A. with services to Los Angeles, but not by specific contract, just because of location.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Are you located and have branches all over the country?

MR. MANN: No. We're located in Malibu, Los Angeles County.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: And that's the only branch?

MR. MANN: That's the only one. The only location we currently have.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Would there be other requirements for attendance at your facility? Family backgrounds, any other kind of -- economic status, anything like that?

MR. MANN: No. No. Just an interest of some sort -- some level of motivation, not necessarily banging on the doors to come in, but some level of motivation on the part of the individual.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Referrals mostly come through law enforcement?

MR. MANN: About 60 percent are law enforcement; 40 percent are just families, say off the street, that just happen to hear about us and call.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So how are you compensated?

MR. MANN: Fee for service through county contracts, through the courts, or private fees, donations, corporate contributions, that sort of thing ...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Where do the -- what are the rates on a private pay? What does it cost to be at your place?

MR. MANN: It varies depending on a sliding scale, but anywhere from \$50 ...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Well, if you're paying the full load.

MR. MANN: About \$95 per day.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So a wealthy parent, who was able to get in, because there was a bed available at that time, would be paying \$95 a day.

MR. MANN: More commonly, health insurance. No one pays out of pocket -- very few. I don't recall any in 5½ years. We are one of the lowest prices in town compared to -- the other alternative, why the demand is increasing, because the alternative, or the short term 30 day inpatient hospital programs, and the ticket for those is around \$20,000 a month.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: From some of what I've learned from being on the State Advisory Board on Drug Programs, is that this type of facility has a very high success rate compared to other kinds of treatment.

MR. MANN: That's correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Like, if someone were to stay in the program for the full year or 18 months, however long it would be in a given case, it is like 90-something percent.

MR. MANN: Sure. Chances of success on that kind of treatment versus a 30 day program is -- just length of stay is a very -- is one of the most important criteria in success. Yes.

The other referring sources are coming from private chemical dependency hospitals -- the ones I just mentioned -- after they discharge their kids, identified residents or kids that need continued care, they often refer -- they're coming from San Diego, Palm Springs, Lancaster, Oxnard, up to San Luis Obispo, Paso Robles. Employee assistance groups are becoming very interested, unions, corporations that have internal, in-house employee assistance programs, and lastly, the private families that are in crisis with kids on drugs and just find out.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Is funding a problem ...

MR. MANN: Of course.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: ...for you to keep your doors open?
Getting -- in other words ...

MR. MANN: You mean, are we underfunded?

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: If there's not enough beds, and there is such a need and insurance is paying, and there you are in Los Angeles but you're serving people all the way to Malibu -- or all the way to San Luis Obispo and so forth, why don't you expand?

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Well, we attempt. We've gone from ...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: You have 5 houses now?

MR. MANN: ...6 to 30 beds.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So you have 5 houses with 6 beds each?

MR. MANN: Right. We are attempting -- we're actively working on the campus to set up a campus facility.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: But is it financially feasible for you to expand on your own free enterprise system and working with insurance companies and all that, or are you dependent upon government subsidies to be able to expand.

MR. MANN: No. It's the other way. If -- it's the government subsidies that make it difficult. They pay for about 65 percent of our services so we have to generate in-house almost 35 percent of the cost of care. We have to generate by fundraising...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: That's for that patient that is...

MR. MANN: That is referred by a court system.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: ...is a court system referral.

MR. MANN: The private pays through health insurance are about a break-even because our goal is to keep the fees as low as possible.

When we're dealing with the private sector, mostly what we deal with are dollar maximums. The company says you have -- there's \$10,000 in benefits available. Well, we want to stretch that out as long as possible so ...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: My understanding is that there is this tremendous lack of facilities for this type of person who needs this in that ...

MR. MANN: Right. It's phenomenal. Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: The state is practically bankrupt in terms of what it's got compared to what it needs.

MR. MANN: That's correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And that it is the most successful of all types. In fact, if you can get a kid into one of these programs, the chance of success is very very good, compared to very very bad in every other approach.

MR. MANN: It's not an easy business to operate. It's not as if it is something that you can just go out and open it like a fast food or a franchise. If I could franchise it right and left I might do that, but it's a lot of work; it's very difficult; it keeps us very busy just with 30 beds, and we're attempting -- our plans are for a campus that will house approximately 100 -- the 90 to 100 range.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: What I'm wondering though is that if we need facilities like this, a therapeutic community is what this is called, isn't it?

MR. MANN: Yes. It's a model of that.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: If we need more of these, and if our goal would be to try to do those things in the Legislature to promote the creation of more of these, what do we do? It sounds like just providing more funds for it isn't necessarily the answer.

MR. MANN: Well, it would be the answer for us. I'm not certain about anybody else.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: It would?

MR. MANN: It would be the answer for us, but these ...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: You would open more beds?

MR. MANN: Certainly. In an instant. It's not economically ...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Well, why won't you open more beds for the insurance companies.

MR. MANN: Well, we're attempting to do that; that's the market we have to work with because that's the only way it is economically feasible to stay afloat, but then we're dealing with ...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I don't understand the economics of this. I'm not trying to pester you, but ...

MR. MANN: Okay. I don't want to make it sound like anybody that has health insurance can just walk in the doors. Insurance companies are equally finicky about their -- they're

hung up on -- you have to be a hospital; you have to be in an inpatient program. They're learning these days to accept alternative treatment centers, so to speak, so that we're having more and more luck -- more and more families are able to get help for their kids through their insurance policies and us, but it's not as if it's 100 percent.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: But you said that if there was more state money you would definitely open more beds.

MR. MANN: Right, because the state underpays us.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: But you're trying to open more beds under the insurance thing. It sounds like there would be more chance that you would open more beds if there was state funding than there is using the private method. Am I making any sense?

MR. MANN: I don't care where the kids come from. A 15 year old is a 15 year old whether he's a ward of the court or his parents live in Encino, it doesn't matter to me. If they come to us for help, we'd like to work with them.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: You can't afford to take the court kids.

MR. MANN: Right. That's the problem. So we have to put our effort in to do something. Now a lot of our effort goes into raising internal monies to subsidize all the kids that come in. That's true.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: You take out-of-state kids, too. You mentioned Nevada.

MR. MANN: Yes. I think Nevada heard about us and suddenly their social workers are calling.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I don't want to monopolize, because we're getting late here. I don't think I can ask my question well enough, so I'll try you some other day.

MR. MANN: Okay. Feel free. That's my main obstacle. The one is financial. Once operating, it is possible to stay afloat. We've been afloat 5 years through our own fundraising efforts in combination with the lack of money from the state. We manage. It's not easy or pleasant but we manage.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Plus the ...

MR. MANN: Starting up, the difficulty is where do you get the money because that's not available from the state.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Plus just the politics that go on in various communities, and I think it's a sad comment on society, but it is harder than heck to get some of these places started in various neighborhoods.

MR. MANN: Let me tell you why, though. The zoning department, the regional planning department, the state licensing department, add a lot more difficulty to the process than do the local communities. There is always going to be community resistance to any kind of program. Everyone loves us; they want us to do it in the other county. We hear that from everybody, now and then, that's okay. That we can deal with because that is simply emotional-political. There is nothing they can do about it. We run a good operation. We're clean. They can't cite us for anything. All they can do is complain. Eventually they're quiet and life goes on.

Dealing with zoning, regional planning, is a whole "other" story. See, for us to open a campus, we need to go through conditional use permits and all that kind of stuff for a year. In the meantime, we have a piece of property and a campus that are sitting dormant, that has to be paid for, and in addition to everything else that goes on. It makes it a near impossibility for a nonprofit organization that doesn't have tremendous backing from either the private sector or the state so the two aspects: start up funds, because state money doesn't start until the date your doors are open. Your beds have to be made, food in the cupboards before you start getting the money from the state. Well, how do you get the house, the food, the beds, the property and all that is up to you -- us -- the agency -- that's the difficulty.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Well, if we came up with a method, which I can't imagine what it would be -- but let's say we did ...

MR. MANN: How about a no interest loan. That'd be fine.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: ...of some hard money, somehow, that would be available for starting up facilities.

MR. MANN: Call me. Yeah.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: There would be a lot more facilities throughout the state for this type of residential treatment for adolescents.

MR. MANN: Yeah, I'd be pretty confident and say I'd guarantee that -- at least from us, and I'm sure (inaudible)...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Would it be possible -- let's say start up costs were taken care of -- would it be possible then to repay that over a period of time?

MR. MANN: Possible. Sure.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So, really, we might only need one pot that would be like a loan fund that would go out for start up and then be repaid.

MR. MANN: That's correct. That's correct. Also I don't know what your involvement is with the whole rate setting system in AFDC and group homes and residential care in California, but that's a real mess, and doesn't help.

MR. MANN: Number 1 is start. Number 2 is ongoing finances. That's essentially what I had to say.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay. We really appreciate that -- coming up from Malibu. I must admit it is interesting, the success rates. I've heard that too, of similar programs, and I know it must take a lot of time and effort and money, and it must be hard work. Any time you house the residents, it's got to -- it's a 24 hour job all the time...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: What is your success rate?

MR. MANN: I can't give it to you in statistical form because we don't have any objective or systematic follow-up. We just don't have the resources for that. I can only base it primarily on the number of repeat referrals from the same sources -- not the same individuals. The same agencies, the same probation officers or social workers or EAPs or whoever it is that continually refer people, that I assume (from a free market

sense) must be reasonably satisfied. We do try to track and maintain contact with our graduates and those that leave, but when they start to come from all over the state, it gets to be nearly impossible.

Personally, and intuitively, I am pretty pleased, but I couldn't give you any paper on that.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: How long have you been with the program?

MR. MANN: Five and a half years. The whole time.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Does your program have a success rate? Same deal?

MR. FLAMING: (inaudible -- not on mike).

MR. MANN: Yeah. Success criteria gets to be very tricky. I mean no drugs, no use, no crime is a relative improvement.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: When they enter your program, and they're there 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, do you have a total no drugs policy or is it a phase thing?

MR. MANN: No drugs. No alcohol. No cigarettes.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Okay, Mr. Mann. Thank you. Appreciate it.

We now have Ms. Susan Cohen, Executive Director, California Probation, Parole and Corrections Association, and we have, hopefully, if we can get to one more witness after Ms. Cohen, it would be Dr. Moriarity, Program Director, Nine Grove Lane with the youth advocates and she's also been waiting patiently but was not on the agenda here.

Okay. Ms. Cohen.

MS. SUSAN COHEN: I thought I was the end of the batting order but now I guess I'm the clean-up crew. You've heard a lot of testimony from a number of diverse sources today and I think it's kind of appropriate to put probation at the end of that because all of the interests that were expressed to you about teen suicides, about truancy, drug abuse, alcohol use, are interests that probation and local corrections dealing with youth, as well as state corrections dealing with youth, have to confront.

I just want to lay a few numbers on you. All the data that I had prepared for you I'm sure you're well aware of and I'd be glad to give it to you in writing and it's boring to listen to anyway, but I do think you need to be aware of just the biggest overview of the numbers.

In 1985, which is the last year for which we have data, 350,000 nationally were in jail, prison or juvenile correction facilities on drug related offenses on the date surveyed. In California, 1986, there were 79,000 juveniles on probation, 86,000 in local detention facilities and 81,000 juveniles in the California Youth Authority. Now, not all of those were drug offenders...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: These are all different kids, they're no double-ups there.

MS. COHEN: That's correct; different kids, not counted more than once, unfortunately. The fact that they're not all

incarcerated or under supervision on drug offenses doesn't tell the whole story though because almost all the data that anybody can amass indicates a significant proportion, if not 80 percent, then certainly well over 50 percent of offenses committed by juveniles are in some way related to alcohol or drug abuse. Either the kid is "high" when he or she does whatever he or she does, or they're committing crimes in order to get money to support their habits: their drug of choice, be it alcohol or some other substance. So, there is an absolutely inextricable link between juvenile crime and juvenile drug and alcohol abuse.

One more piece of data. This from the U.S. Department of Justice indicates the age of all persons, nationally, convicted of narcotic offenses has shown a gradual shift toward younger defendants. Between 1982 and 1986, those who were between 20 and 29 years of age when convicted increased from 50.7 to 55.3 percent, and those under 20 years of age when convicted increased from 2.7 to 7.4 percent. That's more than triple the number of young people coming into the drug involved offense categories.

Given that sort of data, what are we going to do about it? Well, your committee has heard a lot of testimony and, obviously, comes from the perspective that what we have to do about it is prevent rather than mop up. What we in the system are doing are mopping up. We're talking about treatment in jails. We're talking about treatment in juvenile halls. We're talking about "too late." Once a kid has gotten himself into the juvenile justice system, penetrated as far as juvenile

institutions and has a drug problem, it is too late, not perhaps to save that kid, but to solve the problem of drug abuse for that individual. He is already a drug abuser. He or she has the potential of causing a great deal of crime, of killing himself or herself with AIDS from the use of shared needles, of frying his or her brain and being a cost to society for the rest of their life, and all of those are after-the-fact problems. The only kind of solution that is going to work is a solution at the front end.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Maybe it's best to say it is too late as a class to solve the problem, where there may be individual successes, but as a group, it's too late.

MS. COHEN: That's right. As a social issue, we're dealing with the "too late" part of it when we try to deal with it from the point of view of the corrections community. I would, in light of some of the testimony you've heard today, like to stress for you that probation personnel, parole personnel, correctional personnel, care about kids. They are people who come into a helping profession to assist young people and adult offenders, to keep the community safe, to raise the quality of life in the communities in California and across the nation. They are not people who by choice shine on young people in trouble. The problem, as expressed by Miss Davis and certainly by parents and others who have terrible pressing, frustrating problems with young people, is that they go to the probation department, which used to be where everybody could go to get help, and they say "Can you help me?" And the probation department has to answer, "No, we can't."

"No, we can't" stems from -- this is quick and dirty, but summed up: no resources. Proposition 13 diminished the ability of probation departments to respond to social need, more effectively and more dramatically than any other element of the criminal justice system. Probation took the biggest hits. They have had to restrict their services more than any other element of the justice system, and probably, most other elements of the human services system. There is no money to do unmandated things.

At the same time, or roughly at the same time as Proposition 13, in 1977 a bill called AB 3121 was signed into law. It deinstitutionalized status offenders. It meant that probation departments no longer had a mandate to securely detain young people who hadn't committed crimes. Status offenders are outside the purview in most counties of probation because there are no resources for them, so we in probation are faced with the terrible prospect of having to say to a parent, say to a district attorney, say to a judge, say to a church, "No, we can't do anything about that child because he or she hasn't committed a crime yet. Call us when he knocks over the 7-11, or when you find him shooting an illegal substance." We can not. Not that we don't want to. Not that we didn't wish we could. Not that we don't have the energy for it. We don't have the resources for dealing with the precriminal offender. And, as you said a moment ago in another context, it is a very sorry commentary on what our culture has come to. We will spend \$60,000 a bed to build a detention place for a young person. That \$60,000 could prevent

maybe hundreds of young people from using drugs if it were put to early childhood intervention, education programs, some sort of comprehensive service delivery system, because in the end, the truth is that everything costs less than incarceration, and probably it is also true that everything works better. By the time you're locking kids up, you're not solving the problem, you're just trying to incapacitate them from causing more problems.

So, what I would suggest to you in terms of recommendations from the field -- of course it's always about money, isn't it? -- is to look to funding for prevention efforts, and you know, every now or then, somebody who is too dumb to know better or says I'm tough enough to say this, says, "How about a sin tax?" Now, if all those folks who were buying alcohol were paying a little bit more for delinquency prevention or drug abuse prevention or alcohol abuse prevention services, that might provide at least some pot of money. What I'd want to say to you is that I'd help you in any way I can and any way the association can to try to identify pots of money, but clearly, money is needed for probation departments, for drug programs, for all of the human service providers of both prevention and treatment services.

Secondly, I think that legislative clarification is needed as to the mandates that you place on human service providing agencies. When you tell probation departments that their job is to go catch those crooks, to stop the kids who are in gangs, to stop the kids who are murdering one another and

murdering others, to put their energies to court reports and to investigations and incarcerating those 602 offenders, you are in effect saying to them, "We understand you don't have anything left for the status offender, for the predelinquent youth." If in fact there is going to be emphasis, as there should be, on prevention, there has to be legislative clarification that that is as much a mandate, and then the dollars behind the mandate, as in anything else.

There is a model out there that I would recommend to you -- you're probably well aware of it -- I think the only way any of what you're after is going to happen, is through collaborative efforts among all the interested players. In SB 1112, Senator Presley has designed what is now a three county demonstration project -- it started out to be more comprehensive than that -- a project that he calls "The High Risk Youth Act." Other states have what they call YINS (Youth in Need of Services) or PINS (Persons in Need of Services) legislation. It is an approach which involves schools and health and mental health and the criminal justice system in identifying needs and attempting to address those needs before a kid has moved too far into the criminal justice system.

So, my suggestion to you would be that we look for money; that we look at who all the folks are who care, and attempt to design some ways that we can bring all those systems to bear at once on the problem of not just drug abuse but all of the myriad problems affecting young people in California and in the nation, because the problem is so comprehensive that

piecemeal solutions are only going to throw it a little bit out of whack for awhile. We might solve a part of one problem and then we're left with all of those others which just rise to the surface and take up the space.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: You know, I appreciate those comments, especially on the money involved with prevention programs. We're scratching like heck on this AB 134 to get state funding that's not even a match of the federal. The federal is up around \$10 million. We're fighting like crazy just to try to get \$5 million out of the state, and it's a difference between spending \$2 on a student or \$3 on a student, and, boy, I hear you.

MS. COHEN: The analogy that maybe I'd want to leave you with is not a pretty one but it seems to be pretty effective, is that as we keep spending all our resources at the other end -- in the jail beds and the juvenile hall beds -- and leaving ourselves with nothing for prevention is a lot like not doing AIDS research so we'll have enough money left to buy coffins for all the folks who are going to die. What we're doing is treating the very end of the disease, saying, "Oh, it's awful," and not doing anything to stop it.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Well, if we could put that on a video, I think it would be a very strong message. Ms. Cohen, thank you very much. I appreciate that. And, we have just a few, very short minutes, Dr. Moriarity, if you'd like to come and testify, we'd appreciate it.

DR. DEIRDEE MORIARITY: I'll try to make it short for you.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Thank you.

DR. MORIARITY: I'm with the agency, Youth Advocates. We're a two-county agency. We run Huckleberry House 1 and 2 in the city and we run Nine Grove Lane in an outreach counseling center in Marin County. Huckleberry House 1 was the first runaway shelter in the United States and we've expanded from there. We run a crisis shelter. We run a hotline. We do assessment. We do low income housing down to a dollar. We run the schools, both regular, the court and the continuation schools. We do a little bit of everything.

In our shelter we have 6 beds. Our average stay is 67 days; we do crisis intervention. We get kids who are referred by the police department. They're brought in because they're at risk at home; they're runaways; they're referred by schools; they're brought in because they're molest cases under investigation; we get a wide variety.

We make an approximate average of 16 child abuse reports a month, so we see a lot of different families. What we have been seeing, more than we've ever seen before, is multi-generational dysfunctional families. These are families that the children grew up dysfunctional; they had children at 16, 17, 18 years old; those children are not 16, 17, 18 years old and are just as dysfunctional as the parents who produced them; they are also having children. We're going into a third generation of multidisfunctional families. Sixty percent of the families that we see are substance abusers, and I'm saying the families are substance abusers, not just the kids. The kids that we get were

often introduced into drugs by being given marijuana by their families when they were 8, 9, 10 years old. So, we're looking at not just treating kids, we have got to start treating the family. The kids don't exist in a vacuum.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I'm aware of personal cases where, to me, it's shocking that a parent would provide marijuana or anything else to their child, but is that a huge problem? Medium size problem? Or happens once in awhile?

DR. MORIARITY: In the families that we see, 60 percent of the people that we have are substance abusers and this is booze, pot, crack, cocaine -- and I'm not talking about low income families -- I'm talking about multi-economical levels here, and a large, large number of them were introduced or saw their parents using it and started borrowing from their parents, whether or not it was booze or pot or crack or cocaine or whatever, they got it from within the home first. It was model behavior for them, and that's what we're dealing with, so when we ask a kid to go to drug counseling, we're not going to have a huge impact if what he's got at home in his environment...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: What's the answer? I'm sorry to interrupt, but to me, I mean, there's no difference but I was going to make a difference between a child who -- you know, most houses, I suppose, have a little cupboard somewhere where they have a bottle stashed away, even if there is not a lot of drinking going on in the house, and I've known of teenagers who may have sneaked in...

DR. MORIARITY: Sure.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Okay. That's one thing. And, the alcohol is, at least, a legal substance at this point, but marijuana is not a legal substance, and for a parent to -- I'm wondering -- I guess what I'm getting at is, of the -- it's one thing -- I'm after the parents that are giving their kids the drug deliberately to try because they think it's okay, I guess.

DR. MORIARITY: They did. We get a lot of the parents who, basically, grew up in the 60s and until very recently, they did not consider it a problem. All of a sudden now, they have decided that their values have changed and you shouldn't use drugs anymore, and they're telling this to the kids and the kids are going, "Now, wait a minute, I got it from you. How come you're telling me now, 'no.'" So, we have a real modeling behavior and they see it in their peers. They go to the parties. The parents come over -- various parents -- and somebody is always in the back room.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Do you have any idea or suggestion on how you would deal with just the problem of a parent -- I mean, are there additional penalties that would make any difference at all?

DR. MORIARITY: What we try to do is, at the crisis shelter, when we house a kid, we blackmail the parents, basically, is what we do. We say we won't shelter your kid unless you come in for family counseling and we deal with it as a family problem. And, a lot of times families will come to us for family counseling because we're youth advocates and we're not a drug and alcohol agency. They don't want treatment for drug and

alcoholism because that means having to deal with their own problems, you see, but they will go and deal with a family crisis.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: And then you trap -- you get them hooked in there.

DR. MORIARITY: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Well, that's great, what you do. I applaud that approach -- maybe it's the only approach. Is there anything the legislature can do with that problem of a parent giving their children -- introducing their children to marijuana on a deliberate basis.

DR. MORIARITY: What we get, unfortunately, is that we deal with the kids that fall through the cracks. We deal with the kids who, basically, are being emotionally abused at home for whatever reason, because substance abuse is out of control. You cannot get an emotional abuse case on a teenager through in this state. You won't get it because they're a teenager. They're told they can run away from home, and we say, well, they did run away from home; we have them; now what do we do with them? And, what they're told is that if it's bad enough that you want to leave the home, and you're a minor, in order for social services to pick you up, you have to turn in your parents, because, otherwise, they've got no reason to take the child out of the home. It's not bad enough for social services to come in for a neglect case on a teenager which is -- they don't do it. But, unless the kid turns the parent in, and now we've got the law involved here, or unless the kid pushes his own behavior to the

point he gets picked up by probation. Probation finally feels at least they've got a handle on the kid, and they try to do the very best they can, there's not a whole lot we can do. So, we get a lot of kids who fall through the cracks because they're not willing to turn in their parent and the parent is not willing to come to counseling, and until the kid becomes a 602, he is going to stay in that environment.

So, one of the things we would recommend is that all emphasis, when it comes down to anything having to do with drug education, is that it be family oriented. That they push family involvement, whether or not the family wants to be involved or not. You push it anyway. You try to get the family involved. They have to go. They have to be involved, however you have to do it because, otherwise, you're not changing the environment for the kid; he's still being modeled, and he will start using because booze and drugs are for pain. You know, we use them for physical pain and the kids use them for emotional pain.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: So, if there was a curriculum that could be developed in the schools that would deal with the whole series of things -- drug abuse being one of them, but the whole self-esteem, et cetera, et cetera. For that program to be successful, it should also have a component of family involvement, and I think there are some curriculum ways you can do that. I suppose you could give homework to a kid that he had to go home and talk to his parent about some of these things.

DR. MORIARITY: Yeah, we've had some kids beaten up about that, too. You sent my kid home to tell me that I drink too much?

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: No, I don't mean that...

DR. MORIARITY: Unfortunately...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: No, you misunderstood me...

DR. MORIARITY: Unfortunately, what happens...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: A parental component would be an important aspect of curriculum.

DR. MORIARITY: It is extremely important but we have to go a little bit beyond that because, usually, the parents who are willing to be involved aren't the parents who have the problem, and if you make it voluntary, the parents who have the real problems aren't going to come.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: But there are a lot of parents that want to be involved and don't know how to.

DR. MORIARITY: Yes, that's very true.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: I mean, there are a lot of parents -- I think -- who really want to be the best parents in the world but they just don't know how to be parents.

DR. MORIARITY: And we deal with those all the time; we call it reeducation counseling, and we get a lot of those, and because we get the kids who are just beginning to have problems as far as crisis -- this is their first runaway; this is whatever -- and they come in and we do aftercare counseling: 10 to 12 sessions to try to intervene before this situation becomes...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: How are you funded?

DR. MORIARITY: We have got about -- in my program alone, we've got about 6 funding sources. I spend...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: The government being one of them?

DR. MORIARITY: The federal runaway money is one of them. We get community mental health money. We get United Way money. I get Buck Fund money in Marin County...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Buck Fund?

DR. MORIARITY: Yeah.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: What's that?

DR. MORIARITY: It is a very famous fund of a woman who set up a trust fund...

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Private -- foundation.

DR. MORIARITY: Yeah, private foundation. So we get it from -- and I spend a lot of time writing proposals trying to keep the doors open, basically. We also charge client fees but the majority of our clients can't pay much. We do take third party payments, but then the majority of people we have can't pay, so we spend a lot of time scrambling. We are seeing more 13, 14 year old girls. The age is slipping drastically of the kids we're getting who are in crisis. And, 50 percent of these 13, 14 year old girls are already sexually involved, most of the time they're sexually involved is when they're doing drugs or alcohol, and consequently, you have early pregnancies and it all comes down to the drugs and alcoholism.

Basically, what we're suggesting is that 1) family orientation, but 2) there's got to be more income; there's got to be more money made for low income counseling. This is a dirth of it everywhere. We have the few places that offer low income housing but they have waiting lists of three months long for families who are in crisis, and even those who go down to \$5 a session, and the people who can afford to go use it.

And, the other thing we need more of, that someone touched on before, is sliding scale "detox" centers and residential, because we have these kids, we refer all the time to drug and alcohol services but if the parents don't have the money -- and in Marin you're talking about \$12,000 for a 90 day program -- there is nothing. There is nothing for these kids unless they go to AA or NA and that just is not effective. So, we have a lot of those things, and you have to put more teeth into child support laws.

The majority of the families we see are one income families, where the mother has no money for aftercare. These kids -- she doesn't have any control over them; she's commuting; she's clerical work for the most time; trying to figure out where her kids are when she is not home; and she has no money: 1) for counseling, but 2) for aftercare; and she is alone out there and we're seeing more and more and more of these kids who are out of control and there is nothing she can do. She's helpless. So, we need more support in those laws, also.

And, I think that's about it. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Doctor, thank you. I really appreciate your really good testimony. I'm glad you let us know you were here.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Do you have a business card?

DR. MORIARITY: Sure do.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Is there any last comments you might like to make, Assemblyman Leslie?

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: Just to compliment the Chairman on a good hearing and I'm learning a lot...

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: Same here.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: ...and I think we're going to have a lot of these I assume, over the course of the next year, and this is useful. I think, you know, if I can learn the vocabulary, like I learned what a "ARP" was -- no, a "SARB", but no, I think we pick up a little each time and by the time we're done with this, maybe we'll have some pretty good ideas.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I agree. And, thank you. I appreciate your being here the whole afternoon, your input. And, to all the witnesses, it really is helping us. We will be having more hearings and certainly in the interim, we'll have some around the state, and then we'll be coming back. We need this kind of data; we know it's out there; you know it's out there if we can put it together from the different people in the field and the experts and the agencies, and maybe synthesize something that can make a difference from the legislative perspective. We know you're making differences out there in the day-to-day operations. You're in the trenches and we're trying to find things that we could assist to help standardize some of the best approaches and get it out there on a wider basis, especially in the preventive mode that we've been talking about.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: One thing I'd just like to toss out by way of dialogue here in terms of future hearings, there's a lot that's already been done in terms of curriculum and prevention, which we've heard today, is going to be one of the

most important methods. Prevention education and trying to get things early rather than try to deal with them later, and there are various curricula; there's the QUEST Program and the DARE Program and all that, and I would like to, at least for your consideration, the idea of having one of our hearings be a detailed hearing of what is in these curricula and why they're working so we can understand the inner psychology of these curricula.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: You're a detail person. I've observed that.

ASSEMBLYMAN LESLIE: It's what -- what are they teaching? And have it in enough detail where maybe we could have several hours on DARE and a couple hours on QUEST and really get into the insides of it to see if there is some fundamental, educational philosophies that seem to be working and what is it? I think there's some things out there that are really working well and then pick the best of those and see if we can't pass some legislation along the lines of your bill that would take the best of these various curriculums and see if we can't get it used on a statewide basis.

CHAIRMAN CLUTE: I think it's a good point. There's some excellent programs out there and it would be helpful to have them come forward and tell us about them. A good point.

Okay. Thank you.

#