

# **STUDENT DRUG-TESTING PROGRAMS**

**An overview and resource guide**



## **STUDENT DRUG-TESTING COALITION**

Helping students pursue a better future.

**Compiled and written by:**

**C. E. Edwards, for the Student Drug-Testing Coalition  
a project of the Drug-Free Projects Coalition, Inc.  
[www.studentdrugtesting.org](http://www.studentdrugtesting.org)  
Fourth edition**

**©2008 C. E. Edwards & the Drug-Free Projects Coalition, Inc.**

This program manual and all updates copyrighted by C. E. Edwards & The Drug-Free Projects Coalition, Inc.. To maintain the integrity and quality of this manual, it may not be altered or copied without the express written consent of the Drug-Free Projects Coalition, Inc. Duplication of up to four (4) pages permitted with:

- 1) Credit line on each page: C. E. Edwards & Drug-Free Projects Coalition, Inc.  
©2008
- 2) E-mail copy of published use to:  
C. E. Edwards, dro-edwards@earthlink.net

Disclaimer: The material provided herein is not intended to be a substitute for legal advice to any school and/or school district and is provided for general informational purposes only. The applicability of any federal law or regulation to any school and/or school district, and the advisability of carrying out a drug-testing program, should be determined by each school and/or school district on an individual basis after carefully considering legal obligations and requirements. Specific legal issues should be referred to legal representatives of the school and/or school district.

C. E. Edwards and the Drug-Free Projects Coalition, Inc. disclaim responsibility for any claims, losses, or damages alleged by any person or entity as a result of the use of the materials compiled in this overview manual. Every effort has been made to insure accuracy. This manual is intended for instructional purposes only.

*C. E. Edwards, 2008*

# CONTENTS

About the Student Drug-Testing Coalition	
Mission and purpose statement	4
Coalition membership	5
Student drug-testing programs - the facts and the need	6
What parents, experts and educators say about student drug-testing	7
Random drug-testing programs	10
Eligibility for student random drug-testing programs	11
Student drug-testing program components and procedures	
Components of a student drug-testing program	12
Recommended standards	13
Drug-testing procedures overview	14
Effectiveness of student random drug testing	16
Institute for Behavior and Health study for U.S. Department of Education	17
McKinney studies of 2001, 2003, 2004	19
SATURN study for National Institutes of Health and Drug Abuse	22
Hunterdon Central Regional High School study	24
Legalities of student random drug-testing programs	26
Landmark U. S. Supreme Court case rulings	24
Federal Circuit Court rulings of significance	28
State court rulings of significance	29
Appendix A	
Do these prevention programs work? The evidence of experience	30

# **ABOUT THE STUDENT DRUG-TESTING COALITION PROJECT**

## **Mission and purpose statement**

The Student Drug Testing Coalition, a project of the Drug-Free Projects Coalition, Inc. was formed to assist educators and school administrator's in helping students pursue a better future. The coalition is an international volunteer group consisting of leaders of drug-prevention organizations and concerned parents who believe that non-punitive student drug-testing programs are the most effective and economical means to reduce student drug use. The coalition is dedicated to encouraging each school district to evaluate the documented effectiveness of non-punitive student drug-testing programs as the most effective method to ensure that their schools are drug free. The coalition's primary goal is to assure that each school board, superintendent, headmaster and principal has the information and resources necessary to implement a non-punitive student drug-testing program.

The coalition's objectives are to:

- (1) Assist school administrators and parents to become knowledgeable about the mental and physical consequences of drug use and that drug use encourages truancy, disruptive class behavior, lack of teacher respect, bullying, and violence. Further, student drug use interferes with learning and academic achievement and is a threat to not only the drug users but, as importantly, to all students and teachers.
- (2) Educate school administrators and parents about the dangers of students driving or parking on school property or participating in driver education while under the influence of drugs.
- (3) Provide school administrators and parents information concerning the effectiveness of non-punitive student drug-testing programs including the documented improvement in class room behavior, academic achievement and the reduction in school violence. Enable school administrators to increase the safety of students driving or parking on school property, including those participating in driver education.
- (4) Assure that school districts have access to information to correctly implement non-punitive student drug-testing policies and programs that meet constitutional and privacy requirements.
- (5) Establish a means for school districts to exchange ideas and information about student drug-testing programs and to support schools in meeting any legal challenges and frivolous lawsuits.
- (6) Assure that law and policy makers are aware that student drug testing is a proven and economical method to substantially reduce student drug use.

*Helping students pursue a better future*

## STUDENT DRUG-TESTING COALITION MEMBERSHIP

Malcolm K. Beyer, Jr.  
Chairman

Andrea Barthwell, MD	International Consultant
Dan Bent, Esq.	Fair Mediation
Lisa Brady	Superintendent, South Hunterdon Regional High School
Robert L. DuPont, M.D.	President, Institute for Behavior and Health, Inc.
Elizabeth Edwards	Drug-Free Projects Coalition, Inc.
David Evans, Esq.	Executive Director Drug-Free Schools Coalition, Inc.
Calvina Fay	Executive Director, Drug-Free America Foundation, Inc.
Joseph C. Franz, M.D.	Medical Director, SPORT SAFE Testing Service, Inc.
Matt Franz	Operations Director, SPORT SAFE Testing Service, Inc.
Linn Goldberg, M.D. FACSM	Professor of Medicine, Oregon Health & Science University
Dr. Harvey Graves	CEO/President Pinnacle Employee Testing Services, Inc.
Brian Heywood	National Drug Prevention Alliance (UK)
Ginger and Larry Katz	The Courage to Speak Foundation, Inc.
Carla Lowe	The Legal Foundation Against Illicit Drugs
Joseph R. McKinney, J.D., Ed.D.	Chairman, Dept. of Educational Leadership, Ball State University
Roger Morgan	Californians for Drug-Free Schools
Joyce Nalepka	President, Drug-Free Kids: America's Challenge
Laura Shelton	Executive Director Drug and Alcohol Testing Industry Association (DATIA)
Ivan Van Damme, M.D.	The International & Scientific Forum on Drug Abuse; Europe Against Drugs (EURAD, Belgium)

## STUDENT DRUG-TESTING PROGRAMS

## The facts and the need

- By the 12<sup>th</sup> grade more than one-third of high school seniors have used drugs.<sup>1</sup>
- 80% of high school students and 44% of middle school students have *personally* witnessed illegal use, possession and dealing of drugs on school grounds.<sup>2</sup>
- 61% of high-school students and 31% of middle-school students report they attend schools where drugs are used, kept or sold. The 2007 numbers represent increases over previous years.<sup>3</sup>
- Students attending schools where drugs are used, kept or sold are at a higher risk for drug use than students attending drug-free schools.<sup>4</sup>
- Substance abuse adds at least \$41 billion dollars to the costs of elementary and secondary education in terms of special education, teacher turnover, truancy, property damage injury, counseling, and other costs.<sup>5</sup>
- Schools that have implemented non-disciplinary student drug testing programs have found the programs to be effective in reducing drug use and improving the learning environment for all students.<sup>6</sup>
- 80% (2002-03 school year) and 79% (2003-04 school year) of schools with random student drug-testing programs achieved scores higher than the state average on the mandated graduation test for grades 10-12.<sup>7</sup>

## *Helping students pursue a better future*

---

<sup>1</sup> PRIDE 2004-2005 National Summary, August 2006. Over 35% of 12th grade students used marijuana and 8.8% used cocaine within past year.

<sup>2</sup>National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, August 2007: “National Survey of American Attitudes on Substance Abuse XII, Teen and Parents.”

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University. “Malignant Neglect: Substance Abuse and America’s Schools”. September 2001.

<sup>6</sup>Institute for Behavior and Health, Inc., “Preliminary Study of Student Drug Testing Programs” for the U.S. Dept. of Education, August 2002. DuPont, Robert L. M.D., et al.

<sup>7</sup>McKinney, Joseph R., J.D., Ed.D. “The Effectiveness of Random Drug Testing Programs 2005” August 2005.

## WHAT PARENTS, EXPERTS AND EDUCATORS SAY ABOUT STUDENT-DRUG TESTING PROGRAMS

What do the majority of adults nationwide think about student drug testing?

When asked, “*Do you think school districts should or should not be allowed to test public school students for illegal drugs before those students can participate in non-athletic activities,*” it was found that the majority of those polled (1,020 adults nationwide) support student drug testing.

70% of adults responding said they thought student drug testing should be allowed.

29% responded that student drug testing should not be allowed.

1% had no opinion on student drug testing.

*Source: CNN/USA Today Gallup Poll (June 21-23, 2002) <http://www.pollingreport.com/education.htm>*

What do parents say about student drug testing?

“Recent newspaper accounts of the Supreme Court hearing on student drug testing on 3/19/02 included a picture of Pennsylvania mother Sharon Smith holding a poster that featured a photo of her daughter who had died of a drug overdose. We were there with posters featuring a picture of our child as well. My son Ian died September 10, 1996. He was only 20 years old. We wanted the court and other Washington government officials to know that we believe that student drug testing could have saved our children’s lives.”

*Source: Ginger and Larry Katz, Founders of The Courage To Speak Foundation, Norwalk, CT*

“10 reasons why . . . support student drug testing:

Adam, 18, deceased.

Mark, 24, deceased.

Garrett, 22, deceased.

David, 26, deceased.

Billy, 17, deceased.

Cooper, 22, deceased.

Ian, 21, deceased.

Angela, 18, deceased.

Michael, 22, deceased.

Stephanie, 19, deceased.

The parents of these young people believe their children might still be living had their school systems supported their parental message of "no drugs" by drug testing the students.”

*Source: Joyce Nalepka, President Drug., Free Kids: America’s Challenge. Washington Post, March 23, 2002*

What do experts on youth drug use and student drug-testing programs say?

“The school years are a critical passage in a young person's life. While in school, children face the challenge of learning in the academic, social, physical, and emotional realms. When drugs infect a school it cripples the learning process. Children become casualties. The physical and psychological effects of drug and alcohol use can cause lifelong and profound losses. Substance use decreases a child's chances of graduation and academic success.”

*Source: David G. Evans, Esq., Executive Director of the Drug-free Schools Coalition. Flemington, NJ*

“The evidence is clear that student drug testing will keep drugs and violence out of our nation's schools. We know from our own coalitions, and from examples in this [ONDCP booklet 'Drug Testing in Schools'], that drug testing works.”

*Source: CADCA Chairman/CEO Gen. Arthur T. Dean*

“There is one method that stands out as the most effective prevention method today, and that is student drug testing. [It is] the most effective demand-reduction tool, I believe, that this country has ever known...”

*Source: Former New Orleans District Attorney Harry Connick*

“I applaud [the] Supreme Court decision to approve random drug tests for public high school students...Drug testing is [a] proven weapon in the fight to keep our kids off drugs.”

*Source: CASA Chairman and President Joseph A. Califano, Jr.*

“[W]e find that testing students who participate in extracurricular activities is a reasonably effective means of addressing the School District's legitimate concerns in preventing, deterring, and detecting drug use.”

*Source: Justice Clarence Thomas, U.S. Supreme Court in its ruling June 27, 2002 in Board of Education ISD #92 of Pottawatomie v. Earls, et al.*

“This failure to protect our children from drug use and addiction is unacceptable. We cannot responsibly withhold tools as effective as drug testing from communities that believe such measures are appropriate and will save young lives.”

*Source: John P. Walters, Director of the Office of National Control Policy in the foreword to its 2002 publication 'What you need to know about drug testing in schools'*

What do educators say about student drug testing?

“Those of us charged with ensuring the safety and well-being of students and staff must take seriously the threat imposed by students' illegal drug use. We can no longer simply say that the measures we have employed previously are enough. The challenge before school boards and communities is clear. We need to do a better job helping our teenagers say no to drugs. The Supreme Court has paved the way for stronger, stricter interventions. The dramatic success of our program at Hunterdon Central makes this challenge abundantly clear: Why do student random drug testing? You do it because it works.”

*Source: Lisa Brady, former principal of Hunterdon Central Regional High School, New Jersey. In a commentary from the Student Assistance Journal, Summer 2003, Vol. 15, No. 3*

“Without a doubt, mandatory drug testing, when put in place for the right reasons, and with careful consideration to its implementation, is an extremely positive and effective deterrent to the use of drugs.”

*Source: Mike Motheral, Superintendent of Schools, Sundown (Texas) ISD*

“We have had only 6 positive-test results since adding random drug-testing to our prevention programs in 1998. Some community members have asked me why don't we just stop the program. I responded: What, are you kidding. We've saved 6 kids. Even if we only save one more--what's a child's life worth?”

*Source: Michael Barber, Assistant Superintendent of Pell City Schools, AL*

## **STUDENT RANDOM DRUG-TESTING**

### **One component of a drug-prevention program**

Benefits of a student random drug-testing program:

- ▶ Deters student drug use
- ▶ A proven intervention program
- ▶ Reduces school suspensions and expulsions
- ▶ Enhances existing drug-prevention programs
- ▶ Creates a safe, drug-free learning environment
- ▶ Gives students a reason to say “NO” to drug use
- ▶ Involves parents in school drug-prevention efforts
- ▶ A fair and accurate method of detecting drug use by students
- ▶ A program with strict privacy and confidentiality requirements
- ▶ Reduces violent behaviors, classroom disruptions, truancy and criminal activity
- ▶ A means to obtain assessment, counseling, and treatment for youth involved in drugs

What a student random drug-testing program is NOT:

- ▶ A means to expel students
- ▶ A program involving law enforcement
- ▶ A punitive program, with academic consequences
- ▶ A record of drug use that will follow the student when leaving the school
- ▶ A replacement for parental involvement and other drug-prevention efforts
- ▶ A means to determine what prescription drugs students may be using legitimately

## STUDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR RANDOM DRUG TESTING

U. S. courts have supported random testing of students participating in:

- ▶ Athletics<sup>8</sup>
- ▶ Extra-curricular activities<sup>9</sup>
- ▶ Students with parking passes or driving on school property<sup>10</sup>

U. S. courts have **NOT** upheld random testing of students when:

- ▶ All students are subject to the random drug-testing program<sup>11</sup>
- ▶ When a testing program required consequences for a positive nicotine test<sup>12</sup>
- ▶ When students were required to inform the school of any prescription medications being taken<sup>13</sup>

**See <[www.studentdrugtesting.org](http://www.studentdrugtesting.org)> for summaries of case rulings**

---

<sup>8</sup>U. S. Supreme Court, *Vernonia v. Acton*, 1995 ruled that random testing of student athletes does not violate the U. S. Constitution.

<sup>9</sup>U.S. Supreme Court, *Board of Education ISD #92 of Pottawatomie v. Earls, et al.* June 2002 ruled that random testing of students in extra-curricular activities does not violate the U.S. Constitution. U. S. Supreme Court (536 U.S. 822 [2002]) No.01-332. Argued March 19, 2002. Decided June 27, 2002.

<sup>10</sup> *Todd, et al. v. Rush County Schools* U. S. Seventh Federal Circuit Court of Appeals 133 F.3d 984. Argued November 5, 1997; Decided January 12, 1998; United States Court of Appeals, *Joy v. Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp.*, Seventh Circuit, Case No. 99-2261. 212 F.3d 1052 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000) Argued Nov. 12, 1999, Decided May 12, 2000.

<sup>11</sup>*Odenheim v Carlstadt-East Rutherford School District* New Jersey Superior Court 510 A.2d 709. 1985; *Tannahill v. Lockney Independent School District* Northern District Court of Texas (133 F. Supp.2d 919, Northern District, Texas) Decided March 1, 2001

<sup>12</sup>United States Court of Appeals, *Joy v. Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp.*, Seventh Circuit, Case No. 99-2261. 212 F.3d 1052 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000) Argued Nov. 12, 1999, Decided May 12, 2000.

<sup>13</sup>*Weber v. Oakridge School District 76* Oregon State Supreme Court 16-00-21584; A114141. Appeal from Circuit Court, Lane County. The Oregon State Supreme Court denied Certiorari in *Weber v. Oakridge School District* 69 P.3d 1233 (OR 2003). Court of Appeals ruling prevails.

## **STUDENT DRUG-TESTING PROGRAM COMPONENTS**

Standard components of a student drug-testing program:

- ▶ Written Policy
- ▶ Faculty drug identification training
- ▶ Student drug-education programs
- ▶ Student-assistance programs
- ▶ Drug-testing program (random, reasonable suspicion, for cause)

## STUDENT DRUG<sup>14</sup> TESTING: THE STANDARDS

- All student drug-testing records shall be kept strictly confidential in accordance with *written* school policy and the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)<sup>15</sup>
- All test-result notifications and collections shall be done following strict privacy and confidentiality guidelines as established in a *written* policy.
- Drug-testing procedures shall be applied consistently to all students subject to testing.
- Drug-test procedures shall include confirmatory testing at a state licensed or federally certified laboratory using spectometry (as applicable) when a screening-test result is positive.<sup>16</sup>
- A certified Medical Review Officer (MRO) shall review and rule on all confirmed-positive drug-test results.
- Parents or legal guardians, the student, and school personnel (*on a need-to-know basis*) shall be the *only* persons notified of test results by the MRO. Law enforcement is not notified.
- All records relating to and *including* student drug-test results shall be destroyed by the school/district upon graduation or other departure of the student from the school district.
- Any drug-screening tests conducted using on-site test kits, shall be done using products with FDA 510(k) pre-market clearance.<sup>17</sup> Alcohol tests should meet federal standards, have FDA clearance or be approved by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.
- Choice of specimens to be used for drug and alcohol testing is at the discretion of the school/school district.<sup>18</sup>

### *Helping students pursue a better future*

This information is meant solely to provide an overview of generally accepted minimum standards for any drug/alcohol testing program and in no manner constitutes recommendations or technical information as to an appropriate testing method.

---

<sup>14</sup>The term “drug” refers to alcohol, illicit and licit drugs.

<sup>15</sup>FERPA, signed into law on August 21, 1974, was passed to protect the privacy of student education records. The original law took effect November 19, 1974. It has been amended six (6) times since passage, with the last amendment being in October of 1998. Covers records, files, documents and other materials containing information directly related to a student that are maintained by an educational agency or institution.

<sup>16</sup>Spectometry such as GC/MS, GC/MS/MS, LC/MS/MS depending upon the specimen used for testing (i.e. urine, hair, saliva etc.).

<sup>17</sup> FDA 510(k) pre-market clearance provides that a test kit function as it was designed & marketed to function; its efficacy is supported by scientific studies; and that manufacturers comply with federal labeling requirements and federal regulations

<sup>18</sup>School districts may wish to consider following established drug-free workplace standards and practices, as well as giving consideration to testing standards, practices and specimen types that are proven to be legally defensible and reliable. A review of case law and statutes on student or workplace drug testing may provide guidance.

# OVERVIEW OF DRUG-TESTING PROGRAM PROCEDURES

Specimens may be:

- ▶ Urine
- ▶ Oral fluids
- ▶ Sweat
- ▶ Hair
- ▶ Breath (for alcohol testing if access to breath testing equipment)

Most programs test for the presence of illicit drugs & alcohol:

- ▶ Using a standard 5-panel screen for marijuana, PCP, opiates, amphetamines, cocaine
  - ▶ In addition, some school districts test for steroids, nicotine, alcohol and/or club/designer drugs
- Note: Marijuana remains the drug of choice of young people*

**What is the cost of a drug test?**

**On average, a student drug test will cost between \$10.00 and \$30.00 using urine or oral fluids specimens.**

**Compare this to the \$700.00 cost of equipping one high school football player.**

Collection Methods (should follow well-established standards and procedures):

- ▶ Usually on-site by trained faculty member, school nurse or drug-testing program contractor
- ▶ Private and unobserved
- ▶ Secured restroom facility to eliminate tampering/adulteration
- ▶ Chain of custody procedures adhered to for all specimens
- ▶ Specimen handling documented through entire process

**What is the purpose of Medical Review Officers (MROs)?**

**MROs review all confirmed positive-test results to determine if there is a legitimate reason (i.e., valid prescription drug use) for the positive-test result. When there is legitimate prescription drug use, the test is ruled negative and the school is not informed of the prescription drug use. This protects the privacy of the student and prevents the school from exceeding legal boundaries.**

Testing Process:

- ▶ Screening or initial test may be on-site with kit or specimen may be sent to a laboratory
- ▶ Confirmatory test is **always** at a laboratory and **always** recommended when screening result is positive
- ▶ Review of all confirmed-positive test results by a Medical Review Officer (MRO)
- ▶ Reporting of results to school-designated representative via secured communication

School handling of drug-test results:

- ▶ Privacy and confidentiality protections in place for students and the school district
- ▶ Notification of drug-test results to parent/guardian and the student
- ▶ Positive-result test consequences are usually suspension from the qualifying activity for a specified period of time
- ▶ Student assistance involvement and community referrals as necessary which may be handled by a Student Assistance Professional, a school counselor, student advisor or the parents
- ▶ Requirement for student to be drug-free as a condition of returning to the qualifying activity
- ▶ Destruction of the drug- testing records upon student's departure from the school district or upon graduation

**Student Assistance Programs (SAPs)**

- 1) Define a school's role in creating safe, disciplined and drug-free learning environments and to clarify the relationship between student academic performance and the use of alcohol, other drugs, violence and high-risk behavior;**
  - 2) Educate parents, students, agencies and the community about school policy on alcohol, tobacco, other drugs, disruptive behavior and violence and provide information about student assistance;**
  - 3) To identify & refer students with academic and social concerns to a multi-disciplinary problem-solving and case management team;**
  - 4) To provide information, support and problem-solving skills to students who are experiencing academic or social problems;**
  - 5) To build bridges among schools, parents and community resources through referral and shared case management;**
  - 6) To integrate student assistance services with other school-based programs designed to increase resilience, improve academic performance and reduce student risk for alcohol, tobacco, other drugs and violence.**
- Source: National Association of Student Assistance Professionals (NASAP)*

## **EFFECTIVENESS OF STUDENT RANDOM DRUG-TESTING PROGRAMS**

Studies demonstrating the effectiveness of student drug-testing programs to decrease and deter student drug use are readily available. The most interesting and conclusive studies as to the effectiveness of a student random drug-testing program, are those containing data of student drug use prior to implementation of a drug-testing program. Evidence of the success of this prevention program is found in the experiences of school administrators, coaches and principals.

Several of the leading studies are presented in this manual in summary form as well as documentation of the experience of student drug-testing programs from the observations of not only educators and administrators, but from the perspective of the students. Full study reports may be obtained at [www.studentdrugtesting.org](http://www.studentdrugtesting.org)

A controversial and well publicized study by University of Michigan researchers is also presented at the web site along with an analysis of the study and why it *cannot be relied upon as definitive* in correlating student drug use and random-testing programs in schools. The study has been widely criticized by researchers and others. In its analysis and critique of the study, the Student Drug-Testing Coalition has called for a peer review of the work. *This study did not determine the effectiveness of student random testing programs.*

**Student random drug testing works!**

## **INSTITUTE FOR BEHAVIOR AND HEALTH (IBH) STUDY FOR THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION 2002**

This 2001-2002 school-year survey of nine schools provides detailed information on the components of a student random drug-testing program. There were 7 public schools and 2 private schools in the study, from suburban, rural and urban locations in several states throughout the U.S. The programs, which all include random testing, have been in place for an average of 3-4 years. In completing the surveys, the student drug-testing program representative provided information about the program's policies, procedures, history and results.

The goal of this preliminary study by IBH is to capture the initial experiences of these early adopter schools to produce a picture of current SDT practices and to identify problems as well as successes from these early efforts. The study findings are presented in two forms. In the Results section the data from the 9 school programs are pulled together to give a picture of their collective experiences. In the Appendix of the report, a detailed description of each of the 9 school programs is provided.

A major variation in programs was in the categories of students tested (ranging from athletes only to all extracurricular activities plus student drivers to all students). As might be expected, the consequences of positive tests varied among schools, with only the private schools expelling students after a second positive test [ed. note: Private schools are not subject to state or federal constitutional considerations and may test all students].

Another variation was in the substances that were routinely tested for. Most included the 5 drugs that form the standard core of drug testing (marijuana, cocaine, amphetamine/methamphetamine, opiates and PCP), but there was considerable variation in how many other substances were included. Linked to the variation in substances tested for was a considerable range in the reported lab fees.

What is most striking in the study's findings are the common elements identified by these pioneer programs. All of the student drug testing programs were based upon a health and safety rationale, with the purpose of prevention rather than punishment. In every school surveyed the student drug testing program was just one part of a larger, comprehensive initiative to keep students safe from drugs.

Formal written policies were established and publicized. Procedures were implemented to prevent fraud, ensure accuracy, and protect the confidentiality of test results. None of the schools reported students with positive drug tests to the police. Instead, the route was for counseling and treatment.

Programs' successes were indicated by reduced number of positive tests, lowered levels of disciplinary problems and, in some cases, self-report survey data. Despite some schools' concerns about-or direct experience with-legal challenges and objections from particular groups within the community, these

student drug-testing programs have persisted and appear to have won increasing support from the various groups.

Lessons learned and advice to other schools strongly emphasize the importance of involving the various stakeholders in the planning process and making sure they understand that the program is intended to help students say no to drugs.

All schools retain the student random drug-testing programs because drug use has been reduced along with the behaviors and problems associated with drug use by students. This study also provides information on the costs of drug testing for schools.

## **McKINNEY STUDIES OF INDIANA HIGH SCHOOLS 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005**

1) The Effectiveness and Legality of Random Drug-Testing Policies, 2001: Principals were asked to compare drug and alcohol activity during the 1999-2000 school year when drug-testing policies were in effect with the 2000-2001 school year when schools were not allowed to continue with their random drug-testing policies.<sup>19</sup>

Overview of results (Published 2002):

- ▶ 85% of the high school principals reported an increase in either drug usage or alcohol usage among their students after the drug-testing program was stopped, compared to the 1999-00 school year (when they had a drug-testing plan implemented).
- ▶ 80% reported an increase in illicit drug usage during the 2000-01 school year compared to the previous year.
- ▶ 59% reported an increase in alcohol usage during the 2000-01 school year compared to the previous year.
- ▶ 78% of the principals reported that there was an increase (compared to the 1999-00 year) in the number of students who came forward and told them that drug and alcohol usage was on the rise since the drug-testing program was stopped.
- ▶ Principals reported a statistically significant number of more students suspended or expelled for drug or alcohol related incidents during the 2000-2001 year than the previous year (with SDT).
- ▶ 89% of the principals believe that the drug-testing program undermines the effects of peer pressure by providing a legitimate reason to refuse to use illegal drugs and alcohol.
- ▶ 97% of the principals said their community supported the drug-testing program.

2) The Effectiveness of Random Drug Testing Programs: A Statewide Follow-up Study, 2003: This study is presented as a follow-up to the 2002 study. Its purpose was to determine how many schools in Indiana re-implemented random drug-testing programs after suspending those programs in the late summer of 2000. It also investigated the effectiveness of the re-implemented drug-testing programs as compared to the previous school year when random drug testing was suspended.

Overview of results:

- ▶ 94% of principals reported believing that the random drug-testing policy discourages drug and alcohol use among students.
- ▶ 88% (52) of high school principals responding to the survey reported re-implementation of random drug-testing at their schools.

---

<sup>19</sup>The Indiana Court of Appeals ruled that random drug testing policies for students were unconstitutional under the Indiana Constitution in August 2000. (*Linke v. Northwestern Sch. Corp.*, 734 N.E. 2d 252 (Ind. Ct. App. 2000)). All Indiana schools halted their random drug testing programs after the decision and waited for a decision by the Indiana Supreme Court. The Indiana Supreme reversed the appellate court in the summer of 2002 and school districts in Indiana have reinstated their programs or are considering implementing random drug testing programs.

- ▶ 73% of the principals reported a decrease in drug usage (compared to the period without a random drug-testing program) among students who are subject to the drug-testing policy.
- ▶ 25% of principals reported that drug use “remained the same” and 2% (1) reported an increase in drug usage.
- ▶ 51% of the high school principals reported a decrease in alcohol usage (compared to the period without a random drug-testing program) among students at their school who are subject to the random drug-testing policy.
- ▶ 45% of principals reported that alcohol use “remained the same” and 4% reported an increase in the use of alcohol.
- ▶ 26% of principals reported that their drug-testing program did not test for alcohol. Most of these principals responded to the alcohol use question with “remained the same”.
- ▶ 40% of principals responding to the survey reported that fewer students had been suspended from participation in athletic programs for drug use since re-implementation of the random drug-testing program.

### 3) Study of High Schools with SDT Programs, 2004:

Summary of results:

- ▶ 80% (42/52) of High Schools with SDT programs in 2002-03, scored higher than the State average on the State mandated graduation test (grades 10-12).
- ▶ A statistically significant number of High Schools (37/52 - 71%) with SDT programs in 2002-03 had graduation rates higher than the State average 0.001 Z test.
- ▶ SDT provides positive effects for students not involved in drug use.
- ▶ Number of expulsions and suspensions due to drugs, alcohol and weapons for SDT high schools showed a 30% reduction.

Dr. McKinney also reviewed and summarized Columbus, Indiana survey data on students at two high schools in that community. The high schools have surveyed students regarding alcohol, tobacco and drug use every 2 years since 1995. Evaluation of the SDT programs began in 1999. The Indiana Prevention Resource Center (IPRC) coordinates the student self-reporting questionnaire (ATOD).

Key findings: Comparing 2001 to 2003

- ▶ Participation in athletics, clubs, intra-murals, art programs extracurricular activities: There was no significant difference in the number of students participating in athletics and extracurricular activities when a High School had SDT program compared to no SDT program. In fact, direction was toward increased participation in all grades in 2003.
- ▶ In the past month, students in all four grades (9-12) reported that the frequency of serious arguments involving shouting were significantly down. In the frequency of physical fights, grades 10 and 12 reported fights significantly down.
- ▶ 90.5% of students stated that they thought SDT is effective in deterring substance abuse.

### 4) The Effectiveness of Random Drug Testing Programs 2005:

As a follow-up to previous surveys of 65 Indiana high schools with random student-drug testing programs (RSDT), those same high schools were again surveyed in 2005 about the effectiveness of RSDT programs. Information on the costs of such programs was incorporated into the most recent survey, along with questions regarding athletic and extra-curricular participation levels.

Summary of results:

- ▶ Majority of respondents reported student drug use decreased with a random testing program
- ▶ One-half of principals reported increases in activity/athletic program participation
- ▶ No school experienced reductions in student participation in activities
- ▶ 91% of high schools reported a per-test cost of \$30.00 or less
- ▶ High schools with random student drug-testing programs exceeded the state average for test scores on a state-mandated graduation test as well as exceeding the state average for graduation rates

## **SATURN AND RELATED STUDIES**

### **Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, Oregon**

1. 1999: Acceptability and potential deterrent effects of drug testing.

Results of the survey were presented to the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) 1999 in Seattle. Research conducted by L. Goldberg, MD, FACSM; D. Elliot, MD, FACSM, E. Moe; K. Kuchl; G. Clarke. The full study report was published in 'Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise', 1999:31(5)S123 and was supported by the National Institutes of Health, Drug Abuse.(NIH & NIDA)

#### Summary:

To assess the use of alcohol and other drugs in athletes, male (n=1506) high school football players and adolescent females (n=2085) were surveyed. Results included lifetime use of alcohol (76.2% male, 65.3% female), marijuana (29.4% male, 14.8% female) and amphetamines (8.4% male, 7.8% female). Also surveyed by confidential questionnaire 1299 were students from 28 high schools to determine potential deterrent effects and acceptability of drug testing. Of those surveyed, only a small minority (<9%) said they would use drugs and just 12% claimed they would continue to use alcohol if random drug testing were school policy. Importantly, drug testing received broad support. This preliminary data suggests high acceptability and potential benefit by such a program.

2. 1999-2000: Pilot study of two public high schools comparing a school with a student random drug-testing program to a school without a student random drug-testing program. Structure of study: Student athletes at Wahtonka high school were subject to random drug testing, while student athletes at Warrenton high school were not subject to random drug testing; approximately 276 student athletes participated (drug tested=135, not drug tested=141).

#### Preliminary findings reported:

- ▶ Wahtonka (with testing program) reported a drug-use rate one-quarter that of Warrenton;
- ▶ 5.3% of Wahtonka students (with testing program) said they were using illegal drugs as compared to 19.4% of Warrenton students; and
- ▶ Wahtonka student athletes (subject to drug testing) were less than one-third as likely to use performance-enhancing substances as athletes at Warrenton.

3. 2000-01: Student Athlete Testing Using Random Notification Study (SATURN Study)

Report on preliminary results of a three-year pilot study begun in the 2000-01 school year. Reported by its coordinator, Linn Goldberg, MD, FACSM of the Oregon Health Sciences University, during the U. S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools Annual Conference, October 2003, Washington, D.C.. The SATURN Study is being conducted with support from NIH and NIDA. Structure of the study: 13 schools participating; 7 conduct random testing of athletes at a 50% random-test rate; 5 of the 7 schools conduct testing during the entire school year, 2 schools random test during the athletic season only; student surveys have been conducted for two years; 6 schools do not randomly drug test athletes.

#### Preliminary findings:

- ▶ There were no decreases in sport-activity participation by students when subjected to a random drug-testing program, in fact, *an 11% increase in participation was found*;
- ▶ a 50% random test rate appears to be an adequate level to deter drug use, since students believed that there was a strong likelihood they would be tested;
- ▶ heavier alcohol users may decrease their use when subject to random drug testing;
- ▶ heavier marijuana users may be deterred when subject to testing; and
- ▶ drug testing appears to deter frequent drug users rather than the ‘experimenters’.

It should be noted that the studies shown above were designed and implemented prior to a 2002 Supreme Court ruling that expanded student drug testing to include not only athletes, but students in extra-curricular activities. More complete data analysis of the two-year randomized trial is being performed.

# HUNTERDON CENTRAL REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDY

## Impact of student random drug-testing program on drug use by students

Survey Periods: 1997, 1999, 2002

Student groups tested: Athletes 1997-2000 school years, then re-implemented December 2002; students participating in extra-curricular activities initially implemented February-August 2000 and re-implemented December 2002; students holding parking passes initially implemented December 2002.<sup>20</sup>

Conclusions:

Hunterdon Central Regional High School experienced an overall *decrease* in student drug use over a three school-year period (1997-2000) during which time the only change to its substance abuse programs was the implementation of a random drug-testing program covering student athletes. Hunterdon Central Regional High School experienced an overall *increase* in student drug use over a two school-year period (2000-2002), during which time *the only change to its substance abuse programs was the suspension of the random drug-testing program covering student athletes.*

The highest percentage of students taking the surveys, representing all four grade levels, indicated negligible or no drug use consistently throughout the three survey periods demonstrating that a high percentage of Hunterdon high school students do not use drugs.

Summary of Results:

For the period 1997-1999, during which the student body was surveyed two times (1997 and 1999), the high school saw a decline in drug use from the 1997 pre-random student athlete drug testing program levels within the *entire* student population, not just the student group subject to random drug testing during the period as compared to the post-random drug testing program levels.

Overall, the high school experienced a decline in single-drug and multi-drug use, as well as a decline in the use of alcohol. Declines in the use of most drugs surveyed were clearly evident within the 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> grade levels. However, there was an increase in the percentage of 12<sup>th</sup> grade students trying marijuana but indicating no current use. The decline in drug use amongst 11<sup>th</sup> grade students was to a lesser extent than the decline shown by the other three grade levels and in several categories there were increases for this grade level in: 1) patterns of drug use-light marijuana use; 2) ever tried a drug-use of narcotics other than heroin; 3) used a drug in the past month-PCP and alcohol.

For the period 2000-2002, during which the random drug testing of student athletes had been suspended pending outcome of litigation, results of the 2002 survey of students showed that drug use **increased** in the majority of categories surveyed, including the multi-drug use category which *increased* by more than 169% for all four grade levels combined over the 1999 surveyed levels. In some categories, drug

---

<sup>20</sup>August 2000 the school was targeted for lawsuit by the ACLU. The random testing program was suspended until the school prevailed in the appellate court in July 2002 leading to re-implementation of the program in December 2002. The school continued the random drug testing program while the ACLU appeal to the New Jersey Supreme Court was under consideration. The NJ Supreme Court ruled in the school's favor July 9, 2003.

use increased to levels higher than those found prior to implementation of the random drug testing program in 1997. The eleventh grade again stood out from the other three classes in that increases in multi-drug use (52%) were only about one-half or less of any of the other three classes reported increases (9<sup>th</sup> grade-316% increase, 10<sup>th</sup> grade-100% increase and 12<sup>th</sup> grade-209% increase in multi-drug use).

## **LEGALITIES OF STUDENT RANDOM DRUG-TESTING PROGRAMS**

The legal issues of student drug-testing programs are of concern to school administrators when considering a student random drug-testing program. However, in almost all cases before the U. S. courts, school programs of random testing certain student populations have been held to be constitutional under the U.S. Constitution and certain State Constitutions.

In fact, in reviewing over 40 student drug-testing cases, it was determined that in the majority of these cases, the school program was upheld when the school followed well-established guidelines and principles of drug testing in general. Schools have had the benefit of many years of trial and error in workplace drug-testing programs and the same standards are recommended for schools.

U. S. Courts, through case rulings, have also helped to establish generally accepted practices and standards of student drug-testing programs and should be reviewed when considering establishing a program.

Brief summaries of noteworthy cases are presented here. All student drug-testing case rulings and summaries may be found at [www.studentdrugtesting.org](http://www.studentdrugtesting.org) on the SDT Legal Actions page, along with a listing of program components that U.S. Courts have viewed as necessary to a program.

## LANDMARK U. S. SUPREME COURT CASES

1) 1995, U. S. Supreme Court: *Vernonia School District v. Acton*.

This case involved an Oregon high school that discovered its student athletes were leaders in the student drug culture. The school also had concern that drug use increases the risk of sports-related injury. The school district adopted the Student Athlete Drug Policy, which authorized random urinalysis drug testing of students who participate in its athletics programs. Respondent Acton was denied participation in his school's football program when he and his parents (also respondents) refused to consent to the testing. They then filed suit on the grounds that the policy violated the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments and the Oregon Constitution. The Court upheld random testing of high school athletes as constitutional.

This 1995 U. S. Supreme Court ruling opened the door to random drug testing programs for student athletes.

2) 2002, U. S. Supreme Court: *Board of Education Independent School District #92 of Pottawatomie v. Earls, et al.*

This case involved the Student Activities Drug Testing Policy adopted by the Tecumseh, Oklahoma, School District requiring all middle and high school students to consent to urinalysis testing for drugs in order to participate in any extracurricular activity. Respondent high school students and their parents brought this action alleging that the Policy violates the Fourth Amendment. The Court upheld random testing of high school students participating in extra-curricular activities as constitutional.

This 2002 U. S. Supreme Court ruling expanded random drug testing programs to include not only student athletes, but all students participating in extra-curricular activities.

## FEDERAL CIRCUIT COURT CASES OF SIGNIFICANCE

[Note: In the U. S., the Federal Court system has layers just as in State Court systems. The U. S. Federal Circuit Courts of Appeal have jurisdiction for the states included within that circuit area and is the Court just below the U. S. Supreme Court. In the U. S. there are 11 Circuits plus the D.C. Circuit.]

1) 2000, *United States Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit: Joy v. Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp.* The School Board created a Drug-Testing Investigation Committee, composed of students, parents and school personnel, to study drug testing as a method of reducing student substance abuse. The Drug Testing Investigation Committee recommended that suspicion-less student drug testing be part of Penn's drug-prevention program. That recommendation eventually became part of Policy 360, entitled Student Testing for Drugs, Alcohol and Tobacco, which was approved by the School Board on May 26, 1998, and implemented during the 1998-99 school year.

This case is notable due to the fact that while the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals issued an opinion finding the school district policy constitutional under the Fourth Amendment, the Court required to school to amend its policy as it applied to the testing of student drivers for nicotine. In response, Penn amended its policy to read: "A student driver will not be subject to consequences for a positive test for tobacco."

2) 1998, *U. S. Seventh Federal Circuit Court of Appeals: Todd, et al. v. Rush County Schools* In August 1996, the Rush County School Board approved a program prohibiting a high school student from participating in any extracurricular activities or driving to and from school unless the student and parent or guardian consented to a test for drugs, alcohol or tobacco in random, unannounced urinalysis examinations.

This suit was filed by four parents for their four children, all students at Rushville Consolidated High School in Rushville, Indiana. Plaintiff William Todd's parents refused to sign a consent form for the drug testing program, resulting in his being barred from videotaping the football team. Likewise, the parents of the three plaintiff Hammons children refused to sign the consent form and the children were therefore barred from participating in any extracurricular activities.

The school random testing program was upheld as consistent with the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments.

This case is notable due to the fact that students driving to and from school were included in the random drug-testing program.

## STATE COURT CASES OF SIGNIFICANCE

*2002, Court of Appeals of the State of Oregon ( Oregon State Supreme Court denied Certiorari, upholding the Court of Appeals ruling) Weber v. Oakridge School District 76*

Oakridge School District 76 adopted a drug-testing policy requiring all students who wish to participate in extracurricular school athletics to consent to random urinalysis testing throughout the school year and to disclose any use of prescription medications. Ginelle Weber, a student at Oakridge High School, tried out for and made the school's volleyball team. But she and her parents refused to consent to the random urinalysis and disclosure requirements. The school excluded her from the team. Her parents, John and Shannon Weber, initiated action arguing that the district's policy violates Ginelle's right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures guaranteed by Article I, section 9, of the Oregon Constitution.

The trial court concluded that the district's policy violates Ginelle's rights under Article I, section 9, only to the extent that it required her to disclose her use of any prescription medication before having tested positive for alcohol or drug use; the court upheld the constitutionality of the policy in all other respects.

The district then revised its policy, eliminating the compelled disclosure of prescription medication use. The court upheld the constitutionality of the policy as revised.

This case is notable for the fact that the school initially required disclosure of medications, which does not conform to generally accepted standards and principles for any drug-testing program.

## APPENDIX A

## Student random drug-testing prevention programs: do these programs work?

Designing and conducting long-term scientifically-valid studies on student random-testing programs has proven to be complicated and expensive. Results of various studies are continually questioned and data, even within single studies, is sometimes conflicting and confounding. Data from self-reporting drug use surveys have demonstrated less drug use once a program is implemented. While considered reliable, survey data has been questioned in spite of validity checks present in survey instruments. Data from student drug-test results have demonstrated decreases in drug use as positive test results decline over time. Such results, while encouraging and valuable for trending purposes, have limitations in that test results do not provide definitive answers as to why positive-test rates decline.

Another form of evidence is derived from what those with student random drug-testing *experience* have to say about the programs. What does the experience of student random drug-testing programs add to the evidence that answers the question: “do these programs work?”

Quite a lot as it turns out.

The evidence derived from experience is significant and reliable. Evidence, based upon experience, has led the way to solving complex issues for those willing to trust their observations. One of the past century’s greatest physicists based his theories upon observations of the physical world. From these observations Dr. Einstein derived evidence of general principals adhered to by the physical world which became the basis for his well-known theories—many still subject to scientific proof, waiting for the scientific community to develop the means to test his theories.

---

**The *experience* of student random drug-testing programs serves as reliable evidence that the programs decrease drug use among students.**

---

While Einstein’s voice, at times, was the only one supporting what he observed to be firm principals of the physical universe, student drug-testing prevention programs have the benefit of hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of observers telling us what they have witnessed: student drug-testing programs succeed in decreasing and deterring drug use among students; school and learning environments improve; test scores and graduation rates rise; students recognize and acknowledge that schools care about their choices; extra-curricular participation does not decrease, with many schools noting increases in participation levels; students using drugs are identified and helped before drug use dominates their lives; and, from the perspective of the students, it gives them the ability to refuse drugs without losing prestige in the eyes of their peers.

---

**The *experience* of those witnessing student random drug-testing programs is that these programs deter drug use.**

---

School administrators, teachers and coaches have spent years observing student cultures, environments and behaviors. They are expert observers who have much to

say about their experiences with student random drug-testing prevention programs. Students also have experience with drug-testing programs and knowledge of the impact of such programs upon their peers.

So what is being said by people with *experience* of student drug-testing programs?

Zion-Benton Township High School district, Zion, Illinois: Gary M. Fields, Ph.D., former superintendent (1994–2003) who implemented student random drug-testing and SAP programs at the district in 1997 called the program a “six-year success story.” Dr. Fields, who initially opposed student drug-testing, made a list of what was learned as a result of his district’s experience with this prevention program. Number one was “. . . athlete drug testing is powerful in changing the party environment of a high school.” The evidence “. . . from athletes, coaches, teachers, parents, and the community is that the drug testing program has caused drugs of all kinds, including alcohol, to be used less.” (Source: Gary M. Fields, Ph.D., “Student Drug Testing—A Six Year Success Story of One High School,” *Drug Watch World News*, December 2003, p. 10.)

Durant School District, Oklahoma: Greg Howse, Safe School Director stated that school officials determined that the percentage of students who tested positive for marijuana has decreased from 20 percent to 11 percent in less than three years. He cites another success of the program in that a handful of students have thanked him for a program that gives them an excuse to refuse drugs. (Source: Jennifer Palmer and Wendy K. Kleinman, “Durant finds drug testing works,” *The Oklahoman*, February 1, 2008)

Hunterdon Central Regional High School District, Flemington, New Jersey: Lisa Brady, Ph.D., former principal, now superintendent of the district stated that: “After implementing Hunterdon’s program [in 1997], student drug use was dramatically reduced.

That fact has been inspiring enough to help us remain committed to the program even in the face of legal challenges. I have witnessed the change in both the school climate as it relates to drug use and the positive impact it has had on the entire student population. During the court case . . . , the school ceased the random testing program but began to experience a rapid increase in problems associated

---

**“At Hunterdon Central, we have had no students elect to drop from activities since the re-implementation of our program. This has mirrored our experience when we first implemented our program in 1997.” –Lisa Brady, 2003**

---

with school sponsored activities. For the first time in three years, students were found intoxicated on school overnight trips . . . . In addition, there was an alarming increase in the use of marijuana by student athletes as was reported by the student athletes themselves.” In 2003<sup>21</sup> the school re-implemented its program. “At Hunterdon Central, we have had no students elect to drop from activities since the re-implementation of our program. This has mirrored our experience when we first implemented our program in 1997.” (Sources: Lisa Brady, “Unlocking the Potential: Random drug testing works for this New Jersey high school—along with a strong student assistance program for referrals,” and Lisa Brady, “Commentary,” *Student Assistance Journal*, Summer 2003, Vol. 15, No. 3)

---

<sup>21</sup>Hunterdon Central Regional High School won their case in the New Jersey Supreme Court. See <http://www.studentdrugtesting.org> for a summary and the ruling in the case.

Jefferson Parish Public School System, Louisiana: School Board member Julie Quinn stated that “Ultimately, the argument boils down to whether school drug testing actually works. Does testing for drugs deter students from future drug use? . . . if you ask the people on the front lines—the teachers,

---

**“Ultimately, the argument boils down to whether school drug testing actually works. Does testing for drugs deter students from future drug use? . . . if you ask the people on the front lines—the teachers, principals and parents—the answer is absolutely yes.”**  
—Julie Quinn, 2003

---

principals and parents—the answer is absolutely yes. School officials are so pleased with the program and its results [in deterring drug use and getting help for drug users] that we are expanding it for next year [2003–2004].” (Source: Julie Quinn, “Op-ed: Random drug screenings move into the locker-lined halls of learning,” *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, June 8, 2003.)

Abbey School, Faversham, Kent: Peter Walker, former Headmaster began a three-year student drug-testing program in 2004. Mr. Walker gave the project “full marks” after it wiped out drug use among students who, one year before, had self-reported drug use at a level of about 40% of students. “Parents want children to learn in a drug-free environment. This scheme can guarantee this. This year, 40 percent of pupils achieved five good GCSE passes, compared with 26 percent last year and 32 percent the year before. I believe it [student drug testing program] contributed to an all-time high in GCSE pass rates. It has had an effect on contributions in the classroom and on behaviour - with far less disruption . . . .” (Sources: Ryan Sabey, “Couldn't Do Better, School Head's Praise for Drug Test Results,” *News of The World*, April 24th, 2005. “Drug tests help exam passes soar,” BBC News, August 30, 2005)

De La Salle High School, New Orleans, Louisiana: Yvonne R. Gelpi, Principal in testimony about the school’s program, begun in 1997, stated that in three years detentions for fighting were reduced by 85 percent and those for disruptive behavior decreased 65 percent. “Mandatory drug testing works. The purpose of our drug testing program . . . is intended to stop an undesirable behavior that is interfering with learning. We have had no incidence [of false positive test results] in over 2,500 drug tests.” (Source: U. S. Congress. House. Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform, *Hearing on Drug Testing in Schools: An Effective Deterrent?* 106<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, May 30, 2000, 16–17, Washington, D.C.)

---

**“We have had no incidence [false positive test results] in over 2,500 drug tests.”—Yvonne Gelpi, 2000**

---

De La Salle High School, New Orleans, Louisiana: Aaron Middleberg, former student (1995–1999), when asked by Principal Gelpi for his opinion about the student drug-testing program, he told her that the people who had been hanging around outside the school were gone and that the “number one thing that had made a difference was, every single student in De La Salle had a reason to say no. It is not a punishment, it is a privilege to know someone cares that much about you.” (Source: U. S. Congress. House. Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform, *Hearing on Drug Testing in Schools: An Effective Deterrent?* 106<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, May 30, 2000, 46, Washington, D.C.)

Homestead High School, Southwest Allen County, Indiana: Kyle Brown, Junior, in a 2004 Letter to the Editor about his school’s plan to implement a student drug-testing program as response to an editorial. “Monday’s editorial stated that random drug tests are too expensive, of questionable deterrent value and a violation of privacy rights. My school is considering drug tests that cost \$15 each . . . .Certainly, we value our freedom. But if there’s one thing we’ve learned . . . , it is that our freedom has a price. If that means drug testing, so be it. It’s a price I’m willing to pay. The drug-testing proposal gives students a solid and defensible reason to say “no” to drugs and alcohol. It is a reason that will be understood and accepted by our classmates.” (Source: Kyle Brown, Letter to the Editor: “Drug testing in schools will let students be accountable,” *Ft. Wayne Indiana Journal Gazette*, June 23, 2004)

---

**“The drug-testing proposal gives students a solid and defensible reason to say “no” to drugs and alcohol. It is a reason that will be understood and accepted by our classmates.”**  
**– Kyle Brown, student 2004**

---

Marion County Public School District, Ocala, Florida: The Marion County Public Schools District compiled statistics on its random testing program demonstrating that drug-use among students has dropped by one-third since the program’s inception in 2004. According to spokesperson Kevin Christian, “. . . the program is working. It removes the temptation for many students. The results show students are making good decisions.” (Source: Joe Callahan, “Drug use declines among Marion students in sports and clubs,” *The Star-Banner*, August 22, 2007)

Oceanside Unified School District, Oceanside, California: Kenneth A. Noonan, superintendent and vice president of the California State Board of Education commented on the district’s student random drug-testing program in a Letter to the Editor of a local newspaper, “. . . the safety of students at school or school activities should be the highest priority of school districts. In 1997, the Oceanside Unified Board of Education recognized that student athletes under the influence of drugs may endanger themselves or others. Students who are under the influence of drugs while playing a sport are a danger to themselves, but they are also putting their teammates and members of the opposing team at risk.” The district believes strongly in the program and its benefits as demonstrated by Dr. Noonan’s final comments, “It has been in operation for nine years and will continue until decided otherwise by the Board of Education or by a court with jurisdiction.” (Source: Kenneth A. Noonan, Letter to the Editor, “Drug testing succeeds in O’side,” *North County Times*, March 6, 2006)

Scott County School District, Huntsville, Tennessee: Judge Jamie Cotton, founder of the Schools Together Allowing No Drugs (STAND) program that helped to bring random drug testing of students to the district in 2001, noted that there had been a “steep decline in the number of recidivism, the repeat offenders, and in the number of positive tests overall.” He affirmed that “The program has improved students’ behavior and decreased the drug problem.” Scott High School principal Sharon Wilson stated “We think it’s very effective.” (Sources: Heryn Riendeau, “Scott County’s School Drug Testing Program Cuts Student Drug Use,” *WBIR-TV News*, Knoxville, Tennessee, March 2005.)

Pequannock Valley School, Pompton Plains, New Jersey: Dr. William H. Trusheim, Principal, in a message of October 2006 stated that “our random drug testing program . . . has enjoyed a successful first year of existence.” The volunteer program “has grown to almost 80% participation through volunteerism. Students here are making a commitment to live drug and alcohol free. I feel that testing has been a successful deterrent for the students in our district. The reception has been overwhelmingly

positive and we plan to keep spreading the message.”

Bayside Academy, Daphne, Alabama: Tom Johnson, headmaster of the private school when asked to

---

**“I’ve been headmaster for about 25 years. It’s probably number one on my list of the best things I’ve ever done.”**  
**—Tom Johnson, 2004**

---

comment on the impact of the school’s student random drug-testing program said, “I’ve been headmaster for about 25 years. It’s probably number one on my list of the best things I’ve ever done.”  
(Source: *Mobile Press-Register*, 2004)

Killeen Independent School District, Killeen, Texas: Tal Anderson, special assistant superintendent of the district, in a report to the school board stated that “Most of our parents were very supportive and grateful when I told them their child had tested positive for drugs . . .” (Source: Hillary S. Meeks, “School officials: Random drug testing a success,” *Killeen Daily Herald*, April 18, 2007)

Stonefountain College, Athlone, South Africa: Shaheed Shaik, College Head, introduced the policy January of 2006 and it was noted that the program “has been so successful in ridding the school of its narcotics problem that the national department of education is considering extending the programme to other schools. The response has been huge. . . .” (Source: Babalo Ndenze, “Pandor keen to extend Cape drug testing,” *The Cape Times*, 3, November 24, 2006)

Pike County School District, Kentucky: The school district credits its student random drug-testing program with, in their words, “. . . keeping kids off drugs.” In fact, the district’s school board members have voted to expand the program to include more students after a recent survey showed fewer students using drugs than when the testing program was initiated in 2003. (Source: *WYMT Mountain News*, April 2006)

Vista Unified School District, Vista California: Pat Moramarco, athletic director at Vista High School stated that “Some parents said they were concerned that students would stay out of extracurricular activities to avoid being tested, but that hasn’t happened. In fact, enrollment in extracurricular activities has increased slightly this year at the school.” (Source: Stacy Brandt, “Vista Unified’s drug-testing program called a success,” *North County Times*, May 3, 2006)

Georgetown Independent School District, Georgetown, Texas: Joe Dan Lee, Superintendent says the program is working and that the district expanded the program to include students in activities beyond athletics. Shirley Rinn, parent of a Georgetown student athlete said, “it’s a positive program because it’s about more than just punishing students.” (Source: Melissa McGuire, “Georgetown ISD to expand drug program,” *KVUE News*, June 6, 2006)

Tallasse City Schools, Alabama: James T. Jeffers, superintendent commented in a recent article that “For those of us in leadership, the random student drug testing is an expression of our concern for our students and our commitment to helping them grow up as drug-free, healthy and productive adults. The experience in Tallasse has been positive for our students, their families, our school and our community.” He further stated, “The student drug testing program has been well received and

universally supported in the community. Rather than being radical and polarizing, random student drug testing has been embraced by students, parents, teachers and others . . . as an effective supplement to what we teach in the classroom. Random student drug testing reinforces every other prevention program in our school by supporting the no-use standard with testing that is linked to non-punitive consequences.” (Source: James T. Jeffers, “Altering Minds and Reality Through Drug Testing.” *The School Administrator*, 34–5, January 2008)

---

**“Rather than being radical and polarizing, random student drug testing has been embraced by students, parents, teachers and others . . . as an effective supplement to what we teach in the classroom.” —James T. Jeffers, 2008**

---

Milford Exempted Village School District, Missouri: John Frye, superintendent in commenting on having only one positive test result out of 100 random tests performed stated very simply, “Never before have so many negatives added up to such a positive in the Milford schools.”

Hackettstown High School, Hackettstown, New Jersey: Chris Steffner, former principal says “Drug testing students works. The results show testing deters teen drug use.” She commented that she had seen many efforts to keep students from using drugs such as education programs, Just Say No campaigns, scary speeches from people who were caught driving drunk. “None of those things have any lasting impact, peer pressure is so strong.” Stacy Heller, student assistance counselor at the school was quoted in a newspaper article about the school’s two-year old program saying, “Drug use for the school’s 11th- and 12th-grade students, who have been tested the longest, is down significantly.” The school surveyed its students in the Spring of 2004 prior to starting the random-testing program. It re-surveyed students in the Spring of 2006 and compared the data to find that, as one example, there was a decrease in marijuana use among senior students from 45 percent to 29 percent for the two years the program has been in place. (Source: “Principal: Drug Testing Students Works,” *USA Today*, Nation section, July 11, 2006 and Lynn Olanoff, “Student Drug Use Down; Uncertain if Testing is Cause,” *The Express-Times* (New Jersey), October 23, 2006)

Sundown Independent School District, Sundown, Texas: Mike Motherall, superintendent of one of the first districts in the U.S. to implement student and employee drug testing, in an open letter describing Sundown’s program stated, “The biggest change we saw was in attitudes, reductions in discipline referrals, [increases in] extra-curricular participation, and in a positive overall feeling in the district. Without a doubt, mandatory drug testing, when put in place for the right reasons, and with careful consideration to its implementation, is an extremely positive and effective deterrent to the use of drugs.” (Source: Mike Motherall, Open Letter, <http://www.studentdrugtesting.org>)

San Clemente High School, San Clemente, California: Charles Hinman, principal, whose school has a voluntary student random drug-testing program, spoke about his school’s program to Fresno educational leaders, saying, “The program gives students an excuse to say no to peers who may invite

---

**“If there’s five people coming at you to use drugs, you can say, ‘I’m being tested.’ There won’t be as much pressure.” —Phillip Cortez, 2004**

---

them to do drugs. They can say that their parents made them enroll in the program and that they could be tested at any time. The intent of the program is not to catch kids doing drugs. It is partly to arm them with a way to face peer pressure.” San Clemente High spends \$7,000 a year on its voluntary testing program, using funds it

receives from student parking fees. Several students from Fresno's Roosevelt High School attended Mr. Hinman's presentation and agreed that a testing program would give students an excuse to say no to drugs. Senior Phillip Cortez was quoted as saying, "If there's five people coming at you to use drugs, you can say, 'I'm being tested.' There won't be as much pressure." (Source: Anne Dudley Ellis and Marc Benjamin, "Student drug tests explored; Autry pushes random but voluntary system," *The Fresno Bee*, March 19, 2004)

Bullitt County School District, Shepherdsville, Kentucky: Jaime Goldsmith, District director of safe and drug-free schools states, "We have had nothing but success with this program." The Bullitt District's program has been expanded from two high schools to encompass athletes and students in competitive extracurricular groups at all of its middle and high schools. (Source: Daarel Burnette II, "Bullitt will expand student drug testing," *Courier-Journal* [Louisville], April 15, 2008)

Scottsbluff School District, Scottsbluff, Nebraska: Galen Nighswonger, high school principal, in a report on the first year of the district's random-testing program, stated, "The committee worked very hard to provide a tool which would have a positive effect on our students. The extremely low number of positive tests indicates the program is worth the cost." (Source: Mindy Burbach, "Random Student Drug Testing," Scottsbluff School District, Galen Nighswonger, First Year Report to the Board of Education, July 05, 2007)

*This sampling of comments was created from a review of hundreds of media interviews, articles, school reports, letters and messages. The comments chosen are representative of what the experts are saying about their experience with student random drug-testing programs. C. E. Edwards, May 2008*



**STUDENT DRUG-TESTING COALITION**

Helping students pursue a better future.

A PROJECT OF THE  
DRUG-FREE PROJECTS COALITION,  
INC.  
PROGRAMS AND STRATEGIES TO  
PREVENT AND REDUCE DRUG USE  
© 2008