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**This Month in the NEWS**

CSG’s four regions are busy preparing for their annual meetings this summer.

The National Assembly of Quebec will host the 47th Annual Meeting and Regional Policy Forum for The Council of State Governments’ Eastern Regional Conference (ERC). The meeting will be held Aug. 12–15. This year’s theme is “Regional Challenges, Innovative Opportunities: Sharing State-Province Expertise.”

The 62nd Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Legislative Conference will be held Aug. 26–29 in Traverse City, Mich. This year’s theme is “Lighthouse for New Ideas.”

The 61st meeting of the Southern Legislative Conference will be held July 14–18 in Williamsburg, Va. In addition to meetings of various task forces and committees, the meeting will include a discussion of the Federal Real ID legislation and financial implications for the states.

The Council of State Governments-WEST will meet Sept. 16–19 in the Jackson Lake Lodge at Grand Teton National Park. The theme for the Wyoming meeting is “Energizing the West!”

You can find out more about the annual meetings in the regions by visiting the CSG home page, and clicking on the regions at the top of the page.

---

**What Do You Think?**

*State News* is here to serve you, our membership. Do you have issues you’d like to see us cover? Is something going on in your state that might be helpful to other states in similar situations? Let us know. Visit the CSG Web site, www.csg.org, and click on the Capitol Comments link. Click on the Talk Back link in the blog and give us your input.

**Dealing With Alzheimer’s Disease**

States are facing many challenges in providing quality health care services to their elderly citizens. One issue involves Medicaid supported long-term care services for patients with Alzheimer’s disease. An upcoming *State News* article will focus on state policies on care for Alzheimer’s patients. What is your state doing, and what do you think needs to be done? Visit Capitol Comments, CSG’s blog, and click on the Health link to add your comments.

**Talk Back**

What would you like to see covered in Capitol Comments? Click on the Talk Back category link on the CSG blog and give us some ideas of the type of information you seek.

---

**capitol trivia**

**Question:**

Every state has two members in the U.S. Senate, but which states have the fewest number of representatives in Congress? Which state has the most representatives?

*To find the answer, log onto CSG’s Web site at www.csg.org!*
Maryland policymakers are encouraging families in their state to Take 15 for the Family. The statewide initiative encourages families to dedicate at least 15 minutes each day to everyday activities, like eating dinner, and make these moments into learning opportunities.

The initiative’s goals include building awareness among parents that involvement in their children’s education is critical. It provides resources to make their involvement easy and fun.

Resources include Take 15’s Web site, which includes parent tips in English and Spanish, suggestions for family activities, and links to Maryland Public Libraries and other family-friendly Web sites.

For example, an activity sheet titled “Help girls improve their self-esteem” encourages families to talk with their daughters about gender stereotypes and think critically about how girls and women are portrayed. It also encourages the use of inclusive language, such as police officer instead of policeman.

The links page of the Web site promotes other state programs, like Eat Smart, Be Fit Maryland, and national organizations like The National Center for Family Literacy.

To find out more tips from Take 15 for the Family, visit http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/familylit/Take15/overview.

CSPN’s Redesigned Web Site Offers New Functions

For families saving for a child’s college education, timing is of the essence and so is accuracy of information. That’s why the College Savings Plans Network—a nonprofit association representing 529 college savings plans—recently launched a redesigned Web site at www.Collegesavings.org.

The enhanced site not only educates families about the importance of saving for college, it also makes it easy for families to find, view and compare 529 plan information. These plans, named after Section 529 of the Internal Revenue Code, are tax-advantaged investment plans designed to encourage saving for the future higher education expenses of a designated beneficiary.

Visitors to the site can take advantage of an investor education component called The 529 Classroom. This special section explores the importance of saving for college and provides useful information about 529 plans. Visitors can quickly get up-to-speed through a series of frequently asked questions and other resources.

“We want all American families to know that a college education is an achievable dream—they just need to plan for it,” said Jackie Williams, executive director of the Ohio Tuition Trust Authority and chair of CSPN. “Our goal with the Web site is to give families the tools and information they need to make an educated decision about the best way to save for college. We also want people to know that 529 plans are an excellent tool to reach your financial goals in a tax-advantaged way. There’s a 529 plan to fit virtually every budget and need.”

For those actively searching for a plan, the site connects to all state-administered 529 plans across the country. The highlight of the site is the database-driven features that allow families to select and compare 529 plans by state or specific plan features. Collegesavings.org also offers a host of information, including downloadable literature, relevant news articles and links to government and non-profit sites.

Founded in 1991, CSPN is an affiliate of the National Association of State Treasurers. Established to make higher education more attainable, the network serves as a clearinghouse for information and monitors federal activities and promotes legislation that helps families save for college.

“The new Web site represents the states continued commitment to providing consumer-friendly resources to families across the country. I would encourage anyone interested in learning about 529 plans to take a few minutes to educate themselves and explore their opportunities by going to Collegesavings.org,” said Mississippi State Treasurer Tate Reeves, president of the National Association of State Treasurers.
More foreign-born residents than ever are becoming naturalized U.S. citizens, according to a March report from the Pew Hispanic Center.

According to the report, the number of naturalized citizens increased by 144 percent from 1995–2005—the sharpest increase among immigrants from any country. The population of immigrants eligible for naturalization in 2005 was 8.5 million; of these more than a third, or nearly 3 million, were Mexican.

The report also found that the longer immigrants have been in the United States, the more likely it is they will become citizens. Men and women are about equally likely to naturalize. Immigrants are more likely to naturalize if they speak English well, are highly educated or have high incomes. Homeowners and immigrants married to U.S. citizens are more likely to be naturalized than those who rent or are married to non-citizens.

In total, the report says, there are nearly 4.4 million naturalized citizens from Latin America, 4 million from Asia, 2.8 million from Europe and Canada, and 444,000 from Africa and other regions. The naturalized citizen population from the Middle East is 726,000, but its numbers grew 156 percent from 1995 to 2005.

The Pew Hispanic Center is a nonpartisan research organization supported by The Pew Charitable Trusts. The Center’s mission is to improve understanding of the diverse Hispanic population and to chronicle Latinos’ growing impact on the nation.

To find out more about this report, visit the center’s Web site at http://pewhispanic.org/.

State Tort Reforms Vary, Need Work, Study Says

State and federal initiatives to enact medical malpractice tort reforms lack empirical bases for understanding how reforms might affect malpractice premiums and costs, a recent report by Health Affairs says.

The health public policy journal report provides a state-by-state analysis of tort provisions and tort law provisions associated with high and low claims frequency and payment levels.

State reform efforts vary widely. Some states have limited recoverable damages, but even the limits differ in scope and stringency from state to state. Some limit total damages while others limit “pain and suffering” damages, and still others limit damages but retain major exceptions.

According to the report, state tort revisions primarily fall into four categories:

- **Reducing reliance on lay juries:** In response to physicians’ concern about being judged by laypersons, some states have required that medical experts be of the same specialty as the physician facing a suit, or actually be practicing physicians. For example, in West Virginia, expert witnesses must practice or have training in diagnosing or treating conditions similar to the plaintiff’s and devote at least 60 percent of their professional time in clinical practice or teaching in that field or specialty.

- **Limits on damages and attorney’s fees:** Some states restrict the amounts that medical malpractice claimants can recover. In 1975, California limited pain, suffering, inconvenience, physical impairment, disfigurement and other “noneconomic damages” to $250,000 and has not subsequently adjusted this amount.

- **Apportioning liability and specifying how payments are made:** Legislatures have changed rules governing joint and several liability, whether damages are made in lump sum or periodic payments, and how far collateral sources of payments would reduce damage awards. For example, Kansas limits damages to the portion of the injury caused by each defendant, while Pennsylvania subjects negligent defendants to liability for the entire amount only when they are responsible for 60 percent or more of an injury.

- **Time period for commencing a suit:** States have changed statutes of limitations, usually resulting in a shortened window of opportunity for bringing malpractice suits. But some states start the clock from the moment of injury, while others impose time limits only after a reasonable period for discovering injuries.

The study found that tort law changes have had a measurable but limited impact on physician malpractice claims, depending on the size and strength of the tort reform. According to the study, no tort provisions enacted to date address patient safety. It suggests that future initiatives should take a creative approach toward integrating tort law and patient safety measures in order to improve accountability and quality of care.

To view the entire report, visit http://content.healthaffairs.org/cgi/content/full/26/2/500?ijkey=SsPWI5njhmmw&keytype=ref&siteid=healthaff#SEC4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>16.00¢</td>
<td>2.00¢</td>
<td>2.30¢</td>
<td>38.70¢</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>8.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.40¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>18.00¢</td>
<td>1.00¢</td>
<td>37.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>21.50¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.20¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>18.00¢</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
<td>20.90¢</td>
<td>58.50¢</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>22.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>25.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>23.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. of Columbia</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>20.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>4.00¢</td>
<td>10.90¢</td>
<td>4.07¢</td>
<td>12.94¢</td>
<td>50.31¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>7.50¢</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>7.80¢</td>
<td>1.00¢</td>
<td>17.70¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>16.00¢</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>10.82¢</td>
<td>1.12¢</td>
<td>31.85¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>25.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>19.00¢</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>16.24¢</td>
<td>30¢</td>
<td>55.80¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>18.00¢</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>12.60¢</td>
<td>80¢</td>
<td>49.80¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>21.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>24.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>16.90¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.70¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>20.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>26.80¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.70¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>23.50¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.90¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>21.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.90¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>19.00¢</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>10.93¢</td>
<td>88¢</td>
<td>49.20¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>20.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>18.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.80¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>17.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.95¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>27.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.15¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>27.10¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>23.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.91¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>18.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>10.50¢</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>4.00¢</td>
<td>32.90¢</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>17.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>8.00¢</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>15.90¢</td>
<td>35¢</td>
<td>60.10¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>29.90¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.55¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>23.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>28.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>16.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>24.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.30¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>12.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.70¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>30.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>16.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.15¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>22.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>20.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.80¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>20.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>24.50¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.90¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>19.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>17.50¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.60¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>34.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>20.50¢</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>6.50¢</td>
<td>45.40¢</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>30.90¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.30¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>18.40¢</td>
<td>13.00¢</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.40¢</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal gasoline tax includes 0.1¢ to the Leaking Underground Storage Tank account.

*State sales taxes only. Retail or wholesale tax fixed in cents/gal. † Other business taxes included. Sales tax cents per-gallon rates calculated by applying the percentage rate to the national average price-per-gallon of gasoline (US all grades, all formulations) as estimated by the Energy Information Administration (07/01/06–12/31/06).

Source: Washington Department of Transportation.
State legislatures around the country increasingly are learning how information technology can reshape the future of health care. But states face numerous obstacles in their efforts to adopt health IT, including determining who pays for it and how the privacy of exchanged information is ensured.

By Sean Slone
Health care providers and state officials believe they have seen the future of health care. It looks something like this:

- Doctors use electronic health records (EHRs) to compile the legal and permanent institutional records of patient care. No more paper files scattered around multiple doctors’ offices.
- Prescriptions are created, processed and communicated electronically. No more worrying whether the pharmacist can interpret a doctor’s notoriously bad handwriting.
- Physicians use easily-transportable, tablet-style computers to chart vital signs, access test results, get a list of recommended procedures and exchange information with other providers.

Patients also play a more active role in this brave new world. Personal Health Records (PHRs), which they can access online, hold the history of all their encounters with the health care system. Health data Web sites allow consumers to compare health care services, facilities and health plans by accessing quality and cost information. They can take online personal health assessments, identify steps to healthier lifestyles and monitor their progress.

Several states are well on their way to realizing this future and to seeing the benefits of lower cost, higher quality health care. The benefits develop from:

- The creation of permanent health records that can’t be lost in a natural disaster or emergency, which can help prevent duplicative tests and medicine interactions that contribute to 30 percent of annual wasted health care dollars;
- The personalization and standardization of preventive care; and
- The provision of greater access to information for health care consumers.

But states face numerous obstacles in their efforts to adopt health IT, including determining who pays for it and how, and ensuring the privacy and confidentiality of the information exchanged.

After 30 years of struggling through the old way, I think I was peculiarly adapted to see some of the potential of it (information technology). I thought of all the time I spent sorting through papers and trying to call and get information and history and records, and I thought it would be marvelous to have that information at hand.

—Dr. Gary Dillon
Indiana state senator
Kentucky’s e-Health Network

Kentucky’s experience with e-health began in 2005 with the passage of legislation that called for the creation of a secure, interoperable statewide electronic health network. No deadline for full implementation was attached. The law created the Kentucky e-Health Network Board—composed of leaders from government, academia, public health and the private sector—to accomplish this goal. The board was charged with making recommendations about various strategies for creating the network.

Since its creation, the board has been involved with long-term planning and smaller short-term projects such as a grant program to develop e-prescribing in the state. The board also completed an inventory and assessment detailing the needs and challenges facing the adoption of health IT and information exchange.

But perhaps the state’s most significant project is the Kentucky Health Information Partnership.

“What we heard over and over again from experts around the country was that getting doctors and hospitals and other health care entities to adopt electronic medical records is really a long-term call,” said Trudi Matthews, senior policy adviser in the Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services. “And if you put all your efforts toward just that, it’s going to take you awhile to get there. But if you can, while you’re working on that goal, also really focus on taking the information that’s already available electronically—and there’s quite a bit of it—and figure out how to exchange it, you can not only provide real value in a clinical setting but you can also move adoption of health IT forward faster.”

The partnership’s efforts to marshal existing data from insurance claims forms will mean that at the end of two years, the state will have the foundation of a statewide health information exchange with information on more than 60 percent of Kentucky residents.

“No other state at this point has anything close to it,” Matthews said. “We’ve got a lot of additional work to do to get every person in Kentucky to have a fully functional, interoperable electronic health record. But we’ll have a whole lot more information available with this project than we would otherwise.”

Indiana’s Private Sector Approach

Just across the Ohio River from Kentucky, Indiana’s electronic health initiatives have evolved in a different way.

The Indiana Health Information Exchange (IHIE) was created in 2004 to serve the five major hospital systems in Indianapolis. It provides physicians with a single source for clinical lab and test results and hospital encounter information from all participating central Indiana hospitals. The IHIE currently serves only the central Indiana region but plans exist to extend the network and to add additional services.

“The hospital communities in and around Indianapolis had a real vision on health information exchange and they basically took the position that it makes a lot of sense to have a single entity be responsible for delivering all of our results,” said Thomas Penno, the IHIE’s chief operating officer. “So they created the IHIE to do just that—to be the post office, if you will, to deliver the results.”

Penno said this clinical messaging service was an easy way to get the health IT ball rolling in Indiana.

“I just can’t emphasize enough that you’ve got to go slow and tackle the easier stuff, the low-hanging fruit. And clinical messaging we think is one of them. For us, it (didn’t) require a huge amount of capital to get going,” he said.

Penno believes clinical messaging is a model that can quickly pay dividends.

“You can quickly turn it into a cash positive, self-supporting service. Then what you’ve basically done is laid the architecture to connect the health information components … Then you can start to look at layering on different services,” he said.

State government has taken notice of the IHIE as well as similar efforts like one in the South Bend area. State Sen. Gary Dillon sponsored legislation in 2005 to establish a medical informatics commission to study health information and communication technology in Indiana. The commission last year recommended the creation of a public-private corporation to facilitate the development of a statewide network.

“The commission felt that we should have an ongoing corporation that would go out, provide the expertise and encourage and help develop standards so that all these entities can communicate with one another,” Dillon said. “So we took the approach that it would not be a state run entity … We felt with all the expertise we had going that it made sense to assist these private efforts.”

Dillon, a physician, said he’s an unlikely champion for health IT since he’s not exactly a “techie” himself. But when it came to recognizing the possibility and the promise of health IT, he didn’t need a lot of convincing.

“After 30 years of struggling through the old way, I think I was peculiarly adapted to see some of the potential of it,” he said. “I thought of all the time I spent sorting through papers and trying to call and get information and history and records, and I thought it would be marvelous to have that information at hand.”
What States Are Doing

State legislatures around the country increasingly are seeing how information technology can reshape the future of health care. During 2005 and 2006, more than 35 health IT bills were passed and signed into law. More than 65 bills have been introduced in 30 states in 2007 so far.

Some of these state initiatives are being generated first in the executive branch. Governors in at least 15 states have issued executive orders calling for the development of health IT strategies.

“I think governors play a critical role in all of this for a number of reasons,” said Janet Marchibroda, CEO of eHealth Initiative, a Washington, D.C.-based nonprofit that advocates on health IT issues. “When you think about what’s needed to drive improvements in our health care system, particularly with the use of health IT and mobilizing data across very fragmented entities whose incentives are sometimes not aligned, (it) requires leadership across the state.

“The governor’s involvement, whether it’s through the executive order or convening a steering committee to help with planning or simply putting money in the budget request to the state legislature, just plays an important role in supporting existing efforts as well as beginning ones where none exist.”

Many states have authorized a commission to provide leadership and advice on statewide IT adoption. Marchibroda says the commissions convene diverse groups of stakeholders to assess the health IT environment in the state. They then begin to divvy up their work in similar ways, with working groups focusing on issues like finances, governance, technical considerations, and privacy and confidentiality.

Legislation in many states has authorized studies, called for the integration of quality goals, instituted grants or loan programs, and set target dates for the adoption of EHRs.

“Some folks say we need a certification process or we need more regulations (about what states can do),” Marchibroda said. “(But) this is working very nicely organically. There is so much cross pollination and discussion and sharing of best practices across states.”

Building infrastructure is becoming a key objective for states as well, with many facilitating the creation of regional health information organizations (RHIOs) similar to Indiana’s IHIE. It is hoped these organizations will become the foundation of a national health information network.

“At the state level, you’re primarily seeing coordination, education, planning, sharing, figuring out the role of the state as purchaser,” Marchibroda said. “But what’s happening is the actual health information exchange networks themselves are cropping up around medical trading areas or regions, communities within the state … What we found is, in order to get to sustainability, you really need to provide value within the local market.”

President Bush in 2004 called for most Americans to have an EHR by 2014. He established the position of National Coordinator for Health Information Technology and charged him with pursuing a 10-year strategy for the adoption of EHRs and the creation of a National Health Information Network (NHIN) to connect those records.

Bush also signed an executive order last year calling on the federal government to provide better information to consumers on the price and quality of health care. This federal transparency initiative also calls on the government to establish and utilize standards for quality and health information technology in its health care purchasing decisions.

Other federal action includes creation of a commission to validate health IT products for functionality, interoperability and security standards, as well as creation of a public-private partnership to develop interoperability standards with regard to health IT software.

Playing Catch Up

Despite all the activity, the U.S. is far behind other countries in adopting health IT. According to a recent survey, only 28 percent of U.S. doctors use EHRs, compared with 98 percent in the Netherlands, 92 percent in New Zealand and 89 percent in the United Kingdom. Only 23 percent of U.S. doctors have access to computerized alerts about potentially harmful drug doses or interactions, compared to 93 percent in the Netherlands. And 40 percent of U.S. doctors say they find it “very difficult” or “impossible” to identify patients overdue for preventive care or tests.

As Kentucky Gov. Ernie Fletcher, a family practice physician, told the recent e-Health Summit in Louisville, “even though our diagnostic and treatment modalities have changed substantially, the process of delivering that health care has not significantly changed keeping up with technology.”

Moreover, the U.S. health care system lags most other economic sectors in adopting information technology.

“It’s estimated that most industries in America spend an average of about $8,000 per worker on information technology,” Fletcher said. “That figure is just $1,000 per worker in the health care industry. We’ve got a lot of catching up to do in investing in technology.”

Marchibroda at eHealth Initiative agrees, but remains optimistic.

“We’re way behind on all fronts,” she said. “We’re at a competitive disadvantage given the dollars we spend on health care and the quality of our health care related to other countries … But I think we’re sort of approaching a convergence of a number of things that are going to move us ahead in the next five years.”

—Sean Slone is a health policy analyst at the Council of State Governments.
At the state level, you’re primarily seeing coordination, education, planning, sharing, figuring out the role of the state as purchaser. But what’s happening is the actual health information exchange networks themselves are cropping up around medical trading areas or regions, communities within the state … What we found is, in order to get to sustainability, you really need to provide value within the local market.

—Janet Marchibroda
CEO of eHealth Initiative

Health IT: The Benefits and Challenges

Analysts say the cost and quality benefits of adopting health information technology are profound.

“Right now the best estimates are that we waste 30 percent of what we spend in health care because of duplicate tests, drug-to-drug interactions, preventable complications, missed tests and prevention opportunities, the mound of paperwork that providers have to deal with—all of this stuff does not enrich the patient care experience,” said Trudi Matthews, senior policy adviser in the Kentucky Cabinet for Health and Family Services. “We know we can do better.”

Electronic Health Records (EHRs) can help physicians prevent duplicative and costly tests, know what medicines a patient is taking, and provide personalized preventive care reminders to patients. They can also provide valuable information about a patient when he or she suffers injury or illness far from home.

Medical histories stored on EHRs would be less likely to be lost during a natural disaster as well. Many believe the displacement of residents after Hurricane Katrina further confirmed the need for a national health record system.

E-prescribing can help prevent medicine interactions, allergic reactions and medical errors.

Health IT can also help practitioners monitor overall public health. It can allow them to access diagnostic information on a confidential basis from a group of patients and detect trends in disease faster.

Many states also see health IT as an important tool in making health care price and quality information more readily available. Some are using state agency Web sites to publish data on hospital acquired infection rates and hospital errors.

Most importantly, health IT ideally allows physicians to spend more time caring for patients and less time searching for information or shuffling paper.

Barriers and Challenges

States contemplating the adoption of health IT face a number of hurdles.

Variations in state and federal privacy regulations must be worked out, and the transition to EHRs presents administrative challenges and manpower issues. But it’s the high cost of implementing EHRs and health information exchange that remains one of the biggest concerns. States are considering various ways to finance health IT, including through the appropriations process, state grants and contracts, and tax incentives for health IT users.

The numbers are daunting, however. The University of California-Davis recently reported that an effort to set up an electronic health record system there, which was expected to cost $76 million and be completed in 2006, is only half complete and has cost $85 million so far. A recent estimate said it will cost Florida $51 million to build a secure data network for electronic medical information.

“Everybody agrees that e-health has value but figuring out who will help contribute to the effort, figuring out who benefits from a particular e-health application and therefore who should pay for it, is really diffuse,” said Matthews.

Indiana State Sen. Gary Dillon agrees.

“One of the problems is that the cost of getting systems set up is borne by the provider and the benefits accrue to the payers. So you have to work to develop some incentives for some of this to be done,” he said.

Although there are many issues to be resolved in e-health, many states are already making plans for a more high tech health future. In the process they’re making decisions that may lead to substantial improvements in the quality, cost and accessibility of health care.
By Laura Coleman

They have tattoos, piercings or both, aren’t afraid to dye their hair unorthodox colors, and are more culturally and socially tolerant than any other generation. They grew up with personal computers and cell phones and came of age in the shadow of 9/11.

They are heavily involved in their communities and think community engagement is very important. Civic engagement, on the other hand, is a different story—only about four-in-10 agree with the statement, “It’s my duty as a citizen to always vote.”


While this demographic presents very unique challenges to policymakers during campaign seasons, according to Wendy Wheeler, president of the Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development, it’s not impossible to involve these people in the political process.

“I think it’s not real to them. They’re very engaged in things that influence community change,” she said. “But I think the traditional policy influencing structures we have are exclusionary to young people. Statistically young people are very good at raising money for volunteer organizations—through run-walks or fun runs, for example. So it’s not that they don’t want to participate … It’s that the structures aren’t set up in a way that meets their needs or is engaging to them.”

Dr. Dan Shea, director of the Center for Political Participation at Allegheny College, agrees that this generation is more community than politically minded.

“There is a whole bunch of data to suggest that volunteer rates are growing every year, and not just for high school seniors or college freshmen,” Shea said. “But at the same time, the data suggest they are not especially political. There is a disconnect between civic engagement and community engagement. This is very worrisome for us. One generation removed from the political process will have consequences.”

Engaging young people in politics could sound like a tedious task, requiring a bridge to span the perceived generation chasm. But while some characteristics of Generation Next make them very unique, other aspects may prove very similar to those of their lawmaking elders.

What Defines Generation Next?

During the seven-year span when Generation Nexters were born, Ronald Reagan was president, AIDS had just been identified, the Space Shuttle Challenger exploded, terrorists blew up Pan American 747 over Scotland, and the Intifada movement began in the West Bank.
Then, during their more formative years, came the O.J. Simpson trial; the don’t ask, don’t tell military policy; the war in Bosnia; sheep cloning; President Clinton’s impeachment; intellectual property disputes; and most notably, the events of Sept. 11, 2001.

Data from the 2004 U.S. Census indicate that there are about 27,808 Generation Nexters in the United States, and only 14,334 are registered to vote. This means that 48.5 percent of the generation is not registered. Of those who are registered, 58.1 percent reported they do not vote.

Coincidently, most state legislators fall into the Baby Boomer Generation. According to two-year old data from the National Conference of State Legislators, the average state legislator is 56 years old.

Outlook and Worldview

More than nine-in-10 Nexters are satisfied with their family life and with their relationships with their parents, according to a report by the Pew Research Center.

But according to Shea, it’s not just their relationships with family that matter. It’s the connection between their parents’ participation in politics and the child’s future participation that makes a difference.

“It’s a very important variable, which helps explain why fewer young people are turning out to the polls,” Shea said. “Many of their parents came of political age during the 60s and 70s, so they’ve raised their kids to be active, but not through traditional channels.”

This makes sense: The Pew report deemed Generation Next the least traditional generation. Seventy-five percent of young people polled say this generation is more likely to have casual sex than young people 20 years ago, 69 percent say they engage in binge drinking more often than their predecessors, and 63 percent say they use illegal drugs more often.

In the late 1980s, 11 percent of young people classified themselves as non-religious, compared to 20 percent of today’s 18-to 25-year-olds. Forty-three percent of Nexters say churches should keep out of political matters, which is similar to the opinions of Seniors—52 percent say the church should not express their views.

Personal finances and job security

Generation Nexters say the most pressing problem facing them today is financial issues, including bills, debt and the cost of living. In fact, personal finance, listed as a top concern by 30 percent of Nexters, trumped the 16 percent concerned about
finding a job, career advancement, job security and job satisfaction; health care with 2 percent; and the war in Iraq, the national economy, terrorism, gas prices and politics, which collectively came in last place with 2 percent.

It’s crucial for policymakers to know this kind of information, and act on it, according to Dr. Connie Flanagan, professor of youth civic development in the College of Agricultural Sciences at Penn State.

“Young people aren’t disinterested in politics,” said Flanagan. “In some ways, it’s just a language that we use. I would say they have lots of opinions and are highly interested. If you ask youth if they are concerned with getting a secure job and the benefits that go with that, if they’ll be able to pay for health care, they have lots of opinions. They are not only very interested, they are very well-informed.”

Forty-six percent of Generation Nexters are still in school, according to the Pew report, so it is likely they have not settled on a career path. Of the 59 percent who are working, only 21 percent say it is very likely they’ll stay with their present employer for the rest of their working lives. Seventy-one percent are paid an hourly wage, and only 53 percent of employed Generation Nexters receive health care benefits from their employers. As a whole, only 67 percent of this generation is covered by some form of health insurance.

Social Issues

Issues that divided Americans during the past several elections—including gay marriage and creationism—aren’t as controversial for Generation Next.

Sixty-three percent of Generation Nexters believe humans and other living things evolved over time, compared with 47 percent of people ages 41 to 60. Additionally, Gen Nexters are the most likely to believe immigration strengthens American society with 52 percent, followed by the Baby Boomers with 44 percent. Almost six-in-10 Nexters say homosexuality is a way of life that should be accepted by society, and 47 percent favor gay marriage.

“There are real generational differences on social policies and those can be hot button topics in communities, but not as controversial on a college campus,” said Shea. “George Will described what young people think about being gay or not gay is either being right or left-handed. I think that’s a pretty good point.”

Getting Generation Next Involved:
Tips for Policymakers

“Engage with Youth, Not for Youth”

Knowing these traits for Generation Next and brainstorming with legislative staffs on ways to engage with young people is key to getting them involved, Wheeler said.

“The first thing I’d say is to engage young people in issues that matter to them,” she said. “The idea is engaging with youth, not for youth.”

Flanagan agrees. “The strategy of the parties has always been to bring out their base, and I can understand why ... for loyalty, et cetera. But young people aren’t normally in that base so that strategy automatically cuts Generation Next out,” she said.
“Start going to them. Almost nobody comes to them and asks what they think.”

Flanagan said there are stereotypes in dealing with young people, as if every meeting must be a social event. But this isn’t the case.

“Treat young people as people with brains, who have opinions. Engage them in face-to-face discussions,” she said. “Meeting face to face can really build trust. Are you talking the talk or really walking the talk.”

Authentic meetings—not meetings that are set up with pre-planned questions and answers—are very important to this generation, Wheeler said.

“The young people of this generation are very savvy,” she said. “Media literacy is very strong. They know when they’re being marketing objects in campaigns. They recognize ingenious engagement very much faster than other generations. Sometimes they are turned off by politics because the voter is the object rather than the partner.”

According to Shea, election reform options involve policy matters and political parties.

“Same day registration is very important and will work,” he said. “Turnout among younger folks in states with same day registration is dramatically higher. Young people because of their busy lives often miss regular deadlines, but are anxious to vote come Election Day. They are quite mobile and busy with multitasking.”

Hiring young staff members is also crucial.

“Set up partnerships with young people,” said Wheeler. “Look at your own staffs—how you as policymakers do business. Are your advisory structures intergenerational? Do you have an intergenerational staff? Not just interns, but real job tracks for young people.”

Shea agreed. “Give young people positions of responsibility and they will rise to the occasion,” he said. “Just having them to the headquarters or offices to make Xeroxes is not going to cut it.”

Wheeler said engaging with young people will benefit both the legislators and the political process.

“They can bridge gaps across cultures much more easily than older or middle-aged generations,” she said. “They have strengths that generations ahead of them don’t have … obviously with technology. They excel at things the older generations must work on a little more, and with incredible energy and hope in possibility.”

Make Issues Pertinent to Young People

Some experts say young people are more interested in global issues than state or local issues, but most agree that politics has a more noticeable effect closer to home.

“The likelihood of people having an effect is much higher locally than federally,” said Flanagan. “Whether it’s in the state or closer to home, you are much more likely to garner change at the state or local level. The news doesn’t educate people as much on those levels.”

Wheeler said young people are a little bit fuzzy on state and national issues, and that could make a difference in their engagement.

“I don’t have any data, but my impression is they are very concrete on local issues and they also get the global issues, but there is a gap with the state and national,” she said. “They can think about global warming and why their creek is polluted. But what the statehouse does about it is foreign.”

To Meg Heubeck, director of instruction of the Youth Leadership Initiative at the University of Virginia, civics education can supplement the media in this respect.

“Social studies is low on the burner,” she said, because its testing is not included in No Child Left Behind. “Our motto here at YLI is civics all year, every year. If you don’t place a value on it, how can you expect young people to take it seriously?”

Heubeck suggests that policymakers get out and go to classrooms.

“Return your mail. Answer your calls,” she said. “If young people come to your office, take a few minutes to listen and pay attention. Share your story about how you got involved. Even if students don’t agree with you, ultimately they respect the fact you are coming in to talk with them.”

Get the Party Involved

Shea says political parties should strive for a greater impact on young people.

“The argument we’ve made is throughout American history, parties have been instrumental in drawing young people and immigrants into the political process,” he said. “Now they’re
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No Child Left Behind, the federal education act passed by Congress in 2001, is up for reauthorization this year. Education officials across the country are calling for additional funding and for changes that would give them more flexibility in implementing the law.

By Mary Branham Dusenberry
he community of Ten Sleep, Wyo., includes 82 students in kindergarten through 12th grade—in the entire school district.

Ten Sleep’s tiny school district isn’t alone. One-third of Wyoming’s 48 school districts have fewer than 300 students, according to Jim McBride, the state’s superintendent of public instruction. Those districts are much smaller than what No Child Left Behind, the federal education law adopted in 2001, defines as a small school district—one with fewer than 2,500 students.

“If you have a school that’s failing, you have to offer choice,” McBride said. In Wyoming, there’s no real choice to provide. “That’s an issue. We need additional flexibility to address what other options there might be for that community.”

McBride, like many school officials across the country, thinks NCLB is a good law, for the most part. While they applaud the accountability and focus on every child, they would like to see more flexibility and better funding as Congress considers reauthorization this year.

“This is not going to be a quiet reauthorization,” said Jack Jennings, president and CEO of the Center on Education Policy, a research organization that has monitored the effects of NCLB. “It’s going to be a brawl. I don’t think the states or local school districts understood what No Child Left Behind meant when it passed, but they do today. They want to be heard on how it should be rewritten.”

McBride and other state school chiefs have taken steps to ensure their voices are heard. Like McBride, many have drafted recommendations for consideration by their senators and representatives. Organizations such as the National Governors Association (NGA), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), among others, have collectively and separately made recommendations on what changes are needed to achieve the goals of NCLB.

“States are very concerned about what they see is a rigid approach to No Child Left Behind,” Jennings said, “and a lack of funding.”

States Want More Flexibility

No Child Left Behind was passed in 2001 with overwhelming bipartisan support. It coincided with reform movements in many states, according to Gene Wilhoit the director of the CCSSO and formerly Kentucky’s education commissioner.

“It built upon what was happening in many states at the time,” Wilhoit said of NCLB.

“You have to step back and say the overall trend of standards-based reform, which is a bipartisan reform movement going back to the early 1990s, is leading to states taking a much more vigorous role (in education),” Jennings said.

Before NCLB, Jennings said, many states did not have full testing programs and accountability systems. Federal officials believed local control of school districts did not bring about the improvements needed in education. But by stepping in, the federal government has taken a much more active role in education, which traditionally has been a state domain.

“The law was a wake-up call to many states,” Wilhoit said. “The law did provide us a basis for evaluating where we were and where we were going.”

But most see the stringent federal guidelines as a deterrent to carrying out reform in the states, each of which has a variety of school districts.
“A widely diverse urban district is, by definition, going to have to meet more targets than a homogenous suburban district,” Wilhoit said. “So we’ve got to begin to develop systems that recognize those differences.”

State and local school officials’ frustration over the years is evident.

Samantha Anderson, media relations director for the Communities for Quality Education (CQE) in Washington which tracks laws related to NCLB, said over the past five years 23 states have considered opting out of the law entirely, and some have studied how opting out would affect funding. While none of those proposals have passed, 49 states have sought waivers, and 29 have called for full funding of the law.

Now, Anderson said, many state legislatures are hoping their congressional delegation will make recommended changes to NCLB.

The federal government provides about 8 percent of the funding for local school districts, Anderson said. So while there is relatively little funding that accompanies NCLB, “there are a lot of hoops to jump through,” she said. “States are still bearing the brunt of education costs, but have the onus of the requirements of the federal government.”

That’s one area governors, along with CCSSO and NASBE, would like to see changed. Wilhoit said it’s critical that the federal government recognize the traditional role, and authority, of states in education, and give states more authority to carry out the NCLB mandates.

“This is a critical time in our history in educational development,” Wilhoit said. “What a shame it would be to thwart that with a one-size-fits-all education plan.

The Assessments

The law’s focus on subgroups—such as students with disabilities, English language learners and minorities—has drawn universal praise.

“What states are telling us is that No Child Left Behind has brought attention to groups that have been ignored before,” Jennings said.

But it’s created some disparity among school districts, some of which may have more diversity than others. School districts with several subgroups can fall in the failure category of adequate yearly progress (AYP) measurement more quickly than a district with less diversity.

Wilhoit said a school district could miss AYP in multiple subgroups, and would be considered at the same failure level as a district with more subgroups that missed AYP in just one area.

“An urban district … one year may not make AYP because they’re not reaching the goal for, let’s say, non-English speaking students,” he said. “They may deal with that and make that goal next year and miss another single one. They’re still not going to make AYP. That’s a tough game for them to play. They’re bouncing around from one subpopulation to another.”

Wilhoit believes states should have some flexibility in dealing with those districts. While the federal government has granted waivers to states in various areas, NCLB still places some fairly onerous requirements on schools across the country.

The law includes a mandate that every student be proficient by 2014. Most people, including the bill’s co-sponsor Sen. Edward Kennedy, now believe that timetable is unrealistic.

A CQE study of school districts in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts projected that 77 percent and 74 percent of the schools, respectively, would fail to meet the law’s proficiency requirement by 2014, according to Anderson.

Since Wyoming districts have fewer subgroups to measure, McBride believes his state would have an easier time meeting the 100 percent proficiency goal than other states with more diverse and needy students. But he believes attaining that goal will still be mathematically impossible in his state.

“We have 3 or 4 percent (of students) who are cognitively disabled,” he said. “Some of those children, when achieving at their very best, won’t reach that goal.”

Many in education are recommending growth models, which measure individual students’ achievement. McBride believes those models could more accurately gauge students’ education as they progress through school.

Anderson said the current system compares classes from one year to classes from the previous year. “They’re not looking at students as they progress from third grade to fourth grade,” she said. “Growth models do give a much better picture of student improvement.”

Wilhoit believes if growth models are approved, they should not be a one-size-fits-all. “What we want is growth models identified within the context of the different states being able to come forth with models they see fit,” he said.

Four of the 11 joint recommendations of CCSSO, NGA and NASBE deal with assessment. In addition to the growth models, the groups are asking Congress to allow states and local districts to come forth with models they see fit,” he said.
to determine the appropriate testing instruments; to create rewards and penalties for schools that fail to make progress based on tiered success levels rather than the current pass/fail, all-or-nothing guidelines; and to allow flexibility in testing students with disabilities or those who are English language learners.

“If we continue down this path and with the kinds of criteria, regulations and rules and operational interactions we have, it’ll be stifling. We don’t see a way that we’ll be able to reach the lofty goals, the ideals laid out in No Child Left Behind, with that kind of model.”

—Gene Wilhoit, director Council of Chief State School Officers

Funding Falls Short

Implementing No Child Left Behind has been costly to states and local school districts.

“Local school people and state leaders say there’s not enough money to carry out the demands,” said Jennings. “That’s clearly a major complaint about the act.”

Wilhoit said the law created several critical funding needs. States need money for teacher incentives, the additional assessments required under the law, data systems development, research and development, and support for low-performing schools, he said.

“No Child Left Behind is requiring an unbelievable amount of data gathering and data reporting,” he said, adding that states need more money for data systems development. “Five years ago, you probably couldn’t have found 10 states that had individual student identifiers that would track student progress over time.”

Growth models considered by several states would require those identifiers.

In addition, Wilhoit said more schools soon will be identified as low-performing. “It’s not enough to label something as non-performing,” he said. “If this is going to be successful, we’ve got to get in there and help them.”

He’d like to see states receive funding for research and development, and have that research focused on what is happening in the states.

“States need a lot of feedback about what works, what doesn’t work, and we need more money in research to provide the support that’s going to be necessary,” Wilhoit said. “There are a lot of concerns out there. If we don’t get more federal resources, this is not going to be a successful intervention strategy over the next five years. It’s incumbent on Congress to come forward with resources and help us in these areas.”

The penalties in NCLB, including one that requires school districts to offer choice to students at failing schools, add other costs to states and local districts.

“The costs that are involved with school choice can be phenomenal, just for busing alone,” Anderson said.

State departments of education are struggling because of the additional tasks placed on them by NCLB, according to Jennings.

“In this whole reform movement, state departments of education are expected to do all sorts of things they haven’t done before, like setting academic standards, setting up accountability systems, judging the qualifications of local teachers, providing assistance to schools considered failing,” said Jennings. “Most of them say they don’t have the resources to carry out the act adequately.”

State Goals for Reauthorization

While state and local school officials are asking Congress to loosen up on the requirements in NCLB and to more adequately fund the law, the Bush administration and the Commission on No Child Left Behind are seeking new requirements in the act that will put additional burdens on the state.

“You have state officials and local school districts saying the federal government is asking us to do too much without flexibility and enough money,” Jennings said. “The Bush administration and the NCLB Commission, backed by the business community … are saying American schools need to be improved much more, therefore you have to increase the requirements.

“That’ll be the debate,” he said.

Jennings predicts that if Congress does not bring about changes that states and school districts are seeking, there may be another round of lawsuits from school districts wanting to opt out of the law.

Some people on Capitol Hill predict NCLB won’t be reauthorized until after the 2008 presidential election. Wilhoit and others hope that’s not the case.

“If we continue down this path and with the kinds of criteria, regulations and rules and operational interactions we have, it’ll be stifling,” Wilhoit said. “We don’t see a way that we’ll be able to reach the lofty goals, the ideals laid out in No Child Left Behind, with that kind of model.”

—Mary Branham Dusenberry is managing editor for State News magazine.
Three proposals for the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind call for more flexibility and funding, but there are some differences among them.

The Bush Administration
President Bush and Education Secretary Margaret Spellings have been traveling to different states to promote the administration’s “Building on Results: A Blueprint for Strengthening the No Child Left Behind Act.” Among other things, their plan proposes:

- Giving more flexibility for states to measure individual student progress;
- Allowing states to target resources to the most needy students, and improve assessments for students with disabilities and limited English proficiency;
- Incorporating growth models to measure individual progress toward proficiency by 2014;
- Allowing states to prioritize school improvement activities based on school needs;
- Developing a teacher incentive fund, and allowing new teachers in small rural school districts additional time to meet the Highly Qualified Teacher requirements; and
- Allowing vouchers that would allow federal money to follow students at schools in troubled schools to another public or private school in a geographic area.

Commission on No Child Left Behind
The Commission on No Child Left Behind released a 230-page bipartisan report in February that called for a wide-reaching expansion of the law. Among other things, it would:

- Allow states to include achievement growth in calculations for AYP (adequate yearly progress);
- Require schools to ensure all seniors are proficient in reading and math;
- Hold schools accountable for raising science test scores by 2014;
- Establish a definition of a “Highly Effective Principal,” similar to the “Highly Qualified Teacher” designation, and require principals at Title I schools to meet that designation;
- Judge teachers based on student performance;
- Require schools that make AYP to make 10 percent of their seats available for transfers from schools in which students are eligible for choice. If a school district is unable to provide for transfer, the district must offer tutoring to eligible students;
- Create national standards and tests that states would be encouraged to adopt; and
- Provide aggressive and effective interventions for schools targeted for corrective action.

Coalition of State Groups
A coalition of the National Governors Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Association of State Boards of Education in April recommended, among other things:

- Enhancing state accountability systems by allowing growth models to complement existing status measures and promoting the use of multiple measures aligned to state standards;
- Allowing states to retain the authority to determine the appropriate testing instruments in schools;
- Creating a rewards system for states to recognize schools making progress, and assistance for states to help schools that aren’t;
- Providing flexibility in assessing students with disabilities or English language learners;
- Providing flexibility and assistance in helping states develop a highly qualified teacher work force;
- Allowing states to target resources to close the achievement gap;
- Expanding high school programs such as Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB), and providing more funding for such programs; and
- Reinforcing the role of the states’ governors and education departments by recognizing and reinforcing states’ authority over K-12 education.
ICAOS Committee Want to Ensure Sex Offenders Are Monitored Across State Lines

By Mary Branham Dusenberry
Sex offenders in North Carolina are classified by a tier structure, with each level crime determining the punishment. A Tier 1 sex offender, the most severe, would have the most severe punishment, including active GPS tracking for the rest of his life after he leaves prison. New Jersey has no statewide residency requirements, but 113 cities have set restrictions that make it virtually impossible for sex offenders to live within city limits.

In Georgia, lawmakers considered a bill in 2006 that would have prohibited sex offenders from living in the state at all. New York legislators have barred sex offenders from operating ice cream trucks. Offenders can’t run massage parlors in California. Eight states allow castration of sex offenders.

The laws vary. The penalties are tough in some states; not as tough in others. The states’ approaches, conditions and requirements for management of sex offenders are vastly different and these differences create problems when sex offenders want to transfer across state lines.

“Sex offenders are a very transient offender population,” said Robert Guy, the director of North Carolina’s Division of Community Corrections who chairs a new ad hoc committee of the Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision. “They like to move. They will move to try to go where there’s less restriction and less control, if possible.”

The ad hoc committee of ICAOS is working to develop a policy statement and proposed rules to guide the transfer of sex offenders among states. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands are members of ICAOS.

The committee, which met for the first time in March, hopes to develop a policy and rules that create minimum expectations for compact members concerning the sex offender population. The committee hopes to present recommendations to the full membership at ICAOS’s annual business meeting in September. Rules of the national compact supersede any conflicting state laws, according to Don Blackburn, executive director of ICAOS.

Guy said in the last 18 to 24 months, states have been proposing and adopting laws dealing with sex offenders. Much of the activity in the states is in response to the federal government’s passage of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act in July 2006 and high-profile child abduction cases across the country.

“We have got to get some direction about crossing state lines,” Guy said. “If we don’t get things under control, a state that has a less restrictive law or has very little to do with sex offender regulations might become the state of choice for sex offenders.”

That was the case in North Carolina before that state passed a new sex offender law. Guy said many Georgia sex offenders had previously sought transfer to his state because the punishment was not as tough.

The compact seeks to remedy these inconsistencies. The flood of sex offender legislation recently has created many discrepancies across state lines. Many states, for instance, have passed laws that ban a sex offender from living within 1,000 to 2,000 yards of a school or day care. Others also have requirements for GPS tracking—some for just the most serious offenses, others for any sex offense across the board.

“We want states to pass laws, but we don’t want states to pass laws that are in conflict with the overall mission of the agreement of the compact between the states,” Blackburn said.

Before the new compact was adopted, said Blackburn, “we had states passing laws that wouldn’t allow offenders to be in their states and it would be a crime if they were there.

“We don’t want states passing laws that prohibit sex offenders from even living in their state. We still need to get sex offenders … where they have the most resources for their successful rehabilitation,” he said.

Guy said a first step of the ad hoc committee is to gather information about new sex offender laws passed in 2007. He said it’s important that sex offenders be registered, but many tough state laws may drive sex offenders underground.
“The last thing you want to do is lose sex offenders and they become homeless,” he said. “The irony to that is, you pass GPS tracking. But if they (sex offenders) don’t meet the 1,000 foot residency requirement and they become homeless, you can’t hook up the GPS. There’s no phone. There’s no house. They’re living in tents or under a bridge, so GPS isn’t going to do you much good either.”

Some states have found those residency requirements have created problems with tracking offenders. “How you drive them (sex offenders) underground is if you don’t allow them a place to live. Then where are they going to live?” Blackburn said.

The answer, now, may be for sex offenders to find states with less restrictive punishments.

“We’ve got tough punishment for sex offenders in North Carolina, but when they do get out of prison, when they try to go out of state, I’m responsible as the sending state. It’s my responsibility to make sure they go through the compact, that they meet the rules before they transfer anywhere. If not, then they’re going to stay in North Carolina where I’ve got them on GPS tracking or at least I know where they’re living,” said Guy. “That’s one of the big issues … making sure they’re not free to move about the country.”

Guy said the bar has been raised on what punishment sex offenders receive, but “state laws do not even come close to looking alike. Some components are the same, but on the punishment side …”

Guy said he’s often hesitant to release sex offenders to live in other states.

“A Tier 1 sex offender in North Carolina, a child predator, I’m not letting him leave my state period, until I know the other state, in the receiving state, that he complies with the rules, that he has residency there and that he has a reason to be there.

“We don’t slow it down, once they get across state lines. That’s what happens with many of these sex offenders. Tragically they start moving about and changing locations and changing their environment, that’s part of their M-O. That’s why the compact is so important.”

The committee will be deliberate in its efforts to construct guidelines for transfer of sex offenders across state lines. “It’s such an important topic for me as a commissioner and as a director of parole and probation that it’s not something you want to hurry into and make knee-jerk decisions and not accomplish anything,” Guy said.

Guy would also like the committee to offer a resource to help states struggling with the types of laws they want to pass.

“We’ve got to make sure we have a pretty good aggressive plan that we can get out in front of this thing,” Guy said. “If not, I’m afraid we’ll have a compliance issue in the states.”

Tracking Sex Offenders

That’s one reason registration—and an ability for states to track those registered offenders—is so important.

When the Adam Walsh Act was under consideration, officials estimated that more than 100,000 sex offenders had registered in the state where the offense occurred, then moved to another state but failed to re-register, Blackburn said. ICAOS is developing a national database that will tie the state registries together. Blackburn said about 30 percent of registered sex offenders are under active state supervision. When they cross state lines, those offenders will be in ICAOS’ new information tracking system.

“Sex offenders like to move. They want to get lost. They want to move to those states where there is no supervision,” he said.

The Adam Walsh Act requires that after each state registers a sex offender, it must track that offender.

“You’ve got to have some database to track them, so when they go to another state, they only have five days to register. The Adam Walsh Act is trying to stop sex offenders from getting lost,” Blackburn said.

“We are hoping to tie into other state systems with this system so we can track all sex offenders as they move across the states, which will be an easy interface between our system and state systems,” Blackburn said. “We are hoping nationally to be able to track all sex offenders if they cross state lines, because that’s where they get lost.”

The Adam Walsh Act, he said, requires registration within five days. Blackburn said other requirements are more stringent than in the past, so states will need to track all offenders, not just those under supervision.

“We hope this is a spark and assistance to states … that our database system is going to be a platform and a help for them in order to comply with the Adam Walsh Act and all the other sex offender requirements … and tracking all these sex offenders,” Blackburn said.

He said ICAOS also hopes to interact with other databases through government agencies, and is working with federal probation and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

“The more systems we have their names in and the more they interconnect, the better off we’re going to be,” Guy said. “Right now, there are a lot of paper systems out there. We’ve got to get automation. The sex offender is one population we have to make sure we track.”

In developing the new tracking system, Blackburn said ICAOS has found some state registries are behind on entering as many as 10,000 names.

“So we have states that may have somewhat of a registry, but they don’t have the resources or people to enter the names into it, So they’ve got thousands sitting there to be entered into it,” he said. “These people (sex offenders), while they haven’t been entered into the system, move to another state. Guess what? You’ve lost them.”

He’s hoping the ICAOS database can help eliminate some of those problems. And, he said, federal money is available to help states build their own database systems.

“We believe our system is going to be a backbone that can easily facilitate them interfacing,” Blackburn said. “Most states have a management system that they track their own offenders. We’re trying to link with those systems so if these people cross state lines, then we’ll know where they are.”

Guy said linking to the ICAOS database shouldn’t be a problem, at least for North Carolina. “We have 125,000 offenders under our supervision and it’s all automated,” he said. “So the national system will be a perfect link for us because as they apply to go out of state, it will be interfaced with the national network.”

—Mary Branham Dusenberry is managing editor for State News magazine.
The National Emergency Management Association polled its primary membership in 2006 to get a picture of what emergency management is like across the U.S. The survey found, among other things, changes in the way emergency management directors are appointed, variations in the organizational structure of departments and the increasing role these directors are playing in the states.

By Beverly Bell
The number of emergency management personnel has increased; state budgets inched up; and more governors than ever are appointing the emergency management director, recognizing the critical role these individuals play.

Those are a few of the findings from the annual survey conducted by the National Emergency Management Association. At the end of 2006, NEMA, a CSG affiliate, polled its primary membership—the state emergency management directors who are responsible for coordinating all disaster preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery in their respective states. There were 54 responders, representing 49 states, the District of Columbia and four U.S. territories.

Other results from the survey show the wide range of organizational structures for both emergency management and homeland security; how state director turnover remains an issue; and why state emergency management programs must be strong since most disasters are handled at the state level without federal help.

New Leaders, Turnover Affect the Field

State governments across the country are dealing with the implications of a large, aging U.S. population. The National Association of State Personnel Executives (NASPE) estimates 28 percent of state employees—not including those in higher education—will be eligible for retirement within the next five years.

According to the NEMA survey, this same trend cannot be verified in state emergency management. It is true that the majority of state directors (30) fall in the 51- to 60-year-old age range and six directors are 61 to 70. However, in the past, the state emergency management director position was often filled by a retired member of the military. The average age of the person serving in this capacity was higher, but not because of overall aging factors.

The most pressing issue for emergency management is recruiting, developing and retaining the next generation of emergency management leaders to address 21st century challenges. Current directors bring a wealth of experience to the table. The survey found that 37 state emergency management directors have been in the profession for 12 or more years. Thirteen of these have 28 or more years of experience.

But 36 directors—two-thirds of those surveyed—have been in their jobs three years or less. Turnover is inherent in state government where newly elected governors make appointments and bring in their own teams. In 2006, 36 states held gubernatorial contests, which accounted for some of the new emergency management director appointments. However, most appointments were due to a maturation of the field, growing federal mandates, budgets not keeping pace, and the lure of the private sector, which pays experienced emergency management professionals premium salaries.

To help ensure that knowledgeable personnel are chosen for this important post, NEMA is developing qualifications for state emergency management positions, training curriculum and continuing education. When finalized, these guidelines will help governors and other state officials make certain they have the right people in charge to handle any kind of disaster.

A particular challenge for new directors is that they took over after Sept. 11, 2001, when the focus—and most federal dollars—have been directed toward terrorism instead of all-hazards. They have to deal with a complex and conflicting paradigm, where the emergency management and homeland security parameters aren't clear-cut. How emergency management can develop new talent as well as retain its knowledge base, so that lessons learned can be applied to better prepare for and manage all future disasters, remains a question.

When Disaster Strikes: Effective Emergency Management Structures

The state directors polled have handled 447 gubernatorial disaster declarations, almost 80 percent more than the estimated 250 presidential disaster declarations they’ve coordinated. The statistics indicate most disasters in the United States are handled at the state and local level.

It also indicates why more governors are choosing to appoint emergency management directors. Governors are realizing that in many cases, the success of their administrations can hinge on how effectively they handle a disaster. In the most recent survey, 34 governors appoint the emergency management director, up from 32 in 2005 and 29 in 2004.
The structures under which the emergency management directors operate differ. In 14 states, the emergency management agency is located within the department of public safety; in 16 states, it is located within the military department under the auspices of the adjutant general; and in 11 states, it is located within the governor’s office.

However, there are certain organizational similarities for states with the most disaster experience. For example, seven of the top 10 states with the most disaster declarations as listed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) have day-to-day emergency management operations housed in the governor’s office. In seven of these states, the emergency management director is appointed by the governor. In eight states, the director reports directly to the governor.

After suffering the devastation from Hurricane Katrina, Louisiana changed its emergency management organizational structure in 2006, making it an agency within the governor’s office. Locating emergency management in the governor’s office can offer certain advantages, such as a direct line to the top state office when critical decisions need to be made. It can also result in better coordination of all state agencies, local jurisdictions and various disciplines.

**Emergency Management Dollars, People**

The 2007 operating budgets for state emergency management agencies range from a low of $270,000 to a high of more than $35 million for a total of $225,134,020. The average state emergency management agency budget is $4,169,149, and the median is $2,494,598. This compares to the 2006 operating budgets that ranged from $454,000 to almost $38 million. In that year, the average state budget was $4,090,365, while the median was $2,065,250.

Currently, there are approximately 4,675 personnel in state emergency management agencies. In 2005, staff totals stood at 4,491. Even with the slight increase, this means there are a little more than three people coordinating state emergency management activities for every 200,000 U.S. citizens. This is significant responsibility for relatively few people who are expected to develop disaster operations plans, conduct training and assist the governor during an event. There are also growing homeland security assignments, such as updating state plans to reflect the National Response Plan (NRP), training emergency responders and state and local officials on the National Incident Management System (NIMS), and implementing the National Preparedness Goal—all of which are tasked most often to emergency management.

**State Homeland Security Still Being Defined**

Four and a half years after a National Strategy for Homeland Security was developed, many states still face the challenge of assimilating homeland security into their emergency management and response systems. This is apparent from the wide range of structures and responsibilities under which state homeland security offices operate. In some cases, state homeland security directors manage grants and budgets; in other cases, they have very limited roles. The inconsistent approach is a clear indication that the relationship between homeland security and emergency management is still being defined.

All states have a designated homeland security point of contact. In fact, preparation on the state level for a terrorist attack occurred several years before Sept. 11, 2001, with groundwork being laid after the 1995 bombing at the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Okla.

Over the past few years, the homeland security designee has become a critical member of a governor’s staff. While each state recognizes its importance, the person responsible for these duties varies widely from state to state. According to the survey, 22 states have established the unique position of homeland security adviser or homeland security director. In 11 states, either the emergency management director or a combined emergency management/homeland security director is the primary point of contact. Five states have the adjutant general serving in this capacity, a decrease from seven in 2005. Seven public safety secretaries/commissioners are in this role. Nine states have created totally different positions.

Many states also are modifying the structure of their homeland security office. Thirteen states house the day-to-day operations in the governor’s office, while six run it out of the adjutant general/military affairs department. Another six have it in a specific homeland security department. Nine states keep the homeland security function in their emergency management office, while
nine operate out of their public safety department. The remaining states have other structures in place.

The trend of the homeland security director becoming less of a political appointment in the governor’s office and more institutionalized in the organizational structure of state government continues. Forty-two states have authorized their homeland security offices, departments or agencies through either executive order or state statute. This is up from 39 in 2005.

**Paying for State Homeland Security**

The federal government is still footing most of the bill for most state homeland security offices in the form of grants. The NEMA survey shows 46 states receive at least 60 percent of their homeland security funding from federal money. This compares to 39 states in 2005. Of these 46 states, 22 operate with 100 percent federal funding. Only three states—Georgia, New Hampshire and New Mexico—rely totally on state appropriations for their homeland security funding.

The number of staff dedicated to homeland security is now 2,399. The striking aspect of this finding is how quickly state homeland security personnel has grown. The amount of homeland security professionals now equals more than half of those working in emergency management. This is particularly surprising considering that the emergency management field dates back to the 1950s, and adequate funding has been a constant challenge.

There are many more findings in the NEMA FY2007 State Director Annual Survey, including state disaster funding mechanisms; state director and deputy director salaries; educational backgrounds; and more details on how state emergency management agencies and homeland security offices are structured. For a complete report, visit the NEMA Web site at [http://www.nemaweb.org/](http://www.nemaweb.org/).

—Beverly Bell is a policy analyst with the National Emergency Management Association.
Public-Private Partnerships Help States Bridge the Gap

As Congress debates funding and other issues in transportation, states are turning to the private sector to meet the needs of their communities.

By Kristi Guillory
By 2009, the Highway Trust Fund, which funds major highway projects, is projected to have a $700 million deficit.

Transportation issues are likely to become a major focus of Congress. The current Congress will have to examine methods to deal with the deficit in the federal Highway Trust Fund, the need to develop a national infrastructure for the national highway system and ways to manage the competing needs of state, federal and local responsibilities for infrastructure construction and funding.

The next highway reauthorization law, which is due in early 2010, is expected to prompt debate about changing the funding mechanism that has paid for construction of the nation’s interstate system for the past 50 years. By 2009, the Highway Trust Fund, which funds major highway projects, is projected to have a $700 million deficit. The federal 18.4 cents-a-gallon tax on gasoline is the primary source of funding for the Highway Trust Fund, but this amount has not been increased since 1993.

Since the mid-1980s, states have been turning to public/private partnerships (PPPs) in order to supplement their transportation funding needs. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) defines public-private partnerships as “a contractual agreement formed between public and private sector partners, which allows more private sector participation than is traditional. The agreements usually involve a government agency contracting with a private company to renovate, construct, operate, maintain and/or manage a facility or system. While the private sector usually retains ownership in the facility or system, the private party will be given additional decision rights in determining how the project or task will be completed.”

Many states utilize alternative sources of funding, namely in the form of PPPs, in order to accomplish needed projects. As of August 2006, 22 states have significant transportation PPP authority. These states have leveraged this authority to fund bridges, toll roads, highways and other highway projects. Of all these projects, toll roads have been utilized with the most frequency.

In 1988, Virginia became the first state to enact legislation enabling PPPs that involved highways. The Dulles Greenway was the first purely private toll road built in the United States in more than 100 years, with construction of the toll road completed in September 1995. Financing for the toll road came from a variety of both domestic and international sources: Italy’s toll road operator Autostrade, the Texas-based engineering and construction firm of Brown & Root and the Toll Road Investors Partnership.

Initial traffic volume on the Dulles Greenway fell short of the forecast at the time of construction, with only 8,000 vehicles, rather than the projected 35,000 vehicles, using the facility each day. The decreased volume caused financial strain, and an Australian company purchased a portion of the toll road in 2005 for $617.5 million.

In January 2005, the City of Chicago reached an agreement with the Skyway Concession Company, a consortium jointly owned by MIG and Spain’s Cintra, for a 99-year lease to operate and maintain the Chicago Skyway. The Skyway is a 7.8 mile tollway connecting Interstate 90 on the west end and the Indiana Toll Road on the east end of the city. The contract price was $1.83 billion.

The consortium is required to carry out all capital improvements, and the city is required to collect and retain all toll revenues during the term of the lease. The lease agreement contains a schedule for toll increases, beginning in January 2007 through 2017. The City of Chicago plans to use the proceeds from the Skyway to repay nontransportation needs such as the city’s obligations, fund operating budget shortfalls, and also fund other programs, such as winter heating assistance and homeless shelters.

In June 2006, Indiana closed a 75-year deal with Statewide Mobility Partners for the operation and maintenance of the Indiana Toll Road. The contract price for the 157-mile toll road was $3.8 billion. While the negotiation was underway, Indiana Gov. Mitch Daniels raised the fee for the toll for the first time in 21 years. The lease agreement includes increases to the toll charges as well as a non-compete clause that prohibits Indiana from building or improving any limited access highway within a 10-mile corridor on either side of the toll road. The state of Indiana plans to use the proceeds from the toll road largely for transportation-related projects.

Current funding for surface transportation is not enough to maintain existing transportation systems, nor is it enough to meet increased demand, which is why states have turned to PPPs to fund projects. PPPs can be used to help finance new or existing infrastructure development by adding new capacity to the overall transportation system.

There are several common features of PPP agreements worth noting.

One common feature of PPPs is the length of the lease agreement, which can range anywhere from 55 years to 99 years. These long lease agreements provide potential tax benefits in the form of accelerated depreciation, normal depreciation and amortization, all of which can contribute to reducing the cost of the lease.

Another common feature of PPP agreements is a schedule for increased toll prices, which provides security to those involved in the agreement for future increased revenue.

These partnerships allow states to resolve the transportation funding shortfalls, without waiting on the federal government.

—Kristi Guillory is senior policy analyst and assistant counsel in CSG’s Washington D.C. office.
The New England Transportation Institute is conducting a three-year study on rural transportation, focusing on mobility, safety and connectivity.

By Karen Imas

The rural town center—local main streets, town doctors, mom and pop shops—has taken a hit. Rapid demographic change in rural areas is impacting mobility and accessibility for residents of these regions.

“The reliance on the short trip, such as getting to the general store, has decreased,” said Matt Coogan, director of the New England Transportation Institute (NETI). “People are moving to rural areas and imposing longer trip distances to work and school.”

Coogan is conducting a three-year study funded by SAFETEA-LU, the federal transportation legislation, to evaluate elements concerning rural transport in three areas—rural mobility, rural safety and issues of connectivity in the system for its residents.

In the first research focus area, the grant will support activities which establish a portrait of rural transportation patterns. Applying the concepts of both mobility and accessibility to the rural Northeast, the project will explore the issue of rural isolation.

- How serious a problem is rural isolation and perceptions of access (or lack thereof)?
- How are we resettling the rural areas?
- How are demographics going to change the demands made on the transportation system?
Are there alternative settlement patterns, with alternative transportation implications?

“Isolation occurs when the local store closes down because of the opening of a regional retail center many miles away. Isolation occurs when the local doctor is replaced by a regional medical center, also many miles away,” said Coogan. “In many rural areas, the support function of the local small town has disappeared; and the most basic trips are now longer in distance.”

The demographics in rural areas, including parts of New England, compound the challenge of isolation and mobility. The rural institutions needed to deal with the change in the baby boomer generation either do not exist or are simply not scaled for the coming challenge.

The study also will explore the extent to which concepts associated with Smart Growth are and are not applicable to settlement patterns in the rural Northeast. Smart Growth solutions acknowledge that very long trip distances have become a problem.

Alternative patterns are being proposed across the region but the question remains whether they will gain traction in rural areas. Initiatives to address accessibility have been introduced in rural areas across the country. The city of Burlington, Vt., created bus service for a new downtown mall. Ridership has been increasing.

Maine implemented a more unconventional program where retired individuals with driver’s licenses transport seniors who are no longer able to drive, to doctors’ appointments. The program basically connects those who need a ride to the hospital with those who have a ride to offer. By being a driver, one accumulates points to have the same services rendered in return.

“In cities, you can take a train or bus to the hospital,” said Coogan. “Aging and mobility is a serious subject everywhere in the U.S. but more so in rural areas where there is limited public transit.”

Coogan’s next phase of research is centered on implications for safety and health in transportation. NETI will work with other major researchers to examine the behavioral basis of transportation patterns with major safety implications, with a particular emphasis on the question of speeding in rural areas by younger drivers, which could be tied to higher death rates in those areas. Rural young males between 18 and 28 have a death rate on the highways that is five times that of their urban counterparts.

The physical dispersal of places of employment, medical services and schools in rural areas also impacts health in that individuals have no choice but to drive rather than walk.

NETI, in partnership with the University of Vermont, will host a conference this summer on safety and health issues. Coogan hopes the scientific research that will be presented will eventually work its way into public policy.

NETI’s mission is to promote regional and national understanding of rural transportation trends and issues through research and related learning activities.

—in Karen Imas is director of communications and leadership training for The Council of State Governments Eastern Regional Conference.
focused on the election at hand, not the long-term. If they were interested in the long-term, they would focus on the youth.”

The Center for Political Participation suggests using different outreach technologies, like networking Web sites such as Facebook and MySpace. A majority of Generation Nexters have used one of these sites, and more than four-in-10 have created personal profiles on them.

“Go to where they are,” Shea said. “If they are on Facebook, the parties need to join that. Don’t expect to draw students out to the party potluck.”

Since members of this generation are active in their communities, combining partisanship with service is another suggestion the center makes. For example, plan an area clean-up event followed by a party picnic. In addition, some party fundraisers are cost-prohibitive to younger voters, so encourage party members to buy extra tickets to fundraisers so students can attend, or allow students free admission for helping with setup.

Participation: It’s Habit Forming

Shea said students are informed about a lot of issues.

“They have spent a lot of time understanding the dimensions of issues via the Internet and the blogs and social networking and so forth,” he said.

But young voter participation in state elections is not up to par.

“Whereas participation in federal elections is poor among young generations, it’s anemic in state and local elections,” said Shea.

However, there is good news, he said. Working to increase young voter turnout can change the shape of politics because once they start to participate, they won’t stop.

“Students are ready, and once people begin, it’s habitual,” said Shea. “Once they’re pulled into the process, you’ve got them for life.”

—Laura Coleman is associate editor for State News magazine.

Resources


Throwing a Better Party: Local Mobilizing Institutions and the Youth Vote is available at The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement’s (CIRCLE) Web site at http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/Working-Papers/Fountain%20Youth_CPP.pdf.
Rural Telecommunications Conference Set for October

Illinois Lt. Gov. Pat Quinn is assisting in planning a rural telecommunications conference.


The conference will focus on both the deployment of broadband and the effective utilization of increased bandwidth.

“This event brings together national leaders in broadband technology to share ideas, communicate successful strategies and help spread broadband connectivity to every corner of our country,” said Quinn.

The meeting is open to federal, state and local leaders and officials, private sector telecommunications industry professionals and academic researchers.

The meeting will include discussions of shared best practices in making broadband economical and sustainable. Practical applications of broadband—including provision of medical and educational needs to rural areas—will also be highlighted.

Those interested in presenting or planning a panel should contact iira@wiu.edu. To register for the meeting or learn more, visit www.ruraltelecon.org/conference.

Williams, Barnes, Pink to Speak at MLC Meeting

Williams, Barnes, Pink to Speak at MLC Meeting

Distinguished journalists and political commentators Juan Williams and Fred Barnes and best-selling author Daniel Pink will speak at this year’s Midwestern Legislative Conference Annual Meeting Aug. 26–29 in Traverse City, Mich.

Williams is a senior correspondent with National Public Radio, a political analyst for Fox News and an Emmy Award-winning documentary writer and author. A former White House correspondent, Barnes is executive editor of The Weekly Standard and co-host of Fox News’ “Beltway Boys.” He also has two weekly radio shows.

Williams and Barnes will discuss and debate the race for the White House as well as other key issues in U.S. politics.

Best-selling author Daniel Pink, author of the influential and highly acclaimed “A Whole New Mind,” will deliver the meeting’s keynote address on the role of technology in society and the work force.

In addition to these and other speakers, the MLC event will feature sessions and roundtable discussions on key policy issues affecting the Midwestern states and their legislators.

Participants also will have the chance to take part in professional development training and to network with colleagues from the region.

For more information about the MLC Annual Meeting, call CSG Midwest at (630) 925-1922. Registration for the meeting can be completed online at www.csgmidwest.org.

Doyle Named Chair of Midwest Governors Association

Wisconsin Gov. Jim Doyle has been named the new chair of the nonprofit, nonpartisan Midwestern Governors Association. Doyle succeeds Minnesota Gov. Tim Pawlenty, last year’s chair.

Doyle recently announced his chair’s agenda, which will focus on regional efforts to achieve energy independence and fight global warming; increasing the region’s economic development opportunities; and making recommendations for reauthorization of the farm bill.

The MGA is made up of governors from 12 Midwestern states: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota and Wisconsin. The organization’s goal is to foster collaboration and cooperation among the governors on key policy issues facing the region.

The MGA is supported in its efforts by staff in CSG’s Washington, D.C., and in Midwestern offices.

For more information about the MGA, visit www.midwesterngovernors.org or contact Ilene Grossman at (630) 925-1922 or igrossman@csg.org.
The Council of State Governments—WEST (CSG-WEST) reconstitutes its committees and selects new leadership from lawmakers around the West every two years. These committees plan and implement the organization’s policy forums and studies.

Leadership for CSG-WEST for 2007–08 will be:

- Education: Rep. Dave Quall (Washington), chair and Rep. Ronda Rudd Menlove (Utah), vice chair
- Transportation & Trade: Sen. John Barrasso (Wyoming), chair, and Assembly Member Pedro Nava, (California) vice chair
- Water & Public Lands: Rep. Dell Raybould (Idaho), chair, and Assembly Member Kelvin Atkinson (Nebraska), vice chair

In addition to policy committees, Western legislative leaders also head CSG-WEST projects. California Sen. Mike Machado chairs WESTRENDS, a board that looks at demographic and economic trends affecting the region. Montana Sen. Kim Gillan serves as vice chair.

Diputado Juan Jose Gonzalez Espinoza from Chihuahua will serve as chair and Texas Sen. Eliot Shapleigh will serve as vice chair of the Border Legislative Conference, a joint program of CSG-WEST and the Southern Legislative Conference.

The Legislative Council on River Governance, an association of legislators from the states of Washington, Oregon, Idaho and Montana who review Columbia River Basin issues, will be chaired by Oregon Rep. Bob Jenson.

Oregon Legislative Administrator Dave Henderson will chair the CSG-WEST committee of nonpartisan legislative service agency directors, and Alaska’s Legislative Affairs Executive Director Pam Varni will serve as vice chair.


---

The National Lieutenant Governors Association’s (NLGA) work on a public health education campaign recently won a national award from the American Society of Association Executives (ASAE).

NLGA is the recipient of ASAE’s Award of Excellence, which recognizes contributions to advance American society, ASAE Chair Charles McGrath said.

The award recognizes NLGA’s “Ending Cervical Cancer in our Lifetime” campaign and the work of the 11 lieutenant governors who participated in the first phase.

“NLGA is pleased to sponsor this potentially life-saving campaign,” said NLGA Executive Director Julia Hurst. “This recognition gives us an opportunity to again emphasize the facts regarding the preventable nature of cervical cancer which still kills more than 3,700 women annually.”

Nearly all cases of cervical cancer are caused by the human papillomavirus (HPV), a virus spread through sexual contact.

Cervical cancer is highly curable if detected early and detection occurs through regular Pap testing of women.

“Free or reduced cost Pap tests are available to some women in every state by calling 800-CDC-INFO,” said Hurst. “In addition, an FDA-approved vaccine is now available which is proven to protect against HPV infections which cause 70 percent of all cervical cancer cases.”

Lieutenant governors from Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Utah and Virginia participated in the first phase of the campaign.

“Collectively, their work included Olympian Jackie Joyner Kersee, four state secretaries of health, a dozen legislators and cancer survivors, as well as visits to 11 colleges and the use of the campaign materials in four classrooms educating future nurses,” said Hurst. “As a direct result of their work, cervical cancer facts were included in more than 60 media stories, more than 100,000 direct mailers, and in public service announcements airing on cable across Virginia.”

The award for the campaign is one of only 13 presented nationally this year from among more than 11,000 eligible associations. The campaign is now being considered for ASAE’s Summit Award, the highest annual award for association contributions to society.
This calendar lists meetings as designated by CSG’s Annual Meeting Committee. For details of a meeting, call the number listed. “CSG” denotes affiliate organizations of CSG. Visit www.csg.org for updates and more extensive listings.

### May 2007

**May 5**
- CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Executive Board Meeting—Baltimore, MD—Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjohnson@csg.org.

**May 5–8**
- CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Eastern Region Seminar—Baltimore, MD—Sheraton Inner Harbor Hotel. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjohnson@csg.org.

**May 17–19**
- CSG/Healthy States Policy Development Workshop—Atlanta, GA—Marriott Suites Midtown & Global Communications Center/CDC. Invitational event for up to 30 legislators working in the areas of aging, health disparities and community approaches to wellness. Contact Pam Goins at pgoins@csg.org.

**May 20–23**
- CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Midwestern Region Seminar—Ashland, NE—Eugene T. M honey State Park. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjohnson@csg.org or visit www.nastd.org.

### June 2007

**June 6–9**
- CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Western Region Seminar—Albuquerque, NM—Hotel Albuquerque at Old Town. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjohnson@csg.org or visit www.nastd.org.

**June 10–13**
- CSG Spring National Committee and Task Force Meetings—San Juan, Puerto Rico. Contact Gladys Parks at (859) 244-8108 or gparks@csg.org.

**June 10–14**
- CSG/National Association of State Chief Administrators (NASCA) & National Association of State Facilities Administrators (NASFA)—NASCA & NASFA National Conference and Resource Expo—Lake Tahoe, NV—Montbleu Hotel. Contact Maria Stone at (859) 244-8181 or mstone@csgeast.org or visit www.nasca.org or www.nasfa.net.

**June 16–20**
- CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—2007 Southern Region Summer Seminar—Mobile, AL—The House Renaissance Hotel. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjohnson@csg.org.

### July 2007

**July 8–11**

**July 10–12**
- CSG/Healthy States Policy Academy on the Prevention of Childhood Obesity—Hilton Head, SC—Hilton Head Marriott. Event for up to 30 state legislators interested in policy approaches for the prevention of childhood obesity. Contact Pam Goins at pgoins@csg.org.

**July 13–17**
- CSG/Midwestern Legislative Conference—13th Annual Bowhay Institute for Legislative Leadership Development Program (BILLD)—Madison, WI—F NU Center of Executive Education. Contact Laura Tomaka at (630) 925-1922 or ltomaka@csg.org or visit http://www.csgmidwest.org for more information.

**July 14–18**
- CSG/Southern Legislative Conference—Williamsburg, VA. Contact Nana Hallman at the Southern Legislative Conference at (404) 633-1806 or visit www.southerngovernors.org for additional information.

**July 15–17**
- CSG/National Association of State Treasurers—NAST Issues Conference—New York, NY—Barclay InterContinental Hotel. Contact Adnee Hamilton at (859) 244-8174 or ahamilton@csg.org or visit www.nast.org.

Other meetings have value to state officials. Purchase a meeting listing by calling (800) 800-1910 or by e-mailing sales@csg.org. Announce your meetings to thousands in the state government market through an advertisement or a Web listing.

### August 2007

**Aug. 4–8**
- CSG/National Association of State Labor Officials—2007 Annual Meeting—Savannah, GA. Contact Leslie Scott, association manager, at (859) 244-8182 or lscott@csg.org or visit www.naslabor.org.

**Aug. 11–15**
- CSG/Eastern Regional Conference—47th Annual Meeting and Regional Policy Forum—Quebec City, Quebec—Hilton Hotel. Contact Pamela Stanley at (614) 383-5711 or pstanley@csg.org or visit www.csgeast.org.

**Aug. 23–25**
- CSG Healthy States Forum for State Legislators—Innovation and Collaboration in Wellness—New Orleans, LA—Hilton New Orleans Riverside. Contact Pam Goins at pgoins@csg.org.

**Aug. 25–27**
- CSG/Southern Governors’ Association (SGA)—73rd Annual Meeting—Blacks, MS. Contact Liz Purdy at (202) 624-5897 or sga@soo.org or visit www.southerngovernors.org.

**Aug. 25–30**
- CSG/NASTD—Technology Professionals Serving State Government—30th Annual Conference and Technology Showcase—Minneapolis, MN—Hyatt Regency. Contact Pamela Johnson at (859) 244-8184 or pjohnson@csg.org or visit www.nastd.org.

**Aug. 26–29**
- CSG/Midwestern Legislative Conference—62nd Annual Meeting—Traverse City, MI—Grand Traverse Resort and Spa. Contact Cindy Andrews at (630) 925-1922 or candrews@csg.org or visit http://www.csgmidwest.org for more information.

### September 2007

**Sept. 16–19**
- CSG/CGS—WEST—Annual Meeting—Jackson Lake Lodge, WY. Contact Lolita Umushia at (916) 553-4423 or csgeast.org.

**Sept. 16–19**
- CSG/National Association of State Treasurers—NAST Annual Conference—Survive OR—Sunriver Lodge. Contact Adnee Hamilton at (859) 244-8174 or hamilton@csg.org or visit www.nast.org.

**Sept. 29–Oct. 4**
- CSG—2007 Henry Toll Fellowship Program—Lexington, KY—Hilton Suites at Lexington Green. Contact Krista Rinahert at krinehart@csg.org or (859)244-8249 or find out more at http://www.csg.org/leadership/tolfellows/default.aspx.

### November 2007

**Nov. 5–8**
- CSG/CSG—WEST—Western Legislative Academy—Colorado Springs, CO. Contact Mary Lou Cooper at (916) 553-4423 or csgw@csg.org.

**Nov. 11–14**
- CSG Annual State Trends and Leadership Forum—Oklahoma City, OK. Contact Gladys Parks at (859) 244-8108 or gparks@csg.org.

### December 2007

**Dec. 2–5**
- CSG/National Association of State Treasurers—NAST Treasury Management Conference—San Antonio, TX—Hyatt Regency Hill Country. Contact Adnee Hamilton at (859) 244-8174 or hamilton@csg.org.
Although the federal government tends to get more attention, state officials are often on the front lines of cutting-edge trends and issues. On the other hand, sometimes in the community of state governments, the more things change, the more they stay the same.

In print since 1958, State News (formerly State Government News) has chronicled many of the changes … and continuities. Here’s what we reported on:

**40 Years Ago—May 1967**

**Governors’ Terms, Running Mates**

Wisconsin voters approved eight constitutional amendments in elections in the spring of 1967, including two that affected the election of the state’s governor. Voters approved amendments that provide for the joint election of the governor and lieutenant governor, effective with the general elections of 1970. The voters also approved an amendment that increased the terms of the governor—as well as lieutenant governor, secretary of state, state treasurer and attorney general—from two years to four years.

**Update**

Governors in 48 states now are elected to four-year terms. Only governors in Vermont and New Hampshire serve the shorter two-year terms, according to the 2006 Book of the States, published by The Council of State Governments. In 24 states, governors and lieutenant governors are elected on a slate, while in 19 states they are elected separately. There is no lieutenant governor in six states. New Jersey will elect a lieutenant governor for the first time in 2009. The governor and lieutenant governor will be elected jointly.

**25 Years Ago—May 1982**

**Handling Radioactive Waste**

States were taking action in the early 1980s to regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste. Actions earlier in the decade included governors’ calls for federal enforcement of transportation and packaging regulations and closure of disposal sites temporarily after trucks delivered damaged and leaking nuclear waste containers. Then-Gov. Richard Riley of South Carolina testified before Congress that states that restrict the transportation or disposal of low-level radioactive wastes within their boarders were telling those states that did, including South Carolina, “that we must be their nuclear garbage cans forever more … They cannot have just the benefits of nuclear power, nuclear medicine and research, they must share in the responsibilities as well.”

In its Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act of 1980, Congress required each state to be responsible for disposal of the commercial low-level radioactive waste generated within their borders; allowed states to enter into interstate compacts to provide for regional disposal sites for radioactive waste; and allowed those compacts to restrict the use of regional disposal facilities to member states.

All 50 states were taking steps to address the issue of low-level radioactive waste disposal.

**Update**

A South Carolina governor was in the news battling transport of radioactive waste into his state again in 2002. Gov. Jim Hodges vowed to use state troopers to block federal shipments of plutonium from Colorado to the South Carolina’s Savannah River nuclear site. He wanted assurances the plutonium wouldn’t be left there forever. Hodges was able to delay the shipments briefly.

**10 Years Ago—May 1997**

**Telemedicine Slow to Develop**

Modern telecommunications technology makes it possible for doctors in one location to treat patients who are miles away. But the interactive, long-distance health delivery raised questions about costs and quality of care, as well as the rights of states to regulate health-care professionals, according to an article in the May 1997 State Government News.

The states’ rights question involved the use of telemedicine across state lines. Robert Waters, counsel to the Center for Telemedicine Law, said there is no evidence that 50 licensing laws for the same profession, with 50 different standards, are necessary, according to the article. State laws require physicians to be licensed in their states before practicing medicine.

**Update**

States have been working to allow telemedicine across the country. According to a 2004 stateline.org story, regional alliances were being forged to develop agreements and the technological know-how to share medical expertise across state lines in emergencies. The Southern alliance would use telemedicine to connect medical expertise to a point of need. The Midwestern alliance was planned to use agreements to share lab space and workers.

Both the Southern and Midwestern interstate medical agreements were expected to tackle issues of liability, licensure and reimbursement. The result will be that interstate medical consultations happening sporadically at the time — after special licensing and approvals — could occur more easily under the agreements, project leaders said.