

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Update to the Report on
Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for Defense Dependents Education
February 2011



Preparation of this study cost the Department of Defense a total of approximately \$106,000 in Fiscal Years 10-11.
Generated on 2010Dec28 1027 RefID: D-7EB0E43

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I Introduction	3
II Executive Summary	5
III Number of Students Transitioning	11
IV Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) Recommendations	13
V Plan for Outreach	16
VI Conclusion	30

Appendices:

- 1. Projection of Military Students Transitioning by State**
- 2. Projection of Military Students Transitioning by Military Service**

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Section 574 (c) of P.L. 109-364, as amended (20 U.S.C. § 7703b note), the Secretary of Defense is required to provide an update to the plan to provide assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) that experience projected growth or loss in the enrollment of military dependent students. The projected growth or loss must be a result of force structure changes, relocation of military units, or the closure or realignment of military installations under the base closure laws.

The report addresses the following:

- An identification – current as of the date of the report – of the total projected number of military students who are anticipated to be arriving at and departing from military installations as a result of force structure changes, relocation of military units, or realignment of military units, including:
 - An identification of military installations affected by such arrivals and departures;
 - An estimate of the number of such students arriving at and departing from each such installation; and
 - The anticipated schedule of such arrivals and departures by school year.
- Such recommendations as the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) and Department of Defense (DoD) considers appropriate for means of assisting impacted LEAs in accommodating increases in enrollment of military students as a result of such an event and;
- A plan for outreach to be conducted for affected LEAs, commanders of military installations, members of the Armed Forces, and civilian personnel of DoD regarding information on the assistance to be provided to LEAs that experience growth in the enrollment of military students as a result of any of the aforementioned events.

Education is a concern for parents everywhere and the military is no exception. The quality of education available to military children can affect retention, and morale. Military families frequently say that the quality of their children's education is one of the most important criteria when selecting a neighborhood during relocation or deciding on a permanent change of station. Military children face added stressors due to frequent relocations. The disparity between State standards and requirements can negatively impact academic and athletic placement and development.

Although DoD understands elementary and secondary education is under the jurisdiction of the state and local governments, quality education is a high-priority issue for military families. The Department is committed to supporting the education continuum of military students. A significant element of family readiness is an educational system that provides not only a quality education but also one that recognizes and responds to the unique needs of children of military families. The relocation of thousands of military

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

students through Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC), global rebasing, and other force structure changes creates opportunities to enrich and expand partnerships with military-connected school communities.

Children of military families transfer schools an average of six to nine times in their lives, placing strain on both parents and children. The process of transitioning as well as having parents deployed is difficult and the difficulties are further exacerbated when military parents and children have to worry about overcrowded school facilities upon arriving at their new community.

To date, a comprehensive and systematic process to assist states and LEAs impacted by military mission growth has not been established. States and communities are supportive of our nation's military and are preparing for mission growth. To successfully accommodate the current mission growth, there must be a strong partnership between the federal government, states, and schools to address the clear and demonstrated need to provide a quality education to the children of our military parents and DoD civilian employees.

At present, there is limited federal financial support provided to states and localities to cover the vast and diverse needs resulting from the federal government's mission growth. Although states and communities will certainly benefit and grow economically after the population moves to their area, clear federal data and financial support is needed to help build or ensure the requisite school infrastructure exists before the arrival of new militarily-connected students.

The Department considers the education of military-connected students an important aspect of operational readiness. Ultimately, the education of military dependent students is a vital national security issue. A high-level, coordinated federal-state-local partnership is necessary to address the educational needs of our nation's militarily-connected students.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Department is committed to a comprehensive approach to the projected growth or loss in the enrollment of military dependent students in local educational agencies with respect to scale, timing and scope. The Department is dedicated to facilitating increased levels of collaboration among all stakeholders and extending its reach to the federal, state, and local levels.

To ensure all military children receive an education of the highest quality, DoD has directed two assessments; one will review the effectiveness of DoD in meeting the educational needs of all military children, and the other will review the physical conditions of the public schools on military installations in the United States. A similar assessment program was completed for all Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) school facilities and resulted in receipt of funding for DoDEA to initiate an aggressive renovation, modernization or replacement program to raise all DoDEA schools to the Department's facility quality standard.

- The education review will assess the current state regarding curricular areas such as Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) and foreign languages, virtual learning and the state of early childhood education in DoDEA and military connected public schools. It will address the transition issues of military families and the effects on children and review the programs associated with Impact Aid and the DoDEA's Educational Partnership Grant Program.
- The second assessment, which examines the condition and capacity of public schools on military installations, will establish comparative data on the quality of facilities that students of military families attend. This assessment is a necessary initial step in a process that will evolve based on the findings. The assessment will identify the magnitude of the overall problem and the resources needed to renovate, expand or replace those schools with the greatest need so that all schools meet acceptable standards.

The Department is providing the number of students of military and/or DoD civilian/contractor personnel from installations who are projected to be gained and lost both by state and Military Service from School Years (SY) 2010 to 2012 in Appendices 1 and 2. Many factors influence a military family's decision to relocate and the timeline for their relocation. Therefore, the numbers provided in this report must be viewed in the context of these factors.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The most accurate accounting of the number of students occurs between the installation and the local community. Housing locations and availability, housing construction timelines, specific demographics of the military members moving to a location, impact of deployment, and the evolving mission of the Armed Services are factors in determining accurate numbers of arriving students.

The influx of new students to a mission growth community raises several education challenges, the most urgent of which is that incoming student numbers may exceed the current educational capacity, particularly regarding school facilities.

The U.S. Department of Education Impact Aid Program announced 24 awards totaling \$59.4 million in May under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Impact Aid Discretionary Construction Grant Program. The purpose of ARRA is to provide school facility emergency repair and modernization grants to certain LEAs that are eligible for Impact Aid. Four awards were granted to school districts serving military dependents as a part of this competition.

In order to encourage quality reintegration time, the Departments of Education and Defense have developed guidance for school districts based on best practices for approving “block leave.” This concept seeks to permit students to take time to be with a recently-returned deployed parent while minimizing the impact on their course of study or attendance record.

The Secretary of Education will make supporting military families one of the Department’s sixteen supplemental priorities for its discretionary grant programs. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Education will seek new means of collecting and reporting data to promote transparency around the performance of military-connected children as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Finally, the U.S. Department of Education is working to improve its Impact Aid funding of school districts serving military dependent children. This includes allowing school districts that experience high growth due to military base realignment to apply for funds using current year, versus previous year, student counts.

States developing shared common and high academic standards and measures of achievement offer great benefit to military families. The Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSI) is a state-led effort coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). The standards were developed by states in collaboration with content experts, teachers, and school administrators to provide a clear and consistent framework to prepare children for college and the workforce. Currently 33 states have adopted the standards set forth by the CCSI. This will benefit military connected families as they move from state to state, no longer subject to widely varying state standards.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Office of Economic Adjustment continues to assist regions experiencing mission growth as a result of Base Realignment and Closure, Global Defense Posture Realignment, Army Modularity, and Grow the Force/Grow the Army. The following recommendations derive from OEA's interactions with these regions and their specific experiences with student growth.

OEA's Recommendations:

Release Timely Data: Advance information on the timing and profile of arriving student populations continues to be necessary for LEAs to plan and carry out responsive improvements to public facilities and services.

Establish a Clearinghouse to Disseminate and Share Information: A clearinghouse can provide consistent and current information on student growth for all stakeholders.

Be Flexible in the Federal Response: Maximum flexibility is needed across the minimal Federal assistance available to support student growth responses. Additionally, an intergovernmental team, under the direction of an authorized Federal entity, can be an on-call rapid response resource to respond to student-growth issues.

Document Construction and Renovation Efforts: Innovative construction and renovation efforts need to be documented and publicly available to support state and local responses where funding gaps impede state, local, and private efforts to provide off- and on-base facilities.

Better Coordinate Federal Education Programs: The U.S. Department of Education Impact Aid Program and DoD Supplemental Impact Aid and Impact Aid for Large Scale Rebased programs can be better coordinated to further support local education operating budgets through better data collaboration and facilitating timely payments.

Better Align Federal, State, and Local Education Laws, Regulations, and Administration: Federal, state, and local education statutes, regulations, and program guidance need to better align to ease the transition of military-dependent students and their families.

The Department and the Services have many initiatives underway directed at meeting the challenges of families, commands and educators.

The Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children, through the Council of State Governments, was developed to address issues associated with class

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

placement, records transfer, immunization requirements, course placement, graduation requirements, exit testing, and extra-curricular opportunities. Currently thirty-five states have enacted the Compact.

The Department expanded the Military Family Life Consultant (MFLC) program to support and augment 297 military-connected LEAs. The consultants provide non-medical support to faculty, staff, parents, and children for issues amenable to short-term problem resolution such as school adjustment issues, deployment and reunion adjustments, and parent-child communications.

The Department also offers military families who are experiencing deployment, whether they are active duty service members, Guard and Reservists on a deployed status, or DoD civilians, free, unlimited access to Tutor.com, an online homework, tutoring and career service.

The DoDEA's Educational Partnership Program continues to provide information and support to increase understanding of the unique needs of military dependent children and academic support to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for those children.

Through competitive and invitational grant programs, DoDEA awarded \$38M to thirty-two school districts in FY 2010. These schools, located throughout the U.S., serve communities near more than thirty military installations. There are more than 37,000 students from military families within these schools, and more than 190,000 total students.

The Educational Partnership Program developed special education professional development modules and is making them available to military-connected LEAs. The Educational Partnership Program also developed an interactive educational resource for military families, military leaders and school leaders. The resource, *Students at the Center*, provides information on important policies, procedures, and best practices that are critical to supporting the needs of military families' education.

The Educational Partnership Program is developing a School Liaison web-based, online course called "*Keeping Students at the Center*" to provide a wealth of resources for School Liaisons. The modules will provide School Liaisons tools and resources to assist them in increasing awareness and knowledge that will enable military families and leaders to be advocates for quality education.

The Educational Partnership Branch is conducting a study, mandated by section 537 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2010, P.L. 111-184, to analyze military-connected LEAs compared to non-military-connected LEAs. The study explores the educational options available to military children that attend schools in need of improvement within the military-connected LEAs, the challenges military parents face in

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

securing quality schooling options for their children, and the educational attainment and impact of children from military families on LEAs.

Through the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed between the Secretaries of Defense and Education in June 2008, the two agencies are collaborating and leveraging their combined strengths to improve the educational opportunities of military-connected students. This increased coordination has provided the opportunity for several new initiatives.

The Army implemented the Army School Support Services Strategic Plan to produce a support system that addresses students' learning environments, academic skills, and personal management skills. The Army has 141 School Liaison Officers located on installations worldwide to provide school support services to Army Families and students, communicate with school districts regarding Army students and installation issues, advise and support installation commands on school matters, and link students and Families to education and post secondary resources and opportunities. Included in the array of education supports and services the Army provides to Families, is the research-based afterschool academic programs initiative that is designed to increase the number of Army youth who successfully achieve proficiency on required state assessments, improve academic grades, and foster the resilience and well-being of Army youth.

The Marine Corps established and staffed 33 School Liaison positions to help parents, commanders and schools work more closely together. School Liaisons advocate for military-connected school aged children, form partnerships with schools and other agencies, assist school districts in applying for available competitive and non-competitive grants and disseminate information on supportive programs like Tutor.com and Student Online Achievement Resources (SOAR).

The Navy's Child and Youth Education Services (CYES) program, which provides a Navy-wide programmatic focus on K-12 issues, is focused on providing "school-based" services that are more accessible to children and families. The school-based programming model, Connect K-12, builds upon the Transition Center Concept born and cultivated in Hawaii schools. In September of 2010, the Navy opened its pilot Connect-K-12 sites in LEAs in San Diego, CA. The mission of Connect K-12 is to cultivate an environment supportive of transitioning families, school preparedness and military mission readiness.

Every Air Force base has a designated senior military officer or senior Air Force civilian who advocates for students of Air Force members with community and school leaders. Air Force installations also have a full-time Civilian School Liaison Officer position. The Liaison officers will work with parents, school staff, other installation agencies, and base leadership to ease the school transition of military-connected students and work

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

individual and systemic issues related to ensuring military children have the best educational options available.

Progress has been made on many fronts and various initiatives are ongoing to assist LEAs that experience growth in the enrollment of military dependent students and to aid students during times of transition and deployment. The Department will continue its concerted efforts to build relationships between local communities, military installations, LEAs, and our state and federal partners to address issues that impact the education and well-being of military dependents and their families.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

III. NUMBER OF STUDENTS TRANSITIONING

The Department is vigilant to ensure timely and accurate distribution of the numbers that communities will use to plan and develop infrastructure and implement systems to support projected growth. In a time of increasingly constrained resources, efficient planning becomes even more important. Local military commands have established relationships with LEAs to provide data regarding the projected number of transitioning students to facilitate planning for the impact of growth on school resources and facilities.

These local relationships allow communities to address the unique characteristics of the mission and the corresponding demographics of the anticipated population. The military student growth and loss data are taken from the projections that the Services provided in the preparation of this report. The data are delineated by states (Appendix 1) and by Military Service (Appendix 2). The projections in Appendices 1 and 2 reflect the *projected military student growth and losses by school year*. As in prior years, the following guidance was provided to each of the Military Departments for use in determining the numbers of students transitioning:

- *Military Student*: (a) Defined as an elementary or secondary school student who is a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces; (b) an elementary or secondary school student who is a dependent of a civilian employee of the DoD; and (c) an elementary or secondary school student who is a dependent of personnel who are not members of the Armed Forces or civilian employees of the DoD, but who are employed on federal property.
- *Installation*: Those installations located in the fifty states and the District of Columbia. If the installation has joint forces, the military department responsible for the installation shall report the total gain and or loss of military students.
- *School Year (SY)*: Refers to the school years that begin in the fall of 2010-2011 and end in the summer of 2011-2012.

As in past years, the following formula was provided to calculate the number of military students per military member and DoD civilian:

- 48 % of military members or DoD civilians have a child;
- 1.6 children per military member or DoD civilian (average); and
- 63 % of children are school-age.

The Military Services were provided the opportunity to adjust the formula to reflect their individual demographics. The Marine Corps adjusted the formula for the number of students per military member. As of September 2010, 32.5 % of Marines have children, and 52% are school age (6-19 years old).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

When using Military Service member data to evaluate the number of school age children of military, DoD civilian, and contractor employees who will potentially be moving to a particular military installation, the numbers need to be evaluated in the proper context. The number of Military Service members moving to a particular installation may not be a true indicator of what is actually happening in a particular community with regard to the number of military students.

Military dependent students are absorbed into a community in several ways. Not all students attend traditional public schools. Students may attend public charter schools, private and/or religious schools, DoD Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools, if eligible, or may be homeschooled. Additionally, there may be several LEAs that serve one installation.

The projected number of students assumes that every student will accompany the military member. However, many factors affect military decisions to move and/or when to move to new locations. The following factors may influence whether the military family moves and, if so, when:

- Scheduled deployment of a military member soon after relocation- families may choose to stay at a current location and/or return to a location closer to extended family if the military member is scheduled to deploy soon after arrival at a new location;
- Permanent Change of Duty Station date occurring after the school year begins- family members may choose to stay at a location until the completion of the current school year to alleviate transition challenges; and
- The quality of education at the new location.

The projected number of civilian/contractor students assumes that DoD civilians and contractors will leave their current duty location and transfer to the new location and that no positions will be filled by hiring civilians already living in/around the gaining installation.

IV. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT (OEA) RECOMMENDATIONS

OEA assists states and regions at the following growing installations: Aberdeen Proving Ground, Cannon Air Force Base, Eglin Air Force Base, Fort Belvoir, Fort Benning, Fort Bliss, Fort Bragg, Fort Carson, Fort Drum, Fort Hood, Fort Knox, Fort Lee, Fort Meade, Fort Polk, Fort Riley, Fort Sill, Fort Stewart, Joint Base Andrews–Naval Air Facility Washington, Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Joint Base San Antonio, Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center Twentynine Palms, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, Marine Corps Air Station New River, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Marine Corps Base Quantico, National Navy Medical Center Bethesda, and Redstone Arsenal.

Extensive planning assistance from OEA has yielded strategies to improve local facilities and enhance public services across several areas of need, including student growth and education. Through late 2009, growth locations identified eighty-seven education projects as necessary for absorbing the student growth. The Office of Economic Adjustment validated seventeen projects, representing an estimated need of \$276 million, as necessary to support the growth.

Based on these efforts, OEA recommends the following:

Release Timely Data: *Advance information on the timing and profile of arriving student populations continues to be necessary for LEAs to plan and carry out responsive improvements to public facilities and services.*

State and local governments need current information on expected military student growth to carry out the necessary local facilities and public service adjustments. Nearly every region faces a dynamic where the affected region works with the local installation to refine the Military Headquarters' personnel projections (on which student growth projections are premised), because of on-the-ground realities. This dynamic yields conflicted estimates and can confuse the local responses as well as efforts to assist by Washington-based policy-makers.

Establish a Clearinghouse to Disseminate and Share Information: *A clearinghouse can provide consistent and current information on student growth for all stakeholders.*

It is imperative that all stakeholders work from the same set of facts when assisting the local education response. This diverse set of stakeholders includes locally affected parents and children, communities (government, businesses, workers, etc.), LEAs, installations, Governors and their state agencies, entities under DoD and the U.S. Department of Education, non-profit organizations, and Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A clearinghouse can greatly address the problem by providing:

- The number of projected “military-dependent students” for incoming military, defense civilians, and installation contractor employees;
- Timelines for their arrival;
- A statement of actual military-dependent students, across military, defense civilians, and installation contractor employees that have arrived for the current and preceding school years (local education officials and installations have indicated they track this information);
- A statement of needed off-base education facilities and services;
- A statement of needed on-base education facilities and services;
- The anticipated Federal share in the consumption of these facilities and services;
- Progress in providing these off-base and on-base facilities and services;
- Federal programs of assistance; and,
- Best practices from other state, local, and public-private experiences.

Be Flexible in the Federal Response: *Maximum flexibility is needed across the minimal Federal assistance available to support student growth responses. Additionally, an intergovernmental team, under the direction of an authorized Federal entity, can be an on-call rapid response resource to respond to student growth issues.*

There is not a responsive program of Federal assistance for local student growth needs. Support for construction (addressed in the next recommendation), teacher recruitment and training, social services, and operations and maintenance varies across each location based on local and state ability to pay.

A team comprised of experienced state (governor and cabinet-level agencies), Federal (DoD and U.S. Department of Education), and certain nonprofit organizations should be established as a rapid response, one-stop resource to address:

- School construction (financing, planning, architecture and engineering, and bricks and mortar);
- Teacher certification and student achievement;
- Student counseling;
- Curriculum;
- Impact Aid (U.S. Department of Education and DoD programs); and
- The effect of some Federal and state attendance requirements on school systems.

Document Construction and Renovation Efforts: *Innovative construction and renovation efforts need to be documented and publicly available to support state and local responses where funding gaps impede state, local, and private efforts to provide off- and on-base facilities.*

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

There are several examples where local education facilities have been constructed or renovated through public and/or private funds. These experiences need to be documented and shared as best practices to support those regions where financing the construction or renovation of facilities remains difficult. Recognizing it takes an average of two to four years for a school to be built (from inception to completion), some LEAs are at a critical point where local students (military and civilian) are being placed in less-than-ideal facilities as the military migration occurs.

Additionally, there are more than 150 on-post public schools owned by non- DoD entities, including LEAs. These schools present a unique challenge as local civilian authorities often lack the financial resources to effectively capitalize or recapitalize facilities on Federal land.

Better Coordinate Federal Education Programs: *The U.S. Department of Education Impact Aid Program and Department of Defense Supplemental Impact Aid and Impact Aid for Large Scale Rebasing programs can be better coordinated to further support local education operating budgets through better data collaboration and facilitating timely payments.*

In conversations with school administrators, many raised the need to close the gap between existing Impact Aid funding levels and the actual cost of educating military-dependent students.

The U.S. Department of Education's Impact Aid Program has been a long-standing source of revenue to compensate school districts for the presence of Federal-dependent children. According to LEAs, impact aid funding is typically used to offset operating expenses. In recent years, many LEAs have experienced a reduction in impact aid *support* due to Federal financial restrictions and distribution formula limitations. In addition, there are cases when these payments are distributed up to two years after the Federal student has arrived in the school district.

Congress initiates the Department of Defense Impact Aid programs annually to supplement local educational agencies "heavily impacted" by military or Department of Defense civilian dependents (more than 19.5 percent of the total average daily attendance), and to assist communities making adjustments resulting from changes in the respective size or location of the Military Forces. To implement the programs, the Department of Defense uses student counts from the U.S. Department of Education's overall Impact Aid data. Local educational agencies and interest groups have suggested that the U.S. Department of Education's data may undercount military students due to voluntary parent survey responses. To better determine Defense Impact Aid funding requirements, local educational agencies, states, and interest groups suggest the Department of Defense, through installation commands, assist the local educational

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

agencies to collect military-dependent data. The additional outreach can provide a more accurate count of Defense-connected children by reducing non-response rates.

Better Align Federal, State, and Local Education Laws, Regulations, and

Administration: *Federal, state, and local education statutes, regulations, and program guidance need to better align to ease the transition of military dependent students and their families.*

These issues are well known to local education administrators, parents, and many stakeholders, and include:

- Learning standards and graduation requirements vary from state to state. Students and their families find dramatically different standards between former, current, and future locations, resulting in the possibility of repeating a grade, taking a different achievement test, delayed graduation, and general anxiety with each move.
- Teacher certification requirements. Military spouses, certified to teach in some states, find themselves unable to teach in other states. By the time a spouse is certified in a new state, the family may need to move again when the military member is transferred.
- Attendance requirements under state and Federal standards may conflict with the “block leave” military families take with their family members around deployments.
- Further effort is necessary to adequately resource and train teachers and other staff to work with students whose parents are preparing to deploy, are currently deployed, or are returning from deployment.

It is imperative that Federal and state policy makers continue to strive to provide flexible regulations, statutes, policies, and practices that are responsive to these issues.

V. PLAN FOR OUTREACH

The Department continues to be engaged in outreach activities on many levels with the overarching goal of helping all military students receive a quality education. In addition to the issues facing transitioning students, many military students have been affected by their parent’s repeated and often extended deployments. Significant research surrounding the psychosocial effects of deployment on military children concludes that multiple deployments have effects on school performance and behavior. All these issues result in a need for collaboration and coordination among the DoD, the Military Services, installations, LEAs, communities and families. Outreach efforts are varied and cross many organizations. Collaboration among all stakeholders is underway in many areas. Examples of efforts include the following:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

1. Department of Defense Initiatives:

Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children

In 2006, DoD in coordination with the Council of State Governments, developed the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children to alleviate the significant school challenges encountered by military families due to frequent relocations in the course of their service. In this regard, most military dependent children will matriculate through approximately eight different school systems from kindergarten to 12th grade. The Compact was developed to address issues associated with class placement, records transfer, immunization requirements, course placement, graduation requirements, exit testing and extra-curricular opportunities.

The Compact reflects input from policy experts and stakeholders from eighteen different organizations, including representatives of parents, teachers, school administrators, military families, and federal, state, and local officials. The Compact establishes guidelines that will allow for the uniform treatment, at the state and local district level, of military dependent children transferring between school districts and states. As further validation of these guidelines, the Compact has been reviewed and approved by the legislatures and signed into law by Governors of thirty-five states as of the end of 2010.

The Compact became active upon approval by the 10th state in July 08, 2008. The Interstate Commission, comprised of representatives of member states along with ex-officio members, met in October 2008, November 2009 and, November 2010 to establish necessary rules and guidance to implement the Compact. The Interstate Commission has designated its officers and established standing committees.

Although DoDEA cannot participate as a member of the Compact, DoDEA has committed, to the extent allowable by law, to abide by the Compact provisions covering class placement, records transfer, immunization requirements, course placement, graduation requirements, exit testing and extra-curricular opportunities. DoDEA also serves as an ex-officio member to the Interstate Compact Commission.

As part of the Compact, member states are establishing State Councils to oversee implementation of the Compact and to assist in resolving Compact-related disputes that may arise. Membership of the States Councils must include a representative from the State Department of Education, a superintendent of a school district with a high concentration of military children, a state legislator, and a representative from the military community who acts as a liaison to the Council.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of Defense Education Assessments

To ensure all military children receive an education of the highest quality, DoD has directed two assessments. The assessments will 1) examine the effectiveness of DoD in meeting the educational needs of all military children and 2) assess the physical condition of public schools on military installations. DoDEA completed a similar assessment program that examined the physical condition of all DoDEA school facilities, resulting in funding for DoDEA to initiate an aggressive renovation, modernization or replacement program to raise all DoDEA schools to the Department's facility quality standard.

The Education Review will provide a profile of DoDEA schools and military-connected LEAS. Data will be collected regarding the current demographic information, student and staff diversity, school data, assessment data, and transition obstacles.

The Education Review will determine each school's current status of curriculum areas such as STEM, foreign languages, virtual learning, and early childhood education. In addition, the Education Review will address transition issues of military families and review the programs associated with Impact Aid and the DoDEA Educational Partnership Grant Program.

Furthermore, the review will address deficiencies and develop action plans to make improvements and review ways to leverage existing strengths within the system such as the DoDEA Virtual School, DoDEA Grants Program, and DoDEA Partnership professional development opportunities.

Finally, the review will determine the latest research information and share documentation to assist in formulating next steps regarding current critical nation-wide educational concerns such as, STEM, language acquisition and early childhood education.

The second assessment, which examines the condition and capacity of public schools on military installations, will establish comparative data on the quality of facilities that students of military families attend. This assessment is a necessary initial step in a process that will evolve based on the findings. The assessment will identify the magnitude of the overall problem and the resources needed to renovate, expand, or replace those schools with the greatest need so that all schools meet acceptable standards. The assessment will ensure the resources made available are applied to those schools with the highest priority requirement in a fair and equitable manner.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of Defense and Department of Education Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

In 2008, the Deputy Secretaries of Defense and Education signed an MOU to create a formal partnership between the two departments to support the education of military students. Through the MOU, the agencies can now leverage their coordinated strengths to improve the educational opportunities of military-connected students.

The MOU provides a series of objectives and responsibilities shared by the agencies to assist states and communities as they prepare for projected increases in military-dependent students. The MOU defines, in general terms, the areas on which the departments will work together to strengthen and expand efforts to ease student transitions, including quality of education; student transition and deployment, data, communication, outreach, and resources. The MOU also creates a working group composed of members from the two departments who will work to implement the MOU as well as issue semiannual reports on their progress.

The U.S. Department of Education continued to reach out to stakeholders dedicated to the support of military-connected children in preparation for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The reauthorization of this act will govern much of the U.S. Department of Education's work in the area of K-12 education and readiness for postsecondary opportunities. Current ESEA goals include closing the academic achievement gap and helping all children learn by holding states and schools accountable for students' academic progress. Reauthorization is expected to address fairness and flexibility for schools, the richness and rigor of the curriculum, support for teachers and principals, school accountability, and turning around low-performing middle and high schools.

In February 2010, senior leaders from the U.S. Department of Education, met with key military family stakeholders to discuss the reauthorization of the ESEA. The meeting was part of the U.S. Department of Education's efforts to reach out to stakeholders in preparation for the reauthorization of ESEA. The discussion focused on military issues as they impact provisions and programs in the law and how a reauthorized ESEA can better support military impacted students.

Capitalizing on this opportunity, DoD proposed the inclusion of a reportable military child subgroup in ESEA. An ongoing challenge for the U.S. Department of Education, DoD, and other advocates identified through the collaborative discussions of the MOU working group is the lack of data on military children, including which schools they attend and how they are performing.

After exploring ways to improve the knowledge base on these issues, DoDEA is conducting a study that will examine the performance and influence of military children in eight military-connected school districts throughout the country. This analysis is part

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

of a larger study mandated by section 537 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2010, P.L. 111-184, to examine the educational options available to military children that are attending schools that are identified as "in need of improvement" by ESEA.

The Departments will continue their concerted efforts to build relationships between local communities, military installations, school districts, and our state and federal partners to address issues that affect the education and well-being of children of the military and their families.

The Department of Defense Education Activity Educational Partnership Program

Recognizing the need for a catalyst to integrate existing educational efforts, DoDEA serves to champion quality educational opportunities for all military children.

Consequently, section 574 (d) of P.L. 109-364, as amended, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to utilize defense-wide operations and maintenance funds to provide programs for LEAs that educate military-connected students. It is estimated that 80% of military children in CONUS attend public schools.

DoDEA's Educational Partnership Program provides information and support to LEAs to increase understanding of the unique needs of military children and academic support to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for military children.

Baseline:

- There are 1.2 million military children worldwide; 85% are living in the United States; approximately, 60% are school age.
- There are 625,000 children of National Guard and 705,000 children of Reserve Members.
- Data from the U.S. Department of Education reports that there are 300 LEAs with a military child enrollment of 5% or more.
- Military children, 6-18 years of age constitute 58% of children impacted by deployment; 33% are 6-11 years old and 25% are 12-18 years old.
- Approximately two million military children have experienced a parental deployment since 2001.
- Significant research surrounding the psychosocial effects of deployment on military children concludes that multiple deployments have effects on school performance and behavior.

DoDEA recognizes that supporting military children takes a school-wide effort, and professional development programs can help to inform school staff of the academic challenges that these children face.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Partnership Grants

To satisfy the congressional mandate, which has been extended every year and is currently effective through 2013, to provide programs to LEAs with military-connected students undergoing transition from force structure changes, a competitive grant program has been established. LEAs serving military installations experiencing projected military student growth of 400 or more military connected students during a timeframe of two school years were deemed eligible to compete.

To build capacity with school districts that may not be experiencing growth due to military force structure changes, an invitational grant program was established. District performance and demographic data are used to identify needs and ensure that decisions to extend invitations to submit a grant proposal are based on sound data.

In 2009, DoDEA awarded 45 three-year grants to 44 LEAs to implement projects that will enhance learning opportunities, student achievement, and educator professional development in schools where enrollments include at least 15 % of students from military families. The Educational Partnership grants are located across all levels of PreK-12 schools, the majority (60%) of the 298 schools in the grant program are elementary schools, and fewer than three % of the schools are combination schools. About 18 percent of the schools are middle schools and nearly 20 percent are high schools.

Nearly 30 percent of the schools participating in the 2009 grant program did not make their respective states' adequate yearly progress (AYP) requirements in school year 2008-09, and about half of these schools are in the School Improvement Program, indicating the schools did not make AYP for two or more consecutive years. These data indicate that DoDEA is meeting its priority of awarding grants to low performing schools in districts that serve military installations experiencing significant military student growth. Additionally, the program provides educational and support services to schools with 189,400 students, of which nearly 41 percent are from military families.

Through the 2010 competitive and invitational grant programs, DoDEA awarded \$38M to 32 school districts. These districts, located throughout the U.S., serve communities near more than 30 military installations. There are more than 37,000 students from military dependent families within the targeted schools and more than 190,000 total students. The majority of the grants -- 26 of the 32 awarded in FY 2010 are focused on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) projects.

Since 2008, DoDEA has provided \$97 million in grants to 77 public schools districts and nearly 600 schools serving more than 100,000 military dependent children.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Special Education Professional Development

The DoDEA Educational Partnership Branch, in collaboration with Cambium Learning Group, Inc. developed special education professional development modules and provided them to military-connected LEAs. The modules are available on DVD and are downloadable from the Internet. Facilitator guides are included to provide additional resources for each module, including implementation and evaluation content. The nature of the modules makes them valuable to individual teachers seeking to gain new knowledge and skills, or for schools and LEAs seeking to implement the specified practices collectively.

In addition to the modules being available as a stand-alone product, the Educational Partnership Program offered two face-to-face professional development seminars using the modules in the summer of 2010. The four-day seminars were hosted by the Clover Park School District in Lakewood, Washington, and Onslow County Public Schools in Jacksonville, N.C. The seminars included training for 150 participants, including special education teachers, regular education teachers, and school administrators.

Students at the Center: A Resource for Military Families, Military Leaders and School Leaders

The *Students at the Center* guide outlines the important policies, procedures, and best practices that will enable military families, military leaders, and school leaders to provide military-connected children the best possible support for success. Throughout the guide are resources designed to aid everyone involved in providing quality education for military families. The resource serves to:

- Empower parents to be better advocates for their children and to more fully understand the rules and policies LEAs must adhere to while meeting the needs of all of their students;
- Inform Military leaders on how to best to work with LEAs to meet the needs of our families and to take advantage of resources available through DoD; and
- Assist LEAs around the country that have within their populations, the children of our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines, Coast Guardsmen, National Guardsmen and Reservists.

The web version of the guide is available at www.militaryk12partners.dodea.edu. The print and DVD versions of the resource guides are available through MilitaryOneSource.com.

Keeping Students at the Center -- School Liaison Web-based Online Course

The DoDEA Educational Partnership Branch is developing a School Liaison web-based, online course called “Keeping Students at the Center” to provide a wealth of resources for School Liaisons from all military services. The modules will provide School Liaisons tools and resources to assist them in increasing awareness and knowledge and enable military families and leaders to be advocates for quality education. It will help the

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

School Liaison assist military families, military leadership, and school leadership in supporting the educational needs of military-connected students.

The course is intended to augment, not replace, specific training each military service provides for its own School Liaisons.

Military and Family Life Consultant Program

In response to the increasing number of children with a deployed parent, DoD extended the Child and Youth Behavioral - Military Family Life Consultant (MFLC) program to support and augment military-connected public schools. The program is also utilized in DoDEA schools. The Child and Youth Behavioral MFLCs provide non-medical support to faculty, staff, parents, and children for issues amenable to short-term problem resolution such as school adjustment issues, deployment and reunion adjustments, and parent-child communications. There are currently 220 MFLCs in 297 military-connected public schools serving over 104,629 students.

Tutor.com

Eligible military families now have access to a free, online tutoring service provided by DoD called Tutor.com for Military Families. The program offers military families access to professional tutors 24/7 for help with homework, studying and test preparation. This service is especially helpful for students who have a parent deployed or need help keeping up with schoolwork when relocating.

Tutors help students of all skill levels--from elementary to advanced--in math, science, social studies and English. Tutors are screened and background-checked, and are experts in the subject they tutor. Eligible families get access to this service by going to www.tutor.com/military.

2. Other Agency Outreach Efforts:

Department of Education

The President's Educate to Innovate Campaign will mobilize its efforts to support military children's math and science achievement. As a key step, the National Math and Science Initiative, in partnership with the Office of Science and Technology, the DoD, and leading non-profits and companies, will lead efforts to expand access for military-connected children to attend Advanced Placement classes in STEM in public high schools that serve a large number of military families. The initiative starts this year with four schools serving Fort Campbell, KY and Fort Hood, TX. Support for an additional three schools is expected in September 2011.

In May 2010, the U.S. Department of Education announced twenty four awards totaling \$59.4 million under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Impact Aid Discretionary Construction Grant Program. The purpose of the ARRA Impact Aid

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Discretionary Construction Program is to provide school facility emergency repair and modernization grants to certain LEAs that are eligible for Impact Aid. This program serves LEAs that have little ability to fund school facility repair and modernization projects from local resources compared to other LEAs.

Four awards were granted to military districts as a part of this competition. Central Union School District, serving Naval Air Station Lemoore, CA received \$1.1 million to remediate an inadequate fire suppression system at the Central Union Elementary School. Derby Unified School District, serving McConnell Air Force Base in Kansas, received \$2.1 million to remodel the existing library/media center, create new classroom space, office and study space at the Cooper Elementary School. Socorro Independent School District, serving Fort Bliss, TX received \$2.4 million to upgrade the HVAC system for the Americas High School. The Portsmouth City School Board serving Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, NH received \$3.7 million to replace or upgrade all systems and elements of the Lakeview Elementary School building.

In order to encourage quality family reintegration time, the U.S. Departments of Education and Defense have provided guidance to school districts based on best practices for approving “block leave.” The concept seeks to permit students to take time to be with a recently-returned deployed parent while minimizing the impact on their course of study or attendance record.

The Secretary of Education will make supporting military families one of the Department’s sixteen supplemental priorities for its discretionary grant programs. This priority, when applied, would favor grant applications to meet the needs of military-connected students for the first time. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Education will seek new means of collecting and reporting data to promote transparency around the performance of military-connected children as part of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Data collection is critical to directing education and counseling resources to those areas most impacted by deployments and other stressors.

Finally, the U.S. Department of Education is working to improve its Impact Aid funding of school districts serving military children. This includes allowing school districts that experience high growth due to military base realignment to apply for funds using current year, versus previous year student counts.

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)

States developing shared common and high academic standards and measures of achievement offer great benefit to military families. The Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSI) is a state-led effort coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO. The standards were developed by states in

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

collaboration with content experts, teachers, and school administrators to provide a clear and consistent framework to prepare children for college and the workforce. Currently 33 states have adopted the standards set forth by the CCSI. This will benefit military-connected families as they move from state to state, no longer subject to widely varying state standards.

3. Military Service Initiatives:

United States Army

The Army is committed to providing Army children and youth with programs and services that promote academic success and total wellness. Ensuring that Army children and youth experience excellence in school support, youth services and child care is an important component of the Army Installation Management Campaign Plan and helps fulfill the Army Family Covenant, the promise the Army has made to provide Army Families a quality of life commensurate with their service and sacrifice to the Nation. As a result, the Army has put into operation specific and targeted actions, including:

The Army implemented the Army School Support Services Strategic Plan. The research-based strategic plan was developed by an interdisciplinary group of stakeholders and addresses students' learning environments, academic skills, and personal management skills to produce a support system that ensures positive outcomes for our Nation's Army children and youth.

Army School Liaison Officers (SLOs) are located on installations worldwide to provide school support services to Army Families and students, communicate with school districts regarding Army student and installation issues, advise and support installation command on school matters, and link students and Families to education and post secondary resources and opportunities. Currently, there are 141 SLOs.

As part of a continuing effort to support Families through transition and deployment, the Army has focused on the responsibilities of SLOs and significantly increased marketing efforts to let Families and school districts know about the support they provide.

Tutor.com is one of the elements of the Army Child, Youth & School Services (CYSS) School Support Study Strong program. Academic tutoring is being offered to active duty military at no cost to the Families. On-line tutors are available 24/7 to provide support in: math, science, English, social studies, advanced subjects (i.e., calculus, physics) and college ACT and SAT prep. Other areas of support are essay writing, state aligned test preparation, and school projects.

Homeschool support is provided to those Families who choose to home school their children. These Families face unique challenges and barriers and SLOs gather and share policies and resources with these Families. Homeschool students may attend CYSS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

youth center homework centers and technology labs on Army installations before and after school.

Research-based afterschool academic programs designed to increase the number of Army youth who successfully achieve proficiency on required state assessments and improve academic grades are offered at selected schools and Youth Centers. Research based academic enrichment activities that support the STEM initiative are included along with activities that are designed to foster youth resilience and well-being.

Knowing that transportation to and from after school programs is challenging for Army Families, the Army has purchased 199 Army Family Covenant-funded buses to provide transportation so that Army students can participate in youth programs.

The Army continues to support Families and school districts by funding training for school administrators, counselors and teachers.

4-H Clubs and Boys and Girls Clubs of America (BGCA) provide community linkages and positive growth and development opportunities for Army children and youth, ages 6-18, as they move from one installation to another. BGCA curriculums used in the Army help with homework and empower girls to deal with bullying.

Youth Sports and Fitness is the largest CYS Services Programs and is proving to be important in helping children deal with stress and fight childhood obesity. Military Family Life Consultants are providing non-medical, short term, situational problem solving counseling services in schools.

Child Behavioral Consultants assigned to CYS Services programs are providing social, emotional and behavioral support for children and youth with concerns subsequent with multiple deployments.

United States Marine Corps

With the end strength of 202,000 accomplished, the Marine Corps has over 52,000 school-aged children. Recognizing that these children, who are as mobile as their military parents, face additional challenges associated with frequent moves between schools and educational systems of differing quality and standards, the Marine Corps established and staffed twenty three School Liaison positions to help parents and commanders interact with local schools and districts. Two Regional School Liaisons and a Headquarters Senior School Liaison Specialist ensure consistent, effective program implementation and provide for appropriate representation to state and federal education authorities.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The roles of the Marine Corps School Liaisons include:

- The School Liaisons advocate for military-connected, school-aged children and form partnerships with schools and other agencies in an effort to improve access and availability to quality education as well as to mitigate education transition issues;
- School Liaisons are actively involved in efforts to assist school districts in applying for available competitive and non-competitive grants, and focusing on issues arising with military-connected school aged children such as the impact of deployment on the student. School Liaisons assist the local school agencies with applying for MFLCs to assist those students, teachers, administrators, and parents with deployment related issues and training and;
- School Liaisons are involved in actively promoting and disseminating information to United States Marine Corps families about free, online programs available to military students and their parents to enhance and improve academic performance such as: Tutor.com, Student Online Achievement Resources, and Curriculum Pathways.

Complementing these efforts, the Marine Corps supports the adoption of the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children with states to ensure reciprocal acceptance of enrollment, graduation requirements, eligibility, and placement requirements.

United States Navy

Even in peacetime, Navy children face special circumstances and with normal ship to shore deployment rotations as many as 70% of our Sailors are in some phase of the deployment cycle or experiencing multiple moves between installations with their families. During their Kindergarten through 12th grade years, they may attend anywhere from six to nine different schools, in addition to the “regular” transitions between grammar, middle and high school. Most teenagers of Navy parents will attend at least two high schools before graduating.

Navy recognizes that Family Readiness = Mission Readiness; therefore, the Navy continues to assume the responsibility to support our Sailors and their families by mitigating the effects of these sacrifices on Navy dependent children through the implementation of the CYES --a Navy-wide programmatic focus on K-12 issues. The fifty-eight Navy SLOs serve to help ensure Navy children have access to a quality education they need to achieve their greatest potential.

Child Youth and Education Services (CYES) is a Navy Child and Youth Program (CYP) initiative that addresses K-12 education needs. Navy SLOs provide support in seven core areas:

- School Transition Support;
- Deployment Support;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

- Special Education System Navigation;
- Command, Educator, Community, Parent communications;
- Home School Support
- Partnerships in Education; and
- Post Secondary Preparation

In an effort to reach more families, CYES is focused on providing “school-based” services that are more accessible for children and families. This focus was accomplished by chartering a cross-functional working group to study the way ahead and process initiatives. The school-based programming model, Connect K-12, builds upon the Transition Center Concept born and cultivated in Hawaii schools. Many of the initiatives capitalize on the outstanding resources and collaborative relationships within our own organization.

In September of 2010, the Navy opened its pilot Connect-K12 sites in LEAs in San Diego, CA. The mission of Connect K-12 is to cultivate an environment supportive of transitioning families, school preparedness and military mission readiness. This collaborative effort between the school, Navy and the local community facilitates transition and orientation experiences that addresses the needs of mobile students, and provides support during deployments while promoting academic achievement and successful social and emotional adjustment at school. Some of the collaborators and their initiatives include:

- Navy Fleet and Family Support is providing counselors to facilitate deployment support groups and resiliency groups;
- Child and Youth Behavior MFLCs work in the Connect K-12 centers , provide assistance to teachers, facilitate deployment and resiliency groups, work with families;
- Child and Youth Programs youth center personnel work collaboratively with the School Liaison Officer to provide youth sponsorship; and
- Other collaborators include: School counselors and other staff members, parent volunteers, and various community organizations.

The Connect K-12 school based programming model is an aggressive initiative that will be replicated Navy-wide.

Specific initiatives and outcomes since the 2010 Report to Congress include:

- Navy SLOs serve commanders, school personnel, and families. The commitment to provide stakeholders with current information, resources and professional development resulted in the publishing of fourteen curriculum modules. Topics include: Military Culture 101, Education Culture 101, Navigating the Special Education Process, The Resilient Military Child, Mobile Military Students, Interstate Compact, Partners in Education, Impact Aid, Children and Deployment,

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Post Secondary Opportunities, Navigating the Education Process, and Deployment Support. These modules will be utilized by the SLOs and will be available online as well.

- Implementation of the Special Education System Navigation Core into the SLOs core responsibilities during the 2009-2010 year. All SLOs attended the Wright's Law Boot Camp and were outfitted with a tool chest of resources and an abundance of knowledge to assist families with special needs. Complementing the CYES initiatives to support families with special needs children, Fleet and Family has hired 32 EFMP Support Liaisons in Navy locations based on the concentration of special needs families. The SLOs work hand in hand with the Fleet and Family Services EFMP Liaisons to assist families in navigating the special needs process in the LEAs. Together, the family is provided with a comprehensive support network.
- Navy CYES actively participated in the School Quality Task Force at the direction of the Secretary of Defense. The School Quality Task Force's mission is to evaluate the quality of schools and their facilities that lie on military property (Key West, Great Lakes, Joint Base Pearl Harbor Hickam, San Diego).

United States Air Force

Air Force families across the world include 175,000 children ages 5-18 and these children generally move more than six to nine times during their K-12 schools years, often making multiple moves in high school years alone.

Academic standards, promotion/graduation requirements, services for children with special needs, eligibility for sports and extracurricular activities, and transfer and acceptance for records vary greatly from state to state and even district to district. While these are not new issues, and are not limited to Air Force, national emphasis on quality education and higher standards for admission to many post-high school education and training institutions increase the stakes like never before.

In addition, the added stress of family separation due to deployments has combined with school transition issues to increase the need for providing information and support to military families dealing with military child education issues. Air Force leadership has gone on record stating "ensuring our Air Force children are successfully integrated into local educational systems (is) a major influence on morale and propensity to remain in the Air Force"

Since military child education responsibilities were moved under the Airman and Family Services (AISA) umbrella at Headquarters Air Force, significant progress has been made in institutionalizing support at the installation level. Each Air Force base has designated a senior military officer or senior Air Force civilian to advocate with community and school leaders for the interests of military families.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

In addition, all Air Force installations also have a full-time civilian SLO position. Primary responsibilities include working with parents, school staff, other installation helping agencies, and base leadership to ease the school transition of military-connected students. The SLOs work individual and systemic issues related to ensuring military children have the best educational options available.

This support for all stakeholders will be particularly important at installations showing significant changes in student demographics over the next few years. For example, as Brooks Air Force Base (AFB) in San Antonio, TX closes, the mission will move to Wright Patterson AFB in Dayton, Ohio, resulting in an estimated 1,900 additional military-connected students entering schools in the Dayton area. New missions at Edwards AFB in California will result in an estimated 2,800 plus increase in military-connected students in that location and joint stationing will bring an additional 1,800 Army-connected students to the Eglin AFB area in Florida.

The Air Force continues to work closely with partners such as DoDEA, the U.S Department of Education, and military child connection non-federal entities to meet the need to provide support to our children who face the tough challenges of mobile military lifestyle and the anxiety of parental separation.

VI. CONCLUSION:

The projected student population figures given in this report represent a snapshot in time and will increase or decrease depending on: 1) mission requirements; 2) timely completion of infrastructure, such as housing and utilities; and 3) the military members' decisions about the best time to relocate their school-age children. The most accurate and up-to-date information comes from communities working closely with military installation commanders. Experience demonstrates that communities that work collaboratively with their state(s), installation commanders and business leaders are able to develop and successfully execute educational growth plans that are viable, sustainable and accurately reflect the unique needs of that community.

Although the restructuring of the military installations presents many challenges, both growth and the subsequent expansion of communities represent positive potential. Partnerships and collaborative planning between school systems and the military are crucial. DoD views this as shared responsibility among the military, supporting communities and families all working together toward a common goal.

Progress has been made on many fronts and many initiatives are ongoing to provide assistance to LEAs that experience growth in the enrollment of military dependent students and to aid students during times of transition and deployment.

Quality education of military children affects enlistment, retention, and morale, and has a role in operational readiness. Therefore, the Department will continue its concerted

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

efforts to build relationships between local communities, military installations, LEAs, and our state and federal partners to address issues that impact the education and well-being of military dependents and their families.

Appendix 1: Projected Military Student Growth and Loss by Installation by State

State	Service	Installation	SY 10/11			SY 11/12			Total MIL	Total CIV	Total CTR	Grand Total
			MIL	CIV	CTR	MIL	CIV	CTR				
AK	USAF	Eielson AFB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
AK	USA	Fort Greely	1	65	1	0	4	0	1	69	1	71
AK	USA	Fort Wainwright	79	18	0	58	52	0	137	70	0	207
AK	USAF	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	7	2	0	(1)	0	(16)	6	2	(16)	(8)
AL	USA	Anniston Army Depot	0	(184)	(51)	0	(93)	(120)	0	(277)	(171)	(448)
AL	USA	Fort McClellan	(1)	1	0	0	0	0	(1)	1	0	0
AL	USA	Fort Rucker	(16)	59	(102)	40	39	4	24	98	(98)	24
AL	USAF	Maxwell AFB	(33)	1	0	(33)	1	0	(66)	2	0	(64)
AL	USA	Redstone Arsenal	63	249	(380)	0	(31)	(43)	63	218	(423)	(142)
AR	USAF	Little Rock AFB	200	5	(101)	88	19	27	288	24	(74)	238
AR	USA	Pine Bluff Arsenal	0	(18)	(6)	0	(18)	(16)	0	(36)	(22)	(58)
AZ	USAF	Davis-Monthan AFB	42	3	(113)	0	1	0	42	4	(113)	(67)
AZ	USA	Fort Huachuca	(204)	113	53	(187)	109	(354)	(391)	222	(301)	(470)
AZ	USAF	Luke AFB	(133)	134	0	22	19	0	(111)	153	0	42
AZ	USMC	MCAS Yuma	72	(9)	0	63	0	0	135	(9)	0	126
AZ	USA	Yuma Proving Ground	0	6	0	(1)	50	0	(1)	56	0	55
CA	USMC	Barstow	22	(3)	0	(1)	0	0	22	(3)	0	19
CA	USAF	Beale AFB	36	4	6	0	0	0	36	4	6	46
CA	USMC	Camp Pendleton	302	45	0	29	0	0	331	46	0	377
CA	USAF	Edwards AFB	(374)	381	2922	(13)	(67)	0	(387)	314	2922	2849
CA	USA	Fort Hunter Liggett	(3)	3	(2)	1	12	0	(2)	15	(2)	11
CA	USAF	Los Angeles AFB	18	24	0	6	9	0	24	33	0	57
CA	USMC	MCAGCC 29 Palms	60	30	0	51	2	0	112	31	0	143
CA	USMC	MCAS Miramar	71	(2)	0	70	0	0	141	(2)	0	138
CA	USMC	MCRD San Diego	23	10	0	0	0	0	23	10	0	33
CA	USMC	MWTC Bridgeport	5	21	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	27
CA	USN	NAVAIRWPNSTA China Lake	0	82	0	0	10	0	0	92	0	92
CA	USN	NAVBASE Point Loma	23	(4)	0	(1)	(60)	0	22	(64)	0	(42)
CA	USN	NS San Diego	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
CA	USA	NTC And Fort Irwin	(210)	1	0	30	72	0	(180)	73	0	(107)
CA	USA	Presido of Monterey	202	18	3	299	7	0	501	25	3	529
CA	USA	Riverbank AAP	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	(1)
CA	USA	SAT COM	17	44	(25)	11	6	0	28	50	(25)	53
CA	USA	Sierra Army Depot	0	102	(15)	0	0	0	0	102	(15)	87
CA	USAF	Travis AFB	(2)	(5)	0	(1)	0	0	(3)	(5)	0	(8)
CA	USAF	Vandenberg AFB	36	85	0	12	50	0	48	135	0	183
CO	USAF	Buckley AFB	40	74	0	7	21	0	47	95	0	142
CO	USA	Fort Carson	101	93	(294)	4	38	(41)	105	131	(335)	(99)
CO	USAF	Peterson AFB	60	320	0	20	75	0	80	395	0	475
CO	USA	Pueblo Chem Depot	0	6	0	0	4	0	0	10	0	10
CO	USAF	Schriever AFB	60	70	0	15	20	0	75	90	0	165
DC	USMC	8th and I/Marine Barracks	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	(1)
DC	USA	Fort McNair	(2)	25	0	15	5	0	13	30	0	43
DC	USN	Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling	(50)	26	0	14	310	0	(36)	336	0	300
DC	USA	Walter Reed AMC	(1596)	(1632)	(1160)	9	97	0	(1587)	(1535)	(1160)	(4282)
DE	USAF	Dover AFB	0	0	0	154	1	345	154	1	345	500
FL	USMC	Blount Island	4	(1)	0	0	0	0	4	(1)	0	3
FL	USAF	Eglin AFB	1184	15	62	481	1	62	1665	16	124	1805
FL	USAF	Hurlburt Field	53	40	0	209	0	0	262	40	0	302
FL	USAF	MacDill AFB	8	214	(69)	1	115	(60)	9	329	(129)	209
FL	USN	NAS Jacksonville	667	2	0	(15)	2	0	652	4	0	656

Appendix 1: Projected Military Student Growth and Loss by Installation by State

State	Service	Installation	SY 10/11			SY 11/12			Total MIL	Total CIV	Total CTR	Grand Total
			MIL	CIV	CTR	MIL	CIV	CTR				
FL	USAF	Patrick AFB	11	14	30	3	4	0	14	18	30	62
FL	USMC	Pensacola	16	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	16
FL	USAF	Tyndall AFB	(386)	(3)	(48)	0	0	0	(386)	(3)	(48)	(437)
FL	USA	US Army Garrison-Miami	7	94	0	2	1	0	9	95	0	104
GA	USMC	Albany	47	16	0	1	0	0	48	17	0	65
GA	USA	Fort Benning	158	464	30	(38)	55	19	120	519	49	688
GA	USA	Fort Gillem	(169)	(299)	(148)	0	0	0	(169)	(299)	(148)	(616)
GA	USA	Fort Gordon	(5)	100	131	(201)	39	(10)	(206)	139	121	54
GA	USA	Fort McPherson	(772)	(854)	(521)	2	(4)	0	(770)	(858)	(521)	(2149)
GA	USA	Fort Stewart	(249)	98	0	80	50	0	(169)	148	0	(21)
GA	USA	Hunter Army Airfield	(81)	39	0	(159)	1	0	(240)	40	0	(200)
GA	USAF	Moody AFB	35	7	1	0	0	0	35	7	1	43
GA	USN	NMCRRC Atlanta	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
GA	USAF	Robins AFB	19	47	167	(20)	34	0	(1)	81	167	247
HI	USA	Fort Shafter	(19)	118	(1)	(15)	(12)	0	(34)	106	(1)	71
HI	USMC	MCB Hawaii	(4)	(9)	0	(1)	0	0	(5)	(9)	0	(15)
HI	USA	Schofield BKS Military Reservation	(17)	(85)	0	(135)	44	0	(152)	(41)	0	(193)
ID	USAF	Mountain Home AFB	2	2	29	0	0	(33)	2	2	(4)	0
IL	USA	Rock Island Arsenal	86	134	1	0	(494)	(43)	86	(360)	(42)	(316)
IL	USAF	Scott AFB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IN	USA	Crane Army Ammunition Activity	0	(1)	0	0	(76)	0	0	(77)	0	(77)
IN	USA	Newport Chem Depot	0	(2)	(48)	0	(4)	(100)	0	(6)	(148)	(154)
KS	USA	Fort Leavenworth	186	9	(108)	(1)	75	(2)	185	84	(110)	159
KS	USA	Fort Riley	(71)	(79)	0	(129)	26	0	(200)	(53)	0	(253)
KS	USAF	McConnell AFB	312	12	(10)	16	0	0	328	12	(10)	330
KY	USA	Blue Grass Army Depot	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
KY	USA	Fort Campbell	11	69	(200)	(284)	34	(248)	(273)	103	(448)	(618)
KY	USA	Fort Knox	(631)	(383)	125	56	(169)	(135)	(575)	(552)	(10)	(1137)
LA	USAF	Barksdale AFB	233	124	0	277	26	0	510	150	0	660
LA	USN	Federal City New Orleans	128	64	0	0	0	0	128	64	0	192
LA	USA	Fort Polk	(72)	53	0	17	3	0	(55)	56	0	1
LA	USMC	Marforres, New Orleans	31	93	0	1	0	0	33	93	0	125
LA	USN	NAS JRB New Orleans	30	21	0	2	0	0	32	21	0	53
MA	USAF	Hanscom AFB	153	145	(164)	(2)	329	(273)	151	474	(437)	188
MA	USA	Soldier Systems Center	0	43	(15)	0	16	(1)	0	59	(16)	43
MD	USA	Aberdeen Proving Ground	1	837	378	(57)	228	(101)	(56)	1065	277	1286
MD	USA	Adelphi Laboratory Center	2	(11)	44	0	24	(27)	2	13	17	32
MD	USA	Fort Detrick	(60)	132	87	(18)	104	12	(78)	236	99	257
MD	USA	Fort Meade	399	1799	708	10	105	(3)	409	1904	705	3018
MD	USA	Glen Annexes	114	170	408	(3)	(18)	0	111	152	408	671
MD	USAF	Joint Base Andrews	302	286	186	0	0	0	302	286	186	774
MI	USA	Detroit Arsenal	15	687	3	(1)	(62)	(26)	14	625	(23)	616
MO	USA	Fort Leonard Wood	(20)	18	0	(45)	45	0	(65)	63	0	(2)
MO	USMC	Kansas City	(57)	(59)	0	(4)	0	0	(61)	(59)	0	(120)
MS	USAF	Columbus AFB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MS	USAF	Keesler AFB	(3)	17	(14)	0	0	0	(3)	17	(14)	0
NC	USA	Army Research Office	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	3
NC	USMC	Camp Lejeune	303	(211)	0	38	0	0	342	(211)	0	131
NC	USA	Fort Bragg	870	1099	466	190	114	63	1060	1213	529	2802
NC	USMC	MCAS Cherry Point	(48)	(16)	0	26	0	0	(21)	(16)	0	(38)
NC	USMC	MCAS New River	421	(2)	0	(4)	0	0	417	(2)	0	415

Appendix 1: Projected Military Student Growth and Loss by Installation by State

State	Service	Installation	SY 10/11			SY 11/12			Total MIL	Total CIV	Total CTR	Grand Total
			MIL	CIV	CTR	MIL	CIV	CTR				
TX	USA	Lone Star AAP	0	(9)	(158)	0	0	0	0	(9)	(158)	(167)
TX	USA	Red River Army Depot	0	(843)	(36)	0	(359)	(9)	0	(1202)	(45)	(1247)
TX	USAF	Sheppard AFB	(159)	(56)	0	(58)	(8)	0	(217)	(64)	0	(281)
TX	USAF	Vance AFB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
UT	USA	Dugway Proving Ground	0	1	(22)	41	41	10	41	42	(12)	71
UT	USAF	Hill AFB	32	44	37	2	40	21	34	84	58	176
UT	USA	Tooele Army Depot	0	1	0	0	(11)	0	0	(10)	0	(10)
VA	USA	Arlington Hall NG Readiness Center	24	14	0	7	26	0	31	40	0	71
VA	USA	Fort A P Hill	0	(24)	0	15	16	0	15	(8)	0	7
VA	USA	Fort Belvoir	1419	5292	3295	(2)	20	(67)	1417	5312	3228	9957
VA	USA	Fort Lee	(631)	41	55	(96)	45	31	(727)	86	86	(555)
VA	USA	Fort Monroe	(563)	(778)	(218)	(1)	(6)	0	(564)	(784)	(218)	(1566)
VA	USA	Fort Pickett	0	0	0	7	0	0	7	0	0	7
VA	USAF	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	43	204	58	0	55	(2)	43	259	56	358
VA	USA	Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall	0	49	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	49
VA	USN	Joint Exped Base Little Creek-Fort Story	0	(5)	0	0	(1)	0	0	(6)	0	(6)
VA	USMC	MARFORCOM	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	11
VA	USMC	MCB Quantico	53	378	0	(42)	2	0	11	380	0	391
VA	USN	NFA Arlington	0	0	0	216	216	75	216	216	75	507
VA	USN	NS Norfolk	28	9	0	0	(2)	0	28	7	0	35
VA	USN	NSA NW Annex Chesapeake	0	0	0	54	8	0	54	8	0	62
VA	USN	NSWC Dahlgren	0	2	0	0	41	0	0	43	0	43
VA	USN	NSY Norfolk	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	22
VA	USA	Radford AAP	0	(24)	0	0	(1)	0	0	(25)	0	(25)
VA	USA	Rivanna Station	41	598	915	9	3	7	50	601	922	1573
WA	USAF	Fairchild AFB	189	0	0	26	0	0	215	0	0	215
WA	USA	Joint Base Lewis-McChord	819	318	(52)	(115)	84	(34)	704	402	(86)	1020
WA	USN	NSY Puget Sound	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	22
WI	USA	Fort McCoy	(97)	(65)	11	(21)	80	28	(118)	15	39	(64)

Appendix 2: Projected Military Student Growth and Loss by Installation by Service

Service	Installation	State	SY 10/11			SY 11/12			Total MIL	Total CIV	Total CTR	Grand Total
			MIL	CIV	CTR	MIL	CIV	CTR				
USA	Fort Greely	AK	1	65	1	0	4	0	1	69	1	71
USA	Fort Wainwright	AK	79	18	0	58	52	0	137	70	0	207
USA	Anniston Army Depot	AL	0	(184)	(51)	0	(93)	(120)	0	(277)	(171)	(448)
USA	Fort McClellan	AL	(1)	1	0	0	0	0	(1)	1	0	0
USA	Fort Rucker	AL	(16)	59	(102)	40	39	4	24	98	(98)	24
USA	Redstone Arsenal	AL	63	249	(380)	0	(31)	(43)	63	218	(423)	(142)
USA	Pine Bluff Arsenal	AR	0	(18)	(6)	0	(18)	(16)	0	(36)	(22)	(58)
USA	Fort Huachuca	AZ	(204)	113	53	(187)	109	(354)	(391)	222	(301)	(470)
USA	Yuma Proving Ground	AZ	0	6	0	(1)	50	0	(1)	56	0	55
USA	Fort Hunter Liggett	CA	(3)	3	(2)	1	12	0	(2)	15	(2)	11
USA	NTC And Fort Irwin	CA	(210)	1	0	30	72	0	(180)	73	0	(107)
USA	Presido of Monterey	CA	202	18	3	299	7	0	501	25	3	529
USA	Riverbank AAP	CA	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	(1)
USA	SAT COM	CA	17	44	(25)	11	6	0	28	50	(25)	53
USA	Sierra Army Depot	CA	0	102	(15)	0	0	0	0	102	(15)	87
USA	Fort Carson	CO	101	93	(294)	4	38	(41)	105	131	(335)	(99)
USA	Pueblo Chem Depot	CO	0	6	0	0	4	0	0	10	0	10
USA	Fort McNair	DC	(2)	25	0	15	5	0	13	30	0	43
USA	Walter Reed AMC	DC	(1596)	(1632)	(1160)	9	97	0	(1587)	(1535)	(1160)	(4282)
USA	US Army Garrison-Miami	FL	7	94	0	2	1	0	9	95	0	104
USA	Fort Benning	GA	158	464	30	(38)	55	19	120	519	49	688
USA	Fort Gillem	GA	(169)	(299)	(148)	0	0	0	(169)	(299)	(148)	(616)
USA	Fort Gordon	GA	(5)	100	131	(201)	39	(10)	(206)	139	121	54
USA	Fort McPherson	GA	(772)	(854)	(521)	2	(4)	0	(770)	(858)	(521)	(2149)
USA	Fort Stewart	GA	(249)	98	0	80	50	0	(169)	148	0	(21)
USA	Hunter Army Airfield	GA	(81)	39	0	(159)	1	0	(240)	40	0	(200)
USA	Fort Shafter	HI	(19)	118	(1)	(15)	(12)	0	(34)	106	(1)	71
USA	Schofield BKS Military Reservation	HI	(17)	(85)	0	(135)	44	0	(152)	(41)	0	(193)
USA	Rock Island Arsenal	IL	86	134	1	0	(494)	(43)	86	(360)	(42)	(316)
USA	Crane Army Ammunition Activity	IN	0	(1)	0	0	(76)	0	0	(77)	0	(77)
USA	Newport Chem Depot	IN	0	(2)	(48)	0	(4)	(100)	0	(6)	(148)	(154)
USA	Fort Leavenworth	KS	186	9	(108)	(1)	75	(2)	185	84	(110)	159
USA	Fort Riley	KS	(71)	(79)	0	(129)	26	0	(200)	(53)	0	(253)
USA	Blue Grass Army Depot	KY	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
USA	Fort Campbell	KY	11	69	(200)	(284)	34	(248)	(273)	103	(448)	(618)
USA	Fort Knox	KY	(631)	(383)	125	56	(169)	(135)	(575)	(552)	(10)	(1137)
USA	Fort Polk	LA	(72)	53	0	17	3	0	(55)	56	0	1
USA	Soldier Systems Center	MA	0	43	(15)	0	16	(1)	0	59	(16)	43
USA	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	1	837	378	(57)	228	(101)	(56)	1065	277	1286
USA	Adelphi Laboratory Center	MD	2	(11)	44	0	24	(27)	2	13	17	32
USA	Fort Detrick	MD	(60)	132	87	(18)	104	12	(78)	236	99	257
USA	Fort Meade	MD	399	1799	708	10	105	(3)	409	1904	705	3018
USA	Glen Annexes	MD	114	170	408	(3)	(18)	0	111	152	408	671
USA	Detroit Arsenal	MI	15	687	3	(1)	(62)	(26)	14	625	(23)	616
USA	Fort Leonard Wood	MO	(20)	18	0	(45)	45	0	(65)	63	0	(2)
USA	Army Research Office	NC	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	3
USA	Fort Bragg	NC	870	1099	466	190	114	63	1060	1213	529	2802
USA	Military Ocean TML Sunny Point	NC	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
USA	Fort Monmouth	NJ	(211)	(1266)	(883)	0	(424)	(74)	(211)	(1690)	(957)	(2858)
USA	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	3	199	0	3	(4)	0	6	195	0	201
USA	White Sands Missile Range	NM	2	10	(5)	(30)	48	(5)	(28)	58	(10)	20

Appendix 2: Projected Military Student Growth and Loss by Installation by Service

Service	Installation	State	SY 10/11			SY 11/12			Total MIL	Total CIV	Total CTR	Grand Total
			MIL	CIV	CTR	MIL	CIV	CTR				
USA	Fort Drum	NY	(133)	58	(45)	(60)	9	(1)	(193)	67	(46)	(172)
USA	Fort Hamilton	NY	(14)	(12)	0	(10)	4	0	(24)	(8)	0	(32)
USA	Fort Totten	NY	4	2	0	(6)	(11)	0	(2)	(9)	0	(11)
USA	Watervliet Arsenal	NY	0	6	0	0	(35)	(10)	0	(29)	(10)	(39)
USA	West Point MIL Reservation	NY	117	20	0	(1)	22	0	116	42	0	158
USA	Fort Sill	OK	94	172	229	(218)	42	(23)	(124)	214	206	296
USA	McAlester AAP	OK	0	65	0	0	(249)	0	0	(184)	0	(184)
USA	Umatilla Chem Depot	OR	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
USA	Carlise Barracks	PA	30	7	0	(1)	4	0	29	11	0	40
USA	Charles E Kelly SPT FAC	PA	0	(22)	0	0	0	0	0	(22)	0	(22)
USA	Defense Distrib Depot SUSQ	PA	0	(12)	0	0	9	0	0	(3)	0	(3)
USA	Fort Indiantown Gap	PA	20	1	0	0	0	0	20	1	0	21
USA	Letterkenny Army Depot	PA	0	30	(102)	0	(4)	(7)	0	26	(109)	(83)
USA	Tobyhanna Army Depot	PA	0	11	(71)	0	11	(303)	0	22	(374)	(352)
USA	Fort Jackson	SC	(573)	(62)	0	158	127	0	(415)	65	0	(350)
USA	Camp Rapid TS	SD	(9)	(1)	0	1	0	0	(8)	(1)	0	(9)
USA	Corpus Christi Army Depot	TX	0	31	(20)	0	30	(24)	0	61	(44)	17
USA	Fort Bliss	TX	3108	96	(370)	1755	94	(21)	4863	190	(391)	4662
USA	Fort Hood	TX	(1398)	116	46	286	86	(353)	(1112)	202	(307)	(1217)
USA	Lone Star AAP	TX	0	(9)	(158)	0	0	0	0	(9)	(158)	(167)
USA	Red River Army Depot	TX	0	(843)	(36)	0	(359)	(9)	0	(1202)	(45)	(1247)
USA	Dugway Proving Ground	UT	0	1	(22)	41	41	10	41	42	(12)	71
USA	Tooele Army Depot	UT	0	1	0	0	(11)	0	0	(10)	0	(10)
USA	Arlington Hall NG Readiness Center	VA	24	14	0	7	26	0	31	40	0	71
USA	Fort A P Hill	VA	0	(24)	0	15	16	0	15	(8)	0	7
USA	Fort Belvoir	VA	1419	5292	3295	(2)	20	(67)	1417	5312	3228	9957
USA	Fort Lee	VA	(631)	41	55	(96)	45	31	(727)	86	86	(555)
USA	Fort Monroe	VA	(563)	(778)	(218)	(1)	(6)	0	(564)	(784)	(218)	(1566)
USA	Fort Pickett	VA	0	0	0	7	0	0	7	0	0	7
USA	Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall	VA	0	49	0	0	0	0	0	49	0	49
USA	Radford AAP	VA	0	(24)	0	0	(1)	0	0	(25)	0	(25)
USA	Rivanna Station	VA	41	598	915	9	3	7	50	601	922	1573
USA	Joint Base Lewis-McChord	WA	819	318	(52)	(115)	84	(34)	704	402	(86)	1020
USA	Fort McCoy	WI	(97)	(65)	11	(21)	80	28	(118)	15	39	(64)
USMC	MCAS Yuma	AZ	72	(9)	0	63	0	0	135	(9)	0	126
USMC	Barstow	CA	22	(3)	0	(1)	0	0	22	(3)	0	19
USMC	Camp Pendleton	CA	302	45	0	29	0	0	331	46	0	377
USMC	MCAGCC 29 Palms	CA	60	30	0	51	2	0	112	31	0	143
USMC	MCAS Miramar	CA	71	(2)	0	70	0	0	141	(2)	0	138
USMC	MCRD San Diego	CA	23	10	0	0	0	0	23	10	0	33
USMC	MWTC Bridgeport	CA	5	21	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	27
USMC	8th and I/Marine Barracks	DC	0	(1)	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	0	(1)
USMC	Blount Island	FL	4	(1)	0	0	0	0	4	(1)	0	3
USMC	Pensacola	FL	16	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	16
USMC	Albany	GA	47	16	0	1	0	0	48	17	0	65
USMC	MCB Hawaii	HI	(4)	(9)	0	(1)	0	0	(5)	(9)	0	(15)
USMC	Marforres, New Orleans	LA	31	93	0	1	0	0	33	93	0	125
USMC	Kansas City	MO	(57)	(59)	0	(4)	0	0	(61)	(59)	0	(120)
USMC	Camp Lejeune	NC	303	(211)	0	38	0	0	342	(211)	0	131
USMC	MCAS Cherry Point	NC	(48)	(16)	0	26	0	0	(21)	(16)	0	(38)
USMC	MCAS New River	NC	421	(2)	0	(4)	0	0	417	(2)	0	415

Appendix 2: Projected Military Student Growth and Loss by Installation by Service

Service	Installation	State	SY 10/11			SY 11/12			Total MIL	Total CIV	Total CTR	Grand Total
			MIL	CIV	CTR	MIL	CIV	CTR				
USMC	1st MC District Garden City	NY	(6)	(1)	0	(4)	0	0	(11)	(1)	0	(11)
USMC	MCAS Beaufort	SC	54	(11)	0	(2)	0	0	52	(11)	0	41
USMC	MCRD Parris Island	SC	(1)	7	0	0	0	0	(1)	7	0	6
USMC	MARFORCOM	VA	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	0	11
USMC	MCB Quantico	VA	53	378	0	(42)	2	0	11	380	0	391
USN	NAVAIRWPNSTA China Lake	CA	0	82	0	0	10	0	0	92	0	92
USN	NAVBASE Point Loma	CA	23	(4)	0	(1)	(60)	0	22	(64)	0	(42)
USN	NS San Diego	CA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
USN	Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling	DC	(50)	26	0	14	310	0	(36)	336	0	300
USN	NAS Jacksonville	FL	667	2	0	(15)	2	0	652	4	0	656
USN	NMCRCA Atlanta	GA	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
USN	Federal City New Orleans	LA	128	64	0	0	0	0	128	64	0	192
USN	NAS JRB New Orleans	LA	30	21	0	2	0	0	32	21	0	53
USN	NSY Portsmouth	NH	0	0	0	37	13	0	37	13	0	50
USN	NMCRCA Lehigh Valley	PA	0	0	0	10	0	0	10	0	0	10
USN	NMCRCA Pittsburgh	PA	0	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	0	8
USN	NSA Philadelphia	PA	0	0	0	0	83	0	0	83	0	83
USN	Joint Exped. Base Little Creek-Fort Story	VA	0	(5)	0	0	(1)	0	0	(6)	0	(6)
USN	NFA Arlington	VA	0	0	0	216	216	75	216	216	75	507
USN	NS Norfolk	VA	28	9	0	0	(2)	0	28	7	0	35
USN	NSA NW Annex Chesapeake	VA	0	0	0	54	8	0	54	8	0	62
USN	NSWC Dahlgren	VA	0	2	0	0	41	0	0	43	0	43
USN	NSY Norfolk	VA	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	22
USN	NSY Puget Sound	WA	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	22
USAF	Eielson AFB	AK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USAF	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	AK	7	2	0	(1)	0	(16)	6	2	(16)	(8)
USAF	Maxwell AFB	AL	(33)	1	0	(33)	1	0	(66)	2	0	(64)
USAF	Little Rock AFB	AR	200	5	(101)	88	19	27	288	24	(74)	238
USAF	Davis-Monthan AFB	AZ	42	3	(113)	0	1	0	42	4	(113)	(67)
USAF	Luke AFB	AZ	(133)	134	0	22	19	0	(111)	153	0	42
USAF	Beale AFB	CA	36	4	6	0	0	0	36	4	6	46
USAF	Edwards AFB	CA	(374)	381	2922	(13)	(67)	0	(387)	314	2922	2849
USAF	Los Angeles AFB	CA	18	24	0	6	9	0	24	33	0	57
USAF	Travis AFB	CA	(2)	(5)	0	(1)	0	0	(3)	(5)	0	(8)
USAF	Vandenberg AFB	CA	36	85	0	12	50	0	48	135	0	183
USAF	Buckley AFB	CO	40	74	0	7	21	0	47	95	0	142
USAF	Peterson AFB	CO	60	320	0	20	75	0	80	395	0	475
USAF	Schriever AFB	CO	60	70	0	15	20	0	75	90	0	165
USAF	Dover AFB	DE	0	0	0	154	1	345	154	1	345	500
USAF	Eglin AFB	FL	1184	15	62	481	1	62	1665	16	124	1805
USAF	Hurlburt Field	FL	53	40	0	209	0	0	262	40	0	302
USAF	MacDill AFB	FL	8	214	(69)	1	115	(60)	9	329	(129)	209
USAF	Patrick AFB	FL	11	14	30	3	4	0	14	18	30	62
USAF	Tyndall AFB	FL	(386)	(3)	(48)	0	0	0	(386)	(3)	(48)	(437)
USAF	Moody AFB	GA	35	7	1	0	0	0	35	7	1	43
USAF	Robins AFB	GA	19	47	167	(20)	34	0	(1)	81	167	247
USAF	Mountain Home AFB	ID	2	2	29	0	0	(33)	2	2	(4)	0
USAF	Scott AFB	IL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USAF	McConnell AFB	KS	312	12	(10)	16	0	0	328	12	(10)	330
USAF	Barksdale AFB	LA	233	124	0	277	26	0	510	150	0	660
USAF	Hanscom AFB	MA	153	145	(164)	(2)	329	(273)	151	474	(437)	188

Appendix 2: Projected Military Student Growth and Loss by Installation by Service

Service	Installation	State	SY 10/11			SY 11/12			Total MIL	Total CIV	Total CTR	Grand Total
			MIL	CIV	CTR	MIL	CIV	CTR				
USAF	Joint Base Andrews	MD	302	286	186	0	0	0	302	286	186	774
USAF	Columbus AFB	MS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USAF	Keesler AFB	MS	(3)	17	(14)	0	0	0	(3)	17	(14)	0
USAF	Seymour Johnson AFB	NC	(19)	13	95	0	0	0	(19)	13	95	89
USAF	Grand Forks AFB	ND	(101)	18	0	1	0	0	(100)	18	0	(82)
USAF	Minot AFB	ND	421	5	0	0	0	0	421	5	0	426
USAF	Offutt AFB	NE	(1)	1	51	0	1	0	(1)	2	51	52
USAF	Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst	NJ	709	81	0	0	0	0	709	81	0	790
USAF	Cannon AFB	NM	180	17	0	208	3	0	388	20	0	408
USAF	Holloman AFB	NM	52	2	(2)	0	0	0	52	2	(2)	52
USAF	Kirtland AFB	NM	24	114	(193)	(19)	70	(12)	5	184	(205)	(16)
USAF	Creech AFB	NV	145	1	63	1	0	0	146	1	63	210
USAF	Nellis AFB	NV	25	27	(107)	0	2	0	25	29	(107)	(53)
USAF	Wright-Patterson AFB	OH	511	509	385	91	90	386	602	599	771	1972
USAF	Altus AFB	OK	(2)	0	0	0	0	0	(2)	0	0	(2)
USAF	Tinker AFB	OK	(5)	16	25	2	(6)	0	(3)	10	25	32
USAF	Vance AFB	Ok	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USAF	Joint Base Charleston	SC	(1)	0	0	(2)	109	0	(3)	109	0	106
USAF	Shaw AFB	SC	710	47	65	0	0	0	710	47	65	822
USAF	Ellsworth AFB	SD	4	1	1	0	1	3	4	2	4	10
USAF	Brooks AFB	TX	0	(500)	0	(757)	(742)	0	(757)	(1242)	0	(1999)
USAF	Dyess AFB	TX	(25)	0	(15)	0	0	0	(25)	0	(15)	(40)
USAF	Goodfellow AFB	TX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USAF	Joint Base San Antonio	TX	1741	438	79	50	(26)	(30)	1791	412	49	2252
USAF	Laughlin AFB	TX	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USAF	Sheppard AFB	TX	(159)	(56)	0	(58)	(8)	0	(217)	(64)	0	(281)
USAF	Hill AFB	UT	32	44	37	2	40	21	34	84	58	176
USAF	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	VA	43	204	58	0	55	(2)	43	259	56	358
USAF	Fairchild AFB	WA	189	0	0	26	0	0	215	0	0	215