# Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for Defense Dependents' Education (*Update*)

February 2014











# The Secretary of Defense Update to the Report to the Congressional Defense Committees on Department of Defense Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for Defense Dependents' Education

Department of Defense Education Activity, 2014

The estimated cost of report or study for the Department of Defense is approximately \$83,200 in Fiscal Years 2013 - 2014. This includes \$200 in printing expenses and \$83,000 in DoD labor.

Generated on 2013 Nov 19 RefID: 7-671F3B7

# **Table Of Contents**

Executive Summary.	1
Introduction	2
Number of Students Transitioning	2
Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment Input	
Military-Connected Local Education Agencies Growth and Loss as Reported	
for Federal Impact Aid	
Table 1: Military-Connected States Sorted Alphabetically.	<i>(</i>
Table 2: Top 10 Military-Connected States in FIA Enrollment in SY 2011–12	
Table 3: Top and Bottom 10 Military-Connected States by Growth and Loss	8
Table 4: Top 25 Military-Connected LEAs in SY 2011-12.	10
Table 5: Top 25 Military-Connected LEAs by Total Growth	12
Table 6: Top 25 Military-Connected LEAs by Loss.	14
Plan For Outreach.	
Conclusion	30
Appendices	31
Projections of Military Dependents Transitioning by State.	31
Projections of Military Dependents Transitioning by Service	33
Projections of Military Dependents Transitioning by Growth	34



# **Executive Summary**

ection 574 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, as amended, requires the Secretary of Defense to identify the projected changes in military dependent students by installation as a result of force structure changes, relocation of military units, or the closure or realignment of installations under base closure laws. Section 574 also requires a plan for outreach to be conducted for assisting affected local educational agencies (LEAs) along with recommendations from the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) for assisting impacted LEAs.

This update represents the eighth such annual update to Congress. The original intent of the report was to understand and alleviate the impact of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) on LEAs, which was completed in September of 2011. However, ongoing fluctuations in military dependent student populations require continued Department of Defense (DoD) assistance to impacted LEAs.

Contributors to this report include the Military Departments, the Department of Education, OEA, and the Office of Military Community & Family Policy. Military department projections for school year (SY) 2014–15 show a loss of nearly 4,600 military dependent students (military, civilian and contractors) at the 40 installations reported, compared with a loss of about 5,000 during SY 2013–14 at 64 installations. Fort Campbell is projected to gain the most at about 500 military dependent students, while Fort Knox is projected to lose the most at about 1,300. This is the first year that the number of military dependent students (excluding DoD civilians and contractors) is projected to decline (3,339). The projected change by school year is included by state (Appendix 1), Military Service (Appendix 2), and by growth and loss (Appendix 3).

This year's update also includes an analysis of six years (SY 2006–07 through 2011–12) of Federal Impact Aid (FIA) data to identify the states and LEAs most impacted by the military (Tables 1–3), as well as those states and LEAs that have experienced the most growth and loss (Tables 4–6). FIA is currently the only data source identifying the LEAs military dependent students attend. FIA data reveal that more than two-thirds of all military dependent students are in 10 states, seven of which grew, while the other three lost in SY 20011–12. As expected, the LEAs with the highest concentration of military dependent students are associated with the states with the most military dependent students.

This update concludes with a plan for outreach to LEAs that highlights initiatives that enhance: 1) the ability of impacted LEAs to provide quality educational services for military dependent students and 2) the educational opportunities and outcomes of military dependent students.

The Department will continue its deliberate efforts to build relationships between local communities, military installations, LEAs, and state and Federal partners to improve the educational opportunities of military dependent students. Although elementary and secondary education in the United States is generally under the jurisdiction of the state and local governments, DoD recognizes the need for strong partnerships between the Federal Government entities, states, and schools. These partnerships have proven crucial to helping public education systems provide for the unique needs of military dependent students.

#### Introduction

Section 574(c) of the John Warner National Defense Act for FY07 (P.L. 109–364), as amended (20 U.S.C. 7703b note), requires the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual update to the report to provide assistance to 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.

This report addresses the following:

- The identification of the total projected number of military dependent students who are anticipated to arrive at and depart 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 OEA and DoD consider appropriate for means of assisting impacted LEAs in accommodating increases in enrollment of military dependent students as a result of such an event.
- 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 dependent students as a result of any of the aforementioned events.

To provide a more complete picture of the growth and loss experienced by states and LEAs, FIA data on military dependent students in LEAs was used to examine student growth and loss trends between SY 2006–07 through 2011–12. This data revealed the LEAs and states associated with the military installations that experienced the most growth and loss of military dependent students. FIA is the only source of data to examine the actual changes of military dependent students at LEAs.

There are approximately 1.2 million dependents of active-duty Service members. Over 650,000 school-age dependents live within the continental United States; of these, fewer than 30,000 attend DoD domestic schools. The vast majority of military dependent students attend public schools operated by LEAs. The Department is committed to ensure support is provided during times of mission growth as well as in times of relative stability.

# **Number of Students Transitioning**

While the majority of military personnel moves stemming from force structure changes, relocation of military units, or the closure or realignment of military installations under the base closure laws are complete, student growth data provided by the Military Departments reveal that some projected military dependent student growth and loss is still occurring.



#### Military Departments' Dependent Student Projections Summary

For this update, only installations with projected growth or loss of more than 40 military dependent students are provided. This is due to the fact that the projections are estimates, and any less than 40 would not constitute a significant growth or loss of military dependent students. According to the Military Departments, there are 40 installations that are projected to grow or lose more than 40 military dependent students. The United States Army has 17 installations on the list; the United States Air Force, 11; the United States Marine Corps, 5; and the United States Navy, 7. Overall, 18 installations are projected to gain military dependent students, while 22 are reported to experience reductions.

Military Department projections for SY 2014–15 show a loss of nearly 4,600 military dependent students (military, civilian and contractors) at the 40 installations reported, compared with a loss of about 5,000 students during SY 2013–14 at 64 installations. Fort Campbell is projected to gain the most military dependent students at about 500, while Fort Knox is projected to lose the most at about 1,300. This is the first year that the number of military dependent students (excluding DoD civilians and contractors) is projected to decline (3,339). The projected change by school year is included by state (Appendix 1), Military Service (Appendix 2), and by projected growth and loss (Appendix 3).

### Formula for Projecting Growth for SY 2014–15

The projected growth and loss data are delineated by states (Appendix 1), by Military Department (Appendix 2) and by growth (Appendix 3). The projections in Appendices 1–3 reflect the projected military dependent student growth and losses in SY 2014–15. 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 Dependent 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 are employed on Federal property.
- Installation: Those installations located in the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and the territories. If the installation has joint forces, the military department responsible for the installation shall report the total gain and or loss of military dependent students.
- ♦ SY: Refers to the school year that begins in the fall of 2014 and ends in the spring of 2015.

DoD has maintained the same assumptions to calculate the number of military dependent students per military member and DoD civilian for each year of this report:

- ♦ 48% of military members or DoD civilians have a child,
- 1.6 children per military member or DoD civilian (average), and
- 62% of children are school-age.

The Military Departments 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 to provide a more accurate projection based on the actual percentage of Service members with children (30.53%), the average number of children (1.92), and percentage of school-age children (54.08%). All three factors were calculated from the data provided by Defense Manpower Data Center.

The projected number of students assumes that every student will accompany the military member. However, many factors affect a military family's decision to move and/or when to move to new locations. The following factors may influence whether a 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, to alleviate transition challenges, may choose to stay at a location until the completion of the current school year; 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.

# Department Of Defense Office Of Economic Adjustment (OEA) Input

OEA is in the process of closing out the majority of projects in regions that experienced mission growth from the 2005 BRAC round, Global Defense Posture Realignments, Army Modularity, and Grow the Force/Grow the Army actions. Although there may be some residual mission growth, OEA's interactions with these areas show that there are no new growth concerns, and OEA has no further recommendations or observations.

## Military-Connected Leas Growth and Loss as Reported for Federal Impact Aid (FIA)

Last year's update included five consecutive years of FIA data to show the states and LEAs that experienced growth and loss of military dependent students, and this year's update includes an additional year of data from SY

2011–12. FIA provides the actual attendance data on military dependent students, and comparing multiple years of data allows for trend analysis. Using this data, the LEAs and states with the highest concentrations of military dependent students were identified along with those LEAs and states that experienced the most growth and loss of military dependent students.

The FIA Program is one of the oldest Federal education programs, and it compensates LEAs for the loss of property tax revenue due to the existence of tax-exempt Federal properties. To receive Impact Aid funding, LEAs are required to conduct an annual survey of the Federally-connected student population (which includes military dependent students—students from active duty families, DoD civilians and DoD contractors) and report the data on each category of Federally-connected student to the ED Impact Aid Office. Only those students reported for FIA that are connected to the military and DoD were used for this analysis. The enrollment data is only collected and reported by the LEA and not at the school level.

There are other limitations of FIA data. An increase or decrease in students within a state or LEA could be a result of multiple factors beyond the movement of military families due to force structure changes, realignment of military units, and BRAC law. These include:

- More or fewer military families sending their students to public schools (versus private and homeschooling),
- More or fewer LEAs choosing to apply for FIA,
- ♦ The relocation of military members to or from overseas locations, and
- Increased efforts of the Military Departments to communicate with military families about the importance of filling out the FIA Survey Forms has resulted in increased reporting by LEAs and thus the amount of funding to those LEAs.

Although anecdotal evidence suggests some LEAs do not apply for FIA due to the administrative costs, they do have an incentive to thoroughly collect this data because their FIA funding allotment relies on student counts. Even with some limitations, FIA is the only source of data on where military dependent students attend school and can provide valuable information on growth and loss trends.

#### Growth and Loss in Military Dependent Students by State

To display a complete picture of the trend of growth and loss of military dependent students, FIA data was compiled by state. Providing the data by state shows the macro picture of which states are the most military-impacted and the states that have grown or lost students over these school years. This context is valuable in identifying where most of the military dependent students are, as well as linking state patterns to trends in LEAs. It is expected that the states with the most military dependent students would also have the LEAs most greatly impacted by the presence of military dependent students, and due to the large presence of military dependent students, a significant portion of the growth would also occur in those states.

Three tables are included to explain the state-level status of military dependent students across all states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam. Table 1 provides the number of military dependent students in each state. Over the past six school years, the number of military dependent students as reported for FIA in public schools increased by nearly 36,000. However, the rate of year-over-year growth in military dependent students as reported for FIA slowed significantly, adding only about 2,000 students. The past three years has seen growth of 7,000, 17,000, and 12,000, respectively.

Table 2 shows that Virginia educates the most military dependent students (about 94,000), with Texas next (about 67,000). Rounding out the top ten are California, North Carolina, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Washington, Hawaii, and Colorado. The top ten states have nearly 425,000 military dependent students, while the other 42 (including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam) have less than 200,000 students. Vermont and Iowa do not report any military dependent students, while Minnesota, Oregon, and New Hampshire all report fewer than 100 students.

**Table 1. Military-Connected States Sorted Alphabetically** 

#	State	SY 2006-07	SY 2007-08	SY 2008-09	SY 2009-10	SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	Growth	% Change
1	Alabama	14,399	14,510	14,333	14,823	15,324	16,298	1,899	13%
2	Alaska	11,407	10,974	11,949	12,708	12,272	11,336	-71	-1%
3	Arizona	9,110	9,482	9,312	9,989	11,454	9,872	762	8%
4	Arkansas	2,440	2,448	2,493	2,431	2,585	2,647	207	8%
5	California	49,299	47,146	48,110	49,725	49,126	48,974	-325	-1%
6	Colorado	17,049	17,377	17,061	20,373	22,273	22,735	5,686	33%
7	Connecticut	1,979	1,943	1,857	1,768	1,849	1,811	-168	-8%
8	Delaware	427	402	360	318	325	375	-52	-12%
9	District of Columbia	889	748	691	622	481	363	-526	-59%
10	Florida	36,248	34,781	33,754	34,729	35,077	36,095	-153	0%
11	Georgia	32,652	32,185	33,575	32,967	32,598	32,525	-127	0%
12	Guam	725	1,239	2,486	790	793	925	200	28%
13	Hawaii	24,285	24,136	22,944	23,893	23,972	25,348	1,063	4%
14	Idaho	1,840	1,804	1,727	1,768	1,616	1,456	-384	-21%
15	Illinois	5,438	5,423	5,466	5,802	5,556	5,500	62	1%
16	Indiana	513	504	531	517	503	540	27	5%
17	Kansas	8,950	9,922	9,650	10,754	10,982	10,878	1,928	22%
18	Kentucky	4,598	4,654	4,635	4,974	5,820	5,207	609	13%
19	Louisiana	6,116	6,129	5,518	6,387	7,939	8,431	2,315	38%
20	Maine	1,651	1,350	1,157	795	553	335	-1,316	-80%
21	Maryland	22,092	22,958	25,647	26,421	27,674	27,456	5,364	24%
22	Massachusetts	608	449	443	472	434	417	-191	-31%
23	Michigan	99	110	119	119	116	180	81	82%
24	Minnesota	26	33	24	24	11	25	-1	-4%
25	Mississippi	4,017	3,809	3,753	3,591	3,960	4,086	69	2%
26	Missouri	6,111	6,185	5,986	6,789	6,555	6,887	776	13%
27	Montana	1,371	1,230	1,156	1,503	1,445	1,392	21	2%
28	Nebraska	4,044	3,984	4,016	4,090	4,619	4,512	468	12%
29	Nevada	4,784	4,253	3,273	4,450	4,687	4,012	-772	-16%
30	New Hampshire	68	78	38	43	29	39	-29	-43%
31	New Jersey	3,009	2,925	2,802	2,747	2,798	2,889	-120	-4%
32	New Mexico	7,228	6,833	6,284	5,186	6,256	5,063	-2,165	-30%
33	New York	5,573	5,729	6,459	6,588	7,049	7,303	1,730	31%
34	North Carolina	36,083	36,712	39,278	40,453	42,126	42,607	6,524	18%
35	North Dakota	2,636	2,437	2,184	2,198	2,171	2,015	-621	-24%
36	Ohio	5,147	4,608	4,463	4,835	4,607	4,297	-850	-17%

**Table 1. Military-Connected States Sorted Alphabetically (Cont.)** 

#	State	SY 2006-07	SY 2007-08	SY 2008-09	SY 2009-10	SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	Growth	% Change
37	Oklahoma	17,634	17,181	17,336	17,440	17,641	18,056	422	2%
38	Oregon	128	25	141	132	20	11	-117	-91%
39	Pennsylvania	1,001	1,070	802	759	812	928	-73	-7%
40	Puerto Rico	1,441	1,246	252	603	692	314	-1,127	-78%
41	Rhode Island	1,591	1,640	1,546	1,480	1,387	1,374	-217	-14%
42	South Carolina	11,399	11,139	11,502	10,994	10,958	10,638	-761	-7%
43	South Dakota	1,424	1,020	1,030	1,088	1,394	1,068	-356	-25%
44	Tennessee	10,902	10,813	11,245	11,992	11,482	11,981	1,079	10%
45	Texas	60,428	62,052	63,150	65,660	66,019	66,831	6,403	11%
46	Utah	10,403	9,284	9,555	9,362	7,791	9,289	-1,114	-11%
47	Virginia	88,366	88,943	90,010	91,461	94,041	93,566	5,200	6%
48	Washington	25,395	24,721	25,810	26,485	27,154	27,377	1,982	8%
49	West Virginia	105	326	86	91	104	353	248	236%
50	Wisconsin	925	875	821	821	878	823	-102	-11%
51	Wyoming	1,547	1,411	1,450	1,462	1,405	1,444	-103	-7%
	Total	565,600	561,236	568,270	585,472	597,413	598,884	33,284	6%

**Table 2. Top 10 Military-Connected States in SY 2011-12** 

#	State	SY 2006-07	SY 2007-08	SY 2008-09	SY 2009-10	SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	Growth	% Change
1	Virginia	88,366	88,943	90,010	91,461	94,041	93,566	5,200	6%
2	Texas	60,428	62,052	63,150	65,660	66,019	66,831	6,403	11%
3	California	49,299	47,146	48,110	49,725	49,126	48,974	-325	-1%
4	North Carolina	36,083	36,712	39,278	40,453	42,126	42,607	6,524	18%
5	Florida	36,248	34,781	33,754	34,729	35,077	36,095	-153	0%
6	Georgia	32,652	32,185	33,575	32,967	32,598	32,525	-127	0%
7	Maryland	22,092	22,958	25,647	26,421	27,674	27,456	5,364	24%
8	Washington	25,395	24,721	25,810	26,485	27,154	27,377	1,982	8%
9	Hawaii	24,285	24,136	22,944	23,893	23,972	25,348	1,063	4%
10	Colorado	17,049	17,377	17,061	20,373	22,273	22,735	5,686	33%
	Total	391,897	391,011	399,399	412,167	412,167	423,514	31,617	7%

Table 3. Top and Bottom 10 Military-Connected States in Total Growth from SY 2006–07 to 2011–12

#	State	SY 2006-07	SY 2007-08	SY 2008-09	SY 2009-10	SY 2010-11	SY 2011-12	Growth	% Change
1	North Carolina	36,083	36,712	39,278	40,453	42,126	42,607	6,524	18%
2	Texas	60,428	62,052	63,150	65,660	66,019	66,831	6,403	11%
3	Colorado	17,049	17,377	17,061	20,373	22,273	22,735	5,686	33%
4	Maryland	22,092	22,958	25,647	26,421	27,674	27,456	5,364	24%
5	Virginia	88,366	88,943	90,010	91,461	94,041	93,566	5,200	6%
6	Louisiana	6,116	6,129	5,518	6,387	7,939	8,431	2,315	38%
7	Washington	25,395	24,721	25,810	26,485	27,154	27,377	1,982	8%
8	Kansas	8,950	9,922	9,650	10,754	10,982	10,878	1,928	22%
9	Alabama	14,399	14,510	14,333	14,823	15,324	16,298	1,899	13%
10	New York	5,573	5,729	6,459	6,588	7,049	7,303	1,730	31%
	Total	248,368	252,341	257,638	268,952	278,455	280,875	39,031	13%
42	Idaho	1,840	1,804	1,727	1,768	1,616	1,456	-384	-21%
43	District of Columbia	889	748	691	622	481	363	-526	-59%
44	North Dakota	2,636	2,437	2,184	2,198	2,171	2,015	-621	-24%
45	South Carolina	11,399	11,139	11,502	10,994	10,958	10,638	-761	-7%
46	Nevada	4,784	4,253	3,273	4,450	4,687	4,012	-772	-16%
47	Ohio	5,147	4,608	4,463	4,835	4,607	4,297	-850	-17%
48	Utah	10,403	9,284	9,555	9,362	7,791	9,289	-1,114	-11%
49	Puerto Rico	1,441	1,246	252	603	692	314	-1,127	-78%
50	Maine	1,651	1,350	1,157	795	553	335	-1,316	-80%
51	New Mexico	7,228	6,833	6,284	5,186	6,256	5,063	-2,165	-30%
	Total	47,418	43,702	41,088	40,813	39,812	37,782	-9,636	-20%

When sorting the same data by total enrollment growth over the past five years (Table 3), the picture changes somewhat. Alabama, Kansas, Louisiana, and New York all experienced growth and are in the top ten, while California, Florida, Georgia and Hawaii drop out of the top ten. The state that grew the most was North Carolina, with just over 6,500 new military dependent students, while Colorado, Maryland, Virginia, and Texas all grew by over 5,000 students.

Three states (Utah, Maine and New Mexico) and the territory of Puerto Rico lost over 1,000 students and experienced the largest enrollment drop of all of the states. Utah lost students at Hill Air Force Base (AFB) and New Mexico lost students primarily at Las Cruces School District #2 near Fort Bliss (Las Cruces did not apply for FIA in SY 2011–12). Maine primarily lost students in the Brunswick School Committee that served Naval Air Station Brunswick prior to the closure of that base.

The data reveals that two-thirds of all military dependent students are in ten states. Seven of those states had their military dependent student population grow, while three declined.

#### Growth and Loss in Military Dependent Students by LEA

To determine the growth and loss of military dependent students by LEA, six years of FIA data were compiled from SY 2006–07 through 2011–12. The purpose of this analysis is to identify the LEAs that actually grew or lost military dependent students over this six-year period. This analysis provides a more accurate picture of the impact of troop movements on the enrollment of military dependent students in LEAs that has occurred over the past six years.

Table 4 is sorted by total military dependent student enrollment to display the LEAs with the most military dependent students. These LEAs are generally associated with the states with the most military dependent students. Virginia has the most military dependent students and has seven LEAs in the top 25 and Texas, with the second most, has three LEAs on the list, including the LEA with most military dependent students, Killeen Independent School District. Other states that made the top ten all have at least one LEA on the list.

Over the past six school years, the 25 LEAs with the most military dependent students grew by over 12,000 students. Sixteen of the LEAs accounted for the growth, while nine of the LEAs saw declines in military dependent students. Overall, one third of the military dependent student population (232,000) is in these 25 LEAs.

Table 5 is sorted by the top 25 LEAs that experienced growth in military dependent students from SY 2006–07 through 2011–12. These LEAs grew by almost 34,000, a 30% increase overall in these LEAs. Virginia, the state with the most military dependent students, had two LEAs make the top 25, while five from Texas made the list. North Carolina, the state that grew the most over the past six years, has four LEAs on the list, with increases in personnel at Fort Bragg and Camp Lejeune fueling most of the increase.

Harford County Board of Education is at the top, adding over 2,300 military dependent students, a direct result of the increase in personnel at Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland. Onslow County Board of Education is close behind Harford County by only 17 students. Socorro Independent School District and Prince William County in Virginia also grew by over 2,000. Prince William serves two nearby installations that have grown, Fort Belvoir and MCB Quantico, while Socorro serves Fort Bliss.

Table 6 provides the top 25 LEAs that declined in military dependent student enrollment from SY 2006–07 to 2011–12. Only LEAs that had military dependent student enrollment in both SY 2006–07 and 2011–12 were included. Virginia tops the list with four LEAs that are located around Norfolk, Newport News and Hampton. Texas also has two LEAs, revealing losses of students at Shepherd and Randolph Air Force Bases.

#### Plan for Outreach

DoD has made considerable progress in reaching out to LEAs and in partnering with public and private entities—all with the goal of enhancing the opportunities and outcomes of military dependent students, including specific efforts tied directly to installations and LEAs that experience growth of military dependent students. Illustrations of the efforts include the following:

#### Department of Defense Initiatives

#### Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children

The Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children was developed in 2006 by DoD in coordination with the Council of State Governments. The Compact became active upon approval by the 10<sup>th</sup> state on July 8, 2008. The purpose of the Compact is to alleviate the significant school challenges encountered by military families due to frequent relocations in the course of their service. Mobility is an ongoing reality for military families, and movements resulting from force structure changes, relocation of military units, or the closure or realignment of military installations under the base closure laws have made the Compact even more critical for military families and their dependents. 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 facilitate the uniform treatment, at the state and local district level, of military dependent students 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 46 states as of October 2013.

Table 4. Top 25 Military-Connected LEAs in SY 2011-12 (Sorted by FIA Enrollment in SY 2011-12)

m	ıge	٠,٥	9	9	%	٠,٥	٠,٥	%	.0	%	.0	%	%	9	.0
Change m FY08-1	% Change	%/	-5%	-3%	12%	4%	%0	27%	%8	13%	1%	35%	31%	-1%	%0
Change from FY08-13	Change Mil.	1,500	-1,070	-501	1,480	489	58	2,325	799	1,174	119	2,149	1,833	-107	<u>-</u>
-12)	% Mil.	54%	29%	30%	42%	8%	11%	45%	76%	33%	30%	10%	12%	28%	17%
FY13 (SY 2011-12)	Total Mil.	22,083	20,517	15,425	14,077	13,542	12,691	10,988	10,309	10,153	8,717	8,265	7,782	7,682	7,073
-11)	% Mil.	%95	30%	31%	39%	%8	11%	44%	%97	34%	78%	10%	11%	78%	16%
FY12 (SY 2010-11)	Total Mil.	22,455	20,684	15,997	13,135	14,169	13,064	10,576	10,187	6/6/6	8,102	8,158	7,154	7,605	6,750
-10)	% Mil.	21%	27%	30%	40%	%8	11%	43%	25%	34%	78%	10%	10%	28%	16%
FY11 (SY 2009-10)	Total Mil.	22,623	18,578	15,649	13,077	14,400	12,872	10,392	10,029	10,011	8,017	7,823	6,348	7,540	6,563
(60-	% Mil.	21%	79%	30%	39%	%8	11%	40%	25%	32%	78%	10%	10%	28%	15%
FY10 (SY 2008-09)	Total Mil.	21,983	20,658	16,364	12,571	14,111	12,755	9,493	9,747	9,326	8,247	7,336	5,983	7,401	5,981
(80-	% Mil.	%95	79%	30%	39%	%8	10%	38%	24%	31%	78%	10%	10%	30%	17%
FY09 (SY 2007-08)	Total Mil.	21,692	20,823	15,955	12,553	13,437	12,356	8,917	9,523	8,771	8,431	806'9	6,379	9/1/2	6,834
-07)	% Mil.	%95	30%	30%	39%	%8	10%	37%	24%	32%	78%	%6	%6	31%	18%
FY08 (SY 2006-07)	Total Mil.	20,583	21,587	15,926	12,597	13,053	12,633	8,663	9,510	8,979	8,598	6,116	5,949	7,789	7,074
	Military Impacted LEA	Killeen Independent School District	Virginia Beach City School Board	Cumberland County Board of Education	Central Administra- tive School District	Fairfax County Public Schools	San Diego Unified School District	Onslow County Board of Education	Chesapeake City School Board	Clarksville-Mont- gomery Co. Board of Education	Okaloosa Co. School Board	Prince William County School Board	El Paso Independent School District	Houston Co. Board of Education	Leeward Administra- tive School District
	St.	×	۸	NC	≡	₹	8	NC	≸	Z L	H	≸	×	GA	포
	#	<del>-</del>	2	m	4	2	9	7	∞	6	10	Ξ	12	13	14

Table 4. Top 25 Military-Connected LEAs in SY 2011-12 (Sorted by FIA Enrollment in SY 2011-12) (Cont.)

m	agu	%	%	%	%	,0	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Change m FY08-1	% Change	15%	27%	-11%	%/-	4%	16%	%9-	%5-	-17%	17%	30%	<b>%9</b>
Change from FY08-13	Change Mil.	881	1,348	-768	-429	238	092	-342	-295	-1,067	792	1,205	12,545
3 1-12)	% Mil.	%6	36%	38%	19%	21%	44%	%9	47%	19%	93%	64%	%07
FY13 (SY 2011-12)	Total Mil.	6,652	6,315	6,078	2,895	5,633	5,524	5,461	5,362	2,360	5,319	5,253	232,156
-11)	% Mil.	%8	35%	40%	19%	21%	43%	7%	47%	20%	%86	%02	%07
FY12 (SY 2010-11)	Total Mil.	6,431	6,116	6,439	6,057	5,579	5,400	6,401	5,357	2,765	5,024	5,588	232,172
-10)	% Mil.	%8	32%	39%	19%	20%	45%	%9	46%	20%	%86	%99	%07
(SY 2009-10)	Total Mil.	5,982	5,446	6,441	6,043	5,448	5,108	5,904	5,353	5,943	5,406	5,101	226,097
(60-	% Mil.	%8	32%	39%	17%	21%	41%	%/	46%	19%	%76	%89	%07
FY10 (SY 2008-09)	Total Mil.	6,128	5,367	6,357	5,756	5,427	5,064	5,847	5,477	5,749	4,734	4,836	222,698
(80-,	% Mil.	%8	31%	39%	18%	21%	41%	%/	46%	21%	91%	%99	%07
FY09 (SY 2007-08)	Total Mil.	6,103	5,198	6,404	6,002	5,415	5,025	5,708	5,542	6,353	4,205	4,749	221,059
-07)	% Mil.	%8	30%	40%	18%	21%	40%	7%	46%	21%	%76	%29	%07
FY08 (SY 2006-07)	Total Mil.	5,771	4,967	6,846	6,324	5,395	4,764	5,803	2,657	6,427	4,552	4,048	219,611
	Military Impacted LEA	Anne Arundel Co. Public Schools	St. Mary's Co. Board of Education	Lawton School Dist. 16-1008-000	School Board for the City of Norfolk	Stafford County Public Schools	Clover Park School District #400	Northside Independent School District	Central Kitsap School District #401	Newport News City School Board	Alaska State Depart- ment of Education	Geary Co. Unified School District #475	Total
	St.	MD	MD	¥	Α	*	WA	×	WA	8	AK	KS	
	#	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	

Table 5. Top 25 Military-Connected LEAs Sorted by Total Growth from SYs2006-07 to 2011-12

	ge	%	%	%	<b>%</b>	<b>,</b> º	%	%	.0	<b>.</b> º	%	%	%	%	%
Change FY08-13	% Change	246%	27%	220%	35%	95%	31%	251%	%/	12%	39%	%29	27%	44%	30%
Ch <sub>8</sub>	Change Mil.	2,342	2,325	2,155	2,149	1,847	1,833	1,527	1,500	1,480	1,460	1,419	1,348	1,237	1,205
3 I-12)	% Mil.	%6	45%	7%	10%	20%	12%	19%	54%	42%	72%	15%	36%	43%	64%
FY13 (SY 2011-12)	Total Mil.	3,293	10,988	3,136	8,265	3,852	7,782	2,135	22,083	14,077	5,175	3,551	6,315	4,077	5,253
-11	% Mil.	%8	44%	2%	10%	18%	11%	19%	%95	39%	71%	15%	35%	41%	%02
FY12 (SY 2010-11)	Total Mil.	3,237	10,576	2,194	8,158	3,468	7,154	2,068	22,455	13,135	4,981	3,497	6,116	3,817	5,588
-10)	% Mil.	%6	43%	%9	10%	15%	10%	20%	21%	40%	%02	14%	32%	32%	%99
FY11 (SY 2009-10)	Total Mil.	3,533	10,392	2,517	7,823	2,907	6,348	2,078	22,623	13,077	4,818	3,301	5,446	3,153	5,101
(60-	% Mil.	%6	40%	4%	10%	14%	10%	15%	21%	39%	%09	13%	32%	31%	%89
FY10 (SY 2008-09)	Total Mil.	3,593	9,493	1,428	7,336	2,710	5,983	1,457	21,983	12,571	3,876	2,931	5,367	2,947	4,836
(80-	% Mil.	2%	38%	2%	10%	12%	10%	%6	%95	39%	%89	10%	31%	32%	%99
FY09 (SY 2007-08)	Total Mil.	922	8,917	741	806'9	2,208	6,379	842	21,692	12,553	4,176	2,183	5,198	2,956	4,749
-07)	% Mil.	2%	37%	3%	%6	11%	%6	%8	%95	39%	%59	10%	30%	31%	%29
FY08 (SY 2006-07)	Total Mil.	951	8,663	981	6,116	2,005	5,949	809	20,583	12,597	3,715	2,132	4,967	2,840	4,048
	Military Impacted LEA	Harford Co. Board of Education	Onslow County Board of Education	Socorro Independent School District	Prince William County School Board	Harnett Co. Board of Education	El Paso Independent School District	Vail School District #20	Killeen Independent School District	Central Administra- tive School District	El Paso Co. School District #8 (Fountain Ft. Carson)	Columbia Co. Board of Education	St. Mary's Co. Board of Education	Vernon Parish School Board	Geary Co. Unified- School District #475
	St.	MD	NC	XT	۸	NC	XI	AZ	×	王	8	GA	MD	ΓA	KS
	#	<del>-</del>	2	m	4	2	9	7	∞	6	10	=======================================	12	13	14

Table 5. Top 25 Military-Connected LEAs Sorted by Total Growth from SYs2006-07 to 2011-12 (Cont.)

	ه												
Change from FY08-13	% Change	13%	48%	38%	188%	33%	322%	15%	124%	212%	%8	18%	30%
Ch <sub>2</sub> from F	Change Mil.	1,174	985	976	922	904	892	881	862	807	799	777	33,806
3	% Mil.	33%	33%	27%	11%	24%	3%	%6	11%	14%	79%	3%	18%
FY13 (SY2011-12)	Total Mil.	10,153	3,052	3,526	1,412	3,620	1,169	6,652	1,556	1,187	10,309	5,156	147,774
2-11)	% Mil.	34%	31%	28%	11%	24%	3%	%8	10%	14%	%97	3%	18%
FY12 (SY2010-11)	Total Mil.	626'6	2,779	3,473	1,318	3,624	1,130	6,431	1,461	1,218	10,187	4,969	143,013
-10)	% Mil.	34%	%67	27%	%6	25%	3%	%8	10%	12%	25%	2%	18%
FY11 (SY2009-10)	Total Mil.	10,011	2,597	3,150	1,130	3,517	1,024	5,982	1,413	1,016	10,029	4,413	137,399
(60-	% Mil.	32%	17%	27%	%/	21%	3%	%8	%6	12%	25%	2%	11%
FY10 (SY2008-09)	Total Mil.	9,326	1,443	3,033	915	2,897	1,059	6,128	1,164	951	9,747	4,224	127,398
(80-	% Mil.	31%	23%	76%	2%	23%	3%	%8	%9	2%	24%	2%	16%
FY09 (SY2007-08)	Total Mil.	8,771	1,944	2,713	558	2,941	1,138	6,103	824	386	9,523	4,337	119,662
-07)	% Mil.	32%	24%	27%	4%	22%	1%	%8	2%	2%	24%	2%	15%
FY08 (SY2006-07)	Total Mil.	8,979	2,067	2,550	490	2,716	772	5,771	694	380	9,510	4,379	113,968
	Military Impacted LEA	Clarksville Montgomery Co. Board of Education	El Paso Co. School District #3	Schertz-Cibolo-Universal City Indp. School Dist.	Moore County Schools	Falcon School District #49	Corpus Christi Independent School District	Anne Arundel Co. Public Schools	North Thurston Public Schools	Carteret County Schools	Chesapeake City School Board	Hillsborough County Public Schools	Total
	St.	Z	9	×	NC	9	×	MD	WA	NC	× ×	근	
	#	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	

Table 6. Top 25 LEAs that Experienced the Largest Reductions in FIA Enrollment from SY 2006-07 to 2011-12

Change from FY08-13	% Change	-27%	-32%	-78%	%5-	-17%	-40%	-18%	-14%	-11%	-32%	-14%	-57%	-15%	-3%
Cha from F	Change Mil.	-1,251	-1,201	-1,127	-1,070	-1,067	766-	-903	-844	-768	-763	-736	-707	-524	-501
3-1-12)	% Will	7%	3%	%0	%67	19%	2%	10%	%8	38%	3%	43%	1%	14%	30%
FY13 (SY2011-12)	Total Mil.	3,332	2,508	314	20,517	5,360	1,519	4,056	5,092	6,078	1,626	4,547	542	3,011	15,425
2-11)	Mil.	8%	3%	%0	30%	20%	2%	11%	%/	40%	3%	41%	4%	15%	31%
FY12 (SY2010-11)	Total Mil.	4,096	2,701	692	20,684	5,765	1,454	4,284	4,947	6,439	1,669	4,353	1,506	3,050	15,997
10)	Mil.	%6	3%	%0	27%	20%	%/	11%	%8	39%	3%	45%	3%	15%	30%
FY11 (SY2009-10)	Total Mil.	4,366	2,899	603	18,578	5,943	1,877	4,450	4,999	6,441	1,676	4,407	1,155	3,227	15,649
(60-	Mil.	%6	3%	%0	%67	19%	%6	11%	%8	39%	3%	45%	3%	16%	30%
FY10 (SY2008-09)	Total Mil.	4,420	3,251	252	20,658	5,749	2,459	4,676	5,197	6,357	1,905	4,958	1,334	3,514	16,364
(80-	Mil.	%6	4%	%0	79%	21%	%6	11%	7%	39%	4%	45%	3%	15%	30%
FY09 (SY2007-08)	Total Mil.	4,416	3,611	1,246	20,823	6,353	2,451	4,652	4,776	6,404	2,089	4,835	1,321	3,387	15,955
-07)	Will.	%6	4%	%0	30%	21%	%6	12%	%6	40%	4%	48%	3%	16%	30%
FY08 (SY2006-07)	Total Mil.	4,583	3,709	1,441	21,587	6,427	2,516	4,959	5,936	6,846	2,389	5,283	1,249	3,535	15,926
	Military Impacted LEA	Anchorage School District	Albuquerque School District #12	Puerto Rico State Department of Education	Virginia Beach City School Board	Newport News City School Board	Berkeley County School District	Escambia County School District	Davis County School District	Lawton School Dist. 16-1008-000	Tucson Unified School District	Liberty Co. Board of Education	Frederick Co. Board of Education	Hampton City School Board	Cumberland County Board of Education
	St.	AK	ΣN	PR	\$	₹	SC	균	UT	NO N	AZ	GA	MD	\\$	NC
	#	_	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	6	10	11	12	13	14

Table 6. Top 25 LEAs that Experienced the Largest Reductions in FIA Enrollment from SY 2006-07 to 2011-12 (Cont.)

Military  Milita			FY08 (SY2006-07)	3-07)	FY09 (SY2007-08)	9-7-08)	FY10 (SY2008-09)	(60-	FY11 (SY2009-10)	-10)	FY12 (SY2010-11)	-11)	FY13 (SY2011-12)	3-1-12)	Change from FY08-13	nge 708-13
3,269         16%         3,135         15%         3,050         14%         2,942         14%         2,572         12%         2,783         13%         486           2,025         19%         1,943         18%         1,756         17%         1,707         17%         1,602         17%         1,542         16%         483           1,898         4%         1,435         3%         1,621         4%         1,639         4%         1,497         3%         1,424         3%         474           1,898         4%         1,435         3%         1,621         4%         1,639         4%         1,497         3%         1,424         3%         444           1,898         4%         1,639         4%         1,639         4%         1,497         3%         1,424         3%         443           4,851         6%         4,463         6%         4,328         6%         4,326         6%         4,436         6%         4,328         6%         4,408         6%         4,438         6%         4,408         6%         4,438         6%         4,408         6%         4,408         6%         4,408         6%         4,408	St.	Military Impacted LEA	Total Mil.	% Mil.	Total Mil.	% Mil.	Total Mil.	% Will.	Total Mil.	% Will.	Total Mil.	% Mil.	Total Mil.	% Mil.	Change Mil.	% Change
2,025         19%         1,943         18%         1,756         17%         1,707         17%         1,602         17%         1,542         16%         -483           1,898         4%         1,435         3%         1,051         4%         1,639         4%         1,497         3%         1,424         3%         -474           2,948         10%         2,776         9%         2,908         9%         1,096         4%         2,488         8%         -460           4,851         6%         4,463         6%         4,328         6%         4,408         6%         -448           6,324         1%         6,005         1%         567         1%         476         1%         567         1%         476         1%         -442           6,324         18%         6,002         18%         5,756         17%         6,043         19%         6,057         19%         5,895         19%         -429           1,716         10%         1,564         10%         1,587         9%         1,519         3%         1,410         3%         39         1,410           1,801         4,463         6,043         1,96<	×	Judson Independent School District	3,269	16%	3,135	15%	3,050	14%	2,942	14%	2,572	12%	2,783	13%	-486	-15%
1,898         4%         1,435         3%         1,621         4%         1,639         4%         1,497         3%         1,424         3%         474           2,948         10%         2,776         9%         2,908         9%         1,096         4%         2,488         8%         -460           4,851         6%         4,697         6%         4,463         6%         4,328         6%         4,326         6%         4,408         6%         -443           6,324         1%         660         1%         567         1%         476         1%         357         1%         -443           6,324         1%         6,005         1%         5,797         9%         2,610         8%         2,319         7%         -406           2,725         8%         2,576         1%         6,043         19%         6,057         1%         1,96         -429         1         -429           1,716         1,736         1,664         10%         1,587         9%         1,544         39%         1,407         37%         394           1,801         1,378         1,140         29%         1,010         26%	5	Lompoc Unified School District	2,025	19%	1,943	18%	1,756	17%	1,707	17%	1,602	17%	1,542	16%	-483	-24%
2,948         10%         2,946         10%         2,776         9%         2,908         9%         1,096         4%         2,488         8%         -460           4,851         6%         4,697         6%         4,463         6%         4,328         6%         4,408         6%         -4483           799         1%         686         1%         606         1%         567         1%         476         1%         357         1%         -442           6,324         18%         5,756         17%         6,043         19%         6,057         19%         5,895         19%         -429           2,725         8%         2,578         17%         6,043         19%         6,057         19%         5,895         19%         -429           1,716         10%         1,664         10%         1,587         9%         2,610         8%         2,319         7%         -406           1,801         44%         1,752         42%         1,664         10%         1,587         9%         1,544         39%         1,407         37%         394           1,378         34%         1,262         33%         1,186 <td>SC</td> <td>Charleston County School District</td> <td>1,898</td> <td>4%</td> <td>1,435</td> <td>3%</td> <td>1,621</td> <td>4%</td> <td>1,639</td> <td>4%</td> <td>1,497</td> <td>3%</td> <td>1,424</td> <td>3%</td> <td>-474</td> <td>-25%</td>	SC	Charleston County School District	1,898	4%	1,435	3%	1,621	4%	1,639	4%	1,497	3%	1,424	3%	-474	-25%
4,851         6%         4,697         6%         4,463         6%         4,328         6%         4,326         6%         4,408         6%         4,4463           799         1%         686         1%         606         1%         567         1%         476         1%         357         1%         442           6,324         18%         6,002         18%         5,756         17%         6,043         19%         6,057         19%         5,895         19%         429           2,725         8%         2,797         9%         2,610         8%         2,319         7%         406           1,716         1,716         1,664         10%         1,587         9%         1,544         39%         1,407         37%         394           1,801         44%         1,752         42%         1,664         10%         1,737         43%         1,544         39%         1,407         37%         394           1,378         34%         1,262         33%         1,140         29%         1,010         26%         399         26%         379           11,378         34%         1,03,665         18%         1,010	- In	Weber School District	2,948	10%	2,946	10%	2,776	%6	2,908	%6	1,096	4%	2,488	%8	-460	-16%
799         1%         686         1%         606         1%         567         1%         476         1%         357         1%         -442           6,324         18%         6,002         18%         5,756         17%         6,043         19%         6,057         19%         5,895         19%         -429           2,725         8%         2,573         8%         2,797         9%         2,610         8%         2,319         7%         -406           1,716         10%         1,713         10%         1,664         10%         1,587         9%         1,556         9%         1,407         37%         -394           1,801         44%         1,752         42%         1,693         41%         1,737         43%         1,544         39%         1,407         37%         -394           1,317         34%         1,186         30%         1,1140         29%         1,010         26%         9999         26%         -379           116,120         15%         10,463         16%         108,352         17%         103,665         18%         101,983         18%         98,866         18%         17,254	근	Brevard Co. School Board	4,851	%9	4,697	%9	4,463	%9	4,328	%9	4,326	%9	4,408	%9	-443	%6-
6,324         18%         6,002         18%         5,756         17%         6,043         19%         6,057         19%         5,895         19%         -429           2,725         8%         2,573         8%         2,797         9%         2,610         8%         2,319         7%         -406           1,716         10%         1,713         10%         1,664         10%         1,587         9%         1,556         9%         1,407         8%         -399           1,801         44%         1,752         42%         1,693         41%         1,737         43%         1,544         39%         1,407         37%         -394           1,378         34%         1,262         33%         1,186         30%         1,140         26%         999         26%         -379           116,120         15%         110,463         16%         103,665         18%         101,983         18%         98,866         18%         -17,254	DC	District of Columbia Public Schools	799	1%	989	1%	909	1%	295	1%	476	1%	357	1%	-442	-55%
2,725         8%         2,687         8%         2,797         9%         2,610         8%         2,319         7%         -406           1,716         10%         1,713         10%         1,664         10%         1,587         9%         1,556         9%         1,317         8%         -399           1,801         44%         1,752         42%         1,693         41%         1,737         43%         1,544         39%         1,407         37%         -394           1,378         34%         1,262         33%         1,186         30%         1,140         29%         1,010         26%         999         26%         -379           116,120         15%         110,463         16%         108,352         17%         103,665         18%         101,983         18%         98,866         18%         -17,254	¥	School Board for the City of Norfolk	6,324	18%	6,002	18%	5,756	17%	6,043	19%	6,057	19%	5,895	19%	-429	%/-
1,716         10%         1,664         10%         1,587         9%         1,556         9%         1,317         8%         -399           1,801         44%         1,752         42%         1,693         41%         1,737         43%         1,544         39%         1,407         37%         -394           1,378         34%         1,262         33%         1,186         30%         1,140         29%         1,010         26%         999         26%         -379           116,120         15%         110,463         16%         108,352         17%         103,665         18%         101,983         18%         98,866         18%         -17,254	GA	Richmond Co. Board of Education	2,725	%8	2,573	%8	2,687	%8	2,797	%6	2,610	%8	2,319	%2	-406	-15%
1,801 44% 1,752 42% 1,693 41% 1,737 43% 1,544 39% 1,407 37% -394 116,120 15% 110,463 16% 108,352 17% 103,665 18% 101,983 18% 98,866 18% -17,254	X	Abilene Independent School District	1,716	10%	1,713	10%	1,664	10%	1,587	%6	1,556	%6	1,317	%8	-399	-23%
1,37834%1,26233%1,18630%1,14029%1,01026%99926%-379116,12015%110,46316%108,35217%103,66518%101,98318%98,86618%-17,254	OI	Mountain Home School District #193	1,801	44%	1,752	45%	1,693	41%	1,737	43%	1,544	39%	1,407	37%	-394	-22%
116,120         15%         110,463         16%         108,352         17%         103,665         18%         101,983         18%         98,866         18%         -17,254	X	Altus 33-1018-000	1,378	34%	1,262	33%	1,186	30%	1,140	78%	1,010	792	666	76%	-379	-28%
		Total	116,120	15%	110,463	16%	108,352	11%	103,665	18%	101,983	18%	98,866	18%	-17,254	-15%



The Compact mission is to assist military dependent students in four key areas; enrollment, eligibility, placement and graduation as they transition from one school system to another. The Governors of the forty-six member states have or will soon appoint a Commissioner and State Council who are critical to the resolution of any issues that may arise as a result of these transitions. The staff at the national office provides support and assistance to the Commissioners and Councils.

Although DoD is prohibited from formally joining the Compact, by signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), DoD has agreed to follow all provisions of the Compact, to the extent permissible by law. Additionally, DoDEA serves as an ex-officio member of the Interstate Commission.

Through the Compact, LEAs have flexibility to waive, temporarily in some cases, requirements that are necessary to ensure the continuity of education for military dependent students. For example, unofficial or hand-carried education records can temporarily be used to enroll students in a receiving school, and students are able to matriculate to the next grade, based on the rules in the sending school, regardless if they meet the age eligibility requirements for the new school. Additionally, a receiving school must initially honor the placements of the previous school in Honors, Advanced Placement, and other similar programs, and can also waive some graduation requirements if similar courses have been successfully completed in other schools.

Nine of the ten states that experienced the most growth have adopted the Compact, with New York being the exception. Furthermore, all of the top 25 LEAs with the most military dependent students are in states that have adopted the Compact as well as the 25 LEAs that experienced the most growth over the past six years.

#### DoDEA Partnership and Outreach

The DoD commitment to enhancing the educational opportunities for military dependent students is carried out in large part by the DoDEA Educational Partnership Program. The mission of the DoDEA Educational Partnership Program is to support high quality educational opportunities for military dependent students in public schools by providing resources to LEAs.

Through a Grant Program, DoDEA focuses efforts to improving student achievement by providing resources to enhance student learning, transform the responsiveness of educators to military dependent students, focus on parent and family engagement, and extend virtual learning and foreign language capabilities in military-impacted LEAs.

The DoDEA Grant Program provides DoD's largest investment in LEAs. Section 574(d) of P.L. 109–364, as amended, provides authority for the Secretary of Defense to work collaboratively with the Secretary of Education in efforts to ease the transition of military dependent students and authorizes the use of funds to share experience with and provide programs for LEAs. Since this authority has been in effect, DoDEA has provided \$296 million in grants to 191 LEAs (230 grants total). This investment has supported a wide array of research-based programs including the National Math and Science Initiative, which expands access to advanced placement classes in science, mathematics, and English for military dependent students.

The DoDEA Grant Program includes an emphasis on outcomes. Each grantee is required to conduct a program evaluation and provide quarterly progress reports to DoDEA. DoDEA provides technical assistance to grantees to ensure evaluation designs are appropriate, realistic, and an efficient measure of progress.

Since 2008, over 330,000 military dependent students have benefited from these grants to LEAs. The grants have reached almost 650 elementary schools, 265 middle schools, and 170 high schools.

A recent publication titled "Activities to Support Academic and Transition Outcomes for Military-Connected Students and Their Families: Lessons Learned from the DoDEA Educational Partnership Grants" highlights results from 44 grantees in the areas of professional development, technology, formative assessments, and transition support. The strategies and outcomes, such as those included in this report, can benefit other LEAs and support military dependent students throughout the United States. The full report can be found at: http://www.dodk12grants.org/Docs/DoDEA2009\_Findings\_Report.pdf.

The DoDEA Grant Program has successfully provided funding for improved academic, social, and emotional programs in many of the LEAs that are in the most need of assistance. As funding allows, grants will continue to be provided, with a focus on expanding educational opportunities for all military dependent students.

The DoDEA Grant Program in 2009 and 2010, in particular, targeted LEAs that served installations where military dependent student growth was expected. LEA eligibility was determined by the projected growth numbers provided by the Military Departments for this report. Since 2008, 19 LEAs that are in the top 25 in growth received at least one grant, with many receiving more than one grant. The following profiles highlight five grants to LEAs that have experienced significant growth according to FIA data. The LEAs are: Fountain Fort Carson, CO; Geary County Schools, KS; Harford County Public Schools, MD; Harnett County Public Schools, NC; and Onslow Public Schools, NC. Overall, 19 of the 25 LEAs that have experienced the most growth have received at least one grant from DoDEA since 2009.

#### El Paso County School District #8 (Fountain Fort Carson), CO (2010 Grant Cohort)

#### Military Dependent Student Enrollment: 639

**Schools:** Three Elementary Schools

**Abstract:** The grant funded Mastering Math by Making Connections that targets grades 3–5 at three military-connected elementary schools. Teachers received ongoing training and support to strengthen classroom practices and fundamental understanding of mathematics concepts, along with substantial technological equipment and improvements that facilitated the establishment of digital classrooms.

#### Outcomes:

- Teachers agreed (64 percent) or strongly agreed (36 percent) that they received high-quality training in the mathematics curriculum and using technology. Over 76 percent of teachers reported using Promethean boards all the time in each mathematics lesson, and 80 percent reported using manipulatives to teach mathematics concepts all or most of the time.
- Geary County USD #475, KS (2009 Grant Cohort)

- Military Dependent Student Enrollment: 3,454
- Schools: Six Elementary Schools, Two Middle Schools, One High School
- Abstract: The grant funded a variety of programs and opportunities, including AVID, Success for All, Synergistic
   Learning System interventions, Aventa online courses and instructional coaches in reading, science labs, and others.

#### Outcomes:

- The grant funded 5,565 hours of training provided to 316 faculty, 94 administrators, and 48 others (primarily coaches). Overall, participants rated the quality of professional development, with most ratings above 2.75 on a 3-point scale.
- Advancement via Individual Determination (AVID) as an elective course at the high school was expanded to middle schools, and enrollment is increasing with positive student outcomes. A middle school student shared at a public Board of Education meeting that AVID had turned him around and his attitude toward school. In addition, all seven AVID students who graduated last year from high school went on to college.

#### Harford County Public Schools, MD (2009 Grant Cohort)

#### Military Dependent Student Enrollment: 245

Schools: One Elementary School

**Abstract:** This grant funded the Do The Math and Imagination Station, intervention programs in an extended learning environment, and professional development opportunities for teachers in these programs.

#### Outcomes:

• The goal of 71 percent or better proficiency in mathematics among military dependent students in grades two through five on the Scholastic Mathematics Inventory was exceeded. Military dependent students demonstrated proficiency at a higher rate than non-military students (83.7 percent vs. 73.9 percent for non-military).

#### Harnett County Public Schools, NC (2011 Grant Cohort)

#### Military Dependent Student Enrollment: 2,601

Schools: Six Elementary Schools, Two Middle Schools, One High School

**Abstract:** The PowerUp! Project leveraged access to technology to increase student engagement and achievement in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. The objective of this project is to effectively introduce technology (in the form of classroom laptop carts, iPods, interactive whiteboards, audio reinforcement systems and software solutions) that will enhance the educational experience of all students.

#### Outcomes:

Roughly two-thirds of the professional development activities delivered was focused upon instructional technology since the majority of the schools impacted by the grant had their number of mobile computing devices more than doubled as a result of the technology received via the grant. Teachers at these sites received an abundance of professional development in the successful integration of technology in their curricula to match the rapid influx of devices in their buildings. Integrated into the technology professional development activities were numerous strategies in mathematics and science.

#### Onslow County Public Schools, NC (2009 Grant Cohort)

Military Dependent Student Enrollment: 2,297

Schools: Seven High Schools

**Abstract:** Onslow County established a mobile technology mathematics program, hired technology facilitators to provide professional development training to teachers, and provided a transition support program focusing on military dependent students dealing with academic and/or social emotional needs.

#### Outcomes:

- ◆ The program exceeded its goal to establish a strong transitional counseling program within the county. Two transition counselors were hired to provide academic and emotional guidance for the Onslow County School District. During the three-year project, they have implemented support groups, participated and assisted with numerous community outreach activities, reinstated the Student-to-Student Program in local high schools and collected a vast amount of resources to better serve the county as a whole in this field. Transition counselors organized multiple deployment support groups for elementary and middle school students and since implementation, deployment support groups have grown from 400 to 1,000 students served each year.
- A technology facilitator is now at each of the seven high schools located within the Onslow County School District. The facilitators scheduled and conducted professional development for teachers, assisted students on the use netbooks and specific software, and aided in troubleshooting technology issues. There is strong evidence that facilitators eased the process of integrating the netbooks into the classrooms and decreased student anxiety of utilizing the netbooks.

#### DoDEA Resources for the Military Community and LEAs

In addition to the grant program, DoDEA has provided a number of resources to LEAs and the military community to support their efforts of ensuring each student receives the best education possible. These resources have benefited LEAs that have experienced growth and other impacted LEAs.

Students at the Center: A resource guide that provides educators with an understanding of the unique issues military dependent students face and provides the military community with information on public school systems. To date, over 25,000 Students at the Center guides have been distributed.

Keeping Students at the Center: Training modules designed to support school liaison officers (SLOs) by providing them information, tools, and resources.

Resources to Empower Students: Professional development provided to public school educators through a set of 16 Special Education (SPED) modules and face-to-face training. To date, DoDEA has distributed over 500 SPED module sets to LEAs and trained over 800 teachers and administrators from nine LEAs. Killeen Independent School District, TX; Fountain Fort Carson School District, CO (along with Falcon School District); and Onslow County, NC, all hosted a summer seminar and are on the list of top 25 military-connected LEAs that experienced growth from SY 2006–07 through 2010–11. Other LEAs that hosted seminars that are in the top 25 LEAs with the most military-connected students are Cumberland County, NC; Virginia Beach City Schools, VA; Okaloosa County, FL; Clover Park School District, WA; and Central Kitsap School District, WA.

#### Military and Family Life Consultant Program

In response to the increasing number of children with a deployed parent, DoD expanded the Child and Youth Behavioral Military Family Life Consultant (CYB-MFLC) Program to support and augment military-connected public schools. This program is also utilized in DoDEA schools. The CYB-MFLCs provide non-medical support to faculty, staff, parents, and children for issues amenable to short-term problem resolutions, such as school adjustment issues, deployment and reunion adjustments, and parent/child communications. There are currently 506 MFLCs in 659 military-connected schools serving nearly 191,287 students in the United States.

#### Military Department Initiatives

#### United States Air Force

The Air Force School Liaison Officer (SLO) Program provides resources to assist families as they navigate through K–12 education processes. The organization objective is to assist parents and caregivers of school age children understand local education communities and to educate school administrators, counselors and educators on military life style and how it impacts children.

Active Duty Air Force consists of 329,104 personnel (officer and enlisted) with about 175,000 accounting for school-age children. School-age populations receive support from a) Youth, Afterschool and sponsorship programs through Child & Youth Services and b) Military Child Education/School Liaison Officers (SLOs) support through the Airman & Family Readiness Centers (A&FRC). The Air Force SLO Program is staffed at all 82 installation SLOs (either as a full-time civilian or military designee) with assignment personnel at MAJCOM/Installation Support, Air Force Personnel Services (AFPC) and Headquarters (HQ).

The role of the installation School Liaison Officer includes:

- Planning, organizing and directing school related activities by interpreting and implementing HQ and MAJCOM guidance and policies as they pertain to military child education.
  - Receive and process complaints/concerns elevated from parents, caregivers and school officials regarding issues related to the education of military-connected children.
  - Establish and coordinate reports to the base Community Action Information Board (CAIB) and works issues jointly with local public and private school districts that support military children, to include training opportunities for educators, parents and children.
- Identifying, coordinating and obtaining a variety of resources and services for Air Force family members who have physical, developmental, emotional and/or intellectual limitations.
  - ♦ SLOs work with Exceptional Family Member Program Family Support (EFMP-FS) personnel to assist families with installation and community resources for families.
  - Specialized Training of Military Parent (STOMP) training was provided to 43 installations with information and training about laws, regulations and resource for military families of children with disabilities.
- Functioning as an intermediary and advocate between installation leadership, parents and school administrators.
  - Work with the Medical Treatment Center and/or Military Personnel assignment functions to provide command information and education, Exceptional Family Member Program (EFMP) family support tracking in Air Force Family Integrated Results and Statistical Tracking, respite care; assist with installation consultation and referral, advocacy, marketing, committee chairmanship, coordination of recreational and support group activities.
  - Attend multi-functional meetings to present concerns, solutions, suggestions to school board officials and base leadership and utilize the Integrated Delivery System (IDS) and Community Action Information Board resources to address community issues relating to specific populations, Reserve and Guard, deployed member families, etc.
- Performing a variety of marketing and public relations strategies and administrative responsibilities related to military child education and EFMP support needs and services; determine appropriate methods for collecting data (i.e., from whom or where the data needs to be collected and by what method);
  - Develop and manage a system for compiling and analyzing questionnaire responses and feedback; collect data and conducts follow-ups as necessary to determine whether results have been achieved; analyze and interpret data.
  - Prepare summary of evaluation results and briefs at CAIB or other meetings and prepare and present briefings to command and installation personnel concerning military child education and exceptional family member issue.



Participate in free Military Child Education and Exceptional Family Member training opportunities designed to enhance and develop staff personnel and military families.

#### United States Army

Army School Support Services have a unique and important role to play in supporting Soldier and Family well-being as well as preserving the All-Volunteer Force. Since 1998, as an outgrowth of the Army's landmark Secondary Education Transition Study research, the Army has developed specific and targeted school support actions such as:

- School Liaison Officers with strong educational backgrounds and experience are located on each Army garrison. Currently, 93 School Liaison Officers provide support to garrison commanders, Army Families, and school districts. School Liaison Officers interact with over 3,000 schools in 374 school districts in order to support approximately 655,000 Army-connected school-age children and youth. Additionally, Army School Liaison Officers serve all military-connected Families assigned to the installation regardless of Service affiliation.
- School Liaison Officers advise garrison command staff on matters related to schools; assist Army Families with school issues; communicate information and resources to Army Families and schools; support Army Families during school transitions; collaborate with school districts to build positive relationships and address issues that impact Army students; facilitate training for parents, schools, and garrisons; foster reciprocal transition practices among school districts; and increase school transition predictability for Army Families.
- To ease student transitions to and from schools, Army School Liaison Officers facilitate and implement youth sponsorship programs in collaboration with school districts. School Liaison Officers also gather and share policies and resources to help Families who choose to homeschool their children.

- The Military Student Transition Consultant Program augments services provided to Families by garrison School Liaison Officers by placing professional educators onsite in seven school districts to further support Army Families.
- Parent training and parent advocacy cadres at 23 highly impacted garrisons provide support and encouragement to Army parents to help their children learn, grow, develop, and realize their full potential.
- The Army provides professional development opportunities to school districts to build staff and student resilience, awareness of education issues unique to military-connected students, and skill in responding to military-connected student and Family needs. Key programs prepare educators to address the school transition concerns of mobile students, including students with special needs and teach educators, community professionals, and Family members how to support military children during times of uncertainty, trauma, and grief.
- ♦ The Army provides research-based after school programs to youth 11–18 years old in 171 middle and high schools in communities with high concentrations of Army Families. These programs are designed to increase the number of Army youth who successfully achieve proficiency on required state assessments and to increase students' academic grades. Also included are credit recovery programs at selected schools that allow students to earn academic credits toward graduation and graduate on time with their peers.
- ◆ Academic support is provided to children and youth through online tutoring in mathematics, science, English, and social studies. Army School-Age Centers (grades K−5) and Youth Centers (grades 6−12) at each garrison include a homework center, creating a safe and familiar academic support environment before and after school.

Recognizing that the strength of Army Soldiers comes from the strength of their Families, Army School Support Services is dedicated to supporting Soldiers and their Families and providing world-class customer service to Army Families.

#### **United States Marine Corps**

The Marine Corps School Liaison Program (SLP) is staffed by 24 School Liaisons at the 17 major installations, regional commands, and the HQ. Its mission is to identify and coordinate community resources to reduce the impact of the mobile lifestyle on military school-age children and families; implement predictable support services that assist children/youth with relocations, life transitions, and achieving academic success; and to provide a wide range of resources that facilitate successful school transitions for parents, students, schools, commanders, and communities. This includes forming partnerships with schools, other agencies, and installation units; assisting school districts in applying for available grants; and disseminating information on supportive programs like Tutor.com and SAS® Curriculum pathways. Additionally, Marine Corps School Liaisons work collaboratively with School Liaisons of the other services to coordinate efforts in co-located geographical areas. All School Liaisons provide assistance to military-connected families who are stationed at their installations or reside in their catchment area regardless of service affiliation.

With an active duty population of 198,000 Marines at the end of FY 2012, the Marine Corps has over 66,500 schoolaged children. These children face unique challenges associated with the mobile military lifestyle, the Marine Corps' high number of deployments, and a large number of Marines deployed. Recognizing that these children face additional challenges, the Marine Corps established the SLP in 2008 with the assignment of 18 School Liaisons to identify and coordinate resources, implement predictable support services, and to provide a wide range of resources that facilitate successful school transitions. Realizing the importance of the services and assistance to the families, the SLP expanded to 21 Installation School Liaisons, two Regional School Liaisons, and a HQ Senior School Liaison as the program manager. With this structure, the SLP provides input and direction at the national policy level, provides for appropriate representation at state and national organizations, and ensures efficient and effective program implementation that is consistent and predictable for Marine families as they transition.

The roles of the Marine Corps School Liaisons include:

- The School Liaisons advocate for military-connected, school-age children at public, private, and home schools, and
  form partnerships with schools and other agencies in an effort to improve access and availability to quality education;
- 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. They also assist LEAs with applying for MFLCs to assist students, teachers, administrators, parents with deployment-related issues, and training;
- 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 and SAS® Curriculum Pathways;
- School Liaisons assist the families with school transitions associated with the frequent moves resulting from military
  moves as well as to mitigate education transition issues; and
- School Liaisons educate school administration, counselors, and teachers of the demanding obstacles, both academically and emotionally, confronting the mobile military school-age child.

To analyze program effectiveness and investigate areas of improvement, the SLP conducted an extensive data driven review of the entire program using data from the installations and the results of surveys of the LEAs on and near installations and Marine Corps parent with school-age dependents. As a result of this review, School Liaisons' assets at installations have been redistributed to balance needs and all School Liaisons have been realigned under the Family Care Branch. These changes will provide accessibility, consistency and predictability for parents seeking assistance from the School Liaisons regardless of their geographical location. In support of these efforts, the Marine Corps has developed and fielded a student Transition Folder that contains checklists and resource information to support the transition of the families as well as an Educator Resource Binder to provide information to the school administration on the challenges the transitioning students must overcome.

#### United States Navy

The Navy entered the sixth year of providing SLOs in all communities serving United States Navy families. The primary focus of programming is established to meet Title 10 authority for Youth Sponsorship and for support of families with children having K–12 special education needs. Navy established SLO programs under Navy Child and Youth Programs (CYP) and focuses on K–12 issues to ease transition of children of families during change of station, deployments, and special education system navigation. The foundation and strength of these programs are found in the empowerment of local Commanders to work directly with local educators and community leaders.

At the Navy's core is an expeditionary force with more than two-hundred years of deployment, which continues to place demands on active duty and reserve Sailors and their families. Up to 70% of Sailors are in some phase of a deployment cycle. In addition, up to one-third of Navy families are moving between duty stations in any given calendar year, causing Navy associated children to attend six to nine different schools from kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade years.

The Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), "Sailing Directions" provides vision, tenets, and principles that guide the Navy charting a course to remain ready to meet current challenges, build a relevant and capable future force, and enable and support Sailors, Civilians, and families. Specifically, the challenges facing Navy families will continue to evolve as Navy leadership implements 21st Century defense initiatives focused on a rebalance towards the Asia-Pacific region.

"Our forces will operate forward in new and flexible ways with access to strategic maritime crossroads. Our posture will be focused and improved using a combination of rotational deployments, forward bases, temporary and austere facilities and partner nation ports. People are the Navy's foundation. We have a



professional and moral obligation to uphold a covenant with Sailors, Civilians and their families – to ably lead, equip, train and motivate."

Adm. Jonathan Greenert Chief of Naval Operations (CNO)

Current notional planning under the 2012–20 Strategic Laydown and Dispersal outlines the strategic rationale for homeporting decisions in the 2020 timeframe. The plans are still in development for the CNO to present homeporting recommendations to Secretary of the Navy.

The Commander Navy Installations Command (CNIC) has prepared plans to work with potentially impacted installations. Using the CNIC reception model, the Naval Station Rota, Spain executed a reception plan to support the Forward Deployed Naval Forces (FDNF). The reception plan included sending a 20-member cross-functional team (housing, family support, medical, child and youth, school liaison, school personnel and others) from Rota to Norfolk to meet with Sailors and their families projected to arrive in Spain over the next two years. The reception team provided briefings, one-on-one meetings, conducted needs assessments, opened ongoing communications and provided follow-up points of contact for future questions.

Navy Commanders at all levels continue to use their worldwide SLOs to work with state, local level educators and national education policymakers. Navy Leadership continues to take the lead in support of the Interstate Compact on Educational Opportunity for Military Children (enrollment, eligibility, placement, extracurricular, graduation) and is the DoD lead in a number of states. Additionally, the Navy uses the "Navy System of Care" to support geo-dispersed (Recruiters, ROTC, Activated Reserve) Sailors and their families wherever they are assigned.

Specific to the Navy is seven core areas of programming including: School Transition Support (moving between installations); Deployment Support (assistance to families experiencing all phases of deployment); Special Education System

Navigation (providing focuses support to families with children having special needs); Command, Educator, Community, Parent communications; Home School Support; Partnerships in Education (PIE); and Postsecondary Preparations.

School Year 2012–13 showed powerful growth and impact for Navy School-Based Programs (SBP), with the addition of more than 100 SBPs Navy-wide. Specifically, the partnership with Old Dominion University using interns to work with Navy teams in school-based transition centers and the grants provided to LEAs by DoDEA Education Partnership Branch provides proof that the strength of Navy programming is local execution. The outcomes of local partnerships in Hampton Roads, the University of Southern California with Navy Region Southwest, and Joint Base Pearl Harbor Hickam's partnership with the State of Hawaii reflect partnerships that provide enhanced community capacity building. The Hampton Roads Team received national recognition for their efforts and were honored with the Military Child Education Coalition Pete Taylor Award.

Another considerable improvement in the ability to provide flexible programming in the schools Navy children attend is by using Military Family Life Consultants (MFLC) provided under a central DoD contract. In 2010, the Navy indicated a projected need of up to 220 MFLCs to support SBPs, but resources only allowed for thirty to be assigned. Recent changes to MFLC Program execution greatly increased availability and Navy SBP locations received more than 100 school-based MFLCs this school year.

Community capacity building is the hallmark of the "Navy System of Care." The Navy system of care uses all installation resources and includes preparing families, educators and community support systems at all installations. The past year has seen an increased use of Navy delivery systems to meet the needs of families. Navy installations work closely with schools serving military children to provide in-school support systems including increased use of Fleet and Family Support Program (FFSP), and Exceptional Family Member Program Liaison (EFMPL) partners in the schools.

Navy Commanders continue to show their commitment to their Sailors and families by creating strong bonds with local communities. Navy Commanders at all levels provide a model in doing more with less through open communications and strong "community capacity building."

#### U. S. Department of Education Initiatives

Military families remain a priority for the U.S. Department of Education (ED). Various ED efforts, both new and ongoing, are aimed at addressing the needs of military families, military-connected students, and veterans. In order to better coordinate ED's work with military families, military-connected students, and veterans, ED established the Military Liaison Team (MLT) in summer 2013. MLT's mission is to represent the educational interests of these important student populations; coordinate ED's efforts to address their needs; and foster access to high-quality educational programs and services. In collaboration with other ED offices, MLT's work includes outreach to the military community; advocacy on behalf of military families, military-connected students, and veterans; coordination among offices and other Federal agencies; and support for policy implementation. ED's efforts were aimed at all age groups from preschool and school-aged children of members of the military to veterans and their families seeking postsecondary opportunities.

ED's outreach to the military community in 2013 included, as part of the 2013 "Strong Start, Bright Future" annual back-to-school bus tour, a visit by U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan (Secretary) to Marine Corps Air Station Yuma (Arizona), Yuma Proving Ground (Arizona), and the military-impacted community of Chula Vista (California). The Secretary expressed admiration for military families, support for the Interstate Compact on Education Opportunity for Military Children (Compact), and the need for college- and career-ready standards. The tour emphasized the importance of ensuring that all students benefit from high-quality educational opportunities and spotlighted the Administration's Preschool for All initiative, K–12 education reform efforts, college affordability, the need to build high-speed digital connections to schools and libraries (ConnectED), and comprehensive immigration reform.

In addition, the Secretary addressed participants at the Military Child Education Coalition's (MCEC) 15<sup>th</sup> Annual Training Seminar in July 2013, "For The Sake of the Child," in National Harbor, MD. The Secretary acknowledged the personal sacrifices made by military-connected children who face unique education challenges as the result of frequent

moves and multiple deployments. As a follow-up to this event, ED encouraged states and LEAs to consider the needs of military-connected children as they begin a new school year and provided information and resources regarding the Compact.

As part of the MOU between ED and DoD, ED continued its close relationship with DoDEA and conducted a joint District of Columbia charter schools tour in May 2013. The purpose of this tour was to introduce DoDEA and the Military Service's leadership to well-run, high-quality charter schools, in order to inform their efforts to develop guidance for base commanders on the establishment and operation of charter schools. The director of ED's Charter Schools Program served as tour facilitator and provided participants an overview of charter schools. The group visited two charter schools: E.L. Haynes, which serves 950 students from grades Pre–K through 10, and the newly renovated Capital City Public Charter School, which serves 950 students in Pre–K through 12. Discussion topics included state charter school laws and specific issues, such as enrollment policy, regarding charter schools on local military installations. The last tour stop was the DC Public Charter School Board (PCSB). The PCSB is the sole charter school authorizer in DC and annually evaluates charter schools for academic results, legal compliance, and fiscal management and holds them accountable for results using a performance management framework. Officials discussed their various roles at the PCSB, including oversight and accountability. The DoD Charter School Task Force (led by DoDEA) will use information gathered from these visits to develop standards related to the establishment and operation of charter schools on military installations.

ED staff also assisted DoDEA in reviewing more than 30 applications to fill five vacancies on the Advisory Council on Dependents' Education. Applications included packages from representatives of professional employee organizations, school administrators, students enrolled in the defense dependents' education system, and parents of such students. MLT will be the lead in coordinating ongoing efforts with DoDEA in the implementation of the MOU and other joint activities.

In celebration of the 2013 "Month of the Military Child," in April, ED's Student Art Exhibit Program partnered with MCEC to host the art exhibit titled "America's Children." The exhibit featured some 50 works of visual art and writing from students based around the United States, Puerto Rico, and abroad, including, Canada and Germany. Students participating in the event spoke about the unique life experiences of being military children, the challenges they encounter, and their ability and resilience in overcoming them.

ED's Early Learning Office conducted a panel presentation on the Administration's Preschool for All initiative and included military personnel to address the positive impact of early learning for military-connected children. Preschool for All would benefit military families who live off-base, especially those making at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty level, by providing high-quality early learning opportunities for children four years of age.

The Secretary's supplemental priority for military families in ED's discretionary grant programs can be used in grant competitions to encourage applicants to propose projects designed to meet the needs of military-connected children, Service members, spouses, and veterans. In FY 2013, two grant competitions—Charter Schools Program non-SEA grants and Child Care Access Means Parents in Schools—used this priority to give preference to applicants focused on military-connected families. In addition, the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program, which used the priority in FY 2012, made additional awards by funding down the 2012 slate.

In FY 2013, the Impact Aid Program continued its focus on providing timely accurate payments to Federally-impacted LEAs across the U.S. The Impact Aid Program resolved a long-standing issue with payments relating to military housing undergoing renovation and rebuilding. As a result, several prior year application payments were closed out and the final payments distributed. Payment highlights for this year include:

- FY 2013 \$582.3 million paid to 640 LEAs serving military-connected children
- ♦ FY 2012 \$571.6 million paid to 633 LEAs with military-connected children
- FY 2011 \$651.1 million distributed to 646 LEAs with military-connected children
- Final FY 2010 \$683.2 million distributed to 652 LEAs with military-connected children
- Final FY 2009 \$661.3 million distributed to 673 LEAs with military-connected children





The Impact Aid Discretionary Construction Program awarded a \$4 million construction grant to Douglas School District, which serves Ellsworth AFB in South Dakota. Douglas School District serves approximately 2,500 students on or adjacent to Ellsworth AFB, with a total of 1,000 eligible federally connected students, which represents approximately 40 percent of the total student population. This award is to remediate emergency, health, and safety issues at Vandenberg Elementary School, which serves 381 students on the installation and is currently located in the designated flight zone of the runway of Ellsworth AFB. The proposed project will replace the existing school with a new facility outside of the flight zone and will include: 24 classrooms, an administration area, computer lab, special education classrooms, library, music areas, art room, gymnasium, commons/cafeteria, kitchen, and support areas. The district will provide a local share of \$7.6 million for this new school project.

The Impact Aid Program's senior leadership has continued its positive relationship with its military-connected LEAs through participation in conferences sponsored by the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools Association and the Military Impacted Schools Association. Participation in these events allows the federally connected LEAs to voice their questions and concerns related to program activities and provide valuable feedback to the program for future initiatives.

ED remains committed to providing information to military members and their families to assist them in accessing high-quality and affordable postsecondary opportunities. The Department continues to work collaboratively with DoD, Veterans Affairs, Labor, other agencies, and the Services in the implementation of the VOW (Veterans Opportunity to Work) to Hire Heroes Act of 2011. Key to this work has been supporting the Administration's call for a comprehensive redesign of the military's transition program, Transition GPS. ED staff have contributed to the design of the transition program, including the evaluation and design of the higher education and career and technical training modules, and have continued to advise on program direction, assessments, and delivery systems.

The most recent updates on the Federal Student Aid (FSA) website provide high-level and detailed information on a variety of programs regarding student loans and grants. There is also information on exclusive financial aid resources for

military families. This year, FSA Awareness and Outreach teams participated in collaborative efforts with Infinity Technology of McLean, Virginia; Fort Meade, Maryland; Quantico Marine Base, Virginia; Fort Myer, Virginia; Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland; Henderson Hall, Arlington, Virginia; and Fort Belvoir, Virginia and conducted unique training opportunities (Train-the-Trainer) to provide useful resources to aid Transition GPS higher education track facilitators, Education Service Officers, counselors, and volunteers who serve the military community. The training was received positively and made an impact in practice; plans are in motion to conduct more training in FY 2014. FSA Awareness and Outreach also collaborated with DoDEA in hosting two sessions on financial aid in the online FSA Chat Room. FSA Awareness and Outreach will continue its effort in working with the military community locally and around the world.

One of ED's ongoing efforts specifically targeted for veterans is the Veterans Upward Bound (VUB) Program. The VUB Program is a discretionary grant program administered by the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE). The VUB Program provides awards to institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations, community-based organizations, secondary schools, and combinations of these institutions, agencies, and organizations to operate projects designed to prepare, motivate, and assist military veterans in the development of academic and other skills necessary for acceptance into and success in a program of postsecondary education. In FY 2013, ED awarded 50 grants totaling \$13,249,572.

In FY 2010, OPE's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education received an appropriation to fund Centers of Excellence for Veteran Student Success. Fifteen grants were awarded. In October 2013, at the conclusion of three years, all projects reported on data for veteran enrollment, persistence from the first to the second year, and completion/graduation. Those data are now being analyzed, and a report will be issued. Veteran enrollments range from about 100 to almost 6,000 across the fifteen projects. All grants have been extended one year to collect additional data in 2014.

Building on Executive Order 13607, "Establishing Principles of Excellence for Educational Institutions Serving Service Members, Veterans, Spouses, and Other Family Members," ED convened more than 100 experts to review approaches that could be scaled and replicated to foster veterans' success on campus. A wide range of stakeholders participated: ED, VA, DoD, nonprofit organizations, foundations, veteran service organizations, and importantly, veterans who had recently completed postsecondary education in a range of disciplines. From creating a culture of connectedness and implementing an early alert system, to developing systems to ensure sustainability of effective practices, the best practices emerging from this work, launched as the "8 Keys to Success," offer steps postsecondary institutions can take in order to assist veterans and Service members in transitioning into higher education, completing their college degrees, obtaining career-ready skills, and achieving success.

In collaboration with DoDEA and other Federal agencies and stakeholders, ED will continue its efforts on behalf of military families. The Secretary and ED senior leadership will use the bully pulpit to support efforts that address the needs of military-connected students, including: Preschool for All; the Interstate Compact; college- and career-ready standards; access to higher education; and partnerships among military installations, LEAs, and state and federal partners in order to comprehensively address the education needs of K–12 military-connected students.

#### 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 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 of education available to military dependent students affects retention, readiness, and morale of our nation's all-volunteer military. The Department is committed to influence and provide resources to ensure military dependent students achieve the academic success and have every opportunity for a quality educational experience. The Department is steadfast in its efforts to encourage and support 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 dependent students and their families.

# **Appendices**

# **Projected Military-Connected Student Growth and Loss by State**

Service	Installation	State		SY 14/15		Grand Total
Service	IIIStaliation	State	MIL	CIV	CTR	Granu iota
USA	Fort Wainwright	AK	62	43	0	105
USAF	JB Elemendorf-Richardson	AK	-103	0	N/A	-103
USAF	Little Rock AFB	AR	-423	0	N/A	-423
USAF	Luke AFB	AZ	124	0	N/A	124
USMC	MCAS Yuma	AZ	48	0	N/A	48
USAF	Davis Monthan AFB	AZ	-111	0	N/A	-111
USA	Presidio of Monterey	CA	85	19	0	104
USAF	Beale AFB	CA	59	0	N/A	59
USA	NTC and Fort Irwin	CA	63	-9	0	54
USMC	MCRD San Diego	CA	-121	0	N/A	-121
USMC	Camp Pendelton	CA	-250	0	N/A	-250
USMC	MCAGCC 29 Palms	CA	-282	0	N/A	-282
USN	Groton	СТ	82	0	N/A	82
USAF	Eglin AFB	FL	86	0	N/A	86
USN	Mayport	FL	44	0	N/A	44
USA	Fort Gordon	GA	125	2	-61	66
USAF	Robins AFB	GA	-23	-24	N/A	-47
USA	Fort Benning	GA	-52	-52	-60	-164
USA	Scholfield Bks Military Reservation	HI	117	39	-12	144
USA	Fort Shafter	HI	51	24	0	75
USN	Kaneohe	HI	-66	0	N/A	-66
USAF	McConnell AFB	KS	-51	0	N/A	-51
USA	Fort Campbell	KY	534	-29	-15	490
USA	Fort Knox	KY	-1,283	-31	0	-1,314
USA	Fort Polk	LA	108	0	0	108
USA	Fort Meade	MD	210	22	0	232
USAF	Keesler AFB	MS	-64	0	N/A	-64
USA	Fort Bragg	NC	-546	-37	-119	-702
USMC	Camp Lejeune	NC	-801	0	N/A	-801
USN	Ballston Spa	NY	-51	0	N/A	-51
USA	Fort Drum	NY	-732	-63	0	-795
USA	Fort Sill	OK	-252	-32	-22	-306
USAF	JB San Antonio	TX	25	-98	N/A	-73
USA	Fort Bliss	TX	-88	-63	-2	-153
USA	Fort Hood	TX	-120	-75	-549	-744

\*N/A: data was not available and not reported.

# **Projected Military-Connected Student Growth and Loss by State (Cont.)**

Service	Installation	Ctata		SY 14/15		Cuand Total
Service	Installation	State	MIL	CIV	CTR	Grand Total
USN	Norfolk	VA	130	0	N/A	130
USAF	JB Langley-Eustis	VA	101	0	N/A	101
USA	Fort Lee	VA	-42	-39	0	-81
USN	Newport News	VA	-138	0	N/A	-138
USN	Whidbey Island	WA	206	0	N/A	206
	Total		-3,339	-403	-840	-4,582

<sup>\*</sup>N/A: data was not available and not reported.

# **Projected Military-Connected Student Growth and Loss by Service**

		2		SY 14/15		
Service	Installation	State	MIL	CIV	CTR	Grand Total
USA	Fort Campbell	KY	534	-29	-15	490
USA	Fort Meade	MD	210	22	0	232
USA	Scholfield Bks Military Reservation	НІ	117	39	-12	144
USA	Fort Polk	LA	108	0	0	108
USA	Fort Wainwright	AK	62	43	0	105
USA	Presidio of Monterey	CA	85	19	0	104
USA	Fort Shafter	HI	51	24	0	75
USA	Fort Gordon	GA	125	2	-61	66
USA	NTC and Fort Irwin	CA	63	-9	0	54
USA	Fort Lee	VA	-42	-39	0	-81
USA	Fort Bliss	TX	-88	-63	-2	-153
USA	Fort Benning	GA	-52	-52	-60	-164
USA	Fort Sill	OK	-252	-32	-22	-306
USA	Fort Bragg	NC	-546	-37	-119	-702
USA	Fort Hood	TX	-120	-75	-549	-744
USA	Fort Drum	NY	-732	-63	0	-795
USA	Fort Knox	KY	-1,283	-31	0	-1,314
USAF	Luke AFB	AZ	124	0	N/A	124
USAF	JB Langley-Eustis	VA	101	0	N/A	101
USAF	Eglin AFB	FL	86	0	N/A	86
USAF	Beale AFB	CA	59	0	N/A	59
USAF	Robins AFB	GA	-23	-24	N/A	-47
USAF	McConnell AFB	KS	-51	0	N/A	-51
USAF	Keesler AFB	MS	-64	0	N/A	-64
USAF	JB San Antonio	TX	25	-98	N/A	-73
USAF	JB Elemendorf- Richardson	AK	-103	0	N/A	-103
USAF	Davis Monthan AFB	AZ	-111	0	N/A	-111
USAF	Little Rock AFB	AR	-423	0	N/A	-423
USMC	MCAS Yuma	AZ	48	0	N/A	48
USMC	MCRD San Diego	CA	-121	0	N/A	-121
USMC	Camp Pendelton	CA	-250	0	N/A	-250
USMC	MCAGCC 29 Palms	CA	-282	0	N/A	-282
USMC	Camp Lejeune	NC	-801	0	N/A	-801
USN	Whidbey Island	WA	206	0	N/A	206
USN	Norfolk	VA	130	0	N/A	130

\*N/A: data was not available and not reported.

# **Projected Military-Connected Student Growth and Loss by Service (Cont.)**

Comileo	Installation	State		SY 14/15		Cuand Tatal
Service	Installation	State	MIL	CIV	CTR	Grand Total
USN	Groton	СТ	82	0	N/A	82
USN	Mayport	FL	44	0	N/A	44
USN	Ballston Spa	NY	-51	0	N/A	-51
USN	Kaneohe	HI	-66	0	N/A	-66
USN	Newport News	VA	-138	0	N/A	-138
	Total		-3,339	-403	-840	-4,582

<sup>\*</sup>N/A: data was not available and not reported.

# **Projections of Military Dependents Transitioning by Growth**

		_		SY 14/15		
Service	Installation	State	MIL	CIV	CTR	Grand Total
USA	Fort Campbell	KY	534	-29	-15	490
USA	Fort Meade	MD	210	22	0	232
USN	Whidbey Island	WA	206	0	N/A	206
USA	Scholfield Bks Military Reservation	HI	117	39	-12	144
USN	Norfolk	VA	130	0	N/A	130
USAF	Luke AFB	AZ	124	0	N/A	124
USA	Fort Polk	LA	108	0	0	108
USA	Fort Wainwright	AK	62	43	0	105
USA	Presidio of Monterey	CA	85	19	0	104
USAF	JB Langley-Eustis	VA	101	0	N/A	101
USAF	Eglin AFB	FL	86	0	N/A	86
USN	Groton	СТ	82	0	N/A	82
USA	Fort Shafter	HI	51	24	0	75
USA	Fort Gordon	GA	125	2	-61	66
USAF	Beale AFB	CA	59	0	N/A	59
USA	NTC and Fort Irwin	CA	63	-9	0	54
USMC	MCAS Yuma	AZ	48	0	N/A	48
USN	Mayport	FL	44	0	N/A	44
USAF	Robins AFB	GA	-23	-24	N/A	-47
USN	Ballston Spa	NY	-51	0	N/A	-51
USAF	McConnell AFB	KS	-51	0	N/A	-51
USAF	Keesler AFB	MS	-64	0	N/A	-64
USN	Kaneohe	HI	-66	0	N/A	-66
USAF	JB San Antonio	TX	25	-98	N/A	-73
USA	Fort Lee	VA	-42	-39	0	-81
USAF	JB Elemendorf-Richardson	AK	-103	0	N/A	-103
USAF	Davis Monthan AFB	AZ	-111	0	N/A	-111
USMC	MCRD San Diego	CA	-121	0	N/A	-121
USN	Newport News	VA	-138	0	N/A	-138
USA	Fort Bliss	TX	-88	-63	-2	-153
USA	Fort Benning	GA	-52	-52	-60	-164
USMC	Camp Pendelton	CA	-250	0	N/A	-250
USMC	MCAGCC 29 Palms	CA	-282	0	N/A	-282
USA	Fort Sill	OK	-252	-32	-22	-306
USAF	Little Rock AFB	AR	-423	0	N/A	-423
USA	Fort Bragg	NC	-546	-37	-119	-702

\*N/A: data was not available and not reported.

# **Projections of Military Dependents Transitioning by Growth (Cont.)**

Service	Installation	State		SY 14/15		Grand Total
Service	IIIStallation	State	MIL	CIV	CTR	Granu iotai
USA	Fort Hood	TX	-120	-75	-549	-744
USA	Fort Drum	NY	-732	-63	0	-795
USMC	Camp Lejeune	NC	-801	0	N/A	-801
USA	Fort Knox	KY	-1,283	-31	0	-1,314
	Total		-3,339	-403	-840	-4,582

<sup>\*</sup>N/A: data was not available and not reported.









