



INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

**An Assessment of the DoDEA  
Community Strategic Plan  
2001–2006**

Richard K. Wright

September 2002

Approved for public release;  
distribution unlimited.

IDA Document D-2764

Log: H 02-001761

**This work was conducted under contracts DASW01 98 C 0067 and DASW01 02 C 0012, Task BE-3-1981, for the Department of Defense Education Activity. The publication of this IDA document does not indicate endorsement by the Department of Defense, nor should the contents be construed as reflecting the official position of that Agency.**

**© 2002, 2003 Institute for Defense Analyses, 4850 Mark Center Drive, Alexandria, Virginia 22311-1882 • (703) 845-2000.**

**This material may be reproduced by or for the U.S. Government pursuant to the copyright license under the clause at DFARS 252.227-7013 (NOV 95).**

INSTITUTE FOR DEFENSE ANALYSES

IDA Document D-2764

**An Assessment of the DoDEA  
Community Strategic Plan  
2001–2006**

Richard K. Wright



## **PREFACE**

This document reports the work performed by the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) for the Director, Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) in partial fulfillment of the task entitled “Assessment of DoD Education Activity Programs and Operations.”

This report would not have been possible without the time that 505 individuals so willingly gave during 132 interviews. This included many military leaders, parents and educators throughout the world. Their honest and candid comments and opinions were instrumental in ensuring that the assessment would provide meaningful results to the DoDEA leadership and further enhance DoDEA’s ability to accomplish its mission. Appreciation is also extended to the many people who helped to coordinate the installation and school visits.

Within IDA, this report was reviewed by Mr. Ronald Krisak, and Mr. Robert Graebener. Their comments and suggestions are gratefully acknowledged and improved the quality of the report.



## CONTENTS

SUMMARY .....	S-1
I. BACKGROUND .....	I-1
A. DoDEA Community Strategic Plan (CSP) 1995–2000 .....	I-1
B. DoDEA CSP 2001–2006 .....	I-2
C. Assessment of CSP Implementation.....	I-2
D. Assessment Approach.....	I-3
1. Interviews .....	I-3
2. Document and Data Analysis .....	I-5
E. Organization .....	I-5
II. SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS .....	II-1
A. Awareness of the CSP .....	II-1
B. Understanding of the CSP.....	II-5
C. Acceptance of the CSP .....	II-6
D. Support of the CSP .....	II-8
E. Value Added by the CSP.....	II-10
F. CSP 1995–2000 VS. CSP 2001–2006 .....	II-12
G. The 2001–2006 CSP and the SIP/DIP .....	II-14
H. Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement.....	II-16
I. Goal 2: Performance-Driven Efficient Management Systems .....	II-18
J. Goal 3: Motivated, High Performing, Diverse Workforce.....	II-19
K. Goal 4: Network of Partnerships Promoting Achievement .....	II-21
L. CSP Measures and Milestones .....	II-24
M. DoDEA Budget.....	II-26
N. Performance Appraisals.....	II-28
O. CSP 5-Year Time Frame.....	II-30
P. Reviewing and Changing the CSP.....	II-31
III. ASSESSMENT .....	III-1
A. Awareness of the CSP .....	III-1
B. Understanding of the CSP .....	III-3
C. Acceptance of the CSP .....	III-3

D. Support for the CSP.....	III-6
E. Value Added by the CSP.....	III-8
F. CSP Measures and Milestones and the DoDEA Budget.....	III-9
G. Performance Appraisals.....	III-12
H. CSP Review .....	III-13
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	IV-1
A. Conclusions .....	IV-1
B. Recommendations .....	IV-7
References .....	Ref-1
Glossary .....	GL-1

APPENDIXES

A—DoDEA Community Strategic Plan: Comparison of Components .....	A-1
B—Demographics of Individuals Interviewed .....	B-1



## FIGURE

III-1. DoDEA CSP One-Page Handout, With CSP Glossary Terms Highlighted ....	III-4
---	-------

## TABLES

I-1. DoDEA Composition, School Year (SY) 2001–2002 .....	I-1
I-2. Overview Demographics of Interviews Conducted .....	I-4
I-3. Districts and Schools Visited or Represented During Interviews .....	I-4
III-1. Methods for Publicizing the CSP .....	III-1
III-2. Awareness of the 1995–2000 CSP and Priority Benchmarks .....	III-2
III-3. DoDEA CSP 1995–2000: Communications and Awareness .....	III-2
III-4. Composition of CSP Leadership Team .....	III-5
III-5. Focus of the 1995–2000 DoDEA School Improvement Plans .....	III-7
III-6. Effectiveness of 1995–2000 CSP in Improving DoDEA Schools .....	III-8
III-7. Effect of the 1995–2000 CSP and Benchmarks on Local Schools .....	III-8
III-8. Impact of the 1995–2000 CSP on Various Activities .....	III-9
III-9. CSP 2001–2006 Measures and Milestones .....	III-10
III-10. Implementation Milestone Requirements .....	III-11
III-11. Two Examples of Measures Requiring Additional Detail .....	III-12



## SUMMARY

### A. BACKGROUND

The Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) provides education to more than 105,000 eligible Department of Defense (DoD) military and civilian children, from preschool through grade 12 in 224 schools located in the United States and overseas. It manages and directs the Department of Defense Dependent Schools (DoDDS) (the overseas school system) and the DoD Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS) (the stateside system).

In August 1995, DoDEA published its first Community Strategic Plan (CSP) for the period 1995–2000. In March 2001, DoDEA published its second CSP, which is a revision of the initial CSP and covers the period 2001–2006. The current CSP contains a vision statement, mission statement, eight guiding principles, four goals, nine outcomes linked to specific goals, and measures and milestones for each outcome.

In fall 2001, the Director, DoDEA requested that the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) conduct an assessment during the first year of implementation to:

- Determine the awareness, understanding, acceptance, and support of the different stakeholder groups
- Evaluate how well the procedures used in developing this plan result in support for the plan from all stakeholder groups (as contrasted with the previous CSP)
- Determine if any changes or modifications should be made in implementing the CSP that will further facilitate accomplishment of stated goals and outcomes.

This assessment is based on interviews with DoDEA stakeholders and a review of relevant documents and other data. From December 2001 to April 2002, 132 individual and small-group interviews were conducted with 505 people at 24 Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations in the Continental United States (CONUS), Europe, and the Pacific. An effort was made to analyze as much factual data as possible to provide additional insights about the interview results and clarify misperceptions. Conclusions and recommendations are based on subjective and objective data collected during the assessment.

## **B . ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSIONS**

Interview comments about various topics are generally consistent within each stakeholder group, regardless of location (DoDDS-Europe, DoDDS-Pacific, and DDESS). Comments vary among stakeholder groups to some extent by the level of military leader (installation commander or senior military leader) and administrator (principal, superintendent, or area director), and the degree of parent and teacher involvement with the CSP.

Many interview comments make references to the specific CSP 2001–2006 Goals. The four goals are:

- Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement
- Goal 2: Performance-Driven, Efficient Management Systems
- Goal 3: Motivated, High-Performing, Diverse Workforce
- Goal 4: Network of Partnerships Promoting Achievement.

Most individuals in every stakeholder group are aware of the CSP. There is general agreement that some parents may never be aware of the CSP because of a lack of interest, rather than a lack of opportunity to become aware of it. The CSP has been well publicized, especially the vision, mission, goals and outcomes. The amount of awareness concerning the details of the CSP varies among the groups. Military leaders and parents are more aware of the details of Goals 1 and 4. Teachers and principals are most aware of the details in Goals 1 and 4 because these are the areas in which schools have been told to focus their efforts. They are aware of those aspects of Goals 2 and 3 that impact them and the schools. Administrators above school level are aware of all goals to a greater degree than the other stakeholders. Some stakeholders are aware of ongoing DoDEA and school initiatives (e.g., emphasis on student achievement and partnerships) even though they may not know that these initiatives relate to the CSP. Those individuals who are responsible for implementing or coordinating aspects of the CSP are more aware of the appropriate details. At the installation and school level, stakeholder groups are usually more aware of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) than they are of the CSP, but there is an effort to link the two plans. Continuous publicity about the CSP is necessary if awareness by all stakeholder groups is desired.

Understanding of the CSP varies by stakeholder groups and levels within those groups. There is greater understanding of areas related to an individual's duties and responsibilities or with an individual's involvement with the school, and less understanding about other parts of the CSP. Military leaders and parents understand the broad goals and

outcomes, but not the specifics of the measures and milestones. For the most part there is no need for them to have a detailed understanding. Some terminology and content is difficult for parents to understand, but efforts in some districts and schools to explain parts of the CSP in simpler language have been helpful.

All stakeholder groups accept the 2001–2006 CSP primarily because of its focus on student achievement, the involvement of all stakeholder groups in its development, and the flexibility it offers at the school level with each SIP. All groups appreciated the narrow focus of the four goals and the fact that Goal 1 is the primary focus at the school level. Acceptance for the 2001–2006 CSP is higher than for the previous CSP because of DoDEA’s efforts to increase representation of all stakeholder groups.

Military commanders support the CSP and are asking what they can do to help. The parents are more involved because the parents realize that an active partnership exists between themselves and the educators. Parents are able to address issues affecting their children’s education and get these issues resolved. The educators feel they are being trusted to do their job and are being treated like professionals. They realize the value of the CSP and the relationship of their SIP to the CSP. Teachers appreciate the fact that they are able to provide input to the SIP and are taking ownership. Educators at all levels feel that the current DoDEA leadership encourages initiative.

All stakeholder groups agreed that it was not only beneficial but also essential to have a strategic plan that guided the entire organization. It reassures the military leaders and parents—regardless of where they are in DoDEA, everyone is working towards the same four goals—with the emphasis on student achievement. The CSP provides a consistent focus for everyone (at every level), provides legitimacy for their efforts, and encourages community support and involvement. Equally important to all stakeholder groups was the acknowledgement that each school was different and that the CSP offered the flexibility to have a SIP that focused on its own needs.

The significance of the change and improvement between the CSP 1995–2000 and the CSP 2001–2006 is felt primarily by the educators since most of them have been involved with both CSPs. The military leaders and parents are only concerned with the current CSP and its ability to ensure a quality education. The stakeholders who were familiar with the previous CSP agreed totally that the 2001–2006 CSP is a significant improvement. The previous CSP was too complex, cumbersome, directive, and overwhelming. Educators were not sure what was important. The current CSP is more focused, and this makes allocating resources much easier. It is also easier to understand and more manageable,

logical, and practical. The decentralized execution and flexibility at the school level are seen as a significant and positive change.

Most administrators have explained the relationship of the CSP to the SIP and the district improvement plan (DIP), which is understood by those military leaders and parents involved in the process. Each school would have a SIP, even without the DoDEA CSP, because it is required for the accreditation process, but the CSP ensures that all schools stay within its broad framework. A SIP focuses primarily on CSP Goals 1 and 4, and a DIP addresses all four goals. Administrators hope that the flexibility offered the schools through this CSP will continue.

All stakeholder groups appreciate the present CSP's clear focus on student achievement for all students. They agreed that they did not want testing to become the only basis for evaluation. They understand measurements are needed to assess achievement, but other components, in addition to testing, also need to be included. There is a concern that the number of tests and the amount of time required to prepare for, administer, and evaluate tests will increase. Many of the Parent-Teacher-Student Associations/Parent-Teacher Organizations (PTSA/PTOs) now require schools and teachers to explain how requested funds will be used to support student learning before a allocation is approved.

A performance-driven, efficient management system viewed primarily as a responsibility of administrators above school level. Military leaders and administrators realize that this will require the proper allocation and prioritization of resources. Most parents are not aware of the details of this goal, but parents in advisory organizations are interested in the outcome as it relates to school safety.

All stakeholder groups want a high-quality workforce. They understand and support the need for diversity, but they do not want to sacrifice quality for diversity.

To determine what professional development (PD) and training courses are best for teachers and schools, a needs assessment, based on the SIP, should be conducted. Although educators do not think DoDEA should dictate what courses are provided, it is appropriate for some PD and training (e.g., training on the implementation of a new curriculum) to be determined and developed by DoDEA. Teachers would like to see more time for collaboration. DL should be used to provide some PD and training.

All stakeholder groups realize that partnerships are essential for ensuring a school's success and for improving student achievement. Each stakeholder group has established numerous programs to develop and maintain strong community-school relationships.

All stakeholder groups work hard to get more parents involved in their children's education and emphasize that parents share responsibility with the schools for their children's education. The degree of parental involvement varies depending on the school, the parent's background, and the school level (ES, MS, or HS). More parents are asking how they can help at home and that there is more communication between teachers and parents. There will always be some parents who do not want to become involved.

Military leaders and most parents are not aware of the details of the CSP measures and milestones but hope that the results associated with the milestones will be disseminated like accountability reports of past years. They are mainly interested in those measures and milestones that apply at the school level. Educators realize that some measures still need to be defined and hope that there will be some flexibility retained at the school level for determining the details. Considerable baseline data are required, but most of the educators view the data required by the present CSP to be less of an administrative burden than the data required by previous CSP. Attaining all the milestones will require the concerted effort and involvement of all stakeholder groups—especially the educators.

All stakeholder groups realize that budget and other resource cuts could impact on meeting CSP and SIP goals. Parents want to be sure that funds are prioritized to support student achievement. Educators feel that budget cuts will impact Goals 2 and 3 more than they impact Goal 1. Teachers' attitudes toward the accomplishment of Goal 1 remain positive. The educators' major frustration related to the budget continues to be not knowing in advance the budget for the school year. Shortfalls should result in an acknowledgement that a milestone may not be met by the specified date or to the degree required. Educators will need to be creative and innovative as they adjust to any shortfalls.

Military leaders and parents think that teacher performance appraisals should be linked to student achievement and/or the SIP in some way. Both DDESS and DoDDS began new performance appraisal systems with School Year (SY) 2001–2002. The DDESS system focuses on the improvement of instruction, and the DoDDS system focuses on improving the quality of instruction. The DoDDS system includes a Professional Growth Plan (PGP) component that focuses on a teacher's professional growth. Both systems are indirectly linked to the CSP and the SIP.

Military leaders and parents will not see the entire 5-year plan being executed but do expect to see continuous improvement regardless of the time their children are in DoDEA schools. All agreed that it takes several years to plan, implement, and execute a program,

and DoDEA's geographic dispersion makes this task even more complex. The 5-year time frame works well with the SIP and the accreditation process.

Stakeholders thought that an annual review of the CSP would be good but cautioned that there should be no major changes. The goals and outcomes should remain, with changes to the measures and milestones as necessitated by budget cuts or identification of areas that require change. DoDEA documents indicate that the CSP will be reviewed annually, but a review has not been conducted since the 2001–2006 CSP was initiated. The DoDEA website<sup>1</sup> contains a comprehensive report highlighting what each of DoDEA's five operational directorates did during SY 2001–2002 to implement the CSP goals and outcomes.

### **C. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- The CSP and SIP should be publicized annually at the beginning of each school year.
- Principals and superintendents should brief new installation commanders, senior military leaders, and School Liaison Officers (SLOs) about the CSP and SIP after they assume their new positions.
- The CSP and SIP's relationship to the education of their children should be explained to the parents.
- Questions about the SIP should be included in any DoDEA survey about the CSP.
- Principals should provide a one- to two-page summary of accomplishments related to the SIP and relevant parts of the CSP, based on the milestones and other activities that occurred during the past school year.
- Principals should ask for partnership support and have a detailed plan of what is needed.
- All teachers should receive training on computers and other available technology to support student learning. The software should be current and should be compatible with any new computers that are purchased.
- Milestone suspenses indicated by SY should be restated to be more specific.
- The new performance appraisal systems should be evaluated after 2 years to assess how well they are accomplishing their intended purpose.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.odedodea.edu/>.



## I. BACKGROUND

The Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) is a field activity operating under the direction, authority, and control of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Military Community and Family Policy) (DASD(MC&FP)). He reports to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management Policy) (ASD(FMP)), who, in turn, reports to the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness (USD(P&R))). DoDEA provides education to eligible Department of Defense (DoD) military and civilian dependents from preschool through grade 12 at sites in the United States and overseas.

DoDEA consists of an overseas school system [the Department of Defense Dependent Schools (DoDDS)] and a stateside system [the DoD Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS)]. DoDDS is further subdivided into three areas [Europe, Pacific, and America (Cuba)], with schools located in 14 countries. DDESS is located in seven states, Puerto Rico, and Guam. See Table I-1.

**Table I-1. DoDEA Composition, School Year (SY) 2001–2002  
(Enrollment as of 30 September 2001)**

	Headquarters	Districts	Schools	Enrollment
DoDDS		10	155	73,663
Europe	Wiesbaden, Germany	6	115	48,954
Pacific	Okinawa, Japan	3	39	24,379
America	Guantanamo Bay, Cuba	1	1	330
DDESS	Peachtree City, GA	11	69	32,523
DoDEA	Arlington, VA	21	224	106,186

### A. DoDEA COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN (CSP) 1995–2000

In August 1995, DoDEA published its first CSP for the period 1995–2000. A leadership team comprised mostly of DoDEA personnel developed the CSP between November 1994 and March 1995. It contained a vision statement, a mission statement, 7 guiding principles, 10 goals, and benchmarks for each goal. The goals included the 8 goals contained in the Education Reform Bill, or Goals 2000, signed by the President on March 31, 1994, and 2 additional goals related to accountability and organizational development. Forty benchmarks (later increased to 42) were defined as a clearly written, measurable commitment that directly supported the achievement of the goal, focused on student or organizational outcomes, and incorporated a baseline against which progress can be

measured.<sup>2</sup> Of the 42 benchmarks, 14 were identified as priority benchmarks. Also developed were implementation strategies that explained how the goals and benchmarks would be achieved. Objective data were gathered and used to measure progress against the benchmarks. The data were reported annually in accountability reports.

## **B . DoDEA CSP 2001–2006**

In March 2001, DoDEA published its second CSP, which is a revision of the initial CSP and covers the period 2001–2006. Planning for the CSP began in March 1999, with an expanded leadership team that included representatives of all stakeholder groups. The leadership team incorporated the findings from a DoDEA CSP Research Report prepared by The McKenzie Group, Inc. This report reviewed the process and accomplishments of the previous CSP. The current CSP contains a vision statement, a mission statement, eight guiding principles, four goals, nine outcomes linked to specific goals, and measures and milestones for each outcome.

Appendix A, Table A-1, compares the components of the CSP 1995–2000 and the CSP 2001–2006.

## **C . ASSESSMENT OF CSP IMPLEMENTATION**

The current CSP became effective in School Year (SY) 2001–2002 and was implemented at all levels within DoDEA. In fall 2001, the Director, DoDEA requested that the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) conduct an assessment during the first year of implementation to:

- Determine the awareness, understanding, acceptance, and support of the different stakeholder groups
- Evaluate how well the procedures used in developing this plan result in support for the plan from all stakeholder groups (as contrasted with the previous CSP)
- Determine if any changes or modifications should be made in implementing the CSP that will further facilitate accomplishment of stated goals and outcomes.

There was no requirement to assess how well the various DoDEA units (school, district, or area office) met the milestones that were established for SY 2001–2002. The Director, DoDEA expected that the milestones would be met and would be evaluated based on the reports submitted by each level to the next higher level within DoDEA.

---

<sup>2</sup> *DoDEA Community Strategic Plan, Volume 1*, DoDEA, August 1995.

## **D. ASSESSMENT APPROACH**

This assessment is based on interviews with DoDEA stakeholders and a review of relevant documents and other data.

### **1. Interviews**

Interviews were essential for gathering information about the awareness, understanding, acceptance, and support of the CSP by each stakeholder group. An extensive number of interviews were conducted with military leaders, parents, administrators, and teachers.

#### **a. Interview Demographics**

From December 2001 to April 2002, 132 individual and small-group interviews were conducted with 505 people at 24 Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations in the Continental United States (CONUS), Europe, and the Pacific. Installations, schools, and individuals were selected to ensure that the interviewer would receive input from a representative sampling of all stakeholders. This would help to ensure that a particular group or location did not overly influence the assessment. After the interviewer selected a location, the details of the visit and interviews were coordinated through district superintendents and School Liaison Officers (SLOs). Everyone was helpful and accommodating during this process. The interviewer felt that the interviewees provided objective thoughts and information about the CSP.

The 36 military and civilian leaders and 12 SLOs who were interviewed represented all the Services. A total of 139 parents were interviewed, 21 of whom are also military members. Among the parents, 16 are serving on school boards, 40 are serving on a School Advisory Committee (SAC) or School Improvement Team (SIT), and 83 are serving on neither but are actively involved in the schools their children attend. These parents had 287 children enrolled in all grades of DoDEA schools. The 146 administrators included principals, assistant principals, superintendents, assistant superintendents, representatives of district offices, and key personnel in DoDEA, DDESS, DoDDS-Europe, and DoDDS-Pacific headquarters. The 172 teachers interviewed included 59 who are serving on a SAC or SIT and 23 who are union representatives.

Table I-2 summarizes the interviews by location, number of interviews conducted, and categories of people interviewed.

**Table I-2. Overview Demographics of Interviews Conducted**

Location	# Interviews	# People	# People by Stakeholder Group					
			Mil Ldrs	Civ Ldrs	SLO	Parents	Admin	Teachers
Germany	24	104	7	3	4	26	33	31
Italy	14	66	1	1	1	26	12	25
England	13	48	1		1	18	6	22
Okinawa	17	74	3		1	17	30	23
Korea	15	52	7	1	2	11	14	17
Japan	13	38	4	1	1	11	4	17
Hawaii	3	6	2	1	2		1	
CONUS	33	117	4			30	46	37
<b>Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>172</b>

Table I-3 summarizes the school districts visited and number of schools represented during the interviews. The 93 schools represented during the interviews included a wide range in terms of student enrollment and grade composition. The communities visited had from 2 to 11 schools.

**Table I-3. Districts and Schools Visited or Represented During Interviews**

Area	District	# Schools
DoDDS-Europe	5 of 6	44 of 115
	Isles	8 of 16
	Brussels	5 of 13
	Kaiserslautern	15 of 15
	Heidelberg	8 of 27
	Mediterranean	8 of 20
DoDDS-Pacific	3 of 3	25 of 39
	Okinawa	12 of 12
	Korea	5 of 8
	Japan	8 of 19
DDESS	4 of 11	23 of 69
	Ft. Benning	7 of 7
	Ft. Campbell	3 of 8
	Ft. Bragg	5 of 9
	Camp Lejeune	8 of 8
<b>Total</b>		<b>93 of 224</b>

Appendix B, Tables B-1 through B-5, contain additional demographic details about the interviews. These tables include more details about the military leaders, the SLOs, the parents and their involvement with the schools, the administrators and other individuals, the teachers and union representatives, and the number of interviews conducted at each location.

## **b. Interview Process**

At the beginning of each interview, the interviewer explained the purpose of the IDA assessment and the manner in which the interview would be conducted. Although each interviewee may have had a personal interest in and biases about the CSP, he/she had to be as objective and open-minded as possible during the interview. The focus was on understanding how aware the interviewees were of the CSP and how well they understood it, supported it, and accepted it. The interviewees also understood that what was important was their assessment (facts, opinions and perceptions).

Only the interviewee(s) and the interviewer were present during the interview, and all interviews were for nonattribution. The interviewer took detailed notes, but the sessions were not tape-recorded. A general list of questions was used for the interview, but no survey was administered. In many cases, an interviewee would comment about a topic that had not been mentioned in a previous interview, and further discussion ensued. Most interviews lasted 1 hour. After all the interviews had been completed, the comments were reviewed to determine the consistency—or lack of consistency—between and within the various stakeholder groups. While the interviewees' perceptions are just as important as their knowledge of the facts, distinguishing between perception and fact was a necessary part of the process.

## **2. Document and Data Analysis**

The process used to develop the CSP was reviewed along with the results of the research done by The McKenzie Group, Inc., which assisted DoDEA in the development of the CSP 2001–2006. Although there was no requirement to assess the implementation at the end of the first year, the DoDEA evaluation was reviewed to determine if there are ways to improve the implementation process.

An effort was made to analyze as much factual data as possible to provide additional insights about the interview results and to clarify misperceptions. Conclusions and recommendations are based on subjective and objective data collected during the assessment.

## **E. ORGANIZATION**

Section I provides background information about DoDEA, the 1995–2000 CSP and 2001–2006 CSP, and the assessment approach.

Section II summarizes the interviews, which are organized by the major topics discussed. While the summary may contain some interviewee comments that are factually incorrect, these comments are still provided so the reader can assess the extent to which misperceptions exist. The summary of each topic indicates the general thoughts and opinions of each stakeholder group. It reflects the positive and negative comments, many of which (in the opinion of the interviewer) are insightful.

Interview results are intended to show what is important to the stakeholders and to allow the reader to review the viewpoints of the various stakeholder groups and see where there was agreement or disagreement and confusion or understanding. In the summary of interviews, no attempt was made to substantiate all the statements or assertions, although clarification of misperceptions is provided where appropriate.

Section III presents an assessment of the CSP development and implementation process. It incorporates some of the interview results and a discussion of various factors that impact the assessment.

Section IV contains the conclusions and recommendations.

## **II. SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS**

This summary of the interviews is organized by the major topics discussed. While the summary may contain some stakeholder comments that are factually incorrect, they are provided so that the reader can assess the extent to which misperceptions exist. Each topic summary indicates the general thoughts and opinions of each stakeholder group and reflects positive and negative comments.

Many interview comments make references to the specific CSP 2001–2006 Goals. The four goals are:

- Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement
- Goal 2: Performance-Driven, Efficient Management Systems
- Goal 3: Motivated, High-Performing, Diverse Workforce
- Goal 4: Network of Partnerships Promoting Achievement.

### **A. AWARENESS OF THE CSP**

#### **1. Military**

Most military leaders are aware of the CSP's top-level components, especially Goals 1 and 4. They are not aware of all of the details, but do not think that this is necessary. The details are primarily for those who must implement the CSP. Most commanders hear about the CSP frequently and think it is well articulated. Some commanders received a copy of the CSP pamphlet, others received a summary of it, and others were briefed on it. At some locations, the pamphlet is briefed at commander's courses by either a DoDEA representative or the SLO. One commander was aware of the CSP but was not briefed on it.

Military leaders and parents have many opportunities to become aware of the CSP. The DoDEA Communications Office conducted a great awareness campaign, and the school districts have done a good job getting the word out. Information is publicized all the time and in numerous ways. The material is available, but more parents need to read it. People who are more involved with the schools are more aware of the CSP. The challenge is to keep it simple and then communicate it to everyone (e.g., decide what is important for each stakeholder group and then summarize this information in one or two pages).

Stakeholders may not be aware of the specifics of the CSP, but they are aware of ongoing initiatives at their level of interest. For instance, parents know that education is important even if they do not get the details of the CSP. The CSP was discussed at the school open house in the fall, in community meetings, school handbooks, and in e-mails. It would be difficult not to know *something* about Goals 1 and 4. Parents know about a plan for having good schools and are more aware of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) than [they are of] the CSP. The DoDEA advisory organizations at each level and parents are aware of the CSP. The SIP and CSP are briefed at SAC and Parent-Teacher-Student Association/Parent-Teacher Organization (PTSA/PTO) meetings, and it is time well spent. At those meetings, goals and outcomes are discussed, but there is not much discussion about measures and milestones.

## **Parents**

Most parents are aware of the existence of the CSP and the emphasis on high student achievement and partnerships, even if they do not associate these areas with Goals 1 and 4. Parents are less aware of Goals 2 and 3. Parents are aware of programs at the school level but not necessarily that these programs are part of the CSP or SIP. Some parents were aware of the SIP but were not aware of the CSP. Some parents stated that they get limited information about the CSP but get a lot of information about high student achievement from the schools and the teachers.

Parents have plenty of opportunity to become aware of the CSP through all the publicity. Information about the CSP is available if parents want it. The average parent is not aware of details in the CSP, but the more involved parents are. Some parents are only vaguely aware of the CSP, and some have not heard about it. Information is getting out to parents, so those who are not aware choose not to be aware. The information provided about the CSP is adequate. In some cases, too much information is provided and remembering it all is difficult. It would be better to have a short, simple version. Some schools put out information in smaller amounts over a period of time. The CSP is just one of many programs parents hear about.

Information about goals and outcomes has been distributed to parents. Information about the CSP and SIP has been posted in schools, sent home in newsletters, and mailed to parents' quarters. Some parents do not read the information they receive from the school. However, it is covered in parent orientations, discussed on the local TV channel or the American Forces Radio and Television Service (AFRTS), included on the school website,



addressed in briefings by the principal, and discussed at parent meetings. Some see it on TV but do not pay much attention to it. Some school boards and SACs were briefed on goals and outcomes, but did not receive much information about measures and milestones. Some received several briefings on the CSP, while others received a brochure, but had limited discussion.

### **3. Administrators**

All stakeholder groups are aware that the CSP exists. If they are not aware of the CSP, it is not because the principals and schools do not disseminate the information. Nobody can recite the CSP, but they understand the general concept. All administrators and teachers are aware of the CSP. The degree of awareness varies among military leaders and parents. Parents have heard about it, and they are aware that the schools are working on a SIP. SAC, SIT, and PTSA/PTO members know and understand the CSP in more detail. All parents have had ample time to become aware of CSP. Administrators think it would be a really oblivious parent who had not heard about the CSP. There are probably some parents who do not care about the CSP.

Area directors and superintendents talk about the CSP with all stakeholder groups. Superintendents briefed their District Advisory Council (DAC) and installation commanders. Principals were told to make the teachers and community aware of the CSP. Principals briefed faculty and parents at the start of the school year. Principals take every opportunity to talk with parents and teachers about CSP goals. Principals discuss the CSP and SIP with parents at PTSA/PTO and parent-teacher nights. Many principals try to put it into language that all parents can understand. Some parents do not feel that the CSP is important because they are more focused on their own child. Information is disseminated to parents, but it may not have much meaning until it has an impact on their children. Administrators realize they will need to discuss the CSP each year.

Most of the information provided to stakeholders focuses on the CSP goals and outcomes. Information about the measures and milestones is provided to those who have a greater need to know or an interest in them. Goals 1 and 4 are emphasized when talking to military leaders and parents. Sometimes information contained in the CSP is disseminated without saying it comes from the CSP, so some stakeholders may not make the connection. They may be aware of the general content, even if not the specific components. They do not associate with the terminology but do associate with the four goals. Many parents hear more about the SIP, but principals relate the SIP to the CSP. Parents do not need to have

extensive detail about the CSP unless they want it. Most parents understand what is going on at the school level. Parents are aware of the process but cannot recite the CSP.

The CSP is well publicized. Military leaders, parents, school boards, SACs, and PTSA/PTO organizations have been briefed. Parents are inundated with school-related material to read, so an effort is made to disseminate information about the CSP in numerous ways (this varies among installations). There have been school-, installation-, and district-level presentations. Parents get a packets that includes information about the CSP. The CSP pamphlet had limited distribution and was not intended to be provided to every stakeholder. Copies are available if people want it. At many locations, a one-page summary was developed for military leaders and others. The CSP is also addressed in school newsletters, on posters throughout the schools, on bulletin boards in installation facilities, on the AFRTS or local installation TV channel, in town hall meetings, on the school website, and in the installation newspaper.

#### **4. Teachers**

All teachers are aware of the CSP and realize that it has an impact on them because of the emphasis on student achievement. Most teachers received a one- or two-page summary of the CSP goals and outcomes, while most SIT members received the CSP pamphlet. Teachers have become aware of the CSP details as it has become necessary. SIT teachers do most of the work with the CSP. The average teacher is less aware of the details in the CSP, unless these details relate to the SIP. Since the CSP is new, a big effort was made to make everyone aware of it at the start of the school year. There is probably more focus on the CSP this year because it is tied to the SIP and the accreditation process. Some schools conducted in-service training to involve all teachers during the development of the school profile and the development or modification of the SIP goals. Teachers know that the CSP exists and that it impacts them.

Parents know the school's emphasis is on student achievement, even if they do not understand how it correlates to the CSP. All parents should be aware of the CSP, but they are more likely to be aware of the SIP. Those parents who are aware of the CSP are not aware of the specific components. Some parents are not aware of CSP. Getting the word to parents is hard even when teachers try because the parents are so busy. A parent's awareness varies by the amount of his/her involvement in the school and their child's education.

The CSP received lots of coverage and discussion at all levels—from DoDEA Headquarters (HQ) to the school. Information was widely disseminated in newsletters, e-mails, and bulletins.

## **B . UNDERSTANDING OF THE CSP**

### **1 . Military**

Understanding the CSP varies by stakeholder groups and levels within those groups. The CSP does a good job of presenting expectations and responsibilities. Military leaders understand the basics of the CSP but not all of the details. It is easy to understand the four goals. The structure and content enable discussion with and among all stakeholder groups. It is simple enough to understand overall, but a CSP booklet cannot be handed to parents with an expectation they will understand all of it. Parents should be able to understand the major CSP components but not the details. Some of it is hard for the average layman to understand. Some schools translated, paraphrased, and interpreted the CSP for parents and disseminated information about Goals 1 and 4 in newsletters. Most educators understand the details of Goals 2 and 3.

### **2 . Parents**

Parents understand the broad goals and outcomes of the CSP, but they do not understand the specifics of the measures and milestones. Parents have a basic understanding of the CSP (e.g., what it will do for their child and how it helps the children, teachers, and schools). Even though some parents may not understand the CSP, they generally understand what is going on in the schools. It is hard to understand some of the content, especially for English as a Second Language (ESL) parents. Some parents think the language is confusing and difficult to understand, that the level at which the CSP is written is too high, or that it is written for educators rather than parents. Some concepts/terms not familiar to parents (e.g., DoDEA performance standards, high quality indicators, and so forth).

### **3 . Administrators**

Although the CSP is logical, thoroughly understanding it takes time. The entire community should understand the four goals and the outcomes. The level of understanding depends on the position of the individual. Greater understanding focuses on areas related to an individual's duties and responsibilities, with less understanding about other parts of the

CSP. The administrators think everyone understands the goals and outcomes but perhaps not other aspects of the CSP. The language in the CSP may not be understood by all parents, so many administrators have simplified it to make it easier to explain and market to stakeholders. The CSP pamphlet is too detailed for military leaders and parents. It was not written specifically for parents, and parents do not need to have a comprehensive knowledge of the CSP. Parents who are interested in their children's education will make more effort to understand the CSP.

The terminology is more difficult to understand when discussing the measures and milestones, but most people do not need a detailed understanding of them. Teachers focus primarily on Goal 1. Generally, all stakeholders understand Goals 1 and 4, while educators also understand the basics of Goals 2 and 3. The meaning of some of the measures and milestones in Goals 2 and 3 can be difficult to understand, even for some educators. Educators understand that Goal 1 is the most important goal and that the other goals support it.

#### **4. Teachers**

Some teachers have a greater understanding of the CSP than other teachers because of their duties (e.g., being members of the SIT or serving as grade-level leaders). Most teachers do not think they need to understand all details of the CSP. They should understand the vision, mission, goals, and outcomes. They should also understand the details of Goal 1 since that is their primary responsibility. The CSP is easier to understand after reading it several times. Principals are presenting it to teachers a little at a time. Administrators have more detailed knowledge than teachers. Teachers are still on the learning curve with CSP.

Parents understand the general focus of the CSP, even if not the details. It is easy to explain the goals to most parents, but some parts of the CSP are too technical for them. Some schools rewrote goals and outcomes in simple language so it would be easier for parents to understand.

### **C. ACCEPTANCE OF THE CSP**

#### **1. Military**

Military leaders endorse the CSP because it appears to be manageable, measurable, and achievable. It appears to be well thought out, logical, and comprehensive. The CSP addresses the needs of children and desires of parents with specific, concrete programs.

The parents are interested in what is being done in the schools, why things are being done, and how all this will impact their children. The military leaders like the centralized control and decentralized execution and the fact that flexibility exists at each organizational level as long as actions and programs stay within CSP's bounds. Each stakeholder group seems willing to take ownership as appropriate. Schools are taking the CSP and their own SIP seriously. No derogatory comments are heard about either plan. DDESS parents accept the CSP and want to move on base because of the schools and the motivated teachers.

## **2 . Parents**

The way the CSP is written makes sense and everything seems to mesh. The four goals and nine outcomes are right on the mark. Parents think that the focus on student achievement is correct and that it is in line with what the schools are trying to accomplish. Parents appreciate that parents and teachers were involved in the development of the CSP, and this involvement makes it easier for the parents to accept the CSP. They like the broad goals and the flexibility that the schools will have and are glad the bottom line is student achievement. CSP execution should not be an added burden for the schools because of the decentralized execution it allows. Parents do not want teachers to be overwhelmed with more/extra work that detracts from their primary responsibilities. They like the baselining and assessment so schools can determine how to focus their efforts to improve student achievement. What is important is how the CSP will affect their children.

## **3 . Administrators**

It is easy to accept this CSP. The focus on student achievement is what educators do. The CSP is more readily accepted because all stakeholder groups were involved in the its development. Administrators are satisfied that their input was considered because of who was on the leadership team. At several locations visited, the draft CSP was briefed to various stakeholder groups, and input was solicited. Administrators think that DoDEA HQ is committed to the CSP. The previous CSP was not widely accepted, but the current CSP appears to be. Administrators do not see the CSP as an added burden since the SIPs and school needs are linked to it. Principals have bought into CSP because of more involvement and training on the CSP. They like the narrow focus of four goals and that the CSP impacts all levels, from DoDEA HQ to each school. Each stakeholder group can accepts the parts applicable to them. Schools like the fact that they have only one primary goal to concentrate on: Goal 1 (Highest Student Achievement). They are concerned about the other three goals but see those as supporting goals. The CSP can be used as justification to gain

support of school-level programs from higher headquarters. Teachers know a CSP is needed and will embrace the program when they realize its impact on student achievement. Because of the flexibility the CSP offers at the school level, teachers should be able to accept responsibility and be held accountable for student achievement.

#### **4. Teachers**

Teachers want to teach and help children learn. Teachers recognize the value of this CSP and do not see anything seriously lacking in it. Many teachers knew they were represented in the CSP development but were not aware of an opportunity to comment on the draft CSP. Some teachers would have reviewed the draft if they had known about it, while others would not have reviewed the draft because they have faith in the system. Because of the focus on student achievement, everything in the plan should lead to improving the education of children. They like that the CSP is a “we will” program rather than a “you will” program and treats teachers like professionals with unique needs. They also like the sense of flexibility offered at the school level for teachers. The goals are broad enough for all teachers to accept and are better than being held accountable for 42 benchmarks. Teachers are getting past their initial apprehension and starting to buy-in to the CSP because they are involved through the SIP; however, some are still hesitant because of their experience with the last CSP. They are concerned with how the CSP will be implemented. Linking the CSP to the SIP and day-to-day activities is a good idea. At the school level, teachers will have ownership when they understand their control in the process. Administrators and grade-level chairs will be the key. Some teachers are concerned about the heavy reliance on statistics because they are not statisticians and may not know how to use them properly. To be able to make good decisions, teachers know that the data must be accurate.

### **D. SUPPORT OF THE CSP**

#### **1. Military**

The military commanders support the CSP and think the parents also support it. They hear some concerns expressed by parents but nothing major. Commanders ask what they can do to help and see a link to all goals for the military. They support the flexibility that the CSP affords the local schools. The CSP appears to be supported by the SACs.

## **2. Parents**

The community supports the CSP. Parents choose to live on a DDESS installation and extend at an installation because of the schools. Parents support the school system's approach: How can we help your child? The advisory organizations are working to support the CSP. Parents become more proactive when they feel that issues important to them will be heard, an explanation will be provided, and so forth. Some parents are less proactive and hope someone else (e.g., SAC or PTSA) will help execute the CSP. Parents who are concerned about their children's education see the relationship of the CSP and SIP to what the students are doing. However, although parents support the CSP, they are more interested in the results and outcomes.

## **3. Administrators**

Administrators and teachers think DoDEA HQ is implementing the CSP in a rational, measured process. They feel they are being trusted to do their job and are being treated like professionals. Most of the administrators and teachers see the relationship of the CSP to what they do, and, therefore, they support it. They appreciate that the CSP's flexibility allows a focus on what is important at each level and that each school can focus differently. Senior military leaders and installation commanders appear to support the CSP. Educators and parents support the emphasis on Goal 1.

Teachers seem to have a more positive attitude about and support for this CSP. They see the value of the CSP and the relationship of the SIP to the CSP. Most teachers do not feel pressure from above to focus on specific areas. The teachers have an opportunity to provide input to the SIP and be part of the solution. However, administrators indicate that the teachers are concerned about the amount of time spent on the CSP and SIP. They would like less time spent in meetings and more teacher planning time. Some teachers see a conflict/mixed signal about what is important if work on the SIP must be done after school rather than during the school day. Some teachers are frustrated by the lack of time to work on the CSP/SIP. Those teachers think they have too much to do already and want to know how the CSP relates to what they do on a daily basis.

## **4. Teachers**

If the CSP continues to focus on student achievement and allows flexibility at the school level, it will be supported. Teachers will support the CSP if they see DoDEA doing its part. They do not want it to be just another bureaucratic program. Teachers think the

administrators will support them if changes to the CSP are needed. Good teachers have a sense of ownership because they are already doing these things. They can work with this CSP because it is straightforward, relevant, and easy to internalize. All goals are tied to student achievement—directly or indirectly. There is some added burden but not much. Supporting the CSP is easier because of its relationship to the SIP. CSP chairs are working to get all teachers involved in developing a school profile. The SIP process is starting to have a positive impact. Teachers want time to implement the CSP properly. They are concerned about gathering data, computing the results of surveys, and integrating and interpreting the data. Not all teachers have bought into data collection. The union is concerned about accountability and the use of test scores.

## **E. VALUE ADDED BY THE CSP**

### **1. Military**

The military relates to and understands strategic planning. It is used to developing goals and objectives, enacting them, and tracking progress. It is important to provide overall strategic guidance and priorities and to get everyone focused and headed the same direction. The CSP provides the framework to focus resources in four specific areas but ensures that the primary focus is on student achievement. Everything should be tied to the CSP, even things like maintenance and safety. It provides a vision and goals from the top but allows flexibility at the school level. The CSP recognizes that each school and installation has a unique situation. Schools do better when they have goals and focus on these goals. The CSP precludes schools from going off on their own without focus. It is critical to work the components of the CSP actively rather than allowing the CSP to stagnate. Parents are happy when their children do well and there is a good relationship with the teachers. If this occurs, little else matters to the parents.

### **2. Parents**

It is definitely worth having the CSP and making everyone aware of it. It is necessary for DoDEA to have overall goals, objectives, and standards. The CSP gives purpose and direction for the school system and provides identifiable goals and a degree of consistency for all stakeholder groups at every level. This was the first time some parents have seen a school system that had a comprehensive 5-year plan rather than just teachers doing their jobs in their own way. A CSP is necessary even if some parents do not read it or are not aware of it.



Parents like to see that a plan and process exists at the DoDEA level. They are reassured when they know that the same plan will exist at the next installation to which they move. The parents' fear is that things are always different at each new location. The CSP will help make their children's transition successful and provide more consistency. They can go from one DoDEA school to another DoDEA school and expect the same thing. Parents are not at one place long enough to see significant change over time, but it is good to know that a plan exists to accomplish positive change throughout the entire school system. Some parents expressed hope that the CSP will really have a positive outcome rather than exist only to meet some requirement.

Because of standardization, parents see the CSP as a way that DoDEA can be held accountable. The CSP provides parents a better understanding of what is required of the schools and what teachers should be doing. This also helps give parents confidence their children will be prepared for school in another Local Educational Agency (LEA). The CSP allows parents who are new to the DoDEA system to see how the CSP links to the SIP from a system perspective. The CSP allows schools to network, learn what works in other schools, and improve their own SIP.

### **3. Administrators**

The CSP provides a process for continuous evaluation and improvement throughout DoDEA. It allows a basis for reporting status and progress to civilian leadership above DoDEA, to the military leaders, and to the parents. Because DoDEA is so dispersed, having an organization-wide plan that provides consistency and focus and guides the entire school system is helpful. Also, having a plan in which the entire community was involved in developing is good. This helps gain military support and community involvement. The CSP makes it easier to establish priorities and focus resources and requires accountability at all levels. The CSP focuses on the most critical areas and requires that every DoDEA program be aligned with it. When parents question some aspect of the educational program the response can be related to the CSP goals. The CSP, District Improvement Plan (DIP), and SIP can be used to support and justify programs.

Even without a CSP, administrators would still work on the areas encompassed by the four goals, but the CSP provides legitimacy, highlights what is important, gives sense of direction, and helps decision-making. All visionary educators would probably do what is contained in the CSP, but the CSP provides a focus. It allows for some standardization between areas and districts and brings together schools within a district as a team to help

move everyone forward. Although there were DIPs and SIPs in the past, the CSP provides a framework and focus for every district and school. Each school links into a system-wide plan, but each can deal with its own unique situation. The process provides focus for the schools and helps teachers develop goals and strategies that focus on student achievement.

#### **4. Teachers**

The CSP provides guidance, focus, and goals for stakeholders at all DoDEA levels. It provides continuity, yet allows flexibility. The CSP provides consistency across DoDEA for parents and the military and helps bring schools and the community together. The plan is real and useful for parents. They will see results. With the emphasis on quality, the CSP keeps everyone honest and provides checkpoints to accomplish the mission and attain goals. The relationship among all four goals is good and helps to allocate resources.

The overarching framework of the CSP makes it easier for parents to move within the DoDEA school system, even if each SIP is unique. The CSP provides a roadmap for all schools and districts in DoDEA. Everyone works toward the same overall goals within DoDEA, even though each school has its own SIP. The SIP provides an annual roadmap, but the CSP provides a long-term view that facilitates transitioning students and reassures parents during transition. The SIP helps keep each department focused in relation to the goals.

### **F. CSP 1995–2000 vs. CSP 2001–2006**

#### **1. Military**

With the previous CSP (1995–2000), the schools did what they wanted to do, sometimes with little consistency among schools. CSP 2001–2006 is more focused, with only 4 goals, which is better than the previous CSP, which had 10 goals. Simple, broad goals will keep these goals in the forefront for the duration of the plan. Trying to do a few things well and having the resources to accomplish them is better than trying to accomplish too many things without adequate resources. The previous plan required decisions about priorities since all the goals and benchmarks could not be accomplished. This CSP has a good chance for success because of its centralized planning and decentralized execution. The development of this CSP included input from all stakeholder groups, and a good mix of stakeholders was involved.

## **2. Parents**

CSP 2001–2006 is a vast improvement over the previous CSP. It is simpler, easier to understand, and more flexible. Parents who were aware of the previous CSP thought it was too cumbersome and complicated. It should be easy to transition to this CSP from the previous one (i.e., going from 10 goals and 42 benchmarks to 4 goals and 9 outcomes). Any plan is better than no plan, but this one is definitely better.

## **3. Administrators**

The current CSP is a big improvement over the previous CSP. It is easier to understand and explain, it is shorter and more practical, and it is logical. Everyone understands that the priority is on high student achievement. In the previous CSP, it was not clear that this was the main priority. The current CSP with 4 goals and 9 outcomes is more manageable than the previous CSP, which had 10 goals and 42 benchmarks. The CSP 2001–2006 goals are simple and realistic. The more limited goals and outcomes allow everyone to focus on what is really important and to do what should be done. The current CSP appears to require less involvement than the previous one, but it is actually more comprehensive and demanding. All new initiatives must support the CSP. In the past, there were many new initiatives but no apparent focus or coherence. This plan is process-driven and emphasizes standards. The previous plan was data- and event-driven.

The current CSP is collaborative in nature and focuses on how everyone at every level can improve student achievement. It provides more latitude at the school level and allows educators to focus on what each school's priorities should be, consistent with the CSP. Principals are required to devote more time to being the instructional leader of the school rather than just an administrator. The current CSP, DIPs, and SIPs, the school accreditation, and the school standards are all aligned.

Some good things came from the previous CSP. It did provide an overall strategic plan for DoDEA, where none had previously existed. Although the previous CSP was flawed, it still provided a broad focus for all. It forced everyone to learn about performance measures. However, the previous CSP was too directive in nature and was perceived to imply that educators were not able to perform their duties properly. The priority benchmarks were not necessarily tied to areas on which each school needed to focus. DoDEA told the schools the areas on which they were to focus, and the priorities never changed, regardless of where schools thought the focus should be.

#### **4. Teachers**

The current CSP is much better than the previous CSP, which was overwhelming, too complex, and difficult to relate to the faculty. This CSP is less complicated and easier to understand and implement. Parents understand this CSP. Unlike the previous CSP, the most important goal in this CSP is student achievement. This CSP correlates with what teachers have been doing anyway. It focuses on quality (4 goals and 9 outcomes) rather than quantity (10 goals and 42 benchmarks). The priority benchmarks of the previous CSP were different for DoDDS and DDESS and focused on areas not necessarily related to what was important for student achievement. It was never clear what was most important in previous CSP. Teachers hear less complaints about this CSP than they heard about the previous one.

Compared with the previous CSP, in which everything was directed by DoDEA, this CSP also provides greater flexibility. This flexibility allows schools to adapt to the needs of their students and determine what is important. Each school is allowed to interpret the CSP at the local level through the SIP and to select their own areas of improvement. The current CSP is not as burdensome. It has fewer requirements to gather meaningless data, which allows the teachers more time with the children. The time spent will be appropriate to the results. With the previous CSP, data were reported, but nobody was held accountable for not meeting benchmarks.

### **G. THE 2001–2006 CSP AND THE SIP/DIP**

#### **1. Military**

The CSP prevents schools from focusing on something not consistent with DoDEA organizational goals but still provides flexibility at each level. The CSP has top-level controls, but the military likes the flexibility offered to the school through the SIP and the linkage of the SIP to the accreditation process. At SAC and PTSA/PTO meetings, some principals explained how the CSP and SIP fit together and how local programs must be consistent with the CSP.

#### **2. Parents**

Parents involved with or aware of their SIP see the relationship between it and the CSP and the flexibility provided at the school level. They think teachers are in tune with the CSP and SIP and view the schools using the CSP to provide the framework for the SIP.

Both the CSP and the SIP allow the measurement of progress over time, from school year to school year. Many principals are providing briefings on the relationship of their SIP to the CSP.

### **3. Administrators**

Administrators like the fact that schools have considerable latitude in developing their own plan and view support for that flexibility at each level within DoDEA. Administrators hope this flexibility will continue, even after some of the measures are better defined. A DIP is developed by considering the CSP and the SIP. The SIP is the primary document used at the school level, but it is closely linked to and aligned with the CSP during the development process. The CSP gives overall direction but allows districts and schools to focus on their individual needs. Without a CSP, there would still be a SIP, but the CSP ensures that all schools and districts stay within the broad framework of the CSP.

The CSP has helped focus SIP development and eliminate separate agendas at the school level. In the past, principals could establish any goals they wanted, but, now, the goals must relate to student achievement. The SIP is a way to reach the CSP goals at the school level and provides an opportunity to focus on what is important. SIPs focus primarily on Goal 1 and secondarily on Goal 4. CSP Goals 1 and 4 are an easy fit and provide enough latitude for schools when they develop their SIP. The SIP is developed to support the CSP and the accreditation process and to meet the needs of the school and community. A SIP includes a school profile, professional development (PD) plan, and implementation, review, and evaluation procedures. Schools review data each year and decide how and what to adjust. All teachers are involved in SIP development to some extent.

Terminology of the different plan titles can be confusing: The CSP is the “Community Strategic Plan,” but, at some locations, CSPs called “Continuous Student Progress” and “Continual Student Process” have been developed. At the school and district level, it is not a “strategic plan” but, rather, an “improvement plan”. Some stakeholders associate “community” with an installation, rather than encompassing all of DoDEA and every installation that has schools.

### **4. Teachers**

It is good that the CSP, SIP, and accreditation are linked together. All schools stay within the CSP framework. The CSP has key elements but allows schools decide how to implement them. Emphasis on student achievement helps improve the SIP. It is not difficult

to align the SIP with the CSP because of the flexibility allowed. When the SIP was written, the connection to the CSP had to be evident. It was not developed first and then made to fit the CSP. Each school population is different, so the focus will be different, and the amount of growth and improvement will be different. The CSP supports and accepts this reality.

Teachers are buying-in to SIPs because they are involved in establishing school goals. They feel like the initiatives are theirs, rather than having everything directed by DoDEA. Previous SIPs only involved a few teachers, whereas this one involves almost everyone. Being able to provide input gives teachers a sense of ownership and makes them feel like they are part of a team. They even see the value of gathering baseline data.

Terminology may be confusing. There are improvement plans [e.g., SIP, DIP, and EIP (Europe Improvement Plan)] that support a strategic plan (the CSP).

## **H. GOAL 1: HIGHEST STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT**

### **1. Military**

This goal should be evident, but having a focus on student achievement at every level is necessary. Goals 1 and 4 are of most concern to the military. The military leaders know that DoDEA is interested in student achievement and appreciates the fact that the CSP focuses on all students. The military leaders and parents want consistency. Parents are concerned and do not want testing become the only basis for evaluation. Other components to assess student achievement also need to be included. The process is important, but the outcome is the key. Student achievement must be tied to a challenging curriculum and course offerings.

### **2. Parents**

Even without the CSP, parents were aware of the schools' focus on student achievement and know it is a priority in the schools. They like the emphasis and focus on student achievement and see a lot of positive things in the CSP related to it. Parents are concerned about high-stakes testing and statistics and how results will be used. They want to be assured that the measure of student achievement will not be based solely on test results. They see testing as becoming a major focus that is causing stress for teachers. Parents believe that teachers want their students to succeed, but the CSP helps keep the teachers focused on critical elements. Parents think the schools are doing their best with the staff and resources available, but parents would like to see more program-based staffing in

support of student achievement. Parents are concerned that some teachers do not know how to use technology and computers effectively to support learning. Most parents know that student achievement requires a partnership, but these same parents feel that some of their peers believe that student achievement is the sole responsibility of the teacher. PTSA/PTO funding and advocacy is focused on Goal 1.

### **3. Administrators**

Goals 1 and 4 are important to the parents. Emphasis on student achievement has always existed; however, it is essential that military leaders and parents understand that. In the past, DoDEA used to talk about student achievement, but now it is definitely the main focus at every level. Expectations are clear. There is a sense of freedom to do what is best rather than being told what to do and how to do it (as was done in the past). This CSP is good because it focuses on all children—both the top and bottom quartiles. Teachers are beginning to expect that all students will improve vs. some will never improve. Teachers understand the need to validate student achievement, but they are concerned with assessments and exactly how achievement will be measured. They are not concerned about evaluating students as much as they are concerned about the time required. Testing takes a lot of time and resources, and teachers are concerned that the number of assessments may continue to increase. Criterion referenced tests are good and a strength of the CSP, but teachers are concerned about too much testing. Area and district staffs are devising plans to help schools develop a school profile, to learn how to analyze data, and so forth. Stakeholders know that the data are reviewed every year and an effort is made to improve.

### **4. Teachers**

Schools and teachers have focused on Goal 1 for years, but it is good to reemphasize it. Teachers want students to do well. Accomplishing the specifics of this goal will be a challenge, but changes in teaching strategies will effect improvement. Teachers will assess student needs and determine what is necessary to raise student achievement. The change in standards that focus on performance is good. It is also good to emphasize achievement for students at all levels. Teachers are concerned about the amount of testing and how the results will be used because of the constant and high turnover of students. They test and evaluate one group, make adjustments, and then have an entirely different group of students the next year. They want test scores kept in perspective and used simply as one indicator, not the only measure. Teachers know how to use technology to support student achievement.

## **I. GOAL 2: PERFORMANCE-DRIVEN, EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS**

### **1. Military**

This goal is not of direct concern to the military, but they realize this is more important because of budget shortfalls. Proper resource allocations and the establishment of priorities become important. They assume that Goals 2 and 3 will be met if Goals 1 and 4 are accomplished. The military and DoDEA need to link their repair and maintenance and military construction master plans. To support planning efforts, the military needs to do a better job of getting timely information to DoDEA concerning restationing and relocation of military units.

### **2. Parents**

Parents know that this goal is important in accomplishing Goal 1, but they view it as the responsibility of the school system. Most parents were not aware of the details of this goal.

### **3. Administrators**

This goal forces educators to justify the allocation of resources and services in terms of improving student achievement. Principals hope that the DoDEA HQ will also focus on Goals 2 through 4. Administrators hope this goal will result in the development of better management tools and provide better data management. The area and district staffs provide support services and are primarily responsible for this goal. Information about the budget, staffing, logistics, facilities, and so forth is explained to those who need or want to know. The implementation of best business practices is important, but success is also dependent on the availability of funds. DoDEA HQ controls most of the funds. Schools identify the resources needed, and the district determines if funds are available. The technology plan needs to be tied to CSP. Computers that do not have upgraded software are not efficient. Parents on SACs and school boards are interested in the safety component of this goal.

### **4. Teachers**

Teachers assume this goal will be done above the school level. There is not much they can do. They want more information on this goal. Sometimes the union hinders efficiency. With standards-based instruction, teachers need to get together more, but the union



sometimes decides when, how, and so forth. Principals are overworked regardless of the number of students. Teachers would like to see a lower pupil-teacher ratio (PTR).

## **J. GOAL 3: MOTIVATED, HIGH-PERFORMING, DIVERSE WORKFORCE**

### **1. Military**

This goal is important because it supports Goal 1. Teacher quality is always a concern. The military recognizes that teaching at some locations, especially in the Pacific, can be difficult, but the military tries hard to provide educators with a good quality of life. They have no problem recruiting minorities as long as there is no sacrifice in educator quality.

### **2. Parents**

Parents know this goal is important in accomplishing Goal 1, but they see it as the responsibility of the school system, without involvement by them. Most parents were not aware of the details of this goal. They expressed the need to continually recruit high quality teachers. Parents in DoDDS-Pacific, especially Korea, were aware of the high teacher turnover, but think the schools are doing a good job of recruiting replacements.

### **3. Administrators**

Although this goal is tied closely to and is essential to the accomplishment of Goal 1, it should remain a separate goal. This goal is primarily a district-and-above responsibility, but the schools must also be involved. Administrators realize they must be customer oriented and work with all stakeholders in a professional manner. They try to support and be responsive to teacher needs.

Principals would like more information about potential teachers during the recruitment process. When they tell DoDEA about a position that needs to be filled, they get a name and phone number but no resume, background information, and so forth. They have discovered that they can find some information about the individual on the Internet, but they would rather have the information that DoDEA gets with a teacher's application. The principals have been very pleased with their student teachers and would like to see more of them hired. DoDEA must work to get teachers hired sooner. This will cause less stress for the new teacher and allow the principal to do better planning the use of personnel.

Diversity is hard to achieve and may conflict with quality. Administrators want to ensure that the best-qualified teachers are hired. Teachers who are recruited must meet not only the minimum standards, but be best qualified. They do not want to see DoDEA focus too much effort on diversity at the expense of quality. Some principals feel that spouse preference hinders hiring the best-qualified teachers.

Everyone understands the need for extensive training and PD. Although training and PD would occur anyway, they are important components of the CSP and SIPs. The training that is offered should be based on the SIP and not be dictated by DoDEA HQ. A large portion of the budget is devoted to PD, and these resources must be used wisely and distributed equitably. A large percentage of teachers will take PD courses even if they are not required. Many—but not all—teachers return to school and apply what they learn.

#### **4. Teachers**

PD opportunities exceed what LEA teachers get, but teachers have fewer PD opportunities than they have had in the past. More PD opportunities exist in DoDDS than in DDESS. PD should focus on what is important and what is needed by teachers, based on a needs assessment. PD should include more time for collaboration among teachers. Teachers are not sure what impact they have on decisions about what PD is received, but they are asked at the local level. They are asked what they want to attend and why and agree to give in-service training at the school after they have received the training. Some PD is directed by the district or higher level. There is more in-house PD being provided now, especially with budget constraints. Distance learning (DL) cannot provide all PD, but some PD via DL could be useful. The teacher mentoring program should be used to help new teachers understand and implement the CSP and SIP.

DoDEA recently required four mandatory courses for recertification: multi-cultural education, computers, special education, and reading. Teachers did not think that this requirement for recertification was appropriate and asked DoDEA to reconsider the request. They were pleased when DoDEA rescinded the requirement.

Teachers understand the need for diversity but do not want to see any sacrifice in quality.

## **K. GOAL 4: NETWORK OF PARTNERSHIPS PROMOTING ACHIEVEMENT**

### **1. Military**

The support between the military community, parents, and schools has always been good, even without this goal. A close working relationship exists at all levels. Goal 4 is not necessarily needed since we do it already, but it serves a purpose by reinforcing the need. The military in Europe lost sight of this during the 1990s. Schools are now more responsive about partnering than they were in the past. Military commanders see more involvement when all stakeholder groups work together. The key is a desire for everyone to work together. Sometimes, principals think the partnerships are one way. They need to figure out how to extend the school to the community's needs. Commanders emphasize that the community and schools must work together. The military provides support to schools when asked. Partnerships must be maintained, regardless of changes in military leaders.

Commanders are supportive and involved, and they see many examples of partnerships. The SLOs attend school board, SAC, and Installation Advisory Committee (IAC) meetings and discuss schools at newcomer briefings. Commanders have monthly or quarterly meetings with principals. Principals (DoDDS) and superintendents (DDESS) attend installation staff meetings. Commanders host welcome-back and teacher appreciation functions for teachers. At some locations, the orientation of new unit commanders includes a briefing on DoDEA. Partnering includes adopt-a-school, tutoring, and mentoring programs. Commanders visit the schools and talk to children about drugs and discipline, conduct sensing sessions, and read to them. Military commands publicize the CSP in numerous forums (e.g., TV, paper, meetings, and so forth). A United States Air Force Europe (USAFE) CSP is being developed to support the DoDEA CSP.

Commanders emphasize to parents that they and the schools share the responsibility for their children's education. Military leaders discuss with parents the importance of teamwork in schools. Parent involvement—formal and informal—is good. Parent-teacher relationships are good, and the flow of communications between teachers and parents is good. Most locations have plenty of volunteers in the schools. Military and civilian workers are allowed to volunteer in the schools each month. Some parents choose not to become involved and informed. DoDEA can communicate with these parents forever but to no avail.

## **2. Parents**

The partnership in most communities is excellent. Partnerships have been emphasized in the past but now are more focused because they are a major goal of the CSP. The CSP helps reinforce the desire and need for partnerships and provides more legitimacy. DoDEA is trying to pull different parts of the community into the schools. The commanders have done a great job getting the military involved. In the past few years, the effort to get fathers involved has intensified. Businesses are contributing awards. The PTSA works to keep the community involved. Developing and maintaining partnerships must be a continual process. Much partnership work is being done in the schools. Parents and soldiers come into school, students write for the post paper, high school students work with elementary school students, and so forth.

The degree of parental involvement varies depending on the school, the parent's background, and the school level, but the schools have plenty of volunteers. Most schools and teachers work hard to get parents involved. Some teachers do not know how to use volunteers effectively. Most parents are willing to help, but some are reluctant to volunteer without being asked. Sometimes, getting parents to volunteers in the high schools is difficult. Parents like being asked for their input, ideas, and recommendations. They also like receiving and sending e-mail to teachers. Most teachers are receptive to this, and parents receive lots of communications from the teachers.

Many parents are involved in their children's education. The active and involved parents try to reach out to other parents, to explain the need for involvement with their child's education and to try and get them involved. Most commanders are supportive and allow military parents time to attend parent-teacher conferences and other school activities. Most parents attend parent-teacher conferences. Most teachers are willing to assist parents, but expect parents to help. Parents get information on working with students in newsletters. Most parents feel comfortable talking with teachers and administrators and find that they are responsive. Effective communications depends on the relationship between the teacher and parent. Most problems with the parent-teacher relationship are the fault of the parent who does not want to be involved in the education of their children.

## **3. Administrators**

Partnerships are essential for ensuring a school's success and for improving student achievement. Reinforcing partnerships is good even though the community has always provided good support. Partnerships would be strong with or without the CSP. It is an

important CSP component that nearly everyone understands and supports. This goal (Goal 4) is important to parents and military leaders and is the secondary focus of the schools after Goal 1. Most administrators think they have good partnership programs. It takes a lot of time to coordinate and maintain effective partnerships. Above the school level, administrators are trying to establish partnerships with the business community and universities. Principals question the partnership audit they have been asked to conduct. They think it is too bureaucratic and time consuming and not very meaningful. Providing a list of partnership best practices makes sense and would be more beneficial for other administrators.

Parents want to know how well the school is meeting their children's needs and how their children will do when they transfer to an LEA. Principals, SACs, and PTSA/PTOs are working to get more parents involved with their children's education. Principals and teachers constantly try to provide parents with information and data about the school and their children. They are trying to educate parents on what will help their children in school and at home. They also provide information to parents about what their children should be doing. Many parents volunteer in the schools, with most of them at the elementary level. The demographics of the parents affect the degree of involvement.

Most military leaders are strong supporters of the schools in their communities and often ask what they can do to improve the level of support. The military wants to know that direction and standards exist and that the schools are meeting the children's needs. If administrators ask the military to do something, the military has never turned them down. Units readily help by providing labor, classroom mentors, field days, displays, and so forth. The SLOs have done an outstanding job supporting the schools and working with them to establish effective partnerships.

#### **4. Teachers**

Military units and parents who want to help are involved in the schools. For years, schools have focused on Goal 4 as a means to engender community support for the schools. There are four components to a partnership: the military community, the parents, the teachers, and the students. The base commander's support of is important, and command support is better at some installations than at others. Military partnerships are already in place at most schools. Schools need parental and military involvement, and most teachers think it would occur even without the CSP. Many teachers think the CSP has placed

more emphasis on community involvement than on parental involvement. Both are necessary, but the latter is more critical to student achievement.

Parent-teacher-student interaction is good. The schools always try to get lots of parents involved. The better the school, the better the level of participation by parents. At many schools, the same parents volunteer for everything. Plenty of parents volunteer at the elementary-school (ES) level, fewer at the middle-school (MS) level, and even less at the high-school (HS) level. Getting HS parents involved is a constant struggle. Teachers see the value of having parent members on the SAC and SIT and of inviting parents to attend the meetings.

Teachers see both types of partnering: volunteers in the schools and parents working with their children at home. More parents are asking about how to help at home. Parents are interested in ensuring that their children do well, even if the parent does not understand the material his/her children are studying. Many opportunities exist for parents to know how they can help their children. Communication with parents is now more prevalent because of the emphasis on e-mail, parent-teacher conferences, phone calls, workshops, forums, and newsletters. Teachers send e-mail to most parents and exchange e-mail with many of them. They develop study plans for at-risk students. Mostly at the ES level, parents come in at other times (besides parent-teacher conferences) to speak with the teachers. They can tell if parents are involved at home, but determining how much this at-home involvement improves student performance is difficult. Teachers become frustrated when they have to reiterate and emphasize things to parents, but they realize this is necessary and important because of the high turnover. It takes time, but the results are worth it.

Parents do not ask about the CSP or SIP at the parent-teacher conference. If the teacher offers to discuss the CSP or SIP, the parents are only interested in their children's progress. Surveys and questionnaires are valuable evaluative tools because parents respond fairly well, which helps the teachers get good data.

Partnering and teamwork within the school among the educators should occur more frequently. Teachers need more time for planning.

## **L. CSP MEASURES AND MILESTONES**

### **1. Military**

Military leaders hope that the status of milestones and other data will be disseminated in the same manner as the accountability reports of past years were disseminated.

There are discussions in general terms about how DoDEA intends to attain the goals, but the measures and milestones are discussed primarily among educators. Principals are open to sharing information with parents who come in and ask. The military wants to see some flexibility retained at the school level rather than directing how to achieve the goals. They realize it will take time to determine the specifics of some measures but that is better than having no measure or deciding to add one later as an afterthought.

## **2 . Parents**

Parents know measures and milestones are necessary and important, even though most of them do not understand the specific details. Parents realize that funding cuts may require milestone changes. They are primarily concerned with the milestones that apply at the school level. They will be interested in seeing how well DoDEA achieves the established milestones.

## **3 . Administrators**

The measures and milestones seem reasonable and seem to fit in a logical, progressive sequence. Administrators like annual milestones spread over the 5-year period, which is different from the previous plan. The new CSP's first year is difficult because of the effort required to gather and assess data and to establish baselines. Some of the measures may be difficult to quantify by how successful they are and the degree of impact on student achievement. Testing will be quite extensive and have an impact at the school level. There is a concern that the testing may lead to the development of "high-stakes" testing like many states have adopted recently [e.g., Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) and Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)].

Administrators know the specifics of some measures but how to assess and document them still needs to be determined. They assume these measures were not defined before publishing the CSP because of a desire to disseminate and begin implementation of the CSP. They think some measures were left undefined because DoDEA HQ wanted to get input from the field or because it would allow the districts and schools some flexibility in determining the details of the measures. Lack of specifics may allow each organization to determine the best way to define a measure and what data are needed. Some measures may differ among the districts and schools.

The administrative burden of data collection and executing this CSP is not as great as that of the previous CSP. Administrators think they will be able to get much of the

required data needed for the measures because these data are similar to what is collected already to help teachers with assessments. Some administrators expressed concern about the lack of analysts at the school level and, which, in turn, could pose a potential problem in determining how to interpret and use the data from student, parent, and faculty surveys.

Meeting the measures and milestones will require targeting limited resources. Some administrators thought that budget cuts could result in changes to the measures and milestones. Changes may be required, depending on the availability of resources (e.g., reduce a percentage target, change the milestone date, and so forth).

#### **4. Teachers**

The measures are important to parents and should be attainable over the 5-year period. The measures and milestones will allow teachers to learn new strategies, do things better, and learn from others. Gathering and analyzing data and collaborating with other teachers are helpful in determining student progress and identifying shortfalls. All measures must be defined clearly. As measures are defined further, teachers hope that data collection will not become a time-consuming burden and add to the teacher workload. Gathering baseline data is time consuming, but much of the subsequent data should be available to teachers and schools.

Depending on budget cuts, measures and milestones should be adjusted as necessary.

Teachers are concerned about accountability because of student turnover and teacher turnover, which is increasing with spouse preference. More time is needed to train teachers on testing.

### **M. DoDEA BUDGET**

#### **1. Military**

Senior military leaders try to help DoDEA with its budget battles. At some installations, the commanders are getting superintendents and principals involved with Congressional delegation visits that relate to infrastructure funding.

Budget and other resource cuts may impact on how well CSP goals can be accomplished. Changes in budget may necessitate changes in the CSP and SIP. The budget must be reviewed to determine whether measures and milestones need to be canceled, revised, or



moved out on the timeline. Most military leaders have not had or heard any budget discussions related to the CSP, except for military construction.

## **2 . Parents**

The budget should be focused and prioritized to support student achievement. Parents hope that funding will be available to continue the implementation of major programs. PTSAs/PTOs provide funding to support efforts that help all children. Before the PTSA/PTO will provide funds, a teacher or principal must justify the request, including an explanation of how the funds will be used to support the SIP.

## **3 . Administrators**

Administrators see the primary impact of the budget on Goals 2 and 3. The CSP may cause DoDEA to operate differently than it has with respect to the budget. Linking the budget to the CSP forces administrators to look at best business practices that support the CSP and ask how much something costs. Resources must be prioritized and allocated against CSP and SIP goals and their components. Budget cuts may require changes in milestones. Understanding the budget process better would be helpful. Developing and executing a school year budget driven by the fiscal year and frequently continuing resolutions is difficult. In the first semester, there are either no funds or funds from the previous school year, but these funds run out on 30 September.

With constrained resources, administrators at every level need to review their expenditures to ensure that these expenditures are really necessary and support the CSP or SIP. Establishing budget codes that relate funding to the CSP will be helpful. Although most of the DoDEA budget is spent on fixed costs, everyone needs to think about how the limited discretionary dollars relate to goals and priorities. Justifying expenditures will be easier if these expenditures are linked to a goal. Those expenditures that are not linked to a goal should be questioned.

Superintendents and principals are asked for input on priorities of major issues identified by DoDEA. Superintendents review the budget in the context of the CSP. Principals and teachers realize that they have to justify funding and relate budget requests to the SIP. Principals appreciate the effort to push to the school level as much of the discretionary funds as possible. Schools will use their funds to support SIP goals. Principals get input from teachers for that year's budget. Principals prepare an itemized budget, but developing and executing goals and strategies would be easier in the SIP if the principals knew the

actual budget for the school year. Administrators are concerned about the high cost of technology and providing safe schools and the impact that budget cuts will have on those areas.

Budget reductions will increase reliance on getting funds from the PTSA/PTO. The PTSA/PTO now looks at the SIP and CSP to determine the best use of funds. They require teachers who request money to explain how it will be used to enhance student achievement.

#### **4. Teachers**

Enough funding must be available to allow schools to meet the goals, measures, and milestones. The faculty helps prioritize needs that relate to student achievement. The CSP and SIP can be effective even if funds are reduced. Teachers do not view budget cuts as a major impact on Goal 1. However, since budget cuts impact Goals 2 and 3, there is an indirect impact on Goal 1. Much of what the teachers do at the school level is not tied to a budget (e.g., writing across the curriculum). The teachers will make do with the resources available.

Teachers submit requests for supplies and equipment, but sometimes what is ordered does not come. Everything that is ordered must be justified with respect to the SIP. Teachers become discouraged when they explain why funds are needed and how they will be used but the funds are not provided. Teachers are frustrated by the absence of an approved budget. Knowing what the budget will be before they do planning for the SIP would be helpful, rather than having to make adjustments after the fact. A teacher may need computer software to support a teaching strategy for a new program, but he/she does know if the school will be able to purchase it.

The PTSA/PTO has restrictions and tough procedures about use of their funds. The funds must be justified and must be beneficial to a large group of students.

### **N. PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS**

#### **1. Military**

Teacher performance evaluations and the SIP should be related in some way, but they not sure of best way to do it. This should be DoDEA's responsibility.

#### **2. Parents**

Parents think performance evaluations should be tied to student achievement, but they do not want to see a teacher's initiative stifled. Parent members of some SACs were

briefed on the new performance appraisal system and expressed reservations about how good the “pass-fail” system will be.

### **3. Administrators**

Our job as educators is to teach. Children should learn. If they do not, we are not doing our job well. The CSP and the new performance appraisal systems in DoDDS and DDESS are new this year. Teacher performance will be evaluated against improved instruction; therefore, it is linked indirectly to the CSP and SIP. Improved instruction should result in higher student achievement. Accountability should be much better with the new appraisal system, but getting it institutionalized will take time. The new system should be evaluated in a few years to determine if it is better than the previous system.

DoDDS principals will question a Professional Growth Plan (PGP) if it does not relate to improved instruction. If it does not, a teacher can be encouraged but cannot be forced to change the PGP so it relates to improved instruction. Some principals were not sure what they could do to ensure that a teacher’s PGP resulted in improved instruction. A PGP is supposed to be tied to student achievement, but a teacher can do what he/she wants to do to improve his/her professional growth. All PGPs that principals reviewed related to improved student learning in some way. Likewise, principals are not sure how to hold a teacher accountable if there is no growth.

### **4. Teachers**

DoDDS and DDESS have a new appraisal system, which is performance oriented. The new systems are not tied directly to the CSP or SIP, but certain areas will encompass them (e.g., student achievement, classroom management, and so forth). Some teachers stated that a performance evaluation should not be tied to student performance because of the many variables that can impact student performance from year to year. However, it could include how well a teacher supports the SIP.

Because of what is required, the PGP will relate indirectly to the SIP and CSP. A DoDDS teacher must show how the PGP will help students and should be related to student achievement. The growth plan should relate to the teacher and the students, but a teacher could opt to do something that only impacts on the his/her growth. A good teacher would not do this, but one who is not so good might do this. The PGP focuses on improving teacher performance to help student achievement.

## **O. CSP 5-YEAR TIME FRAME**

### **1. Military**

Having a roadmap to know where one is headed is helpful. DoDEA needs to look out far enough that the CSP does not change with each leadership change. A time frame that is too short will result in an overlap between implementing one CSP and developing a new one. The time frame is more useful for educators than for parents, who will not be at the same location in 5 years. Although military leaders and parents will not see all of the changes, they should see continuous improvement regardless of when they arrive or depart an installation. If the time frame is short, parents will see a constantly shifting focus. They are more interested in consistency. A long-term time frame is good because resource allocation and the effort required to plan and execute programs take time.

### **2. Parents**

Parents will not see the execution of the entire CSP, but they think the time frame is good and that the CSP will remain viable during that period. The 5-year time frame allows every level of the organization to plan, implement, and evaluate. It will allow DoDEA time to implement actions and accomplish goals. Parents recognize that a lot of work is required to implement this CSP and that it will take time to realize significant changes.

### **3. Administrators**

Five years is about right because it allows adequate time to implement the CSP correctly (i.e., educate stakeholders, gather data, evaluate progress, make changes, and so forth). A multi-year plan is needed because the milestones are dispersed over a 5-year period. Achieving them properly in less time would be difficult. To institutionalize change takes 3 to 5 years. Since DoDEA is so geographically dispersed, it also takes longer. Five years works well because the SIPs are based on a 5-year cycle driven by the accreditation process.

During the 5 years, the CSP needs continued emphasis from the DoDEA leadership. If emphasis does not continue, support will drop off, and new stakeholders will not become aware of the CSP. Because of the turnover of military leaders and parents, they need to be informed continually about the CSP and the progress being made. Although the same military leaders and parents will not experience the CSP from start to finish, that should not matter.

#### **4. Teachers**

The time frame seems about right and provides continuity. Teachers hope the CSP will last that long without major changes. They do not want constantly changing targets as in the past, because it makes the plan too confusing. The time frame works well with the SIP and the accreditation process. It takes time to evaluate a program to determine whether it works or does not work. A shorter period of time may result in interpreting data that do not provide a correct assessment. The student turnover can have an impact on data assessment. It takes time to gather and evaluate data, execute a program, and assess the impact.

### **P. REVIEWING AND CHANGING THE CSP**

#### **1. Military**

The CSP should be reviewed, but there was no consensus on frequency. Some recommended an annual review because so much can change in a year, but others were not sure of the right frequency or depth of review. Some thought there should be a mid-point review—not only by DoDEA, but by the Dependent Education Council (DEC) and Advisory Council on Dependents' Education (ACDE).

Military leaders think that DoDEA intends to adhere to the CSP, with minimal changes. If something is not working, it should be changed; however, there should not be any major changes. The vision, mission, and goals should not change. The impact of the CSP needs to be assessed to ensure it is on target. Initially, it may not be 100-percent correct. A review should also be conducted to determine and evaluate any new and innovative ways that make schools better, make goals easier to achieve, and so forth. A significant change in the budget may necessitate CSP changes. To encourage review and feedback, the process simple should be simple. Although a review should be done, explaining any changes to stakeholders is important.

#### **2. Parents**

Parents do not want any major changes, but they think the CSP should be reviewed to determine whether the plan is on track. Only minimal changes should be made, if necessary. Some parents think an annual review should be conducted, while others see no need to do it that frequently. A review may result in identifying something about which DoDEA may not have been aware before it impacts CSP implementation. Funds could be cut, and this could delay meeting measures and milestones.

### **3. Administrators**

The CSP should be reviewed periodically, perhaps every year, to ensure that it is accomplishing what is desired. During the review, there should be no major changes, only minor revisions, if required. The goals and outcomes should not be changed, even if the measures and milestones need to be adjusted. The timeline should provide continuity rather than continual change. If something is identified that is not right, it should be changed, but the CSP should not be a moving target. Some clarification is still needed for some of the measures, and, as that is done, it may require some modifications to the CSP.

### **4. Teachers**

The CSP should be reviewed periodically to ensure that it is accomplishing what is desired. Minor changes can be made, if necessary, but no major changes should be made. The goals should remain the same, regardless of what else may be changed. Because of the flexibility at local level, there should not be much need for any major changes in the CSP. There should be contingencies if less money is available or if there is another reason that something is taking longer to accomplish than expected. Based on past experience, some teachers are concerned about changes after a brief period of time.

### III. ASSESSMENT

Information in this section is intended to augment the information in Section II to provide a better understanding of selected issues addressed by stakeholders.

#### A. AWARENESS OF THE CSP

An extensive publicity effort was launched to introduce the CSP in DoDEA communities. Stakeholder groups and individuals were briefed, and information was disseminated in numerous ways. Table III-1 is a list of forums and formats by which stakeholders indicated they became aware of the CSP.

**Table III-1. Methods for Publicizing the CSP**

Town hall meetings
Commander and staff meetings
PTSA/PTO Meetings
SAC and school board meetings
SIT meetings
<i>Stars and Stripes</i> Newspaper
Installation newspaper
Armed Forces radio and television service
Installation TV channels
Websites (all organizational levels)
School bulletins and newsletters
Teacher e-mails and newsletters to parents
CSP pamphlet
CSP posters
CSP one-/two-page summary
CSP pocket cards
CSP bookmarks
CSP PowerPoint briefings

Based on the interviews, there was general agreement that everyone was aware of the CSP, with the exception of a few parents. However, it should not be assumed that this awareness will continue for the duration of the CSP, which will expire at the end of SY 2005–2006. In May 1999, the McKenzie Group, Inc., conducted a CSP Survey,

which was administered to parents, administrators, military personnel and teachers throughout DoDEA.<sup>3</sup> Some of the results from the survey are pertinent to this assessment.

Two questions asked about awareness of the 1995–2000 CSP and the 14 Priority Benchmarks (Table III-2). Only 22 percent of the parents were aware of the CSP and only 50 percent of the parents were aware of the priority benchmarks. The response to those questions by teachers and administrators ranged from 90 to 95 percent.

**Table III-2. Awareness of the 1995–2000 CSP and Priority Benchmarks**

	Parents	Teachers	Administrators
I am aware of the current DoDEA CSP			
Yes	22%	90%	90%
No	78%	10%	10%
I am aware of DoDEA’s 14 Priority Benchmarks			
Yes	50%	95%	94%
No	50%	5%	6%

In response to the statement “The current (1995–2000) DoDEA CSP is largely unknown to parents,” 13 percent of parents, 26 percent of teachers, and 34 percent of administrators agreed with the statement (Table III-3).

**Table III-3. DoDEA CSP 1995–2000: Communications and Awareness**

The current DoDEA CSP:	Percentage of respondents who agreed with the statements		
	Parents	Teachers	Administrators
Is largely unknown to parents	13.2	26.2	34.2
Needs to be better communicated to parents	15.4	38.6	45.1
Needs to be more clearly communicated to schools	6.7	21.1	20.7

These responses would infer a large number of parents were aware of the CSP (a contradiction to the previous responses) or that the respondents did not know how aware other parents might have been about the CSP. Parents may have been more aware of the local SIP than of the CSP, but the survey did not address the SIP.

In response to questions about doing a better job communicating the CSP to parents and the schools, only a few parents (15 percent or less) thought DoDEA needed to do better. Among teachers and administrators, a larger percentage thought DoDEA needed to do better, more so in communicating the CSP to parents than to the schools. The results could

---

<sup>3</sup> *DoDEA Community Strategic Planning Research Report*, The McKenzie Group, Inc., DoDEA, February 7, 2000.



infer that DoDEA did a good job making stakeholders aware of the CSP or that respondents were not very interested in the CSP and had heard enough about it.

No data exist about awareness of the 1995–2000 CSP when it was first introduced, but it is probable that the publicity and availability of information about the CSP was less toward the end of the CSP period. It is interesting to note that there was a greater awareness of the priority benchmarks for all groups than there was for the CSP. This may be because these benchmarks were to be included in every SIP and information about them was reported in the school annual accountability reports.

## **B . UNDERSTANDING OF THE CSP**

Some of the terminology used raised a concern related to understanding the CSP. Although educators understood the terminology, parents did not know what some of the terms meant. At the end of the CSP pamphlet is a glossary that has definitions or descriptions of 32 terms. However, since there was never an intention to provide a pamphlet to every stakeholder, most people cannot look in the glossary. If they do want to know what a term means, they can ask an educator, get a copy of the CSP from the school, or review or download the CSP from the Internet.<sup>4</sup>

The CSP documentation that was provided to most stakeholders was a one-page CSP 2001–2006 Summary that listed the 4 goal topics, 9 outcomes, and outcome objectives (Figure III-1). Figure III-1 includes 17 terms (highlighted in the figure) contained in the CSP Glossary of Terms. As mentioned in the interview summary, some administrators tried to simplify some of the language in a revised summary version they disseminated.

## **C . ACCEPTANCE OF THE CSP**

One aspect of acceptance on which many stakeholders commented was that all stakeholder groups were represented and actively involved in the development of this CSP. Those who were aware of the previous CSP stated that it was developed primarily by DoDEA HQ.

As part of the research conducted by the McKenzie Group, which supported the development of both CSPs, they used a three-tiered data collection approach to ensure that

---

<sup>4</sup> DoDEA Community Strategic Plan 2001–2006 (see <http://www.odedodea.edu/csp/index.htm>).

**Department of Defense Education Activity  
Community Strategic Plan 2001–2006**

**GOAL 1: Highest Student Achievement**

**Outcome A: Student Performance and Assessment**

All students will achieve or exceed **proficiency levels** aligned to clearly defined program and curricular **performance standards**. Individual student progress will be continuously measured using multiple **internal and external performance-based assessments**.

**Outcome B: Opportunities To Learn And Citizenship**

All students will have access to varied and challenging learning opportunities and appropriate **interventions** and/or modifications to encourage continuous learning and productive citizenship.

**GOAL 2: Performance-Driven, Efficient **Management Systems****

**Outcome A: **Resource Allocation/Academic and Student Support Services****

An annual budget plan will be designed and implemented at **all levels** in direct support of the Community Strategic Plan. All appropriate operational levels will have **the resources**, authority, and **accountability** to ensure equitable student access to programs and support services necessary to achieve or exceed individual education standards.

**Outcome B: Facilities and Equipment**

All levels will participate in the development and implementation of an equitable plan to identify and schedule maintenance, **life-cycle replacement**, and upgrades to facilities, equipment, technology, and materials that support an environment conducive to learning.

**Outcome C: Safe Environment**

All schools will have safe, well-managed, and disciplined environments conducive to learning.

**GOAL 3: Motivated, High Performing, **Diverse Workforce****

**Outcome A: Personnel Management Practices**

Administrators at all levels will continually recruit, hire, support, evaluate, and recognize personnel in order to retain a highly motivated and committed workforce, who reflect the diversity of the school community, in support of student achievement.

**Outcome B: Continuous Professional Development And Training**

Personnel at all levels will participate in continuous **professional development** and **training** to support standards, which enhance job performance.

**GOAL 4: Network of **Partnerships** Promoting Achievement**

**Outcome A: Partnerships**

All levels of the organization will develop, promote, and maintain a network of meaningful partnerships and alliances to enhance social, emotional, and academic growth and to maximize resources.

**Outcome B: Communication System**

All levels of the organization will develop and implement a multimedia communication plan to enhance dialogue and promote trust among staff, parents, students, and the community.

**Figure III-1. DoDEA CSP One-Page Handout,  
With CSP Glossary Terms Highlighted**

they received input from all stakeholder groups. They conducted individual interviews with DoDEA personnel, on-site focus groups, and individual interviews in DoDDS and DDESS and developed and analyzed a written survey administered to a sample of parents, teachers, and administrators.

DoDEA created a Leadership Team to develop both the 1995–2000 CSP and the 2001–2006 CSP. In both cases, the intent was to include representatives from each stakeholder group, which they did. As mentioned in the CSP 2001–2006, one of the largest criticisms of the 1995–2000 CSP was that it was mainly developed by HQ staff, with very little input from others. A review of the Leadership Team Composition (Table III-4) reflects the effort to eliminate that criticism. There were fewer DoDEA HQ personnel and more individuals overall involved in the development of the 2001–2006 CSP. The only teachers involved in the 1995–2000 CSP were the four union representatives. In the 2001–2006 CSP, 8 teachers were included among the 3 area team members.

**Table III-4. Composition of CSP Leadership Team**

Organization	CSP 1995–2000	CSP 2001–2006
DoDEA HQ <sup>1</sup>	20	4
DoDDS-Europe <sup>2</sup>	4	11
DoDDS-Pacific <sup>2</sup>	2	7
DDESS <sup>2</sup>	7	11
Union Representatives (FEA and OFT)	4	7
Military (Command and Service Representatives)	3	10
Parents	8	8
National Military Family Association	2	1
Special Guests		3
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>62</b>

**Notes for Table III-1:**

1. *Additional DoDEA Headquarters personnel were involved in the development of 2001–2006 CSP Measures and Milestones, but were not included in the Leadership Team.*
2. *Only administrators were members of the CSP 1995–2000 Leadership Team.*

The CSP 2001–2006 Leadership Team reviewed the previous CSP, the DoDEA assessment data that evaluated how well the CSP goals and benchmarks were met,<sup>5</sup> and the

---

<sup>5</sup> *DoDEA Strategic Plan Status Report*, February 2000.

McKenzie Group research data.<sup>6</sup> Following the review, the team revised the DoDEA vision, mission, and guiding principles and established new goals and outcomes. Once this was done, the steering committee, district superintendents, and DoDEA HQ staff and other subject matter experts (SMEs) developed the measures and milestones.<sup>7</sup> The draft CSP was put on the DoDEA website<sup>8</sup> and distributed to the field, with requests for comments and recommended changes. Based on the interviews, some stakeholders were briefed on the draft or were aware of the opportunity to comment on it, and some were not. Final input was considered, changes were made, and the CSP 2001–2006 was published. Overall, stakeholders were satisfied with the procedures used to create the CSP.

#### **D. SUPPORT FOR THE CSP**

Support for a plan or program is reflected in the active involvement of individuals or groups, which goes beyond acceptance (a more passive process). One factor generating support for this CSP is the flexibility that educators think they have to focus on what is important at their organizational level and location, which can vary considerably from school to school and district to district. As long as a SIP plan stays within the bounds of the CSP, educators can focus on school-level identified needs. This was not the case with the previous CSP.

The 1995–2000 CSP contained 14 Priority Benchmarks (from among 42 benchmarks) that were selected as system-wide priorities for SY 1995–1996. The districts and schools were given the flexibility to address their students’ needs through the development of strategies suited to their communities.<sup>9</sup> This flexibility was limited to some extent by DoDEA guidance, which stated that all schools must address specifically designated priority benchmarks (Table III-5)<sup>10</sup>. The District and School Accountability Profiles for SY 1995–1996, SY 1996–1997, SY 1997–1998, and SY 1998–1999 provide a brief summary of accomplishments related to the DoDEA 1995–2000 CSP and SIP priorities.

---

<sup>6</sup> *DoDEA Community Strategic Planning Research Report*, The McKenzie Group, Inc., DoDEA, February 7, 2000.

<sup>7</sup> *DoDEA Community Strategic Plan Process, 2001–2006*, DoDEA Briefing, undated (2001).

<sup>8</sup> See <http://www.odedodea.edu/>.

<sup>9</sup> *Department of Defense Education Activity, Community Strategic Plan*, Volume 1, August 1995.

<sup>10</sup> *Department of Defense Education Activity School Improvement Guide: Implementing the Community Strategic Plan*, August 1995.

**Table III-5. Focus of the 1995–2000 DoDEA School Improvement Plans**

Goal/Benchmark	System	SY 1995–1999
<i>Benchmarks reported on annually in school accountability profiles</i>		
3 Student achievement and citizenship		
3.1 Increase proficiency in Language Arts/Reading	DoDDS	X
3.10 Demonstrate student technological proficiency	DDESS	X
4 Math & science achievement		
4.2 Narrow the achievement gap between racial, ethnic and gender groups	DoDDS DDESS	X X
4.3 Increase student proficiency in math and science		
7 Teacher education & professional development		
7.1 Provide professional development structure for educators	DDESS	X
8 Parental Participation		
8.1 Implement/evaluate multi-tiered school-home partnership	Both	X
10 Organizational Development		
10.7 Effective communications system for all DoDEA constituencies	DoDDS	X
10.8 Establish technology for teachers and administrators	Both	X
<i>Additional benchmarks required for all SIPs in SY 1995–1996</i>		
9 Accountability		
9.1 Establish and evaluate a system-wide accountability process	DoDDS	X
10 Organizational Development		
10.1 Establish School Improvement Teams & shared decision-making	Both	X

During the 4-year period, only 5 benchmarks each for DoDDS and DDESS were included in the accountability reports.

The 1995–2000 CSP also stated that adopting some of the goals while ignoring the others will not result in a system capable of raising the achievement of all students. The conflicting guidance in the CSP, as well as the requirement to develop a SIP that was in fact directed by DoDEA, left stakeholders frustrated. Focusing on the same benchmarks for several years did not allow any opportunity to recognize that things change, improvements are made, and other benchmarks may become more important. Within the guidance and constraints provided by DoDEA, each of the schools did identify specific areas on which to focus, and these usually changed each year.

The 2001–2006 CSP does not include any detailed or specific guidance to the schools about areas on which they should concentrate their efforts. The school-level educators have the flexibility to develop their SIP as long as it stays within the parameters of the CSP.

## E. VALUE ADDED BY THE CSP

All stakeholder groups stated that it was important to have an overall strategic plan that provides direction and focus for everyone involved with DoDEA. The DoDEA plan ensures consistency across DoDEA while providing flexibility at the school level. It also provides a basis for reporting progress and results.

In the McKenzie Group, Inc., CSP survey conducted in May 1999, some questions relating to the value of the CSP focused primarily focused at assessing the impact at the school level.<sup>11</sup> Most respondents thought that the CSP was somewhat effective or very effective in improving DoDEA schools [parents (69 percent); teachers (67 percent), and administrators (76 percent)] (Table III-6). Likewise, most teachers (65 percent) and administrators (77 percent) thought that the DoDEA CSP and Priority Benchmarks had a somewhat positive or very positive impact on their school (Table III-7).

**Table III-6. Effectiveness of 1995–2000 CSP in Improving DoDEA Schools**

Overall, how would you rate the current Community Strategic Plan in improving DoDEA schools?	Percentage of respondents in agreement with statements		
	Parents	Teachers	Administrators
Very Effective	15	7	12
Somewhat Effective	54	60	64
No Effect	18	15	7
Somewhat Ineffective	7	10	11
Very Ineffective	6	8	6

**Table III-7. Effect of the 1995–2000 CSP and Benchmarks on Local Schools**

What effect, if any, have the DoDEA Community Strategic Plan and Priority Benchmarks had on your school?	Percentage of respondents in agreement with statements	
	Teachers	Administrators
Very Positive	9	15
Somewhat Positive	56	62
No Effect	17	11
Somewhat Negative	14	9
Very Negative	4	3

---

<sup>11</sup> *DoDEA Community Strategic Planning Research Report*, The McKenzie Group, Inc., DoDEA, February 7, 2000.

Respondents were also asked to state if they agreed with several statements, nine of which related to the value of the CSP in terms of the improvement or benefit of certain actions at either the DoDEA or school level (Table III-8). There was most agreement with the statement, “The current (1995–2000) DoDEA CSP has helped schools work toward specific goals,” [parents (12 percent), teachers (58 percent), and administrators (68 percent)]. There was very little agreement with the statements by parents, with responses ranging from 1 percent to 12 percent. The percentage of teachers and administrators agreeing with the statements was higher than the percentages of parents for all statements. One statement, “The current (1995–2000) CSP has resulted in increased learning,” comes closest to assessing the value of the former CSP with the primary focus of the current CSP: Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement. Only 37 percent of the teachers and 31 percent of the administrators agreed.

**Table III-8. Impact of the 1995–2000 CSP on Various Activities**

The current DoDEA CSP:	Percentage of respondents in agreement with statements		
	Parents	Teachers	Administrators
Helped establish common goals for all DoDEA schools	9.7	50.4	58.2
Has helped schools work toward specific goals	12.1	58.1	67.9
Helped increase DoDEA’s educational standards	7.7	26.5	38.6
Has resulted in increased learning	7.8	35.3	35.3
Has resulted in improved teaching	6.6	37.0	31.0
Has helped teachers set priorities	7.9	43.3	54.3
Does not affect daily classroom activities	3.7	15.5	17.4
Has provided direction to DoDEA management	6.8	27.0	56.5
Has resulted in management improvements	0.9	10.9	23.9

Respondents viewed value in the 1995–2000 CSP in general terms but saw less value when asked about its impact on specific outcomes. Respondents might have agreed more if these questions and statements were asked about their SIP.

## **F. CSP MEASURES AND MILESTONES AND THE DoDEA BUDGET**

The 2001–2006 CSP contains measures, outcome milestones, and implementation milestones associated with each of the 9 outcomes. Table III-9 indicates the number of measures and milestones associated with each. Although there are 89 milestones, many of them are related to each other, but appear to be delineated for clarity (e.g., several milestones related to an accountability system for showing achievement of standards and several milestones related to partnership programs).

**Table III-9. CSP 2001–2006 Measures and Milestones**

Goal	Outcome	Measures	Outcome Milestones	Implementation Milestones
1	A	7	4	15
	B	4	3	3
2	A	3	3	6
	B	2	2	5
	C	1	1	5
3	A	3	3	10
	B	4	4	10
4	A	2	3	4
	B	3	3	5
Total	9	29	26	63

All milestones have a date (e.g., “By October 2004” and “By SY 2005”) by which they are to be accomplished. SY is usually referred to with two dates (e.g., SY 2002–2003 for the school year which began in August 2002). It is not clear whether SY 2005 means SY 2004–2005 or SY 2005–2006 and whether it is the beginning of the school year (August) or the end of the school year (June). Without clarification of the specified dates, different units (schools, districts or area offices) could report results over a 22-month period.

Some members of stakeholder groups stated that measures and milestones might have to be adjusted based on budget changes or other unanticipated resource problems. Other stakeholders thought that most of the measures and milestones could be accomplished, especially those related to Goals 1 and 4, even if the budget was cut. There should be no need to change the measures based on resource shortfalls of money, time, personnel, equipment, supplies, or facilities. The measures provide the criteria to document results based on measuring or monitoring performance on assessments, participation rates, access to programs, and success in attaining specified objectives. They specify percentages and other data as the basis for reporting outcomes.

Most outcome milestones (21 of 26) require all units, schools, students, or stakeholders to accomplish a specific task by a specified school year. Five outcome milestones in Goal 3 require meeting targets related to recruitment and professional development. All 63 implementation milestones require a certain action to develop a specific product (Table III-10).



**Table III-10. Implementation Milestone Requirements**

Actions		Products		
Align	Evaluate	Assessment	Measures	Strategies
Analyze	Identify	Criteria	Policies	Systems
Conduct	Incorporate	Data	Practices	Targets
Design	Initiate	Formulas	Procedures	Technology
Develop	Use	Indicators	Processes	Tools
Establish		Instruments	Standards	

A review of the 89 milestones indicates that the ability to accomplish most of them is a function of time available, although accomplishing some are a function of both time and money. Those milestones that may be impacted by budgets that are less than requested or by required budget cuts relate to facilities, equipment, materials and courseware for educational programs, summer school, safety, technology, and professional development. There may be an inability to meet the milestone by the specified date or to the degree required.

There are two options in dealing with the milestones and their relationship to resource shortfalls. One is to leave the milestone unchanged regardless of resource shortfalls, and the other is to change the milestone date because of a resource shortfall. In the first option, the reporting unit can document its accomplishment and explain what caused the shortfall and what actions are being taken as a result. In the second option, if it is determined that the milestone cannot be met, the date or degree of accomplishment required could be changed. This course of action runs counter to the complaints of many stakeholders about the constantly changing requirements that came from DoDEA HQ during the execution of the 1995–2000 CSP. Any resource shortfall should be acknowledged, and everyone should understand that a milestone was not met because of it.

As mentioned by those stakeholders who had studied the CSP and reviewed the measures and milestones, some of the measures are not clearly defined (e.g., a percentage of schools meet the standards, where there is no standard). However, the CSP takes this into account by having an implementing milestone to develop the standard and an outcome milestone where the measure is to be incorporated (once it has been developed). Table III 11 provides two examples.

**Table III-11. Two Examples of Measures Requiring Additional Detail**

<i>Example 1: Goal 2, Outcome B: Facilities and Equipment</i>		
Measure	<i>Percentage of schools that meet the standards for facilities, equipment, furniture, materials and technology necessary to provide an instructional program aligned with student performance standards.</i>	
Outcome Milestone	<i>All schools will meet the standards for facilities, equipment, furniture, materials, and technology necessary to provide an instructional program aligned with student performance standards.</i>	By SY 2006
Implementation Milestone	<i>Develop the standards for maintenance and upgrade/replacement of facilities, equipment, furniture, materials, and technology necessary to provide an instructional program aligned with student performance standards.</i>	By SY 2001
<i>Example 2: Goal 4, Outcome A: Partnerships</i>		
Measure	<i>Percentage of units at each level with a network of partnerships and alliances that meet or exceed the criteria of quality.</i>	
Outcome Milestone	<i>All units at each level will have a network of partnerships and alliances that meet or exceed the criteria of quality.</i>	By SY 2006
Implementation Milestone	<i>Develop jointly, with representation from each level, criteria to determine the quality and impact of partnerships on student learning and maximizing resources.</i>	By Sept. 2001

**G. PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS**

The interviews included discussion about the relationship between the CSP and the new performance appraisal systems in DoDDS and DDESS effective SY 2001–2002. The military leaders and parents thought these areas should be linked in some way but did not know the details of either system or if a linkage existed. The general consensus among educators was that these areas were linked indirectly, but these educators expressed uncertainty about any requirement for the DoDDS PGP to be linked.

The primary objective of the DDESS Performance Appraisal Program for Teachers is the improvement of instruction.<sup>12</sup> The DoDDS Educator Performance Appraisal System is designed to increase student learning by improving the quality of instruction. Teachers at the professional level in DoDDS will have a PGP structured to support their professional growth and development in their efforts to improve student learning.<sup>13</sup> The PGP focuses on the teacher’s professional growth. The critical performance elements used to evaluate

<sup>12</sup> DoDEA Regulation 3000.1, *DDESS Performance Appraisal Program for Teacher and Other Professional Bargaining Unit Members*, DoDEA, December 27, 2000.

<sup>13</sup> *DoDDS Educator Performance Appraisal System*, DoDEA, undated (2001)

teachers in each system are focused on accomplishing the respective purpose of each appraisal system. Although none of the elements specifically require improved student achievement, a teacher who satisfies all critical elements will improve his/her instruction, which should lead to higher student achievement—the primary goal of the CSP and SIPs.

## H. CSP REVIEW

All stakeholder groups stated that the CSP should be reviewed periodically. They were also unanimous in not wanting any major changes. Minor changes may be necessary, and that is satisfactory. Their idea of minor changes included minimal changes to the measures and milestones once some criteria were better defined, slippage of milestone dates, and changes identified by stakeholders if problems occur as they began to implement the plan that were not foreseen initially.

The CSP is designed to help DoDEA accomplish its mission: providing, in military communities worldwide, exemplary educational programs that inspire and prepare all students for success in a global environment. A review is necessary to determine if any internal or external changes may necessitate a change to the CSP and to ensure DoDEA's mission can be accomplished. The frequency of review should be based on

- Major changes to DoDEA's internal or external environment
- An assessment of the progress the CSP is making in tracking those areas needed to determine whether the units are meeting their milestones
- Significant financial considerations.

Generally, a strategic plan should be reviewed annually to determine the cumulative effect of changes that have occurred.<sup>14</sup>

The CSP 2001–2006 states that “the Steering Committee and District Superintendents will annually develop performance measures and milestones for the year—and future years—to ensure continued progress toward reaching the goals and objectives.” An undated briefing on the CSP 2001–2006 process states that the Steering Committee and District Superintendents will develop measures and milestones. in March 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005.<sup>15</sup> During an AFRTS interview discussing the CSP 2001–2006, the

---

<sup>14</sup> Robert L. Eskridge, “The Strategic Planning Review Process,” Chapter 8 in *The Strategic Planning and Management Handbook*, David I. Cleland and William R. King (Eds.), Van Nostrano Reinhold Co., February 1987.

<sup>15</sup> DoDEA Briefing, *DoDEA Community Strategic Plan Process, 2001–2006*, undated (2001)

Director, DoDEA stated that DoDEA will review the goals annually to determine what worked and what did not and to assess where to go from there.<sup>16</sup> A review has not yet been conducted.

A comprehensive report highlighting what each of DoDEA's five operational directorates<sup>17</sup> did during SY 2001–2002 to implement the CSP goals and outcomes was published on the DoDEA website.<sup>18</sup> The report includes the implementation actions, current evidence of success, next steps, and annual targeted measures for each outcome.

Measures, outcome milestones, and implementation milestones are included in the CSP and extend through SY 2006. Stakeholder groups were briefed on the CSP, and it was well publicized. During the interviews, there was never any mention of additional measures and milestones being developed. Those stakeholders who were aware of the measures and milestones thought they were reasonable and that spreading them out over the 5-year period was a rational approach. Stakeholders thought the objectives would be attainable, barring any unforeseen circumstances (primarily related to significant cuts in the budget). The possibility of creating additional measures and milestones, as indicated in the CSP, would probably go beyond what stakeholders would consider “minor changes” and be viewed as an additional burden, primarily for educators.

---

<sup>16</sup> AFRTS News (Transcript), *DoDEA New School Year*, 4 September 2001. (see <http://www.odedodea.edu/communications/video/DoDEA1.htm>)

<sup>17</sup> DoDDS-Europe, DoDDS-Pacific, DDESS, Education, and Management

<sup>18</sup> DoDEA Community Relations/Partnership Office: CSP Implementation 2001-2002, (see [http://www.odedodea.edu/csp/main\\_page.htm](http://www.odedodea.edu/csp/main_page.htm))

## **IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **A. CONCLUSIONS**

Interview comments about various topics are generally consistent within each stakeholder group, regardless of location (DoDDS-Europe, DoDDS-Pacific, and DDESS). Comments vary among stakeholder groups to some extent by the level of military leader (installation commander or senior military leader) and administrator (principal, superintendent, or area director), and the degree of parent and teacher involvement with the CSP.

#### **1. Awareness of the CSP**

DoDEA conducted an extensive publicity campaign to introduce the CSP in DoDEA communities worldwide. Most individuals in every stakeholder group, with the exception of some parents, are aware of the CSP. There is general agreement that some parents may never be aware of the CSP because of a lack of interest, rather than a lack of opportunity to become aware of it. All stakeholders agree that the CSP has been well publicized, especially the vision, mission, goals and outcomes.

The amount of awareness concerning the details of the CSP varies among the groups. In general, stakeholders are aware of the DoDEA vision and mission, and everyone is highly aware of the four goals. Military leaders and parents are more aware of the details of Goals 1 and 4 than they are of the details of Goals 2 and 3. Teachers and principals are most aware of the details in Goals 1 and 4 because these are the areas in which schools have been told to focus their efforts. They are aware of those aspects of Goals 2 and 3 that impact them and the schools. Administrators above school level are aware of all goals to a greater degree than the other stakeholders. Some stakeholders are aware of ongoing DoDEA and school initiatives (e.g., emphasis on student achievement and partnerships) even though they may not know that these initiatives relate to the CSP.

Those individuals who are responsible for implementing or coordinating aspects of the CSP are more aware of the appropriate details. The installation commanders are aware of more details contained within the CSP than are the senior military leaders. Parents and teachers on a SAC, a SIT, or a school board are more aware of the measures and

milestones than are the other parents and teachers. At the installation and school level, stakeholder groups are usually more aware of the SIP than they are of the CSP, but there is an effort to link the two plans. Based on the McKenzie Group CSP Survey, there was little awareness by parents in 2000 of the CSP 1995–2000. Continuous publicity about the CSP is necessary if awareness by all stakeholder groups is desired.

## **2. Understanding of the CSP**

Understanding of the CSP varies by stakeholder groups and levels within those groups. Greater understanding occurs in areas related to an individual's duties and responsibilities or to an individual's involvement with the school, and less understanding occurs with other parts of the CSP. Military leaders and parents understand the broad goals and outcomes but not the specifics of the measures and milestones. For the most part, they do not need to have a detailed understanding. Some terminology and content are difficult for parents to understand, but efforts in some districts and schools to explain or rewrite confusing parts of the CSP in simpler language have been helpful.

## **3. Acceptance of the CSP**

All stakeholder groups accept the 2001–2006 CSP primarily because of its focus on student achievement, the involvement of all stakeholder groups in its development, and the flexibility it offers at the school level with each SIP. The military leaders and parents think the CSP adequately addresses the needs of the children. Many parents may be more concerned with the details of their children's education than with the CSP, except to the extent that it helps their children. The challenge for teachers and principals is to have parents realize how their children's progress is tied to school improvement. All groups appreciated the narrow focus of the four goals. They realize there are requirements to accomplish at every level with respect to all goals, but they like the fact that Goal 1 is the primary focus at the school level. Acceptance for the 2001–2006 CSP is higher than for the previous CSP because of DoDEA's efforts to increase representation of all stakeholder groups in the CSP development process.

## **4. Support of the CSP**

Military commanders support the CSP and are asking what they can do to help. The parents are more involved because the parents realize that an active partnership exists between themselves and the educators. Parents are able to address issues affecting their children's education and get these issues resolved. The educators feel they are being trusted

to do their job and are being treated like professionals. They realize the value of the CSP and the relationship of their SIP to the CSP. Teachers appreciate the fact that they are able to provide input to the SIP and are taking ownership. The 1995–2000 CSP stifled initiative at the school level because of its requirement to focus on specific benchmarks even if the school-level educators thought that they should place emphasis in other areas. Educators at all levels feel that the current DoDEA leadership encourages initiative.

## **5. Value Added by the CSP**

All stakeholder groups agreed that it was not only beneficial but essential to have a strategic plan that guided the entire organization. It reassures the military leaders and parents—regardless of where they are in DoDEA, everyone is working towards the same four goals—with the emphasis on student achievement. Although educators thought they would work on the areas encompassed by the CSP, even if they did not exist, the CSP provides a consistent focus for everyone (at every level), provides legitimacy for their efforts, and encourages community support and involvement. Equally important to all stakeholder groups was the acknowledgement that each school was different and that the CSP offered the flexibility to have a SIP that focused on its own needs. In 1999, most stakeholders who completed a surveyed about the 1995–2000 CSP agreed it was effective in improving DoDEA schools; however, there was much less agreement about the impact on specific outcomes.

## **6. CSP 1995–2000 vs. CSP 2001–2006**

The significance of the change and improvement between the CSP 1995–2000 and the CSP 2001–2006 is felt primarily by the educators since most of them have been involved with both CSPs. The military leaders and parents, who are usually at an installation for 3 years, may not be aware of the changes and probably will not care. They are only concerned with the current CSP and its ability to ensure a quality education. The stakeholders who were familiar with the previous CSP agreed totally that the 2001–2006 CSP is a significant improvement. The previous CSP was the first overall strategic plan for DoDEA. It provided a focus and helped everyone learn more about performance measures. However, the 10 goals and 42 benchmarks of the previous CSP were too complex, cumbersome, directive, and overwhelming. Educators were not sure what was important. The current CSP is more focused, and this makes allocating resources much easier. It is also easier to understand and more manageable, logical, and practical. The decentralized execution and flexibility at the school level are seen as a significant and positive change.

## **7. The 2001–2006 CSP and the SIP/DIP**

Educators thought the terminology might be confusing to military leaders and parents in equating a strategic plan with an improvement plan. Most administrators have explained the relationship of the CSP to the SIP and the DIP, which is understood by those military leaders and parents involved in the process. Each school would have a SIP, even without the DoDEA CSP, because it is required for the accreditation process, but the CSP ensures that all schools stay within its broad framework. A SIP focuses primarily on CSP Goals 1 and 4, and a DIP addresses all four goals. Administrators hope that the flexibility offered the schools through this CSP will continue, even after some of the measures are better defined.

## **8. Goal 1: Highest Student Achievement**

All stakeholder groups appreciate the present CSP's clear focus on student achievement for all students. They agreed that they did not want testing to become the only basis for evaluation. They understand measurements are needed to assess achievement, but other components, in addition to testing, also need to be included. There is a concern that the number of tests and the amount of time required to prepare for, administer, and evaluate tests will increase. Parents were concerned that some teachers did not know how to use technology and computers effectively to support learning, but the teachers thought they did. Many of the PTSA/PTO now require schools and teachers to explain how requested funds will be used to support student learning before a allocation is approved.

## **9. Goal 2: Performance-Driven Efficient Management System**

This goal is viewed primarily as a responsibility of administrators above school level. Military leaders and administrators realize that this will require the proper allocation and prioritization of resources. Most parents are not aware of the details of this goal, but parents in advisory organizations are interested in the outcome as it relates to school safety.

## **10. Goal 3: Motivated, High-Performing, Diverse Workforce**

All stakeholder groups want a high-quality workforce. They understand and support the need for diversity, but they do not want to sacrifice quality for diversity. Principals would like to have more information about a potential teacher before they conduct a phone interview with these teachers. They would also like to be able to hire as teachers more individuals who were former DoDEA student teachers.



To determine what PD and training courses are best for teachers and schools, a needs assessment, based on the SIP, should be conducted. Although educators do not think DoDEA should dictate what courses are provided, it is appropriate for some PD and training (e.g., training on the implementation of a new curriculum) to be determined and developed by DoDEA. Teachers would like to see more time for collaboration. DL should be used to provide some PD and training.

#### **11. Goal 4: Network of Partnerships Promoting Achievement**

All stakeholder groups stated that partnerships would exist even without including it as a CSP goal, but continued emphasis is always beneficial. Military commanders are supportive and involved at all levels. Educators realize that partnerships are essential for ensuring a school's success and for improving student achievement. Each stakeholder group has established numerous programs to develop and maintain strong community-school relationships.

Some teachers think that the CSP may emphasize community involvement more than it emphasizes parental involvement. However, all stakeholder groups indicated that they work hard to get more parents involved in their children's education and emphasize that parents share responsibility with the schools for their children's education. The degree of parental involvement varies depending on the school, the parent's background, and the school level (ES, MS, or HS), but all agree there are plenty of volunteers in the schools. Teachers state that more parents are asking how they can help at home and that there is more communication between teachers and parents. There will always be some parents who do not want to become involved.

#### **12. CSP Measures and Milestones**

Military leaders and most parents are not aware of the details of the measures and milestones, except that they exist. These stakeholders hope that the results associated with the milestones will be disseminated like accountability reports of past years. They are mainly interested in those measures and milestones that apply at the school level. The educators think the measures and milestones are reasonable and obtainable. They realize that some measures still need to be defined and hope that there will be some flexibility retained at the school level for determining the details. Considerable baseline data are required, but most of the educators view the data required by the present CSP to be less of an administrative burden than the data required by previous CSP. Attaining all the milestones will

require the concerted effort and involvement of all stakeholder groups—especially the educators. It is not clear when a milestone suspense that specifies an SY (e.g., SY 2003) should be met, because it could be anywhere within a 22-month window, depending on interpretation of the suspense. Administrators have done a good job to include as many teachers as possible in the SIP and related CSP process.

### **13. DoDEA Budget**

All stakeholder groups realize that budget and other resource cuts could impact on meeting CSP and SIP goals. Depending on the severity of budget cuts, these cuts may have an impact on meeting established milestones. Parents want to be sure that funds are prioritized to support student achievement. Educators feel that budget cuts will impact Goals 2 and 3 more than they impact Goal 1. Teachers' attitudes toward the accomplishment of Goal 1 remain positive. The educators' major frustration related to the budget continues to be not knowing in advance the budget for the school year. There may be some impact because of resource shortfalls, but educators believe they will be able to cope with these shortfalls. Shortfalls should result in an acknowledgement that a milestone may not be met by the specified date or to the degree required. Educators will need to be creative and innovative as they adjust to any shortfalls.

### **14. Performance Appraisals**

Military leaders and parents think that teacher performance appraisals should be linked to student achievement and/or the SIP in some way. Both DDESS and DoDDS began new performance appraisal systems with SY 2001–2002. The DDESS system focuses on the improvement of instruction, and the DoDDS system focuses on improving the quality of instruction. The DoDDS system includes a PGP component that focuses on a teacher's professional growth. DoDDS educators are confused about the extent to which a PGP must be linked students performance as opposed to their own personal growth. Both systems are indirectly linked to the CSP and the SIP. Parents expressed reservations about the “pass-fail” system.

### **15. CSP 5-Year Time Frame**

All stakeholder groups thought the 5-year time frame for the CSP was about right. None wanted to see any major changes, even if the DoDEA leadership changes. Military leaders and parents will not see the entire 5-year plan being executed but do expect to see continuous improvement regardless of the time their children are in DoDEA schools. All

agreed that it takes several years to plan, implement, and execute a program, and DoDEA's geographic dispersion makes this task even more complex. Most educators realize that the CSP will require continuous emphasis during the 5-year period to gain support from new military leaders and parents who may not be aware of the CSP. The 5-year time frame works well with the SIP and the accreditation process.

## **16. Reviewing and Changing the CSP**

All stakeholder groups think the CSP should be reviewed periodically, but there was no agreement about frequency. Most thought that an annual review would be good, but all cautioned that there should be no major changes. The goals and outcomes should remain, with changes to the measures and milestones as necessitated by budget cuts or identification of areas that require change. DoDEA documents indicate that the CSP will be reviewed annually, but a review has not been conducted since the 2001–2006 CSP was initiated. A review should be conducted to determine if there have been any internal or external changes that may necessitate changes to the CSP. The DoDEA website contains a comprehensive report highlighting what each of DoDEA's five operational directorates did during SY 2001–2002 to implement the CSP goals and outcomes.

## **B . RECOMMENDATIONS**

- The CSP and SIP should be publicized annually at the beginning of each school year.
- Principals and superintendents should brief new installation commanders, senior military leaders, and SLOs about the CSP and SIP after they assume their new positions.
- The CSP and SIP's relationship to the education of their children should be explained to the parents.
- Questions about the SIP should be included in any DoDEA survey about the CSP.
- Principals should provide a one- to two-page summary of accomplishments related to the SIP and relevant parts of the CSP, based on the milestones and other activities that occurred during the past school year.
- Principals should ask for partnership support and have a detailed plan of what is needed.

- All teachers should receive training on computers and other available technology to support student learning. The software should be current and should be compatible with any new computers that are purchased.
- Milestone suspenses indicated by SY should be restated to be more specific.
- The new performance appraisal systems should be evaluated after 2 years to assess how well they are accomplishing their intended purpose.

## REFERENCES

- AFRTS News (Transcript), *DoDEA New School Year*, 4 September 2001. See <http://www.odedodea.edu/communications/video/DoDEA1.htm>.
- AFRTS News Plus (Transcript), *DoDEA New School Year*, 4 September 2001. See <http://www.odedodea.edu/communications/video/DoDEA2.htm>.
- Community Strategic Plan One Page*. See <http://www.pac.odedodea.edu/information/downloadablefiles/Strategic%20Plan.pdf>.
- DoDDS Educator Performance Appraisal System*, DoDEA, undated (2001).
- DoDEA Briefing, *DoDEA Community Strategic Plan Process, 2001–2006*, undated (2001).
- DoDEA Briefing, *DoDEA Community Strategic Plan, 1995–2000 Recap*, undated (2001).
- DoDEA Briefing, *DoDEA Community Strategic Plan, 2001–2006*, DoDEA Superintendent's Conference, July 25, 2001.
- DoDEA Community Relations/Partnership Office, *CSP Implementation 2001–2002*. See [http://www.odedodea.edu/csp/main\\_page.htm](http://www.odedodea.edu/csp/main_page.htm).
- DoDEA Community Strategic Plan, CSP*, DoDEA, March 2001.
- DoDEA Community Strategic Plan 2001–2006. See <http://www.odedodea.edu/csp/index.htm>.
- DoDEA Community Strategic Plan Development Team Meeting. See [http://www.odedodea.edu/2001\\_strategic\\_plan/research\\_meeting/index.html](http://www.odedodea.edu/2001_strategic_plan/research_meeting/index.html).
- DoDEA Community Strategic Plan, Volume I*, DoDEA, August 1995.
- DoDEA Community Strategic Plan, Volume II, School Year 1995–96 Priorities*, DoDEA, August 1995.
- DoDEA Community Strategic Planning Research Report*, The McKenzie Group, Inc., DoDEA, February 7, 2000.
- DoDEA Community Strategic Planning Research Report*, The McKenzie Group, Inc., DoDEA, August 1995.
- DoDEA CSP Implementation Milestones* See <http://www.odedodea.edu/crp/calendar.htm>.
- DoDEA News Release, *DoDEA to Set Strategic Direction for 2000–2006*, December 4, 1998.
- DoDEA Regulation 3000.1, *DDESS Performance Appraisal Program for Teacher and Other Professional Bargaining Unit Members*, DoDEA, December 27, 2000.
- DoDEA Strategic Plan Status Report*, February 2000.
- Robert L. Eskridge, "The Strategic Planning Review Process," Chapter 8 in *The Strategic Planning and Management Handbook*, David I. Cleland and William R. King (Eds.), Van Nostrano Reinhold Co., February 1987.

*School Improvement Guide: Implementing the Community Strategic Plan*, DoDEA,  
August 1995.

Wright, Richard K., *Review of Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA)  
Schools*, IDA Paper P-3544, Institute for Defense Analyses, October 2000.

## GLOSSARY

AB	Air Base
ACDE	Advisory Council on Dependents' Education
AFRTS	American Forces Radio and Television Service
ASD(FMP)	Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management Policy)
CONUS	Continental United States
CSP	Community Strategic Plan
DAC	District Advisory Council
DASD(MC&FP)	Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Military Community & Family Policy)
DDESS	Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools
DEC	Dependents Education Council
DIP	District Improvement Plan
DL	distance learning
DoD	Department of Defense
DoDDS	Department of Defense Dependent Schools
DoDEA	Department of Defense Education Activity
EIP	Europe Improvement Plan
ES	elementary school
ESL	English as a Second Language
FEA	Federal Education Association
HS	high school
HQ	headquarters
IAC	Installation Advisory Committee
IDA	Institute for Defense Analyses
LEA	Local Educational Agency
MS	middle school
OFT	Overseas Federation of Teachers
PD	professional development
PGP	Professional Growth Plan
PTO	Parent-Teacher Organization
PTR	pupil-teacher ratio

PTSA	Parent-Teacher-Student Association
RAF	Royal Air Force
SAC	School Advisory Committee
SB	School Board
SIP	School Improvement Plan
SIT	School Improvement Team
SLO	School Liaison Officer
SME	subject matter expert
SOL	Standards of Learning (State of Virginia)
SY	School Year
TAAS	Texas Assessment of Academic Skills
TOY	Teacher of the Year
USAFE	United States Air Force Europe
USD(P&R)	Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness)



**APPENDIX A**

**DoDEA COMMUNITY STRATEGIC PLAN:  
COMPARISON OF COMPONENTS**



**Table A-1. DoDEA Community Strategic Plan:  
Comparison of Components**

DoDEA CSP 1995–2000	DoDEA CSP 2001–2006
<p align="center"><b>VISION</b></p> <p>For the year 2000, DoDEA envisions a school system unbound by traditional school concepts of time, location and age requirements, DoDEA provides all students with vast opportunities for learning and civic involvement. The entire DoDEA community shares the responsibility for building the academic success of each student. DoDEA is a learner-centered educational organization characterized by, and widely recognized for, its ability to provide its students with the knowledge and skills required for high levels of achievement, both in school and in the dynamic global community in which they live.</p>	<p align="center"><b>VISION</b></p> <p>Communities investing in success for ALL students!</p>
<p align="center"><b>MISSION</b></p> <p>The entire DoDEA community provides a world-class educational program that inspires and prepares all students in military communities around the world for success in a dynamic global environment.</p>	<p align="center"><b>MISSION</b></p> <p>The Department of Defense Education Activity provides, in military communities worldwide, exemplary educational programs that inspire and prepare all students for success in a global environment</p>
<p align="center"><b>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</b></p> <p>All students must have equal access to high quality education and the opportunity to be challenged to perform at higher levels of achievement.</p> <p>Accountability is an integral part of the educational process.</p> <p>The National Education Goals and the DoDEA Community Strategic Plan provide a framework for academic excellence.</p> <p>High expectations from positive, motivated and competent staff promote excellence.</p> <p>Everyone can be an active, lifelong learner.</p> <p>Student success is a shared responsibility and requires the full participation of all stakeholders; e.g., parents, military personnel and educators.</p> <p>Everyone must demonstrate a respect for individual and cultural diversity and civic responsibility; e.g., respecting the rights of others, honesty, fairness, and justice.</p>	<p align="center"><b>GUIDING PRINCIPLES</b></p> <p>Student achievement...a shared responsibility.</p> <p>Trust and respect for other's rights.</p> <p>Unlimited opportunities to reach high expectations.</p> <p>Dedication to lifelong learning.</p> <p>Equal access to a quality education based on standards.</p> <p>New and motivating challenges to inspire excellence.</p> <p>Total accountability with teamwork.</p> <p>Success for all...students first!</p>

**Table A-1. DoDEA Community Strategic Plan:  
Comparison of Components (Continued)**

<p align="center">GOALS (# Benchmarks)</p> <p>Education Goals—Goals 2000</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Readiness (4)</li> <li>2. High School Graduation Rate</li> <li>3. Student Achievement and Citizenship (12)</li> <li>4. Math and Science Achievement (3)</li> <li>5. Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning (3)</li> <li>6. Safe Schools (1)</li> <li>7. Staff Development 4)</li> <li>8. Parental Participation (1)</li> </ol> <p>Organizational Goals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Accountability (4)</li> <li>10. Organizational Development (8)</li> </ol>	<p align="center">GOALS (# Outcomes)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Highest Student Achievement (2)</li> <li>2. Performance-Driven, Efficient Management Systems (3)</li> <li>3. Motivated, High Performing, Diverse Workforce (2)</li> <li>4. Network of Partnerships Promoting Achievement (2)</li> </ol>
<p align="center">IMPLEMENTING STRATEGIES</p>	<p align="center">MEASURES</p>
<p align="center">PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</p>	<p align="center">MILESTONES</p>

**APPENDIX B**  
**DEMOGRAPHICS OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED**



**Table B-1. Distribution of Military Leaders and Civilian Staff/  
School Liaison Officers Interviewed**

By Service	O-8	O-6	O-5	O-4	E-9	Total	Civilian	
							Staff	SLO
Joint		3	1			4		
Army	1	2	4	1		8	5	6
Navy		3	1			4		1
Air Force		6	2	1		9	1	5
USMC		1	2		1	4	1	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>

  

By Location								
Germany	1	4	2			7	3	4
Italy		1				1	1	1
England			1			1		1
Okinawa		2	1			3		1
Korea		3	3	1		7	1	2
Japan		2	2			4	1	1
Hawaii		1		1		2	1	2
CONUS		2	1		1	4		
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>

  

By Position								
Cdr/Dep		9	8			17	2	
Staff	1	6	2	2	1	12	5	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>

**Table B-2. Distribution of Parents Interviewed**

Parents	SB	SAC/SIT	Neither	Total	Children
<b>By Base</b>					
Army	3	13	37	53	106
Navy		8	11	19	36
Air Force	6	14	25	45	92
USMC	7	5	10	22	53
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>287</b>

<b>By Location</b>					
Ramstein AB	6			6	12
Baumholder		4		4	10
Heidelberg		5	11	16	28
Germany	6	9	11	26	50
Aviano AB		2	6	8	17
Vicenza			6	6	15
Naples		6	6	12	25
Italy		8	18	26	57
London		2	5	7	11
RAF Alconbury			3	3	6
RAF Lakenheath		3	5	8	15
England		5	13	18	32
Okinawa		11	6	17	38
Seoul		1	5	6	7
Osan AB		2	3	5	10
Korea		3	8	11	17
Camp Zama		3	4	7	16
Yokota AB		1	3	4	8
Japan		4	7	11	24
Ft. Benning	1		5	6	12
Ft. Campbell	2		3	5	13
Ft, Bragg			3	3	5
Camp Lejeune	7		9	16	39
CONUS	10		20	30	69
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>287</b>

<b>Grade &amp; Service of Military Parent Interviewed</b>					
	Army	Navy	Air Force	USMC	Total
0-6		3			3
O-5	4				4
O-4	1			1	2
CW3	2				2
E-9			1		1
E-7			1		1
E-6	1	2	3		6
E-5			2		2
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>

- |   |
|---|
| Parental Involvement:<br>School Advisory Committee<br>School Board<br>School Improvement Team<br>PTSA/PTO<br>Classroom Volunteer<br>Tutor<br>Substitute Teacher<br>Mentor<br>District Advisory Council<br>Area Advisory Council |
|---|



**Table B-3. Distribution of Administrators Interviewed**

	Asst Prin	Principal	Asst Supt	Supt	Dist Ofc	DoDEA/Other*	Total
<b>Base</b>							
Army	10	26	2	5	17	1	61
Navy	2	6				1	9
Air Force	7	22	2	1	7	11	50
USMC	3	11		2	7		23
Other						3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>146</b>
<b>By Location</b>							
Spangdahlem AB		5		1			6
Ramstein AB	1	8					9
Baumholder		4					4
Wiesbaden	3	4				1	8
Heidelberg	1	4		1			6
Germany	5	25		2		1	33
Aviano AB		3					3
Vicenza	2	2		1			5
Naples	2	2					4
Italy	4	7		1			12
London		1					1
RAF Alconbury	1	2					3
RAF Lakenheath			1		1		2
England	1	3	1		1		6
Okinawa	6	6	1		6	11	30
Seoul	4	3			5		12
Osan AB	2						2
Korea	6	3			5		14
Japan		4					4
Hawaii						1	1
Ft. Benning		3	1	1	3		8
Ft. Campbell		2	1	1	5		9
Ft, Bragg		4		1	4		9
Camp Lejeune		8		1	7		16
Quantico MCB				1			1
DoDEA/Other						3	3
CONUS		17	2	5	19	3	46
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>146</b>

\*Includes Directors for DoDDS-Europe, DoDDS-Pacific, DDESS, and Area Staff

**Table B-4. Distribution of Teachers Interviewed**

ES		MS		HS		Total
Teacher	Other	Teacher	Other	Teacher	Other	

SAC/SIT	Union	TOY
(Included in total)		

By Base

Army	32	1	9	3	10	1	56
Navy	6		6		8	1	21
Air Force	27	1	6	2	19	2	57
USMC	14	9	8	2	3	2	38
Total	79	11	29	7	40	6	172

17	9	3
6	4	1
33	7	1
3	3	2
59	23	7

By Location

Spangdahlem AB	3	1	3	1	2		10
Baumholder	4				1		5
Heidelberg	9		3	2	2		16
Germany	16	1	6	3	5		31
Aviano AB	2			1	1		4
Vicenza	3		3			1	7
Naples	6		3		5		14
Italy	11		6	1	6	1	25
London			2		3	1	6
RAF Alconbury	4				4		8
RAF Lakenheath	7		1				8
England	11		3		7	1	22
Okinawa	6		7	1	7	2	23
Seoul	2				4		6
Osan AB	6				5		11
Korea	8				9		17
Zama	4		1		2		7
Yokosuka			1				1
Yokota AB	5		2		2		9
Japan	9		4		4		17
Ft. Benning	6	1					7
Ft. Campbell	2		1	1	1		5
Ft. Bragg	2		1				3
Camp Lejeune	8	9	1	1	1	2	22
CONUS	18	10	3	2	2	2	37
Total	79	11	29	7	40	6	172

10		
5		
11	1	
26	1	
2		
4	2	
6	2	
2	1	1
7	2	
7	1	
16	4	1
4	2	2
1	1	
1		1
2	1	1
	3	
	1	
5	4	
5	8	
	1	
	2	1
	1	2
	1	
	5	3
59	23	7

**Table B-5. Interview Locations and Number of Interviews Conducted**

Location	# Interviews	Mil Ldrs	Parents	Admin	Teachers
Spangdahlem AB	4	1		2	1
Baumholder	4	1	1	1	1
Ramstein AB	4	2	1	1	
Wiesbaden	3	1		2	
Heidelberg	9	1	3	2	3
Germany	24	6	5	8	5
Aviano AB	3		1	1	1
Vicenza	5	1	1	2	1
Naples	6	1	2	1	2
Italy	14	2	4	4	4
London	4		2	1	1
RAF Alconbury	5	1	1	1	2
RAF Lakenheath	4		1	1	2
England	13	1	4	3	5
Okinawa	17	4	2	6	5
Seoul	9	2	3	2	2
Osan AB	6	1	1	1	3
Korea	15	3	4	3	5
Camp Zama	5	1	2		2
Atsugi NAS	1	1			
Yokota AB	7	1	2	1	3
Japan	13	3	4	1	5
Hawaii	3	2		1	
Ft. Benning	6		2	3	1
Ft. Campbell	7		2	3	2
Ft. Bragg	7	1	2	3	1
Camp Lejeune	8	1	2	3	2
Quantico MCB	1			1	
DoDEA/Other	4	1		3	
CONUS	33	3	8	16	6
Total	132	24	31	42	35



# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE September 2002		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (From-To) November 2001-September 2002	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  An Assessment of the DoDEA Community Strategic Plan 2001-2006				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER DAS W01 98 C 0067/DASW01-02-C-0012	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)  Richard K. Wright				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER BE-3-1981	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)  Institute for Defense Analyses 4850 Mark Center Drive Alexandria, VA 22311-1882				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER  IDA Document D-2764	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Department of Defense Education Activity 4040 N. Fairfax Drive Webb Building, Room 939 Arlington, VA 22203				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT  Approved for public release/unlimited distribution (28 April 2003).					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT This document assesses the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) Community Strategic Plan (CSP) 2001-2006 during the first year of implementation. The objective is to determine the awareness, understanding, acceptance, and support of the different stakeholder groups; evaluate how well the procedures used to develop the document result in support; and make recommendations to facilitate further the accomplishment of stated CSP goals and outcomes. This document includes (1) summaries of interviews with military leaders, parents, administrators, and teachers in the Continental United States (CONUS), the Pacific, and Europe and (2) a review CSP documents and research reports for the current and previous CSP. Interview comments are generally consistent within each stakeholder group, regardless of location. They vary among stakeholder groups to some extent by the level of military leader and administrator and the degree to which the parent and teacher are involved with the CSP. There is more awareness, understanding, acceptance and support of the current CSP because of how it was developed and is being implemented. This CSP is considered to be more focused and less complex than the 1995-2000 CSP and also offers more flexibility at the school level.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Community Strategic Plan (CSP), Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools (DDESS), Department of Defense Dependent Schools (DoDDS), Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA), goals, measures, milestones, outcomes, School Improvement Plan (SIP), student achievement					
partnerships			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT Uncl.	b. ABSTRACT Uncl.	c. THIS PAGE Uncl.	SAR	89	Dr. Joseph D. Tafoya
					19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code) 703-696-4247

