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Executive Summary

The Rochester City School District Board of Education convened a Special Advisory Committee to Explore Educational Opportunities to examine the feasibility and desirability of a military-style high school in Rochester, NY. The Committee conducted a series of information gathering actions including surveys, focus groups and interviews with key community leaders to gauge the level of community support, and identify specific community concerns regarding the proposed school model. Questions included in the survey can serve as an indicator of potential enrollment in addition to gauging community interest.

Results of the community surveys, focus groups and interviews indicate a significant level of support within the greater Rochester community for a military-style school. Support was stronger in the Monroe County region outside of the City, but a majority of respondents in the City and County favored establishment of a military-style school. Community support was shown for a coeducational school drawing enrollment from the greater Rochester region. Survey responses indicated that enough interest exists to be reasonably certain enrollment targets could be met, despite objections from opponents of the plan.

Based on community input and the expertise of the individuals involved, the Advisory Committee recommends establishment of a military-style school as a standalone program school, drawing the majority of students from the Rochester City School District while also enrolling students from the Greater Rochester Area. It is recommended that the U.S. Army be the military service branch partner, and that the District apply for a National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC) to allow streamlined establishment of the school. It is recommended that the school open with 75 students in the 9th grade cohort, growing both up and down to reach a full enrollment of 450 students in grades 7-12 by the end of four years.

The recommended curriculum is college preparatory Regents curriculum, with a Regents diploma with distinction for every student, with special emphasis on the STEM 4+1 diploma pathway. Technology built on Project Lead the Way curriculum is suggested, as well as art and music electives for all students. The music curriculum is recommended to be tailored toward a drum and bugle corps as part of the academy’s Drill and Ceremony activities. Extracurricular clubs and activities should be unique offerings that are not offered elsewhere in the District.

The primary community concerns centered on: the selection process for students; oversight to prevent harsh disciplinary tactics and abuse; and the potential for the school to become a military recruiting pipeline and limit students’ options for post-secondary plans. Careful attention would be required in the detailed planning stage to address these issues, and may be met through structural components and District policies.
Introductory Section

Introduction

On March 3rd 2016, Rochester City School Board President Van White announced the creation of the Special Advisory Committee to Explore Educational Opportunities. The charge of this committee was to provide independent advice and recommendations to the Board on matters relating to the curriculum, instruction, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and any other matters relating to the development of a military academy for the students of the Greater Rochester Community. See Appendix A for the official charge to the committee. This report outlines the committee's methodology, research, results, and recommendations to the Rochester City School Board.

Problem Statement

Should the Rochester City School District create a military-style academy in order to provide students and parents with enhanced educational opportunities within a military model based learning environment?

Stakeholders

The primary stakeholders in this initiative are the parents and students of the greater Rochester area, who would also be the main beneficiaries of this educational option. Other stakeholders include professional educators in the District, community members, civic leaders, church and non-profit organizations, local business leaders, the military community, and area colleges and universities. Input and feedback was requested from all of these stakeholder groups during the course of the Committee's research.

Objectives

There were three primary objectives of this committee: 1) identify the extent of community support for the creation of a military academy option; 2) outline and design the basic framework and educational principles that would define a military academy; 3) determine the feasibility of creating a military academy within existing fiscal, contractual, and legal constraints. The following sections of this report outline the specific outcomes of the Committee research.

Background

Data was collected to understand and document currently existing public secondary military schools in the United States, and to examine their performance compared to their home districts to the extent possible. This data is found in Appendix B.
Community Input

Methods
Community input was sought through a variety of methods, including surveys, interviews and focus groups. Table 1 outlines the target groups for the various information collection methodologies.

Table 1: Information Gathering Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Information Collection Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students (RCSD and Monroe County)</td>
<td>Survey, Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents (City and surrounding region)</td>
<td>Survey, Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Members</td>
<td>Survey, Focus Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Community</td>
<td>Survey, Focus Group, Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Community (K-12, higher education)</td>
<td>Survey, Focus Group, Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Community</td>
<td>Survey, Focus Group, Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church/Non-profit/Community Groups</td>
<td>Survey, Focus Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions (teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, support)</td>
<td>Survey, Interviews with key leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Suburban Transfer Program</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several versions of a survey were developed to solicit input from stakeholders regarding their level of support and interest in the concept of a military school, and the type of school desired. Free response questions were included to allow input regarding perceived opportunities, outcomes and concerns. Student surveys were prepared for:

1) RCSD middle and high schools (including a Spanish version),
2) Monroe County high schools, and
3) Rochester private and charter schools.

Requests for participation were sent to:

1) principals of RCSD schools,
2) superintendents of Monroe County districts, and
3) school leaders of private and charter schools.

Prior to distribution, a doctoral professor from St. John Fisher College reviewed the surveys for content, structure and bias. To solicit input from the wider community of stakeholders, a more detailed
The survey included demographic questions designed to allow disaggregation of data by stakeholder group, age, race, gender, home location and military contact. Requests for survey input were made through media outlets (television, radio and print), church leaders, veterans’ organizations, Rotary District 7120, and community organizations, such as Metro Council for Teen Potential and the RCSD Office of Parent Engagement. Links to both English and Spanish versions of the survey were posted prominently on the RCSD website for approximately one month. Survey results were tabulated and summarized by the Community Input Subcommittee. See Appendix C for the student and community survey instruments.

Focus Group members were solicited through the community survey and by direct invitation of Committee members. Focus groups were held on Saturday, March 19, 2016 at East High School in Rochester. Focus Group protocols were developed with the input of the entire Advisory Committee, and reviewed for content, structure and bias by a doctoral professor from the University of Rochester. Facilitators were used to guide discussions, and the sessions were audio recorded for later analysis. Note takers in each session also recorded observations. Committee members then summarized key themes emerging from the Focus Groups. See Appendix D for the Focus Group protocols.

Individual interviews with key community leaders in Rochester and Monroe County were conducted by the Advisory Committee co-chairs, Todd Baxter and Ulises Miranda. Key leaders were identified from educational, governmental, and business organizations, and a list of potential interviewees was prepared by the Committee Co-Chairs. The members of the Advisory Committee reviewed this list and made the final selection for one-on-one interviews. The Committee Co-Chairs contacted key leaders, explained the purpose of the interview and confirmed an appointment date/time. In some cases, the interview protocol was shared prior to the appointment, enabling some of the key leaders to prepare answers to protocol questions in advance. The following agencies/organizations were interviewed:

- Rochester Teachers Association
- Association of Supervisors and Administrators of Rochester
- Board of Education Non-teaching Employees
- Rochester Association of Paraprofessionals
- Leadership Academy for Young Men
- Junior Reserve Officers Training Corps Instructors
- Urban-Suburban Inter-district Transfer Program, Monroe #1 BOCES
- Rochester City Mayor’s Office
- Greater Rochester Chamber of Commerce
- Klein Steel

Time and scheduling constraints prevented the Committee Co-Chairs from interviewing the RCSD Interim Superintendent, members of the Rochester City School Board, and the surrounding town supervisors. The results of the interviews were summarized and key themes were identified. See Appendix E for the interview protocol.
Results

Surveys

Both the student and community surveys showed support for the concept of a military school in Rochester:

The RCSD student survey showed 67% in favor of the idea, and 33% opposed.

The community survey showed overall support of 70% of respondents, with 24% opposed and 5% undecided.

Further breakdown by subgroups revealed that support for the idea was stronger in the suburbs than in the City, with the support of 54% of City residents and 83% of Monroe County residents outside the City. The survey results from parents reflect the same level of support as the residents of their community in the City and County.

In both the student and the community survey, the majority (approximately 80%) supported the concept of a regional school as opposed to an RCSD-only school. An overwhelming percentage of students (93%) supported a co-ed school, rather than a single-gender school.

In terms of interest in attending a military school, 42% of students (73) responded that they would be interested in attending, and 46% of community respondents (232 people) stated that they would definitely be interested in having their child attend. Only 20% of respondents were undecided.

In citing the benefits expected from a military school, respondents most frequently mentioned the concepts of discipline, structure and respect. Concerns centered on costs; recruitment; possible limitation of opportunities for students to military careers (“pipeline” to military was often mentioned); disciplinary practices and the need for objective oversight of the school. Another concern was the way in which students would be selected, specifically regarding students being forced to enroll in the school as a punishment or involuntarily; adequate capacity for interested students; and that students who may benefit most from the structure may not choose to enroll.

Appendix F contains detailed survey results, including charts and graphs of the demographics of respondents, as well as maps showing the home locations of those interested in having students attend.

Focus Groups

Focus groups provided input from a relatively small group of participants, and the opinions ranged from totally supportive to totally opposed to the concept of a military school. Unsurprisingly, the military community and the student groups were fully supportive (the student group was made up mainly of JROTC cadets from the current programs). Parent, education and business community groups were cautiously supportive, while the community resident/non-parent group was openly opposed to the idea.
Caution must be used in generalizing the opinions as indicative of any one group of stakeholders since the groups were comprised of small numbers of volunteers with clearly held strong opinions on the subject. The groups were extremely civil and thoughtful, and expressed a desire to continue to be included in the discussion as the idea progresses through the decision making process. A list of e-mail addresses has been provided separately for this purpose. Appendix G includes summaries of the Focus Group discussions.

Interviews

A total of ten interviews were conducted with key leaders from the Rochester community. The guiding question “Are you generally in favor of or opposed to the idea of a military school in Rochester?” provided a measurement on a scale of 1 to 5. These measurements were averaged and resulted in an overall score of 4.2 (Supportive). There were no responses of 1 or 2 (Not Supportive) and three responses were measured as neither in favor nor opposed. Key Leader respondents consisted of 7 males and 3 females.

Common word descriptors that were frequently used in the interviews include:
Parents- 28
Kids- 24
Supportive- 17
Needs- 17
Community- 17
Disciplined- 14
Option- 13
Boarding- 12
Mix- 10

Key leaders were concerned about parental support for the military school and emphasized the importance of informing parents about military schools. All key leaders agreed that the school should be co-gender/ co-educational, and some interviewees cautioned against having an all-male school in a society and military that is just beginning to include women in more occupational specialties.

When asked about other types of school options that should be considered, key leaders suggested boarding school and charter school models. One key leader stated that all options are available for RCSD students, “Even the military is an option through the two JROTC units that are currently available”. The boarding school option was frequently mentioned. Appendix H contains individual interview summaries.

Limitations

The survey was an anonymous instrument with voluntary participation through multiple solicitation routes. Individuals who choose to participate in such surveys generally have strong opinions about the topic and will gravitate toward the polar opposite ends of the spectrum. The survey should not
be taken as a quantitative representation of community opinions, but rather as an indicator of the level of support within the community.

While the student survey reflected approximately the same gender and racial/ethnic composition as the RCSD student population, the racial/ethnic distribution of the respondents to the community survey may not adequately reflect the population of families in the Rochester City School District.

Compared to 2014 U.S. Census data for Rochester, the percentage of African American respondents in the survey is about half that of the City as a whole. However, 16% of respondents did not want to provide demographic information, so the true representation is unknown.

Assuming that most parents are the same race as their children, the community survey respondents differ significantly in terms of race/ethnicity from the student survey respondents and from District parents.

Table 2: Demographic Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Category</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>2014 US Census</th>
<th>RCSD District demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4% (all other categories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF

Source: http://www.rcsdk12.org/domain/8
Legal Framework

JROTC Legislation

The legal framework for Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps programs, the basis for a military-style school, is established under 10 US Code § 2031. Under this legislation, the purpose of a JROTC program is:

“to instill in students in United States secondary educational institutions the values of citizenship, service to the United States, and personal responsibility and a sense of accomplishment.”

Potential Challenges

The first major challenge identified was the impact of federal, state, city, and District regulations. Positive support from labor and the various unions would be a necessity, and an archetype is needed on which to base the school program. A military-style academy requires rules specific to the environment being created, as well as an organizational flow chart with unique requirements.

The second major challenge was to determine how a military academy could meet the specific expectations and educational requirements that students and families would desire, while complying with governing regulations. A military school might have unconventional admissions and retention guidelines for both students and educators, and would certainly have a code of conduct that would be more detailed than in other scholastic environments. Furthermore, a military education’s curricular requirements reasonably exceed preexisting norms established within public secondary education.

Lastly, the ethics of the Committee itself and its relationship with the military community were subject to self-scrutiny in order to guarantee an unbiased product and recommendation to the Rochester City School District. Many of the members of this Committee have a background with strong military ties, and several are approaching transition points in their careers. It would be an error for this Committee to recommend anything to the district that is not fully based in fact and unbiased. Additionally, it is unethical for any member to have positive recommendations for the sole purpose of furthering one’s own career. Maintaining transparency and objectivity is paramount to providing a credible recommendation. It would also be untruthful to hide the fact that one of the Committee members is responsible for Army Recruiting in the Greater Rochester Area. Only unbiased truth and accountability will guarantee that the public at large trusts the results of this inquiry and does not suspect ulterior motives.

Targeted Dialogue

No federal, state, or local laws exist to the knowledge of this Committee that prohibit a public high school from operating under a military model. In fact, there are dozens of such schools throughout the country, including the Western New York Maritime Charter School in Buffalo. Furthermore, RTA president Adam Urbanski has confirmed the support of RCSD teachers’ union in opening the school. The faculty of the proposed military school can negotiate specifics under the provisions of the “School Level
“Military” is a broad label that includes multiple possibilities for a model or service for the school to emulate. Several universities include multiple ROTC programs and have many branches of military service represented, but most high schools tend to function under the organization of a single represented service. All military schools in the U.S. have members or retired members of the military as well as civilian instructors. The military academy in Rochester should also use this model, and have a clearly defined “reporting structure” to ensure a hierarchical delineation of responsibilities with as little friction as possible between “military” (uniformed) and “civilian” (non-uniformed) staff.

An inclusive school would also maintain an inclusive code of conduct, befitting an organization that strives to uphold the discipline and standards of a military unit. The code of conduct would require family support, clearly defined and written standards of student and educator conduct, and a strong peer mentoring/student code enforcement structure. The military of today refrains from the use of “punishment” and focuses on “retraining”, except for the most egregious of infractions. The school would utilize a crisis intervention model in which the staff teach, model and counsel appropriate behavior and rely on mediation techniques in order to foster positive leadership qualities.

However, if continuous and repeated attempts to promote growth are unsuccessful, it may be best for the student to consider a different environment. The same would be true for educators, who may wish to seek a position at a different school. In these cases, RCSD standard procedures would apply.
Recommendations

Overall Recommendation

**Question 1.** Is it feasible and desirable for the RCSD to open a military academy to provide enhanced educational opportunities primarily to the students and families of the Rochester City School District and to the students and families of Monroe County?

**Answer and Results Summary:** Yes. Based upon the work completed by the Advisory Committee, a military high school in Rochester is not only operationally feasible but also desirable. The results obtained through community interest surveys and focus group sessions reveals that a majority of respondents would like the District to offer a military school that utilizes the public military academy model. One such definition is provided by the Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the United States.

School Type

**Question 2.** What did the Advisory Committee determine to be the best plan for starting school size during year one and subsequent year growth of the proposed military high school?

**Answer and Results Summary:** It is suggested to start with a cohort of seventy-five high school freshman students (9th Grade) to maximize success, and grow both up and down to a full grade 7-12 configuration within four years, with seventy-five students per cohort. It is proposed that remedial and social emotional support be emphasized during the first year to ensure that the first cohort of 9th graders will be ready to acquire and lead the “whole person” concept of the military academy.

Non-Selected Alternative Plans Considered:
- Plan B (Better): Start w/200 students, 100 per grade 8th, 9th. Grow 100 each following year
- Plan C (Good): Start w/ 100 students, 9th grade. Grow 100 each following year

**Question 3.** What did the Advisory Committee determine to be the best type and configuration of military school for the RCSD?

**Answer and Results Summary:** A subcommittee explored the feasibility of four school types: 1) District public school with independent BEDS code, 2) program within a single District school (e.g. PTECH at Edison), 3) stand-alone program school drawing from the District at large (e.g. All City High School), and 4) charter school. After analyzing each of these options and considering the school culture, identity and community, staffing, curriculum, and school programming, the Committee recommends Option 3. The program drawing from the District at large would allow access to the military academy for any RCSD student who has the desire to attend. The benefits of this option include:

- Enrollment can come from the District at large
- Simplify the enrollment process
- Allow for wider canvassing of students from the entire city
Common interest in military education and strong discipline
- Public relations: presents as an inclusive school for all students
- Any student who wants this opportunity could participate
- Psychology of identity and allegiance to the “roots” of the home school
- At start-up, allows students to maintain identity with a home school

For more information regarding the benefits of program schools, please see appendix I which contains the complete analysis of all four school types.

**Question 4:** What did the Advisory Committee determine to be the best configuration for the military component of the school?

**Answer and Results Summary:** Submit an application for a National Defense Cadet Corps (NDCC), which results in a full RCSD cost-incurred plan (see Appendix J (evaluation planning worksheet) and Appendix K (application)). Upon investigating the various configurations considered, starting a new JROTC Program cost-shared within the RCSD is not an attractive option because of the large number of high schools awaiting approvals in the United States, resulting in a wait of at least several years for approval. Congressional discourse is prevented by the current “first come, first served” methods of approving high school programs at the national level.

Non-Selected Alternative Plans Considered:
- Plan B (Better): Transfer one current JROTC Program and continue existing shared cost.
- Plan C (Good): Consolidate both existing JROTC Programs in one building and continue existing shared cost.

**Question 5.** What did the Advisory Committee determine to be the optimal gender configuration of the student population of the proposed military school?

**Answer and Results Summary:** The Advisory Committee recommends a coeducational military high school. Based upon student survey result, stakeholder Focus Group feedback, and interviews with key community leaders, the Advisory Committee determined that a co-gender military high school would best serve the community as Rochester’s first military academy high school.

**Question 6.** Where did the committee recommend the school’s students be drawn from (Catchment Area)?

**Answer and Results Summary:** The Advisory Committee recommends a wider regional draw. Based upon the work of the Advisory Committee, Focus Group surveys and key community leader interviews, a significant number of respondents indicated that this opportunity should be offered to students outside of the Rochester City School District. The Committee was in agreement that the majority of students should be comprised of RCSD students.

Non-Selected Alternative Plans Considered:
- Plan B (Better): All of Monroe County, but not outside of Monroe
- Plan C (Good): Rochester City Only
Location

**Question 7**: What did the Advisory Committee determine to be the best location for a military school?

**Answer and results summary**: The Advisory Committee recommends that the military school be housed in a standalone building configured for a secondary school, including appropriate classrooms and office space, cafeteria, library, gymnasium with locker rooms, and outdoor athletic space. The Committee did not review or recommend specific buildings or locations.

Non-Selected Alternative Plans Considered:
- **Plan B (Better)**: Share building space with the Young Men’s Leadership Academy at Charlotte.
- **Plan C (Good)**: Share building space with another RCSD secondary school.

Leadership

**Question 8**: What leadership structure should be considered for the proposed military academy high school?

**Answer and Results Summary**: The Committee recommends a leadership triad. Organizational structure at level one: an Academy Director; at level two: shared operational responsibility between the Principal/Academic school leader and the Commandant. The Advisory Committee placed increased emphasis on the functional responsibilities that would be required by the school administrator. Many military schools are led by a General Officer in a position of President of the school. The Advisory Committee felt that the best leadership structure for the proposed military school would be an Academy Director at the top, with the Principal/Academic leader and a Commandant both subordinate to the Academy Director, yet administratively equal in organizational responsibilities. The Principal would be responsible for academics and instruction, while the Commandant would be responsible for military order and discipline within the school building. Historically, these two leadership positions within many military schools have been at odds with each other. As leadership emphasis is adjusted for any number of high school issues, the Academy Director would have the final authority.

Non-Selected Alternative Plans Considered:
- **Plan B (Better)**: Principal, Vice-principal of Instruction, Commandant of Cadets
- **Plan C (Good)**: Principal, Vice-principal, JROTC Unit Instructors

Program

**Question 9**: What did the Advisory Committee determine to be the best programming options for a military school?

**Answer and results summary**: The Advisory Committee recommends a college preparatory curriculum for the military academy. A Regents diploma with distinction will be targeted for every
student, and students will follow a rigorous course of study with a special emphasis on the STEM 4+1 diploma pathway.

A Regents Course of Study for the academy will include a minimum of:

- Mathematics - 4 years, minimum 2 Regents Examinations
- Science - 4 Years, minimum 2 Regents Examinations
- English Language Arts - 4 Years, ELA Regents Examination
- Social Studies - 4 Years, 2 Regents Examinations (U.S. History, World History)
- L.O.T.E. - 4 years of study
- Health/Physical Education
- Arts
- Service Learning/Character Development

Emphasis will be placed on academic readiness and rigor and support must be provided to any learner in need of assistance in foundational academic literacy (reading) and mathematics, so that all learners can gain access to the military academy. Furthermore, students will be given opportunities to explore career pathways in the STEM fields, including Photonics, Robotics, Computer Programming, and pre-engineering coursework, such as those pathways found in Project Lead the Way. Additional curricular focus will be placed on service learning, and students will complete service projects that are integrated in the core curriculum. Resources will include the National Medal of Honor Curriculum, which emphasizes courage, sacrifice, patriotism, citizenship, integrity, and commitment. These core values will be woven throughout all school programming and also explicitly taught in the curriculum, with an emphasis on service to others.

Curriculum models from the Junior ROTC National Program will also be integrated into the curricula adopted in the Rochester City School District. Students will be prepared for college and careers and for post-secondary success. Metrics of success will include student pass rates on the Regents examinations, academic performance, and enrollment in extracurricular programming, including marching band and STEM clubs such as First Robotics. Student placement on exams such as the ASVAB and ACCU-Placer, which are used to help direct post-secondary learning pathways, will also be monitored for program evaluation and to support student learning.

**Question 10.** What sports and extracurricular programs should be offered at the proposed military academy high school?

**Answer and Results Summary:** The structure of sports teams would be largely driven by the school type model chosen (i.e. standalone school with a unique BEDS code vs. program school). Under the proposed program school model, the Committee recommends unique, low-cost, minimal-injury, individual development sports programs (i.e. fencing, jujitsu, rowing, etc.) that are limited to 3 to 4 categories that will enable students/ cadets/ school to truly excel. The Advisory Committee recommends that sports within this proposed program school model allow students to participate in traditional competitive team sports through their home schools. In addition, the military high school should offer unique clubs in the afterschool program, including robotics, adventure/outdoor activities and other unique options in addition to the JROTC activities.
Non-Selected Alternative Plans Considered:
Plan B (Better): Full array of sports- Football, Basketball, Baseball- single gender
Plan C (Good): Shared sports with other schools and existing school teams

**Question 11.** What music program should be considered for the proposed military academy high school?

**Answer and Results Summary:** The Advisory Committee recommends the Drum and Bugle Corps (Drill and Ceremony) because military schools should retain the customs and traditions of parades, pass-in reviews, and drill. Much of the JROTC after school program will consist of mandatory drill and ceremony practice. Drill Team and Color Guard are routine military school activities. The Advisory Committee also felt that service to the community is an important component of a military school, and should be required for graduation. Color Guard presentations to various community events and in support of other Rochester City schools would require expanded cadet community participation.

Non-Selected Alternative Plans Considered:
Plan B (Better): Full Marching Band and Choral Group
Plan C (Good): Orchestra and Choral Group

**Other**

The Advisory Committee also has the following related recommendations:

- If the military school receives authorization to proceed, a full legal review by attorneys of the District and by Staff Judge Advocates from the military is highly encouraged.
- Since the Army has the bulk of military experience in the greater Rochester region, an Army JROTC program is recommended as the backbone of the military academy.
- Admissions procedures should include some type of compact or agreement signed by students and parents to be certain that they understand the school program before ranking it as number one on their school selection form.
- The military school should include school-based laundry facilities in order to maintain military decorum of uniforms.
- A district-wide policy regarding recruiter access to RCSD schools should be established. The policy should apply equally to all schools, including the military academy.
- Develop and implement an education campaign in the Rochester community regarding military schools to address misconceptions surfaced during the surveys and focus group discussions.
- The Committee recommends that during the entire process of school formation, transparency between the public, levels of government and unions is maintained to ensure all parties are positively engaged.
- Use the email list of Focus Group participants (provided separately) to maintain open lines of communication and notification of activities related to the proposal.
- A targeted outreach effort within the city of Rochester needs to be planned to inform parents about the plans for the military-style school. It is recommended that these outreach sessions be organized through large churches and community recreation centers.
Budget

The Budget Subcommittee developed an estimated budget and a recommended program model in a standalone building, using an enrollment progression as shown in the table below. The Committee developed four-year figures for staffing, start-up and on-going expenses in a number of categories. The budget is an approximation and not a fully developed financial projection. In order to present the unique offerings of this program, the Subcommittee made several assumptions about costs that would be borne by the District:

- Facility costs, including rent and utilities
- IT Support and Network costs, data backup and support
- Transportation
- Food service

Depending on the building selected, the cost may be greater or lesser than projected. For example, if the selected school has an established library, gym or arts & music program, those costs would be excluded from the proposed budget.

Table 3: Enrollment Assumptions for Budget Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>75 student 9th grade cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>75 student 9th and 10th grade cohorts (150 students total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>75 students each 9th, 10th and 11th grade cohort, plus 75 students in 7th grade cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>Full enrollment of 75 students each in grades 7-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below is a summary of projected costs, and reflects expenses over four years, as additional students are added. Appendix L shows the detail of the staffing projections that contribute to the budget.

Table 4 Projected Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$1,893,900</td>
<td>$3,078,870</td>
<td>$5,309,681</td>
<td>$6,992,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (50%)</td>
<td>$946,950</td>
<td>$1,539,435</td>
<td>$2,654,841</td>
<td>$3,496,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Compensation</td>
<td>$24,750</td>
<td>$50,400</td>
<td>$102,600</td>
<td>$156,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Materials</td>
<td>$906,750</td>
<td>$558,750</td>
<td>$889,500</td>
<td>$986,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,772,350</td>
<td>$5,227,455</td>
<td>$8,956,622</td>
<td>$11,631,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 demonstrates incremental staffing costs specific to military personnel. Under Option 1: NDCC, RCSD covers the full cost of military staffing and equipment until the US Army approves the JROTC program. It is unknown how long the approval process will take. Under Option 2 (transfer of existing RCSD JROTC unit) the US Army will cost-share the program by 50% immediately upon approval.

Table 5 Incremental Military Staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YR 1</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
<th>YR 2</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
<th>YR 3</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
<th>YR 4</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$119,340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$121,727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$124,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JROTC Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$201,960</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$274,666</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$350,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$68,666</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$70,040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$249,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$321,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$465,059</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$544,400</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget supports the curriculum for an enhanced learning environment that leads to a College Preparatory Advanced Regents Diploma with Distinction to ensure that every student is successful. Other Compensation is also included in the budget to support:

- Additional Leadership Summer Camps
- Additional field trips for military studies, cultural and science museums
- Enhanced Arts Program through establishing Classical, Drum and Bugle Corps
- Unique athletic and sporting clubs designed to foster teamwork and enhance individual athletic skills
- Unique experience in Engineering to include Project Lead the Way, and a First Robotics team.

The estimated cost is demonstrated in Table 6:

Table 6 Other Compensation Cost Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Compensation, $150 per student per year, after school with 2% increase per year</td>
<td>$11,250</td>
<td>$22,950</td>
<td>$46,800</td>
<td>$71,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Compensation - Orientation and Retreats, $30 per student per year</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trips, $150 per student per year with 2% increase per year</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>22,950</td>
<td>46,800</td>
<td>71,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$102,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$156,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A – Charge to the Advisory Committee

Special Advisory Committee to Explore Educational Opportunities

Charge to the Ad Hoc Committee

The Committee shall be known as the Special Advisory Committee to Explore Educational Opportunities.

The Committee will be advisory to the Rochester Board of Education and will consist of students, staff, parents, and community members who shall explore the feasibility of opening a military academy to provide enhanced education opportunities primarily to the students and families of the Rochester City School District as well as to the students and families of Monroe County.

The Committee shall provide independent advice and recommendations to the Board on matters to the curriculum, instruction, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and any other matters relating to the development of a military academy. The Committee shall submit a written report to the Board within sixty (60) days of its initial meeting, to include the Committee’s views and recommendations pertaining to the possible development and opening of a military academy.

The Committee will be chaired by two participants selected by the Board of Education.

Please contact the Board’s office with questions or concerns at (585) 262-8525.
## Performance Data for Public Secondary Military Schools in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>% of Students Scoring &quot;Proficient&quot;</th>
<th>% Students Scoring &quot;Proficient&quot;</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Expulsion Rate</th>
<th>Drop-Out Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% at &quot;Proficient&quot; and above (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>% at &quot;Proficient&quot; and above (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>5-Year</td>
<td>Local District Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Military Institute</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>4-Year: 02.27% (2014-15)</td>
<td>0% School 01% District (2014-15 CA Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Military Institute</td>
<td>30% meet or exceed CA standards (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>30% meet or exceed CA standards (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>4-Year: 60.5% (2013-14 CA Data)</td>
<td>13.3% School 11% District (2013-14 CA Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Military Academy</td>
<td>Math: 27.6% meet or exceed DE State Standards (2014-15 DE Data)</td>
<td>Reading: 54% meet or exceed DE State Standards (2014-15 DE Data)</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>90.3%: 4-Year Rate (2013-14 Data) for Expulsions &amp; Suspensions</td>
<td>4% School 11% District (2014-15 Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Marion Military Academy</td>
<td>43% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>Reading: 45% Writing: 55% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>4-Year: 80.7% (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood Hills Military Academy</td>
<td>59% (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>Reading: 47% Writing: 59% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>4-Year: 76.6% (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota Military Academy</td>
<td>65% (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>Reading: 64% Writing: 71% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>4-Year: 79.3% (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of School</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>Local District Comparison</td>
<td>Other Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver Military Academy</td>
<td>94%: School (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>23.4%: &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>34%: &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>35% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above in Math (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>Science: 20.7% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Math &amp; Science Academy (Merged with Amos Middle School in September 2014)</td>
<td>91.3%: School (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>31.1%: &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>35.1%: &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>38.4%: Reading &quot;Proficient&quot; or above in Reading (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>Science: 24.3% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of School</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>Local District Comparison</td>
<td>Other Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Military Academy</td>
<td>96%: School (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>47%: &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>40%: &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>35% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above in Math (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>Science: 36.4% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rickover Naval Academy</td>
<td>93%: School (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>38%: &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>62%: &quot;Proficient&quot; or above in Reading (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>35% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above in Math (2014-15 Data)</td>
<td>Science: 33.7% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maryland:**

| Forestville Military Academy (converted back to a traditional high school in 2013) | NO DATA ON STATE OF MARYLAND EDUCATION DEPARTMENT WEBSITE |

**Missouri:**

| Cleveland Junior Naval Academy         | 95.0%: School (2015 Data) | 71.5%: "Proficient" or above (2015 Data) | 81.3%: ELA I "Proficient" or above (2015 Data) | 58.8%: ELA II "Proficient" or above (2015 Data) | Science: 76.6% "Proficient" or above (2015 Data) | 91.67% (2015 Data) | 72.00%: 4-Year Rate (2015 Data) | 0%: School 11.9%: District (2015 Data) |

**New Jersey:**

<p>| Marine Academy of Science and Technology (MAST) | 100% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data) | 100% &quot;Proficient&quot; or above (2013-14 Data) | District level data not found on N J Education Department website | 97.0% (2013-14 Data) | 96.3%: 4-Year Rate (2013-14 Data) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of School</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Local District Comparison</th>
<th>Other Subjects</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Expulsion Rate</th>
<th>Drop-Out Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bataan Military Academy</td>
<td>95.1%: School (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>19%: Math (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>34%: Reading (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>50%: Reading (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>Science: 29% (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>56.8%: 4-Year Rate (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>68.7%: 4-Year Rate (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military &amp; Global Leadership Academy</td>
<td>95%: School (2012-13 Data)</td>
<td>25%: Math (2012-13 Data)</td>
<td>50%: ELA (2012-13 Data)</td>
<td>53.4%: ELA (2012-13 Data)</td>
<td>Biology: 56.8% (2012-13 Data)</td>
<td>92.6%: 4-Year Rate (2012-13 Data)</td>
<td>81%: 4-Year Rate (2012-13 Data)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Military Academy</td>
<td>42.65%: School (2015 Data)</td>
<td>58.82%: Math (2015 Data)</td>
<td>Not available on PA Education Department website</td>
<td>Science: 27.94% (2015 Data)</td>
<td>Not available on PA Education Department website</td>
<td>96.59%: 4-Year Rate (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>97.5%: 4-Year Rate (2013-14 Data)</td>
<td>0.62%: School (2013-14 Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of School</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>Local District Comparison</td>
<td>Other Subjects</td>
<td>Local District Comparison</td>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>5-Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Carolina:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Magnet Academy</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Military Academy</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wisconsin:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha Military Academy</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C – Survey Instruments

Military School Community Input Survey

A Special Advisory Committee is studying the feasibility of establishing a military style school in Rochester, NY. The proposal includes establishing a school, which could be public or charter, that would voluntarily enroll students and would be free to parents. (This is not a private school study.) The programs being considered do NOT include recruitment into the military as part of the curriculum (10 U.S. Code § 2031). This survey is designed to gather input from a wide variety of stakeholders in the Greater Rochester community. Your responses are anonymous, unless you provide your contact information to be included as part of a separate focus group to be conducted at a later date. The input will be used to inform the work of the Special Advisory Committee to Explore Educational Opportunities.

* Required

Skip to question 14.

Demographic Information

In this section, you will respond to a series of questions about your background and characteristics. The information will be used to analyze responses by various categories and subgroups of individuals.

1. Are you or any member of your immediate family a member of the US military? (check all that apply) *
   Check all that apply.
   [ ] no
   [ ] myself
   [ ] parent
   [ ] child
   [ ] sibling
   [ ] Spouse

2. Are any members of your extended family or close friends a member of the US military? (check all that apply) *
   Check all that apply.
   [ ] no
   [ ] grandparent
   [ ] uncle/aunt
   [ ] cousin
   [ ] nephew/niece
   [ ] inlaws
   [ ] close friend or close family friend
   [ ] Other: ____________________________

*Note: also translated into Spanish
3. Which stakeholder group(s) do you most represent as you answer this survey? *
Check all that apply.

☐ Parent
☐ Community resident (not a parent)
☐ Business community
☐ Non-profit/church/service agency
☐ Education Community
☐ Military Community

4. What is your gender? *
Mark only one oval.

☐ male
☐ female
☐ Other: ________________________________

5. What is your age? *
Mark only one oval.

☐ Under 16 years old
☐ 18-29 years old
☐ 30-49 years old
☐ 50-64 years old
☐ 65+ years and over

6. Where do you live? *
Mark only one oval.

☐ Within the City of Rochester
☐ Monroe County, outside of the city
☐ Greater Rochester area, outside of Monroe County
☐ Outside of the Rochester area

7. Please enter your home zip code *

_________________________________
8. Where do you work? *
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ not applicable
   ○ In the City of Rochester
   ○ In Monroe County, outside of the city
   ○ In the Greater Rochester area, outside of Monroe County
   ○ Outside of the Greater Rochester area

9. What is the highest level of education you have completed? *
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Less than high school
   ○ Some high school
   ○ High school graduate
   ○ Some college
   ○ Trade/technical/vocational training
   ○ 2 year college graduate (Associate's degree)
   ○ 4 year college graduate (Bachelor's degree)
   ○ Some post graduate study
   ○ Master's degree
   ○ Doctoral degree

10. Are there any children under the age of 18 currently living in your household? *
    Mark only one oval.
    ○ yes
    ○ no

11. Race/Ethnicity *
    Mark only one oval.
    ○ Black or African American
    ○ Hispanic
    ○ White
    ○ Asian
    ○ American Indian or Native American
    ○ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
    ○ Mixed Race
    ○ Prefer not to answer
    ○ Other: ___________________________
12. Household income level (yearly) *
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Less than $10,000
   ○ $10,001 to $24,999
   ○ $25,000 to $34,999
   ○ $35,000 to $49,999
   ○ $50,000 to $74,999
   ○ $75,000 to $99,999
   ○ $100,000 to $149,999
   ○ $150,000 or more
   ○ Prefer not to answer

13. Would you be interested in being part of a Focus Group of approximately 12 people to discuss this proposal in more detail (date/time/place to be determined — mid-March) *
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ yes  Skip to question 20.
   ○ no   Stop filling out this form.

Skip to question 20.

Opinion questions
In this section, you will respond to questions related to your support of or objection to establishment of a military school in Rochester, NY. You will be presented with both closed-ended and open-ended questions to respond to.

14. Do you think a military style academy should be offered as an option in the Rochester City School District? *
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ yes
   ○ no
   ○ undecided

15. If a military style academy is approved, should enrollment be limited to Rochester City School District students, or should it be open to students from surrounding districts as well? *
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ RCSD students only
   ○ Students from both city and surrounding communities
16. If a military style academy was an option at this point, would you consider it for your child? *

   Mark only one oval.

   ○ Definitely yes
   ○ Undecided
   ○ Definitely no
   ○ not applicable (not a parent)

17. In thinking about a military academy, what benefits, positives or opportunities do you believe exist? *

   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________

18. In thinking about a military academy, what concerns or negatives do you have? *

   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________

19. Please list any additional comments or questions below.

   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________

Skip to question 1.

Contact Information for Focus Group

You have reached this section only if you indicated that you wish to be considered as part of a small Focus Group. Please check the appropriate box below. If you would prefer NOT to include your information here (since it will identify you with your survey responses), choose the Email direct option and send the required information in an email to RFS@milfocgroup.com. Please be sure to write down this email address, and send your name, phone number and stakeholder group as soon as possible. If you choose to submit information within this survey, choosing the second option will take you to the next section.
20. How would you like to submit your contact information? *
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Email direct to RCHDMilitaryfocusgroup@gmail.com  Stop filling out this form.
   ☐ Complete the information in the next section

Contact Information

21. Name *

   ____________________________

22. Stakeholder Group *
   Which stakeholder focus group would you be interested in participating in? 
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Parent
   ☐ Community resident (not a parent)
   ☐ Business Community
   ☐ Church/Nonprofit/Community Service Agency
   ☐ Military Community
   ☐ Education Community

23. Phone number *

   ____________________________

24. Email address *

   ____________________________

25. Would you be available for a meeting on a Saturday morning at a conveniently located city school? *
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no

Powered by Google Forms
Military School Student Survey, RCSD

This survey is designed to gather student input on a proposal in the Rochester City School District to establish a public military style school (may be public or charter) that students would voluntarily choose to attend, and would be free to parents. By law, the school would NOT be permitted to recruit for the military services as part of its curriculum. Your responses are anonymous, and will be used solely to inform the work of the Special Advisory Committee to Explore Educational Opportunities.

* Required

1. Do you think that a military school should be offered as an option in RCSD? *
   Mark only one oval.
   [ ] yes
   [ ] no

2. If a military school was opened, should it be open only to RCSD students, or to students from all over Monroe County? *
   Mark only one oval.
   [ ] RCSD only
   [ ] All over Monroe County

3. If a military school option was available when you were choosing a school for yourself, would you have considered applying? *
   Mark only one oval.
   [ ] yes
   [ ] no

4. If a military school was opened, should it be single gender or co-ed? *
   Mark only one oval.
   [ ] Boys only
   [ ] Girls only
   [ ] Co-ed

5. Why do you think a military school would be a good idea?

   ___________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________

*Note: also translated into Spanish
5. Why do you think a military school would be a bad idea?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

7. Are any of your immediate family members in the US military (active duty, National Guard/Reserve or veteran/retired)? (check all that apply) *

Check all that apply.

☐ Parent/step parent
☐ Other Guardian
☐ Sibling (Brother/sister/step or half brothers or sisters)
☐ None

8. Are any of your extended family or close friends members of the US military (active duty, National Guard/Reserve or veteran/retired)? (check all that apply) *

Check all that apply.

☐ Grandparent
☐ Aunt/Uncle
☐ Cousin
☐ Other relative
☐ Close friend or family friend
☐ None

9. Are you a high school or middle school student? *

Mark only one oval.

☐ High school
☐ Middle school

10. Gender *

Mark only one oval.

☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Other: __________________________
11. Race/Ethnicity (check all that apply) *

- Black or African American
- Hispanic
- White
- Asian
- American Indian or Alaskan native
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Prefer to not answer
- Other: ____________________________

Powered by
Google Forms
Appendix D – Focus Group Protocols

Large Group Session

Good morning, and welcome to our Focus Group session. I would like to thank East Upper & Lower Schools for hosting us today. In the event of an emergency, please exit the building through the nearest doorway. Restrooms can be found across the hall from this Forum room, and in the hallway near the classrooms we will be using. We are members of the Advisory Committee making a recommendation to the Board of Education about whether to establish a military-style academy in Rochester. Mr. Van White, president of the Board of Education, asked us to gather information from community residents about your thoughts related to the proposed school. The Board wants to know whether this proposal is feasible in the Rochester City School District. We are having discussions with multiple groups this morning.

Introduce Mr. Van White and ask him to say a few words of welcome.....

You are here because you responded to the community survey and indicated that you would like to be part of a more in depth discussion about the issue. You are all members of the Rochester community and your input is very valuable to us.

Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers but rather differing points of view. Please feel free to share your point of view even if it differs from what others have said. Keep in mind that we’re just as interested in your concerns as your supportive comments, and at times the concerns are the most helpful.

The group leaders will review the guidelines for participation when you get into your breakout sessions. Your discussion should take approximately one hour. When your group finishes, you are free to go. If you are waiting for people from other focus groups, you may wait in the main atrium by the security desk.

To find the rooms for your focus group, please follow the signs in the hallways directing you to the D wing.

Thank you for participating in the discussions today. We are looking forward to hearing your input.
Small Group Sessions

Good morning, and thank you for coming to participate today. My name is _______________________, and my assistant is _______________________. This group is the _______________________________. Is everyone in the right place? If not, you can step out into the hall and someone will help direct you to the proper room.

You’ll notice we are recording the session today because we don’t want to miss any of your comments. People often say very helpful things in these discussions and we can’t write fast enough to get them all down. We will be on a first name basis today, and we won’t use any names in our reports. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The reports will go back to the advisory committee staff to help them in the recommendation to the Board of Education.

I will quickly review the guidelines for our discussion, and then we will get started.

- There are no right or wrong answers, only differing points of view
- We are recording, so one person speaking at a time
- We are on a first name basis
- You don’t need to agree with others, but please listen respectfully as others share their views
- We ask that you turn off your cell phones. If you cannot and if you must respond to a call, please step out of the room into the hallway as quietly as possible and rejoin us as quickly as you can.
- My role as moderator will be to guide the discussion
- You will talk to each other

Let's begin. We've given you name tags to wear to help us remember each other's names. Let's find out some more about each other by going around the room. Tell us your first name and where you went to high school.

See your specific stakeholder group protocol for questions .... Remember to keep the discussion moving and try to get every person to give their opinion on each question. Probe simple answers by asking “why”, or asking people to elaborate on their response (“can you tell me a little more about that?”). You should be aiming to complete the discussion in 60 minutes.

As the final question, ask:

Is there anything additional you would like us to know that you have not had a chance to talk about today?
Parent Group questions

What do you think the advantages would be to opening this kind of school in the Rochester area?

What concerns would you have about opening a military school in the Rochester City School District and the Monroe County area?

Imagine your child attending a military academy…. How do you think your child would be affected?

Do you think the decision to choose a school like this should be made by the student, the parent, or both? What if the parent wanted the student to attend but the student was reluctant, or vice versa?

Do you think a school like this should involve some kind of compact that parents, students and the school sign spelling out the expectations and obligations?

As a parent, what educational focus would you want in a school like this? For instance, would you want to see a rigorous college prep curriculum with AP and dual college credit classes, or perhaps a vocational training focus? Would you want to see a CTE (career and technical education) track?

CTE studies are organized in New York in the following content areas:

- Agricultural education
- Business & Marketing education
- Family & Consumer Sciences education
- Health Occupations education
- Technology education
- Trade, Technical & Industrial education
A military school would almost certainly involve uniforms for students. What is your opinion about that? If uniforms are required, do you think parents should be required to pay for some or all of the uniform costs?

One of the main characteristics of a military school is generally strict discipline. What would you want this to look like? If it involved physical tasks such as push ups or walking tours after school for tardiness to class, how would you feel about that?

What after school and extracurricular activities would you be interested in seeing?
**Community Resident group questions**

What advantages do you think there would be to the community if a military school opened in Rochester?

What concerns would you have about opening a military school in the Rochester City School District and the Monroe County area?

As a taxpayer, how would you feel about your tax money supporting such a school?

What location or area of the city do you think would be best for this type of a school?

How would you feel about having a school like this located in your neighborhood?
Education Community questions

What benefits do you think a military school would bring to RCSD? The Monroe County area as a whole?

What concerns would you have about opening a military school in the Rochester City School District and the Monroe County area?

What educational focus would you want in a school like this? What types of course beyond the core academics and military training would you want to see (i.e. AP/college credit/ CTE/ vocational/ electives)?

What extracurricular activities would you want to see included?

At a military school, structure, orderliness and discipline are emphasized. If that structure included uniforms for teachers, how would you feel about it? What would be an acceptable uniform – military-like dress, civilian dress but uniform, other?

Knowing that discipline and structure are an expected part of a military school, what do you envision this looking like? What are your concerns with this model? What would you like about this?

How likely do you think educators would be to participate in extracurricular activities to support the mission of the school?

Do you think educators would support a longer school day or year than is currently offered in RCSD?

Do you think teachers and administrators would be likely to want to teach in a school like this?

If this school opened, do you feel it should be a public school or a charter school?
**Business Community questions**

What benefits do you think a military school would bring to RCSD? The Monroe County area as a whole?

What concerns would you have about opening a military school in the Rochester City School District and the Monroe County area?

Assuming many of the students from a military school would not join the military and may go straight into the workforce, what outcomes and attributes would you expect to see for students of a school like this?

In what ways do you envision business organizations partnering with a school like this? Is there an opportunity for co-op or internship, volunteers, mentors, tutors, guest speakers, field trips?
Military Community questions

What benefits do you think a military school would bring to RCSD? The Monroe County area as a whole?

From your military experience, what would you NOT want to see in a military school in the Rochester area?

What inherent value do you think there is in military-like training, even if students from the school choose not to enter the military?

From your military experience, what are the best ways to develop leadership skills in young people?

How do you see the local military community supporting a school like this?

If students at the school are not cutting it, either behaviorally or academically, what do you think should be done with them?
Church/non-profit/service organization questions

What benefits do you think a military school would bring to RCSD? The Monroe County area as a whole?

What concerns would you have about opening a military school in the Rochester City School District and the Monroe County area?

What outcomes and attributes would you expect to see for students of a school like this?

In what ways do you envision your agencies and organizations partnering with a school like this? Is there an opportunity for service projects, volunteers, mentors, tutors?

Part of the instruction in the JROTC curriculum includes multicultural instruction about different cultures and religions. In the military, it is important to understand the traditions and cultures of the people you are working with, or working against. How do you feel about this type of instruction being included in the curriculum?
Student questions

In your opinion, what is the greatest benefit to military style education?

What concerns would you have about a military school?

If you attended a military-style school, what do you think you would miss from a traditional school?

What extracurricular activities would you want to see offered as part of a school like this?

New students would need to be trained in what to expect and how to behave in a military school. Imagine there was some kind of “boot camp” for incoming students. How would you structure it?

Imagine you were going into 9th grade and you were filling out your selection paper. If this military school was an option, would you rank it in your top 3? Why or why not?

A military school would probably involve wearing some kind of military uniform every day. How would that affect your thinking?

A military school would probably involve physical training beyond the usual physical education requirements. It would probably be based on the activities new military recruits are expected to do, like push ups, sit ups and running a mile in a certain time. How do you feel about that?

Some of the discipline activities in a military school might involve things like doing jumping jacks, push ups, walking tours (laps) for a certain amount of time for misbehavior like being late to class or being rude to a teacher. How would you feel about that? What if it meant you had to come to school on a Saturday to serve your discipline?
Appendix E – Interview Protocol

Special Advisory Committee to Explore Educational Opportunities

Interview Questions
School Board Members, Local Government Leaders, Union Leaders

Interviewer: Thank you for taking the time to meet with me today to discuss the RCSD proposal to open a military school in Rochester. Your input is very valuable to the committee as we work to make a recommendation to the Board of Education. I will ask you a short series of questions, and would like you to respond with any and all thoughts you have related to the question. Your responses will be used only by the committee in making its recommendation to the Board of Education, and will not be released publicly. Before we begin, do you mind if I record our interview for transcription? (If it is ok, start recording. If not, do not record and take notes as completely as possible.)

1. Are you generally in favor of or opposed to the idea of a military school in Rochester? On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being not at all supportive and 5 being completely supportive, where would you rate yourself?

2. For question 2, choose the appropriate option based on their answer to #1.
   a. If you are supportive (4 or 5): Please describe the environment you would expect at the proposed school, and why you are in favor of it.
   b. If you are not supportive (1 or 2): Please describe the environment you would expect at the proposed school, and why you are opposed to it.
   c. If you are neither in favor or opposed (3): Please explain which aspects of the proposed school appeal to you, and which do not appeal to you.

3. Regardless of whether you are in favor of or opposed to the idea, what opportunities do you see for students as a result of this school that do not exist now in RCSD?

4. Regardless of whether you are in favor of or opposed to the idea, what concerns do you have about the proposed military school model?

5. If the committee recommends that the district pursue the military school option, do you feel that the school should be open only to RCSD students, or to students from across the county? What advantages or disadvantages do you foresee? Describe your vision of what that school climate would be like if it included both city and countywide students.

6. If the committee recommends against opening a military school, what other school type options would you like to see considered instead?
Appendix F – Survey Results

Community Survey

Survey results were collected anonymously via a Google Form. Timestamping shows results received between February 22 and March 20, 2016. Results from respondents under 18 years of age were combined with student survey results for analysis purposes. Obvious duplicate results and blank submissions were removed, leaving a total of 653 unique responses.

Demographics

Respondents were 50% male, 49% female and 1% other, including transgender, agender, cis woman, non-binary and prefer not to answer. Forty seven percent of the respondents indicated there were children under the age of 18 living in the household.

Ages of respondents were broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Respondent</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-29 years old</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49 years old</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64 years old</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+ years and over</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Racial/ethnic breakdown of respondents is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Race</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual household income level breakdown of respondents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Household Income</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,001 to $24,999</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highest education level of respondents is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Level</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/technical/vocational training</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 year college graduate (Associate's degree)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year college graduate (Bachelor's degree)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some post graduate study</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents reported living in the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the City of Rochester</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County, outside of the city</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Rochester area, outside of Monroe County</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the Rochester area</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents reported working in the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Location</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the City of Rochester</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Monroe County, outside of the city</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Greater Rochester area, outside of Monroe County</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the Greater Rochester area</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The breakdown of stakeholder groups represented by the survey responses is shown below. The total is greater than 100% because respondents could choose more than one stakeholder group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resident (not a parent)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business community</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit/church/service agency</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Community</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Community</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results
The answers to the main question posed by the survey, should the RCSD offer a military style school, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should RCSD offer a Military style School?</th>
<th>70.3%</th>
<th>459</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more detailed analysis of the response to the main survey question shows the breakdown of responses by residence location as well as by parental status. Of the 70.3% “yes” responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Non-parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the City of Rochester</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County, outside of the city</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Rochester area, outside of Monroe County</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the Rochester area</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 24.3% “no” responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Non-parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the City of Rochester</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County, outside of the city</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Rochester area, outside of</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the Rochester area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 5.4% “undecided” responses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Non-parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the City of Rochester</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County, outside of the city</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Rochester area, outside of</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the Rochester area</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In consideration of enrollment, the respondents were mostly in favor of a regional approach over an RCSD limited school.
A different viewpoint considers the responses of each geographic area separately (on the left the total response from that area, and on the right, only the parents in each area):
A related question asked whether the respondent would enroll their child in a military style school if it was available in RCSD. Of those who reported being a parent, results are shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely no</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 232 parents who would definitely send their child:

- Within the City of Rochester: 39%
- Monroe County, outside of the city: 11%
- Greater Rochester area, outside of Monroe County: 6%
- Outside of the Rochester area: 44%

Of the 174 parents who would definitely not send their child:

- Within the City of Rochester: 61%
- Monroe County, outside of the city: 32%
- Greater Rochester area, outside of Monroe County: 6%
- Outside of the Rochester area: 1%

Of the 96 undecided parents:

- Within the City of Rochester: 54%
- Monroe County, outside of the city: 4%
- Greater Rochester area, outside of Monroe County: 35%
- Outside of the Rochester area: 7%
To determine exactly where the interest in military school enrollment was emanating from, self-reported home zip code data was used to create maps indicating numbers of respondents who answered “definitely yes” to whether they would send their child to the school. Maps were created using [www.easymapmaker.com](http://www.easymapmaker.com). The maps below show different levels of zooming to represent the interest.

*Figure 1 Large scale zoom*

*Figure 2 Regional Scale zoom*
Figure 3 Monroe County zoom

Figure 4 City level zoom
Answers to the open-ended survey questions revealed much about the respondents’ thoughts and attitudes related to the proposed military school. In answer to the question “In thinking about a military academy, what benefits, positives or opportunities do you believe exist?”, a word frequency analysis resulted in the following words and phrases expressed most often.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of occurrence</th>
<th>Word or phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Discipline/self-discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>structure/ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Respect/ respect for others (8) / respect for authority (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>None/no benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>opportunity/ies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Work ethic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Physical fitness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sense of belonging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selected key phrases used in expressing the benefits of a military school included the following direct quotes:

“The benefits of helping to create US citizens who take pride in their neighborhood, community, country and world.”

“Better education, better preparation for college, better training for life.”

“Give kids with less options and troubled students a structure they can excel and be proud to be a part of rather than dropping out”

“Self discipline should be taught in other venues, not just the home. Students might also see a wider range of options open to them after graduation that might not have been visible in their current school setting.”

“Not for everyone, obviously. But it can be beginnings of a great career path, as well as can be a highly structured environment that can be very good for kids that need it for learning style/behavioral issues.”

“The ability for parents to have more options to choose from which THEY may believe is appropriate for THEIR child”

“I am concerned that people would have the misconception that this prepares a student only for the military. A military academy would prepare them for LIFE.”
“Good to encourage self discipline and intrinsic motivation for students. Expose them to other opportunities that can help them escape poverty.”

“This is a project that the RCSD can’t afford to not do.”

“I’m currently looking for a military school for my son. So it can be wonderful if is here in Rochester.”

“I work with at risk youth in RCSD and would LOVE to see this become an option for your youth!! Would there be a selection process?”

“As a parent who would benefit from this, I pray this comes to pass. It would be a god send for those of us with no options.”

In response to the question “In thinking about a military academy, what concerns or negatives do you have?”, a number of themes emerged.

Pipeline to military/recruiting/limited options for students (~55)

- students will see the military as the only option for their career
- students will not be adequately prepared for college or career other than military
- urban students being targeted by the military

Selection procedures/punishment/students forced to attend/capacity issues (~55)

- students being placed at the school as a punishment for bad behavior by either parents or the district
- strong feeling that students should WANT to be at the school; if students are placed there against their will, a recipe for disastrous results
- not enough seats for all who would want to attend
- not enough students would want to attend to fill it
- what are the criteria? Don’t want it to become an “elite” school

Hazing/bullying/abusive disciplinary tactics (~35)

- hazing by students
- physically/mentally/emotionally abusive tactics by staff

Funding and costs associated with such a school (~30)

- money better spent elsewhere
- objections to any spending related to military in schools
- costs for JROTC instructors and program in general
- taking money away from other options

Equal opportunities – females, students with disabilities (~15)

- clear preference by majority for co-educational school
- inclusion of students with disabilities – equal opportunities
Weapons/guns (~10)

- discomfort with any training in weapons use
- school would teach students to use firearms – could then use in community

Oversight – who is in charge? (~10)

- suggestion of an “office of integrity”
- who will maintain control over excessive military tactics
- who will assure that academics are up to par?

Interference by RCSD/School Board/parents into school operations (~10)

- desire to allow school the freedom to operate according to the military model without undue interference
- fear that district will impede the very thing that would make this school different

Curriculum focus, including arts and creativity (~10)

- overemphasis on military culture to the exclusion of arts and creativity
- what will the academic focus be?

Need for social emotional supports (~5)

No concerns: a large number of people indicated no concerns (~200).

Selected key phrases used in expressing concerns about a military school included the following direct quotes:

“A military type school may not be right for every child - especially ones with some sort of disability.”

“any internal punishments should be closely monitored”

“Children in this city don't need anymore instruction on violence and control. They need chances to be artistic and explore their own potential.”

“Concern that people think military based school are for troubled inner city children which is a bias and far from the truth”

“Concerned that it will not have enough academic rigor and will not lead to good outcomes for students who decide to not enlist in the military; concerned that spots will not be prioritized to students who need the structure (i.e. have poor home life); concerned that an insular culture could lead to hazing, bullying and other violence”

“Could counsel out underperformers/ problem students- should not receive public funds unless all students (inc. special needs) are included, and could not be filtered out to public schools”

“Creating additional pipelines for youth to enter the military industrial complex. Also, military schools have a lot of history engaging in physical and sexual abuse.”
“Economic mobility for Rochester’s youth should not involve a pipeline to be put in danger overseas.”

“Educators with think they are all-knowing sending kids there as punishment rather than making it a choice”

“For many children that would benefit from this style of education, there are likely significant issues or situations in their personal lives that may directly conflict with successful school performance. If efforts aren't made to address these concerns while providing this structure, the chances of success for those students will be greatly reduced”

“I'd be concerned about this being seen as an opportunity to place troubled youth in order to fix the behavioral ills of the district, similar to what has been done in the past with alternative school programs. This should be an elective place that students and parents WANT and DECIDE to place a child, and NOT a dumping ground for children that cannot control themselves in a school environment.”

“It should not just be focused entirely on military. Sure, if military is the end goal, this would be a great way to get the student pointed in that direction. However, there should be a depth of teaching, in a military-type environment, that would help the student to become well-rounded in all aspects, not just military. The student should not be negatively affected if military career (ie, signing up for service while in high school) is not sought after.”

“Lack of buy-in for the population you would want to target”

“Limiting students at a young age to the perception that they are military bound and potentially closing off other options”

“Military culture is very sexist and homophobic, in addition to being inherently violent. It's not something I believe our culture should admire and romanticize the way we do. I'm also concerned that "military-style" discipline would create a prison-like setting. And for that to be something that we as a district celebrate--and other schools within the district to decide to emulate--is troubling to me.”

“Needs good oversight to also provide the nurturing needed for age and stage”

“Not everyone who needs this type of education will take advantage of it.”

“Only allowing certain children to attend and "cherry picking" only students that will definitely conform to the structure of the school. I believe that all students should have an equal opportunity to enroll and attend. Students that do not conform to other school settings and have behavioral situations should be greatly encouraged to attend.”

“Opportunity for abuse and turning it into a recruitment mill instead of a school.”

“Pigeon-holing students of color, with disabilities, or from low-income backgrounds into the military field”

“That already disadvantaged children are being prepped for military service and made ripe for military recruiters vs. college recruiters or job recruiters. We can have a disciplined school WITHOUT militarism.”

“The model is too focused on conformity and tradition, making it an archaic hiccup in 21st century education. We need to build schools that foster autonomy, get youth
involved in their communities and their interests, and prepare students to create any path they desire after graduation. We should not limit the scope of youth and stunt the development of youth by funneling them through military academy.”

A number of people expressed negative feelings about the military in general, and as a result, lack of support for this type of school. (~40) Many of these people were quite vehement in their opposition to the proposal, as evidenced by the following direct quotes:

“In a world where success is increasingly linked with creativity, independent thought, science, and enlightenment, the thought of a "school" which emphasizes drudgery, authoritarianism, and dogma is repugnant. In a world so in need of understanding, cooperation, and love, the thought of a "school" which promotes xenophobia, hatred, and violence is unthinkable.”

“More efficiently siphoning children from poor communities and communities of color into an organization that uses them as cannon fodder in savage wars against innocent civilians in order to further benefit the wealthy. To create such a school would be not only egregiously immoral, but also fiscally foolish. The Department of Defense if one of the most well-funded organizations in the history of humanity. If they want a military academy here then they should pay for every single dollar of it, not leech money from our woefully underfunded school system.”

“My concern is that we are continuing to push the military industrial complex on the minds of our youth. They need to understand that military ultimately leads to war and death. Indoctrinating them before they are capable of making a rational decision about this negative and tyrannical US military regime is a disservice to the students and our country.”

“I will organize and protest such a school.”

Some common assumptions that were stated multiple times included the idea that the school would be (or should be) a boarding school, the idea that the school would not follow standard academic curriculum, and that only military (uncertified) personnel would be instructors.

**Student surveys**

Student surveys were distributed to Rochester City School District middle and high schools through principals, as well as to Monroe County school districts through superintendents and to private and charter schools through school leaders. Survey results were obtained between February 22 and March 16, 2016 from RCSD schools. No results were obtained from county or private/charter schools. Some students provided input via the larger community survey. Those results were culled from the community survey and combined with the student surveys.
Demographics
Approximately 200 student responses were received. Student survey respondents were 53% male, 46% female and 1% other. Of the responses, 67% were from high school students, and 33% from middle school students. Racial/ethnic breakdown of respondents is (students could select more than one category):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Native American</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 30% of students reported having an immediate family member serving in the military, but 53% reported having a close friend or family member currently serving or having formerly served in the military.

Results
The answers to the main question posed by the survey, “Do you think that a military school should be offered as an option in RCSD?” were as follows:
When asked about enrollment, student response indicated:

Students were also polled on whether the proposed school should be single gender or co-ed.

Finally, students were polled on whether they would have wanted to apply to a military style school, if it had been available as an option when they were selecting a school. Results were as follows:
Appendix G – Focus Group Results

**Parent Focus Group:** The parent group consisted of all women with male children. Two were city parents and one was a suburban parent. The discussion was summarized by the facilitators as being lively with more discussion of the concerns than the pros of the school. The overall tone was described as mixed, leaning toward “against” due to opposition to war in general and use of weapons in any form within the school. One parent seemed to make a connection between crime and the military. Another parent had a pro-military stance, and expressed concerns about selection process (what are the entrance specifications?), noting that she wouldn’t want everyone to get in but did not want to see a waiting list either. Parents were clear that they felt students should want to be at the school, and should be fully informed about the expectations before signing up. One parent expressed that she liked the idea of the strictness, comradery and knowledge that would be part of the school. Concerns were expressed about the credentials of the teachers and whether they would be military only or certified content teachers. All three parents were not knowledgeable about the military structure and options (JROTC, ROTC, different branches of the service, active duty vs. National Guard and Reserves, etc.)

**Student Focus Group:** The student focus group consisted of eleven students, most of whom were JROTC cadets from the two JROTC programs in RCSD. One student was from an RCSD school without JROTC but who is doing her senior project on her desire to implement JROTC within her school. The focus group was definitely biased toward a pro-military slant. Unsurprisingly, the group agreed that a military school would be a good thing, citing the discipline, and the unity of purpose in being there as long as students chose to be there. Discussion about an incoming student “boot camp” of sorts revealed ideas about how to structure it so the students would understand what they were getting into without scaring them off. A desire was expressed that is not be “all serious, all the time” and that there be some fun days, dress down days, and opportunities for normal teenage fun.

**Military Community Focus Group:** The military focus group consisted of six military or retired military members, all male. Unsurprisingly, this group was unanimously in favor of a military school. The group clearly felt that the discipline and structure of the military environment would be beneficial, though they cautioned against overly harsh disciplinary tactics and “hazing” type behaviors. Discussion focused on correcting and retraining behaviors rather than exclusion of students not living up to standards. There was generally agreement that the school should be all-inclusive in terms of types and backgrounds of
students, though with mixed opinions on segregation by gender for classes. The group felt that a mix of suburban and urban students would be mutually beneficial and may provide networking opportunities for future life options.

**Education Community Focus Group:** The education focus group consisted of five educators from various schools and backgrounds. Overall, the group was mixed to positive in their opinion about a military school. In general, educators are interested in students having choices and options, but are concerned about the RCSD track record of trying different things only to give them up and move on to something else. The group would like to see less focus on standardized testing. The educators had a belief that this would be a school that was primarily a feeder to the military. The concept of it being a boarding school came up multiple times.

**Business Community Focus Group:** This group consisted of three men from various business backgrounds. Overall, the group was mixed to positive in support of a military school. The group had concerns about how admissions would be handled, and stressed that there should be voluntary enrollment by the student rather than punishment or being forced to attend. The group was interested in moving away from standardized testing and into a more experiential/discovery based curriculum. Other concerns included labeling of students and disciplinary policies. The group acknowledged that family support would be an integral part of making the school successful while noting that family support is often lacking within the city community. This will be a challenge to address.

**Community Residents (non-parent) Focus Group:** This group consisted of six individuals who were community members, but not parents. Overall, the group was not favorable to the idea of a military school, with the exception of one person. The group was concerned about the lack of diversity among the people in the focus group discussions. Overall, there was more support for expanding options for creativity and community service. Concerns were expressed about taking students out of the community (into the military) and send them into harm’s way. Most of the group members would not be in favor of this school being located in their community, and questioned why this is being proposed in the city and not in suburban communities. Much of the discussion focused on topics around education but unrelated to the military school itself.
One group member stated that seeing the JROTC cadets in uniform standing at ease in the hallway made her uncomfortable, and commented “they shouldn't be acting like that”.

**Church/non-profit/community agency Focus Group:** This group included just two young men. Overall, the feeling of the group was neutral, neither supportive nor opposed to the idea. The individuals wished there had been more information shared about the proposal for the school (structure, curriculum, etc) so that they would respond to the specifics. They were interested in knowing how the school would be run and how the students would be selected, as well as whether the main focus would be on military discipline or academics.
Appendix H – Interviews

Interview 1: Union leader
Interview 2: Union Leader
Interview 3: Union Leader
Interview 4: Urban Suburban Program Leader
Interview 5: Union Leader
Interview 6: Rochester Business Community Leader
Interview 7: Rochester Business Community Leader
Interview 8: RCSD Upper Level District Administrator
Interview 9: RCSD School Level Leaders
Interview 10: Rochester Community Leader
Community Leader Interviews

Interview One - Union Leader

Descriptive Statements:

Supportive rating is 5

Wonderful idea. I would describe the environment as having a rigid structure.

I am concerned with what happens to our schools if this doesn’t work. District schools are bad now. What is going to happen if this doesn’t work?

Another concern is who is going to signup for this type of school?

My greatest fear is what is going to happen with kids that have great issues. There must be structure.

My rating is neutral (3 on scale from 1 being not at all supportive and 5 being completely supportive) because I don’t know very much about what a military school is or how it operates.

We must have a pleasant environment. There should be discipline, but supportive.

Expectations are that the military school will be clean. Cleanliness with a caring environment.

There should be self-worth and values. Kids these days don’t have values, but the military may instill self-values through this type of school.

This school will provide greater opportunities.

In the military, kids will be marching. Younger kids march, but not that they are a child, but better a part of something.

Principals will obtain respect by kids standing at attention as opposed to other schools.

The administration should have tours of the school after it starts to inform parents. More then simple open houses, this military school should have many tours of the campus so that parents can be informed and stay informed about the school and what it does.

Students at a military school should do more listening then talking. Start a dialog with parents everyone will have something to contribute.

There must be a measurable difference over time because this school is going to be a change.

This school should not be limited to just RCSD. It will be so awesome that everyone should come. Just like church, all are welcome!

There should be no boundaries for this school.

This school should have a pleasant environment. This makes you want to come.

Staff should be able to resolve issues before it gets to the administrative level. Military staff should be men-of-their-word.
Community Leader Interviews

Interview Two - Union Leader

Descriptive Statements:

Supportive rating is 4.

The expectations I would have for the military school is structured, respectful for leadership and peers.

Apathy and respecting the values of others is another expectation.

Attention to the idea that the environment may create anxiety. We need to make sure everyone is okay.

Highly engaged a structural would be words that I would use to describe the expectations of this school.

I have little contact with military people. My only contact is with an uncle in WWII. Other then that my contact is with friends of my children.

The military schools are good for students who need structure. For some kinds of kids this can be a major success story.

I think this military school can be for everybody. It is for everybody! My children’s friends entered the military at a late age. After exhausting other things, the military is what he decided upon. That’s what it took. He thought that the military would be a different world. So he did it and it was the step he needed to experience.

The male brain is less mature so the military was a different experience for him after exhausting other things.

Career opportunities for young kids- now that’s what we need. Kids need the opportunity to enter a career after high school. They need to graduate high school and have a career. Military schools will provide an “eye opening” enlightenment. They are going to give the military some thought at this school.

Urban kids do not have a close tie to the military so having a military school will provide a tie-in.

Some concerns that I would have revolve around the military school NOT being exclusive to JROTC. The ideas must be inclusive for everyone.

Resources at large- The resources need to be there and need to be for all kids.

The military school concept should retain seats for a majority of kids. I am not opposed to have kids attend from all over Monroe County.

The advantages of drawing kids from all over Monroe County is that there should always be a mix of kids from different poverty levels and different backgrounds etc. There are no disadvantages.
Community Leader Interviews

Interview Three- Union Leader

**Descriptive Statements:**

Supportive rating is 4 or 5.

The expectations are that it will be co-educational.

Girls are tougher than males. Girls are very hard to teach and discipline.

Expectations are that this school is not just for behavioral issues, there should be a mix.

There should be good peer influence in such a school.

The opportunity is that kids may be more likely to go into the military.

This school could be a greater connection with emergency preparedness occupations, police, fire community government.

There should be a family atmosphere allowing them to be part of a group- part of something bigger.

There should be a life-line of hope.

There should be a balance of structure- there should be a time for “we love you” but also a time for tough discipline- a time for everything.

Choices, the more choices the better.

If we are going to have a military academy, it should be structured very structured.

The younger the students are, the better from the start.

Boarding school option should be considered. If they are going to do this, let’s do a boarding school.

My concern is that we must educate parents about this. How are we going to inform and train parents. Parents will need to “step-up” at a military school.

How will the staffing be offered? Are the teachers that apply going to be trained to teach and be in a military environment?

What will be the selection requirements for students and teachers?

How will students be dismissed from the school or expelled? How will students at a military school be asked to leave?

You should promote the military school to elementary students (6th Grade) so there will be an expectation of what the military school is all about and the students and families may look forward to this different experience.
Community Leader Interviews

Interview Four - Urban Suburban Program

Descriptive Statements:

Supportive rating is 3.

My kids were never given the opportunity to attend a military school, but they had a positive experience with friends.

My assumption of a military school is that it will provide discipline.

The military school will be a better option then going to jail.

It will be effective in making a man out of them.

The appeal will be discipline.

I define discipline as time management, study, and listening to somebody (authority).

It will give them life skills.

I would also include in the definition of discipline, physical fitness.

My concern is that if a student does decide to go and it gets too hard for them, what happens? What happens to them and how does that impact. So, what would happen?

What safety net will be in place to if the program doesn’t work out for them?

I think that the RCSD already offers a huge amount of programs for each student. The problem is that the Parents don’t know what will work the best for their own child. One size does not fit all. So the concern is that parents may not be engaged with the child and may not know what is best for their child.

If parents don’t know their child, then they will not know where to send their child.

Parents need to be involved.

The RCSD needs supports in place to help target where their kid should go- is it the arts, music, culinary arts etc. ? It doesn’t work without parental support.

School teachers and all school personnel are doing too much for parents and their kids. Parents need to get involved. “what are you going to do Parents?” So we may be doing too much for parents.

The more you do, the less the parents will do.

The trades are missing within the Suburban schools. Suburban schools in the surrounding area are concerned more with graduation rates and future 4 year college attendance. So this may change as we adopt the military school.
Community Leader Interviews

Union Leadership Interview

**Descriptive Statements:**
Supportive rating is 3
I like choice, discipline
Can negotiate a contract within the school, if 80% of the teachers find it beneficial
Creating a military school may be a good idea
Must help address the district's achievement problem

**Coding Key Words:**
choice
discipline
negotiate a contract
achievement problem
Community Leader Interviews

Rochester Business Community Leader Interview

Descriptive Statements:

Supportive rating is 5
Union has lots of control
Great concept
Secure as much time as possible - it will take about five years to turn the culture
Principal needs operational control - do not say you're going to lead by title only
Flexibility in facility, work hours, parent involvement
You want veterans in the school district
Build job skills job
Give experience
Give them a tablet - be technology focused
Involve the board curriculum
Physical fitness training is key
Find a bunch of success stories
Summer program – must have involvement - Williams program
Give a clear path of future options
Make it exciting
Crossroad Park has lots of building space
Make this a place everyone wants to come to
West Point

Coding Key Words:

union
exciting place
summer program
physical fitness
job skills
flexibility
control
Community Leader Interviews

Rochester Business Community Leader Interview

**Descriptive Statements:**

Supportive rating is 3

Field trips to Rochester Institute of Technology, U of R – spend time on the campus

SAT Prep

Farash Charitable Foundation Grants

Mindful meditation

Yale connection

Steal the best when you visit other schools, visit Chicago

Business community realizes quality education of charter schools

Focus on time management, study skills and test taking

Charter schools are not restrained by tenure, unions or seniority

Students at failing schools should get preference

**Coding Key Words:**

RIT & U of R

SAT Prep

Business community

Charter schools not restrained
Community Leader Interviews

RCSD District Level Leader Interview

**Descriptive Statements:**
Supportive rating is 5
People chose schools based on the sense of community more than more the curriculum
Have to build the sense of community
Keeping things general, try to find a good middle ground for the kids
School within a school
Create ramps for kids to move towards once they are grounded in the school, give the options, get some general experiences and slow them down to make turns within the same school
You get bigger than 400 you can't stay tight 100-125 per grade level max
Giving a sense of future and purpose
What are the outcomes, the draw for students and parents - RIT feeders, college credits, ASVAB, SAT...some kind of outcome on state tests
Not a fan of application process, the neediest are deselected as the process is difficult to navigate through, selection part of summer program to select in
Take a planning year. Hire your principal well ahead of time.
Leadership and technology are key goals, you can build a culture around them, not so much robotics
When team teaching you will teach at the lowest common denominator
Have your SME’s teach with strong support as needed, provide a boost to the teacher
If you utilize dual leadership you need one boss, a principal, commandant leads military education

**Coding Key Words:**
Sense of community
ramps for kids
application process
outcomes
100-125 per grade level
team teaching
one boss
Community Leader Interviews

RCSD School Leaders Interview

**Descriptive Statements:**
Supportive rating is 5
Principal handling school, Commandant runs military programs for Principal
Dual teaching - could increase student ratio
Selection process for teachers, military instructors, students
Love competitions
All male recommendation
Success and retention rate
Teacher morale would go up
Setting standard early
Uniform - kiss, B’s one day
Work with neighborhoods around the schools

**Coding Key Words:**
principal
dual teaching
competitions
all male
teacher morale
neighborhoods
Community Leader Interviews

Rochester City Government Leader Interview

Descriptive Statements:
Supportive rating is 5
Would rather family courts (pins) students be brought into the program, not just the elite
Focus on kids in 6th and 7th grade who may show signs of problems
Don't want it to become school just for the elite
Recondition a person till they are successful
District Charter School is an option - still maintain funding, but get flexibility
Location option old School Without Walls building- on Clinton – Owned by the City, run by the RCSD
Wonderful idea.

Coding Key Words:

wonderful
firm
supportive
## DISCUSSION

### RCSD PUBLIC SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Own BEDS code</td>
<td>✓ Accountability system could lead to closure if school falls into accountability status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Autonomy</td>
<td>✓ Number of Students to enroll?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Sense of Identity</td>
<td>✓ Difficult to get buy-in for a stand-alone if no current record of success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Access to Independent Facility</td>
<td>✓ Limited Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Location on a district campus</td>
<td>✓ Shared campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Gain recognition as an outstanding public school in the RCSD portfolio of schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DISCUSSION - STAND-ALONE RCSD PROGRAM SCHOOL

**EX. ALL CITY HIGH SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ Psychology of identity and allegiance to the “Roots” of the home school</td>
<td>✔ Identity formation can be challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ At start-up, allows students to maintain identity with a home school</td>
<td>✔ Demographics/rivalries between areas of the city “gangs” or territories ...can happen when students draw from all around the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Enrollment</td>
<td>Suburban-Urban Grant: West Irondequoit, Brighton, Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Simplify the enrollment process</td>
<td>• Pre-K plans for Suburban-Urban Programming: McKinney Vento- Funding- Could it support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Allow for wider canvassing of students from the entire city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Common interest in military education and strong discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Public relations: Presents as an inclusive school for all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Any student who wants this opportunity could participate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DISCUSSION - CHARTER SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ Autonomy/Identity</td>
<td>✔ Building location: Must seek, find, lease or own and pay from per pupil aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Buffalo Model exists as a prototype</td>
<td>✔ Pay retirement (no TRS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Hiring and Scheduling autonomy</td>
<td>✔ Staffing: novice teaching staff, high turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ Flexibility over curricular programming and school day</td>
<td>✔ Funding limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Removes resources and students from the RCSD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J – JROTC Planning Worksheet

**EVALUATION WORKSHEET**

**POTENTIAL ARMY JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM**

For use of this form, see AR 1-65-2; the proponent agency is DODPER.

The public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average one hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provisions 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. Send your form to the appropriate DOD Agency.

Where insufficient space is provided on this form to record complete observations, comments or recommendations, additional blank sheets will be used identifying item by corresponding number.

### 1. SCHOOL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. NAME OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>b. ADDRESS OF SCHOOL (P.O. Box must also provide a street address for mailing purposes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2. SUPERINTENDENT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Name</th>
<th>j. Telephone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 3. PRINCIPAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i. Name</th>
<th>j. Telephone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 4. GRADE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Estimated JROTC Enrollment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n. HAS THE SCHOOL EVER APPLIED FOR A JROTC PROGRAM SUPPORTED BY ANOTHER SERVICE?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF SO, WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THAT APPLICATION?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p. HAS A JROTC PROGRAM EVER BEEN DISSOLVED AT THIS SCHOOL?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF SO, WHEN AND WHY.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. TYPE OF COMMUNITY</th>
<th>b. SIZE OF COMMUNITY</th>
<th>c. ARE STUDENTS BUSED?</th>
<th>d. ARE THERE ANY PROBLEMS RELATIVE TO AVAILABILITY OF HOUSING FOR INSTRUCTORS?</th>
<th>e. WILL JROTC INSTRUCTORS BE PERMITTED TO CONDUCT RECRUITING VISITS TO Feeder SCHOOLS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f. NUMBER OF JROTC UNITS IN THE CITY/DISTRICT</th>
<th>g. SPECIFY SERVICES OF JROTC UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### EVALUATION WORKSHEET POTENTIAL ARMY JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM (Continued)

#### FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dedicated Use of Classrooms</th>
<th>Shared Classrooms</th>
<th>Administrative Office Space</th>
<th>Dedicated Use of Classrooms</th>
<th>Shared Classrooms</th>
<th>Administrative Office Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Proximity to the remainder of the school and to other JROTC areas</td>
<td>b. Noise control</td>
<td>c. Maintenance of facilities</td>
<td>d. Storage area for training aids</td>
<td>e. Lighting</td>
<td>f. Telephone available to JROTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Type and condition of furniture</td>
<td>h. Size</td>
<td>i. Construction</td>
<td>j. Construction</td>
<td>k. Security considerations</td>
<td>l. Environmental considerations - heat, humidity, seepage, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### c. SUPPLY STORAGE AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Size</th>
<th>(2) Proximity to other JROTC areas</th>
<th>(9) Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) Environmental considerations - heat, humidity, seepage, etc.</td>
<td>(5) Security considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### a. ARMS STORAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Describe existing facility area</th>
<th>(2) List modification required</th>
<th>(3) Proximity to other JROTC areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### d. MAINSHIPSHIP FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Describe existing facility area</th>
<th>(2) List modification required</th>
<th>(3) Proximity to other JROTC areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### g. DRILL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Outside</th>
<th>(2) Inside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### f. If an area is not currently available, describe plan to overcome method of funding and timeline for completion:

- (4) If a facility is not currently available, describe plan to meet the maintenance, tracking and competition portion of the program, to include funding, timeline for completion, paint or rifle program.

#### h. LIMITATION ON USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Surface conditions</th>
<th>(2) Limitations on use (e.g., gym shoes, rifles prohibited, area available)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**EVALUATION WORKSHEET POTENTIAL ARMY JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ARE THE FACILITIES COMPLETELY IDENTIFIED BY THE SCHOOL ON THE DA FORM 3126?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. MAY INSTRUCTORS RENOVATE FACILITIES IF REQUIRED?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECTED SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. IS A RIFLE RANGE A PART OF THE SCHOOL FACILITY?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF NOT, WHERE IS THE RANGE WHICH WILL BE USED FOR JROTC MARKSMANSHIP INSTRUCTION AND RIFLE TEAM PRACTICE (include on DA Form 3126)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. WILL THE SCHOOL PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION TO/FROM THE RANGE DURING REGULAR SCHOOL HOURS, AT ITS OWN EXPENSE (include on DA Form 3126)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WILL SCHOOL PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION AT ITS OWN EXPENSE, FOR JROTC ACTIVITIES such as parades, color guard, rifle matches, AWOLAway FROM THE MAIN CAMPUS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN WHAT RADIUS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WILL SELECTED RIFLE TEAM/DYDRILL TEAM MEMBERS BE AWARDED A SCHOOL LETTER?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. DO SCHOOL OFFICIALS UNDERSTAND THE PROCEDURES FOR PAYMENT/REIMBURSEMENT OF JROTC INSTRUCTORS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WHAT LENGTH CONTRACT WILL JROTC INSTRUCTORS BE OFFERED?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. WILL THE SCHOOL PAY JROTC INSTRUCTORS THE MINIMUM, OR DOES THE SCHOOL SYSTEM HAVE PAY SCALES ABOVE THOSE FIGURES?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. WILL THE SCHOOL PAY JROTC INSTRUCTORS FOR COACHING DUTIES (like army teams)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. WILL THE JROTC DEPARTMENT BEALLOCATED A PORTION OF THE SCHOOL'S BUDGET?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHAT IS THE ESTIMATED ANNUAL FIGURE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. WILL CREDIT BE AWARDED FOR JROTC PARTICIPATION?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW MUCH PER YEAR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILL THIS CREDIT COUNT TOWARD GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. WILL JROTC INSTRUCTORS BE REQUIRED TO MEET CERTAIN STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. WILL JROTC INSTRUCTORS BE REQUIRED TO JOIN A TEACHERS UNION?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EVALUATION WORKSHEET: POTENTIAL ARMY JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM (Continued)

#### 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>RECOMMEND IMMEDIATE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ARMY JROTC UNIT AT THIS SCHOOL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>THE SCHOOL DOES NOT PRESENTLY HAVE ALL REQUIRED FACILITIES AVAILABLE, BUT SCHOOL AUTHORITIES HAVE AGREED TO PROVIDE SUCH FACILITIES BEFORE OR DURING THE FIRST YEAR OF JROTC TRAINING, WITHIN THE TIMETABLE SPECIFIED BELOW. RECOMMEND IMMEDIATE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ARMY JROTC UNIT AT THIS SCHOOL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>RECOMMEND AGAINST ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ARMY JROTC UNIT AT THIS SCHOOL FOR THE REASONS SPECIFIED BELOW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>IS SCHOOL ENROLLMENT APPROACHING CAPACITY? (Explain economic plans in remarks.) YES NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>LIST VOCATIONAL ELECTIVES AND EVALUATE THE POTENTIAL OF A JROTC PROGRAM TO COMPETE FOR A CROSS SECTION OF THE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT. (Details in remarks.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>REMARKS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. EVALUATING OFFICER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE NAME AND TITLE</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PAGE 4, DA FORM 7410, MAR 2000
The following agreement and information is to be considered as part of this contract

Agreement regarding facilities to be provided for the use of the National Defense Cadet Corps program, without expense to the Department of the Army.

The authorities of the above-named institution agree that the facilities specified below shall be furnished for the use of the N DCC program, without expense to the Department of the Army (please check "as needed" or "as required" as will not be used in describing the following):

### Room and Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Exclusive or Joint Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Storage rooms, particularly for clothing and small articles of equipment, must be adequately lighted and ventilated and be provided with shelving, cabinets, and locked armories. Windows must be securely barred and shore reinforced and filled with cylinder locks.

### Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF ROOMS</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>EXCLUSIVE OR JOINT USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Classrooms must be adequately lighted and ventilated and provided with standard equipment. If so use is specified, rooms must be available for Army ROTC classes when scheduled.

### Assembly Hall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEATING CAPACITY</th>
<th>PROJECTOR EQUIPMENT</th>
<th>WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR NDCC CLASSROOMS AS FOLLOW:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gymnasium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF GYM OR OTHER RECREATION AREA</th>
<th>WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR NDCC CLASSROOMS AS FOLLOW:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outdoor Drill Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR NDCC CLASSROOMS AS FOLLOW:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Target Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF RING POINTS</th>
<th>WILL BE UNDER JURISDICTION OF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remarks

An original and five copies of this form will be made. One copy will be kept by the institution and the original and four copies will be forwarded as follows:

**1. To Commander, US Army First ROTC Region, Ft Bragg, NC 28010, from those in—**

- Connecticut
- Delaware
- District of Columbia
- Georgia
- Maine
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New York
- North Carolina
- Pennsylvania
- Rhode Island
- South Carolina
- Vermont
- Virginia
- West Virginia

**2. To Commander, US Army Second ROTC Region, Ft Knox, KY 40121, from those in—**

- Alabama
- Florida
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Kentucky
- Louisiana
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- Missouri
- Ohio
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Wisconsin

**3. To Commander, US Army Fourth ROTC Region, Ft Lewis, WA 98430, from those in—**

- American Samoa
- Alaska
- Arizona
- Arkansas
- California
- Colorado
- Guam
- Hawaii
- Idaho
- Iowa
- Kansas
- Louisiana
- Maine
- Montana
- Nebraska
- Nevada
- New Mexico
- New York
- North Carolina
- North Dakota
- Ohio
- Oklahoma
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- Rhode Island
- South Carolina
- South Dakota
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Utah
- Virginia
- Washington
- West Virginia
- Wisconsin
- Wyoming

DA FORM 3128-1, MARCH 2000

APD 1-42/808A
DATA PERTAINING TO SCHOOL

1. TYPE OF SCHOOL (Check appropriate box)
   - MUNICIPAL
   - STATE
   - DENOMINATIONAL (Specify)

2. LIST ACCREDITING AGENCY
   - REGIONAL
   - STATE
   - OTHER

3. TOTAL ENROLLMENT

4. ESTIMATED NO. OF QUALIFIED STUDENTS WHO WILL ENROLL IN
   THE NDCC PROGRAM

5. LIST TECHNICAL COURSES OFFERED AT THE SCHOOL

6. WILL STUDENTS BE GIVEN A MEDICAL EXAMINATION?
   - YES
   - NO

7. A SCHOOL BAND
   - WILL
   - WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE FOR NDCC CIVILIAN USES

DA FORM 3128-1, MARCH 2000
## Appendix L – Staffing Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
<th>YR 1</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
<th>YR 2</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
<th>YR 3</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
<th>YR 4</th>
<th>Projected Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academy Director (Overall leader)</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$132,600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$135,252</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$137,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal - Secondary</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$135,252</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$137,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal - Middle</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$135,252</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$137,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$108,202</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$220,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commandant</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$119,340</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$121,727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$124,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JROTC Instructor (Under JROTC, 50% cost shared by US Army)</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$201,960</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$274,666</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$350,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Instructor (Medal of Honor Instructor, MS level)</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$68,666</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$70,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home School Assistant</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$38,760</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$39,535</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Clerk</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$44,880</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$45,778</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$91,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. School Secretary</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$57,120</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$58,262</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$116,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Assistants</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$32,640</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$65,280</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$33,293</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$99,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Custodian Engineer</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$41,616</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$42,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian Engineer</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$59,160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$60,343</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$61,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Sentry (Crisis Interventionist Model)</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$28,560</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$85,680</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$29,131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$118,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Assistant (1 per core teacher, .3 per other electives and non-core)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$397,800</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$686,664</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$955,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Total Pay</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Total Pay</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Total Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Vocal Music</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$64,260</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Phys Ed</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$64,260</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$131,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Art</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$64,260</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Instr Music</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$64,260</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Technology</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$64,260</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$131,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Business/Marketing</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$64,260</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - English</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$192,780</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$327,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Health</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$32,130</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Foreign Language</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$128,520</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$196,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Math</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$192,780</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$327,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Science</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$128,520</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$262,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Social Studies</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$128,520</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$262,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - ESOL</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$64,260</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$98,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCHR - Special Ed</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$257,040</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$393,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per diem building Teacher</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>42,840</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$42,840</td>
<td>43,697</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$43,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$64,260</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$196,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$18,900</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$32,130</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Social Worker</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$128,520</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$196,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>52,020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$52,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>64,260</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$32,130</td>
<td>65,545</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,893,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,078,870</strong></td>
<td><strong>93.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,309,681</strong></td>
<td><strong>121.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,992,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>247,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>251,940</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>635,684</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>758,764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>919,500</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>1,754,910</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>2,844,974</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3,919,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-teaching Staff</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>201,400</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>282,540</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>576,382</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>748,152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>526,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>789,480</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,252,642</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,566,343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher:student ratio</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>