



May 13, 2008

Dear JROTC Task Force,

We thank Sandra Lam, Kevin Gogin, Kathy Fleming, Barbara Blinik, Peter Hammer, Daisy Santos, and Lori Murakami for the time they shared with us on 4/23/08.

The *Leaders* design team present at the 4/23 meeting included 6 people.

- Peggy Alexander, MA, is a California credentialed high school teacher with over 23 years of curriculum development expertise.
- David Dionisi, CLU, ChFC, CPT, MBA, is a former Army officer and Fortune 500 executive. He is an expert on US and international leadership development.
- Don Forrester, MD is certified by the American Academy of Family Practice and the American College of Physician Executives. He is a health and wellness expert.
- Mary Anne Kirsch, MPS, CPT, is a Life Credential California teacher. Her experience enabled the team to infuse literary strategies throughout the curriculum.
- Jennifer Kocsis is a high school intern. She attended to share her first-hand experience of classes in the *Leaders* program, the leadership skill building community service alternatives, and her service learning experiences.
- Mary Wind, MPA, is the President of the Teach Peace Foundation and she has over 25 years designing and teaching leadership programs.

In addition to the above people that were available to answer questions at the 4/23 meeting, our team has additional experts and even uses some of the same consultants and resources as the JROTC design team. The *Leaders* program is the product of years of work and a significant six-figure investment.

Introduction

In this report, we provide a detailed analysis of the misunderstandings in the evaluation findings. We wish to have a good working relationship with everyone and offer this report to help the talented professionals in the SFUSD and on the JROTC Task Force see program strengths where they previously noted deficiencies.

The following materials were provided to the Curriculum Review team.

- *Program of Instruction*
- *LET 1* textbook
- *Instructor Manual*
- *We the People*
- *Student Leadership Planner*
- *Seeing David in the Stone*
- *The Power of Forgiveness*
- *The Shadow of Hate*
- *The Complete Guide to Service Learning*
- *Voices of Patriots*
- *NEFE High School Financial Planning Program*
- *The Art of Focused Conversation*
- *Whale Rider*
- *Addicted to War*
- *Its My Life*
- *Hope*
- *Bringing Down a Dictator*
- *Strength Through Peace*
- *A Force More Powerful*
- *Voices of a People's History of the United States*
- *A People's History of the United States*
- *First Aid Manual*

The Biggest Misunderstanding

During the 4/23 meeting it was clear to our team that the *Program of Instruction* (the latest version of the POI is maintained online at www.teachpeace.com/Leaders%20Program%20of%20Instruction.pdf) was a document that many Curriculum Review team members had not reviewed. This single document is one of the key resources necessary to evaluate *Leaders*.

Perhaps due to the volume of materials submitted, the *Program of Instruction* was missed as the Curriculum Review evaluation conclusion “no detailed method of classroom delivery were provided at the time of the review” is contradicted by this 100 page document.

The table of contents from page 3 in the *Program of Instruction* is on the following page and illustrates a range of classroom delivery topics.

Program of Instruction Table of Contents

CONTENTS	
Program of Instruction Cover Page.....	4
Preface.....	5
Collaboration, Research, & Best Practice Content Providers.....	5
Course Scope	8
Promotions & Awards.....	12
Organizational Structure	13
Uniforms	15
National & California State Standards	15
Course Prerequisites.....	16
Equivalency Credit	17
Credentialed Instructors.....	18
Special Information	18
How to Use this Curriculum.....	19
What curriculum tools does the Leaders program provide?	21
Training Units & 720 Hour Chart	23
Core or Required Lessons.....	25
Elective Lessons.....	35
Course Descriptions.....	39
Frequently Asked Questions.....	92
Summary.....	99

The *Instructor Manual*, which is over 250 pages, also provides detailed classroom delivery information.

The *Program of Instruction* also addresses many of the other areas noted as “missing” or deficient in the evaluation (e.g., the evaluation finding “uncertain of the research background” used to develop the program is explained in detail on pages 5 to 8).

In addition to the *Program of Instruction* misunderstanding, the evaluation of *Leaders* is fundamentally flawed because the evaluators are unaware that *Leaders* is primarily a leadership development program. The evaluators describe *Leaders* as a peace issues program, missing the robust leadership lessons and the “Leadership” and “Foundations for Success” modules that are in *Leaders*.

A credentialed California instructor, Brad Archer, not affiliated with the Teach Peace Foundation and not conducting the review at our request, wrote:

Two closely-related claims made by the curriculum review committee are that the materials "reflect a common point of view centered on peace," and that "students are engaging in ways to respond to issues only from" a position advocating peace. However, examples refuting these claims abound throughout the Instructor Manual. Much of the material is completely neutral vis- a-vis questions of war and peace. Likewise, students are frequently called upon to consider multiple perspectives and employ keen critical thinking skills.

This independent reviewer makes additional content evaluations based on the "Leaders Education & Training 1" student manual.

Lesson 5, "Your Personal Character," is, if nothing else, a lesson on critical thinking. The lesson focuses on the decision-making processes, and has nothing to do with peace (i.e., "Peace" isn't even mentioned.) It simply addresses which character traits will likely help us succeed.

Lesson 15, "Actions of Successful Leaders, Part 2," focuses on the value of finding common ground with our adversaries. In reinforcing the value of respectful discourse and negotiation, this lesson seems to really promote the consideration of multiple perspectives.

Lesson 20, "Becoming an Active Learner," aims to assist students in the development of critical thinking skills. Students are called on to be critical thinkers by relying on evidence and by developing objective, informed viewpoints.

Lessons 21-27 are politically neutral, have nothing to do with "Peace," and instead focus on brain physiology, learning styles and the development of solid study habits.

Lessons 36-49 deal exclusively with personal health issues, and avoid discussions on conflict and politics. These sections are simply promoting healthy choices and awareness of first aid techniques.

The concrete examples on the following pages illustrating material misunderstandings are provided.

Concrete Example 1: “Leadership” and “Foundation for Success” modules focusing on LET 1 in both programs.

JROTC	Leaders	Source
Leadership (Theory and Application)		
Chapter 1: Being a Leader		
Leadership Defined	Leadership Defined	LET 1
Leadership Reshuffled	Leadership Approaches	LET 1
Leadership from the Inside Out	Leadership from the Inside Out	LET 1
Principles and Leadership	Principles and Leadership	LET 1
Sexual Harassment/Assault	Sexual Harassment/Assault	LET 1
Chapter 2: Leadership Skills		
Steps from the Past	12 Actions of Successful Leaders Part 1 (with Steps from the Past)	LET 1
Roles of Leaders and Followers	12 Actions of Successful Leaders Part 2 (with Roles of Leaders and Followers)	LET 1
Using Your Leadership Skills/Taking Charge	12 Actions of Successful Leaders Part 3 (with Using Your Leadership Skills/Taking Charge)	LET 1
Foundations for Success		
Chapter 1: Know Yourself Socrates		
Self Awareness	Self Awareness	LET 1
Appreciating Diversity	Diversity Challenges & Opportunities	LET 1
Personal Growth Plan	Student Leadership Planner	LET 1
Becoming an Active Learner	Becoming an Active Learner	LET 1

Chapter 2: Learning to Learn		
Brain Structure and Function	Human Nervous System and Function	LET 1
Left Brain/Right Brain	Left Brain/Right Brain	LET 1
Learning Style and Processing Preferences	Learning Style and Processing Preferences	LET 1
Multiple Intelligences	Multiple Intelligences	LET 1
Chapter 3: Study Skills		
Thinking Maps	Leaders Visualization Maps	LET 1
Reading for Meaning	Reading for Meaning	LET 1
Study Habits that Work for You	Study Habits that Work for You	LET 1
Chapter 4: Communication Skills		
The Communication Process	The Communication Process	LET 1
Becoming a Better Listener	Becoming a Better Listener	LET 1
Communicating in Groups	Public Speaking Skills	LET 1
Chapter 5: Conflict Resolution		
Causes of Conflict	Causes of Conflict	LET 1
Conflict Resolution Techniques	Nonviolent Conflict Resolution Techniques	LET 1
Chapter 11: High School Financial Planning Program		
NEFE Introduction: Setting Financial Goals	NEFE Introduction: Setting Financial Goals	From NEFE
No JROTC alternative	Setting Financial Goals II	LET 1
No JROTC alternative	US National Debt Clock & Your Share	LET 1

JROTC has cadet experience “Leadership” and “Foundations for Success” modules. The JROTC version of these modules are rated in the 10 criterion categories and only failed 1 criteria (i.e., Reflects diverse and multiple perspectives and the exact evaluation comment is “The materials are embedded in the context of the JROTC setting for a cadet and from a military perspective. The content and lesson format is strong but would be hard to use just the two modules to teach it outside of the JROTC examples and references.”)

The *Leaders* “Leadership” and “Foundations for Success” modules **are focused on a leadership experience broader than a military perspective** (i.e., we have corrected the area where JROTC failed). In addition, *Leaders* version of these modules are more advanced than JROTC. For example *Leaders* is state-of-the-art leadership training using *Seeing David in the Stone* which is taught to Fortune 100 executives.

We respectfully submit that the misunderstanding of *Leaders* at this very fundamental level led to many of the smaller misunderstandings all of which we correct in this analysis.

Concrete Example 2: *Leaders* is incorrectly dismissed for having content where “there are many resources for teachers to use in teaching this concept.” *Leaders* offers unique content as illustrated by the fact it is the only program in the country offering a non-military version of the module called Citizenship in Action.

Unit 1 - Citizenship in Action		
Chapter 1: Leaders and Getting Involved		
JROTC	<i>Leaders</i>	Source
Army JROTC - The Making of a Better Citizen	The Making of a Better World Citizen	LET 1
The Past and Purpose of Army JROTC	The Purpose of <i>Leaders</i>	LET 1
Moving Up In Army JROTC	Taking a Key Role in <i>Leaders</i>	LET 1
The Signs of Success	The Signs of Success	LET 1
Your Personal Appearance and Uniform	Your Personal Character	LET 1
The Stars and Stripes	The First Stars and Stripes & Origins of the Peace Symbol	LET 1
Proudly We Sing - The National Anthem	Inspirational Music & Team Building	LET 1
American Military Traditions, Customs, and Courtesies	American Traditions, Customs, and Courtesies	LET 1

Concrete Example 3: All JROTC “Leadership” and “Foundations for Success” modules are in the framework of “Units” as this is the language used by both JROTC and *Leaders*.

The below diagram shows “Units” by grade level in the form of lesson hours.

Program Framework	LET 1	LET 2	LET 3	LET 4	TOTAL
Unit 1 - Citizenship in Action	18		2	6	26
Unit 2 - Leadership Theory & Application	18		12	10	40
Unit 3 – Foundations For Success	30		36	16	82
Unit 4 – Wellness, Fitness and First Aid		28			28
Unit 5 – Geography, Map Skills, and Caring for the Environment		6			6
Unit 6 – Citizenship in History & Government		32	16		52
Physical Activity/Leader Assessment					
Leadership Application	20	20	20	20	80
Student Challenge	10	10	10	10	40
Activities					
Service Learning/Community Service	10	10	10	10	40
Administration/Testing	24	24	24	24	96
Additional Required Teaching & Leadership Hours	0	0	0	34	34
State & Leaders Elective Hours	50	50	50	50	200
TOTAL HOURS	180	180	180	180	720

Note: The SFUSD operates on a 144 hours model. Both JROTC and *Leaders* have significant extracurricular activities. Unlike JROTC, the *Leaders* program can be modified by the SFUSD and thereby provide tremendous flexibility.

While opponents of the JROTC program oppose its military focus, the vast majority of people applaud its leadership development. As illustrated above, by design *Leaders* keeps what is good about JROTC while offering substantial improvements with a focus on leadership skills relevant for both for-profit and not-for-profit career paths.

Concrete Example 4: What Students Learn in JROTC and *Leaders* is similar although *Leaders* offers far more advanced 21st century learning and critical thinking education (e.g., a larger and more diverse set of citizenship building electives). Slide 11 in the 4/23 presentation further illustrates the diversity and balance of content offered by the *Leaders* program. Somehow the evaluation focused on the “peace” dimension of *Leaders* and transformed it into a negative for the criteria category “Reflects diverse and multiple perspectives.” The exact statement in the report is “The current set of materials tend to reflect a common point of view centered on peace; resources seem limited on the different and multiple perspectives that would provide students with the facts for making their own decision.” As noted in bullet five below, we do teach nonviolent conflict resolution. We submit that teaching nonviolence as a component of developing leaders skills is a program strength.

Below is the slide shared in the 4/23 meeting summarizing what students learn.

Content of <i>Leaders</i>	Teach Peace
Students Learn	
"Helping young people acquire sufficient background to perform their role as citizens."	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Citizenship• American and World History• How Government Works• Our Constitution• Nonviolence as a force more powerful than violence• Caring for the environment• Importance of individual and government financial responsibility• Wellness• First Aid / CPR• Preventing Drug Abuse• Effective Oral/Written Communications• Technology Awareness• Career Opportunities• Current Events	 A photograph of the Statue of Liberty, showing the upper portion of the statue including the crown and the torch held in the right hand. The statue is green and set against a clear blue sky.

Summary

We submit that the above four "Concrete Examples" prove beyond question that a misunderstanding has occurred. We provide a detailed analysis of every finding in the attached Appendix. Our common goal of providing the students with top-notch leadership development is within reach. The students and community of San Francisco are the big winners in this reconsideration of *Leaders*. We thank the JROTC Task Force for this opportunity to correct the record and look forward to exceeding expectations when we meet with the School Board Curriculum Sub-committee on June 9th.

APPENDIX – Rebuttal of deficiencies in the order they appear in the Curriculum Review evaluation

This Appendix illustrates how deficiencies noted in the evaluation are actually *Leaders* program strengths. The format of this section begins with the *Leaders* Curriculum Review presentation on 4/23. The PowerPoint slides for the 4/23 presentation are available online at <http://www.teachpeace.com/Leaders0423.pdf>.

We were asked by Sandra Lam to specifically address the following points.

1. Overview of goals and objectives
2. Content of *Leaders*
3. Instructional strategies / methods used
4. Strategies to differentiate for diverse learners
5. Research base from which the program was developed
6. Locations where the program and components are being used
7. Support for professional development of teachers

We submit that the slides, organized to follow the above seven points, illustrate thoughtful answers on all the information requested. Furthermore, we were careful to test for understanding after each section in the presentation. Due to the limit of having 30 minutes to present the above seven points and 30 minutes to respond to questions, we also shared with the Curriculum Review team that they could obtain even more information on these topics in the *Program of Instruction*.

The points below follow sentences in the Curriculum Review evaluation

Point 1: The evaluation report implies it is a negative to advocate for peace. In the process of doing this the *Leaders* program is inappropriately reframed from a leadership development program for high school students to a generic peace studies program which it is not. While we think peace studies programs are wonderful, *Leaders* is a leadership development program. The parent organization, the Teach Peace Foundation, is not a lobbying organization but a 501(c)(3) educational non-profit. We submit more precise language for the opening sentence in the findings is “the curriculum comes from an educational non-profit with special expertise and experience in leadership development.”

Point 2: The second sentence in the findings builds upon the failure to realize that *Leaders* is a leadership development program. The statement “there are many resources for teachers to use in teaching this concept” is referring to peace issues and not leadership development. *Leaders* is the only comprehensive alternative to JROTC in the country. The JROTC Task Force can confirm this point as they have looked for an alternative for more than year.

Point 3: The *Leaders* evidence is not anecdotal. We brought a student and instructor involved in classes, service learning, and community service to the 4/23 meeting. The program offers many tried and true components although the entire program is being offered for the first time. The *Leaders* program was designed for San Francisco and is the product of significant field research and real-world testing. Consider high school student Jennifer Kocsis’s service learning and community service activities to reinforce this point. She led an event last month called the *Iran Talks* with Scott Ritter and she was a leader on a team that helped educate lawmakers in DC. Jennifer also has first

hand experience with running an annual Leadership awards dinner and organizing a community *Evening of Lights*.

Point 4: Our understanding was the JROTC Task Force limited our student reach to a pilot in one school. The comments about the district-wide risk of a new program like *Leaders* are disingenuous in this light.

Point 5: The final statements in the first paragraph provided the JROTC Task Force with a negative finding on something incredibly positive. We submit that the accurate closing statement is “all the materials requested were provided in advance of the meeting.” During the meeting the complete *Instructor Manual* was requested and this was also promptly submitted arriving before the JROTC Task Force meeting. The sentence “No concrete lesson plans or detailed method of classroom delivery” is simply incorrect. While we have a written note on our copy of the evaluation that the *Instructor Manual* was received, from the JROTC Task Force vantage point it looks like we simply did not have an *Instructor Manual*.

This information in the evaluation, specifically that “there was no detailed method of classroom delivery,” again confirms that the *Program of Instruction* was not thoroughly reviewed. In addition, slides 13-16 presented on 4/23 specifically offered additional details on the method of classroom delivery (slide 13 is “Performance-based learning”, slide 14 is “21st Century Learning”, slide 15 is “National & California State Standards,” and slide 16 is “Learning Plan”).

To continue on this point, there was a 30 minute time limit to present and 30 minutes for questions and answers. From our team’s perspective, our curriculum expert, Ms. Peggy Alexander, provided specific classroom delivery examples to include experiences in very demanding school environments.

Returning to the *Instructor Manual*, we were asked to bring samples to the 4/23 meeting but did not have a requirement for a complete *Instructor Manual*. We had previously provided the complete Student Manual called *LET 1*. When the *Instructor Manual* was requested in addition to the sample, we said we would promptly submit it which we did. The *Instructor Manual*, a 250+ page book, documents in great detail our performance-based learning. In addition, the *Program of Instruction* provides the learning objectives, for the core lessons in not just *LET 1* (which is the focus of the evaluation and only program the JROTC Task Force is considering for an initial pilot), but *LET 1, 2, 3 and 4* as well. From this perspective, we not only provided the detail method of classroom delivery, we hit the ball out of the park.

Responses to the findings in the Evaluation Grid

1. The first criterion in the grid is “Content Relevant to Student.” The evaluation notes “concerns for students who disagree” and “uncertain research.” At the same time, the JROTC mirror aspects of the *Leaders* program are evaluated as positive with materials of interest to students with topics supported by three or four lessons and with good research and lesson formats.

As illustrated by Concrete Example 1, there is a big disconnect as *Leaders* has near identical core topics, uses the same research company as JROTC for our model and methodology, and even uses the same software to produce our lesson formats.

The general structure for the teaching plan body is consistent throughout the *Instructor Manual* with advice for teachers partitioned in the below seven categories.

1. PARTICIPATE in learning warm-up activities.
2. REVIEW lesson objectives.
3. REVIEW key words.
4. COMPLETE exercises to assess understanding of key words.
5. PARTICIPATE in a lecture/discussion of the lesson that is often led by a student.
6. COMPLETE practice exercises to assess understanding lesson concepts.
7. PARTICIPATE in a summary of the lesson.

Each *Leaders* lesson includes instructor tips, needed learning materials, and other resources.

2. The next evaluation point is “Reflects diverse and multiple perspectives.” *Leaders* receives a poor evaluation for “a common point of view centered on peace” and “resources seem limited on the different and multiple perspectives that would provide students with the facts for making their own decision.” The below picture illustrates the materials we use to promote “diverse and multiple perspectives.”



Unlike JROTC that teaches blind obedience to authority, we teach students to question the answers. A key objective of the *Leaders* program is to develop critical thinking skills. This is carefully documented on slides 5, 14 and 22 of the 4/23 PowerPoint presentation, in the *LET 1* book, *Program of Instruction*, and *Instructor Manual*.

3. We received a “yes” on connections to contemporary issues with the caveat of issues related to peace. We submit that the “yes” should be for a wide range of

important contemporary issues. A key theme of this response to the Curriculum Evaluation, as highlighted in the “Concrete Examples” earlier in this analysis, *Leaders* is not limited to or focused on only peace topics. Students learn citizenship, history, wellness, first aid, preventing drug abuse, effective communications, career opportunities, current events, and America’s democracy.

We do offer a range of exciting peace related electives. For example we teach about peace leaders like Martin Luther King, Jr., Mahatma Ghandi, and Howard Thurman. We see this dimension of *Leaders* as essential as to teach leadership in the context of 21st century social justice learning.

4. The fourth evaluation point is “Engages students in critical thinking around the topics leading to 21st century citizenship.” The evaluation is “No” for *Leaders* but JROTC “provides students with introductions to a variety of topics. Many are of personal development and less on contemporary issues.”

The below is slide 14 in the 4/23 presentation on 21st century content


Teach Peace

Instructional strategies / methods used

21st Century Learning

“Helping young people acquire sufficient background to perform their role as citizens.”

- ✓ In Addition to Core Subjects 21st Century Content should include:
 - Global Awareness
 - Financial, Economic, Business, and Entrepreneurial Literacy
 - Civic Literacy
 - Health and Wellness Awareness
- ✓ Learning and Thinking Skills
- ✓ Information and Communications Technology (ICT) Literacy
- ✓ Life Skills (to include leadership)
- ✓ 21st Century Assessments (high quality standardized testing along with effective classroom assessments)



**All exist in
Leaders!**

Source: Partnership for 21st Century Skills (www.21centuryskills.org).

Leaders has many personal character development topics. We offer more electives and specifically more contemporary issue electives than JROTC. For specific lessons information for the entire *Leaders* program, please see pages 37 to 94 in the *Program of Instruction*. The following are the LET 1 electives.

Leaders LET 1 Elective

Lesson Title
1 Question the Answers
2 Why a Brighter Future Is Possible
3 Coach Carter
4 Important Female Voices for Peace 1
5 Nonviolence - A Force More Powerful 1
6 Peacemaker Martin Luther King, Jr. 1
7 Forgiveness
8 Hope
9 How You Start Influences How You Finish
10 Howard Thurman - Value Aligned Behavior
11 Open and Honest Communications
12 Using the Internet to Find Places
13 Addicted to War
14 Nuclear Bombs 101

Classes like the *Leaders* “Nuclear Bombs 101” are rarely taught in high schools. We know this from our first hand research and the fact that high schools reach out to us to provide this instruction. For example, in February we taught this class to over 400 students and without exception, we received praise from teachers and students. So how is a class like “Nuclear Bombs 101” connected to critical thinking and contemporary issues? A key message of the class is to perform our role as citizens in the 21st century we need to know the basics of the nuclear age. For example, all citizens should know that a Hydrogen bomb can be far more powerful than an Atomic bomb. We submit that the evaluation for critical thinking around the topics leading to 21st century citizenship is a strong yes.

5. The evaluation of “Resources appropriate for 9th and 10th grade levels produced a “No” for *Leaders* and “Yes” for JROTC. We agree with the JROTC evaluation when the militarism, discriminatory practices, marching, and blind obedience are removed. When the negatives of JROTC are removed, the end result is *Leaders*. The *Leaders* program, by this logic, should be a very strong “Yes.”
6. The evaluation of “Resources differentiated for Special Education and English Learners” resulted in “No” for *Leaders* and “Uncertain” for JROTC. Again, this is odd as JROTC specifically discriminates against disabled students as a program entry requirement and *Leaders* seeks to welcome and support everyone. On slides 17 to 22 in the 4/23 PowerPoint, in the *Instructor Manual*, and in the *Program of Instruction*, we provide examples of how we support diverse learners. Slide 18 summarizes our diverse learner support.

Supporting Diverse Learners

"Helping young people acquire sufficient background to perform their role as citizens."

- Scaffolding for all students.
- The LET 1 to 4 system reinforces the ability to ramp up students with the flexibility to enter any LET.
- Service learning and multimedia enable students to see, hear, and touch the data.
- Diverse learners are supported with peer tutoring, group cooperation, and experts in addition to qualified instructors.
- Active learning by teaching (students teach new content to each other with instructors guiding the process).
- *Leaders* transition options for former JROTC students is unique.



The LET 1 book is mapped to California Department of Education English Language Arts grades 9 and 10. The content standards are noted immediately below each lesson title in the *Instructor Manual*.

While we realize there is always more a program can do to support Special Education and English Learners, we offer a few options that are unique. We offer various ways to excel in the program. Academic excellence is just one dimension. service learning, community service, and development of functional skills (see slide 21), are other dimensions.

Student and instructor mentoring is also an important way we support students. *Leaders* is designed to create esprit de corps and a place where you are always appreciated and welcome.

7. The seventh evaluation point, "Develops leadership skill" was rated incorrectly citing no concrete lesson plans or detailed classroom delivery. Since both corrections are noted in Point 5, please refer to page 11 for the correct information.

We offer leadership skill development that is highly valued as demonstrated by the fact it is currently delivered to executives at Fortune 100 companies (see lessons 14 to 16). The *Leaders* program brings expert leaders from a range of for profit and not-for-profit career fields into the classroom (see <http://www.teachpeace.com/speakersbureau.htm>). *Leaders* offers a range of leadership development opportunities. See lessons 3 to 12 in the *Instructor Manual* and *LET 1* book for specific examples of scaffolding. Scaffolding is the provision of

sufficient supports to promote learning and includes resources, tasks, guidance on skill development, and the sequencing of lessons.

We are confident that with this additional information about *Leaders*, the Curriculum Review team will join our curriculum experts and find that *Leaders* is exceptional in how we develop leadership skills.

8. The evaluation of “Engages in Community Service” is incorrect. The comment is “includes a chapter on service learning” and this misses a key *Leaders* design feature. In the 4/23 presentation on slide 22 we explain how community service learning is a core *Leaders* component.

In our meeting on 4/23, student Jennifer Kocsis provided community service and service learning experiences. Her comments were expanded on by two of our credentialed California instructors.

On slide 18 of the 4/23 presentation and in the *Program of Instruction* we explain that we use a comprehensive service learning program created by Lion Clubs International called Lions-Quest. As part of this program we use *The Complete Guide to Service Learning* which is a positive prevention approach that teaches a broad range of life skills. Lions-Quest facilitates our skills-based classes and the successful execution of a service-learning program.

The *Leaders* program mandatory core service learning is integrated in each LET.

Lesson	Lesson Title	LET Page(s)	Hours
A	Orientation to Service Learning	Appendix	2
B	Plan and Train for Your Leadership Project	Appendix	2
C	Project Reflection and Integration	Appendix	2

9. The ninth evaluation point “Develops a sense of community.” The evaluation is “potentially” although we provided examples of past success during our discussions (see slide 6 for student community, slide 28 for instructor community, and Lesson 8 for one of many lessons that promotes esprit de corps). The lesson plans are filled with activities that help develop a sense of community and strengthen interpersonal relationships. For these reasons we submit the evaluation should be a strong “yes.”
10. The final item in the Criteria Grid is “Develops self discipline and responsibility.” The *Leaders* evaluation is “Potentially” and “no specifics in helping students to learn these skills.” We provide extensive specifics in the *Program of Instruction* and the *Instructor Manual* (also see slides 14, 16, 21, and 22).

Consider Lesson 5 which is Your Personal Character. Students are taught character traits that help leaders be successful and how virtues can also be vices. Other powerful examples are Lessons 9 to 13 which (i.e., defining leadership, leadership approaches, developing a personal code of ethics, leadership principles, and education to prevent and respond to sexual harassment).

Closing Curriculum Review Comments

The first sentence depicting the Teach Peace Foundation as an advocacy group instead of an educational non-profit designed to create programs for people of all ages is misleading. Our specific organizational vision is "We will be one of the top ten providers of peaceful leadership education in the United States by 2016."

The second sentence noting inadequate research is misleading for several reasons. First the statement fails to note that both JROTC and *Leaders* use the same research company (i.e., WIDS).

Second, in the production of this curriculum the Teach Peace Foundation has incorporated the latest educational theories used in secondary education. To offer the best program possible, materials from a range of credible and proven sources have been incorporated to create the *Leaders* program. In each *Leaders* Education and Training (LET) category, the *Leaders* program introduces new materials and this is the first time we or anyone for that matter is offering an integrated 4-year program to replace JROTC.

Third, the research for *Leaders* has four parts.

1. The first part is the model and methodology for our performance-based learning which is a product of the Worldwide Instructional Design System (WIDS). WIDS is division of a not-for-profit organization that is dedicated to the advancement of education. A WIDS advisory team from two-year colleges, industry, and K-12 schools, collaborated to build and test our WIDS model and methodology. Our WIDS license enables us to benefit from the WIDS Advisory Team which continues to validate and enhance the performance-based approach with a network of teaching professional. We use the WIDS model and methodology to develop core abilities, competencies, performance standards, and learning plans.
2. *Leaders* instruction uses award winning and industry recognized learning materials. Examples include *The Shadow of Hate*, *We the People*, *A Force More Powerful*, and *The High School Financial Planning Program*. In this category of materials, we benefit from the field testing and fact that this content is taught in schools across the country.
3. While the *Leaders* program is new, many of the *Leaders* classes have been taught as part of instruction delivered by the Teach Peace Foundation. Peace Clubs, a program operated by the Teach Peace Foundation, has and continues to serve as a real-world testing environment for components of the *Leaders* program.
4. Finally, to understand *Leaders* and how we came to build and select best-of-the-best content, it is helpful to know that *Leaders* is the product of both a "green-field" and a "reengineering" design effort.

The green-field approach allows innovations to be free from existing program limitations. As an example, many established businesses start new companies to be free of old practices and thereby maximize flexibility, speed, and ultimately the ability to address customer needs. The focus of the green-field effort was to identify and fill existing educational gaps to help students acquire the background and skills they need as citizens in our democracy.

Amanda Saechao, a student at John F. Kennedy High School, is a key leader sparking the creation of *Leaders*. She attended a presentation during our green-field stage and then went on to partner with the Teach Peace Foundation to create and lead Youth for Freedom. Amanda and her class officers have demonstrated that leaders are among us and can take flight with well-designed leadership education and training.

The reengineering approach benefits from analysis of best practices. The focus of the reengineering consisted of a careful review of JROTC to assess what deserved to be kept and what needed to be replaced, improved, and supplemented. To facilitate high schools desiring to transition from JROTC to *Leaders*, the *Leaders* program mirrors the general JROTC framework. Some resources, like *We the People*, are used by both JROTC and *Leaders*. As a result, *Leaders* offers the best of JROTC and goes beyond JROTC with 21st century innovative leadership education and training (e.g., the 12 actions of successful leaders from *Seeing David in the Stone*, *A Force More Powerful*, *The Power of Forgiveness*, *Strength Through Peace*, and unique leadership experiences).

Content providers from our best practices research resulted in the following *Leaders* partnerships and solution offerings.

1. *The High School Financial Planning Program* (HSFPP) by the National Endowment for Financial Education (NEFE) and "Create a Financial Plan" from the book *Perfect Money Planning*.
2. *Seeing David in the Stone*, by James and Joseph Swartz, is leadership education program used by Fortune 100 companies. The program is based on 12 actions mastered by highly successful leaders. The Teach Peace Foundation is the only organization in the country to offer the new high school version.
3. *Its My Life*, a youth motivational program from the American Friends Service Committee provides students with education on a range of career alternatives.
4. *Student Leadership Planner*, a youth action guide to achieving your personal best by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner, Ph.D.
5. *We the People* (WTP), developed by the Center for Civic Education to promote civic responsibility in students, is integrated into the Citizenship in History and Government core and elective lessons.
6. *Addicted to War*, by Joel Andreas, is according to former Army Col. James Burkholder, "the most truthful recitation of our government's policies available anywhere." *Addicted to War* was reviewed by San Francisco Unified School District's Office of Teaching and Learning. The San Francisco Board of Education has approved the distribution of the book to schools as a supplementary resource.
7. *In Real Life: Sexual Harassment in Schools*, by Concentrics, Inc., provides insight into how to recognize and resolve incidents of sexual harassment.

8. *Arlington West*, a broad spectrum of Iraq War viewpoints derived from 83 heartfelt conversations with soldiers, veterans, military families, and children.
9. Lions-Quest is a comprehensive service learning program created by Lion Clubs International. The book, *The Complete Guide to Service Learning*, is a positive prevention approach that teaches a broad range of life skills. Lions-Quest facilitates skills-based classes and the successful execution of a service-learning program.
10. *A Force More Powerful* and *Bringing Down A Dictator*, both by York Zimmerman, are superb resources to teach leadership based on historical successes of Gandhi, Mikhuseli Jack, the Danish resistance in World War II, Lech Walesa, Chilean workers opposed to Pinochet, and students seeking democracy in Yugoslavia.
11. *The Art of Focused Conversation for School*, by Jo Nelson, provides over 100 ways to guide clear thinking and promote learning.
12. *The Shadow of Hate*, by Teaching Tolerance, is a powerful program to teach recognizing and respecting the beliefs or practices of others. Teaching Tolerance, a project of the Southern Poverty Law Center, was founded in 1991.
13. *Strength Through Peace*, a book by Coleman McCarthy, teaches the ideas of peace leaders.
14. *Speakers Bureau*, a Teach Peace Foundation program that brings leaders into the classroom. Students benefit from hearing directly from business executives, government officials, non-profit leaders, and meeting winners of the Teach Peace Foundation *Evening of Peace* award. The *Evening of Peace* is a student-led awards ceremony to recognize peace leadership.

In summary, the 4/23 presentation and *Program of Instruction* information about the *Leaders* research is substantial and incorrectly represented in the Curriculum Review evaluation.

The sentence “SFUSD was asked to work with them to create a better model which would require central staff to do additional work around curriculum development and professional development” is another misunderstanding. We were informed by a member of the JROTC Task Force that SFUSD wanted to work with the pilot organization to help validate standards mapping and offer help to improve the JROTC alternative program. We think it would be in the best interest of the students to interact with the SFUSD at checkpoints doing the pilot program. However, we did not say we needed help but we did say we welcomed working with the Unified School District. The statement we made was meant as a nice gesture and we were surprised to see it as a reason for failing the *Leaders* program.

We do wish to note that we offered to make all the program changes that surfaced during the pilot at no cost to SFUSD. We offered this as our sincere desire to offer the best program possible for the students of San Francisco.

The remaining closing Curriculum Review comments on “narrow perspective” and “supporting different kinds of learner” have already been addressed in the “Concrete Examples.”

The criticism that literacy lessons are discrete lessons is true (e.g., Lesson 26 Reading for Meaning) but disingenuous because literacy strategies are also infused throughout the curriculum. For example, every lesson in the LET 1 book has new vocabulary words to learn. As noted in the Criterion Grid comment 6 every lesson in the *Instructor Manual* is mapped to the California Department of Education English Language Arts grades 9 and 10. These content standards are noted immediately below each lesson title in the *Instructor Manual*. We not only understand the literacy challenge but have addressed it and note this as another reason why *Leaders* is superior to JROTC. The infusion of the literacy strategies was performed by a lifetime credentialed California teacher with over 30 years of experience.

We believe the materials submitted and the clarifications to the Curriculum Review evaluation demonstrate the *Leaders* program is ready to be piloted. We realize that we must also demonstrate our readiness to the School Board Curriculum Review Subcommittee on June 9th. We thank the JROTC Task Force and Curriculum Review team for the opportunity to put this misunderstanding behind us so that we may serve the students of San Francisco.

Sincerely,

Dave Dionisi

Dave Dionisi
Teach Peace Foundation
539 J Street
Davis, CA 95616
530-554-7061
www.teachpeace.com

cc: Curriculum Review team, the *Leaders* Design team, Superintendent Carlos Garcia, and School Board members.