

**Chapter 1 : Best Evidence Encyclopedia Program Overviews: Expeditionary Learning**

*COMPREHENSIVE HIGH SCHOOL REFORM DESIGNS* school reform should look like the conditions that, if put in place, could really make a difference and some insights into how to do it (see, for example, *Institute for Research and Reform in Education*, ; Lee and Smith, ; Legters, Balfanz, and McPartland, ; Moinar,

Let me count the ways in which it informed me: It provides a specific example of a general phenomenon: It is a form of social production – the production of human beings. And whether education is good or bad depends very much on what it produces. It sets out an almost perfect paradigm for the design process: That paradigm is not unique or new, but its execution here is brilliant. *New Designs for the Comprehensive High School: From Concept to Practice* George H. Copa and Bruce A. Jilk Introduction This paper is presented in two parts, each developed by one of the above authors. The first part describes the design process used to create the learning specifications for *New Designs for the Comprehensive High School* and introduces the learning specifications themselves. More depth of description of the learning specifications and their rationale can be gained from the reports noted in the bibliography at the end of the paper. The second part of the paper will deal with translating the learning specifications into the design of a supportive learning environment. The features of the learning environment, including learning technology, begin to suggest in very concrete ways the recommended changes needed for effective 21st century high schools. Copa This research and development began in January, , and was funded by the U. The initial development work was completed in December, , with continued refinements made as *New Designs for the Comprehensive High School* is the focus of presentations, workshops, and technical assistance to schools which are implementing the design concepts. We have had an opportunity to present to a wide diversity of professional and lay groups. We also have directed workshops for several schools systems and state education agencies. You and I leave school as it is, can change it slightly or turn it inside out and upside down. We have moved from the agricultural age, to the industrial age, and now to the information age. In a sense, we are trying to give birth to major reforms in education and are constrained by an outdated operating system and building design. When we started this work and brought our Design Group together for the first time, the first question they asked us was: The mismatch of school and life, inequity in educational opportunity, and the increasing demand for schools effectiveness. First, concerning the mismatch of school and life, those who have studied the contrast of life inside of school and life outside note that: Young people have noticed this contrast between life in school and life outside. And, they are beginning to wonder about the meaningfulness of school and whether or not they should put their motivations into this place. In this context, too large a group of young people have dropped out of high schools in the United States. The second problem area that we needed to address in *New Designs* is inequity in educational opportunity. In most high schools in the United States, you can find inequity in educational opportunity among students. By operating schools in ways that allow this inequity to exist, we are losing the talents and full potential of a whole lot of young people to our communities. And, if you look where our investments are now going, education is losing funding increases to prisons and crime prevention, to often for the same students for which the school held low expectations and provided weak educational opportunities. If we are going to redesign high schools for the 21st century, we have to deal in a very substantive way with the inequity of educational opportunity we find in each school. The third problem area addressed was the need to improve school effectiveness without increasing costs. The expectations of the public for school performance are going up, and resources are constant at best. What do you do in a situation like that? One solution is to consider doing things in very different ways. Our thinking is that designing high schools for the 21st century is an educative process. We can not simply look at the last new high schools that were built in the area and hope to get by with minor modifications. We must go through a serious educative process to figure out new designs. The resources for the design process will include a review of the latest educational research and cutting edge professional practice in schools throughout the world. The design process must be a learning process where the designer, the community, and the school staff work together and learn, if you will, to uncover and discover new ways to design the high school learning experience and environment. In our design

process we carefully reviewed the many government sponsored and commissioned reports suggesting needed changes to improve high schools in the United States. The process also involved group interviews with students, teachers, and school administrators, each as separate groups. The interviews that were conducted as part of New Designs were held in cities including Atlanta, Detroit, and Los Angeles. In each place we convened a small group of students, 7 or 8 or 9, and talked to them about learning and about the school environment and about the staffing and the relationships that would best support them in the learning process. We talked through with them what it was like when learning was really occurring, when they could feel it, when they could see it, how was it organized, what resources were there, what was the environment like and so forth. Students often commented on this experience as being the first time anybody had seriously talked with them about school design. Conversations with students is one of the ways to get new and relevant ideas for school designs. In each of the cities noted above, we held similar meetings with teachers and with school administrators. We also composed a National Design Group made up of stakeholders in the high school that included a chief state school officer, researchers, school administrators, counsellors, academic and vocational teachers, and business and labour representatives. All of the above were the ingredients in the design process for New Designs for the Comprehensive High School. In addition, we looked historically in the United States from the time high schools began to review the major changes, the reform initiatives, and what could be learned from these experiences so that we did not reinvent the past. We wanted to make sure that if we did recommend some of concepts and idea from the past, we were building on strengths and avoiding limitations. We also noted that the performance of high schools in the United States are no longer being compared with the schools in the next-door community. They are being compared internationally. With this in mind, we examined high school change initiatives in six other countries: What are the changes they are making? What problems are they encountering in their high schools? What could we learn from each country about designing future- oriented high schools in the United States? The Design Vision A very brief presentation is made of the key points in the vision that we had for the learning experience and school design in New Designs for the Comprehensive High School. Perhaps high schools in the United States are as good as they can be in the current way that the schools are designed and operated. There is a real need to think about design and operation in some very different ways if we are to improve effectiveness without increasing costs. The Carnegie unit as a framework for learning time, the department structure for organising staff, and the nine month school year all represent confinements on thinking about high school operation and supporting designs. Second, we wanted to break through some of the traditional educational practices where they were standing in the way of progress to school effectiveness and efficiency. Some of these practices have already been noted above. We have new high schools opening in the United States today that have academic and vocational wings. At the same time, we are spending millions of dollars to integrate the curriculum knowing that the split of academic and vocational forces young people to make choices between these two areas when they need both for a bright future. At the same time we are introducing major new initiatives that call for closer collaboration and partnership with the community as being essential to improving school effectiveness. These are some of the current educational practices from which we need to break. Third, more and more schools and states across the country are promising the idea of a common set of learner outcomes for all graduates. Conversations with school administrators and board members in these schools and states suggest they are getting very nervous about what it is going to take to deliver on the promise of a common set of learner outcomes for all students. The guarantee of a common set of outcomes for all students. My projection is that we can not deliver on this promise the way high schools are currently organized and operated. Schools that are going to deliver on the promise of a common set of outcomes for all students will very likely have to look different than the schools we have today. For example, these schools will need to believe that a student can learn the same thing in a variety of subject matter areas or in a variety of settings. If the student needs to learn problem solving, the school will recognize that it could be learned in an art class or a business class or a science class. Fourth, the design vision is that learner outcomes are closely related to the challenges and opportunities in work, family, and community life. So, rather than starting with a curriculum that is modelled on the university or based on the latest textbooks, the challenges is to begin to sort out what are the important

challenges and opportunities that young people are going to face, they either are facing now or will in the future in work, family, and community settings, and then began to work backwards and see what curriculum makes sense. That is a new way to approach curriculum design and not the typical way we go about planning the high school learning process. And, it would take some courage; but, if we want to reconnect the school and life for young people, we will have to take this approach seriously. Fifth, the new high school needs to operate as a learning community. When we talked with folks in high schools across the United States, one of the major concerns is they wanted the school to have a greater sense of caring, of common and high expectations, of attachment and ownership for their high school. We can not make anyone do them; they are attributes given when there is a feeling of being trusted and cared for and so forth. And one of the places where this happens is where there is a strong sense of community. So we decided that somehow the sense of community must be strengthened in new school designs. Sixth, we want a high school where there is a close alignment among the learner outcomes, learning process, learning organization, and the learning environment. The importance of the idea of alignment or coherence within the school comes from the work on total quality management and continuous quality improvement as applied in the private sector and increasingly in the public sector. The assumption is that if we want quality and effectiveness and efficiency, internal alignment and coherence of operation is needed. Aims and processes have to fit together. Many high schools, particularly large high schools, do not fit this pattern. Too often there are many things going on and they are going in several different directions; they do not form a consistent and coherent pattern. We are recommending a design process that will result in much more alignment and coherence in the operation of high schools, resulting in increased quality and efficiency. Seventh, the attention in a New Designs school is on learning in contrast to teaching. Much of the current high school environments seems to be first a teaching environments. It is largely classrooms, set up for an adult with twenty to thirty young people; the teacher stays in the room and young people move around on a bell system. What would happen if you begin to reverse these roles and make the learners the center of attention. Eight, we want the school to have a special character that gives focus, coherence, and spirit to learning. This concept draws on the school effectiveness literature and from the experience of private schools where it is suggested that one of the things that contributes to quality and high performance is a sense of specialness. And, everybody in the school knows what this specialness is from the janitor to the students, teachers, administrators, the school board.

**Chapter 2 : Scaling Up First Things First | MDRC**

*The Comprehensive School Reform program is designed to foster coherent schoolwide improvements that cover virtually all aspects of a school's operations, rather than piecemeal, fragmented approaches to reform.*

Page Share Cite Suggested Citation: Comprehensive High School Reform Designs. The National Academies Press. Implementing any one of these features will have modest effects at best on student engagement. The evidence suggests that narrowly construed interventions addressing isolated aspects of school functioning and student experience are not sufficient to move students toward high levels of engagement and achievement. Implementing some of the suggestions made in this volume without consideration of the larger picture could even undermine student engagement. Comprehensive school reform models have been created to guide whole-school, sometimes whole-district, efforts to improve student engagement and learning. The goal is to put all the pieces together to create a set of reforms that will support and reinforce each other and be sufficient to improve substantially student engagement and learning. Designers of school reform models also create organizational structures that provide ongoing assistance for implementation on a broad scale. As a movement, comprehensive school reform has existed for some time. A few reform models that exist today began as long as two decades ago. Most recently, reform of secondary schools has begun to receive attention from other federal and private philanthropic sources. In this chapter we summarize a group of comprehensive school reform models available to high schools. The central features of the various design models overlap considerably, and one goal is to show the high level of consensus that has evolved regarding the features of effective secondary schools. A second goal is to provide examples of strategies that have been developed to reorganize high schools in ways consistent with the specific, research-based recommendations made in this volume. Designs included in this review of comprehensive reform initiatives are limited to those that: The annex to this chapter provides a brief description of each initiative included in this review. First, we examined the degree to which comprehensive models that met our criteria include some of the key features of engaging high schools suggested by the research reviewed in this volume high standards for both academic learning and student conduct, personalization, meaningful and engaging pedagogy and curriculum, and professional learning communities. Department of Education grant L. Therefore, we did not include them in this analysis. Table summarizes this analysis. As the table demonstrates, there is considerable consistency in the presence of these four features in the description of the models, although not necessarily in all schools that have attempted to implement the models. Notwithstanding these variations, the conclusions regarding some of the qualities of engaging schools discussed in this volume are remarkably well represented in national school reform models. Although in theory the models are consistent with empirical evidence on engaging schools, efforts to implement the models are still works in progress. For many reasons related to resources, the availability of credible and qualified technical assistance providers, and support and consistency in policies at the district and state levels, implementing these models in the real world is difficult. We return to some of the most common obstacles later in the chapter. Another approach to whole-school reform that incorporates principles of engagement is the movement to create small schools. The specific goals and findings related to small schools are discussed in Chapter 4. Although creating small schools is a prominent reform strategy, it does not fit the criteria for a comprehensive reform design because of the variability in objectives and design. Small schools are also often new schools rather than reformed existing schools with existing staff, administrators, and students. Table summarizes the strategies used by the comprehensive school models that met our criteria. Most of the strategies that are included in the models are based on research that has been discussed in this volume. All of these reform models are designed to raise expectations for student academic performance and ensure equity of opportunity to meet these higher standards. Some models explicitly state what students are expected to know and be able to do by subject areas and by grade levels. Many reform models do not incorporate specific strategies for improving student conduct, although most work to improve behavior by providing more personalized, rigorous, and engaging experiences for students, including greater access to higher quality student and family services. For models that explicitly address how to improve

behavior, staff work with small teacher learning communities to help them develop more effective disciplinary approaches that are consistent with existing policies. The models propose a variety of strategies for personalizing student and family experiences. Some models involve reorganizing larger schools into smaller units often called small learning communities or academies where the same students and teachers stay together for longer periods during the school day "block" scheduling and over at least two school years "looping" , as described in Chapter 4. In some cases the smaller units have themes based on career or academic interests see Chapter 7 , which give students and their families some choice in the noncore curriculum. One of the goals of creating smaller learning units is for teachers to have fewer total students to know and to teach and for students to see fewer teachers. This is also achieved sometimes by using resources to involve more adults in teaching roles, thus reducing the student-teacher ratio see Chapter Another strategy that is common in comprehensive reform models is to provide an advisor, mentor, or advocate to each student, as described in Chapter 6. All of the comprehensive reform models address how teaching is done and what is being taught, although they vary considerably in how prescriptive they are. In most cases schools are expected to create schedules and staff assignments that increase instructional time and, in some designs, to reduce student-to-adult ratios, especially in language arts and math. Some of the reforms also include more specific guidelines for students who are substantially behind their grade level. The use of technology and project learning, cooperative learning, learning opportunities that are embedded in real-world contexts, and other strategies to involve students actively in the learning process are endorsed and supported by all models. A curriculum that crosses traditional discipline boundaries is also common in the reform models. All of the comprehensive reform models recognize the importance of supporting teachers and helping schools build a community of adult as well - o Cal. One of the purposes of the designs that reorganize large high schools into smaller units is to create teams of teachers who share the same students. All of the models include opportunities for teachers to meet with one another to discuss their instruction, student progress, and governance and policy issues affecting the school community. Some reform models work with schools to provide small learning communities with individual and disaggregated student data that are used to develop strategies to improve student achievement. All designs provide professional development opportunities, and some provide in-class and ongoing coaching. The relative emphasis on project-based learning, new teaching strategies, curriculum development and implementation, team building, and leadership training vary considerably among the reform models. A remarkable degree of overlap exists among the features and strategies stressed in comprehensive reform models and those the committee found evidence to support in its review of the research literature. Admittedly, many of the conclusions about effective practices are based on soft and incomplete evidence. Nevertheless, there is substantial convergence in the conclusions drawn by different people who have examined existing research and craft knowledge both about what needs to be done and prom-. We turn next to evidence on the success of comprehensive school designs to improve student learning. Because most of the models are relatively new, and because some require two or more years to be fully implemented, the data here are both new and thin. Moreover, most of the designs described in this chapter are still in the research and development phase. Because they are changing in response to their emerging results, evaluations are often studies of moving targets. Studies discussed next, however, suggest that extant comprehensive school reform models show some promise of improving student engagement and learning. However, the majority has focused on elementary and middle schools Berends et al. The little evidence that does exist on the efficacy of the high school designs included in this chapter is consistent with evaluations of elementary and middle school reform efforts: Two models that have examined the crime rate of their students sometimes considered a measure of disengagement Coalition of Essential Schools and Talent Development High Schools have found decreases in reported crimes after implementation Ancess and Wichterie, ; Boykin, ; Legters et al. Evaluation studies of high school reform models further show students taking more advanced academic courses<sup>5</sup> Boykin, ; Legters et al. In addition to assessing effects on individual and diverse indicators of student engagement and learning and related outcomes, evaluations of com- 3For example, Coalition of Essential Schools and High Schools That Work. Is the implementation of the designs sufficient to move schools from graduating half or fewer of their incoming freshmen to gradu- ating nearly all,

while preparing them well for postsecondary education or high-quality employment? This question has yet to be answered. In brief, extant evidence suggests that effective implementation of the school reform models included in this chapter does improve some indicators of student engagement and learning. Whether these models can achieve the ambitious goal of improving high school education on a large scale is yet to be seen.

**THE PROCESS** No two models look alike with regard to what consumers and investors should expect in the planning and implementation process, including what roles various stakeholders people who are affected by the reform play in providing supports and pressure to meet expectations. Furthermore, conclusive research evidence does not yet exist indicating that one approach leads to deeper and more sustained implementation of reform in high schools than another approach. To organize some information on how these reform models work with high schools, we list guiding questions about the change process itself and examples of how reform models diverge in their answers. What kind of buy-in does the mode! Some reform models require that staff at the school level vote to adopt the design before initiating a partnership. Other models discourage votes in advance, instead encouraging district leaders including the board and the superintendent , community leaders, and leaders at the school level including administrators, teachers, students, and sometimes parents to decide whether the reform design is the best vehicle to meet their goals. The staff employed by the design mode! Designs converge on strategies for building buy-in once the design is selected. Most designs engage staff, students, and parents in study and discussion. They use examples of how the design features have been implemented in other schools and involve stakeholders in shaping local decisions. What, if any, are the nonnegotiable requirements or fix Ed expectations that the design staff bring into their relationship with school and district personnel? Most of the models expect all school staff to participate in study and discussion of the design features and implementation strategies. Beyond these shared expectations, however, models vary greatly in what prospective high school and district administrators are expected to sign up for in advance. Some districts value the clarity, credibility, and accountability they purchase with the adoption of a design that sets out in advance both the key features and the acceptable pathways to implementing these features. Other districts and schools are concerned that if major decisions about the key features or the implementation strategies do not reside at the building or the small community level, there will not be sufficient buy-in to sustain the reform over rough patches. How does the reform design use data of various forms to initiate, inform, monitor, refine, and sustain the reform process? All of the reform models make legitimate claims to being research based in the sense that their design features are consistent with research on best practices. However, use of data available from participating districts and schools and the requirements for new data to be collected as part of the reform process vary considerably. For example, data on student performance are used in some designs to give teachers and administrators a sense of urgency about initiating and sustaining reform, to inform instructional decisions, and to strengthen collective responsibility for student outcomes. Extensive data are collected by some designs on current instructional practices, school climate, and student and teacher attitudes and beliefs. These designs use these data for a variety of purposes, including guiding the selection of implementation strategies, assessing and improving the fidelity of implementation strategies, and holding individuals and groups accountable for fulfilling commitments to implement design components. Even when designs have similar key features and implementation strategies, they may begin the reform process differently for recent analyses of the reform process, see Berends, Bodilly, and Kirby, ; Berends, Chun et al. Some designs emphasize leading with structural change that ensures personalization, then turning to instructional and curriculum issues. Others lead with instructional and curricular reforms in literacy, then take on restructuring efforts. Still others begin with self-assessment, then use the results to shape entry points for the reform. Reform models also vary significantly in whether they set deadlines for decision making and implementation, and if so, how firmly. Although most want to see all of the key features see Table implemented, there is wide variation in expectations related to the rate of implementation. What role does the design developer pay in supporting planning and implementation of the reforms? All of the reform models present key design features and strategies for implementing those features.

**Chapter 3 : Impact of New Designs for the Comprehensive High School: Evidence From Two Early Adaptations**

*The purpose of this project is to identify and describe the impact of New Designs for the Comprehensive High School (NDCHS) (Copa & Pease, ) on student behavior, attitude, and performance.*

Page xvi Share Cite Suggested Citation: The National Academies Press. The project that is the subject of this report was approved by the Governing Board of the National Research Council, whose members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. The members of the committee responsible for the report were chosen for their special competences and with regard for appropriate balance. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the organizations or agencies that provided support for the project. Includes bibliographical references and index. High school teaching United States. School management and organization United States. Printed in the United States of America. National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine. Upon the authority of the charter granted to it by the Congress in 1949, the Academy has a mandate that requires it to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters. The National Academy of Engineering was established in 1964, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, as a parallel organization of outstanding engineers. It is autonomous in its administration and in the selection of its members, sharing with the National Academy of Sciences the responsibility for advising the federal government. The National Academy of Engineering also sponsors engineering programs aimed at meeting national needs, encourages education and research, and recognizes the superior achievements of engineers. Wulf is president of the National Academy of Engineering. The Institute of Medicine was established in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to secure the services of eminent members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under the responsibility given to the National Academy of Sciences by its congressional charter to be an adviser to the federal government and, upon its own initiative, to identify issues of medical care, research, and education. Fineberg is president of the Institute of Medicine. Functioning in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy, the Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. The Council is administered jointly by both Academies and the Institute of Medicine. Wulf are chair and vice chair, respectively, of the National Research Council. With this report we look at a different ingredient in education motivation and the important role it plays in fostering academic achievement. We all know that our interest in or desire to learn is critical to the amount of effort we are willing to put into a task, particularly if it means mastering difficult or unfamiliar material. Children often come to school eager to learn but, as this report suggests, many lose their academic motivation as they move through elementary school into high school. In fact, by the time many students enter high school, disengagement from course work and serious study is common. The consequences of becoming disengaged from school are extremely serious, particularly for adolescents from urban and poor high schools who may not get the "second chances" afforded those who are more economically privileged. Even the best teachers, curricula, standards, and tests cannot be effective if the students to whom they are addressed are not engaged in learning. What can policy makers, school administrators, guidance counselors, teachers, parents, or others do to influence that motivation, so as to enable our youth to remain engaged in learning throughout high school? This important report provides evidence that high schools can be designed to provide a challenging and rigorous program to all students, and it makes a compelling case for the real possibility of improving the quality of urban high schools throughout our nation. This volume, like most products of the National Research Council, was prepared by a committee of volunteer scholars and other experts. For this particular study, we are especially indebted to the committee chair, Deborah Stipek, for her extraordinary leadership and commitment. Deborah agreed to chair this important activity even though she had just become the dean of the Stanford School of Education. Then, when unforeseen circumstances left the committee with reduced staff, she expanded her role in drafting and

redrafting the text through the final stages of committee consultation and the intensive review process. It is the devotion of leaders like her to the common good that makes it possible for the National Research Council to be such an effective instrument for guiding the nation. On behalf of the National Academies, I thank Deborah and the committee for this report. They have made an important contribution to an ongoing dialogue in the United States that focuses on improving the education of our next generation of citizens. Nothing that we do is more important. Bruce Alberts, Chair National Research Council Acknowledgments The committee could not have completed its work without the help of our sponsor and able consultants and staff. A study committee was formed to address the particular topic of adolescent motivation and school engagement. We are indebted to consultants who provided important background information, assisted in data collection, and prepared written summaries. Amy Ryken, University of Puget Sound, did a thorough review of the motivational effects of high schools that use occupations as themes for instruction. Brenda Arellano, University of California, Santa Barbara, contributed to the literature review on high school dropouts. April Burns, City University of New York, examined evidence on the economic and educational disparities in suburban and urban schools. Adena Klem, Institute for Research and Reform in Education, reviewed comprehensive reform models in urban high schools. Nettie Legters, Johns Hopkins University, reviewed the recent movement toward career academies in high schools. Lonna Murphy, Purdue University, contributed to the literature review on peer influences. Andy Furco, University of California, Berkeley, reviewed literature on issues of motivation and engagement in service-learning. Special thanks are owed to Cary Watson for her multiple and critical roles in completing this report. He ably organized all of our meetings and helped structure our task. Although he left the National Research Council before our study was completed, his broad searches for relevant evidence and early drafting were critical to our progress. We are also grateful to Patricia Morison, deputy director of the Center for Education, for her guidance and advice during the late stages of report revision. Laura Penny, a freelance writer and editor, was our invaluable critical eye in shaping the text. Elizabeth Townsend served as an extraordinarily capable project assistant, maintaining all our email contacts, keeping track of innumerable drafts, and otherwise keeping the project humming, all with good cheer. This report has been reviewed in draft form by individuals chosen for their diverse perspectives and technical expertise, in accordance with procedures approved by the Report Review Committee of the National Research Council. The purpose of this independent review is to provide candid and critical comments that will assist the institution in making its published report as sound as possible and to ensure that the report meets institutional standards for objectivity, evidence, and responsiveness to the study charge. The review comments and draft manuscript remain confidential to protect the integrity of the deliberative process. We thank the following individuals for their review of this report: Although the reviewers listed above have provided many constructive comments and suggestions, they were not asked to endorse the conclusions or recommendations nor did they see the final draft of the report before its release. Appointed by the National Research Council, they were responsible for making certain that an independent examination of this report was carried out in accordance with institutional procedures and that all review comments were carefully considered. Responsibility for the final content of this report rests entirely with the authoring committee and the institution.

### Chapter 4 : Comprehensive school - Wikipedia

*Comprehensive school reform occupies a middle position in the spectrum of reforms proposed for schools, between teacher-by-teacher change strategies and systemic district, state, and national strategies.*

### Chapter 5 : Leslie Santee Siskin

*Comprehensive school reform, or CSR, is among the waves of improvement efforts that radiated from the report A Nation at Risk, a landmark indictment of U.S. public schools. CSR focuses on.*

### Chapter 6 : New Designs for the Comprehensive High School

*Author: George H. Copa Oregon State University. Executive Summary: This project was part of a larger effort of the NCRVE to focus on high schools that were undergoing schoolwide reform and making use of their learning achievement results to further improve their schools.*

**Chapter 7 : "Comprehensive High School Reform: The Lived Experience of Teachers and" by Richard K. N**

*High school reform has moved to the top of the education policy agenda, commanding the attention of the federal government, governors, urban school superintendents, philanthropists, and the general public.*