

Ain Grooms
Small Learning Communities
Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies – Child and Family Policy
March 17, 2008

Executive Summary

The push for smaller schools has resurfaced since the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 brought national attention to the academic achievement of children in our nation's public schools.

Schools are being transformed into "small learning communities" in an effort to decrease discipline problems and to increase attendance, retention and academic achievement.

Three-quarters of the nation's high schools enroll 1,000 students or more, where research has shown that the most effective high school size is between 600-900 students. The national high school graduation rate is 68%, and studies show that graduation rates for students who attend school in high poverty, racially segregated, and urban school districts lag from 15 to 18 percent behind their peers.

Freshmen academies and career academies are examples of small learning communities within a larger, comprehensive high school. However, creating a smaller learning community is not just about "putting fewer students in a classroom"; there must be buy-in from the school faculty and administration. Once restructuring is in place, there is evidence of increased collaboration between teachers, more teacher empowerment, and improved relationships with students – all of which can assist in increasing academic achievement. Small learning communities are not the only school reform solution, but efforts are providing positive results.

Introduction

With the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 taking center stage and bringing national attention to K-12 public education, educators and policymakers alike are continuing to search for ways to improve the academic achievement of public school students. Research has shown that smaller classrooms can increase student achievement, and a school reform movement has resurfaced, aimed at decreasing the size of the school, not just the classroom.

Many schools, especially high schools, have been transformed into “small learning communities” in an effort to increase student achievement and decrease student discipline problems. Studies show that smaller learning environments also positively affect attendance rates, graduation rates, drug and alcohol use, truancy, gang participation, and school safety (National Conference on State Legislatures [NCSL]).

The Need for High School Reform

Between 1940 and 1990, the number of K-12 schools in the United States declined by 69%, yet the country’s population increased by 70%. A study by James Conant published in 1959 suggested that larger schools would be more cost-efficient and could offer a broader curriculum. Currently almost three-quarters of all high school students attend a school with more than 1,000 students (Robertson 1).

As school enrollments increase, the physical space of the school remains the same. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) defines school overcrowding when, “the number of

students enrolled in the school is larger than the number of students the school was designed to accommodate”. A 2000 NCES study found that 14% of U.S. schools are “overcrowded” (between 6% and 25% above capacity) and 8% more are “severely overcrowded” (over 25% above capacity). This study found that secondary schools are more likely to be overcrowded than elementary schools, and schools with a high number of minority students are more likely to be overcrowded than those with less than 50% minority enrollment (Ready et al 1996).

In his report on 2001 high school graduation published by the Urban Institute, Christopher Swanson (7) paints a grim picture of public education:

The national graduation rate is 68 percent, with nearly one-third public high school students failing to graduate. Other statistics show that students from historically disadvantaged minority groups (American Indian, Hispanic and Black) have little more than a 50-50 chance of finishing high school with a diploma. By comparison, graduation rates for Whites and Asians are 75 and 77 percent nationally. Males graduate from high school at a rate 8 percent lower than female students. Graduation rates for students who attend school in high poverty, racially segregated, and urban school districts lag from 15 to 18 percent behind their peers.

Educators and policymakers are now faced with the challenge of changing the landscapes of public high schools in order to improve academic achievement. Experts agree that “ethnic minorities, poor students, and students who speak English as a second language benefit the most from small learning environments; but unfortunately, they are over-represented in urban school

districts with the largest schools” (American Youth Policy Forum [AYPF] 1). Research has found that the most effective high school size is between 600 and 900 students (Robertson 1). A 1997 study by Lee and Smith found that achievement gains in mathematics and reading during the high school years were found to be the largest in schools with between 600-900 students. These schools also had weaker relationships between the student’s socio-economic status and achievement. Lee and Smith also report that “school size was an important factor in determining learning in schools enrolling more disadvantaged students”. Ted Sizer, founder of the Coalition of Essential Schools, did not name a specific small school size, but remarked that keeping the structure “simple and flexible” was one of the five imperatives for better schools (Ready et al 1993).

In 2000, the US Department of Education began the Smaller Learning Communities Initiative, which grants money to local education agencies “to plan, develop and implement smaller learning communities (goal of not more than 600 students) in large high schools (1,000 or more students)”. Funds could be used to restructure the day, create schools-with-schools or career academies, or to implement a host of other innovative methods (NCSL).

Freshmen Academies and Career Academies

There is no one singular way to implement small learning communities (SLCs) within a larger school. Two methods are Schools-Within-Schools (SWS) and Small Schools in the same building (SS). SWS are “separate and autonomous units with their own personnel, budget and program” that operate within a larger school and report to the school principal. SS differ in that

they are entirely separate schools and operate independently from one another, yet are all housed in the same building (ERIC 4).

Common types of SWS are freshmen academies and career academies, and are often implemented in the same high school. Freshmen academies were created because of the fact that ninth grade students transitioning to high school often feel overwhelmed or alienated (Chmelynski 48), and students are sometimes placed in courses that are not suited to their abilities (Neubig 42). Any or all of these factors contribute to the high numbers of students repeating the ninth grade (“the ninth grade bulge”) and then dropping out by tenth grade (“the tenth grade dip”) (National High School Center [NHSC] 1).

Statistics compiled by the National High School Center in Washington, D.C. (1, 2) find that:

- Ninth grade attrition is far more pronounced in urban, high poverty schools: 40% of dropouts in low-income schools left after ninth grade, compared to 27% in low-poverty districts
- Some states have as high as a 20% decrease in enrollment between ninth and tenth grades
- Most high school dropouts fail at least 25% of their ninth grade courses

A typical freshman academy separates freshmen from the rest of the school using the SWS model. Its goals are to provide structure and a sense of belonging, and to facilitate the transition into high school, while at the same time, increasing communication between parents and the school (Clark and Hunley 41). A curriculum coordinator at Dudley High School in Greensboro, NC, said of the school’s experimentation with a freshmen academy in the 1999-2000 school

year, “Being a little more restrictive in a smaller learning community is helpful to some ninth-graders. They have limited movement, less distractions, and they’re far more focused” (Chmelynski 50).

According to the National High School Center (2), schools with transition programs such as freshmen academies had dropout rates of 8%, while schools without such programs averaged a dropout rate of 24%. At Red Bank High School in Chattanooga, TN, after the freshmen academy had been implemented for only one year, the number of students repeating the ninth grade fell to 19 from 73 (out of 270) (Thurman 17).

Freshmen academies are as successful for students in rural settings as they are for students in urban settings. During the 2003-2004 school year, at Muhlenberg South High School in rural Greenville, KY, ninth grade students made large academic gains, increasing by 19 percentile points on the math portion of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) test (Clark and Hunley 45).

Career academies, another type of SWS, usually enroll tenth through twelfth graders, after they have successfully completed the freshmen academy. There are three main features of career academies: (1) a cluster of students who share classes throughout the year and have some of the same teachers for at least two years, (2) a college-preparatory curriculum with a career theme, and (3) partnerships with local businesses that will allow for internships (Conchas and Clark 289; Orr 457).

A 2000 report by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) found that career academies that are “better able to link career-based curriculum and work-based learning activities with strong interpersonal and academic support are more likely to increase school engagement” (Conchas and Clark 290).

Talent Development High Schools (TDHS) is a school reform model that restructures large high schools plagued by attendance and discipline problems, as well as poor student achievement and high dropout rates. Large schools are reorganized into freshmen academies for first-year students and career academies for the upper grades. TDHS was created in 1994 by the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk, located at John Hopkins University’s Center for Social Organization of Schools. As of March 2007, 43 districts in 15 states were operating schools using the TDHS model (What Works Clearinghouse [WWC] 2). According to the What Works Intervention Report on Talent Development High Schools (3), TDHS students were more likely to be promoted to the tenth grade than comparison students (68% compared with 60%).

Reorganization

Reorganizing a large, comprehensive high school into smaller learning communities is a daunting task, and requires the participation of all members of the school community – students, teachers and administrators. Reorganization is not simply about putting “fewer students in a building”; there are several organizational and structural changes that must be taken into account, including:

- School / grade enrollments

- Class size
- Student-teacher ratios on teams / grades
- The number of students a teacher is responsible for
- Instructional grouping
- Block scheduling
- Common planning time
- Length of classes and of the school day (Felner et al 216)

Dr. Betty Despenza-Green, former principal of the Chicago Vocational Career Academy, states, “Everyone wants small but it doesn’t mean anything if you won’t do other work that goes along with it. You can have a bad small school as well as a bad large school. Instead of starting from the physical, you need to start with the program you know you need to have. Then you can see how your existing structure won’t let you do that. And then you do the work of making physical changes” (Davidson).

Reorganization is not something that can be done quickly. A 2005 evaluation of SLC implementation in Albuquerque (NM) Public Schools found that focusing on one SLC and/or team at a time facilitates teacher-buy-in and gives administrators time to craft effective SLC structures, procedures, and schedules (Heath 6). Interviews from the school administrations at five high schools in Boston during their restructuring into SLCs faced the following challenges:

- Simultaneously implementing new district initiatives directed at preparing students for high stakes tests and restructuring the school into small learning communities using inquiry-based, contextual learning strategies

- Decision-making regarding how to fully cluster students and teachers into small learning communities
- Using a variety of approaches to ensure effective leadership
- Balancing the desire of teachers for input into staffing decisions with the need to make sure that students have equal access to a range of pathways.
- Struggling to maintain basic services to bilingual students and to make sure that there is equitable access to upper-grade pathways (Allen et al 3)

These challenges are probably typical to most schools during the reorganization process. SLCs cannot be simply added to an existing school organization; the ones with the most student success are the ones that “serve as the center of school activities”. District-level and building-level policies must support and operate under the same principles of organization as the SLC. For example, a SLC that emphasizes flexibility and autonomy cannot be successfully operated in a bureaucratic system. Also, it is suggested that at-risk and honors programs should be eliminated so that each student is held to the same high standards (Oxley 46).

Teachers and Small Learning Communities

Small learning communities are an escape from traditional learning and a movement toward “personalized learning”. Schools with SLCs focus on the learning experience of the student, and when done well, make schools more developmentally appropriate, the adults in them more developmentally responsive, and the relationships with peers more positive. Small, personalized learning communities “foster productive learning...by providing the opportunities to learn, the

opportunities to teach, and learning supports that enable a school to become a positive, developmentally enhancing context” (Felner et al 210).

High-performing schools, whether comprised of SLCs or not, schedule in ways best for the student. A 2005 report by Education Trust states that, “when making decisions about who teaches whom, high-impact schools consider factors such as past student performance and the teacher’s area of study in assigning teachers to specific courses.” In traditional high schools, teacher seniority typically determines course assignments (Neubig 42).

SLCs, such as career academies, not only benefit students, but the teachers as well. It is critical to have the support of the faculty when restructuring; the principal of a high school in Eugene, OR, states, “It does point out how important it is to have your staff believe. Your staff are the ones who will implement it for 10 or fifteen years of their career.” He also states, “Small isn’t enough; structural change isn’t enough. We want to hone in on the instructional changes happening in the classroom on a daily basis” (Silverman C2). A 1997 study found that “career academy teachers reported more opportunities to collaborate, more adequate teaching resources, and a greater ability to influence key decisions about instruction and administrative matters” (Orr 458).

Numerous studies find strong correlations between desirable team structures and whether teachers in teams feel less “burnt out”, have greater resources and support, and are able to more fully utilize their skills. Teachers in teams that report these positive feelings have far higher

expectations for students, for their own impact on students, and on the degree to which they value and focus on diversity (Felner et al 218).

Teachers must be able to receive pre-service and in-service teacher training and professional development on teaming, integrated curriculum and collaborative work in order to effectively implement SLCs (Orr 458). An integral component of effective teaching and learning is the team members' "inquiry into the effectiveness of their practices" (Oxley 48), allowing teachers to have the opportunity to share what they know, consult about problems of practice, and observe each other's teaching (Orr 459). A teacher study by the MDRC found teacher effectiveness with students to be positively and significantly related to the extent to which teachers participated in professional development, met for program planning and undertook collaborative work with other teachers (Orr 481).

Effective teams are not just teams of teachers working together cohesively during common planning time; they are interdisciplinary teams that are organized around the students the teachers have in common, and should be able to create a coherent, rigorous curriculum that includes fieldwork and community partners (Oxley 46). Ideal staff members will have the desire to integrate curriculum and be willing to work with others within the flexible schedule (Neubig 43).

Common planning time allows teachers to work together and more effectively, but it is imperative that teachers use this time wisely. Project HiPlaces (The Project on High Performing

Learning Communities) outlined five dimensions of team practices that have been found to be the most critical:

- Curriculum coordination and integration
- Coordination of student assessments, assignments and feedback
- Working together to engage parents
- Coordinating together the development of common performance standards
- Working as a team to integrate efforts with other school personnel (counselors, librarians, special education specialists, etc) (Felner et al 217)

Despite the general overall support for restructuring by teachers, reports contend that it does not appear that significant changes in pedagogy are occurring as a result of smaller class sizes.

These reports do show, however, that teachers are spending less time on discipline issues (Robertson 3). Some teachers at TDHS schools in Philadelphia are concerned that “the long blocks did not really double the amount of material covered but instead allowed them to teach about the same amount of material but with greater depth” (Useem et al 7).

Relationships between Students and Teachers

The Search Institute, a national non-profit organization, asserts that “schools that nurture positive relationships among students and among students and teachers are more likely to realize the payoff of more engaged students achieving at higher levels” (Holland and Mazzoli 294). A Colorado high school senior wrote in the foreword to the book *Great Places to Learn: How Asset-Building Schools Help Students’ Succeed*, “Very rarely will students turn away from the opportunity to form connections or become involved, if they are invited and made to feel

welcome...Schools must be more than just a place to learn... it should be a place to belong”
(Holland and Mazzoli 298)

According to the 2005 APS evaluation, students reported that the SLCs “significantly enhanced their trust in teachers by providing personalized instruction and support as well as consistent expectations across classes and teachers” (Heath 3). Students were also more likely to feel comfortable and safe with their teachers, and more likely to think that teachers cared about them, listened to them, and helped them catch up if they fell behind. A 2000 report prepared for the American Youth Policy Forum stated that students in small schools had higher perceptions of themselves academically and generally, and felt more connected to teachers and to each other (NCSL).

There are some cases where the social relations between students and teachers in small schools were not always considered positive. For example, a few students reported they were “unable to live down the negative reputations of older siblings or of parents”, and some teachers reported that they had to work harder to “keep a modicum of privacy” (Ready et al 1994).

Student Choice

In their 2003 report entitled *Engaging Schools: Fostering High Schools Students' Motivation to Learn*, the National Research Council of the National Academies stated, “the fundamental challenge is to create a set of circumstances in which students take pleasure in learning and come to believe that the information and skills they are being asked to learn are important or

meaningful for them and worth their efforts, and that they can reasonably expect to be able to learn the material” (Brand 2).

Studies found that declines in achievement and learning are associated with a steady decline in student interest in and motivation for learning (Felner et al 211). Some SWS programs, usually career academies (incoming ninth-graders are typically required to enroll in a freshmen academy), allow students to select their “subunit”, based on individual preferences. This goal is to foster commitment among students and to increase their interest and engagement in school (Ready et al 2007).

Funding

Partial funding for school reform is provided by the federal Department of Education (NCSL). Private foundations, including the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, and the Open Society Institute have all committed funding toward the small school reform initiative. Over the past twelve years, the Annenberg Foundation has committed over \$500 million to urban school reform (Ready et al 1993). Despite large financial investments from private and public sources, some grant recipients are concerned that the funding will eventually run out. However, school administrations have decided to move forward, as evidenced by an Oregon high school’s decision to move forward with the \$900,000 grant and restructuring (Silverman C2).

Summary of Benefits of Small Learning Communities

Small schools do not guarantee success, but seem to provide environments more suitable for improved achievement. In his report for the American Association of School Administrators, entitled, *Curriculum Adequacy and Quality in High Schools Enrolling Fewer than 400 Students*, Christopher Roelke outlined several benefits arising from participation in SLCs (Roberston 4):

Student/Family Benefits:

- Especially helpful for low socioeconomic status
- Better attendance and retention
- Better behavior
- More engagement and greater sense of belonging
- Better academic achievement
- Increased participation in extracurricular activities
- Greater parent involvement - students and parents have easier access to teachers
- More positive self-image

Teacher Benefits:

- More commitment to the school and to the students
- Greater participation
- Expend more effort for student success
- Allows for greater diversity in program delivery options (team teaching, multi-age grouping, etc)

Institutional Benefits:

- More effective governance
- Better support of staff and students
- More helpful advising
- Less bureaucracy
- Participants are more empowered
- Reform is easier - small numbers allow ideas to be tried and fine-tuned
- Schools are safer

Concerns

The reorganization of large, comprehensive high schools into SLCs is generally a welcome model of school reform. However, not all stories proclaim success. A principal of a high school in Eugene, OR, upon visiting high schools that were displeased with their reorganization into SLCs, stated, “Some worked, some didn’t. The ones that didn’t were pretty ugly. Schools were competing, staffs were fighting, there was lower student achievement. You can’t bulldozer in, carve a school into four pieces, and just expect it will work” (Silverman, C2).

As schools restructure, school administrators are faced with additional questions of curriculum, tracking, cost, space, hiring, and support. Advocates of large schools feel that larger schools are able to create specialized programs because there are a greater number of students with similar needs, but research has shown that large size is no guarantee that advanced courses will be offered, or highly enrolled (Robertson 2). Critics of large schools argue that curriculum specialization leads to differentiation of academic experiences, and ultimately “social

stratification of student outcomes”. Conversely, small schools must focus on core programs, and fold marginal students in. However, a recent study found that some small schools did want to specialize their curriculum, but were constrained from doing so. (Ready et al 1992).

Some SLCs raise additional concerns about student outcomes, in that career academies may unconsciously perpetuate the old models of vocational education and the tracking of students (Raywid, 656). Researchers warn that, “the greatest concern is that charters do not become thinly disguised tracks into which students are placed based on some arbitrary standard of performance or expectation”. One study found that “academically motivated students tended to select subunits with reputations for academic rigor, while struggling students often chose subunits they thought had low academic and behavioral expectations” (Ready et al 2007).

Raywid (656) suggests that neither discipline-based (ex. mathematics or science) nor career-themed academies can work. Instead, schools should be created around themes, such as leadership or human relations, to combat elitism and tracking.

Cost is always an issue in public education, especially when concerning the implementation of a new program. Economists suggest that larger schools increase efficiency and reduce costs (Ready et al 1991). Mike Klonsky, director of the Small Schools Workshop at the University of Illinois at Chicago states, “If you want places to just ‘warehouse’ kids [then] bigger is cheaper, but if you are talking about making a connection to kids and improving graduation rates, then smaller schools are better”. Klonsky estimates that it costs on average a half million dollars to

restructure a large school as opposed to an estimated one million dollars to install security cameras (AYPF 1).

Some school districts may be faced with additional costs if renovation of existing structures is needed in order to house freshmen academies in separate parts of the building (WWC 2).

Opponent of the SLC movement contend that the additional costs for facilities and “redundant” programming makes larger schools more efficient and the cost per student lower (AYPF 2).

However, researchers argue that when measured against the cost per student graduated, small schools are considerably less expensive to operate than large or medium-sized schools because of their low dropout rates (NCSL).

Finding additional classroom space to house smaller classes has also proven to pose a challenge. In some areas, most notably California, school districts have used portable classrooms to allow for more classroom space (Robertson 3). During the 1996-1997 school year, California used 86,500 portable classrooms, causing public health researchers to voice opinions about the effects on student health (Ready et al 1999).

Smaller class sizes also means more teachers. Unfortunately, research shows that in some areas where under-qualified teachers were quickly hired to meet ratios, the results have not been promising (Robertson 3).

Finally, the lack of support, both internal and external, is a major obstacle to SLCs. Schools may feel constrained by regulations and policies outlined by the state board of education, the school

district, and possibly the host school. It is imperative to have the support of the teachers and the administration of the school, as hesitation may derail the progress and success of the SLC implementation (ERIC 5).

Conclusion

We know that most of our high schools as they currently exists are not working for the people who are trying hard to make them work... The traditional high school organization of short class periods, discrete subject areas, and teachers working alone in their classrooms may have worked at one time, but it is clear that it no longer meets the needs of a rapidly changing society and world. Today's high schools students must be prepared to make connections across cultures and field of knowledge. They must be prepared to take on work that requires independent thinking and problem solving... **What is needed is a comprehensive and systemic approach to reform** (emphasis in original)"

- Boston High School Restructuring Task Force

School reform is not a simple process, and the reorganization of large schools into small learning communities is not the only solution for the improvement of public schools. Providing students with nurturing, supportive, and academically rigorous environments has shown to improve achievement and attendance. While additional research is still being conducted on the effects of small school size and small class size, it is possible that restructuring schools into small learning communities, when done correctly and in a manner suitable for sustainability, may be a step in the right direction.

Works Cited

- Allen, Lili, Cheryl Almeida and Adria Steinberg. Wall to Wall: Implementing Small Learning Communities in Five Boston High Schools. (2001) Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory.
- American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF). "Smaller Schools and Learning Communities: The Wave of the Future?" (2000). Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum.
- Brand, Betsy. Reforming High Schools: The Role for Career Academies. (2004). Washington, DC: American Youth Policy Forum.
- Chmelynski, Carol. "Ninth Grade Academies Keep Kids in School." The Education Digest 69.5 (2004): 48-50.
- Clark, Carrie, and Allen Hunley. "Freshmen Academies on a Shoestring." Principal Leadership 7.7 (2007): 41-45.
- Conchas, Gilberto Q., and Patricia A. Clark. "Career Academies and Urban Minority Schooling: Forging Optimism Despite Limited Opportunity." Journal of Education for Students Placed At-Risk 7.3 (2002): 287-311.
- Davidson, Jill. "Innovative School Design for Small Learning Communities." Horace 18.1 (Fall 2001). 14 January 2008 http://www.essentialschools.org/cs/cespr/view/ces_res/208.
- Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). "Downsizing Schools in Big Cities." ERIC Digest 112 (1996). 14 January 2008 <http://www.eric.ed.gov>.

Felner, Robert D., Anne M. Seitsinger, Stephen Brand, Amy Burns, and Natalie Bolton.

“Creating Small Learning Communities: Lessons from the Project on High-Performing Learning Communities about ‘What Works’ in Creating Productive, Developmentally Enhancing, Learning Contexts.” Educational Psychologist 42.4 (2007): 209-21.

Heath, Debra. Evaluation Brief: Small Learning Communities, 2000-2003. (December 2005).
Albuquerque, NM: Albuquerque Public Schools.

National Conference of State Legislatures. “Small Learning Communities.” (2002). 9 January 2008 <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/employ/slc.htm>

National High School Center. The First Year of High School: A Quick Stats Fact Sheet. (2007)
Washington, DC: National High School Center.

Neubig, Mike. “Essential Scheduling Practices for High-Performing Schools with Career Academies/SLCs.” Techniques 81.4 (2006): 42-44.

Orr, Margaret Terry. “Career Academies as a Professional Engaging and Supportive Teaching Experience.” Education and Urban Society 37.4 (2005): 453-89.

Oxley, Diana. “Small Learning Communities: Extending and Improving Practice.” Principal Leadership 6.3 (November 2005): 44-48.

Raywid, Mary Anne. “Themes that Serve Schools Well.” Phi Delta Kappan 87.9 (May 2006):
654-656.

Ready, Douglas D., Valerie E. Lee, and Kevin G. Welner. “Educational Equity and School Structure: School Size, Overcrowding, and Schools-Within-Schools.” Teachers College Record 106.10 (October 2004): 1989-2014

Robertson, Sue. “The Great Size Debate.” CEFPI Brief on Educational Facility Issues (2001 August):1-4.

Silverman, Julia. "High Schools Get Smaller to Get Better." Columbian 20 April 2005: C2.

Swanson, Christopher. Who Graduates? Who Doesn't? A Statistical Portrait of Public High School Graduation, Class of 2001. (2004) Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Thurman, Susan. "Extreme School Makeover: Career Academy Edition." Techniques 82.1 (January 2007): 14-17.

Useem, Elizabeth, Ruth Curran Nield, and William Morrison. Philadelphia's Talent Development High Schools: Second-Year Results, 2000-01. (2002) Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Education Fund.

What Works Clearinghouse. WWC Intervention Report – Talent Development High Schools. (2007) Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.