



# Benchmarks

The Quarterly Newsletter of the National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform

Volume 2, Issue 1

Winter 2001

**Analysis of the National CSRD Competition.....2**

**What Happens Before Schools Get the Grant: Planning for the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program..... 4**

**CSRD Research by the Educational Laboratories.....6**

## Supporting CSR

As K-12 schools across the country continue to focus on school improvement through Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program grants, the national network of Regional Educational Laboratories (RELs) are at the forefront in providing assistance to K-12 schools. Assistance includes making available the most recent school improvement research and sharing research-based school improvement models, practices and processes which schools may consider adopting based on their needs. RELs also assist with implementation and evaluation strategies.

Each of the 10 RELs serves a geographic region of the nation and works in partnership with state and local educators, community members, parents and policymakers, providing assistance in using research to better inform and support their education-related decisions. The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement supports the RELs' CSRD work.

The CSRD program was promulgated by Congress to focus on improving whole schools to ensure that every student will realize academic success. According to this initiative, schools are to develop comprehensive school reform plans based on needs assessments. Improvement models developed or adopted must be based on research demonstrating the effectiveness of their practices and processes. From the beginning of CSRD, the RELs have focused on tailoring assistance to schools and communities, conducting independent and collaborative research studies to examine CSRD program implementation and evaluation, and capturing effective processes and practices for dissemination.

This issue of NCCSR Benchmarks highlights the school improvement research being conducted by the RELs, the results of which will be broadly disseminated.

Dr. Ethel Simon-McWilliams  
REL CEO/Executive Director Liaison

Dr. JoAnn Manning  
CSRD REL Group Leader

NCCSR  
2121 K Street NW, Suite 250  
Washington, DC 20037-1801

AskNCCSR@goodschools.gwu.edu

www.goodschools.gwu.edu

Telephone 1 (877) 766-4CSR or  
1 (877) 766-4277

Fax 1 (877) 308-4995

**About NCCSR — A partnership of The George Washington University, the Council for Basic Education and the Institute for Educational Leadership**

The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform collects and disseminates information that builds the capacity of schools to raise the academic achievement of all students. Through its web site, reference and retrieval services and publications, NCCSR is the central gateway to information on CSR. If you have documents on CSR that should be added to our database, please contact us for submission information.

## Analysis of the National CSRD Competition

By The Laboratory Network Program's CSRD Competition Research Project

What are the characteristics of schools that submitted successful and unsuccessful Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program (CSRD) proposals? What are the major differences between successful and unsuccessful CSRD program proposals? These questions were the catalyst for a national study of the CSRD grant competition proposed by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) and undertaken along with eight other regional educational laboratories (RELs).

Unlike many other federal education innovation programs, CSRD allowed each state education agency latitude in determining the eligibility of schools and districts, the proposal review criteria, the number and schedule of com-

### The CSRD Competition Research Team

- Joan L. Buttram, Patricia Castañeda-English and Victor Sáenz, SEDL
- Billie Hauser and Steven Moats, AEL
- Brett Lane, The LAB at Brown
- Bob Keller, McREL
- Lawrence Friedman, NCREL
- David Zuckerman, NWREL
- Jeve Chang and Mary Church, PREL
- Barbara Davis, SERVE
- Tracy Huebner, WestEd

petitions and the particular CSR models that could be adopted. To determine the characteristics of successful and unsuccessful CSRD applicants across the country, nine RELs gathered data from 28 states regarding their CSRD competitions.

## Results

In general the study demonstrated that while state education agencies adapted the competition requirements and procedures to fit their respective state reform contexts, the various states' CSRD programs are more alike than different.

### Percentage of Successful Applicants

Less than 7.9% of the eligible Title I schools across the nation applied for funding. Of those that applied nationwide, almost half (1,080 out of 2,186) were successful in obtaining funds; the success rates in individual states varied from a low of 27.3% to a high of 88.2%. This variance is influenced by a variety of factors, such as the size of the potential applicant pool, the intensity and frequency of technical assistance efforts on the part of state education agencies, and the length time schools and districts had to develop their proposals.

### Demographics of Successful Applicants

In this study, CSRD awards were made most frequently to schools located in urban areas (69.8%), that served elementary grade levels (60.5%), that had schoolwide Title I programs (86.5%), and that had high levels of students who qualified for free or reduced lunch (67%). After further analyzing the data on free and reduced lunch, researchers suggested that CSRD grants did actually reach high poverty schools.

### CSRD Awards to Targeted Schools

Because CSRD funds were awarded on a competitive basis, a chief concern was that few low-performing schools would apply or have the capacity to write competitive proposals. To assist these schools in "winning" CSRD funds, ten states added extra points to a school's proposal score if the school was labeled "low-performing" on some state indicator (e.g., state's standardized test results). Over half of the applicants



in six of the ten states qualified for additional points because of their low-performing status. In the other four states, 38% or less of the applicants received the extra points.

Four states had over 33% of the schools receive an award as a result of these additional points. Another four states had 10% to 20% of the schools receive an award because of the extra points, and two states had no schools receive an award because of the extra points. The strategy of adding points clearly did not achieve its objective in these last two states. In the eight states where the strategy had some success, the additional points made up between 20% and 46% of the schools' total scores. In the two states where the strategy was not successful, the additional points made up just 3% and 11% of the schools' total scores.

### Comparisons of Successful and Unsuccessful Schools' Proposals

Each SEA developed its own protocol and rubric for scoring applicants' proposals. In order to compare proposals from different states, individual proposal scores were converted to a percentage (based on the total number of points possible) and then analyzed. On average, approximately 24 percentage points separated successful and unsuccessful CSRD proposals. That is, on average successful schools scored 83% while unsuccessful schools scored 59%. Only two states awarded CSRD grants to schools with total scores below 70% and just one state de-

clined grants to schools with total scores over 70%.

### Comparisons Related to the Nine Components

The federal initiative identified nine components that all CSRD programs are expected to meet in order to receive funds. As a group, successful schools scored an average of 22% higher across the nine components than unsuccessful schools. However, there was a great deal of similarity among successful and unsuccessful schools in how well they addressed individual components. Successful and unsuccessful schools' proposals both scored the highest on two components: external technical assistance and support within the school. These two were probably the easiest for schools to accomplish. The first required schools to find technical assistance providers to work with them, and the second to document the support of faculty to undertake this effort. Successful and unsuccessful schools also scored the lowest on the same component: comprehensive design. This suggests that most schools had difficulty in articulating how their CSRD program would incorporate several different components into a schoolwide reform plan.

## What Happens Before Schools Get the Grant: Planning for the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program

By The Laboratory Network Program's CSRD Implementation Research Project

Developing a comprehensive school reform (CSR) plan is a challenging and time consuming process that has a serious impact on the reform's implementation and, ultimately, chances for success. To help schools with the planning process, seven of the Regional Education Laboratories (RELs) have conducted studies on the federal Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) program. In an effort to collectively examine key issues across the different research projects, a cross-REL research initiative was developed in which participants agreed to apply data gathered in their research to address four general areas of CSRD implementation. This article summarizes a report of the common themes identified in the first area: the process each school used to develop its CSR plan and how this process supported CSR implementation. The findings are organized by level of government starting with themes at the federal and state levels, then moving down to the district, and finally the school level.

### Participating States

Alabama	Kentucky	South Carolina
California	Maine	Tennessee
Colorado	Mississippi	Virginia
Florida	Missouri	Washington <sup>1</sup>
Georgia	North Carolina	West Virginia
Hawaii	Oregon	Wyoming
Kansas	Puerto Rico	

### The CSRD Competition Research Team

- Steve Moats, AEL, Inc., in collaboration with Allan Sterbin of the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP) at the University of Memphis
- Ted Hamann, The LAB at Brown University
- Helen S. Apthorp and Robert E. Reichardt, McREL
- Inge Aldersebaes and Steve Nelson, NWREL
- Mary B. Church, PREL
- Barbara Davis, SERVE, in collaboration with Steven M. Ross, Marty Alberg, Robert Horn, Deborah Lowther and Lana Smith of CREP
- Tracy A. Huebner, Grace Calisi and Steven Pariani, WestEd

### Interaction of Federal and State Policies with Model Selection

Federal and state policies influenced schools' model selection mainly through provisions for resource allocation, time and data-based planning. As encouraged by the CSRD legislation, some schools combined resources from Title I and CSRD to support CSR. Two states used CSRD to support other state initiated reform efforts. These states' efforts limited schools' choice of models but also facilitated coordination of CSRD and other reform activities. Time to prepare for CSRD grant applications in several states affected the ability of some schools to gather information about designs, disseminate

---

that information among staff, and involve their school communities in CSRSD planning for the application. Finally, needs analyses that were mandated by separate state or district policies appeared to provide data to guide the CSRSD program planning process in a number of sites across several states.

## District Support for Planning

Districts supported applications for CSRSD grants by

- analyzing data,
- hiring grant writers,
- gathering information from model design teams,
- providing links with the community, and
- helping schools integrate school and district standards or goals for the proposal.

Districts also provided administrative support such as negotiating with model providers and helping with resource allocation. As a key source of information about reform designs, districts could also reduce the choices available to schools. This limiting of schools' choices was sometimes a planned outcome of district level needs assessments.

## School Planning Activities

A key area in several of the RELs research projects was the amount of teacher participation in reform model selection and its effects on implementation. The findings were mixed. Two REL projects (SERVE and AEL/CREP) explicitly examined the effect of model selection on reform implementation and school climate using similar instruments, but they used different definitions of the constructs. Researchers at AEL/CREP found statistically significant differences in school climate and implementation progress between schools using different model selection processes. Researchers at SERVE saw some similar patterns in their data, but used different statistical analysis techniques and variant definitions of the constructs. Using qualitative research methods, researchers at two other RELs (McREL and LAB at Brown) gathered data on the selection processes. McREL reported that teachers appeared to have (gradually) embraced principal-mandated reforms, while re-

searchers at LAB at Brown reported faculty frustration created by a principal's top-down decisions. These contradictory findings may be due to differences in conceptualizations and methodologies, but also to differences in school or district leadership and/or regional cultures.

Finally, NWREL's work focused on schools that were not prepared for reform and described factors that influence a school's readiness to implement CSRSD including leadership, vision, high expectations and accountability.

## Next Steps

The relationship between district support, the model selection process and implementation is an area of continuing research for the RELs. Given what is being learned about school preparedness for reform, a key direction for this ongoing work may be an examination of appropriate district roles given different school-level capacities to decide on and implement reforms.



## CSR D Research by the Regional Educational Laboratories (RELs)\*

REL	Researcher	Study Title and Description
AEL	<p>1. Doris Redfield and Steven Ross  <i>Contact:</i> Doris Redfield (800) 624-9120  redfield@ael.org</p> <p>Steven Ross  (901) 678-3413  smross@memphis.edu</p> <p>2. Caitlin Howley-Rowe  <i>Contact:</i> Caitlin Howley-Rowe (800) 624-9120  rowec@ael.org</p>	<p><b>1. <i>Multi-Site Replicated Experiments on Comprehensive School Restructuring</i></b>  Designed to explore the implementation and impact of comprehensive school reform (CSR) models, this study will cover</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the extent of CSR model implementation,</li> <li>• teachers', administrators', parents' and students' perceptions of the strengths and limitations of the reform implementation,</li> <li>• the impact of the CSR model on school climate, parent involvement, teaching and student achievement, and</li> <li>• differences in implementation and impact of CSR models at the various schools.</li> </ul> <p><i>Completion date:</i> Summer 2004 (estimate)</p> <p><b>2. <i>Three Rural Case Studies</i></b>  These case studies will cover the contexts of, supports for and hindrances to CSR in rural schools and districts. The main outcomes to be examined are the extent of implementation, student performance and staff members' perceptions of the reform.</p> <p><i>Completion date:</i> Spring 2001</p>
LAB	<p>1. Brett Lane and Patti Smith  <i>Contact:</i> Brett Lane (800) 521-9550  x. 293</p> <p>2. Ted Hamann and Ivana Zuliani  <i>Contact:</i> Ted Hamann (800) 521-9550  x. 314</p> <p>3. Ted Hamann and Susan Hackett Johnson (Maine Department of Education)  <i>Contact:</i> Ted Hamann (800) 521-9550  x. 314</p>	<p><b>1. <i>Collaborative State CSR D Evaluation Study</i></b>  The <i>Collaborative State Evaluation Study</i> documents the development and implementation of formative and/or summative state CSR D evaluations. The study also examines the effects different types of evaluations, including evaluation strategies, have on school level CSR implementation, sustainability and student outcomes.</p> <p><i>Completion date:</i> Preliminary Report, December 2000</p> <p><b>2. <i>English Language Learners in the Context of Comprehensive School Reform</i></b>  This study examines the attention that states and CSR D grantee schools are giving to addressing the issues of language diversity in their development of CSR D programs.</p> <p><i>Completion date:</i> Preliminary Report, December 2000</p> <p><b>3. <i>Concentrating Resources to Magnify Gains: The Implications and Promise of the State of Maine's CSR D Roll-Out</i></b>  This study explores the unique process by which the state of Maine positioned itself for CSR implementation. Maine focused CSR D exclusively at the secondary school level and carefully intertwined it with the structured secondary reform initiative called <i>Promising Futures</i>.</p> <p><i>Completion date:</i> Preliminary Report, December 2000</p>

\* This information was submitted to NCCSR by staff from each of the RELs listed. Staff at PREL chose not to participate.

	<p>4. Ted Hamann and Brett Lane  <i>Contact:</i> Ted Hamann  (800) 521-9550 x. 314</p>	<p><b>4. <i>Lessons and Possibilities: Notes Regarding CSRD in Puerto Rico</i></b>  In response to possible federal concerns about CSRD implementation in Puerto Rico (where the sometimes criticized Lightspan model is being enacted in 51 of 75 CSRD schools), this study investigates Puerto Rico's CSRD roll-out and found no systemic reasons for concern. However, the study does offer policy recommendations to the Puerto Rico Department of Education, some Puerto Rico model providers and to the LAB itself.  <i>Completion date:</i> Preliminary Report, December 2000</p>
<b>LSS</b>	<p>No information submitted  <i>Contact:</i> No information submitted</p>	<p><b><i>CSRD Evaluation Project</i></b>  LSS's evaluation project examines the extent of alignment among the nine components of CSRD, states' applications for implementing CSRD and the implementation plans of the local schools receiving CSRD funding. The study has two components.  a) The initial component is developing a database of program features, implementation requirements and outcomes of the implementation of the comprehensive reform initiative in sixteen schools in two New Jersey urban school districts.  b) The second component is a regional study that examines CSRD implementation and impact in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware and the District of Columbia.  <i>Completion date:</i> No information submitted</p>
<b>McREL</b>	<p>1. Helen Apthorp and Ravay L. Snow-Renner  <i>Contact:</i> Helen Apthorp  (303) 632-5622  hapthorp@mcrel.org</p> <p>2. Judy Florian  <i>Contact:</i> Judy Florian  (303) 632-5625  jflorian@mcrel.org</p> <p>3. Dorothy Aguilera  <i>Contact:</i> Lou Cicchinelli  (303) 632-5509  lcicchin@mcrel.org</p> <p>4. Gail Clark, Ceri Dean, Zoe Barley, Rebecca Van Buhler and Helen Apthorp</p>	<p><b>1. <i>An Exploratory Study of CSRD Funded Schools: Classroom Practices in K-5 Literacy</i></b>  This report describes the findings of an exploratory study into the implementation of classroom practices to support early literacy learning in elementary schools with CSRD grants.  <i>Completion date:</i> December 2000</p> <p><b>2. <i>Sustaining Education Reform: Influential Factors</i></b>  This multiple case study project examines the status of systemic reform efforts launched ten years ago in South Dakota in order to 1) identify conditions and factors that facilitate the sustainability of school reforms and 2) provide CSRD districts and schools with insights into how to maintain reforms once external funding ends or attention is diverted to new requirements.  <i>Completion date:</i> December 2000</p> <p><b>3. <i>Adapting Comprehensive School Reform Programs to Districts with American Indian Student Populations</i></b>  This multiple case study examines organizational changes necessary to implement CSR models in schools serving primarily American Indian students.  <i>Completion date:</i> December 2000</p> <p><b>4. <i>Beyond the List: Schools Selecting Alternative Comprehensive School Reform Models</i></b>  This study examines the unique needs of schools located in rural and remote areas of the central region as they select and develop reform models. The report is</p>

	<p>Contact: Gail Clark (303) 632-5584 gclark@mcrel.org</p>	<p>available at <a href="http://www.mcrel.org/csrd/beyondlist.pdf">http://www.mcrel.org/csrd/beyondlist.pdf</a>. Completion date: September 2000</p>
NCREL	<p>1. NCREL and RMC Research, Inc. Contact: Larry Friedman (800) 356-2735 friedman@mcrel.org</p> <p>2. NCREL Contact: Larry Friedman (800) 356-2735 friedman@mcrel.org</p> <p>3. Indiana Education Policy Center and NCREL Contact: Larry Friedman (800) 356-2735 friedman@mcrel.org</p> <p>4. Indiana Education Policy Center and NCREL Contact: Larry Friedman (800) 356-2735 friedman@mcrel.org</p>	<p>1. <b><i>School Level Implementation of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program in the North Central Region</i></b> This study examines schools' efforts to implement their CSRSD proposals and the help they receive from their model providers and districts in the North Central region. The report is based on case studies from a random sample of 40 CSRSD schools and a survey on schools' CSRSD foci and progress of the principal and two teachers in each of the region's CSRSD schools. Completion date: December 2000</p> <p>2. <b><i>Launching Comprehensive School Reform: Early Lessons for State and Federal Policy Makers</i></b> This study describes the initial responses to the CSRSD program from the perspectives of state education agencies, districts, schools and comprehensive school reform model providers in the North Central region. Interviews were conducted with principals of schools that applied for CSRSD grants, principals of schools that did not apply and staff from state education agencies and model developers. Data on non-applicant, applicant and grantee schools was also gathered from the National Center for Education Statistics' Common Core of Data. The findings are available at <a href="http://www.ncrel.org/policy/pubs/pdfs/piv013.pdf">http://www.ncrel.org/policy/pubs/pdfs/piv013.pdf</a>. Completion date: September 1999</p> <p>3. <b><i>A Comparison of High-Performing, High-Poverty Schools and Comprehensive School Reform Schools in Wisconsin</i></b> This study compares school improvement processes and their outcomes in high-performance, high-poverty schools and in CSRSD schools in Wisconsin. The first phase conducted case studies of six high-performance, high-poverty schools, and a teacher survey in those schools and six similar CSRSD schools. Completion date: December 2000</p> <p>4. <b><i>Aligning Comprehensive School Reform and High School Graduation Standards in Minnesota</i></b> This study examines the extent to which the models used by CSRSD schools in Minnesota are aligned with the state's high school graduation standards. Completion date: September 1999</p>
NWREL	<p>1. Jana Potter, Newton Hamilton and Inge Aldersebaas Contact: Elizabeth Blankenship, PPD (503) 275-0753 blankene@nwrel.org</p>	<p>1. <b><i>Programs Don't - People Do: A Framework for Schoolwide Change</i></b> A case study examining the journey of identifying and implementing a school wide literacy program was conducted in two regional schools: Rowena Chess Elementary, Pasco, Washington and Siletz School, Siletz, Oregon. Both of these schools were selected for the case study because they applied for but did not receive CSRSD funds. The intent of the case study is to look at the process a school follows in implementing a schoolwide approach to literacy instruction building on their own resources, experience, training and talents. NWREL staff</p>

	<p>2. David W. Zuckerman, Anton Furman and Steve Nelson  <i>Contact:</i> Elizabeth Blankenship, PPD  (503) 275-0753  blankene@nwrel.org</p>	<p>visited both schools regularly to work with grade level teams, action planning teams and whole faculty meetings to facilitate a process of articulating needs and developing action plans. Both schools are implementing literacy action plans in the 2000-2001 school year. A cornerstone of the action plans is teacher research teams.  <i>Completion date:</i> December 10, 2000</p> <p><b>2. <i>Rural CSRD Schools' Access to Technical Assistance During Early Stages of Adoption and Implementation</i></b>  This research study is a response to voiced concerns that it might be too difficult or expensive for CSRD model providers to work with rural schools, perhaps leading to the schools being shortchanged. The study addresses the following five questions: (1) Were the rural schools in the Northwest able to contract with the design provider of their choice, or were they turned away because of the developer's difficulty in adapting to their circumstances? (2) Were adaptations made to the model, the training or the technical assistance? (3) Were those adaptations related to the schools' small size, social context or geographic isolation? (4) Did these adaptations – or a lack of adaptations to rural needs – lead to lessened or weakened implementation? (5) How do the costs of delivery to rural CSRD schools in the Northwest compare to the costs of delivery to schools in other settings?  <i>Completion date:</i> December 10, 2000</p>
<p><b>SEDL</b></p>	<p>1. Robert V. Carlson  <i>Contact:</i> Joan Buttram  (512) 476-6861  x. 270  jbuttram@sedl.org</p> <p>2. Patricia Castañeda-English, Victor Sáenz, and Joan L. Buttram  <i>Contact:</i> Joan Buttram  (512) 476-6861  x. 270  jbuttram@sedl.org</p> <p>3. Joan L. Buttram, Patricia Castañeda-English, Victor Sáenz  <i>Contact:</i> Joan Buttram  (512) 476-6861  x. 270  jbuttram@sedl.org</p>	<p><b>1. <i>Rural Implementation Case Studies</i></b>  Five case studies that focus on the start-up and ongoing implementation of CSR programs are being conducted in rural schools in Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas. Particular attention is paid to understanding how the rural context influenced the start-up and implementation of these programs.  <i>Completion date:</i> December 2000</p> <p><b>2. <i>Report on the Early Implementation Survey Results for the Southwest Region</i></b>  Teachers and administrators in 278 CSRD schools in the Southwest region were surveyed about factors related to successful implementation of school improvement efforts in fall 1999 and spring 2000. SEDL analyzed survey responses by building to determine whether schools' status on these factors changed. The results were shared with schools so that they could make adjustments in factors that may influence their success.  <i>Completion date:</i> December 2000</p> <p><b>3. <i>Analysis of the Southwest Region CSRD Competition</i></b>  This study provides information about the CSRD applicants during the initial program funding, including schools' demographic characteristics and proposals' strengths and weaknesses.  <i>Completion date:</i> May 2000</p>

	<p>4. Joan L. Buttram, Patricia Castañeda-English, Victor Sáenz and staff from 8 other RELs  <i>Contact:</i> Joan Buttram  (512) 476-6861  x. 270  jbuttram@sedl.org</p> <p>5. Dorothy Aguilera  <i>Contact:</i> Joan Buttram  (512) 476-6861  x. 270  jbuttram@sedl.org</p>	<p><b>4. <i>Analysis of the National CSRD Competition</i></b>  This study provides information about the CSRD applicants in 28 states during the initial program funding, including schools' demographic characteristics and proposals' strengths and weaknesses.  <i>Completion date:</i> November 2000</p> <p><b>5. <i>Native American Case Studies</i></b>  Five case studies that focus on the start-up and ongoing implementation of CSR programs are being conducted in schools with high concentrations of Native American students in New Mexico and Oklahoma. Particular attention is paid to understanding how the American Indian context influenced the start-up and implementation of these programs.  <i>Completion date:</i> December 2000</p>
<b>SERVE</b>	<p>Susan Martelli  <i>Contact:</i> Susan Martelli  (800) 352-6001  smartell@serve.org</p>	<p><b><i>Implementation of Schools Awarded Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program Grants in the Southeast Region</i></b>  This study looks at the degree of implementation of the comprehensive plan, obstacles encountered and ways to overcome the obstacles. Student outcomes will be tracked across three years and correlated with the implementation findings.  <i>Completion date:</i> September 2002 (estimate)</p>
<b>WestEd</b>	<p>1. Kim Taylor and Aimee Moreno  <i>Contact:</i> Kim Taylor  (602) 322-7011  ktaylor@wested.org</p> <p>2. Tracy Huebner and Grace Calisi  <i>Contact:</i> Tracy Huebner  (415) 615-3140  thuebne@wested.org</p>	<p><b>1. <i>Doing CSR: The Role of Leadership and a Professional Learning Community in Implementing Comprehensive School Reform</i></b>  The main objective of the study is to unpack the procedural knowledge of how schools move forward with reform. Three main areas were examined: leadership, school community and professional learning.  <i>Completion date:</i> December 8, 2000</p> <p><b>2. <i>CSRD Implementation: A Study of California Districts Supporting Schools</i></b>  This study looks at the ways in which nine districts in California supported schools from the pre-application phase through the first year of implementation of comprehensive school reform. In this study we categorize the actions that districts took when supporting schools (proactive and reactive) and discuss the different ways districts acted under these typologies.  <i>Completion date:</i> December 8, 2000</p>

## NCCSR HAS A NEW WEB SITE!

The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform has developed a whole new web site. In addition to the old favorites such as CSR Step by Step and the literature database, you'll find several new resources including

- A full CSR library that houses a reading room, the literature database, references by topic, answers to frequently asked questions and a reference help desk,
- An extensive set of links to related government, research, policy and technical assistance organizations, and
- The full set of NCCSR publications: Bookmarks, Benchmarks, Issue Briefs, Research Briefs and, coming soon, a resource guide for the nine components.

Explore the new site at <http://www.goodschools.gwu.edu/>.

The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform (NCCSR) collects and disseminates information that builds the capacity of schools to raise the academic achievement of all students. This is accomplished by continuously examining the literature related to comprehensive school reform (CSR), adding high quality materials to our on-line databases and actively sending useful information to educators and policy makers at the local, state and national levels. Through our web site, reference and retrieval services and publications, NCCSR is the central gateway to information on CSR.

### Contact NCCSR:

The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform  
2121 K Street NW, Suite 250  
Washington, DC 20037-1801

### Web Site:

<http://www.goodschools.gwu.edu>

### Toll Free Numbers:

Telephone: 1 (877) 766-4CSR or 4277

Fax: 1 (877) 308-4995

### AskNCCSR:

[AskNCCSR@goodschools.gwu.edu](mailto:AskNCCSR@goodschools.gwu.edu)

AskNCCSR is a convenient way for email users to request information, order publications from NCCSR, or ask for help from NCCSR's on-line services.

Benchmarks is published four times a year. The National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform (NCCSR) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement and is operated by The George Washington University under Contract No. ED-99-CO-0137. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of The George Washington University or the U.S. Department of Education. The mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. Readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCCSR requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.



National Clearinghouse for  
Comprehensive School Reform  
2121 K Street NW, Suite 250  
Washington, DC 20037-1801



Non-Profit Org.  
US Postage  
PAID  
Wash. DC  
Permit No. 593