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**READY, SET, GLOBAL!**

**AN ASSESSMENT OF GLOBALIZATION IN HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULA**

ABSTRACT

This assessment looked at twenty-one Chicago area high schools to determine how many elements of global education were included in their curricula based on their course description booklets. High schools were selected based on the availability of their booklets online. Booklets were coded specifically looking for technological elements as well as multi and cross-cultural elements and classes offering non-Western languages including Chinese or Japanese. Data found that in all areas, public schools mentioned more opportunities for elements of technology, multiculturalism and non-Western languages. This being said, there were other facts that may have attributed to this including size, percentage of low income students and location.

Living in a globalized society has changed what it means to be successful and what basic skills are necessary to succeed in this global economy. This calls into question whether or not high school students graduate with skills that are now necessary to be successful. High schools are meant to prepare students for college or a world outside of school but, as is common knowledge, high schools all over the country are very different. Recently, the idea of global education has been brought to the forefront of educational topics. If a student graduates without “global education” skills, they may not have another chance to learn them elsewhere. Global education is necessary in high school education but what types or elements of global education are taught can be affected by geographic and socioeconomic factors.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research in the development of global education is limited, particularly in the United States. Most information about global education available is on a comparative basis, using Western European and Asian countries, or is produced by private research firms. In the research that is available, four general areas are addressed including 1) what is considered global education, 2.) why there has been a recent push for global education, 3) examples of how global education has been implemented domestically and abroad, and 4) the current global education policy in the United States.

*What is Global Education?*

Global education is difficult to define because it can mean a variety of things to different people. The term “global education” is most commonly associated with the idea that people in the world are all interconnected and the world should be viewed as one society of humanity instead of a collection of smaller nations (Parker 2008). Waltzer and Heilman (2005) found four common themes defining global education. The four themes include the idea of raising consciousness and awareness of a world outside the United States, allowing students to recognize differences and a “happy multiculturalism,” the ability to think critically about the outside world, and the recognition of a “cosmopolitan identity as well as a sense of responsibility for all humanity” (Waltzer and Heilman 2005:157-158) In another study by Tye and Tye (1993), resistance from teachers to the implementation global education curriculum appeared to stem from the problem of differing definitions teachers applied “global education”.

Additionally, there is no well-defined public vision of global education (Bales 2004). Bales stated that the public cannot grasp the issue of global education because it is hard to visually represent the benefits and why it is truly needed in the school system. She also argues Americans may view global education strictly as learning a language or learning geography (Bales 2004). Parents worry that including global education in the curriculum neglects the current problem of a perceived failing school system. This could be a miscommunication concerning the definition of global education or due to the fact that it is hard for the public to view global skills as a necessity rather than a luxury (Bales 2004). Further research showed that the public believes this form of education is “exotic” and students are already “deficient in international ‘basics’ such as foreign languages and world history” (Bales 2004:208). This calls into question which to do first: fix the existing problems within the school system, or incorporate global education into the curriculum. While definitions of global education may vary, all are consistent in saying that humanity is interconnected with the shrinking world, including international conflicts which affect other countries outside our own (Tye 2003).

*Why the need for global education?*

The need for global education can be argued from several points of view. Researchers such as Parker (2008) argue that global education is a result of nationalistic views implemented in education for two reasons, national security and economic security. The idea that national security is fueling the global education movement is because we don’t know our enemies’ languages. Thus, the United States is at a disadvantage by not knowing the language that our enemies are speaking because it creates a barrier of entry in a global economy as well as a homeland security issue. Researchers at private firms have found it essential for students to be equipped with communication and leadership skills for the future especially concerning economic issues as well as global threats and cross cultural pandemics (Bell-Rose and Desai 2006).

The ability to understand other nations as well as enhancing United States leadership within the global society are reasons why the national security argument resonates with so many politicians (Parker 2008). Simultaneously, schools around the world are seen as a mechanism to strengthen national loyalties while education moves its focus towards global education and a society of humanity rather than a society of independent nations (Tye 2003). Because of this, not all agree with the use of global education. Some, like Burak (2003), think that global education only further deters from nationalism and creates students who are too sympathetic to people from other nations. Burak believes this is a problem in defending the country against international conflicts in the future due to the breakdown of nationalism.

Another motivator behind global education is to keep the United States competitive in the world economic market. The previous United States Secretary of Education, Margaret Spelling, stated that the goal of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) was to help every child achieve success in a global economy by turning students into competent members of a global economy (Parker 2008 and Waltzer and Heilman 2005). The United States wants to use education not only as a way to stay current in the competing economy, but partially to increase U.S. competitiveness against some Asian countries, including Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan, and South Korea (Parker 2008). Providing students with a global education maintains a competitive edge in the workforce and allows the U.S. to maintain its place in the market. The Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century stated that because of globalization, workers from every industry and sector now have to compete with people all over the world for the same job. Other growing economies may have globally educated workforces, could cause the United States to lose its economic edge (2005).

*Examples of Global Education Implementation*

While the United States may not be the world leader in infusing global education into curriculum, some elements of global education have been included in various curricula in the United States. Tye and Tye (1993) worked with 11 different elementary and secondary schools assisting their teachers in adding a global perspective to as many subjects as possible. For example, they suggested adding the global perspective by purchasing maps for all their English classrooms. Also within the United States, other schools have tried to combine several aspects of global education into one. In one specific project in a Hawaiian high school, students were required to produce travel brochures. These brochures student required research which included talking to Japanese tourists and communicating through email with Japanese students in Japanese. This assignment was meant to encourage the recognition of a global community as well as the participation of the local community (Ady 1999).

Other countries have also made attempts on a national scale to introduce more global education courses into their curriculum. In the 1990s both the United Kingdom and Japan experienced a push for more global education courses. In the United Kingdom specifically, global dimension was incorporated into the revised National Curriculum and was expected to be included in all subjects and whole-school activities (Fujikane 2003). At the same time, Japan also revamped their curriculum to include other areas of study such as international understanding, information technology and environmental studies. Public schools were given the opportunity to develop new ways of teaching through interdisciplinary and comprehensive activities (Fujikane 2003:146). Another study from Tye (2003) showed the most frequent subjects in other countries geared towards a global education focused on international political and cultural relations as well as human interaction and its effects on the environment. Comparatively, the United States has no requirements for global education in our classrooms.

*United States Policy and Global Education*

While the United States Department of Education does not explicitly state that global education is required, the department itself is an advocate for including global education as much as possible in all curricula. This inclusion has often incorporated environmental issues, intercultural conflicts and terrorism into lessons (Fujikane 2003). Fujikane also states that since 1994, when school standards were nationalized, the idea of teaching a global perspective grew at local, state and national levels. While information about global education and its implementation may vary from place to place, teaching global issues can be far more standardized because of the use of technology. The United States Department of Education and the United States Department of State have collaborated every year for the past 10 years to produce International Education Week, which is usually during the fall. The goal of International Education Week is to emphasize the importance of international or global education as well as to promote the use of the global perspective in events and activities that foster those qualities (International Education Week 2008). While the United States Department of Education advocates for global education, are elements of global education actually being taught in American schools?

THEORY

The predominant educational theory starting in the 1930s was based on the idea of human development through a welfare system that was maintained by a strong state. This belief remained the dominant idea up through the Second World War until the development of the human capital theory in the 1960s (Daun 2002). Human capital theory rests on the principle that the more education a person receives, the better off that person will be in the future. In other words, increased human capital, including specialized labor skills, is monetarily more valued.

Social theories in education shifted after World War II because of the expansion of primary and secondary education systems due to the Baby Boom. This expansion was closely related to increased economic growth (Daun 2002). More recently there has been another shift in educational theory, from a modernist framework of human capital to a postmodern ideal of globalization. The idea of globalization is grounded in economic change and is connected to education because education is a major factor in economic growth as well. These theories discuss the advantage of globalized education curriculum, particularly as it affects students who are from marginalized groups.

*Consensus Theories*

With the impact of globalization, new theories that incorporated human capital theory were emerging which were called consensus theories (Daun 2002). Consensus theories argue that society is held together by shared values. Values interact within larger structures and are mandatory for social organization. These theories also assume the modernist point of view that societies will eventually progress through the use of rationality. For example, Keynesian human capital exemplifies consensus theory by showing that through gradual change progress can be achieved, and all societies follow the same path to progress. The effort put into education is proportional to the returns which are shown as an increase in human capital.

According to Daun (2002:35) education is seen as the best way to “allocate the most talented people to the highest positions.” This means that social inequality is based on achievement. The assumption is that intelligence as well as achievement is determined on an individual level and that human capital is equally attainable for everyone. Daun also notes that these theories, such as human capital theory, all assume that outside factors--such as race or social class--are not as strong as the investment into education or training.

As globalization has expanded, educational theorists have realized that economies are not constant, proving that merit based education could be a myth. If education was based on merit alone, the market would not be as volatile. Consensus theories neglect other social factors that can affect educational processes: gender, social class, and race are ignored and these factors greatly affect the educational opportunities available to some students. Daun (2002) claims that social class is still a major determinant in the level of human capital student can gain. Because not all students start out at the same level and not all students can reach the same level of education, the gap between them is widened by outside forces.

*Conflict Theory*

Conflict theory or Neo-Marxist theory, is considered one of the more important theories for examining education. According to Daun (2002), Neo-Marxists believe that education is directly affected by the economy and class conflict. Drawing upon a Marxist framework, Bourdieu (1986) identified three different types of capital that can be produced and reproduced: economic capital, cultural capital, and social capital. Economic capital is the amount of financial assets a person has, whereas social capital is measured by value of the groups in which one has membership and one’s social connections. Social capital is a measure of potential social resources. Both economic and social capital differ from cultural capital, which is the skills or knowledge a person has based on their educational advantage. Parents socialize their children to their own cultural capital in the form of attitudes and knowledge. Social and cultural capital can be similar in that they take into account factors within a home, which could include socioeconomic status. Cultural capital is brought to school with the student and then, in conjunction with learned social capital from school, can be used to produce economic capital. Bourdieu recognized that social and cultural capital reproduce socioeconomic structures that create an education gap between classes. As globalization is so closely connected with the economy, including the motives behind education, globalization produces knowledge as a “good,” which may allow a country to compete in the newly emerging global economy.

While these theories take into account the differences in social classes, there are critics of these views. Daun (2002) argues that it is hard to make the connection between the reproduction of socioeconomic structures and what is taught in schools. For example, resistance theory explains what happens when a student’s socioeconomic status and cultural background differ from the school’s culture.

Resistance theory analyzes the conflict between a student’s culture and the culture of the school. Problems emerge when the student is from a different cultural background than the Western culture of the school. Globalization has led to an expansion of Western thought in education worldwide; thus the cultures of schools have become increasingly similar to one another. As Daun (2002) notes, schools teach similar subject matter in similar pedagogical form no matter where they are, across the world. Opposition to the hegemony of school culture is resistance. Giroux (2001) states that students from different cultures, especially in lower classes, are more resistant to the school culture because the student’s culture differs more from the school culture than other students.

Giroux (2001) views schools as the primary socializing agent for producing professionals and technically trained workers. Giroux argues that due to the economic focus of Western curriculum, subjects like citizenship are lost in the increasingly globalizing economic system, which is migrating into the education system. Russell (2007) notes that in the pre-internet era the idea of school as a vehicle for social justice was replaced by the dominating ideals of the economic market, meaning that schools were seen as a place to produce financial professionals instead of socially conscious individuals.

*Globalization and Educational Reform*

While modernist may look at integrating globalization into education as a way to increase human capital, human capital theory neglects conflicts among groups and inequality that may result. Education is becoming a product of the economy because the drive for global education results from the need to stay competitive in a global economy. Simply put, “Globalization represents a revolutionary transformation in the world economy based on information technologies and extensive changes in education” (Russell 2007:10).

Technology is a major force in educational change. (Kenway 1996). It has become more accessible to people around the world but has also changed with the world. Russell (2007) argues that the changes made in the education system are driven solely by the market and technology. This integration of technology and education has become one of the first steps towards a globalized education. Other educational theories argue for integrating several different subjects together with technology. For example, aesthetic theory uses an interdisciplinary approach but to also present information in a new way and “ready for the new global age” (Choi and Piro 2009:30). It is another approach to interdisciplinary classes. The introduction of technology into new disciplines could provide new opportunities for students to learn.

The overview of educational theories presented here illustrates the growing impact of globalization on education. Some view globalizing education as a way to increase human capital. Other theories consider the social advancement and economic improvement through the spread of westernized schools and democracy across the world. Conflict theorists view the change in education due to globalization as a power struggle between those who have power and those who do not. As educational theories continue to adapt to changes in the globalized economy, it is time to consider the types of changes to curriculum that is called for in a global educational system.

METHODOLOGY

This research examines high school curricula within the Chicago-area to determine which, if any, elements of global education are included in their curricula. Using course description books was the easiest way to obtain a copy of the curriculum for each school that was assessed. Schools were separated based on type, geographic location which was defined by the Common Core of Data as well as the Illinois Interactive Report Card. The Chicago- area was also convenient and familiar to the researcher which made the data collection a convenient sample. The goal of this research was to determine if and to what degree global education was being implemented in Chicago-area high schools.

The Common Core of Data (CCD), part of the National Center for Educational Statistics, characterizes schools as falling into one of three geographic categories: urban, suburban or fringe. The CCD defined urban as an economic center with a population greater than 250,000 people. Suburbs were defined as under 250,000 people, but outside the city center. Fringe towns sit further than 30 miles away from the city, are more than 2.5 miles from another town, and have fewer than 25,000 residents (CCD 2009). Schools were stratified using CCD definitions in because these are the definitions used by the Illinois Interactive Report Card classifications.

After schools were stratified, individual schools were picked using a convenience sampling method, with those schools that posted their course description booklets online included in the population. Schools were further separated into categories based on whether the school was public or private, and if private, whether they school had a religious affiliation or not. The table below describes the final categories of schools within the sample.

Table 1: Breakdown of School Categories

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | Urban | Suburban | Fringe |
| Public | Public Urban School | Public Suburban School | Public Fringe School |
| Private | Religious Urban | Religious Suburban | Religious Fringe |
| Independent Urban | Independent Suburban | Independent Fringe |

Seven schools were selected from each geographic category. For public schools, school profile information is available online through Illinois Interactive Report Card (2009) including the size of each school as well as the percentage of low income students. Percentage of low income was used to operationalize socioeconomic status of each public school community. The higher the percentage of low income students was, the lower the socioeconomic status of the school. This information was used as a base of comparison between public schools. All other information for private schools was found through the individual school’s website.

The schools’ course offering books were coded based on the inclusion of global education in the current curricula. A copy of the coding sheet can be found in Appendix A. For this study, global education was viewed in three ways. It is important to realize that the economy is continually shifting in favor of Asian countries. Being fluent in Asian languages is increasingly important in the business world as well as being fluent in Arabic due to oil reserves in the Middle East. Thus, modern languages were coded looking specifically for courses in Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, and other Asian languages as well as culture.

Next, each school’s course description book was coded for cross-cultural or multicultural classes, specifically looking for words such as, cross-cultural or multicultural, but also looking for courses that taught about other systems of government, economies, or culture in general throughout the world, including literature, art or music. The third aspect of global education that was coded was the use of technology in the classroom. For this element, words like Excel, Microsoft, Power Point, online research, Word, computer programming, software, spreadsheet, digital media and other words indicating technology usage were coded. After all the course description booklets were coded, schools were compared based on their size, location, type and socioeconomic status to assess trends within the variables.

*Strengths and Weaknesses*

The goal of this project is to look at the options that are available to students, which is both a strength and a weakness. In order to know what needs to be fixed in the education system it is imperative to know what is available. This can also be a weakness because this study did not measure whether global education is effective, only whether or not it is present. This is also a small study that is only within the Chicago area. Global education likely differs throughout the United States, and may also be operationalized differently in other places. In this case, information was limited to what was available in the smaller amount of time there was to do this project. As well, only information publically available was able to be used. The schools did not have to give any additional information and therefore limited the dataset.

FINDINGS

The goal of this study was to determine how many elements of global education were present in different types of schools throughout the Chicago area. Schools were selected based on the availability of their course description online and then based on their location and were categorized as urban, suburban, or fringe according to the Illinois Interactive Report Card (IIRC). However, halfway through data collection, the IIRC changed. Due to this change, a new way to operationalize the location category had to be developed. Using the new IIRC categories as a guide, schools within city limits of Chicago were considered urban, schools outside of city limits but within 30 miles of the city were considered suburban, and schools more than 30 miles outside the city were considered fringe. This caused a considerable disruption to the data because the use of the new classifications caused schools that had previously been considered suburban to fall into the fringe category. The new definitions did not fit the purpose of this study and thus the location category was not used in this analysis. Twenty-one schools were initially selected and analyzed, comparing these schools on size, location, type and percent low income. Following is the breakdown of schools into their respective categories; a full list of schools is available in Appendix B.

Table 2: Breakdown of School Categories Using Data

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type | Urban | Suburban | Fringe | Total |
| Public | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| Religious | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Independent | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Total | 7 | 7 | 7 | 21 |

*Public v. Private*

An interesting comparison can be made between public and private schools. Of the schools surveyed, ten were public, and eleven were private. Figure 1 shows global education elements on a per school basis for both public and private schools.

Figure 1: Elements of Global Education on a Per School Basis: Public v. Private

This data shows that of the schools that were assessed, public schools provided more opportunities for the use of technology and multicultural elements of education in their classes. This may be due to the size of the school. The average size of a public school for this group was 2090 students; whereas the average size of a private school was 1079 students. Figure 1 shows that the use of technology was evident twice as often in public schools, with a smaller difference in multicultural elements between private and public schools. This being said, size may not be the only factor in the inclusion of global education elements.

*Private: Independent v. Religious*

Within the private school group, there were either religiously affiliated or independent schools. Religious schools were a mix of Protestant and Catholic. Religious schools provided more options for technology and multiculturalism than the corresponding independent schools while still being relatively close in averages. This again may be due to the size of the school. The real difference between private schools was again seen in their size. Chart 2 shows the number of students versus multicultural and technology elements on a per school basis within private schools.

Table 3: The Average Number of Global Education Elements on a Per School Basis v. The Number of Students in Private Schools

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Size** | **Multicultural** | **Technology** |
| **Less than 1000 Students** | 20.0 | 28.0 |
| **Greater than 1000 Students** | 29.5 | 36.3 |

*Public Schools*

Within the public schools, a wide range of types and sizes of schools were analyzed. The percentage of low income students for each public school was also collected from the IIRC. In this case, there was a noticeable difference between schools with more than 25 percent low income and those schools with less than 25 percent low income.

Figure 2: Elements of Global Education on a Per School Basis and Percent Low Income Students of Public Schools

Those schools that had less than 25 percent low income had increased numbers of both multicultural and technological elements included in their course description books. In particular, those schools with a smaller number of low income students had a noticeably larger amount of technology available to their students. Part of this could be due to other factors including their size or location, but may also be due to the percentage of low income students in each school. Additionally, size may also be a consideration in the public schools that were surveyed. Those schools that were larger than 2000 students offered the most elements of technology and multicultural elements in their course description books. Chart 3 shows the size of a public school versus the number of global education elements on a per school basis.

Table 4: The Average Number of Global Education Elements on a Per School Basis v. The Number of Students in Public Schools

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Size** | **Multicultural** | **Technology** |
| **Less than 1000 Students** | 27 | 47 |
| **Between 1000 and 2000 Students** | 37 | 79.5 |
| **Greater than 1000 Students** | 41 | 95.75 |

*Language Offerings*

The last variable assessed in this study was the inclusion of non-Western languages in the schools course offerings. Non-Western Languages were those such as Mandarin, Japanese or Chinese. Out of 21 schools assessed, 11 schools offered non-Western languages, six public and five private schools. Of the five private schools, four were independent schools with all four offering at least one level of Mandarin. This could be a reason why students and parents are attracted to independent schools. Parents who value languages that are not always taught in other schools may look to independent schools to fill that void for their children.

DISCUSSION

These findings have shown that elements of a global education are implemented into high school curricula on different levels depending on the type of school, geographic location of the school number of low income students, and religious affiliation of the school. Through comparing the data and analyzing the findings, a few findings particularly stood out.

As the “location” variable became unusable other variables were used to assess and compare the schools. In both public and private schools, technology was included in a wide range of subjects. This being said, public schools included more opportunities for their students to use technology. This can be attributed to the fact that, typically, public schools in suburban or urban areas tend to be larger than their private school counterparts. This may not be the only reason why the public schools assessed had higher numbers elements of technology. Another cause for the difference in numbers may be related to funding, as public schools are funded in part by property taxes. Schools with fewer low income students may have more funding available to them which, would allow for more technological elements in their curricula. In Figure 1, there is an apparent difference between elements of technology and multiculturalism between private and public schools. As mentioned before, this difference may be in part due to size; for the schools analyzed because public schools were roughly twice the size of private schools. Taking this point into account, you would expect that the number of technological and multicultural elements would be about twice as much in public schools. However, this is not true and the difference could be partly attributed to funding differences.

There is also a clear difference in the number of technological elements versus the number of multicultural elements described in the course description books. This may be due to the fact that technology and education has been recognized and pushed, but that including multicultural elements is something new. These changes in curriculum do not happen overnight. The push for teaching multicultural concepts as well as non-Western languages is recent. It can take time to find competent teachers, and to find funding to integrate multicultural and technological elements into existing curricula. New language programs, especially in non-Western languages, can be more expensive because there are fewer teachers who have those skills. People who are fluent in Mandarin or Japanese have greater opportunities within the business world, which is likely more lucrative. The business use of Mandarin or Japanese is all the more reason to teach students these languages, which will make them more marketable and competitive in a global economy.

If it was possible to re-do this project, I would count the number of classes that included these variables instead of the number of times the variables were mentioned in the course booklets. This would provide a more accurate comparison between the schools, and control for the fact that all schools write their course description books differently. For example one may mention specific computer programs more than once within each class where as other schools may only mention it once.

It would also be beneficial to widen the area of schools, as well as the number. Because of time restrictions, twenty-one was a reasonable number for this study but it would be best to assess an entire state. This would allow for a better assessment overall and a clear demonstration of the differences between communities considered urban, suburban, fringe, or rural.

Not withstanding these limitations, this assessment is a useful tool in determining the future of global education. There is no way to change the current system without an accurate portrait of what is currently taking place in schools. Based on the schools assessed, the public school system has been able to provide more opportunities for students to learn about other cultures and to learn the use of technology. This being said, there may be other ways in which different types of schools have been able to provide similar opportunities for their students. The bottom line is that knowing what opportunities exist is the first step in changing the school system so that every student can use their education to its fullest in a global society.

Appendix A. Coding Sheet

Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ #\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Address\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Type: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Size: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Location: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ % Low Income: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subject | Language | Multi/Cross Cultural | Technology |
| English/Reading | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ |
| Fine Arts | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ |
| Math | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ |
| PE. Health, Drivers Ed | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ |
| Science | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ |
| Social Sciences | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ |
| Modern Languages | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ |
| Other: | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ | \_\_\_ |

Total:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix B. High Schools Assessed

Carmel Catholic High School

Crete-Monee High School

Homewood-Flossmoor High School

Lake Forest Academy

Lake Forest Community High School

Lane Tech High School

Latin Upper School

Marian Catholic High School

Marist High School

Nazareth Academy

New Trier High School

Northside College Prep High School

North Shore Country Day School

Plainfield High School

Plano High School

Saint Francis High School

Saint Ignatius High School

Seton Academy

University of Chicago Laboratory School

Walter Payton College Prep High School

Waubonsie High School
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