



Commission on Class Size and Composition

A Public Discussion Paper

Fall 2001

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Overview of the Research on Class Size.....	4
Class Size, Composition and Collective Bargaining	10
Class Size Reduction Initiatives.....	13
Sharing Your Thoughts And Concerns	17
Written Submissions	18
Registration Form	19
Bibliography	20

INTRODUCTION

In April 2001, the Minister of Education, Training and Youth, Honourable Drew Caldwell, established the Commission on Class Size and Composition, fulfilling a commitment put forward in The Public Schools Act as amended by Bill 42. The Commission, under the direction of Dr. Glenn Nicholls, was given the mandate to consider whether or not there should be a provincial policy on class size and composition and, if so, to make recommendations as to its content.

The Commission's terms of reference include

- ▶ considering the educational welfare of students, their families and communities
- ▶ obtaining a broad exchange of views from across the province on class size and composition issues
- ▶ making research on the impacts of class size on student outcomes as widely available as possible to Manitobans
- ▶ considering the costs and benefits of any recommendations.

Class size refers to the actual number of students in a classroom.

Composition refers to the make-up of each classroom in terms of students' abilities, skills, interests, strengths, and needs.

Through the course of its work, the Commission is to examine factors such as the effects of class size on student outcomes, demographic changes in the student and teaching populations, the use of teacher assistants, multi-grade classrooms and students with special needs. As part of its recommendations, the Commission has been asked by the Minister to consider whether or not class size should be a negotiable and arbitrable item within the collective bargaining process.

Central to the Commission's work is a desire for ensuring the best possible learning experiences, outcomes and social relationships for students. An important component of that work is the impact of class size and composition on teacher working conditions.

While the Commission recognizes the prime importance of high quality teaching and parental involvement in students' school experiences, many parents, teachers, administrators, school trustees and researchers consider

*Provincial consultation sessions are intended to support broad discussions and an exchange of views related to class size and composition. **Sessions are not intended to be formal public hearings.** It is important that participants pre-register for the session. A registration form is located at the end of the discussion paper.*

Consultation Schedule

Thompson

Sept. 27, 2001 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Cranberry-Portage

Sept. 29, 2001 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Dauphin

Oct. 11, 2001 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Brandon

Oct. 13, 2001 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Brandon

Oct. 13, 2001 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Carman

Oct. 25, 2001 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Winnipeg

Nov. 3, 2001 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Winnipeg

Nov. 3, 2001 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Winnipeg

Nov. 6, 2001 7:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

class size and composition to be significant factors that affect the quality of social relationships and student learning experiences and outcomes. Educational research is an important source of information on class size, and the research on class size is extensive. Good research can help to clarify issues and concerns about class size, but it also raises provocative questions that do not lend easy answers to policy directions.

In addition, for many issues in education, the values of parents, students, teachers, school and division administrators, school trustees and communities are also important considerations. Care toward all students and ensuring diverse forms of success for them are examples of such values.

A key component of the Commission's work is an extensive consultation process. Consultation sessions scheduled for the province will provide interested Manitobans with opportunities to express their views and concerns regarding class size and composition. Issues for discussion include but are not confined to: the implications of class size and composition for students, teachers, parents, administrators and trustees, various options for addressing the challenges presented by class size and composition, and economic considerations of these options. The consultation sessions will help the Commission to identify core values and the unique perspectives and circumstances of local school communities. The ideas and concerns expressed by participants along with formal written submissions and other sources of research will be used by the Commission to develop its final report and recommendations due March 2002.

The purpose of this paper is to help guide and support discussions at the consultation sessions and to support the development of formal written submissions by interested individuals, groups and organizations. The paper provides an overview of relevant research and raises a number of questions to help stimulate thoughtful discussion on class size and composition issues. Additional questions will also arise during discussions at the consultation sessions.

By thoughtfully considering many views and respectfully listening to one another, the Commission believes that the challenges posed by class size and composition can be addressed, enhancing the quality of social relationships, learning experiences and outcomes that Manitobans want for all their students.

OVERVIEW OF THE RESEARCH ON CLASS SIZE

Over the past three decades numerous empirical studies on class size have been conducted. What follows is a summary of the landmark and most commonly cited experimental studies and reviews of existing studies. Readers are encouraged to review the literature cited throughout the discussion paper and presented in the bibliography and draw their own inferences and conclusions on the class size research.

An early Canadian initiative on the effects of class size involving grade four and five students was conducted in Toronto in 1977 (Shapson, Wright, Eason and Fitzgerald, 1980). The two year study examined the effects of class size on factors such as teacher expectations and student achievement and the attitudes and opinions of teachers and students.

In the first year of the study, students and teachers were randomly assigned to fourth grade classes of four sizes: 16, 23, 30, and 37. In the second year, the same students and teachers were assigned to grade five classes, but teachers who had taught in large classes were to teach in smaller classes. Students could not be in either the smallest (16) or the largest (37) classes for both years.

The Toronto study found that

- ▶ only the classes of 16 students showed an increase in student achievement, particularly in mathematics concept achievement; there was no improvement in reading, vocabulary or mathematics problem solving
- ▶ there was no advantage for classes of 23, 30 and 37
- ▶ there were no class size effects for students' attitudes toward school or for their self-concept. There were also no differences in students' participation in classroom tasks
- ▶ class size did not affect the amount of time teachers spent talking about course content or classroom routines
- ▶ there were virtually no changes in methods of instruction used by teachers in the different class sizes

- ▶ teachers in class sizes of 16 and 23 spent less time evaluating students' work.

Glass and Smith conducted two comprehensive reviews of class size studies in 1978 and 1982. Their studies suggested that

- ▶ reduced class size can lead to increased academic achievement at all grade levels
- ▶ major benefits occurred when class size was reduced to fewer than 20 students
- ▶ smaller class size improved students' reactions, teachers' morale and the quality of the instructional environment.

Glass and Smith's findings were criticized for including inappropriate studies in their analysis. Many studies, for example, compared normal-sized classrooms to one-on-one tutoring and some studies included non-academic classes such as tennis.

Indiana's 1984 Prime Time, a state-funded program, reduced class sizes in grade one to 18 students and grade two classes to 22 students. After three years, positive outcomes were found on such factors as individualized instruction, time on task and teacher satisfaction. Prime Time's results have been considered inconclusive, however, because in some situations small classes had greater outcomes, while in other situations large classes had better results.

In 1986, Robinson and Wittebols examined over 100 studies for the Education Research Service. Their research suggested that smaller classes do not of themselves result in greater academic gains for students, and the effects of class size on student achievement vary by grade level, student characteristics, subject area, teaching methods and other learning interventions. Their findings also suggested that

- ▶ small class size has the greatest effect in reading and mathematics in the early primary grades (kindergarten through grade three)

- ▶ minority students and students from poor homes achieve better academically in smaller classes
- ▶ positive effects were less likely to occur if teachers did not change their instructional practices.

The Robinson and Wittebols study was criticized for not differentiating poorly designed studies from well-designed studies.

A “Best Evidence Synthesis” prepared by Robert Slavin (1989) focused on the Glass and Smith research and included only those studies that met the following criteria: spanned over one year or more, compared larger classes to classes that were at least 30% smaller or contained 20 or fewer students and randomly assigned or matched students into experimental and comparison groups. Only 8 out of 80 studies analysed by Glass and Smith matched these criteria.

Slavin’s analysis indicated that

- ▶ small positive effects were realized when substantial reductions were made in class size
- ▶ the effects on academic achievement were not cumulative and did not persist after their reduced class size experience
- ▶ significant effects were not likely to occur until class size is reduced to one.

Perhaps the largest and most widely cited experimental study examining the effects of class size on student achievement was Tennessee’s Project STAR (Student/Teacher Achievement Ratio). Project STAR, which has been the impetus for many class size reduction programs, was initially a state wide four-year longitudinal study of class size in kindergarten to grade three. The study involved 42 school districts, 79 schools and over 6,000 students. STAR classes were located in inner city, urban, suburban and rural schools.

Summary of Project STAR Results

- *Students in small classes (13-17 students) made significant progress over students in larger classes in all achievement measures and in all subjects. This was consistent for boys and girls, white and minority students and students from rural, urban or inner city schools.*
 - *The benefit for minority students was about two or three times as large as that for white students in most comparisons.*
 - *The maximum effect of reducing class size was in kindergarten and first grade, but the effect levelled off and declined in second and third grade even when the students remained in small classes.*
 - *No differences were found on student motivation or self-concept.*
 - *There were relatively fewer examples of poor student discipline.*
 - *Teachers had more on-task time in small classes than in regular classes and this remained constant all year.*
-

Project STAR arrived at a similar key conclusion presented by the 1977 Toronto study. Class size does not affect students' measured achievement until class size is less than 20 students. In the STAR study small classes ranged between 13–17 students compared to 16 students in the Toronto study. Project STAR also recommended that there should be relevant inservice for teachers so they could adjust their teaching to smaller classes or teaching with a full-time aide.

Tennessee's Lasting Benefits Study was carried out to track the original sample of STAR students from small classes (Nye et al., 1991). It indicated that

- ▲ STAR students outperformed, showed more effort and initiative and were better behaved than their peers in normal-sized classrooms. There were no significant additional gains in subsequent years relative to the students in normal classes
- ▲ STAR students continued to outperform children from normal classes at a decreasing rate. By grade eight the difference was quite small
- ▲ STAR students were less likely to fail a grade and their special educational needs were identified earlier.

In recent years, the results of Project STAR have been extensively analyzed. This analysis has resulted in a relevant focusing of findings. It suggests that disadvantaged students may benefit far more from smaller classes than do other students. Students who receive large amounts of parental time, tutoring or supplemental schooling may be less sensitive to the effects of small class size. There is a strong relationship between smaller classes and teacher attitudes, morale and satisfaction.

Johnston (1989) studied the impact of Project STAR on the perceptions of 1,003 kindergarten to grade three teachers and found that smaller classes had a positive effect on the quality of life in the classroom. Teachers believed that they did a better job in small classes, instruction took less time, non-instructional activities took less time, discipline

problems decreased because they could manage student behaviour and more learning centres and enrichment activities were provided. Johnston cautioned that his findings were based on self-reported data which were not verified through classroom observation.

Evertson and Randolph (1989) observed Project STAR teachers who did and did not receive training (classroom management, individualized instruction, higher order thinking skills), as well as their counterparts in the normal size classes. They indicated that class size made no difference in the amount of time spent or instructional methods used in reading and mathematics instruction.

In January 2000, Edmonton Public Schools in partnership with the University of Alberta and Alberta Learning conducted a six month pilot project to examine the impacts of small class size on student growth and achievement at grade one in high need schools. The project had a particular focus on teaching practices that maximize growth and achievement.

Teachers in the project were involved in two kinds of professional development activities, one a professional development program on literacy and the other a series of monthly meetings with University of Alberta staff which focused on effective classroom strategies.

The smaller classes provided a better learning environment for students in that they encouraged more cooperation and were calmer. There were fewer distractions, and students participated in a greater variety of activities and spent more time on task. Teachers reported more time for planning. Students talked about noise reduction, increased concentration, an increase in activities and in teachers' attention, and their enjoyment of the smaller classes.

Given the brief intervention period and mid-year implementation, achievement improvements may be seen as inconclusive. Some students displayed better than expected growth in reading comprehension. In addition, a number of students made significant progress in achievement and behaviour on an individual level that was hidden by group results.

Limitations of the Research on Class Size

The research on class size does not provide unambiguous policy guidance. Much of the research on class size has focused on student achievement. The goals of education, however, extend beyond a focus on student achievement. Few studies, for example, have examined the impact of class size on the social and emotional development of students.

Most class size studies have taken place in the elementary grades, particularly in the early years. Optimal class size limits and outcomes in relation to the middle and senior years are less clear. Researchers have been encouraged to expand the scope of their studies to include factors such as home environment and good teaching that are equally vital to successful learning outcomes. Whether teachers of smaller classes may be able to increase parental involvement such that the impact of family variables on learning may be heightened remains a significant research question. Reduced class size offers teachers opportunities to teach differently, but little is known about what makes some teachers more effective than others in smaller classes.

CLASS SIZE, COMPOSITION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Large classes in combination with students with special learning needs may pose greater workload pressures in areas including but not confined to

- *student assessment*
 - *demand in class time for individual attention to address behavioural problems and social issues*
 - *students pursuing or requiring individualized education or learning plans and programs*
 - *securing health and social services and assisting parents in obtaining needed services and supports.*
-

Demands and expectations are continually being placed on schools and teachers to strengthen their core educational missions in the promotion of excellence and academic achievement. At the same time, teachers are expected to address a variety of social and health-related issues and sustain equity of opportunity, which means appropriate, rather than merely similar instruction for all students. Innovations as solutions to a variety of educational challenges also place significant responsibilities for change and improvement on teachers.

Teacher working conditions and workload pressures play an important role in attracting, developing and retaining qualified teachers. Key elements of teacher working conditions include school and division support for professional development, teacher involvement in school decision-making, safety, public respect, and compensation.

One prominent factor that impacts on teachers' working conditions and workload pressures is class composition, particularly the number of students who have significant learning and behavioural needs. The Manitoba Special Education Review (1998) reported that teachers in Manitoba classrooms were encountering increasing numbers of students with special needs, particularly students displaying behavioural problems and Fetal Alcohol Syndrome.

In May 2001, the Commission on Class Size and Composition asked all public school teachers of kindergarten to grade six students to complete a classroom profile on class size and those aspects of composition that most affected their daily work in classrooms. Preliminary analysis of the classroom profiles indicates that teachers reported the following compositional characteristics and issues

- ▲ high numbers of students with a variety of special needs in the classroom and inadequate funding and support for students

Combination classes are classes in which teachers instruct students from two or more adjacent grade levels. Unlike multi-age or nongraded classes, which are created intentionally for philosophical or pedagogical reasons, combination classes are created because of uneven enrollments and fiscal restraints that may make it difficult for school authorities to have additional teachers to implement smaller class sizes.

- ▶ difficulty covering or completing the curricula, particularly in combination or split classes
- ▶ lack of preparation and planning time
- ▶ lack of parental involvement in and support of education.

One key factor that affects class composition is class formation procedures, that is the assignment of teachers and students to classrooms. Class formation procedures are a major task faced by school administrators, one that has important consequences for students, teachers and parents.

Research has shown that the range of ability, and the ratios of high ability and low ability students within classes, can affect curriculum coverage and teacher demands for various forms of instructional support (Burns and Mason, 1998). Consequently, classes with a large range in student abilities may warrant a smaller class size, or other forms of support, than classes with a lower range in abilities.

Class Size and Collective Bargaining

In 2000, the Government of Manitoba introduced Bill 42 to amend The Public Schools Act. The Bill required the Minister of Education, Training and Youth to appoint a commission to make recommendations to government about provincial policy on class size and composition. The Commission was also asked to make recommendations as to whether or not class size should be a negotiable and arbitrable item within the collective bargaining process.

Collective bargaining is generally seen as a union negotiating with the employer for salary, benefits and working conditions for its member employees. In some jurisdictions, teachers negotiate class size as a condition of work. Collective bargaining agreements, then, may contain provisions for class size limits.

Bill 42 provides for binding arbitration without strike or lockout for settling collective bargaining disputes between teachers and school boards. When either party declares an "impasse" because a negotiated agreement on some or all contract items cannot be reached, a third party, an arbitrator, is brought in to settle the dispute.

To include class size and composition as a negotiable and arbitrable item could mean that, should an impasse in negotiations occur, an arbitrator could establish class size limits, and both parties must abide by the arbitrator's decision.

CLASS SIZE REDUCTION INITIATIVES

As a result of Tennessee's Project STAR as well as other studies, a number of jurisdictions, particularly in the United States, have embarked on class size reductions. One of the largest class size reduction initiatives was the California Class Size Reduction Initiative (CSR).

The goal of the CSR program, which began in 1996, was to improve early literacy by lowering kindergarten to grade three classes from an average of 29 to a maximum of 20 students. (This is approximately one-third larger than the classes in Project STAR, which reported that academic gains would be seen within classes of 15 or fewer.) The program also stipulated that teachers receive professional development, but with the use of existing funds.

The results from CSR are preliminary and a more thorough report, including costs, is due in 2002. Some preliminary findings indicate that grade three students in small classes showed, on average, a small positive gain. The gain was similar for all students in smaller classes regardless of ethnicity, income status or English language ability.

Teachers reported spending more time working individually with problem readers and less time on discipline. Teachers in small classes reported they spent more time with smaller groups, while teachers in larger groups spent more time conducting lessons for the whole class (CSR Research Consortium, 1999).

One study's observations of actual classroom practices that occurred in the CSR program classrooms reported that regardless of teacher experience levels, whole-class instruction predominated across all classrooms (Korostoff, 1999). Small group instruction occurred infrequently. Very little one-on-one instruction was observed.

One of the major difficulties encountered with the implementation of the CSR program was an insufficient pool of qualified teachers. Schools with the highest percentage of low-income and minority students were unable to attract qualified teachers (Stecher, Bohrnstedt, Kirst, McRobbie and Williams, 2001). Another issue was lack of classroom space (Bohrnstedt and Stecher, 1999).

Class size reduction is an initiative that reduces the number of students in a regular class on a daily basis.

The space problem was greater for urban districts where there was no room for expansion. The program also created new demands for professional development.

Wisconsin's Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) program was implemented in 1996–97 as a statewide effort to increase the academic achievement of children living in poverty by reducing the pupil-teacher ratio in kindergarten through grade three to 15:1 or less. In some cases there were two teachers in a single classroom of 30 students. SAGE schools were also required to provide before and after school activities for students and community members, as well as implement professional development and accountability plans and complete a rigorous curriculum (Molnar, 2000).

Advantages of class size reductions

- *Improved performance of first grade students*
 - *Enhanced teacher knowledge of students*
 - *Fewer discipline problems*
 - *Increased teacher satisfaction*
-

The preliminary findings of SAGE suggest that first grade students performed better than comparison students in reading, language arts, mathematics and in total test scores for the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills. The advantage of smaller classes for grade one students did not increase or decrease in the second grade. Classrooms with more affluent children outperformed children from poor families. Classrooms with 30:2 student-teacher ratio achieved just as well as classrooms with 15:1 student-teacher ratio with the exception of language areas and mathematics sub-tests in grade two where the students in the 15:1 ratio class outperformed students in the 30:2 ratio.

The SAGE program evaluation also examined teacher attitudes and practices. Having fewer students enabled teachers to know students better. It reduced the need for discipline, which resulted in more time for instruction, less stress and increased teacher enthusiasm for teaching.

Discipline problems tended to decrease in smaller classes, not only because the teacher could more easily detect and respond to inappropriate behaviour, but also because the inappropriate behaviour was redefined. For example, some behaviours not tolerated in a large class, such as walking around the room or talking, were considered more acceptable in a small class because they were less disruptive.

SAGE teachers believed there were particular benefits for special education teachers. The individualization within small classes was seen to prevent future need for special education for some students, spare early labelling, and for those already diagnosed, increase the time they spent in the regular classroom.

In British Columbia, a legislated provincial collective agreement between the British Columbia Public School Employers' Association and the British Columbia Teachers' Federation resulted in primary class size maximum limits of 20 students for kindergarten and 22 students for grades one to three. While smaller classes were considered more able to meet the needs of individual children, several implementation challenges surfaced. Some students were not admitted to schools in their catchment areas because classes were full and had to travel long distances outside their neighbourhood to schools that had room for them. Siblings were separated because there was only room for one in a class. The addition of a single student to a classroom during the school year could result in reorganization such as split or blended classes. There has been recognition that any maximum class size limits need to address the needs of individual students and families in a flexible manner for valid educational and administrative reasons.

Potential challenges in class size reduction initiatives

- *Insufficient numbers of qualified teachers*
 - *Open access for all students*
 - *Disruption to classroom organization*
 - *Additional costs for salaries, facilities, professional development*
-

Implementing class size reduction requires consideration of a number of issues: an adequate supply of qualified teachers and available classroom facilities. The costs of class reductions involve not only increased salary costs but also costs for the necessary facilities and for professional development. Successful student outcomes require teachers to use new instructional strategies acquired through their professional development. In addition, larger classes may continue to exist throughout different grades and subject areas not targeted by class size reduction.

Several other possibilities for reducing student-teacher ratios include:

Targetted Grade and Subject Specific Class Size Ratios

Targetted subject and grade specific class ratios attempt to reduce high student-teacher ratios at key grade levels and in certain subject areas. For example, more teachers for elementary language arts and middle and senior years mathematics would be placed in larger sized classrooms to work with students.

Parallel Block Scheduling*

Parallel block scheduling allows class sizes to be split in half, reducing student-teacher ratio for reading and mathematics instruction. For example, half of the class would go to a computer lab or participate in physical education activities, the other half would remain with the classroom teacher.

Parallel block scheduling takes advantage of existing resources. It does not require additional staff or funding. Although parallel block scheduling requires students to work with other teachers during the day, it does not attempt to shape elementary schools into the form of high schools.

Oak Park Plan*

The Oak Park Plan requires all teachers in a school, including specialty teachers to teach 15 students in the subject areas of reading, language arts, and mathematics for 3 hours a day. For the remaining 2.5 hours, subjects are taught in regular classes of approximately 25 students.

* Additional information will be available at the consultation sessions.

SHARING YOUR THOUGHTS AND CONCERNS

Questions for Consideration

- *What are the implications of class size and composition for the students and teacher in this case study?*
- *What are the implications for class size when classes contain more than one grade?*
- *Is there an optimal class size that would balance student academic achievement, social development and teacher working conditions? If yes, what would that size or range be? How might it vary by grade level and subject area?*
- *Could reduction in class size have an impact on the social development of students?*
- *Could reduction in class size have an effect on teacher recruitment and retention?*
- *Is there a greater need for class size reduction in some schools rather than in others?*
- *There are various ways in which class size and composition issues can be addressed: by school board policy, through decisions in individual schools, by provincial policy and guidelines and through collective agreements between teachers and school boards. What are the advantages and disadvantages of each option?*
- *How could government, school boards, administrators, teachers and parents work collaboratively to address class size and composition issues at the local classroom level?*
- *How could class size reduction be funded?*
- *What advice would you give to the Commission in making recommendations on class size and composition?*

The following section outlines a case study on class size and composition and a number of questions to help initiate and stimulate discussions at the consultation sessions. A case study helps to present a common focus. It reveals the complexity of the situation experienced by students, teachers, parents, school and division administrators and school trustees and allows individuals to identify different points of view in addressing the challenges that class size and composition may present to school communities. The case study represents a starting point for discussions. It is not intended to be the sole focus of or to dominate discussions. The Commission anticipates that additional questions, issues and scenarios will arise during the course of discussions at the consultation sessions.

Case Study for Discussion

Ms Soucy has been assigned to teach a combination grade three and four class. At the start of the school year there are 28 students enrolled in the classroom. 16 students are in grade three and 12 students are in grade four. There is a significant range of ability diversity in the classroom. Ms Soucy believes that there is one student with undiagnosed Fetal Alcohol Syndrome. Another student has a confirmed diagnosis of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). There is no teacher assistant support in the classroom. In November two additional students are placed in her class, one student for whom English is a second language (ESL). There are now thirty students in her class. Between January and March four of the students move out of the neighbourhood and are no longer in the classroom, leaving Ms Soucy to complete the year with 26 students.

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

The Commission on Class Size and Composition is also inviting written submissions by interested individuals, groups and organizations.

Written submissions should contain the following information:

***Deadline for Written Submissions
is November 9, 2001***

- ▶ name, address, and telephone number of the person or organization making the submission
- ▶ a brief description of the nature of the person's or organization's interest in the Commission
- ▶ a clear indication of the issues and questions that will be addressed in the submission
- ▶ copies of any supporting documentation that is of direct relevance to the Commission's terms of reference

Please send your written submissions to the Commission on Class Size and Composition, c/o Room 14, 1577 Dublin Avenue, Winnipeg Manitoba, R3E 3J5, email: classsize@gov.mb.ca.

REGISTRATION FORM

Class Size and Composition Consultation Sessions

Consultation sessions will run approximately three hours. French services will be available at the Saturday, November 3 afternoon session at the Canad Inn – Windsor Park. **Please check one session only.**

	Date	Time	Location	Registration Deadline
<input type="checkbox"/>	Thursday, September 27, 2001	7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Thompson R.D. Parker Collegiate	Friday, September 21, 2001
<input type="checkbox"/>	Saturday, September 29, 2001	10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Cranberry-Portage Royal Canadian Legion	Friday, September 21, 2001
<input type="checkbox"/>	Thursday, October 11, 2001	7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Dauphin Dauphin Regional Comprehensive Secondary	Friday, October 5, 2001
<input type="checkbox"/>	Saturday, October 13, 2001	9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	Brandon Brandon Agricultural Centre	Friday, October 5, 2001
<input type="checkbox"/>	Saturday, October 13, 2001	1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Brandon Brandon Agricultural Centre	Friday, October 5, 2001
<input type="checkbox"/>	Thursday, October 25, 2001	7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Carman Carman Collegiate	Friday, October 19, 2001
<input type="checkbox"/>	Saturday, November 3, 2001	9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	Winnipeg Viscount Gort Hotel	Friday, October 26, 2001
<input type="checkbox"/>	Saturday, November 3, 2001	1:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	Winnipeg Canad Inn – Windsor Park	Friday, October 26, 2001
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tuesday, November 6, 2001	7:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Winnipeg Canad Inn – Garden City	Friday, October 26, 2001

Name: _____

Parent Administrator Student
 Teacher Trustee Other (Please specify): _____

Address: _____

City/Town: _____ Postal Code: _____

Phone Number: _____ Fax Number: _____

Please register by the deadline indicated for each session to the
 Commission on Class Size and Composition
 c/o Room 14–1577 Dublin Avenue
 Winnipeg MB R3E 3J5

or by telephone, fax or email
 telephone (204) 945-0350, toll free 1-800-282-8069, extension 0350,
 fax (204) 948-3286 or email: classsize@gov.mb.ca

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achilles, C. M., and Finn, J. D. *Should Class Size Be a Cornerstone for Educational Policy?* The CEIC Review, 9 (2), pp. 15–23, 2000.
- Bain, H. P. and Jacobs, R. *The Case for Smaller Classes and Better Teachers*. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322632, 1990.
- Bennet, N. *Class Size in Primary Schools: Perceptions of Headteachers, Chairs of Governors, Teachers and Parents*. British Educational Research Journal, 22 (1) pp. 33–55, 1996.
- Betts, Julian R. and Shkolnik, Jamie L. *The Behavioural Effects of Variation in Class Size: The Case of Math Teachers*. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21 (2), pp. 193–213, 1999.
- Bohrnstedt, G. W. and Stecher, B. M. (Eds.). *Class Size Reduction in California 1996–98: Early Findings Signal Promise and Concerns*. Palo Alto, California: CRS Research Consortium, 1999.
- Bohrnstedt, G. W. and Stecher, B. M. (Eds.). *Class Size Reduction in California: The 1998–99 Evaluation Findings*. (CSR Research Consortium, Year 3 Evaluation Report). Sacramento, California: The California Department of Education, 2000.
- Burns, Robert and Mason, DeWayne A. *Class Formation and Composition in Elementary Schools*. American Educational Research Journal, 35 (4) pp. 739–772, 1998.
- CSR Research Consortium. *Class Reduction in California 1996–98: Early Findings Signal Promise and Concerns*. Palo Alto, CA, 1999.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda. *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence*. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8 (1), 2000. <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n1>
- Darling-Hammond, Linda. *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence, Brief No. 2*. Washington, DC: Centre for the Study of Teaching and Policy (CTP), December 1999. <http://depts.washington.edu/ctpmail>
- Deslandes, R. et al. *Patterns of Home and School Partnership for General and Special Education Students at the Secondary Level*. Exceptional Children, 65 (4), pp. 496–506, 1999.
- Edmonton Public Schools and Faculty of Education, University of Alberta. *Small Class Size Project Final Report, 2001*.
- Epstein, Joyce. *School/Family/Community Partnership: Caring for the Children We Share*. Phi Delta Kappan, 76 (9), pp. 701–712, 1995.
- Evertson, C. M. and Randolph, C. H. *Teaching Practices and Class Size: A New Look at an Old Issue*. Peabody Journal of Education, 67 (1), pp. 85–105, 1989.
- Finn, J. D. and Achilles, C. M. *Tennessee’s Class Size Study: Findings, Implications, Misconceptions*. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 21 (2) pp. 97–109, 1999.
- Finn, Jeremy D. *Class Size and Students At Risk: What is Known? What is Next?* Washington, DC: US Department of Education, 1998. <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/ClassSize/title.html>
- Fuller, M. L. and Olson, G. *Home-school Relations: Working Successfully With Parents and Families*. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon, 1998.
- Glass, G. V., Cahen, L. S., Smith M. L. and Filby, N. N. *School Class Size*. California Sage Publications, 1978.
- Glass, G. V. and Smith, M.I. *Meta-analysis of Research on the Relationship of Class Size and Achievement*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory. California Sage Publications, 1982.

- Grissmer, David. *Class Size Effects: Assessing the Evidence, Its Policy Implications, and Future Research Agenda*. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21 (2), pp. 231–248, 1999.
- Halbach, Anke; Ehrle, Karen; Zaborik, John and Molnar, Alex. *Class Size Reduction: From Promise to Practice*. Educational Leadership, 58 (6) pp. 32–34, 2001.
- Hanushek, Eric A. *The Evidence on Class Size: Occasional Paper Number 98–1*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester, 1998. <http://www.edexcellence.nte/library/size.html>
- Hirsch, Erick; Koppich, Julia E. and Knapp, Michael S. *Reflections on Teacher Quality*. Journal of Staff Development, 20 (4), pp. 9–13, Fall 2000.
- Hopkins, Gary. *The Debate over Class Size Part 1: Class Size Does Matter!* Education World, February 16, 1998. http://www.education-world.com/a_admin/admin049.shtml
- Hruz, T. *Beyond Smoke and Mirrors: A Critical Look at Small Class Sizes*. Wisconsin Interest, 7 (2) pp. 29–37, 1998.
- Illig, David C. *Reducing Class Size: A Review of the Literature and Options for Consideration*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Branch, State of California, 1996. <http://library.ca.gov/crb/clssz/clssiz.html>
- Jesse, D. *Increasing Parental Involvement: A Key to Student Achievement*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL), 1997. <http://www.mcrel.org/products/noteworthy/noteworthy/danj.asp>
- Johnston, John M. *Teacher Perceptions of Changes in Teaching When They Have Small Class or An Aide*. Peabody Journal of Education, 67 (1), pp. 106–122, 1989.
- Karoly, L. A. et al. *Investing in Our Children: What We Know and Don't Know About the Costs and Benefits of Early Childhood Interventions*. Washington, DC: RAND, 1998.
- Korostoff, Marilyn. *Observing from the Inside: Teaching and Learning in California's 20:1 Reduced-Size Classrooms*. Teacher Education Quarterly, 26 (1), pp. 39–47, 1999.
- Lewit, E. M. and Schuurmann, Baker, L. *Class Size, The Future of Children*. 7 (3) pp. 112–121, 1997.
- The Manitoba Special Education Review, Final Report*. Winnipeg MB: ProActive Information Services Inc., 1998.
- Molnar, Alex. *Vouchers, Class Size Reduction and Student Achievement: Considering the Evidence*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 2000.
- New Zealand Ministry of Education. *Report of the School Staffing Review Group*. Author, 2001.
- Noga, Janice E. *Evaluation of a District Initiative to Reduce Class Size in Primary Grades: Preliminary Results for Year 1*. Paper presented at the 2001 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Norrie, M., and Mustard, J. F. *Reversing the Real Brain Drain: Early Years Study, Final Report*. Ottawa, ON: Ontario Children's Secretariat, 1999.
- Nye, B. A.; Zaharias, J. B.; Cain, V. A.; Fulton, B. D.; Achilles, C. M. and Hooper, R. *The Lasting Benefits Study: A Continuing Analysis of the Effect of Small Class Size in Kindergarten Through Third Grade on Student Achievement Test Scores in Subsequent Grade Levels: Fourth Grade*. Nashville, TN: Center of Excellence for Research in Basic Skills, Tennessee State University, 1991.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). *Our Children at Risk*. Paris, France: OECD, 1995.
- Pritchard, Ivor. *Reducing Class Size: What Do We Know?* Washington, DC: US Department of Education, 1999. <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/ReducingClass/title.html>
- Robinson, G. E. *Synthesis of Research on Effect of Class Size*. Educational Leadership, 47 (7), pp. 80–90, 1980.

- Robinson, G. E. and Wittebols, J. H. *Class Size Research: A Related Cluster Analysis for Decision Making*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1986.
- Schultz, T. et al. *Early Childhood Reform in Seven Communities: Front-Line Practice, Agency Management, and Public Policy*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), 1996.
- Schweinhart, L. J. *Lasting Benefits of Preschool Programs*. Champaign, IL: Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education, 1998.
- Shapson, S. M.; Wright, E. N.; Eason, G. and Fitzgerald, J. *An Experimental Study of the Effects of Class Size*. American Educational Research Journal, 17 (2), 1980.
- Slavin, Robert E. *Can Education Reduce Social Inequity?* Reaching for Equity, 55 (4), pp. 6–10, December 1997/ January 1998.
- Slavin, Robert E. *Class Size and Student Achievement: Is Smaller Better?* Contemporary Education, 62, (1), pp. 6–12. 1990.
- Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education. *Investing In What Works*. Education Analyst, 3 (3), p. 1, Fall 2000.
- Stecher, Brian; Bohrnstedt, G.; Kirst, M.; McRobbie, J. and Williams, T. *Class-Size Reduction in California, A Story of Hope, Promise and Unintended Consequences*. Phi Delta Kappan, May, pp. 670–674, 2001.
- Toch, Thomas and Streisand, Betsy. *Does Class Size Matter?* US News Online, October 13, 1997. <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/9710131/13size.htm>
- Tomlinson, Tommy M. *Class Size and Public Policy: Politics and Panaceas*. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1988.
- UNICEF. *Towards a Comprehensive Strategy for the Development of the Young Child: An Interagency Policy Review*. UNICEF, New York, NY, 1993.
- University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. 1998–99 Evaluation Results of the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) Program. Centre for Education Research, Analysis, and Innovation, 1999. <http://www.uwm.edu/dept/CERAI/documents/SageThirdYearReport.html> .
- Ziegler, Suzanne. *Class Size, Academic Achievement and Public Policy*. CEA/ACE Connections, 1 (1), 1997.