

## Benefits of Small Class Size

Compelling evidence demonstrates that reducing class size, particularly for younger children, has a positive effect on student achievement overall and an especially significant impact on the education of disadvantaged children. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) is a strong advocate for reducing class size to help raise student achievement, especially in high-poverty, at-risk schools.

In addition to increasing student achievement, smaller classes:

- Improve classroom atmosphere, students receive more individualized attention and teachers have flexibility to use different instructional approaches/assignments.
- Have fewer students to distract each other; lower level of noise.
- Enable teachers to know the students better and can offer more extra help; recognize learning problems/special educational needs.
- Have fewer discipline problems. By spending less time on discipline, teachers report spending more time on instruction.

Class size reduction is most effective when classes are between 15 and 19 students; particular schools are targeted, especially those with low-achieving and low-income students; there is an adequate supply of qualified teachers; and there is adequate classroom space.

Critics of small class size believe that the costs associated with implementing small class sizes are too high because the impact on student performance, they contend, is minimal. Their concerns are not completely groundless. Simply cutting class size does not guarantee significant increases in performance for all students.

Nonetheless, critics do not refute that small class size increases achievement--instead they believe that other initiatives would better serve the goal of increased achievement. But even the most outspoken critics acknowledge that: "There are likely to be situations--defined in terms of specific teachers, specific groups of students, and specific subject matters--when small classes could be very beneficial for student achievement." *Eric A. Hanushek, The Evidence on Class Size, Feb 1998.*

## Supporting Research

### Project STAR

Tennessee's Project STAR (Students-Teacher Achievement Ratio) was designed to determine the short- and long-term effects of small class size in grades K-3 on student performance.

Phase 1: 1985-1989. K-3 classes of 13-17 students were compared with classes of 22-26 students.

#### *Findings:*

- Smaller class students substantially outperformed larger class students on both standardized and curriculum-based tests. This was true for white and minority students as well as inner city, suburban, and rural schools.
- In smaller classes, fewer students were retained in-grade, and there was earlier identification of struggling students.

Phase 2: Lasting Benefits, 1989. This study began as a follow-up study to the STAR study to examine if the effects of smaller class sizes stayed with students once they returned to larger classes.

#### *Findings:*

In fourth grade, students from smaller classes still outperformed students from larger classes in all subjects and were better behaved.

Phase 3: Project Challenge, 1990. Based on these findings, Tennessee began phasing in smaller classes in grades K-3 in the poorest districts.

#### *Findings:*

- These districts moved from near the bottom of school district performance in Tennessee to near the middle in reading and mathematics for second grade.
- In-grade retention was reduced.

#### Update

In 1999, researchers reported that the effects of small class sizes in grades K-3 lasted all the way through high school. Students from small classes are:

- More likely to graduate high school on schedule and less likely to drop out;
- More likely to have enrolled in honors classes and to graduate in the top 10 percent of their class; and
- More likely to take SAT or ACT exams, indicating that they plan to go on to college. Furthermore, the black-white achievement gap is reduced by 56 percent for black students who began school in small classes.

Researchers also found that students in small classes in grades K-3 were between 6 and 13 months ahead of their regular-class peers in math, reading, and science in each of grades 4, 6, and 8. Researchers reported that for the benefits to be sustained through later grades, at least three years in a small class are necessary. In addition, the benefits of having been in a small class in the primary years increase from grade to grade.

### **Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) Program**

SAGE began in Wisconsin in 1996 by phasing in class size reduction in grades K-3 in school districts serving high-poverty students. The aim is to achieve a student/teacher ratio of 15:1.

#### *Findings:*

- SAGE first-, second-, and third-grade students performed consistently better than comparison students in mathematics, reading, and language arts on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills.
- First- and third-grade, African-American SAGE students gained significantly more than SAGE white students, closing the achievement gap. The achievement gap widened for non-SAGE students.
- Teachers reported more individualization in their instruction due to fewer discipline problems; being more knowledgeable about each student; and having more enthusiasm for teaching.

It should be noted that while SAGE findings are consistent with Project STAR findings, SAGE schools were also required to implement a rigorous academic curriculum, provide before and after school activities, and implement professional development programs and accountability plans.

### **Rouse Study**

The Milwaukee Parental Choice Program is a publicly funded voucher program. In her study, Rouse compares the achievement of Milwaukee voucher students and students in three types of Milwaukee Public Schools: regular schools, magnet schools, and school participating in the Preschool to Grade 5 Grant Program (P-5 schools). P-5 schools serve "predominantly minority and extremely disadvantaged: children and receive supplemental state funds that have enabled them to cut their pupil-teacher ratio, on average, to 17 to 1.

#### *Findings:*

- Students in the P-5 (small class size) public schools made "substantially faster gains in reading" than those in the regular public schools, the public magnet schools, and the voucher schools.
- Students in the P-5 (small class size) public schools made faster math gains than students in the regular public schools and the public magnet schools, and the same gains as the voucher schools.

### **Wenglinsky Study**

Educational Testing Services (ETS) researcher Harold Wenglinsky compared 1992 fourth- and eighth-grade NAEP math results to class size and other policy initiatives. For purposes of the analysis, Wenglinsky defined small class size as fewer than 20 students.

*Findings:*

- Fourth and eighth graders in small classes performed better than those in large classes, even when taking into account demographics, resources, and cost of living.
- Fourth graders were one-third of a grade level ahead of their peers from large classes; eighth graders were one-eighth of a grade level ahead.
- The largest gains were found for inner-city students: fourth graders were three-fourths of a grade level ahead of students in large classes.

**Class-Size Reduction (CSR)**

During the mid-1990's, the California legislature passed the Class Size Reduction (CSR) incentive program, which provided funds to schools statewide that set class size to 20 students in grades K-3.

The \$1 billion initiative was signed just six weeks before the start of the new school year. Even though the program was voluntary, there was significant pressure from parents and the press to reduce class size. By the end of the first year, 88% of first graders were in reduced classes along with 57% of second graders.

Due to the program's design, it is unclear how much effect the initiative has had on raising student performance, resulting in some officials questioning the cost-effectiveness of the program. Although researchers are unable to attribute achievement gains directly to CSR, California's efforts to reduce class sizes provide important lessons for education officials trying to implement small classes in their states and/or districts.

CSR researchers point to a variety of reasons for the inconclusive results:

- CSR in California was associated with declines in teacher qualifications and an inequitable distribution of qualified teachers. CSR caused an immediate need for 20,000 new teachers in a very small period of time. To meet the demand, teacher certification requirements were "relaxed" resulting in an influx of un- and under-prepared new teachers. In addition, qualified veteran teachers were taking advantage of the new vacancies to leave less advantaged districts for more desirable positions in more affluent districts.
- CSR was offered in every school instead of targeting funds to disadvantaged schools. This "one size fits all" approach with funding resulted in wealthier districts that already had smaller classes receiving an initial boon of funding, while overcrowded districts were forced to dip into their general funds to cover shortfalls.
- Funding was inadequate. CSR provided \$650 per student compared to the \$2,000 per student provided for the SAGE program.
- Serious problems associated with overcrowded schools were ignored.
- No trial program was conducted to explore various class size reduction options.
- The adopted definition of small classes (20 students) directly contradicted prior evidence and experiences of other states.

## References and Additional Reading

### Benefits of Small Class Size

#### AFT Resources

- AFT Resolutions on Reducing Class Size  
[www.aft.org/edissues/classsize/ResolutionsClassSize.pdf](http://www.aft.org/edissues/classsize/ResolutionsClassSize.pdf)
- Class-Size Program on Track, American Teacher, November 2000.  
[www.aft.org/publications/american\\_teacher/nov00/roundup.html](http://www.aft.org/publications/american_teacher/nov00/roundup.html)
- Recent Research Shows Major Benefits of Small Class Size. Educational Issues Policy Brief. June 1998.  
[www.aft.org/edissues/downloads/Policy3.pdf](http://www.aft.org/edissues/downloads/Policy3.pdf)
- Research on Improving School Safety: The Role of Technology and Reduced Class Size, August 1998. [www.aft.org/research/reports/safety/Review2.htm](http://www.aft.org/research/reports/safety/Review2.htm)
- Sandra Feldman Radio Ad: Class Size II, June 1999. [www.aft.org/multimedia/sfad0699.html](http://www.aft.org/multimedia/sfad0699.html)
- Sandra Feldman Radio Ad: Reducing Class Size, March 1988.  
[www.aft.org/multimedia/sfad0398.html](http://www.aft.org/multimedia/sfad0398.html)
- Smaller Class Size: It's Worth the Effort, American Teacher, December 2000/January 2001.  
[www.aft.org/publications/american\\_teacher/dec00\\_jan01/classnotes.html](http://www.aft.org/publications/american_teacher/dec00_jan01/classnotes.html)
- Where We Stand: Think Small, March 1998. [www.aft.org/stand/previous/1998/0398.html](http://www.aft.org/stand/previous/1998/0398.html)

#### Additional Resources

- Deutsch, Francine M. "How Small Classes Benefit High School Students," NASSP Bulletin. Vol. 87 No. 635, pp. 35-44, June 2003.
- Biddle, Bruce J. and David C. Berliner, "What Research Says About Small Classes and Their Effects," WestEd Policy Perspectives, 2002. [www.wested.org/online\\_pubs/small\\_classes.pdf](http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/small_classes.pdf)
- Pritchard, Ivor. Reducing Class Size: What Do We Know? National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum and Assessment. Revised March 1999.  
[www.ed.gov/pubs/ReducingClass/](http://www.ed.gov/pubs/ReducingClass/)
- U.S. Department of Education. Class-Size Reduction--Myths and Realities.  
[www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/ClassSize/myths.html](http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/ClassSize/myths.html)
- ReduceClassSizeNow.org includes the latest research on small class size, state policies on small class size, and tips for implementing small classes and for endorsing political candidates who support this measure.  
<http://ReduceClassSizeNow.org>
- Lewit, Eugene M. and Linda Schuurmann Baker. "Class Size," The Future of Children. Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 113-121. Winter 1997. [www.futureofchildren.org/usr\\_doc/vol7no3ART8.pdf](http://www.futureofchildren.org/usr_doc/vol7no3ART8.pdf)

### Project STAR

#### AFT Resources

- Statement of AFT President Sandra Feldman on Project STAR Class Size Study, April 29, 1999. [www.aft.org/press/1999/042999.html](http://www.aft.org/press/1999/042999.html)
- Where We Stand: A STAR Story, June 1999. [www.aft.org/stand/previous/1999/0699.html](http://www.aft.org/stand/previous/1999/0699.html)
- Where We Stand: Class Size Revisited, July 2, 1995.  
[www.aft.org/stand/previous/1995/070295.html](http://www.aft.org/stand/previous/1995/070295.html)

#### Additional Resources

- Project STAR News. Benefits of small classes pay off at graduation. April 29, 1999  
[www.heros-inc.org/star-press-release.pdf](http://www.heros-inc.org/star-press-release.pdf)
- Project STAR--Background and 1999 Update, Health and Education Research Operative Services, Inc. [www.heros-inc.org/star99.pdf](http://www.heros-inc.org/star99.pdf)
- Mosteller, Frederick. "The Tennessee Study of Class Size in the Early School Grades," The Future of Children. Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 113-127. Summer/Fall 1995.  
[www.futureofchildren.org/usr\\_doc/vol5no2ART8.pdf](http://www.futureofchildren.org/usr_doc/vol5no2ART8.pdf)

## **Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) Program**

### **AFT Resources**

- Class Size Counts: The Research Shows Us Why, American Teacher, April 1998.  
[www.aft.org/parentpage/class\\_size/sizcounts.html](http://www.aft.org/parentpage/class_size/sizcounts.html)

### **Additional Resources**

- Smith, Phil et al. Class Size Reduction in Wisconsin: A Fresh Look at the Data. Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University. September 2003.  
[www.asu.edu/educ/eps/EPRU/documents/EPSL-0309-110-EPRU.doc](http://www.asu.edu/educ/eps/EPRU/documents/EPSL-0309-110-EPRU.doc)
- Molnar, Alex et al. The 1999-2000 Evaluation Results of the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) Program. December 2000.
- SAGE and Direct Instruction Projects. 1998-99 Results of the Student Achievement Guarantee in Education (SAGE) Program Evaluation. Executive Summary. December 1999.
- Molnar, Alex et al. "Evaluating the SAGE Program: A Pilot Program in Targeted Pupil-Teacher Reduction in Wisconsin," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Vol. 21 No. 2 pp. 165-177, Summer 1999.
- Zahorik, John A. Reducing class size leads to individual instruction. Educational Leadership. Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 50-53. September 1999.

## **Rouse Study**

### **AFT Resources**

- Smaller Classes Trump Vouchers, American Teacher, April 1998  
[www.aft.org/parentpage/class\\_size/trumps.html](http://www.aft.org/parentpage/class_size/trumps.html)
- Vouchers Vs. Small Class Size, April 1998 [www.aft.org/vouchers/report/index.html](http://www.aft.org/vouchers/report/index.html)

### **Additional Resources**

- Rouse, Cecilia. Schools and Student Achievement: More Evidence from the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program, December 1997.
- Molnar, Alex. Smaller Classes, Not Vouchers, Increase Student Achievement, January 1998.

## **Wenglinsky Study**

- Wenglinsky, Harold. When Money Matters. ETS Policy Information Center, April 1997.  
[www.ets.org/research/pic/wmm.pdf](http://www.ets.org/research/pic/wmm.pdf)

## **Class-Size Reduction (CSR)**

- Bohrnstedt, George W., and Brian M. Stecher editors. What We Have Learned About Class Size Reduction in California. CSR Research Consortium, August 2002.  
[www.classsize.org/techreport/index-02.htm](http://www.classsize.org/techreport/index-02.htm)
- Bohrnstedt, George W., and Brian M. Stecher editors. Class Size Reduction in California: Early Evaluation Findings, 1996-1998. CSR Research Consortium, June 1999.  
[www.classsize.org/summary/98-99/](http://www.classsize.org/summary/98-99/)