

# Archived Information

## CLASS-SIZE REDUCTION PROGRAM

**Goal: Reduce average class size nationally, particularly in the early grades, to improve student achievement.**

**Relationship of Program to Volume 1, Department-wide Objectives:** The Class-Size Reduction Program directly supports Objective 1.4 (a talented teacher in every classroom) by providing high-quality teacher training. The program also supports Objective 2.1 (children start school ready to learn) and directly supports Objective 2.2 (every child reading by the third grade) by enabling more individual attention in the early grades. The program supports Objective 3.1 (safe, disciplined schools) by providing a conducive learning environment.

FY 2000—\$1,300,000,000

FY 2001—\$1,750,000,000 (Requested budget)

OBJECTIVE 1: TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

**Indicator 1.1 State/local assessments: Increasing percentages of fourth graders at schools receiving program funds will score at basic, proficient, or advanced levels in reading on state or local assessments.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<b>Status:</b> No 1999 data are available because this is a new program.  <b>Explanation:</b> First data reporting will be due in late 2000.	<b>Source:</b> LEA report cards. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000.  <b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data supplied by states and districts. No formal verification procedure applied.  <b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> States do not routinely assess children in the grades affected by this program. It would be difficult to attribute achievement data collected to the program. Since this program targets children in the early grades, not grade 4, there will be a significant lag in time between receipt of funds and improvements in student achievement at grade 4.
1999:	New program	No target set		
2000:		Target to be set		
2001:		Increasing		

OBJECTIVE 2: TO REDUCE AVERAGE CLASS SIZE NATIONALLY IN GRADES 1-3.

Indicator 2.1 Additional teachers hired: By 2005, school districts will hire 100,000 additional teachers above those expected to be hired without the program.			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Targets and Performance Data				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
1999:	< 29,000	30,000	<b>Status:</b> Movement toward target is likely.	<b>Source:</b> Early Implementation Reports, 1999. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next Update:</i> 2000
2000:		Continuing increase	<b>Explanation:</b> National estimates of Early Implementation Reports (EIRs) data show significant progress toward target. About 29,000 teachers were hired with CSR funds.	<b>Source:</b> Consolidated State Reports. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually <i>Next Update:</i> Dec. 2000
2001:		Continuing increase		
2002:		Continuing increase		
2003:		Continuing increase		
2004:		Continuing increase		
2005:		100,000		<b>Source:</b> National Evaluation. <i>Frequency:</i> One time <i>Next Update:</i> 2001  <b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data supplied by states and districts. No formal verification procedure applied.  <b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> The 29,000 teacher figure is a national estimate based on only 37 percent of districts who reported data as of November 1999 (46 percent of districts are reflected in the data base if the state-level data received from four states for some districts are included). A comparison of responding versus nonresponding districts showed that districts who responded to the data collection were more likely to fall into the highest poverty quartile (over 24.7 percent) and less likely to be small in terms of enrollment. Since the amount of funding given to districts depends solely on poverty (80 percent) and enrollment (20 percent), it is likely that attempts to make national estimates based on this 37 percent of districts are biased.

Indicator 2.2 Number of students per class: Local school districts will reduce the maximum or average number of students per class in grades 1-3 so that the national average class size will be 18 by 2005.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Status:</b> LEAs are reporting that class size is being reduced. Moving toward target is likely.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> New program; baseline from Schools and Staffing Survey is a placeholder for information from the national evaluation, which will be available in next year's plan.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Schools and Staffing Survey, 1993-94. <i>Frequency:</i> 5 years. <i>Next Update:</i> Early Implementation Reports, 2000; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1998-99; State Consolidated Reports, 2000; National Evaluation, 2001.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data validated by NCES review procedures and NCES Statistical Standards.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> There are several ways to measure class size and there is no consensus about the most appropriate way to define class size for the purpose of evaluating class-size initiatives. It will be challenging to accurately portray the effect this program has on class size. The planned national evaluation of the program will attempt to combat this problem by collecting raw information of several key factors in order to calculate class size in an accurate way that also reflects the flexibility of this program.</p>
1993-94:	21.9			
<b>1999-98:</b>	<b>No data available</b>	<b>Decreasing</b>		
2000-01:		Decreasing		
2001-02:		Decreasing		
2002-03:		Decreasing		
2003-04:		Decreasing		
2004-05:		18		

OBJECTIVE 3: TO ENSURE THAT NEWLY HIRED AND EXISTING TEACHERS ARE HIGHLY QUALIFIED AND PREPARED TO TEACH IN THEIR ASSIGNED GRADES OR SUBJECT AREAS.

Indicator 3.1 Increased professional development: Increasing percentages of teachers in grades 1-3 will participate in high-quality professional development in content areas and effective teaching methods.				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Status:</b> No 1999 data are available because this is a new program.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> First data report will be in 2001.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> New program. <i>Frequency:</i> One –time. <i>Next Update:</i> National evaluation, 2001.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedure:</b> Verified by Department of Education attestation process and ED Standards for Evaluating Program Performance Data.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> It would be difficult to accurately measure the concept of high-quality professional development. In addition, the planned national evaluation will only measure professional development participation for teachers affected by this program, not all teachers in the United States, as implied by the indicator wording.</p>
<b>1999:</b>	<b>No data available</b>	<b>Increasing</b>		
2000:		Increasing		
2001:		Increasing		

## **KEY STRATEGIES**

### Strategies Continued from 1999

- ❖ Work with states to distribute grant money on July 1, 2000, and October 1, 2000.
- ❖ Collaborate with the Department's existing programs (such as the Eisenhower Professional Development Program) to improve preservice and in-service professional development for teachers through regular meetings with program staff to share existing and acquire new information.
- ❖ Encourage state and local education agencies to share effective and creative approaches to teacher availability, limited classroom/building space, certification requirements, collective bargaining agreements, and other issues through facilitated workshops and through development by the Class-Size Reduction Team of a publication that contains information on such approaches.

### New or Strengthened Strategies

- ❖ Beginning of national evaluation.
- ❖ Invitational conference, December 1999, on "How Small Classes Help Teachers and Students Do Their Best."
- ❖ Establishment and use of listserv for state CSR coordinators and other interested parties.

## **HOW THIS PROGRAM COORDINATES WITH OTHER FEDERAL ACTIVITIES**

- ❖ Grant to Bureau of Indian Affairs.

## **CHALLENGES TO ACHIEVING PROGRAM GOAL**

- ❖ Uncertainty of funding from year to year, lack of qualified teachers in some locations, space limitations in some facilities.

## **INDICATOR CHANGES**

### **From FY 1999 Annual Plan (two years ago)**

Adjusted—None.

Dropped

- ❖ Indicator 2.1 was dropped because it overlapped with Indicator 2.2.

### **From FY 2000 Annual Plan (last year's)**

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 3.2 was folded into Indicator 3.1 because they overlapped.

Dropped—None.

New—None.