

JSCC Faculty Council Meeting Minutes—November 11th, 2009

The Faculty Council met Wednesday, November 11th, at 3:00 p.m. in the Foundation Board Room of the Student Union.

Present: Mark Walls, Claude Bailey, Stacy Dunevant (and proxy for Roger James), Carol Norman, Nell Senter, John Koons, Kim White, Mechel Camp, Donna Johnsey, Belinda Higgins, Steve Cornelison

Chair Mechel Camp made a couple of announcements: (1) the Philosophy Club and Honors Program presentation at noon, 11-12-09; (2) the Spanish Club's presentation of the Duo Guitiano concert at 6:00 p.m., 11-19-09.

AGENDA ITEMS

1. Statement of Concern (Changed Faculty Evaluation)

A matter introduced at the October Council meeting—the changed JSCC Faculty Evaluation Plan—was discussed by the Council. The Council agreed that the way the plan's documentation was changed without faculty input did not represent a shared-governance model for faculty-administrative relations. It was observed that the Faculty Evaluation Committee had not met last year and has not met this year. Noting the careful work of the 2007 Faculty Evaluation Committee to produce the plan, some on the Council were concerned that such decision-making wasted faculty investments of time or “pre-empted faculty work.” Others expressed concern that in the promotion and tenure assessment process, an irregularity or inconsistency like this creates a potential legal complication for JSCC. It was suggested that to avoid employee challenges, clear protocols and consistent practices for promotion and tenure documentation (as required by TBR) should be maintained and followed by the institution.

The Council finalized a “Statement of Concern” regarding the matter (see attachment 1), and a motion to accept and release it was made, seconded, discussed, and approved.

2. Faculty Project

The Council discussed a 2009-2010 faculty project and determined that planting native trees on campus was a good idea. The Council noted that these plans should be coordinated with Preston Turner in the Landscaping and Maintenance Department. The following motion was made, seconded, discussed and approved:

The Council will request from faculty donations to JSCC's arboretum foundation account to help JSCC meet its goal of developing an arboretum.

3. Collection of Budget Information

Another matter from the October Council meeting was the Council's request for more specific information about JSCC's current financial circumstances and its plans for meeting contingencies. Mechel Camp explained that she will schedule a meeting with Horace regarding the Council's request.

4. Council By-Laws

Regarding the ongoing discussion about updating Council By-Laws, Mechel Camp explained that she is trying to arrange a meeting with the Council's sub-committee to examine the By-Laws line by line.

5. A-100 Guidelines

Mechel Camp announced new TBR mandates for new DSP course formats. She explained that the twelve hours once granted to developmental studies, reduced to nine, now have been reduced to six in math and three in reading. Learning Strategies, as a distinct course, will disappear, and developmental writing courses are, somehow, to become "modularized" to accommodate placement and matriculation goals similar to what evolved for developmental math at JSCC. Camp has been meeting with Mary Jane Bassett, Melina Baer, and others regarding this issue and will attend a TBR meeting Wednesday, November 18th on the matter.

6. Christmas Project

The Professional-Technical Employee Council has proposed that all employee councils do a joint Christmas project. The following motion was made, seconded, discussed, and approved:

The Faculty Council will join the Professional-Technical Employees Council and Classified Employees Council in supporting a needy family at Christmas.

7. Facilitated Classes

According to Mechel Camp, JSCC will no longer use—in any courses—the "facilitated class" approach (in which teachers of record produce on-line content that uncredentialed teachers present). She emphasized that only credentialed teachers will be involved in any aspect of presenting class content. She noted a possibility of using outdated JSCC computers to stock a JSCC online class lab at some high schools. She explained that online dual enrollment students will be "mainstreamed" with regular college students taking regular online courses.

8. Faculty Handbook Issues

Mechel Camp passed out a summary (see attachment 2) of remaining faculty concerns with revisions the VPAA had proposed to the Faculty Handbook or had made to handbook processes, and she clarified the VPAA's final position/perspective on these matters: (1) changes to the virtual office hour policy will stand; (2) doubling of summer office hours will stand (and had not been an objection of the Council's Handbook Subcommittee in June, '09); (3) removal of the "FA" grade does not change the policy of failure after three weeks' absence; (4) the timing of summer and overload compensation is a Banner issue that should be resolved; (5) there will be no change toward distinguishing "advising" hours from genuine "office" hours (doubled Summer '09) and compensating faculty for them.

Finalization of several "TBD items" in the handbook remains "TBD."

9. Adjunct Faculty Representation

Representation and engagement of adjunct faculty, an issue introduced in the October meeting was considered further by the Council. Concerns about how to solicit input from this faculty group were noted. Questions were asked about protocols for seeking Council agenda items from adjuncts or for sending them Faculty Council Minutes. Fundamentally, it was said, these faculty have no easy communication with the broader faculty and lack a voice regarding issues or the terms of their professional work at JSCC.

Logistical difficulties with engaging these faculty were noted. It was stated that the concerns of these part-time faculty differed from the concerns of full-time faculty. Questions were raised about the wisdom of putting voting power in the hands of part-time faculty. The Council Executive Committee reported that the VPAA had expressed interest in adjunct mentoring. The Council had questions about adjunct supervision, generally. It was noted that supervision and mentoring is one thing, but that employee representation is, indeed, another matter for this large group of faculty (under 40% of JSCC faculty overall, but considerably higher in some disciplines). The Council desired to table further discussion until the next meeting.

10. Recognition of Retirees

An end-of-year brunch was discussed for honoring retirees. The Council decided to table this issue and continue to think about appropriate ways to acknowledge and honor retiring faculty.

11. Teaching Load Equivalent / Crediting Incremental Roll Increases

Before tabling it until December, the Council briefly discussed a motion and statement brought by a faculty member to the Council. It regarded administration plans to compensate faculty additionally for incremental increases in class enrollments. It was noted that some faculty might welcome extra compensation for extra students—if (1) money actually were paid for the extra work load and (2) paid in the semester that extra work occurred. However,

in light of TBR's ceiling of 31 hours per academic year, it was questioned whether assigning increments of additional hour-load for extra students could amount to more student load over normal schedules, but no extra money, actually.

A concern also was expressed about how institutionalizing increased student loads matched the spirit and aims of the SACS QEP initiative. Increasing students in classes conflicts with QEP objectives of advancing the use of writing both for learning and for assessment across JSCC's areas. Position statements were distributed from the National Council of Teachers of English about recommended class sizes and instructor loads in writing-oriented courses (See Attachments 3 and 4). For writing-oriented classes, "[i]n sections larger than 20, teachers cannot possible give student writing the immediate and individual response necessary for growth and improvement" (*NCTE Statement on Class Size and Teacher Workload: College*).

The Council agreed to table this motion until the December meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. Next meeting: December 9th at 3:00 p.m. in the Foundation Board Room.

Mark Walls, Secretary

Mechel Camp, Chair

Attachment 1

Council “Statement of Concern” and Motion

To the VPAA, the President, the Deans, Assistant Deans, and Faculty

November 11th, 2009

STATEMENT OF CONCERN:

The administration's decision to change the terms of JSCC's Faculty Evaluation Plan is a significant concern for the JSCC Faculty Council.

The evaluation instrument's design, approved by the Faculty Council in April, 2007, was a product of shared governance at JSCC, involving broad faculty and administrative representation, cooperative work, careful vetting, and, ultimately, Council and administrative review and approval. However, important components of this plan have been changed or suspended without consulting faculty representatives or notifying faculty of the change. Such unilateral action about a matter of critical faculty interest reflects insensitivity for the faculty's expectation of engagement in decisions that impact the terms, conditions, and outcomes of their work and their service.

Decision-making that neglects faculty participation in such matters reveals a misunderstanding of both the content and the spirit of the important mandate for shared governance expressed in Item five of the 2008 “**Recommendations for Strengthening Campus Relationships**,” produced by Dr. Charles Lea and JSCC's Ad Hoc Consulting Committee.

MOTION:

The Council therefore respectfully **(1)** re-emphasizes its commitment to genuinely shared decision-making on matters that impact faculty interests and **(2)** asks that JSCC's administration express its commitment to shared governance and to involving the Faculty Evaluation Committee in developing all faculty evaluation documents.

Attachment 2

FACULTY HANDBOOK

1. Regarding hybrid course virtual office hours: Some faculty remarked that teaching a hybrid class is like teaching two classes, from a workload perspective, since often an instructor meets with the class on both days—once to instruct, once to assist—and in addition has to prepare and maintain online materials. Could this be reconsidered?
2. Regarding removing “FA” from the handbook, faculty asked if this changed the “requirement that students miss no more than three weeks of class in order to pass a course.”
3. Regarding E3—when summer and overload compensation will be paid—faculty asked why this is being omitted since this is important to new faculty.
4. Regarding D13, faculty questioned the doubling of summer office hours.
5. Regarding D13, faculty stated that “office hours” are not being spent as office hours but in advising. Advising should be in addition to regular office hours, with appropriate compensation.
6. When will TBD items be finalized?

Attachment 3

NCTE Guideline

A guideline found to be consistent with NCTE positions on education issues

Statement on Class Size and Teacher Workload: College

last edited 1 year, 4 months ago

Prepared by the NCTE College Section, 1987

In an era of increasing public concern over the writing and reading ability of college students, it is especially important that the workload of English faculty members be reasonable enough to guarantee that every student receive the time and attention needed for genuine improvement. Faculty members must be given adequate time to fulfill their responsibility to their students, their departments, their institutions, their profession, the larger community, and to themselves. Without that time, they cannot teach effectively. Unless English teachers are given reasonable loads, students cannot make the progress the public demands.

Economic pressures and budgetary restrictions may tempt administrations to increase teaching loads. With this conflict in mind, the College Section of the National Council of Teachers of English endorses the following standards:

1. English faculty members should never be assigned more than 12 hours a week of classroom teaching. In fact, the teaching load should be less, to provide adequate time for reading and responding to students' writing; for holding individual conferences; for preparing to teach classes; and for research and professional growth.
2. No more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class. Ideally, classes should be limited to 15. Students cannot learn to write without writing. In sections larger than 20, teachers cannot possibly give student writing the immediate and individual response necessary for growth and improvement.
3. Remedial or developmental sections should be limited to a maximum of 15 students. It is essential to provide these students extra teaching if they are to acquire the reading and writing skills they need in college.
4. No English faculty member should teach more than 60 writing students a term: if the students are developmental, the maximum should be 45.
5. No more than 25 students should be permitted in discussion courses in literature or language. Classes larger than 25 do not give students and teachers the opportunity to engage literary texts through questions, discussion, and writing. If lecture classes must be offered, teachers should be given adjusted time or assistance to hold conferences and respond to students' writing.
6. Any faculty members assigned to reading or writing laboratories or to skills centers should have that assignment counted as part of the teaching load. Identifying and addressing the individual needs of students is a demanding form of teaching.
7. No full-time faculty member's load should be composed exclusively of sections of a single course. (An exception might occur when a specific teacher, for professional reasons such as research or intensive experimentation, specifically requests such an assignment.) Even in colleges where the English program consists mainly of composition, course assignments should be varied. Repeating identical material for the third or fourth time the same day or semester after semester is unlikely to be either creative or responsive.
8. No English faculty member should be required to prepare more than three different courses during a single term. Even if the faculty member has taught the same course in previous years, the material must be reexamined in the context of current scholarship and the presentation adapted to the needs of each class.
9. The time and responsibility required for administrative, professional, scholarly, and institutional activities should be considered in determining teaching loads and schedules for English faculty members. These responsibilities cover a broad range, such as directing independent study, theses, and dissertations; advising students on academic programs; supervising student publications; developing new courses and materials; serving on college or departmental committees; publishing scholarly and creative work; refereeing and editing professional manuscripts and journals; or holding office in professional organizations.

This position statement may be printed, copied, and disseminated without permission from NCTE.

Attachment 4

NCTE Guideline

A guideline found to be consistent with NCTE positions on education issues

More than a Number: Why Class Size Matters

last edited 1 year, 4 months ago

NCTE Position on Class Size and Teacher Workload, Kindergarten to College, 1999

The *Standards for the English Language Arts* describe and clarify what students should learn in English Studies and Language Arts—reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and visually representing—to be literate in today's world. This expanded definition of literacy occurs at a time when classrooms are more culturally diverse than ever, when technology and cyberspace bid for schools' attention and dollars, and when employers are calling for more and more highly skilled workers. The challenges of incorporating these necessarily high standards for the future require citizens and the educational community to reconsider the number of students assigned to teachers of English language arts.

What Our Students Need to Succeed

NCTE believes that all students have the right to:

- ample opportunities to engage in writing activities;
- frequent opportunities for meaningful oral interaction in the classroom;
- frequent, timely, substantive feedback and assessment of their written and oral work;
- multiple authentic assessments;
- effective interaction with peers regarding both oral and written work;
- frequent experiences with various print and non-print technologies;
- ample time for developing critical and reflective thinking;
- a fair share of the teacher's time.

NCTE also believes that students have a right to teachers who:

- develop individual instructional relationships with their students;
- provide frequent, substantive feedback to students' work;
- devise creative curricula which honor individual learning styles;
- guide students in their critical evaluation and use of various technologies, print, and non-print media;
- engage regularly in professional development;
- communicate regularly with students and parents.

Student Rights and Needs

No football coach in his right mind would try to teach 150 players one hour per day and hope to win the game on Friday night. No, the team is limited to 40 or 50 highly motivated players, and the coach has three or four assistants to work on the many skills needed to play the game. The 'student-teacher' ratio is maybe 15:1. But the English teacher—all alone—has 150 'players' of the game of composition (not to mention literature, language, and the teaching of other matters dropped into the English curriculum by unthinking enthusiasts).

—John C. Maxwell

All students have the right to engage in a variety of literacy activities, to have meaningful interaction with peers and teachers, and to receive frequent and timely feedback. Students also have a right to teachers who develop creative curricula. Students need

teachers who have the time and skills necessary to honor individual learning styles and accommodate individual student's instructional needs; who guide students in their critical evaluation and use of various technologies; who engage regularly in professional development; and who communicate regularly with students and parents. These student rights must be the foremost consideration when making decisions concerning class size and teacher workload (see *Breaking Ranks*).

Facts

- Reduced class size provides students with many benefits: greater opportunities for participation, greater individual attention, and improved instruction. Conflicting interpretations and the implications for policy decisions at the local, state, and national levels make research on class size and teacher workload controversial. Yet, a current analysis of long-term studies and recent grassroots research reveals that class size does indeed have a major impact on student achievement, behavior, and attention (see Bracey, "Research").
- Student achievement increases significantly in classes of fewer than 20. Smaller classes, complemented by diverse teaching methods, create better student performance, more positive attitudes, and fewer discipline problems. Students and parents have the right to expect classrooms with these characteristics. (See *Class Size Reduction in Freshman English Classes*.)

Challenges

Teaching workload includes, but is often not limited to, the amount of time spent working, the number of classes taught, and the number of students in each class. Additionally, English teachers spend only about three-quarters of their average work week at school (see Dusel). This average does not reflect the amount of time necessary to adequately address the needs of students. Teachers of English language arts consistently find themselves working outside of school, thus lengthening their work week. This means that teachers of English, on average, work longer hours than their colleagues in other disciplines. A teacher with 125 students who spends only 20 minutes per paper must have at least 2,500 minutes, or a total of nearly 42 hours, to respond to all the students' papers. Therefore, responding to one paper per week for each of their 125 students requires English teachers to work over 80 hours a week. This response and evaluation time must also be balanced with time for in-class instruction, planning and preparation, administrative paperwork and functions, as well as school supervisory and advisory responsibilities. No other nation requires teachers to work a greater number of hours a day and year than the United States. Compared to their counterparts in other industrialized nations, U.S. teachers lack adequate time for class preparation and collaborative work with their colleagues.

Goals and Strategies

To reduce teacher workload and increase the quality of literacy education at the elementary, secondary, and college levels, the NCTE recommends a three-pronged approach: reduce the class size and workload; hire qualified professional teachers; and provide strong professional development. Such an approach will transform English language arts.

Yet, no simple solutions to the complex challenges of increased literacy demands for our students exist. Funding limitations, school space, the available pool of qualified teachers, and increased attention to technology force community and school leaders to make difficult decisions about changes in class size and workload. To address these concerns, the NCTE recommends the following planning strategies:

- Form a planning team of teaching faculty, principals or deans, central office or college administrators, a School Board or governing board member.
- Develop a short- and long-range plan of action, including goals, timeline, rationale, impact on personnel and budget.
- Determine such needed resources as personnel, classroom space, building space, along with the budgetary implications.
- Develop a staff development plan for experienced and new teachers.
- Encourage school-based decisions on such issues as space, teachers, and budget.

Whatever the strategies employed, reducing class size and teacher workload significantly increases the quality of literacy education in our schools.

The first curriculum priority is language. Our use of complex symbols separates human beings from all other forms of life. Language provides the connecting tissue that binds society together, allowing us to express feelings and ideas, and powerfully influence the attitudes of others. It is the most essential tool for learning. Language . . . is the means by which all other subjects are pursued.

—Ernest L. Boyer

Statement on Class Size and Teacher Workload: Elementary

Revised by the NCTE Elementary Section, 1996

1. The elementary classroom teacher should not be responsible for more than 25 pupils per class, and in grades K–1 no more than 20 pupils per class.
2. One class period or a minimum of 30 minutes should be provided within each school day for each elementary school teacher's planning time.
3. A half day a month should be set aside for each elementary school teacher for long-range planning.
4. Participation in continuous professional development programs should be considered a part of teachers' workloads and should involve a minimum of three days released time.
5. Participation in professional meetings and activities at local, state, and national levels should be encouraged and financially supported.
6. The use of additional human resources in the classroom should not justify increased pupil–teacher ratio.
7. A library media center with proper staff and adequate, varied resources should be provided in every elementary school. It is recommended that each media center have a minimum of 25 books per student and that individual classrooms contain adequate resource materials and book collections.
8. Clerical services should be available to teachers on an assigned basis to attend to non-instructional tasks such as the collection of money for special events, attendance records, fund raising, and recess and lunch duty. A teacher's primary responsibility should be instruction.
9. Computers, modems, and a phone line should be available in each classroom.

High schools exist to develop students' powers of thought, taste, and judgment . . . to help them with these uses of their minds. Such undertakings cannot be factory-wrought, for young people grow in idiosyncratic, variable ways, often unpredictably.

—Theodore R.Sizer

Statement on Class Size and Teacher Workload: Secondary

Prepared by the NCTE Secondary Section, 1990

The Secondary Section of the National Council of Teachers of English recommends that schools, districts, and states adopt plans and implement activities resulting in class sizes of not more than 20 and a workload of not more than 80 for English language arts teachers by the year 2000.

Effective learning demands opportunities for students to become actively involved in their education, and demands many roles for their teachers: teacher as facilitator, as enabler, as empowerer—not only as lecturer and transmitter of knowledge. These opportunities and roles cannot be achieved when teachers are faced with large classes and heavy workloads.

- A teacher who faces 25 students in a class period of 50 minutes has no more than 2 minutes, at best, per pupil for one-to-one interaction during any period.
- The greater the number of students in class, the fewer the opportunities for students to participate orally.
- The larger the number of students in a class, the greater the amount of time devoted to classroom management rather than instruction.
- The larger the class size, the less likely teachers are to develop lessons encouraging higher-level thinking.
- Teachers of larger classes are more likely to spend less time with each student's paper, and to concentrate on mechanics rather than on style and content.

Policy makers must realize that when a teacher spends 20 minutes reading, analyzing, and responding to each paper for a class of 25 students, the teacher must have 500 minutes for those processes alone. A teacher with 125 students who spends only 20 minutes per paper must have at least 2,500 minutes, or a total of nearly 42 hours, to respond to each assignment. Therefore, responding to one paper per week for each of their 125 students requires English teachers to work over 80 hours a week.

Simply reducing class size alone does not necessarily result in improved achievement when instructional methods do not change. Therefore, attention to staff development while addressing class-size reduction goals will assure maximum benefits for students.

Researchers have identified the following encouraging results from reducing class size and improving instructional methods:

- Smaller classes result in increased teacher–student contact.
- Students in smaller classes show more appreciation for one another and more desire to participate in classroom activities.

- In smaller classes, more learning activities take place.
- Smaller classes foster greater interaction among students, helping them understand one another and increasing their desire to assist one another.
- Smaller classes allow for potential disciplinary problems to be identified and resolved more quickly.
- Smaller classes result in higher teacher morale and reduced stress.
- Fewer retentions, fewer referrals to special education, and fewer dropouts are the ultimate rewards of class-size reduction.

The Secondary Section recommends the following five-year plan:

1. Establish a goal to reduce each English language arts class to not more than 20 students and to limit each language arts teacher's workload to not more than 80 students. Districts may demonstrate progress toward this goal in a variety of ways.
2. Write a plan for ongoing staff development to assist teachers as they modify instructional techniques to take advantage of reduced class size. These efforts may include such experiences as conference attendance, inservice courses, college courses, teacher support groups, and writing projects.
3. Collect evidence of support for teacher examination, development, and implementation of effective classroom practices that increase the frequency and quality of teacher–student interactions intended to improve students' language competency.
4. Develop a timeline with annual goals and report on annual accomplishments.
5. Seek a statement of support for the plan from the local board of education and the administrators and teachers involved.

To teach content in a way that will make subject matter appropriated by students implies the creation and exercise of serious intellectual discipline... To believe that placing students in a learning milieu automatically creates a situation for critical knowing without this kind of discipline is a vain hope. Just as it is impossible to teach someone how to learn without teaching some content, it is also impossible to teach intellectual discipline except through a practice of knowing that enables learners to become active and critical subjects, constantly increasing their critical abilities.

—Paulo Freire

Statement on Class Size and Teacher Workload: College

Prepared by the NCTE College Section, 1987

In an era of increasing public concern over the writing and reading ability of college students, it is especially important that the workload of English faculty members be reasonable enough to guarantee that every student receive the time and attention needed for genuine improvement. Faculty members must be given adequate time to fulfill their responsibility to their students, their departments, their institutions, their profession, the larger community, and to themselves. Without that time, they cannot teach effectively. Unless English teachers are given reasonable loads, students cannot make the progress the public demands.

Economic pressures and budgetary restrictions may tempt administrations to increase teaching loads. With this conflict in mind, the College Section of the National Council of Teachers of English endorses the following standards:

1. **English faculty members should never be assigned more than 12 hours a week of classroom teaching.** In fact, the teaching load should be less, to provide adequate time for reading and responding to students' writing; for holding individual conferences; for preparing to teach classes; and for research and professional growth.
2. **No more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class.** Ideally, classes should be limited to 15. Students cannot learn to write without writing. In sections larger than 20, teachers cannot possibly give student writing the immediate and individual response necessary for growth and improvement.
3. **Remedial or developmental sections should be limited to a maximum of 15 students.** It is essential to provide these students extra teaching if they are to acquire the reading and writing skills they need in college.
4. **No English faculty member should teach more than 60 writing students a term: if the students are developmental, the maximum should be 45.**
5. **No more than 25 students should be permitted in discussion courses in literature or language.** Classes larger than 25 do not give students and teachers the opportunity to engage literary texts through questions, discussion, and writing. If lecture classes must be offered, teachers should be given adjusted time or assistance to hold conferences and respond to students' writing.
6. **Any faculty members assigned to reading or writing laboratories or to skills centers should have that assignment counted as part of the teaching load.** Identifying and addressing the individual needs of students is a demanding form of teaching.
7. **No full-time faculty member's load should be composed exclusively of sections of a single course.** (An exception might occur when a specific teacher, for professional reasons such as research or intensive experimentation, specifically requests such an assignment.) Even in colleges where the English program consists mainly of composition, course

assignments should be varied. Repeating identical material for the third or fourth time the same day or semester after semester is unlikely to be either creative or responsive.

8. **No English faculty member should be required to prepare more than three different courses during a single term.** Even if the faculty member has taught the same course in previous years, the material must be reexamined in the context of current scholarship, and the presentation adapted to the needs of each class.
9. **The time and responsibility required for administrative, professional, scholarly, and institutional activities should be considered in determining teaching loads and schedules for English faculty members.** These responsibilities cover a broad range, such as directing independent study, theses, and dissertations; advising students on academic programs; supervising student publications; developing new courses and materials; serving on college or departmental committees; publishing scholarly and creative work; refereeing and editing professional manuscripts and journals; or holding office in professional organizations.

Selected Bibliography

Bartholomae, David, and Anthony Petrosky. (1986). *Facts, Counterfactuals and Artifacts: Theory and Method for a Reading and Writing Course*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook.

Bloom, Lynn Z., Donald A. Daiker, and Edward M. White, eds. (1996). *Composition in the Twenty-First Century: Crisis and Change*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

Bracey, Gerald W. (September 1995). "Research Oozes into Practice: The Case of Class Size." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89–90.

Bracey, G. W., and M. A. Resnick. (1998). *Raising the Bar: A School Board Primer on Student Achievement*. Alexandria, VA: National School Board Association.

Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution. (1996). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Class Size Reduction in Freshman English Classes. (1992). San Mateo, CA: Office of the Director of Curriculum, San Mateo Union High School District.

The Condition of Education, 1996. "Teachers' Working Conditions." (NCES 97–371). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Dusel, William J. (1955, October). "Determining an Efficient Teaching Load in English." *Illinois English Bulletin*, 1–19.

Feldman, S. (1998, March 11). "Think Small." *Education Week*.

Hawisher, Gail E., and Cynthia L. Selfe, eds. (1996). *CCCC Bibliography of Composition and Rhetoric*, 1994 ed. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Jones, R. (1998). "What Works: Researchers Tell What Schools Must Do to Improve Student Achievement." *The American School Board Journal*, 28–33.

Myers, Miles. (1996). *Changing Our Minds: Negotiating English and Literacy*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

National Council of Teachers of English. (April/May 1997). *Council-Grams: News and Information for Leaders of the Council* (Vol. LX, No. 2). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Newkirk, Thomas. (1998). *Nuts and Bolts: A Practical Guide to Teaching College Composition*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook.

Rankin, Elizabeth. (1994). *Seeing Yourself as a Teacher: Conversations with Five New Teachers in a University Writing Program*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rose, Mike. (1995). *Possible Lives: The Promise of Public Education*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Shanahan, Timothy, ed. (1994). *Teachers Thinking, Teachers Knowing: Reflections on Literacy and Language*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Standards for the English Language Arts. (1996). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Toch, T., and Streisand, B. (1997, October 13). "Does Class Size Matter?" *U.S. News & World Report*, 22–29.

Wenglinsky, H. (1998). *The Effects of Class Size on Achievement: What the Research Says. A Policy Information Memorandum*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

This position statement may be printed, copied, and disseminated without permission from NCTE.

Copyright © 1998-2009 National Council of Teachers of English. All rights reserved in all media. 1111 W. Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801-1096 Phone: 217-328-3870 or 877-369-6283