1. CALL TO ORDER
   The Chair will call the meeting to order and recognizes that tonight’s meeting is being held on the traditional territory of the Snuneymuxw people.

2. ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

3. DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA

4. CHANGE IN ORDER

5. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

6. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
   6.1 Minutes - October 2011
      That the minutes of the Education Committee Meeting held October 12, 2011 be approved.

7. PRESENTATIONS
   7.1 Ms. Wanda Erickson
       Special Education Students
Please note that the proceedings of this meeting are being recorded to assist in the preparation of the minutes of the meeting. The recording of this meeting are records of the School District, as defined in the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, and as such may be the subject of access requests under the Act.

8. EDUCATIONAL UPDATE - Report from Ms. Frisson and Ms. Southwick

8.1 Achievement Updates

9. CORRESPONDENCE REFERRED FROM THE REGULAR BOARD MEETING

10. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

11. NEW BUSINESS

11.1 Year-Round Schooling

11.2 Trades Training for the 21st Century

Positioning the District for the Ship Building Industry

12. QUESTION PERIOD

Questions from the audience must be submitted in writing and given to the Board's Executive Assistant (Cathy Kelt) for submission to the Chair. The question period is intended to enable the public to obtain clarifying information regarding a current agenda item.

Forms are available in the information rack near the entrance of the Board Room

13. ADJOURNMENT
THE BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES OF SCHOOL DISTRICT 68
MINUTES OF EDUCATION COMMITTEE
HELD OCTOBER 12, 2011

PRESENT:
Trustees - Voting
J. Brennan, Chair
R. Dale
S. Welch

NOT VOTING
N. Allen
D. Murchie
D. Neary

Staff
D. Hutchinson, Superintendent/CEO
F. Frisson, Assistant Superintendent
C. Southwick, Assistant Superintendent
S. Bates, District Principal
L. Tait, District Principal
D. Reimer, Director of Communications
C. Kelt, Executive Assistant

ABSENT
H. Tarasewich, DPAC Rep
C. Bohm, NSAA Rep
C. Lintott, NSAA Rep

IN ATTENDANCE

CALL TO ORDER
The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:23 pm and recognized that tonight’s meeting is being held on the traditional territory of the Snuneymuxw people.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA
There were no additions to the Agenda this evening.

DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA
There were no deletions to the Agenda this evening.

CHANGE IN ORDER
There was no change in order to the Agenda this evening.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA
Folio E11/10/13-01
IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Welch
That the Agenda be approved.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES
Folio E11/10/13-02
IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Dale
That the minutes of the Education Committee Meeting held September 14, 2011 be approved.
CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
PRESENTATIONS

Presentation to Dorothy Watchman - Books for Kids by Helen Fall and Carolyn Isles

Teacher-librarians and teachers were in attendance this evening and extended their thanks to Dorothy Watchman. Dorothy was a parent who started the Books for Kids program. She organized the program 14 years ago when Frank J. Ney Elementary was opened. Her daughter attended the school, and Dorothy was surprised to discover that there was no money in the budget for library books for a new school. As a result, she organized Books for Kids and over the years has raised $115,000 for school libraries throughout the district.

A Day Made Better
Jane Saunders - Davis Road Teacher

Jane Saunders, Davis Road music teacher, was honoured this evening. She was recently one of two B.C. teachers recognized by the “A Day Made Better” program sponsored by Grand and Toy. The program gives “extraordinary teachers the recognition they deserve.” Ms. Saunders was surprised with a presentation at a special school assembly last week. Doug English, Ecole Davis Road principal, said “she’s not just a music teacher...she’s a great community person.”

EDUCATIONAL UPDATE - Report from Ms. Frisson and Ms. Southwick

Ms. Shelley Beleznay and Ms. Elizabeth Pennell gave an update about the many collaborative projects currently underway across the district that focus on improving student achievement, starting with the early years program and continuing through secondary school and Grade 12 graduation.

CORRESPONDENCE REFERRED FROM THE REGULAR BOARD MEETING

Community Members - RE: Education Assistants

This correspondence was referred from the September 28th Board Meeting

The Board of Education of School District 68 (Nanaimo-Ladysmith) receives and refers the correspondence from the community members regarding education assistants to the Education Committee.

The Committee held an in-depth discussion about the ways that the district might improve its
support for students with special need.

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Dale

The Education Committee recommends to the Board of Education of School District 68 (Nanaimo-Ladysmith) that it write to the Minister of Education and copy the Treasury Board that the Board be provided with learning assistance funding for primary students who statistically have needs which qualify for funded support but who have not matured enough to be clinically diagnosed.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no Unfinished Business on the Agenda this evening.

NEW BUSINESS

Aboriginal Education Committee - Update

Ms. Stella Bates and Ms. Laura Tait said that Aboriginal communities and the district have had two Aboriginal Education Enhancement Agreements, with a third agreement currently being developed. They said that while there have been some gains in Aboriginal student success over the past ten years, there is still a long way to go. They reviewed the work that is being done to develop the new enhancement agreement, and the focus that agreement will have on the need for collaboration by everyone in the system to build success for Aboriginal learners.

FOR INFORMATION

Balanced Calendar

Chair Brennan said the Balanced Calendar issue would come forward at a future Education Committee Meeting for discussion.

QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions this evening.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY Trustee Dale

That the meeting be adjourned.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.
Presentation given to the Education Committee of School Board 68 (Nanaimo/Ladysmith) by Wanda Erikson on November 9, 2011

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I am a parent of two children. One child attends a school in School District 68. The other attends a learning centre in Nanaimo run by a local charity. The educational program for the learning centre is provided by the Comox School District.

Thank you for the resolution passed at the September meeting to ensure that space is available in schools for Learning Assistance/Student Support at the level required by the Ministry of Education. That is a positive step and the fact that it was passed unanimously is very encouraging.

I will speak to you on five points. (When I use the term neurological disorders, I include acquired brain damage.)

1. Allow children with neurological disorders to attend school Halloween celebrations.
2. Disallow the practice of sending children with neurological disorders home when they cannot meet a certain behavioural standard
3. Engage the parents of special needs students in a discussion about special needs education, how we can make it better
4. Do a performance audit of special needs education in this District.
5. The connection between homelessness and the lack of suitable school for special needs children.

1. Allow children with neurological disorders to attend school Halloween celebrations

Halloween is the best school day of the year. It occurs once per year. Children with neurological disorders often have poor or intermittent social skills. As a result, their social life can be very limited. They do not get invited to birthday parties or on play dates. The only parties they attend are those provided by the family and school. To take away, as a disciplinary measure, Halloween or any other special fun day that occurs once per year, is too harsh. The School Act states that discipline of a student “must be similar to that of a kind, firm and judicious parent”. No parent of a child with a neurological disorder would ever take away Halloween as a disciplinary measure.

I brought a book for you to share. It is called, “It’s Christmas, David!” by David Shannon. It teaches that special fun days which occur once per year should never be taken away from a child.

2. Disallow the practice of sending children with neurological disorders home when they cannot meet a certain behavioural standard.

The example is the red, yellow, green light system of behavior management. If all is going well for the child, the child has a green light. If things are not going so well, the child gets a yellow light and it is up to the child to turn their behaviour around. If the behaviour is very bad, the child gets a red light and is sent home. I sat at an exhibitor’s table at the Autism Expo this year. I met so many parents whose special needs children were on the red, yellow, green light system. Those children were sent home
frequently. Children with neurological disorders struggle every day with their behaviour. They work hard to be at school and to try to do what is expected of them. In a regular classroom, they may be over-stimulated and they may be confused as to what they are supposed to do. Different environmental factors will interfere with their ability to cope. Just because they can do what is expected sometimes, does not mean they can do it consistently all the time. These children need to be accepted as they are. It is unrealistic to expect them to never have highly escalated behavior. They cannot do it. The children need a school and educators who understand this issue. (By educators, I include teachers, principals, administrators and education assistants.) The Nanaimo learning centres deal with escalated behavior as “a moment”. (It may be a long moment.) In that moment the child needs help from a skilled and compassionate adult to become calm. The learning centres do not send children home when the children are overwhelmed and behave accordingly. The children cannot help it and should not be penalized for having a neurological disorder.

A child has to be very motivated to be at school for the red, yellow, green light behavior management system to work. I have been told this by educators and parents. For some children who struggle at school, being sent home is a reward. This will make the behaviour worse. This is not good for the child or anyone else. I believe that educators know this. This practice appears to take advantage of the child’s disability and is a handy way to remove the child from the school. It places all the responsibility on the shoulders of the child, rather than the adults. That is not fair to the child.

The children need a school they can depend on. Many of these children thrive on routine. A disrupted routine makes school much more difficult for the child. The parents need a school they can depend on. Parents should not have to be on call to the school every day, but this is what is happening in this school district. I know a single parent who had to quit her job because she had to pick up her child from school so often. This practice pushes families into poverty. Other parents have reduced income because their ability to work is so compromised because of this practice. Families of special needs children face huge expenses associated with the disability. These children may always be dependent on their family. Why are we reducing the family’s ability to support their child? How is that good for society?

3. Engage the parents of children with neurological disabilities in a discussion as to how we can make special education better.

I would like the school district to hold a meeting with parents and ask the question, “Is the regular classroom working for your special needs child?” I have spoken to many educators and parents of special needs children about this issue. I have not found one who thinks that the policy of inclusion of every child in the regular classroom works or is a good idea. The educators say the parents lobbied for it. The parents think it’s just a way to fund the classroom at the expense of their special needs children. I ask you, as local politicians, to listen to your constituents.

I wrote to you previously about “Quiet Schools” or “Low Stimulation Schools”. Many children with neurological disorders have sensory integration disorder. This means they cannot process information to their senses in the same manner as other people. They become easily overwhelmed and over-stimulated in a busy environment like the regular classroom. Vancouver Island Health Authority calls for
low stimulation classrooms for children with neurological disorders. Children with neurological disorders may also have difficulty with self-regulation. This means that once they are excited, they have difficulty returning to a calm state. An example is if a child tells a joke in a classroom and the whole class laughs. Most of the children will be able to return to a calm state within a reasonable time. The child with a neurological disorder will stay escalated for much longer. That child may have to leave the classroom and may require assistance from a skilled and compassionate adult to return to a calm state. The child cannot help it. In addition, in that moment when the whole class laughed, the child was part of the group. The child may keep trying to re-create that special moment that made them feel good.

A child’s self esteem is the best indicator of that child’s future success. Self esteem is damaged when a child is rejected by their peers and educators. Every time a child is sent home for behaviour over which they have little control, that child feels unwanted and unworthy. Fewer special needs children per classroom limits a child’s potential to make real friendships. Very often, the best the special needs child will receive from the other students is polite tolerance. That is very different than genuine friendship. Children need to be with other children who accept them as they are and with whom they can have fun. This may need to be a child who can relate to their struggles. Children need to be able to develop lifelong friendships as those will be their support system as they become adults. Fewer special needs children per classroom takes away this opportunity. Without friends, these children are more vulnerable to predators, depression and addictions.

I assume that every educator of children wants to work with children. I do not assume that every educator of children wants to work with very challenging special needs children. The policy of inclusion of every child in the regular classroom, in a regular school, forces this relationship. This is not a relationship that should be forced, as it is the children who pay the price. They lose their school. Educators should be people who want to work with these children. The school district pays a great deal of money for substitute educators when the regular educators take stress leave. This money could be better spent on a low stimulation school for children with neurological disorders.

4. Do a performance audit on the delivery of education to special needs children

There are at least three learning centres in Nanaimo, who teach children with neurological disorders. The parents pay fees for their children to attend. The parents would rather not have to pay for something that is supposed to be provided by the government. The alternatives are: be prepared to pick up your child frequently from school or home school. That is no choice.

I have met so many parents of children with neurological disorders whose children are only allowed to attend school part-time. I met one parent at the Autism Expo whose child is only allowed to attend school for one and half hours per day. Every child should be receiving instruction in all subjects. They are not.

Many children with neurological disorders are being home-schooled by their parents. This is not the parents’ choice but they feel they have no choice. This further isolates an already isolated child. Children need to be with other children to laugh, play and learn.
Children with neurological disorders are entitled to good, free, public education. They are not receiving it. How many children with neurological disorders have left the school district because of inadequate programs? How many are going to school part-time? How many are being home-schooled?

5. The connection between homelessness and no school for children with neurological disorders.

The school district promotes Strong Start programs in schools. Imagine a child who had the worst start imaginable. That child also has a right to good, free, public education. It is not a privilege. It is a right.

Who are the homeless? People with mental health issues, neurological disabilities, addictions. These people were all children once. Perhaps tragic events put them where they are today. But perhaps, they are people with neurological disorders who effectively had no school. Maybe they were sent home from school on a regular basis because they could not do what was expected by the educators. Maybe behavior management systems like the red, yellow, green light system took away their school and they were left without an education. What hope is there to solve homelessness if we cannot provide school for our most vulnerable children? This is where you can make a difference. You can ensure that every child has good, free, public school, is taught in all subjects, is taught by skilled and compassionate educators and is taught in an environment that is conducive to that child learning the very best that they can. Every time a child with a neurological disorder is sent home from school because they do not meet a behaviour code, the educator making that decision is giving that child a push toward the exit door of our society and eventually out the door to homelessness.

Thank you.
School District 68 (Nanaimo-Ladysmith)

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS’ REPORT

Education Committee Meeting

Wednesday, November 9, 2011

Grade Two Project

In an effort to improve literacy achievement in our district, we have identified five schools where a significant percentage of grade one students were not meeting expectations by the end of last school year. Currently in grade two at Bayview, Brechin, Fairview, Georgia, and Mountain View, these children and their class will benefit from extra supports during this school year.

Last month, a meeting took place, with eight of the fourteen teachers. Some teachers could not attend due to parent teacher interviews taking place at the same time. Shelley Beleznay, Elizabeth Pennell and Jane Carroll, led the meeting. Teachers exchanged ideas as to interventions and teaching strategies they have used successfully. They also agreed to use two assessment tools: Benchmarks and the Early Primary Reading Assessment (EPRA).

This group will meet again in early December. In the meantime they will work cooperatively at the school level to enhance instruction in the area of literacy.

Hiring Teachers On Call

The District requires additional teachers on call in the areas of secondary math and science, French Immersion as well as elementary generalists. In addition to adding new TOCs to our lists, we are creating an updated process with the intention of hiring the very best teachers to SD68.

We have created three teams (Elementary, Secondary, and French Immersion) of administrators to:

- Create selection criteria
- Review long lists and create short lists
- Review interview questions and criteria
- Interview and recommend candidates

Aboriginal Education Enhance Agreement #3

We are pleased to report that all of the Aboriginal Communities have been consulted and support the new AEEA. The Ministry is in the last stages of approving this third AEEA and plans are well underway for the signing on December first. Invitations have been sent to Trustees and the larger educational community. Grade four students at five of our schools have been invited to witness the ceremony. Those classes are being prepared by our Aboriginal Department staff. There is a luncheon for dignitaries following the signing and all Trustees are invited to attend.
Threat Assessment Training

On November twenty-ninth and thirtieth we will be hosting our first Level I Threat Assessment Training session led by the District Threat Assessment Team. We will be training a team of administrators, TIC's, Counsellors and MCFD personnel. Conducting our own training will save the district in excess of $10,000.

Kindergarten Facilities

We are visiting every Kindergarten classroom for the purpose of compiling information regarding the facilities aspect of the program. Once all the information is gathered we will devise a prioritized list of needs. One goal is to bring as many classrooms as possible to a certain standard.

Elementary Report Cards

Last school year, the Elementary Report Card Committee implemented an updated elementary report card. One of the features of the updated report was increased detail for parents of special needs students in the form of information about modifications and adaptations of curriculum. The format was changed to allow teachers to download the template as a pdf file from the school district web page. There were a number of frustrations with different versions of Adobe Reader, so it was decided to create a web-based version of the same document.

Assessment and Accountability Task Force

This committee is comprised of two parties, the Board representatives and the NDTA. With the current job action, we have been unable to meet so there has been no progress with this committee since last school year.

Francine Frisson
Assistant Superintendent

Chris Southwick
Assistant Superintendent
Year-Round Education

by Elisabeth A. Palmer and Amy E. Bemis

Abstract

An extensive review of literature from the last three decades provided data regarding models of year-round education (YRE), perceived advantages and disadvantages of alternative calendars, and evidence to support or refute such claims. Many studies on the effects of YRE suffer from inadequate research designs or incomplete reporting of data making it difficult to draw conclusions. Still, in 75 analyses of student achievement, 42 revealed no significant effect on achievement for students attending year-round schools (YRS) while 27 indicated significant positive effects. Data on other outcomes such as attitudes, attendance, professional development, and the impact on families was for the most part inconclusive. In sum, it is reasonable to conclude that students attending YRS are likely to perform as well as if not better than their peers in traditional nine-month programs, especially at the upper elementary school level.

Introduction

In an effort to inform activities and policies related to recent Minnesota legislation on alternative school calendars, this article provides a comprehensive and updated review of the literature and research on effective models of year-round education.¹ It begins with an overview of the legislation, followed by a description of the various models of year-round education (YRE) being implemented nationwide, a discussion of the perceived advantages and disadvantages of these alternative calendars, a review of research on the effects of YRE on student achievement and related outcomes, and finally, a summary of key policy issues raised by YRE.

Background

The first year-round school (YRS) in the United States opened in Bluffton, Indiana, in 1904 for the purposes of increasing school building capacity and student achievement (Glines, 1995). Maximizing facilities and improving educational outcomes by minimizing summer learning loss, offering remediation during intersessions and implementing creative curricular programs are still cited today along with the potential for saving money (Costa, 1987; Zykowski et al., 1991).

As support for YRE grows, more and more school districts are changing their school calendars based primarily on feedback from their constituents and the information provided by advocacy groups such as the National Association for Year-Round Education (NAYRE) and the Minnesota Association for Year-Round Education (MAYRE). With recent legislation in Minnesota², YRE has taken on new meaning as districts consider its potential for helping students achieve the state graduation standards. Although much has been written about YRE, most of the research to date has been incomplete or poorly designed, leaving educators at a loss for solid data upon which to draw conclusions (Adelman, 1992; Hazelton, Blakely, and Denton, 1992; Worthen and Zsiray, 1994). A more comprehensive
review of year-round models, their impact, and implications for public policy are
needed to inform the emerging discussions.

Models of Year-Round Education
For the purposes of this review, YRS were defined as ones that reorganize their
calendar such that blocks of instruction and vacation are spread throughout the
year to make learning more continuous. Such programs do not add instructional
days to those required of students, but simply reallocate the approximately 180
school days.4

Single and Multi-Track
Year-round schools are typically implemented as single-track (ST) with unified
attendance or multi-track (MT) with staggered attendance programs, or some
combination of the two. The primary difference between the two schedules is that
single-track programs provide for the entire student body and staff to follow the
same school calendar, whereas multi-track programs divide students and teachers
into groups and assign each to one of several tracks with staggered instructional
blocks and vacation periods.4 Early reports for the 1998-99 school year indicate
that 2,986 year-round schools exist throughout the United States, Canada, and the
Pacific Region. Ninety-eight percent of these are in the United States. Of these, 59
percent are single-track and 41 percent are multi-track (NAYRE, 1998a). These
figures represent a five-fold increase from ten years ago, when only 494 public
schools in the U.S. were on a year-round calendar. The number of students
enrolled in YRS has increased almost 400%, from 428,961 in 1988-89 to
2,040,611 ten years later (NAYRE, 1998b).
Many varieties of year-round schedules have been implemented throughout this
century. Estimates on the exact number vary, although it has been estimated that
at least 50 different scheduling patterns exist (Quinlan et al., 1987). Only the most
common of these will be discussed here.
60-20 and 60-15:
In the 60-20 schedule, the year is divided into three 60-day sessions with three 20-
day vacation periods. A variation on this schedule is the 60-15, which allows for
an additional three to four week common vacation. As with most year-round
schedules, this plan can be carried out using either the single-track or multi-track
system. Together, these two types of calendars account for 37.1 percent of all
year-round schools. A variation of the 60-15 schedule is the Orchard Plan. In this
plan, used by 0.3 percent of year-round schools, teachers work eleven months and
the students rotate in and out of class.
45-15 and 45-10:
These two schedules account for the largest portion of all year-round calendars
(39.6 percent). In the 45-10 system, 45 days of instruction are followed by fifteen
days of vacation. The related 45-10 plan provides an additional four week
common vacation for staff and students. Again, either of these plans can be
implemented in either a single-track or multi-track system.
Concept 6:
In the Concept 6 plan, the school year is divided into six terms of approximately
43 days. Students and teachers attend two consecutive sessions and then have one session off for a total of 172 instructional days. During the 1997-98 school year, 8.3 percent of year-round schools were following this plan.

Table 1. Comparison of traditional vs. year-round calendars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key: Vacation/Intersession, In school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of Year-Round Education

It is clear from the literature that both advantages and disadvantages are associated with year-round education (Stenvall, 1997; Worthen and Zsiray, 1994). Some of the perceived advantages are: improved achievement, improved teacher and student attendance, reduction in discipline problems, reduction in teacher stress, increased motivation among teachers and students after returning refreshed from more frequent breaks, and increased availability of enrichment opportunities during intersessions. The benefits attributed only to multi-track programs are easing of overcrowding, reduction in class size, opportunities for teachers to work year-round, and better use of facilities with potential for cost savings (Brekke, 1992; Stenvall, 1997).

Perceived disadvantages include: increased administrator burn-out, scheduling conflicts between family vacations and school or community activities, difficulty in arranging daycare, having siblings on different attendance schedules, difficulty in scheduling teacher in-service days, and increased costs of operation. In addition, the multi-track model may require additional operating costs, lack sufficient time for maintenance, be inconvenient for teachers (who may have to change classrooms during the year), lead to overworked clerical staff or administration, increase difficulties in communicating with staff or parents, and result in some students missing school events scheduled at off-track times (Stenvall, 1997; Worthen & Zsiray, 1994).

Little "hard" evidence regarding the impact of year-round education on outcomes other than student achievement exists in the vast literature on YRE and YRS.² Because of the variation in quality of research and the high level of interest in this area, for the purposes of this review we only report results from studies utilizing comparison groups (e.g., pre/post-test for schools moving to year-round schedules; or year-round vs. traditional calendars) and providing tests of statistical significance. The latter criteria is intended as a means of highlighting what we really do know about the effects of YRE rather than simply summarizing the anecdotal evidence that is so prevalent in the literature.
Student Achievement

Studies examining the effects of YRE on achievement in the last three decades were collected and the results summarized. Thirty-three studies published since 1980 met our definition of YRS or YRE. Of the studies meeting our criteria, most dealt with YRE in elementary schools (i.e., grades 3-6). Our second set of selection criteria, met by 19 studies, was that the studies include at least one test of statistical significance and compare progress over a minimum one-year period. A final criteria for our vote count, met by 12 of the 19, was that the studies report positive or negative effects (Cooper, 1989). A total of 75 individual comparisons of standardized achievement tests in reading, math, language, writing, science, social studies, or the complete battery were obtained. Most included elementary schools that had followed a year-round schedule for 3-5 years, while the others had implemented such programs from 1-21 years ago.

Table 2. Vote-count summary of statistically significant directional findings of studies (1980-1997) of year-round schooling effects on achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Language &amp; Writing</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Composite</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive YR</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative YR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Test p-level</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There were 42 tests of YRS effects that revealed no effect or pattern.

Table 2 presents a summary count of the statistically significant positive or negative effects of YRE on student achievement. Because we did not weight any study by its sample size the results should be viewed as suggestive of achievement trends. The results in Table 2 indicate that 27 of the 33 comparisons indicated significant positive effects of YRE on achievement. Likewise, 11 of 13 comparisons in reading and 9 of 11 in math showed significant positive results. In sum, it is reasonable to conclude that students attending YRS are likely to perform as well as if not better than their peers in traditional nine-month programs, especially at the upper elementary school level.

Limitations

As has been true of many such efforts prior to ours, this review of studies on the effects of YRE and student achievement has several limitations. First, the quality of research designs varied considerably. By requiring tests of significance, however, we included only those studies with comparisons over time (i.e., prior to and after implementing YRE) or between different school calendars (e.g., year-round and the traditional, 9-month). Still, many of the studies spanned only one year. Most studies sampled schools, with several comparing a single year-round
school to a traditional school with similar student demographics. Some also tried to control for students' socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and gender in their analyses. Still, a number of studies did adequately describe their samples. Second, many studies did not conduct statistical tests or if they did, did not report all of the relevant data to allow a more sensitive summary analysis of the results across studies. Third, studies did not always specify the type of year-round calendar or whether it allowed for additional days of instruction through intersessions or other extended learning programs. The few studies that attempted to examine the effects of intersessions suffered from poor research design. Finally, changes in the school calendar are often accompanied by innovations in curriculum and instruction that were not taken into consideration in the analyses.

In addition to addressing the limitations noted above, future research might examine other trends noted in studies we reviewed including more consistent scores over time for YRS; a faster rate of growth in achievement for YRS; and the accumulation of greater benefits for at-risk students.

**Related Outcomes**

Research to assess claims regarding the advantages and disadvantages of year-round education was also reviewed. In most instances, few studies met our criteria for quality of research design and completeness of data. Nevertheless, we present a summary of findings on student attendance, teacher absenteeism, students' attitudes, teachers' attitudes, teachers' professional development, administrative burnout, parents' attitudes and the impact on families.

**Student Attendance**

One perceived benefit of year-round education is an increase in student attendance. Our review of twelve studies, however, showed mixed results in this area (Barron, 1993; Costa, 1987; Curry, Washington, and Zyskowski, 1997; Elsberry, 1992; Fardig, 1992; Gandara and Fish, 1994; Herman, 1991; Loyd, 1991; Prohm and Baenen, 1996; Schoewe, 1993; White, 1993; Woolley, 1996). These studies examined absenteeism primarily for programs operating on a 60-20/60-15 or 45-15 schedule and at the elementary and secondary school level. Of the five studies testing for statistical significance, only one (Elsberry, 1992) reported that students in year-round schools had significantly better attendance than the rest of the district. When non-significant differences were reported, they ranged from a two-day increase in attendance to a two-day decrease.

**Teacher Absenteeism**

It is also believed that year-round education may lead to reduced teacher absenteeism because of the more frequent vacations, at least in single-track schools where teachers do not work during intersessions. Our findings indicated that several studies do indeed show a decrease in teacher absenteeism, although these differences tend not to be statistically significant. Of the studies reviewed, six contained data regarding teacher absenteeism (Barron, 1993; Fardig, 1992; Gandara and Fish, 1994; Kocic, 1996; Loyd, 1991; White, 1993). Only two of the authors conducted tests of statistical significance, and neither of these indicated
any differences (Barron, 1993; Kocek, 1996). It is noteworthy, however, that five of the six studies did provide some evidence of a decrease in teacher absenteeism in the year-round schools, ranging from one to three days.

**Student Attitudes**

It is also believed that students on year-round calendars may have improved attitudes because of their more frequent breaks from school. Again, our review showed mixed findings. Only one study surveyed students regarding their attitudes toward year-round education both before and after implementation (Fardig, 1992). The results indicated that after one year of experiencing a 60-15 calendar, students felt more positively about year-round education.

Three studies compared the attitude toward school for students on year-round and traditional schedules (Nygaard, 1974; Powers, 1974; Shields, 1996). While one found no differences, the other two did report significant differences in favor of year-round education in at least a subsample of the student population (e.g., fifth-grade girls showed significant differences; boys did not).

Four studies examined students' attitudes about themselves in terms of self-confidence and self-concept. Two of the studies used the Student Attitude Measure to compare the self-concept of students in large, urban year-round schools to a national norm group (Alkin et al., 1983; Herman, 1991). Results from both studies indicated that the year-round students had significantly lower self-concepts than the norm group. Two additional studies compared year-round students to those on a traditional schedule (Nygaard, 1974; Shields, 1996). One found no difference using the Self Appraisal Inventory, while the other study found that students on a traditional calendar scored significantly higher on items having to do with self-acceptance on the Educational Process Questionnaire.

**Teacher Attitudes**

Related to the issue of teacher absenteeism is that of teacher attitudes, which are thought to improve with more frequent vacations. What did become clear in our review is that the more teachers experience year-round education, the more they like it. Seven of the studies reviewed offered data on teacher attitudes that met our criteria (Costa, 1987; Elsberry, 1992; Fardig, 1992; Loyd, 1991; Nygaard, 1974; Pelavin et al., 1979; Prohm and Baenen, 1996). All included elementary school teachers and three included middle or junior high school teachers. The attitudes measured were about year-round education, school quality, scheduling of personal activities, and morale.

It is clear from the studies of teachers' feelings about year-round education that their attitudes tend to improve with experience in these programs. All three of the studies comparing teachers' attitudes over time found that their satisfaction increased (Fardig, 1992; Loyd, 1991; Nygaard, 1974). One study comparing the year-round to a traditional calendar found that the teachers who were most accepting and positive towards the year-round schedule had the most exposure to it, while staff on traditional calendars had the most negative attitudes about it (Shields, 1996).
When year-round teachers took the Elements of Quality survey covering such topics as management, community confidence in school, and organization of school, they scored higher than teachers on a traditional calendar in all areas, though not significantly so (Costa, 1987). Another study asking about the ease of scheduling personal and family activities showed that year-round teachers expressed significantly higher satisfaction in this area than traditional calendar teachers (Elsberry, 1992). The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire was utilized in one study that found no difference in morale between teachers on year-round and traditional schedules (Nygaard, 1974). Finally, when queried about school climate and effectiveness, year-round staff had a more positive attitude than did those on a traditional calendar in fifteen out of eighteen survey questions, although no significance tests were conducted (Prohm and Baenen, 1996).

**Teacher Professional Development**

One perceived disadvantage of year-round education is that teachers may have a more difficult time scheduling their professional development (e.g., many teachers take graduate classes during the summer vacation period). Only two studies met our criteria for the topic of professional development for teachers (Elsberry, 1992; Fardig, 1992). One questioned elementary teachers before they began their 60-15 year-round calendar and again after the first and second years of operation. Findings indicated that teachers found attending professional conferences, staff development activities, and college courses more difficult than they had anticipated. After two years, roughly half of the year-round teachers noted that participation in these types of activities was more difficult than it had been on a traditional calendar. The other study compared traditional calendar teachers to those on a 60-20 year-round schedule and found no significant difference between the two groups regarding ease of attending professional meetings, staff development activities, or college courses.

**Administrative Burnout**

It has been hypothesized that because principals of year-round schools are required to deal with the most difficult times of the year (i.e., the beginning and end of school) every six to nine weeks, they may experience more stress and/or burnout (French, 1992). Only one study included empirical data on the oft-cited factor of administrative burnout (French, 1992). Researchers administered the Maslach Burnout Inventory to 69 year-round and 70 traditional schedule elementary principals and found no significant differences in their emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, or personal accomplishment.

**Parent Attitudes**

Six studies included either a comparison of attitudes about switching to a year-round before and after transitioning, or a year-round vs. traditional calendar comparison of parent attitudes (Elsberry, 1992; Fardig, 1992; Nygaard, 1974; Pelavin et al., 1979; Prohm and Baenen, 1996; Shields, 1996). All three studies (Fardig, 1992; Nygaard, 1974; Pelavin et al., 1979) gathering data on parents'
attitudes toward year-round school both before and after implementation found
their opinions became more positive over time. Fifty-three percent favored year-
round education during the summer before implementation, while 79 percent
favored it at the end of the first year. Of the three studies comparing the opinions
of parents of children on traditional vs. year-round calendars, one (Shields, 1996)
found no difference in satisfaction, while the other two (Elsgren, 1992; Prohm
and Baenen, 1996) indicated that parents with children in year-round programs
had a more positive attitude toward either their children's education or school
climate and effectiveness; however, statistical testing was not done in any of these
studies.

Impact on Families
One disadvantage of year-round education that is cited is the possible adverse
impact on families in terms of scheduling vacations and childcare. Again, studies
showed mixed results in this area. Three studies with questions for parents
regarding vacation planning and childcare met our criteria for inclusion (Fardig,
1992; Pelavin et al., 1979; Shields, 1996). Findings from the study comparing
parents' opinions before and after implementation found that childcare and
vacation arrangements were not as difficult as these parents had anticipated. The
other two studies compared parents of children on each calendar and found no
differences between these groups in terms of childcare or vacations.

Limitations
Aside from more positive attitudes on the part of teachers, the research on non-
academic outcomes attributed to YRE and YRS is for the most part inconclusive.
Research designs are severely limited by sampling bias (e.g., higher proportions
of at-risk students were enrolled in the year-round school), lack of adequate
comparison groups, little attention to changes over longer periods of time, and
few tests of statistical significance.

Policy Considerations
Several policy issues are raised by the research on YRE and YRS. These issues
are presently being examined more closely by the Alternative Calendar Working
Group which is preparing a report on their findings and recommendations for the
1999 legislative session. Their report will include the results of interviews with
key staff at each of Minnesota's year-round schools as well as the Oxnard School
District in California which has followed a year-round calendars since the 1970s.
It will also include discussions of YRE with regard to the following areas of
policy:
Curriculum and Instruction: opportunities for educational reforms through
differential uses of time;
Staff working conditions: dealing with teachers' contractual and licensure issues,
and administrative burden;
Facilities: optimal utilization of existing and funding for new buildings and
facilities;
Other: scheduling and transportation issues;
Impact: special student populations (e.g., disabled, at-risk); families; businesses and the community; extracurricular activities, athletics, and youth development programs; institutions of higher education; Research: procedures for tracking and reporting the year-round status of schools and achievement data based on the number of instructional days; quality of research on key outcomes.

Summary
This document reviewed research and other publications from the last three decades to provide an overview of the models of YRE, perceived advantages and disadvantages of alternative calendars, and evidence to support or refute such claims. Much of the empirical data regarding the effects of YRE on student achievement and other related outcomes suffers from poor research designs or incomplete data making it difficult to draw conclusions. Still, it is reasonable to conclude that year-round education at least at the upper elementary school level has a positive effect on student achievement. In addition, further research will likely provide support for trends indicating more positive attitudes on the part of teachers.

Endnotes
1 See also, Kneese (1996), Winters (1995), and Worthen (1994).
2 The Minnesota legislature recently enacted laws to support flexible school scheduling. Minnesota Statutes 120.59-120.67 guide the evaluation, planning and implementation of "Flexible Learning Programs" to help meet the educational needs of students. Such programming includes, but is not limited to, plans involving 45 days on, 15 days off school scheduling; four-quarter, quinmester or flexible all-year schedules; extended learning year programs; and four-day weeks. This article examines one type of flexible learning program: year-round education (YRE).
3 Using this definition, programs that extend or add time to the school day, week or year are not included.
4 The primary reason for implementing a MT calendar is to increase schools' capacity for serving increased enrollments (Costa, 1987; Hazelton, Blakely, and Denton, 1992; Zykowski et al., 1991).
5 It has been suggested that the advantages and disadvantages of year-round models discussed below are due more to their status as single- or multi-track rather than to the particular configuration of days on and off within a track.
6 Relevant literature, including published and unpublished reports and articles from refereed journals, was identified in the following manner. First, a search was conducted using several electronic databases. Documents in the ERIC database were published from 1966 to 1998, PsycINFO from 1967 to 1998, and from 1983 to the present-in both the Social Sciences Abstracts and Education Abstracts. Second, relevant reports were requested from the Minnesota legislature and the U.S. Department of Education. Third, bibliographies of recent reports and articles were examined for additional materials. The literature search resulted in 64 total
documents, 40 of which contained empirical data on the effects of year-round education and 24 reports of a descriptive or theoretical nature.

Our search of the literature identified only three studies with achievement data prior to 1980. Two recent meta-analyses by Winters (1995) and Kneese (1996) were also acquired and compared to our sample. Winters' review was based primarily on evaluation studies readily available to the National Association for Year-Round Education.

Kneese's study included a more exhaustive search of the literature. Our sample included all but six of the studies reviewed by Kneese (4 evaluation reports and 2 dissertations) as well as many others.

Three studies were of middle schools, three of high schools, and three did not specify any grade level.

Individual tests were based on separate samples (e.g., 3rd grade, 6th grade, reading, math, etc.). Because many of the same students took multiple tests (e.g., reading, math) we cannot assume independence of data points.

One study noted that the positive impact of the year-round over the traditional calendar disappeared by the third year of implementation, suggesting a need to adhere to the common research practice of examining longitudinal data for a minimum of three years.

A more rigorous meta-analysis is planned at a later date and will take into consideration sample size and quality of the research design.
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Introduction

Year-round education is not a typical alternative way to deliver the curriculum. It is, however, an alternative way to construct the school calendar. It may have positive effects on student achievement, especially for disadvantaged students.

Both traditional and some year-round school calendars can have 180 days of instruction. The traditional calendar, of course, is divided into nine months of instruction and three months of vacation during the summer. Year-round calendars break these long instructional/vacation blocks into shorter units. The most typical instructional/vacation year-round pattern is called the 60/20 calendar (60 days of instruction followed by 20 days of vacation; the second most popular is the 45/15; and the third, the Concept 6 (roughly 80 days of instruction followed by 40 days of vacation). There are numerous other possible patterns, but they are not common.

Year-round education is also known by the number of "tracks" it uses. A school using a "single track" year-round calendar is simply changing the instructional/vacation sequence of the school year; all the students and staff are in school or vacation at the same time. But a school using a "multitrack" year-round calendar does something quite different: it divides the entire student body and staff into different tracks (from three to five). If, for example, a school is using a four-track system, then at any one time three of the four tracks are attending school while the fourth is on vacation. The rotation sequence depends on the year-round calendar being used. In the 60/20 calendar, one track returns from vacation and one track leaves every 20 days.

The advantage of a multitrack system is that it expands the seating capacity of a school facility. For example, a school with a seating capacity of 1,000 could potentially enroll 1,333 students if it uses a three-track system (each track having 500 students and one track always on vacation). The school's seating capacity has been increased by 33 percent. In practice, however, three-track plans typically expand the seating capacity by about 33 percent. If a school with a seating capacity of 1,000 uses a four-track system, it could potentially enroll 1,333 students, increasing its capacity by 33 percent. In practice, four-track plans typically expand the seating capacity by about 25 percent.

Incentive grants are available for school districts planning and operating multitrack year-round education programs. These grants are allocated annually based on the number of students claimed in excess of school site capacity. A disadvantage of adopting a multitrack system is that it reduces each track's operational grant money in the State School Building Program is reduced by the number of additional students housed at a school as a result of its multitrack calendar.

Because of rapid growth, overcrowding, and the cost-effectiveness of year-round programs in achieving class size reduction, the number of districts using multitrack year-round education has grown significantly. In 1986 99 districts used year-round programs. By June 1997 more than 100 did so.

For many, however, the advantages of multitrack year-round education are compromised by the disadvantages. For instance, lengthening the school year beyond 180 days by using on-site classrooms is thwarted by the available-day limitations of each multitrack year-round education track. And offering mandatory remediation sessions, when all classrooms are used all year, is likewise a challenge. A district considering the implementation of multitrack year-round education must consider both its facility needs and its instructional objectives and then choose a course that provides each of its students with the maximum opportunity to learn.

The ability of year-round education to relieve overcrowding has overshadowed its effectiveness as an educational strategy. Yet there are, in fact, compelling reasons year-round education should be considered in its single-track form simply for its educational benefits, especially for at-risk students.

Back to Top

Students with learning disadvantages may receive academic benefits. Student achievement scores improve when those students are attending year-round schools. 1 The explanation is simple: the loss of retention of information that occurs during the three-month summer vacation is minimized by the shorter, more frequent vacations that characterize year-round calendars. For those students without intellectual stimulation, enrichment, or reinforcement during the summer, summertime can be intellectually detrimental.

Also, summer school, the typical time for remediation in traditional calendar schools, is held just once a year. It is scheduled after the school year has been completed, which is often too late. Year-round calendars replace summer school with intersessions (those periods of shorter vacations that punctuate the instructional year). Because intersessions take place more frequently, remediation can occur in sequence, offering to help a student in a timely manner.

Of course, there are other benefits associated with the year-round calendar: teacher and student stress are relieved by regular breaks throughout the year, vacation time can be used more creatively, and the curriculum can creatively incorporate seasonal

Year-Round Schooling
Implementing a year-round education calendar has both facility and programmatic implications. In its multitrack and single-track forms, it can be an important strategy for ensuring that a district can deliver the best possible educational program.

### Statistical Summary of Year-Round Programs, 2005-06

- School districts in California: 1,054
- School districts with enrollments greater than 1,000: 596
- Public schools in California: 9,653
- Total K-12 enrollment: 6,312,103
- School districts using single-track education programs: 156
- Total year-round K-12 enrollment: 1,188,115
- Public schools using year-round education programs (by grade level):
  - Elementary schools: 1,127
  - Middle/junior high schools: 146
  - High schools: 90
  - K-12 schools: 12
  - Alternative high schools: 21
  - Continuation high schools: 26
  - Opportunity schools: 4
  - Total: 1,426
- Single-track programs
  - Number of districts with single-track programs:* 112
  - Number of single-track schools: 740
  - Enrollment in single-track schools: 487,974
- Multitrack programs
  - Number of districts with multitrack programs:* 74
  - Number of multitrack schools: 690
  - Enrollment in multitrack schools: 700,141
- Year-round calendar plans used by schools (districts may use more than one calendar plan)
  - 45/15: 156
  - 65/15: 15
  - 60/20: 420
  - 90/30: 167
  - Concept 8: 99
  - Custom: 573
  - Orchard: 0

*Districts may use both plans.

Source: CBEDS 2005

### Year-Round Calendars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>45/15 Multitrack</th>
<th>Concept 6 Multitrack</th>
<th>60/20 Multitrack</th>
<th>90/30 Multitrack</th>
<th>Orchard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of tracks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Instructional periods</td>
<td>2 to 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of periods</td>
<td>45 to 90 days</td>
<td>45 days</td>
<td>81 days</td>
<td>60 days</td>
<td>90 days</td>
<td>60 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Instructional days</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of vacations</td>
<td>3 days to 3 months</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>43 days</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>3 periods of 15 days each; 1 period of 20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vacations</td>
<td>1 long</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Year-Round Schooling
### Capacity Gain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long instructional blocks, long vacation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent vacations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Single Track</th>
<th>Double Session</th>
<th>Concept 6</th>
<th>Modified Concept 6</th>
<th>90/30</th>
<th>60/20</th>
<th>45/15</th>
<th>4 Quarters</th>
<th>60/15</th>
<th>5 Quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase school building capacity</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides for 180 days of instruction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides multiple vacations for students and staff</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides opportunities for salary enhancements through substitute and/or intercession employment</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides for a common three to four week summer vacation for all students and staff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides multiple intersessions to accommodate enrichment and/or remedial instruction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers maximum opportunity for course offerings in a departmentalized program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If space and funding allow, students may attend all four quarters</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retains a calendar that accommodates two semesters or four quarters</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires fewer room changes, including start-ups and closing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows teachers and students to retain the same classrooms all year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits the addition of school days beyond the required 180-day school year</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits the school year to approximately 163 days, which are lengthened to meet state requirements for cumulative annual minutes of instruction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter vacation is generally limited to one week</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disadvantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Single Track</th>
<th>Double Session</th>
<th>Concept 6</th>
<th>Modified Concept 6</th>
<th>90/30</th>
<th>60/20</th>
<th>45/15</th>
<th>4 Quarters</th>
<th>60/15</th>
<th>5 Quarters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires class rotation or teacher roving</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires three more &quot;start-ups&quot; and &quot;endings&quot;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires additional storage space for teachers and students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires a calendar that does not coincide with a traditional school year calendar</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional demands placed upon cafeteria, custodial, maintenance, and instructional support and administrative services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student testing schedules will defer from track to track</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item Number 11.1

Year-Round Costs

Areas of Savings

- Avoided costs - capital outlay; avoided extra-site operation and staffing, including classified, certificated, and administrative personnel, furniture, supplies and equipment, utilities and maintenance, and transportation
- Potential savings - additional average daily attendance (ADA) generated; shared materials (library, computer, audio visual, science resources, textbooks); benefits (calculated on a 12-month basis for full-time employees); reduced absenteeism (additional ADA and decreased requests for substitute teachers); and decreased vandalism
- Incentives - California Department of Education year-round education implementation and operational Grants

Areas of Costs

- Transition costs - administrative planning, staff development, communication, storage units, storage space, and air conditioning
- Operational costs - expanded office and administrative staff; increased utilities, maintenance, and transportation costs

Example Cost Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Cost Item</th>
<th>Enrollment of 500 Students</th>
<th>Enrollment of 581 Students</th>
<th>Enrollment of 635 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>YRE</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Principal</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>$73,030</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Clerical Staff</td>
<td>$42,075</td>
<td>$50,490</td>
<td>$42,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Noon Aides</td>
<td>$7,751</td>
<td>$10,334</td>
<td>$7,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Custodial Staff</td>
<td>$55,854</td>
<td>$59,576</td>
<td>$55,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel/Fringe</td>
<td>$51,804</td>
<td>$58,029</td>
<td>$51,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational/Additional</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>$34,546</td>
<td>$44,816</td>
<td>$35,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>$11,850</td>
<td>$13,450</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>$270,880</td>
<td>$308,125</td>
<td>$302,674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model is based on a school site with a capacity of 500 students.

Implementing a Year-Round Educational Program

Year-Round Schooling
A. Implementation Steps
1. Select schools and grade levels.
2. Establish a process for resolving issues.
3. Construct a "Pent Chart" for organizing issues, time lines, and responsibilities.
4. Meet consultation requirements (Education Code Section 37816) and November 1 public notice deadline (Education Code Section 37611) if needed.
5. Select and approve a calendar by working with employee groups.
6. Assess the need for facilities modifications, including shade modifications and storage areas for off-track teachers.
7. Submit budget requests to district business office.
8. Decide if year-round education will be implemented on a voluntary or mandatory basis for students and employees.
9. Develop and approve a track preference and assignment policy for students, keeping in mind the need for same schedules for family members. Balance tracks by ethnicity, academic ability, socioeconomic level, and educational need.
10. Develop and approve a track assignment policy for teachers and staff.
11. Determine staff in-service schedule.
12. Institute a year-round education informational network for certificated and classified staff members and parents.
13. Send choices of tracks to parents by early spring.
14. Notify parents as soon as possible of track assignment.
15. Develop a policy and system for track-change appeals.
16. Develop a system for delivering services during the summer (e.g., classroom supplies and textbooks).
17. Modify/expand food services according to need.
18. Modify payroll periods.
19. Develop a system for plant maintenance and utilization of empty rooms.
20. Ensure that air conditioning and insulation are able to provide summer comfort.
21. Bargain with all appropriate classified and certificated units.
22. Develop a work schedule for office, custodial, and administrative staff members.
23. Develop a system to deliver electives and special services, such as special day classes, psychological services, resource specialists, and bilingual education.
24. Ensure appropriate cash reserves to meet summer payroll and supply expenses.
25. Modify transportation system as required, including routes, number of buses, and service schedules.
26. Establish a system for teacher room rotation or roving.
27. Develop a community-school communication system for notifying off-track families of important school dates and activities.
28. Provide activities for connecting off-track employees and parents.
29. Reschedule special events such as holiday programs.
30. Design attendance accounting system as required.
31. Modify report card schedule.
32. Coordinate with community services, such as the recreation department, youth organizations, church groups, and the police department.
33. Identify and coordinate with child care providers.
34. Identify intersession instructional programs and schedules.
35. Modify student testing program.

B. Track Assignment Considerations

General Aims
1. Establish the following priorities in deciding who gets first track preference, of a track:
   a. Keep families together. Give priority to families with children in different schools in accord with Education Code Section 37617.
   b. Respect district employees and keep parents on the same track as their children.
   c. Respect the terms of divorce settlements by respecting parents visitation schedules.
   d. Consider unique family circumstances (e.g., predictable, annual visits of families located in different parts of the country or the world).
   e. Acknowledge unique educational opportunities (e.g., a cellist prodigy who is offered a summer camp).
2. Use a fair, balanced track assignment policy once priorities have been honored. Each track should mirror the ethnic and socioeconomic composition of the entire school population.
3. Minimize ability and/or special education need track segregation. If a special population must be put on one track, isolation and segregation can be minimized by partial day integration of self-selection of track.
4. Develop an appeals process, including:
   a. A site administrator
   b. An appeal committee (made up of an administrator, a teacher and a board member)
   c. Full board
5. Do not:
   a. Load tracks by ability level.
   b. Load tracks by special groups (e.g., band or football).
c. Move students from track to track each year (unless requested).
   d. Wait too long to announce track assignments.

C. Operational Strategies for Special Services

Special Day Classes:
1. Typically confined to one track (or two if the population warrants).
2. Extended school year days are typically offered during inter sessions.
3. Education Code Section 37617 allows exemption from placing students from same family on same track.

Resource Specialists:
1. Typically offered on all tracks.
2. Teaching services stretched to 12 months:
   a. Increasing the number of teaching days per year.
   b. Increasing the number of teaching weeks per year but keeping the number of teaching days the same.
   c. Increasing the number of teaching weeks per year but keeping the number of teaching days the same by converting contracts to four-day work weeks, with fifth-day coverage done by aides, roving RSP teachers, and/or substitutes fill in during vacation time.
   d. Increasing the number of teaching weeks per year while decreasing the number of per-teacher instructional days by sharing contracts.
   e. Increasing the number of teaching weeks per year by assigning the contract teacher to a specific track (or a "traditional" schedule) and filling in the vacation periods with a long-term substitute or roving RSP teacher.

Pros and Cons of Year-Round Education Programs

Pros
- School site accommodates 20 to 30 percent more students.
- Students retain more of their learning.
- Teachers are able to earn more money if they choose to teach extra sessions or substitute.
- There is an increased public perception of teachers as professionals.
- There is a lower cost per student than the acquisition cost of site and building.
- Vandalism is reduced at school sites.
- Kindergarten students can enter when they are ready instead of waiting until September.
- Students may advance academically when they are ready if space permits.
- Inter sessions offer time to supplement instruction.
- Some families prefer staggered vacation schedules.
- The calendar options more closely fit changing lifestyles and work patterns.
- The district incurs fewer capital costs.
- There are savings in insurance costs.

Cons
- Evidence that academic achievement improves with year-round education is inconclusive.
- Maintenance must be done at night and on weekends (all overtime).
- Some maintenance requires more than 15 to 20 days to be completed.
- At intermediate and high school grade levels, family disruptions may ensue.
- Teachers must pack and move everything after every session.
- Athletic scheduling and other activities (such as band) are a problem.
- Communication among staff and staff training are disrupted when 25 percent are absent at all times.
- Transportation costs may increase.
- Current facilities may not be designed for year-round education. Storage of materials is an on-site problem.
- There is increased placement of children in combination classes.
- There are increased administrative costs for designing schedules.
- Children jumping tracks cause a possible loss of community, identity, and scheduling problems.
- There are administrative costs to cover the principal's vacation.
- Having an educational calendar that is be facilities based is not recommended.
- Accommodating legislated school reform, such as extended school year and mandatory summer school, may be more difficult.

State Allocation Board's Year-Round Waiver Policy
A study of the feasibility to implement a multitrack year-round education program is no longer required by the School Facilities Program (SB 50).

Substantial Enrollment Requirement (SER) certification is granted when one of the following conditions are met:

- At least 30 percent of district pupils in kindergarten and grades one to six, inclusive, are enrolled in multitrack year-round education programs.
- At least 40 percent of district pupils in kindergarten and grades one to twelve, inclusive, in the high school attendance area are enrolled in multitrack year-round education programs.

Substantial Enrollment waivers may be granted according to the policy of the State Allocation Board, 4 when:

- A district's current K-6 enrollment shows 300 or fewer ADA or less.
- The number of 34 year students in the district is projected to be insufficient to load four classrooms at state loadings standards at each grade level from kindergarten to grade six.
- A high school district's current enrollment is less than 1,200.
- Students attending school in remote, isolated attendance areas are not included in the "substantial enrollment" evaluation.
- An education hardship would exist in the district by implementing multitrack year-round education.
- The district would suffer a financial hardship by having a substantial enrollment in multitrack year-round education programs and financial recovery status under Assembly Bill 1200. 5

Reduction of Eligibility
If an applicant school district is unable to meet the "substantial enrollment" threshold but has students in multitrack year-round education, it qualifies for a reduced "substantial enrollment" augmentation to the school district's existing student capacity. This lesser increase in existing student capacity is available under the following conditions:

- The governing board of the school district must request by resolution the reduction in the unhoused projected enrollment of less than the 5 percent or 5 percent in lieu of reductions required by State Allocation Board policy.
- The number of district or high school attendance area students in multitrack year-round education is subtracted from the threshold 30 percent or 40 percent "substantial enrollment" requirement for the school district or attendance area, and the difference is multiplied by 20 percent. This total becomes effective "substantial enrollment" in lieu of reduction in the year after the school board's resolution.
- This reduction is temporary. However, if the threshold "substantial enrollment" percentage is not attained in five years from the date of the first project approval after this partial reduction the reduction shall become permanent.
- Each request for a partial reduction of eligibility under this policy shall be approved by the State Allocation Board.

Back to Top

Notes

2. The State Allocation Board provided a new cost savings per pupil figure of $1,285 and directed the Office of Public School Construction to present the report to the Legislature on November 16, 1998.
3. Education Code sections 17017.6 and 17017.7(c).
5. This particular provision is not found in State Allocation Board policy but only in Education Code Section 17017.5(e).
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Do year-round schools improve student learning? A synthesis of the research.

The question of whether year-round education improves student achievement is a key issue in the year-round schooling debate. Proponents of year-round schools claim there are educational benefits for students, reflected in improved test scores. Yet there exists a substantial body of work (Zykowski, 1991, Harp, 1993) which shows no significant differences in educational achievement between students in year-round schools and students in schools with traditional calendars. Another claim (Ballinger et al., 1987) is that long summer breaks in traditional school calendars are harmful as students forget previous learning, and valuable time is taken up in reviewing of curriculum at the start of a new academic year. As an alternative to the traditional calendar, it is often claimed that year-round programs reduce such review time as students have less time to forget material. But the work of Allinder et al. (1992) and Wintre (1986) casts doubt on the perception that students in traditional calendar schools retain less than students in year-round sites. However, as with most of the research on this issue, one can find some evidence to support either side of the argument.

How can one approach this issue and make an objective judgement? As in most cases, the best decision is after a thorough and critical review of the literature. From my reading of the literature I would conclude that the case for improved educational achievement caused by the implementation of year-round calendars is not proven and should be treated with some scepticism, for the following reasons:

1. Many of the studies which show increased educational achievement for students in year-round schools are published by the National Association for Year-Round Education (NAYRE). This organization appears evangelical in its promotion of the concept of year-round education. Such a promotion is not problematic in itself - any organization has the right to promote its cause. However, if organizations publish research reports, such research is subject to the same critical scrutiny as any other research, and some of the research published by the NAYRE appears methodologically suspect. In the Winters (1994) paper, for example, a review of recent studies only included studies supplied by the NAYRE and failed to conduct even the most basic of literature searches. Such a search would have uncovered a number of studies less favourable to the NAYRE case that educational achievement is increased through year-round education. Such studies include Campbell (1994) and Harp (1993).

Further dubious reporting methods occurred in the NAYRE published study by Six (1993). In this study, findings which were unfavourable to year-round schools such as the study by Quinlan (1987) were reported as 'inconclusive', even though in describing the Quinlan study, the Six report clearly states that "traditional calendar schools had the higher scaled test scores at all three testings." Describing the Chula Vista (1990) study, Six concludes that "the results favored year-round education" while also stating that "the mean scores of the traditional calendar schools were generally higher than those of the year-round schools." Six's conclusion appears a novel interpretation of data, but one unlikely to find much support in any objective research community.

The approach of the NAYRE appears to be that if findings are favourable to year-round schools, but statistically insignificant, they are reported as 'favourable'. When the results are not favourable but statistically insignificant, they are reported as 'inconclusive'. By omitting balance from its selection of studies the NAYRE appears far from objective. In addition a number of NAYRE articles appear uncritical and very limited in references, with statements made which are frequently unsubstantiated by evidence. An example is the work of Ballinger et al. (1987) with its generalized and unsubstantiated
claims of the 'failure' of traditional calendar schools, and the linkage between the purported failure and the traditional school calendar.

2. There are a substantial number of studies which are conducted by researchers (with no vested interest in either supporting or opposing year-round schooling) which conclude that there appears to be no significant difference in achievement between students in year-round and students in traditional calendar schools. Such studies include Zykowski (1991), Carriédo (1989), Harp (1993) and Krizter/Glass (1990).

3. One of the methodological problems with many of the studies, whatever their conclusions, is the difficulty of isolating the variable of school calendar in relation to student achievement. This was discussed in the evaluation produced by the Utah State Office of Education's Statewide Evaluation of Year Round and Extended-Day Schools (1989). In this study the authors discussed parallel changes that accompanied year-round innovations, suggesting that other pedagogical and organizational changes may also influence student achievement. In the study by Gandara & Fish (1994), team-teaching and co-operative learning strategies were introduced as well as a year-round calendar. How do we know whether it is the calendar change or the team teaching/co-operative learning that spurs improvement if such an improvement is claimed? The simple answer is that we don't, because the variables have never been isolated.

4. Of the studies which conclude that students in year-round schools do achieve at a higher level than students in year-round schools, the differences in achievement are rarely significant. In the Winters (1994) paper, for instance, only 4 of 19 studies found significant differences (of student achievement) in favour of year-round schools. The author provides a far more optimistic analysis of the findings, stating that 83% of sites found positive improvements in achievement, but most of the claimed improvements were not statistically significant.

A further concern is the narrowness of the measurement comparing year-round with traditional calendars, with test scores used in all cases. The American preoccupation with test scores as a measure of student progress and of system accountability is considerable, and different to many Canadian assessment practices, so far at least. Whether standardized test scores alone represent appropriate comparative measures of students' educational achievement between calendar systems appears questionable but is never debated within the literature I have seen to date. There has been no comparative consideration of higher-level thinking or problem-solving skills. If the goal of education is to maximize the numbers of students in poor areas who pass standardized tests in a cost-effective manner, then some year-round sites can contribute to this goal. If the mandate of the education system is wider, and if equity is of any concern, then year-round schools are clearly more limited on the evidence to date.

5. Issues of educational equity are rarely addressed, but may be significant in terms of educational achievement. Year-round schools are predominantly in disadvantaged communities in many American districts. Is the issue really one of raising educational achievement in such communities, or of limiting spending through reduced capital expenditure? If educational achievement is improved, why are year-round schools not mandated for all communities, and not just for those which are economically deprived? Why do such a minuscule number of private schools (0.0015%) initiate year round calendars, and why are most of those Catholic schools in poor areas? The evidence appears to be that year-round schools are politically unacceptable in wealthier areas, and that arguments for educational gains are not taken seriously by the vast majority of private schools. The Chula Vista study (1991) disconcertingly provides evidence of the growing numbers of poor and minority population students attending year-round schools. In many US districts it appears that inequitable educational provision for rich and poor appears a norm. In a BC context, however, the issue of educational achievement cannot be as easily separated from the ideal of educational equity.

6. There appears to be little examination of alternatives to year-round schools, or even posing of basic questions. What exactly is the problem? Improving student achievement? Saving money? Why does there only appear to be a single solution - year-round schools - in much of the debate? If educational achievement is not significantly and universally improved by the development of year-round schools, is the concept worth the upheaval it causes? What else could be considered? Perhaps we need to re-state the problem within a local context rather than pursue the analysis of a single answer from a foreign country with many educational, social, climatic, demographic and political differences to Canada.
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In a study of San Diego schools, year-round students' test scores in two California tests were compared - the California Assessment Program (CAP) and the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). In a total of 27 comparisons year round schools exceeded traditional calendar schools' results in 17 schools. One traditional calendar school exceeded year-round schools scores and there were no significant differences in nine sites. Comparisons were made between 88 traditional calendar sites and 17 year round sites at grades 3 and 5, as only 17 yr sites had been operational for more than 10 years. The large disparity between sample groups is not explained, nor is there any evidence of attempts to compare similar sites in terms of student demographics or socio-economic status.


One of the key arguments for year-round schools is the effect of the summer break on student learning. This study found mixed results - that students in grades 2 and 3 regressed significantly in spelling but not in math, and the reverse occurs for students in grades 4 and 5. Such inconclusive results do not offer great support for the theory of significant regression caused by long breaks.

Ascher, Carol. Summer School, Extended School Year and Year Round Schooling for Disadvantaged Students. ERIC/CUE Digest number 42, 1988.

"Recent research shows no significant educational benefits from providing summer schools, extended school years, or year round schooling to disadvantaged students."


Claims that "not a single school that has implemented year-round education has experienced a drop in achievement because of its implementation." His claim that LA's year-round schools school scores are higher than comparable scores in traditional schools contradicts LA's own evaluations (see below). Ballinger suggests that a more continuous flow of learning aids student achievement, and that year-round schools particularly benefits ESL students. He also promotes the use of intersessions for remediation and enrichment. Quotes a 1976 (New York) study by Thomas which identifies students' 'summer learning loss' as the main educational reason for year-round schools. He claims that year-round schools reduces both summer learning loss, and the sense of failure that Ballinger claims inherent in traditional calendars, suggesting that year-round schools combats such effects with more regular Intersession activities.


Reports improved scores (between 12 and 20 percentile points) for eleventh grade students attending four quarter continuous year round programs between 1974 and 1986.


Reported higher third grade test scores in a year round site than in a site with a traditional calendar.


A somewhat ancient article, but one that suggests caution in planning year-round calendars and checking the impact on areas such as music, with some reactions of specialist staff being positive and others highly negative. Where the effect seems to be problematic it is because many music programs are geared in part to community events at fixed times to year, requiring group cohesion which is made more difficult when some band members are off-track.

Campbell, W.D. Year Round Schooling For Academically At-Risk Students: Outcomes and Perceptions of Participants in an Elementary Program. ERS Spectrum, vol 12 no 3, 1994.*

Found no educational achievement differences favoring year round schools over those with traditional calendars in Texas elementary schools.


"Although studies generally indicate no achievement loss in year-round schools, district planners need to be aware that research findings are mixed and inconclusive."


Compares grades 3 and 6 CAP and SAT test scores between 18 traditional calendar schools and 10 year round schools. Found that the average test score for traditional calendar schools were higher in both 1984-85 and in 1989-90, but that the year-round schools had the greater increase in improved achievement scores. In terms of student demographics, minority populations increased by 1.7% more in year-round sites than in traditional calendar sites, and there was a widening gap in socio-economic
status between students attending year-round sites than those attending traditional calendar schools, with the poorer students attending year round sites.


Evaluation of year-round schools in this district found that while there were some gains in student achievement during the first year of year-round schools, these were not maintained in the following year. All but one of Orange County’s year round programs are in elementary schools in the 1994-95 school year.


A paper which describes a pilot year round program in California. The pilots aimed to:

- Increase school capacity by at least 18%, using a 60-15 calendar.
- Increase teacher salaries by 20% by extending contracts.
- Reduce class size by 3 students per class.
- Provide 8 additional days of instruction for ‘at-risk students’ in intersessions.
- Operate at no extra cost and preferably show some savings after initial start-up costs. Four criteria for evaluation of the pilots were established:
  - Achievement of all pupils in the pilots measured by standardized tests should exceed the control group (traditional calendar).
  - At-risk students should show gains when compared to similar students in the control group.
  - Pupil and teacher absentee rates should not exceed level established at the baseline year.
  - At least 60% of parents and teachers should express satisfaction with the program.

In terms of educational achievement, the study’s conclusions are mixed. Analysis of variance of gains in math and reading scores suggest that there were no significant differences between the experimental (year-round) and control (traditional calendar) schools, with the exception of one school which showed significant gains in math achievement for its student body as a whole when compared to the control school. There were significant gains in reading achievement at all three year-round schools for the most ‘at risk’ students in some but not all subject areas. What is interesting about this study is that year-round schools was only part of the reform. The schools also implemented support and incentives for team teaching and cooperative learning. What influence such pedagogical changes may have made to students achievement scores is not clear, but it may be expected that such changes might positively influence student achievement.

Glass, G.V. Policy Considerations in Conversion to YearRound Schools. Policy Briefs of the Education Policy Studies Laboratory, No. 92-01, 1992. See also Kreftner and Glass, below.

In terms of students ‘vacation learning loss’ caused by long summer breaks, the authors report a study which found that differences in achievement between students in traditional calendar schools after a long break and those in year-round schools were insignificant. They also discuss curriculum change, stating that year-round programs often stimulate innovative and flexible curriculum models, but that such change is not reflected in student achievement.

Harp, L. Advocates of year round schooling shift focus to educational benefits. Education Week, Feb 24, 1993.

States that ‘the studies looking at educational gains in year-round schools that are available generally provide mixed results and no overwhelming learning gains.’ Mentions a number of reports, including:

A study at A & M University, Texas, showing no measurable achievement gains for year round students.

Research authored by Roby, an administrator from Ohio who found ‘modest’ achievement gains in one year-round school.

Norman Brekke, Superintendent of Oxnard School District, California, who reported that after 17 years of year-round schools, Oxnard students have yet to reach the average state achievement-test scores in most categories. (However, in a statement reported in the April 1990 ‘School Administrator’, Brekke was reported to have said that the (71% Hispanic) district’s scores ‘had surpassed the state’s
average improvement by up to 400% in some grade levels. He was unspecific as to which grade levels and to the overall comparison with average state scores.)

Reports from Orange County, Florida stating that 'many of the benefits associated with the year-round schedule have been more perceived than realised', and that people want you to prove that test scores are going up but that's a very difficult thing to do.'

Peggy Sorensen, a principal in Jordan, Utah, pointed to the uncertain relationship between educational improvement and year-round calendars adopted to ease overcrowding or budget problems.


States that although proponents of year-round schools claim that shorter vacations reduce learning loss, there are no studies that prove the superiority of traditional or year-round calendars in relation to knowledge retention or achievement. She suggests also that YRS may not be effective in influencing curriculum problems, and that if current curriculum does not meet student needs, a change in calendar is unlikely to help.


Concludes that year-round schools are principally a cost-cutting measure, and while they do no harm to student achievement, they do not enhance it. Reports of a yearround district (Cherry Creek) which operated year-round schools in 1974, and found that "differences between standardized test scores in the two types of schools (yearround education, traditional calendar) were found to be insignificantly small even after matching pupils on IQ. Similar findings are reported in Mesa County (Colorado) and across the country."

**Los Angeles School District Reports Alkin et al.** (1982, 1987) reported that students on year round calendars scored 'below district averages' in test scores. When such students were compared with demographically similar students from schools with traditional calendars, no significant differences in achievement were found.

A 1988-89 LA evaluation, publication # 548, reported by Quinn found lower math scores in year-round schools, and that students from year-round schools were less prepared for post-secondary education. The study also reported more burnout in students in year round schools, but there appears little supporting evidence for the latter claims.

In one (1987) LA report "Historical Overview, Operational Data and Summary of the Research on Year Round Education", the district reported contradictory evidence, stating that year-round schools scores were higher in grades 3, 6 and 8 for reading and math, while also stating that only the grade 8 year-round schools students scored higher in math, and only the third grade year-round schools students scored higher in reading.

In a 1991 study of Los Angeles Concept 6 schools by Herman reported in Six (1993), "the results favored the Concept 6 schools, but not at a statistically significant level."


Merino reported nine studies that used a pre-test post-test format to compare student achievement from sites with year round and traditional calendars. At six of the sites there were no significant differences in achievement, and at three sites lower scores were reported at year round schools. But in this as in some other studies, whether calendar was a significant factor appears unclear.

**National Education Association: What the Research says About Year-Round Schools.** 1987
Reports the results of nine studies comparing academic achievement for students in year-round schools with students attending schools with traditional calendars between 1970 and 1980. Four of the studies showed positive gains in achievement in year-round schools (Moortat, Pelavin, Cordova, Kamp). Two showed lower achievement in year-round schools (Harlan, Naty) and the remainder were mixed. Comparisons are dependent on data from standardized tests.


The authors are the Deputy Superintendent and the Director of elementary school services in Granite School District in Salt Lake City, Utah. They report that "year-round scheduling has not raised test scores, but neither has student achievement suffered."

The authors reviewed eight studies of educational achievement in other year-round districts, finding
that 'overall trends show that achievement remains at about the same level or increases slightly after
YRE is introduced.'

Quinlan et al., Year round education: Year-round opportunities. California State Department of
Education. (1987)
Found that year round school students performed below the predicted level compared to traditional
calendar students even when statistical adjustments were made to allow for levels of disadvantage in
year round schools.

Rasberry, Quinn. Year-round schools may not be the answer. ERIC document. (1992)
States that many studies conclude that year round schools do not improve educational achievement.
Quotes the LA evaluations (see separate entry). Other sources include: Prince William County Schools
Technical Report. "Overall, no evidence was found that there is any significant difference in the
education being received on the 45/15 plan as compared to the traditional calendar." In addition,
"two-thirds of the educators on the 45/15 plan found it unsatisfactory." Houston Independent School
District. With 25 year round schools, a 1985-86 study found no difference in test scores between year
-round schools and traditional calendar students. (NB This finding is contradicted by Zykowski and by
Six, both of whom reported increased achievement for YRS students.) Students transferring from year
-round schools to traditional schools often lost a month of instruction and had to catch up after
transferring schools. A 1987 National Education Association report which concludes that 'year round
school generally does not have significant effects on achievement.' Rasberry also quotes comments
from an educator in Lodi, California, who co-ordinates year-round schools who states that any
improvements in learning are not as a result of year round schools.

"Evidence that clearly proves the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of year-round education (in terms of
student achievement) has not been established."

Six, Leslie. A Review of Recent Studies Relating to the Achievement of Students Enrolled In Year-Round
Education Programs, January 1993.
Six reports that ten of thirteen studies favour year-round education when comparing test results
between year-round and traditional calendar sites. However, the report is fundamentally flawed by its
dubious methods of reporting, including the reporting of findings unfavourable to year round schools
(Quinlan, 1987) as 'inconclusive'. Results which appear mixed, such as the Chula Vista (1990) study
are reported as favouring year-round education, and the description of the Gadora (1992) study
represents a highly selective publication of results.

Stimson, J. Combination Classes: Helpful or Harmful. Thrust for Educational Leadership, vol 21, no 6,
Argues that achievement levels in year-round schools may be due to combination (ie mixed grade)
classes in many year-round programs. The author suggests that many combination classes in year-
round schools are formed through administrative necessity rather than because of educational needs.
In a school of 600 students on a four track system, each track will have 150 students. With a teacher-
student ratio of 1:30, there will be 20 teachers in the school.

With seven grades (k-6) and five teachers per track, there must be some combination classes. The
matter is complicated by uneven distribution through the grades, so there may be very small
numbers of grade 3 students and a large grade 5 population, leading to extra combination classes.
The author states that research into combination classes in traditional calendar schools has found no
significant difference in achievement between students in single-grade classes and those in
combination classes. In multi-track year round schools, however, students in single grade classes
achieve more than their counterparts in combination classes in reading, language and mathematics.
The author recommends that schools avoid the use of combination classes in year-round sites.

Utah State Office of Education. Statewide Evaluation of Year Round and Extended-Day Schools,
Executive Summary. 1969.
Somewhat flimsy in its analysis of achievement issues but interestingly identifies what may be a
significant factor that schools which implement year-round programs may also be introducing parallel
changes which may improve student achievement: 'Thus we can say that with the implementation of
year-round education and all the changes that may take place simultaneously, including increased
teacher enthusiasm, more structured curriculum, and increased testing and tracking of students,
academic achievement of students is not hurt and may possibly be benefitted.'

Virginia State Department of Education. Instructional Time and Student Learning: A Study of the
School Calendar and Instructional Time, December 1992.
States that data from year round schools offering optional summer quarters do not indicate superior student performance by students attending year round schools.

**Weaver, Tyler.** Year-Round Education. ERIC Digest, 1992. Weaver quotes several studies which show students in year round schools scoring below students in traditional calendar schools (Merino, 1983; Quinlan, 1987) but concludes that "In the words of Carrillo and Goren (1989), while studies rarely show that YRE lessens achievement, research findings are mixed and inconclusive."

**Webster, William E and Kenneth L. Nyberg.** "Converting a High School to YRE." Thrust for Educational Leadership, Vol 21 No. 6 (Apr. 1992), p.22-25. "There appear to be no trends in any of the districts describing either improvements or decline in standardized achievement test scores as measured by district-administered tests and the California Assessment Program. Further evidence produced from interviews and a review of evaluation reports from Los Angeles Unified School District confirm that the impact of year-round education on achievement scores at the high school level has been inconclusive." This may be a useful indicator, one of the few articles that focuses on student achievement issues at the High School level. In the Winters study, for example, only 3 of 19 sites included secondary student achievement data.

**Winters, W. L.** A Review of Recent Studies Relating to the Achievement of Students Enrolled in Year-Round Education Programs, National Association for Year-Round Education Programs, November 1994. Unfortunately the author of this review, instead of conducting a literature search to find recent studies, relied solely on studies provided to him by the National Association for Year-Round Education, which is a little like conducting a review of BC Collective bargaining and getting all your data from the BCTF. Nineteen studies are included, with the author claiming that students in yearround programs performed better than students in traditional calendar schools. However, there is no explanation of consideration of any variables other than school calendar. Only four of the nineteen studies actually reported differences in achievement which were statistically significant, and some of these claims appear spurious. For instance, although an Orange County (Florida) study included test results for grades 2, 3, 4 and 5, in the Winters study only reading comprehension and math are reported as showing statistically significant gains for grades 2 and 4. What happened in grades 3 and 5 is not reported, but there is no explanation for this omission.


The author of this Canadian study concludes that "the widely held assumption of generalized academic losses over the summer appears unwarranted. More specifically, academic changes over the summer appear to be differentially affected by both content area and grade level. This finding is of obvious practical importance since costly educational interventions are routinely mounted to counteract often non-existent summer losses. It is important for theoretical reasons too for it lends support to the conception of children as active, self-motivating learners."


This study reports mixed results but states that the most comprehensive research conducted by Stanford Research Institute found "no significant difference in achievement between students on year-round calendars and students attending traditional calendar programs." The same study found no significant learning loss for disadvantaged students over the summer vacation.

* indicates the statement in this bibliography taken from the ERIC abstract rather than full text.
Year-round schooling may start in Vancouver next year
Superintendent notes an old agricultural, industrial-based calendar;

BY NAOIBH O'CONNOR, STAFF WRITER  SEPTEMBER 22, 2011

The Vancouver School Board could launch a year-round school pilot project at several city schools as early as 2012/13, according to superintendent Steve Cardwell.

Last year, trustees asked the district’s calendar committee to examine if educational advantages exist in having what’s known as a balanced calendar, which involves lengthening the school year, shortening the summer break and adding longer breaks between sessions.

Several schools in B.C. — including Richmond’s Spul’u’kwuks elementary, Maple Ridge’s Kanaka Creek elementary, Langley’s Douglas Park community school, and Glendale elementary in Williams Lake — offer year-round schools.

“We have not worked out what schools [would be involved] at this point, but we’ve been talking about the balanced school calendar — year-round schools — for a year or so now and believe that the old
agricultural, industrial-based calendar that currently exists with long summers may not necessarily be the right thing for everyone," Cardwell told the Courier. "We want to give another choice to parents and students. We are aware Maple Ridge and Richmond have schools with a balanced-year calendar and they have long lineups or waiting lists to get in and we think we should be looking at the same concept."

Cardwell promised extensive consultation with parents and staff at schools that are considered for the pilot, including surveys and discussions about the structure of the calendar.

"We have about 16,000 students taking summer school every year and it’s not just remedial anymore," he said. "Students are actually going to school during summer, so there’s obviously a very strong interest among parents and students."

Cardwell expects at least three schools, located across the district, will be involved. They’ll likely be evaluated over three years to determine advantages and disadvantages and whether such a calendar should be adopted districtwide.

"You’d want it in place for several years. You’ve got to live through it and monitor and evaluate it on a regular basis — get feedback on how it’s working, so we’d probably look at something that’s say over three years and consider how it’s going at that point," he said.

Elementary schools will likely be chosen for the experiment, but Cardwell said the district wouldn’t rule out the possibility of a secondary school if one were interested.

Grandview/uqinak’uuk elementary on the city’s East Side considered a balanced calendar in 2003, but the idea was dropped by the then COPE-dominated school board, which faced pressure from unions opposed to the idea, former principal Caroline Krause told the Courier in 2010.

Cardwell said he’s not sure if Grandview is still interested.

"I have no idea which schools might come forward and I don’t know the history of what happened before, but I do know you’d need pretty strong parent support for this and, of course, staff support — so lots of discussion."

Consultation needs to start at prospective pilot schools this fall in order for the board to make a decision early next year in time for implementation in the 2012/13 school year, although the teachers’ job action might affect that timeline.

It’s unclear what financial impact a year-round schedule would have on the district, although expenses such as the cost of air conditioning in schools in the heat of summer will need to be determined.
Next school year, some Vancouver school hallways may be alive with students all year round.

Photograph by: Dan Toulgoet, Vancouver Courier
Tune-Up Tech Education in BC: Teachers

New report says proper trades training requires more funding, improved equipment and smaller class sizes.

By Katie Hyslop, 27 Oct 2011, TheTyee.ca

Lack of funds and booming class sizes means tech students are 'jammed into a workspace,' often with dangerous machinery.

When Luc Ouellet made the decision to leave his job as an automotive mechanics teacher, it wasn’t because he didn’t love his job.

He was frustrated with a school system that cut corners and pushed class sizes from a maximum of 20 students to 24, a number he didn’t think was safe in an auto workshop.

That was in the mid-1990s. Ouellet returned to teaching in 2006, assuming the demand for trades workers had translated to more resources and better conditions for secondary technology courses. Instead, classes had ballooned to 30 students, and textbooks were 20 years old.

"For the first couple of years I kept hoping it would change, and I thought rather than leaving again, I would try and become more of an advocate for it," he told The Tyee.

"If everybody bails on it, nothing happens."
But Ouellet did fall on the position, moving to career counseling earlier this year at Ballenas Secondary in Parksville, after the school tried to amalgamate his position with metalwork, without offering extra resources.

He hasn't, however, bailed on his case to improve technology education -- which also includes woodshop, drafting, and computer-assisted mechanics -- and he's not alone in this fight.

Last week, the BC Technology Education Association (BCTEA) released their Best Practices Guide, calling on the ministry of education to improve funding for updating resources and old equipment, improve student safety, and for smaller class sizes.

While some may interpret this as another attempt by the BC Teachers' Federation to pressure the government in their fight against Bills 27 and 28, technology teachers insist this report was a long time coming.

"This is something we've been passionate about, we've been working on, and this is when it's come out. And it's really important to provide the kids with the best opportunities we can to move them forward, because they're going to be the generation that's out there working," says Paul Boscariol, a tech education teacher at LV Rogers Secondary in Nelson, and co-author of the BCTEA report.

**Overcrowded, underwhelming courses**

The BCTEA's Best Practices Guide says technology education has been underfunded since 2002, the year the BC Liberal government introduced Bills 27 and 28, and as a result districts were left with the difficult task of producing the same level of technology education with less resources.

"Funding for tech ed, like everything else that is material and project-based, has dropped significantly, and even though we're being told that money is put into education, the net results of seeing it at the classroom level isn't apparent," says Boscariol.

Where classes were once under 20 students, most of his classes now have 30 students, and often exceed the limit of three students with special needs per class. This means a room built for a maximum of 24 people will often have 30 students, a teacher, and a couple of teaching assistants all trying to conduct a class that likely involves dangerous equipment.

"Sometimes it's kind of like air traffic control; you're trying to keep the planes flying. More kids, there's more things to potentially keep your eye on and there's more things that could go wrong when you consider that in some instances, we have some facilities that really are
poorly designed, because again there are no set standards as far as the design of the facility," he told The Tyee.

But where Boscariol tries to do his best to teach to the curriculum, Ouellet says he knows teachers who have had to water down their programs to accommodate the size, and age range, of their students.

"I know schools where they're teaching Drafting Grade 9, 10 and 11 all in one class, and they're also teaching electronics in that same class with 24 kids. There's no way you can do that realistically," he says.

"The kids are really missing the boat. Why would a student who is bright and ambitious and wants a career in [trades] think that that's where he wants to be when he's treated with programs that equate to nothing?"

**Extend WorkSafe to students: BCTEA**

The BCTEA is calling on the provincial government to improve student safety by reducing class sizes to 20 students for all technology education classes, with the exception of drafting. It's the number the BCTF recommends for technology education, as well as home economics and science labs.

But Boscariol is quick to point out that it's actually a larger number of students than what is allowed in post-secondary technology courses.

"Sixteen is the maximum, and even there we're dealing with 16 adults, whereas... you've got kids as young as 12 to 13 in the middle school level, to 16 to 18 in the senior secondary level, the maturity level isn't the same, the attention span certainly isn't the same," he says.

Tech teachers also want WorkSafeBC to cover students. Currently it covers teachers and education assistants, protecting their right to work in a safe environment.

"We're interested in ensuring that they're considered to be the same as employees in terms of safety and coverage, because for whatever reason that seems to override a lot of the expectations as far as a safe working environment. And when you've got 30 kids jammed into a workspace that's designed for 20 to 24 students, that's not a safe work environment," said Boscariol.

BCTEA is also calling for tech ed classes to be taught only by qualified teachers who have completed the appropriate training, as keeping teachers like Ouellet is difficult.

"A well-respected colleague teaching in a school district in the Lower Mainland was running a great woodworking program, and like the majority of shop teachers, was incredible at scrouring and finding materials for really cheap or free," Boscariol says.

"One day he was sorting through a dumpster of off-cuts from a manufacturing plant for stuff to use with his junior level kids, and he has an epiphany: 'What the hell am I doing? I'm here on my time, rummaging through a dumpster to keep my kids in materials because I don't have adequate budgeting and funding to run it. I'm using my vehicle, I'm burning my gas.'
And we constantly do this stuff. It's ludicrous, and people say, "This isn't what I signed up for."

**B.C.'s future needs tech ed: Boscariol**

On Friday, Oct. 21, the BCTEA presented Education Minister George Abbott with a copy of Best Practices. In an emailed statement to The Tyee, a ministry spokesperson wrote: "The Ministry will review the BCTEA's Best Practices Guide and its recommendations. Safety in the B.C. school system is paramount. School districts have a responsibility to ensure their students study in a safe environment -- whether that's in a classroom or a gym or a workshop."

Ouellet says his district did create a technology education fund after years of complaints from teachers, but it's still not enough. He admits, however, there isn't enough money for all technology programs in every school.

"We need to have all the teachers on the same page to say, 'Maybe it's computer assistance machining, maybe it's welding, maybe it's working on electronics and vehicles or robotics programs,'" he says.

In addition to BCTEA's recommendations, Ouellet would like to see industry invited into schools to evaluate tech programs, ensuring they're up to today's standards.

In his 28 years of teaching, Boscariol doesn't recall government ever putting a lot of money into technology education. But he does remember a push in the 1990s to put computers in schools -- a move that is more expensive than keeping technology education up to date.

"One of my colleagues has a thickness planer in the woodshop, and it's probably about 40-45 years old and the machine is pretty well worn out. Yet that one machine is about $20,000 to $22,000, and people go, 'Oh, my God, that's a lot of money,'" he says.

"However, if you average out that piece of equipment over the course of the 30 or 40 years you're going to get out of it, versus the $30,000 [computer] lab replacement costs [which] is done every four years, it's quite significant."

If money isn't put into technology education now, he argues, B.C. will be paying in the long-run through a decrease in high school graduation rates.

He cites research from the Association for Career and Technical Education, which links a decrease in dropout rates to the availability of adequately funded technology education courses. If these courses are allowed to flounder, he argues, B.C.'s graduation rate will decrease.

Minister Abbott's hint at a plan to improve education does mention more flexibility and choice, as well as a greater emphasis on learning through technology. Boscariol says that choice and technology must include upgrades to technology education programs, or B.C.'s future looks bleak.


11/1/2011
"If they’re not being given a reasonable and quality education and an opportunity to learn in a good working environment, we’re going to be behind."

Katie Hyslop writes about education and youth for The Tyee Solutions Society and others.