

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8225509

Long, Madalyn J. Shannon

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS

The University of Oklahoma

Ed.D. 1982

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1982

by

Long, Madalyn J. Shannon

All Rights Reserved

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
MADALYN J. SHANNON LONG
Norman, Oklahoma
1982

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS

APPROVED BY

Gene Shepherd
George Henderson
A. J. Ruppel
Gene Singleton
Gene Tisdale

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is difficult to adequately express my appreciation to my fine committee chairman, Dr. Gene Shepherd. He has been my friend, my inspiration, and a very caring person throughout our times together. My many thanks go to him.

I wish to thank the other gentlemen on my committee for assisting me with their friendship, concern, and advice: Dr. William Anderson, Dr. George Henderson, Dr. Gerald Kidd, Dr. Gene Pingleton, and Dr. O. J. Rupiper.

My thanks go to Dr. Charles Ballinger, Executive Secretary of the National Council of Year-Round Education. He has been very supportive of my program by sending me needed information and contacting key personnel for me.

If it were not for the emotional support of my family and friends during the writing of this dissertation, it would have been more difficult. Thanks for your encouragement, Mother, John, Esther, Larry, Sylvia, Tom, Virginia, Carter, Vicki, Wayne, Sam, and Dorothy!

Most of all, I wish to thank my husband, James, and my son, David, for encouraging me and accepting the inconveniences. I love you very much!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
III. RESEARCH RESULTS	24
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	55
REFERENCE LIST	62
BIBLIOGRAPHY	64
APPENDIX	
SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Year-Round Calendar Programs	26
2.	Grades Included in Year-Round Program	26
3.	Date of Origin	27
4.	Groups Responsible for Inception	28
5.	Groups Responsible for Goals	29
6.	Groups Responsible for Calendar	30
7.	Parental Option	31
8.	Year-Round Program Selection	31
9.	Options for School Programs	32
10.	Transportation Provided	32
11.	Rank Order of Sources of Income	33
12.	Budget Changes	34
13.	Per Pupil Expenditures	35
14.	Comparison of Year-Round and Nine Month Schools' Expenditures	36
15.	Expenses Attributable to Year-Round Schools ...	37
16.	Public Law 94-142 Implementation	37
17.	Effects of Year-Round School on Attendance	38
18.	Test Score Results	39
19.	Basis for Responses in Table #18	39

20.	Available Resource Personnel	40
21.	Resource Personnel on Twelve Month Contracts ..	41
22.	Resource Personnel Schedule versus Nine-Month Schedule	41
23.	Existence of Intersessions	42
24.	Sources of Funding for Intersessions	42
25.	Existence of Intermural Sports	43
26.	Intermural Sports Program Schedule	43
27.	Frequency of Discipline Referrals	44
28.	Reasons For Changes in Discipline Referrals ...	45
29.	Existence of Year-Round Community Programs	45
30.	Experience as Year-Round Principal	46
31.	Experience as Nine-Month Principal	46
32.	Percent of Staff on Twelve Month Contract	47
33.	Voluntary Year-Round Contract	47
34.	Supplemental Contract	48
35.	Percent on Supplemental Contract	48
36.	Influence on Salaries	49
37.	Percent of Change	49
38.	Work Year for Principals and Clerical Workers .	49
39.	Teacher Attendance	50
40.	Difference in Teacher Attendance	50
41.	Difference in Vandalism Level	51
42.	Explanation of Difference in Vandalism Level ..	51
43.	Principals' Interest in Remaining With Year- Round Schools	52

44.	Benefits of Year-Round Schools as Viewed by Principals	53
45.	Disadvantages of Year-Round Schools as Viewed by Principals	54

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Senator Charles Percy of Illinois once stated, "Every time I drive by an empty school, empty three months a year, I wonder how we can afford to cling to such an old idea." (Mussatti, 1981) Some school districts have eliminated empty buildings during the summer months by utilizing a year-round schedule that staggers student and staff attendance over a twelve-month period. The school districts were able to make increased use of facilities and care for more students. San Diego City Schools reported that most year-round schools provided for at least 175 days in attendance throughout the twelve months which corresponded with nine-month schools' attendance requirements. (Year-round school plans, 1972).

If inflation and the energy crisis continued, the investigator for this study thought that school boards needed to re-examine the calendar organization of the

school terms. To survive financial problems, school personnel needed to consider the option of year-round schools to maintain and improve quality education. Advocates of year-round programs have claimed that year-round scheduling reduced the need for construction of new buildings, utilized space more efficiently, lightened the taxpayers' load of the school expenses, and benefited students with frequent and shorter breaks. In a paper presented at the First Annual Midsouth Educational Research Association Convention, Jensen (1972) felt that the business community would benefit due to evenly-spaced vacations that would keep income flowing year-round, back-to-school sales would be continual due to different entrance times in many programs; graduates would enter the job market over a twelve-month period instead of all in June, and part-time help would always be available from among students on vacation. Mussatti (1981) reported that most year-round schools experienced fewer discipline problems and less vandalism.

Year-round schools were tried briefly in the 1800's; then again at the turn of the century; during the 1930's; and most recently during the seventies. The U.S. News and World Report reported that school board members in six hundred school districts were investigating the possibilities of expanding the school calendar in order to stretch the educational dollars. (The new trend, 1971)

The California State Department reported that a year-round school program had to provide means of helping individuals adjust to a changing world, to contribute to continuous learning, to utilize total community facilities, and to help maximize education funds. (Year-round education handbook, 1975) The Pennsylvania State Department of Education reported that schools of the future needed to ally with the city, to enrich human spirit through museums and symphonies, to be the center of community life, to provide education for all citizens, and to be open year-round. (Year-round school, 1972).

Purpose

Because of an interest in year-round schools, the investigator of this study attempted to locate a compilation of information that listed locations, descriptions, types, and principals' opinions. None was found. Information gleaned by researching through ERIC and Educational Research Service, Inc., consisted of short articles or papers based on cost-effectiveness studies or feasibility studies in individual school districts. Much of this information concerned school districts that had discontinued the year-round programs.

The investigator felt that an up-dated source would perhaps enable interested educators, school board members, legislators, and patrons to study the year-round schools in

a more efficient manner. The product of this study was a resource that listed the locations of currently operating year-round schools as of December 1, 1981, and the types of year-round programs. This resource also included a survey of the principals regarding the areas of scheduling, financial, educational, and administrative matters, as well as the principals' opinions concerning the benefits and disadvantages.

Statement of Problem

This study was undertaken to develop a description of the locations, variety, characteristics, and opinions of the year-round attendance periods in schools in the United States, as of December 1, 1981, as described by the principals.

Procedure

The investigator contacted the fifty State Departments of Education in an attempt to locate year-round schools that had been in existence for at least one year as of December 1, 1981. The replies were cross-referenced with the 1980-81 Eighth Annual National Reference Directory of Year-Round Education Programs, compiled by the National Council on Year-Round Education, San Diego. Two hundred and thirty schools were identified from the responses and cross-referencing, as well as by telephone calls to selected locations.

The first draft of a questionnaire was based on the information gathered from the review of the literature. The first draft was submitted to four educators in Oklahoma whose positions and interest were directly related to this study. Their suggestions were incorporated into a second draft which the researcher submitted to five principals of year-round schools in California. The California principals gave further input for revision to the researcher during individual interviews. The third draft was sent to the Board of Directors of the National Council on Year-Round Education for further validation. From the input of the Board of Directors, a fourth draft was completed and mailed to the 230 identified principals.

One hundred seventy-four principals responded within one month. A second request was mailed to those principals who had not replied. No principals responded within the month, so the inquiries ceased.

From the data received, tables were developed to display the information relevant to the questions and interpretations. Descriptive statistics were utilized in the forms of tabulated data, actual responses, and percentages. Patterns observed in the displayed data were interpreted.

Definition of Terms

Year-round school: A school program that staggers attendance of students and staff over a twelve month period.

Attendance cycle: The particular calendar plan assigned to the year-round program. The most common attendance cycles have been:

1. 45-15 Block: All of the students attend school for 45 days; all of the students take a break for 15 days.

2. 45-15 Staggered: One-fourth of the students are cycled on a 15 day break, while three-fourths of the students attend school for 45 day periods.

3. 45-15 Flexible: An individualized plan that can be either the 45-15 Block or the 45-15 Staggered Plan.

4. 60-20 Plan: All of the students attend school for 60 days and are out of school for 20 days.

5. 90-30 Plan: Two 90-day semesters are separated by a 30 day break; three-fourths of the students attend school at one time.

6. Concept 6: Six 43-day terms; students attend two terms consecutively and another two terms as the school schedules them.

7. Flexible All Year: Individualized plan where the school is open approximately 240 days and the students must attend at least 175 days.

8. Other: A variety of plans that are not widespread.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As a background for this study, consideration was given to the treatment of year-round schools in the literature. A review of the history of year-round schools, characteristics of year-round schools, the principals' roles, concerns of year-round school principals, research studies presented in the literature, and general information concerning the National Council on Year-Round Education were included.

History

In the early 1800's, the school calendar was arranged to fit the needs of the citizens. Rural schools generally lasted six months so the children would be free to work during planting and harvesting seasons. According to three Stanford University researchers, some urban schools had eleven to twelve month calendar schools (Muzio, Hansen, Henderson, 1977). The National Education Association Research Bureau reported that Baltimore and Cincinnati had eleven month school years during the 1800's (The extended school year, 1969).

The Stanford University research indicated that in 1847, when a graded school organization was introduced, and the curriculum was organized into graded units, some pressure was applied to standardizing a school calendar so that children would cover the same materials in a grade. By 1915, a nine-month calendar was the standard for most schools (Muzio, et al, 1977).

According to Muzio, psychologists decided during World War II that factory workers would be more productive if the workers were allowed a break from their tasks. President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill agreed that workers, particularly in the defense plants, needed vacations. These vacations were given during the summer months when teachers could be employed part-time to help fill the vacancies. This was a probable contributing factor to stabilizing the nine-month calendar.

Following World War II, there was an increase in the school-age population that resulted in an overcrowding of the schools. Some school districts attempted to adopt a year-round calendar to avoid new construction. But the nine-month calendar was so firmly entrenched, that most parents did not want to abandon the idea of summer vacation. (Muzio).

Education U.S.A. reported that during the 1960's, some school districts experimented with year-round schools in an attempt to improve the curriculum. Other school

principals had hopes of saving on energy costs by trying the new method ("Previews," 1977). Morris Shepard and Keith Baker (1977) stated in Year-Round Schools that year-round schools would "save on construction costs, and a 5% reduction in operating costs was a reasonable expectation."

It was reported in Education U.S.A. that school districts in certain geographical areas had a need to add air-conditioning, but the expense of air-conditioning was less than new construction. Also, some schools adjusted their summer hours to reduce the need for air-conditioners ("Previews," 1977).

According to Muzio (1977), in 1971 approximately six hundred school districts were considering the feasibility of changing to a year-round school program. The changing life styles of people since World War II were making it more evident that nine-month calendar schools no longer needed to be in the majority. Three-month breaks often found children bored. With a lack of constructive activities, there was often an increase in vandalism and drug usage (Year-round education handbook, 1975).

Chapter Two of the 1975 Year-Round Education Handbook emphasized that the teachers and the public were beginning to realize that September was spent mainly in reviewing what the children had forgotten over the summer.

Also, as taxpayers, the public was wondering why the schools had to be closed for three months of each year, when perhaps the buildings could be used to better advantage. Families were seeing the benefits of vacations that took advantage of off-season rates, taking up winter sports, or taking leave from work more easily.

Until 1976, very few year-round programs were discontinued that had been implemented in the late sixties or early seventies. The majority of those who did discontinue did so mainly for political reasons, as reported by Dr. Charles Ballinger (1980) in the Eighth Annual National Reference Directory of Year-Round Education Programs. Generally, there was a lack of support from the legislature or the local school district, because the policymakers did not seem to recognize the uniquely different needs of the year-round school. (Ballinger). Don Glines (1978) reported in Teacher that some schools' enrollments declined to the point where it was felt that it was inadvisable to continue the program.

In Teacher, Glines continued with the information that more school districts were beginning to realize the options that were offered to patrons. Year-round schools allowed a choice of family life-style; there was continuous year-round learning; and possibly a reduction of energy overload. At that time, Glines reported that leaders had a renewed interest in this flexible scheduling plan for the 1980's.

Characteristics of Year-Round Schools

Children in year-round schools were not in attendance for fifty-two weeks. The students attended school for the same number of days as those students on a nine-month calendar, but the attendance was spread throughout the twelve months (Muzio, et al, 1977). The school year was rescheduled to accommodate more students, to utilize the facilities more efficiently, and/or to provide more varieties of learning experiences.

Parents have been able to request a preference of schedule in order to work vacations around the children's breaks. Due to more frequent recesses, many families were taking winter or spring vacations, instead of the traditional summer break ("The impact of", 1972).

Muzio et al (1977) reported that overcrowding had been the traditional reason for adopting a year-round calendar. Many districts could not afford new buildings or additions to existing ones. The options of busing, double sessions, or longer days were not acceptable to the patrons. At times, declining enrollment also caused a need for year-round schools. By consolidating two schools into one facility and going to a year-round calendar, the school budget realized less expense. Sale of the unused property benefited the school funds account.

School schedules that allowed teachers to vacation at the same time as their classes resulted in no additional cost for salaries in a year-round school. By teaming or combining small schools, a savings in funds was generated, even when adding the eleventh or twelfth month salaries for a few teachers ("The impact of," 1972).

Review of the literature indicated that a variety of educational opportunities were available through year-round schools that might not have been found in the nine-month school calendar. The New York State Department of Education ("The impact of," 1972) and the researchers from Stanford University (Muzio et al, 1977) listed this combination of attributes as characteristic of year-round schools.

1. Children were provided with a continuity of learning experiences that were not available when formal schooling was stopped for three months.

2. Recess breaks were for shorter periods of time which allowed for more retention of knowledge.

3. The breaks were spaced on a regular basis throughout the twelve-month year.

4. Teachers often designed and produced their own materials to fit the year-round schedule, i.e. nine-week units or mini-courses.

5. More individualized instruction was observed in year-round schools.

6. Community involvement was greater.

7. Integration was simplified due to open enrollment.

Principals' Roles

Review of the literature has indicated that administrative leaders have been key factors in the success of year-round education. The principals have had many roles.

When a year-round program was initiated in New York, there was in-service training for teachers and principals. Included in this training were the suppositions that innovative school programs needed to be flexible, to be adaptable to society's needs, and to be open for further change (The impact of, 1972).

The California State Department of Education reported some items that principals felt were important, besides the purposeful planning that was necessary for change (Year-round education handbook, 1975). Those items were:

1. A principal needed to secure participation by the community. The principal needed to make the community aware of the advantages that business and industry might receive.

2. A principal needed to create an environment that was conducive to change, by building trust and credibility.

3. A principal needed to initiate ideas as soon as they were accepted by those involved; sometimes slowly and sometimes rapidly.

4. A principal needed to explain the changes, to emphasize the benefits, and to be honest about any shortcomings.

5. The principal needed to provide opportunities for questions and discussion.

6. The principal needed to be willing to have a trial period.

Another successful method reported by the New York State Department of Education was the use of extensive media coverage by the principals to explain the change to a year-round program. It was felt that an informed public did not resist change as strongly (The impact of, 1972).

Principals had to choose the teaching staff carefully. The teachers needed to agree with the concept of year-round schools. The principals and teachers were the key factors to final success (The impact of, 1972).

Year-Round School Concerns

When year-round programs were started in California, the State Department of Education was committed to the idea that a year-round program would attempt to make the school a continuous focus of community activity and enhance the district's overall effectiveness. The summary of a 1974

survey of professional educators in California indicated six major concerns to be considered when initiating a year-round school. The concerns were:

1. How year-round schools could aid in societal concern for future survival.
2. How year-round schools could contribute to development of life-long learning.
3. How year-round schools could aid each person by adjusting programs to meet individual and societal life/work styles - to enhance the utilization of human resources by creating more humane approaches to personalized needs for students, teachers, parents, and the community.
4. How year-round schools could contribute to the expansion of the learning process by providing maximum continuous learning opportunities for twelve months.
5. How year-round schools could contribute to more effective utilization of total community facilities.
6. How year-round schools could contribute to the re-allocation of fiscal resources.

(Year-round education handbook, 1975)

The summary of the conclusions of this 1974 survey were:

1. There had been better use of students' and teachers' time.

2. Less truancy, vandalism, boredom, and discipline problems had been noted in year-round schools.

3. It was anticipated overall that year-round schools would provide a better balance of work, play, and rest, as well as individualized instruction for the students.

(Year-round education handbook, 1975)

Research Studies

It was reported in Education, U.S.A. that achievement tests in some year-round schools showed no significant differences from that of traditional schools; therefore, no apparent loss of learning. However, the article continued that the Research Director for Colorado Springs District 11 felt that the students in the Concept 6 programs did as well with fewer days (172) as compared to the traditional 185 for nine-month schools. Those 172 days were devoted strictly to learning, with parent conferences and other meetings assigned to non-school days ("Previews," 1977).

The administrator of LaMesa-Spring Valley district in California said, "Attention is up, vandalism is down, and pupil attitudes are fabulous." He felt that the 45-15 Plan in his schools was beginning to show more relaxed teachers, fewer 'sick' days being used by teachers, more parental support, and an improvement in student-teacher relationships ("Pupils learn no more," 1975).

A summary of the comments of the Colorado Commissioner of Education in 1975 indicated that the mechanics of year-round education with its unusual patterns could be a problem, but that those problems could be outweighed by the educational advantages. He listed such advantages as enrichment programs, better use of time and facilities, more community involvement, decreased learning loss during breaks, and strong staff support as reasons for choosing to adopt a year-round school program. The Commissioner also indicated that year-round schools could fill the gap for accountability because there had been a great amount of planning and evaluation in such a program. ("Pupils learn no more," 1975). Howard and McIntire (1980) noted that in Concept Six, special education teachers scheduled the students into vacation classes to minimize the learning loss the pupils would have encountered during the break.

An in-depth study of twenty-four year-round school programs in the United States was undertaken in 1976, as reported in Nation's Schools Report. This study concluded:

1. Operational costs had increased with year-round schools, but there was an apparent overall savings in construction costs.

2. It was possible to design the school's own curriculum and to tailor the courses to the students' individual needs.

3. It was possible to boost achievement scores as evidenced by regular testing to check progress.

4. Learning loss was minimized for children, particularly the disadvantaged students who received little or no educational support at home.

5. Vandalism and juvenile delinquency had declined during the summer months in year-round school districts.

6. It facilitated integration by evenly distributing racial groups on different cycles.

("Year-round schools are alive,"1976)

Seventy-nine school administrators across the United States were surveyed and asked to compare traditional and year-round calendar programs. A summary of those conclusions was reported by Hollifield (1977):

1. Men teachers and heads of households preferred year-round school employment.

2. There were no adverse health effects on the students who attended a year-round school.

3. Eleven percent reported a higher drop-out rate in the nine-month schools.

4. Average daily attendance did not suffer in the year-round schools.

5. Year-round schools helped improve academic achievement as evidenced by standardized tests and the regular grading system.

6. There was no real significant savings, other than on construction costs.

In July, 1972, Gresham, Oregon, Grade School District 4, began a 45-15 year-round school cycle. It increased the potential capacity of the district by 33%. It was reported that a decision had been made that any future buildings would automatically become a 45-15 school and increase the capacity for 33% more students. At this same time, the teachers in Gresham reported that the pupils' attitudes had improved and that the students retained information better. The teachers looked at the problems that arose as challenges for the district, and not as excuses to fail (Partners in education, 1977).

Muzio, Hansen, and Henderson (1977) noted that migrant children benefited because they were able to continue to go to school during the summers to make up what they might have missed while moving around. The children on federal lunch programs received nutritious meals on a continuous basis, rather than missing them throughout the summers.

Some industries struggled with small work forces during the summer months. With a year-round school schedule, workers were able to take staggered vacations through the years and this benefited businesses. Many companies that depended mainly on summer income such as travel agencies,

recreation area operators, and long-distance movers became more involved with year-round business. The year-long business helped eliminate the low peaks of income the businesses had normally encountered during the winter months (Year-round education handbook, 1975).

Los Angeles decided to place 77,000 more students and 3,000 more teachers on a year-round school plan in 1981. Some were placed on the 90-30 Plan and the others were placed on the 45-15 Plan. By doing this, school officials said they did not need to go to double sessions for the pupils attending severely overcrowded schools. The pupils continued to attend school for 177 days, just as the nine-month school students did. ("Los Angeles schools," 1980).

National Council on Year-Round Education

In the spring of 1969, the First National Seminar on Year-Round Education was held in Fayetteville, Arkansas. Approximately 150 interested persons from thirty states, Mexico, and the District of Columbia were in attendance, as reported by Wayne White (1976).

Edwin Vause, Vice-President of the Kettering Foundation, gave the keynote address at this National Seminar. He stressed that educators who were considering the year-round option needed to stress year-round education and have clearly defined objectives that included the community (White).

By the time of the fourth National Seminar, 1972, in San Diego, participants were able to visit year-round schools in operation. This seminar sponsored the beginning of the National Council on Year-Round Education. Wayne White was elected as President and George Jensen as President/Elect. The Council's headquarters were in San Diego, California. (White)

White reported that over the years, the seminars covered the alternative calendars, feasibility studies, and evaluation of programs. By 1975, the seventh meeting of the National Council on Year-Round Education featured speakers from school districts where year-round school programs had failed.

Since 1975, many additional features were planned for the annual meetings, such as tapes, exhibits, and films. The National Council developed a clearinghouse for interested parties to obtain information about year-round schools, in the form of booklets, speakers, and research results. White said that:

It has never been the purpose of the National Council to promote year-round programs. Rather, the purpose has been to provide a source of information to persons interested in investigating year-round education as another way of improving educational opportunities for children. If, in fact, it does prove to be a viable alternative, perhaps the National Council can help shorten the fifty-year lag that it usually takes to bring about general acceptance of an educational innovation (White, p.7).

Dr. Charles Ballinger (1982), the 1981-82 Executive Secretary of the National Council on Year-Round Education, said, "If year-round education were the traditional school calendar and had been so for a hundred years, and if someone came along to suggest a new calendar wherein school students were to be formally educated for only nine months each year, with another three months free from organized instruction, would the American public consider, or even allow, such a calendar?"

Summary

Year-round schools originated in the early 1800's and continued to appear throughout the 1900's. Los Angeles was an example of school districts that were still implementing year-round school programs in the 1980's.

According to advantages reported in the review of the literature, parents and children benefited from year-round schools. There were breaks in every season that not only rested the students, but helped parents schedule vacations, construction costs were lowered which lessened taxpayers' expenses, and there were extra educational benefits.

Review of the literature stressed the importance of the principals' role. For example, principals were responsible for selecting and training the faculty. Also, the principals played an important role in public relations between the schools and the communities.

Research studies tended to be limited in scope. It was difficult to compare year-round programs or to compare school districts without research reports.

Because year-round schools continued, an organization, the National Council on Year-Round Education, was formed. It has been a source of materials, films, or speakers to allow personnel to become better acquainted with different aspects of year-round schools.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH RESULTS

Information requests were sent to the fifty State Departments of Education for purposes of locating the year-round schools in the United States, as of December 1, 1981. The schools were to have been in operation for at least one school year. Follow-up of states that did not respond was done by cross-referencing with the 1980-81 Eighth Annual National Reference Directory of Year-Round Education Programs.

General attributes of year-round schools were identified through the review of the literature. This provided a base for the development of a draft of an appropriate questionnaire. This draft was revised with the aid of interested local administrators. The questionnaire requested information from the principals regarding scheduling, financial, education, and administrative areas. Copies of the second draft were taken to five principals of year-round schools in the Southern California region. In personal interviews, the principals gave more input for improving the questionnaire. The third draft was then sent to the Board of Directors of the National Council on Year-Round Education for further validation. The input from the Board of

Directors was used to develop a final draft. The refined questionnaire was mailed to the 230 principals of the currently-operating year-round schools.

One hundred seventy-four principals, or 75%, responded to the questionnaire with one hundred fifty-nine still administering year-round schools. The principals' responses have been compiled in a resource providing descriptions, commonalities, locations, and principals' opinions. Each question was studied individually, with the use of tables for further clarification. Not every principal answered every question; therefore, totals did not match the total of principals on most tables.

Scheduling

Question #1: What type of year-round calendar cycle or attendance period is being implemented in your school?

This question was designed to determine which calendar cycles were implemented, the prevalence of them, and in which states they were located.

Table #1 indicated that 62 schools had the 45-15 Block calendar cycle and 52 schools had the 45-15 Staggered calendar cycle. Three schools were using the 45-15 Flexible calendar cycle. A total of 127 schools were on 45-15 Plans. The second most frequently mentioned year-round program was the Concept 6 Plan. Most of these were located in Colorado. California had the most year-round schools.

Table 1

Year-Round Calendar Cycles

Cycles	States							TOTALS
	CA	CO	FL	IN	MI	NV	OR	
45-15 Block	51	3	0	2	0	2	4	62
45-15 Staggered	36	2	0	0	6	2	6	52
45-15 Flexible	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
60-20 Plan	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
90-30 Plan	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Concept 6	3	26	1	0	0	0	0	30
Flexible All-Year	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	5
Other	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total	104	31	1	2	6	6	10	159

Question #2: Which grades are involved in the year-round programming?

This question was intended to determine the range of grades included within the year-round schools.

Table 2

Grades Included in Year-Round Programs

Kindergarten through Sixth Grade ..137

Seventh through Ninth Grade 22

Tenth through Twelfth Grade 14

One hundred and thirty-seven principals indicated an elementary program. Some of the principals listed elementary and junior high programs together.

Question #3: In which year was year-round programming first implemented?

This question was designed to determine in what years the school districts had initiated the year-round calendar cycles.

Table 3

Date of Origin of Year - Round Schools

Year	Number of Schools	Year	Number of Schools
1967.....	1	1974.....	26
1968.....	1	1975.....	20
1969.....	2	1976.....	9
1970.....	6	1977.....	17
1971.....	11	1978.....	5
1972.....	25	1979.....	10
1973.....	18	1980.....	2

The table indicated that 89 year-round school programs were started during the years of 1972-1975. The four oldest ones were started in the late 1960's. As late as 1980, however, year-round schools were still being initiated.

Question #4: Who authorized the inception?

This question was designed to determine which group or groups of people were responsible for authorizing a

a year-round educational program. Respondents were to list all groups involved.

Table 4
Groups Responsible For Inception
of Year-Round Schools

Personnel	Number of Responses
School Board	95
School Board, State Department of Education	23
School Board, State Department of Education, State Legislature	19
School Board, Parents	9
School Board, State Legislature	5
School Board, Parents, Staff	4
School Board, State Department of Education, Parents.	2
School Board, State Department of Education, State Legislature, Parents	1
School Board, State Department of Education, State Legislature, Parents, Staff	1

The information in Table #4 indicated that the local School Board was listed by 95 principals as having the authority for initiating or changing to a year-round school calendar. Responses suggested that parents, staff, and legislature had less influence than did the school board. Many responses were noted in group combinations, rather than one single group.

Question #5: Rate the following to show the amount of input each had to the goals, objectives, and total organization of the year-round school program.

This question was intended to probe into the organization of the year-round program and to determine which personnel had set the goals. Principals were to rank order the groups listed, using the numeral "1" to indicate much input and marking as low as the numeral "5" to indicate very little input.

Table 5

Groups Responsible for Year-Round Goals and Objectives

Personnel	Rank Order				
	1	2	3	4	5
School Board	86	17	19	14	15
Administration	114	15	4	9	8
Teaching staff	77	26	23	11	12
Parents	50	37	34	12	16
State Department	4	9	19	10	55
State Legislature	6	4	4	8	83
Other:					
District Year-Round Office	1				
Migrant Education Office		1			
Study Committee	1				
Students	1				

The administration, school board, and teaching staff were listed as having the most input in setting the year-round goals and objectives. Parent groups were listed fourth most frequently as being ranked #1. The State Legislature and State Departments of Education were listed most frequently as having the least amount of input.

Question #6: Who finally determines the school calendar?

This question was designed to determine what group or groups had the authority to determine the school calendar.

Table 6

Groups Responsible For Determining the Calendar	
Groups	Number of schools
School Board	76
School Administration	22
Negotiations	17
Study Committee	17
School Administration, Teaching Staff	10
School Board, Administration	8

Fifty percent of the principals who responded to this question, or 76, reported that the local school board determined the school calendar. Administrators were listed second most frequently as having that authority.

Question #7: (A) Do parents have a voice in selecting the children's calendar cycle?

Question #7 had several parts. It was designed to determine if parents could choose their children's calendar cycle. It was also intended to determine if year-round programs were voluntary, if children had the option to attend a nine-month school, and if so, was transportation provided.

Table 7
Parental Option of
Calendar Cycle

Option	Number of Schools
Yes	104
No	49

Two-thirds, or 104, of the respondents indicated that the parents had a choice in selecting the children's calendar cycle. One-third noted that parents did not have a choice.

(B) Is the year-round program mandated or voluntary for parents?

Table 8
Year-Round Program Selection

Choice	CA	CO	FL	IN	MI	NV	OR
Mandated	31	27	1	0	6	2	9
Voluntary	63	2	0	2	0	0	0

Seventy-six of the principals responded that the year-round program was mandated, while sixty-seven principals noted that it was voluntary. Twenty-seven of the twenty-nine Colorado schools had mandated programs. California had voluntary programs in two-thirds, or 63, of the 94 schools.

(C) Do parents have the option of sending their children to a nearby nine-month calendar school?

(D) If the answer to "C" is "yes", is transportation provided for them?

Table 9 Options for School Calendar			Table 10 Transportation Provided		
State	Yes	No	State	Yes	No
California	74	23	California	25	41
Colorado	29	2	Colorado	6	23
Florida	0	1	Florida	0	0
Indiana	2	0	Indiana	0	2
Michigan	6	0	Michigan	0	6
Nevada	5	0	Nevada	1	4
Oregon	2	8	Oregon	0	2
Total	118	34	Total	32	78

According to the responses in Tables #9 and #10, 118 schools allowed parents the option of sending their

children to a nine-month school. Thirty percent, or 34, of the schools did not give parents a choice. Seventy percent, or 78, of the principals indicated that transportation was not provided for transfer students.

Financial

Question #8: Rank order the initial sources of income.

This inquiry was used to determine the main source of income for year-round schools. The principals were to use the numeral "1" to indicate the most income and the numeral "3" to indicate the least amount of income.

Table 11

Sources	Rank Order		
	1	2	3
Local funds	86	48	11
State funds	77	59	6
Federal funds	4	11	106

Local funds were listed most frequently as being the main source of income. State funds were listed second most frequently as the main source of income.

Question #9: In which budget area was there the most financial savings, if any, as a result of changing to a year-round calendar? Where was the most increase?

This question was designed to determine if there was any particular area of savings or extra expenditure attributed to the year-round program.

Table 12
Budget Changes

Budget Area	Savings	Increase
Construction	96	1
Salaries	8	70
Equipment	21	3
Utilities	9	38
Transportation		6
Maintenance		6

Ninety-six of the principals indicated a savings in construction costs. Equipment was listed as the budget area having the second largest amount of savings. Salaries and utilities accounted for the largest financial increases. Principals noted on the questionnaires that most of the increase in salary expenses was for clerical workers.

Question #10: (A) What is the per pupil expenditure?

This question had two sections. It was designed to determine the per pupil cost in a year-round school as compared to the per pupil cost in a nine-month school.

Table 13

Per Pupil Cost	Per Pupil Expenditures						
	States						
	CA	CO	FL	IN	MI	NV	OR
\$1000-1100	8						
\$1200-1300	1	1					
\$1400-1500	6		1				1
\$1600-1700	7	1					
\$1800-1900	7	1					2
\$2000-2100	4					1	
\$2200-2300	3	2			6	1	3
\$2400-2500		4					1
\$2600-2700	3	5					

As Table #13 indicated, the highest per pupil costs appeared to be located mainly in Colorado schools. California expenditures ranged from \$1000 to \$2700 per pupil.

(B) How does this compare with a nine-month school in the area?

Table #14 indicated that most year-round schools and nine-month schools had the same per-pupil expenditures. Most principals who stated that year-round school expenses were higher indicated that the difference ranged from \$20.00 to \$100.00 per pupil per year.

Table 14

Year-Round School Per Pupil Expenditures
Compared to Nine Month School Costs

States	Per Pupil Expenditures		
	Year-Round School Same As Nine Month	Year-Round School Less Than Nine Month	Year-Round School More Than Nine Month
California	60	4	9
Colorado	17	4	3
Florida			1
Indiana	2		
Michigan	2		1
Nevada	3		1
Oregon	4	1	2

Question #11: As an administrator operating a year-round school, which of the following expenditures would you most likely attribute to year-round schools only?

This question was designed to identify those categories of added expenses that might be attributed to year-round school programs. Several principals responded to more than one item.

As indicated in Table #15, air conditioning was listed most frequently as being the main expense attributable to year-round schools. Listed second most frequently as an added expense were the costs for additional personnel and administrative staffing.

Table 15

Expenses Attributable to
Year-Round Schools

Category of Expense	Number of Responses
Air Conditioning	76
Additional personnel	56
Administrative staffing	53
Pupil transportation	33
Innovation and change	28
Instructional materials	4

Educational

Question #12: Are there any difficulties implementing Public Law 94-142 into the year-round program?
If yes, explain.

Since Public Law 94-142 was mandated, this question was designed to probe any difficulty there might have been in implementing the law into the school program.

Table 16

Satisfactory Implementation of PL 94-142	
Choice	Responses
Yes	111
No	31

Implementing Public Law 94-142 did not seem to cause any apparent problems in 111 schools. The 31 principals who indicated problems in dealing with PL 94-142 stated one reason: the special education teachers were not on a year-round contract, so the year-round schools were unable to schedule special education during the summer months.

Question #13: Has average daily attendance (improved, declined, stabilized) since implementing a year-round program?

This question was included for the purpose of determining whether a different calendar cycle might have influenced the average daily attendance pattern of students. The question was designed to determine in what manner year-round schools might have influenced the attendance pattern.

Table 17

Effects of Year-Round Schools
on Average Daily Attendance

Effect	Responses
Attendance improved	47
Attendance declined	23
Attendance stabilized	80

Fifty-three percent, or eighty, of the principals indicated a stabilized average daily attendance. Thirty-one percent, or forty-seven of the principals indicated an improvement in the average daily attendance.

Question #14: What do you perceive is the impact of year-round schools on test scores? On what basis do you make this statement?

This question was designed to determine if test scores varied from the nine-month schools test scores. It was also designed to determine how principals decided if there was a change.

Table 18

Test Score Result	
Results	Response
Improvement	61
Decline	2
No change	88

Table 19

Basis for Response	
Basis	Responses
Based on data	115
Based on judgment	21

Fifty-eight percent, or eighty-eight, principals reported no change in test scores. Forty percent, or sixty-one, of the principals reported an improvement in test scores. Eighty-five percent, or one hundred fifteen, of the responses were based on data.

Question #15: (A) What personnel services, other than the usual teaching and administrative services, are available for students?

This three-part question was designed to determine what resource personnel were available and to determine if the contract arrangement varied from the teaching staff.

Table 20

Available Resource Personnel	
Personnel	Responses
Counselor/Psychologist	62
Special Education	54
Speech Therapists	52
Nurse	28
None	25
Social Worker	14
Title I Aides	14
Library/Media Aides	12
Bilingual Aides	7

Counselors/psychologists, special education teachers, and speech therapists were listed most frequently as additional resource personnel available for the pupils. Twenty-five principals noted there were no additional personnel in the schools.

(B) Are these resource personnel on a twelve month contract?

(C) Do these resource positions differ from a nine-month school? If yes, in what ways?

Table 21

Resource Personnel On Twelve Months	
Options	Responses
Yes	36
No	50

Table 22

Resource Personnel Schedule Same As Nine-Month	
Options	Responses
Yes	25
No	51

Fifty-seven percent, or fifty, of the principals indicated that the resource personnel were not on year-round contracts. The other 43%, or 36, of the responses indicated that the resource people were on a twelve month contract.

Table #22 indicated that two-thirds, or 51, of the schools had resource personnel positions that were not the same as a nine-month school's. The principals who felt that the positions varied were concerned with the working schedules of the positions. They reported that the resource personnel worked perhaps only four days a week, worked nine months, or scattered vacations throughout the school year, which caused scheduling problems. The actual resource personnel positions were no different, but the work schedules were.

Question #16: Have intersession programs been provided? If so, how were they funded?

This question was included to determine the existence of intersession programs and the means of funding these sessions.

Table 23

Existence of
Intersession
Programs

Options	Responses
Yes	71
No	84

Table 24

Sources of Funding
For Intersession
Programs

Sources	Responses
State funds	23
Regular budget	21
Tuition	12
Community	7
Federal funds	2

Eighty-four, or 55%, of the principals reported that there were no intersession programs in the schools, while seventy-one, or 45%, of the principals reported the existence of intersessions. Several California principals noted that Proposition 13 eliminated monies for their intersession programs. State funds and the regular local budget provided the funds for most of the programs. Intersession programs were listed as being an integral part of the Concept 6 program to meet the required number of days.

Question #17: Is there an intermural sports program?

This two-part question was designed to locate the existence of interscholastic sports programs in the year-round schools. It also was designed to determine the various methods of scheduling to allow for student participation.

Table 25

Option	Existence of Intermural Sports Program						
	States						
	CA	CO	FL	IN	MI	NV	OR
Yes	29	14	1	1		1	5
No	64	17		1	6	3	5

Ninety-six principals reported that the schools did not have an intermural sports program. Most of those schools were elementary grades. Fifty-one schools reported that there was an intermural sports program.

(B) How is it scheduled so that students may participate in the various programs?

Table 26

Intermural Sports Programs Schedule	
Methods	Responses
Off-track students return	18
Scheduled after school	11
Each track has own program	7
Community leagues	4
Play against schools on same schedule ...	3

Having off-track students return to campus for sports was reported most frequently. The second most frequently mentioned option was scheduling sports outside of school hours.

Question #18: (A) Has the frequency of pupils being referred for discipline problems changed?

This two-part question was designed to determine if there had been factors in a year-round school program that affected the behavior of students. This question was intended to examine if there were any changes in frequency of discipline referrals.

Table 27

Frequency of Discipline Referrals	
Change	Responses
Increased frequency	2
Decreased frequency	66
Same frequency	70

Sixty-six, or 49%, of the principals reported a decrease in disciplinary referrals. Seventy, or 50%, of the principals indicated no change in the frequency.

(B) To what do you attribute any change?

Table #28 indicated a variety of responses from the principals for a decrease in discipline referrals. The

decrease was most often attributed to a more rested population due to several vacation breaks, as well as less crowded conditions.

Table 28

Reasons for Change in Discipline Referrals

Reasons	Responses
More rested students, due to frequent breaks	17
Fewer people on campus	12
Assertive discipline program	9
Better attitudes	7
Total year-round program	4
Well-organized school	3
Excellent staff	3
Counseling center	1

Question #19: Do community agencies provide services on a year-round basis, such as Scouts, libraries, YMCA, youth, or church groups?

This question was included to determine if the community cooperated with year-round school activities.

Table 29

Existence of Year-Round Community Programs

Options	Responses
Yes	114
No	37

One hundred fourteen, or 75%, of the responses indicated that youth organizations in the community had provided year-round programs.

Administrative and Staff

Question #10: How long have you served as a principal of year-round schools?

Question #21: How long have you served as principal of nine-month schools?

These two questions were devised to determine the experience levels of the principals who responded to this questionnaire.

Table 30

Years' Experience As
Year-Round School
Principal

Years	Responses
0-2	17
3-4	47
5-6	38
7-8	29
9-10	22
11-12	1

Table 31

Years' Experience As
Nine-Month School
Principal

Years	Responses
0-5	76
6-10	32
11-15	29
16-20	10
21 and over	6

Three to six years were listed most frequently as the length of service of the year-round school principals. Seventy-six, or 50%, of the principals had spent five years or less as a principal of a nine-month school.

Question #22: According to a basic contract, what percentage of the professional staff work year-round? Do they have a choice?

This two-part question was devised to determine how many staff members worked twelve months. It also was designed to determine whether a twelve month contract was voluntary or mandatory.

Table 32

Percent of Staff on Twelve Months	
Percent	Responses
0-15	50
16-30	23
31-45	6
46-60	15
Over 60	45

Table 33

Voluntary Year-Round Contract	
Options	Responses
Yes	115
No	41

Fifty principals reported that 15% or less of the staff worked twelve months. Forty-five principals reported that 60% or more of the staff worked on a twelve-month contract. The staff members had a choice according to 115 principals.

Question #23: Is there a supplemental contract for extra teaching time? What is the percentage of the staff who choose to take the supplemental contract?

This question was intended to determine how many schools had a supplemental contract. It also was designed to determine the percentage of teachers who chose to elect the supplemental contract.

Table 34		Table 35	
Supplemental Contract		Percent on Supplemental Contract	
Options	Responses	Percentage	Responses
Yes	69	0-10	42
No	85	11-20	3
		21-99	7
		100	2

Eighty-five principals reported that there was no supplemental contract in the school policy. Principals of 42 schools that had a supplemental contract reported that less than 10% of the personnel elected to take the contract.

Question #24: How has year-round education influenced professional salaries? What is the percentage of change?

This question was devised to determine if year-round schools influenced salaries, and if so, in what manner.

Table 36

Influence on Salaries	
Options	Responses
Increase	24
Decrease	0
No change	131

Table 37

Percent of Change	
Percentage	Responses
1-5	5
5-10	4
10-20	9
20-30	4

Table #36 indicated that there was no apparent change in professional salaries in 131 schools. From the responses that indicated an increase, the most frequently listed percentage increase was from 10% to 20%.

Question #25: What is the work year for principals?

Question #26: What is the work year for clerical workers?

These two questions were devised to determine the length of the work year for principals and office workers.

Table 38

Work Year For Principals and Clerical Workers			
Personnel	Length of work year		
	10 months	11 months	12 months
Principals	60	60	35
Clerical	41	44	65

One hundred and twenty principals worked ten or eleven month schedules. Sixty-five principals reported that the clerical workers had twelve month contracts, while eighty-five principals reported that the clerical workers had ten or eleven month contracts.

Question #27: Do you perceive the attendance pattern of year-round school teachers to be different from that of a nine-month school teacher? If yes, in what way?

This question was designed to determine if teaching in a year-round school affected a teacher's daily attendance pattern.

Table 39

Teacher Attendance Varied From Nine Month Teachers	
Options	Responses
Yes	77
No	73

Table 40

Difference in Teachers' Attendance Patterns	
Difference	Responses
Less absenteeism	66
More absenteeism	9

Approximately 50%, or 77, of the principals indicated there was a difference in the attendance patterns of teachers in year-round schools. The majority, or 66, of the principals who indicated a difference stated there was less absenteeism among the teachers.

Question #28: Compared with a traditional campus, do you see the level of vandalism being different on a year-round campus? If yes, how?

This two-part question was designed to determine if vandalism levels were different at year-round schools.

Table 41

Difference in Vandalism on Year-Round Campus	
Options	Responses
Yes	72
No	83

Table 42

Explanation of Difference	
Difference	Responses
Less vandalism	67
More vandalism	1

Seventy-two, or 45%, of the principals reported there was a difference in vandalism levels on the campuses. Of these same principals, 67 noted that there was less vandalism on the campuses.

Question #29: If you, as the principal, had to make a choice, would you stay in a year-round program?

This question was devised to probe the interest level of the principals in continuing as a year-round school principal.

Table #43 indicated that 75%, or 119, of the principals were interested in remaining with a year-round school. Twelve principals were unsure and twenty-eight preferred not to stay with year-round schools.

Table 43

Responses	States							TOTALS
	CA	CO	FL	IN	MI	NV	OR	
Yes	80	22	1	2	6	5	3	119
No	15	9					4	28
Not Sure	8	1					3	12

Question #30: What are the benefits of a year-round educational program?

This question was designed to ascertain the principals' opinions. The responses indicated the benefits of the year-round school, as viewed by the principals.

The benefit listed most often in Table #44 was that of frequent breaks. The principals noted extra comments on the questionnaire including the fact that students returned from breaks more rested and ready to return to school. The second most frequently mentioned benefit was the fact that students retained knowledge better. The principals noted that less re-teaching had to be done, because the breaks were shorter and there was less time for forgetting. The third and fourth most frequently mentioned benefits were better use of facilities and better curriculum change and development.

Table 44

Benefits of Year-Round Schools as Perceived by Principals	
Benefits	Responses
Frequent breaks	104
Better knowledge retention by students	53
Better use of facilities	38
Facilitates curriculum change and development	21
Cuts down on construction costs	17
Less crowding	14
Ease of remediation and individualization	11
Parental support	10
Improved discipline	9
Additional courses offered during breaks	7
Higher test scores	6
Enthusiasm among all people involved	6

Question #31: What are the disadvantages:

This question was devised for determining possible shortcomings in a year-round school, as viewed by the principals.

Thirty-six principals noted that the total staff was never together, for the main disadvantage. Scheduling problems and parental objections were also listed as disadvantages. The fourth most frequently mentioned disadvantage was administrative stress. These four areas comprised 63% of the responses.

Table 45

Disadvantages of Year-Round Schools

As Perceived by Principals

Disadvantages	Responses
Total staff never together	36
Scheduling difficulties	29
Parental objection	29
Administrator stress	27
Being the "minority" in the school district	17
Higher costs	15
Sharing room, setting up, taking down after each break.	15
Cannot do thorough maintenance	13
Special services personnel on nine-month contract	11

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was undertaken to identify and locate the year-round schools and to develop a description of the characteristics of the year-round schools in the United States as of December 1, 1981. The schools were to have been in operation for at least one full school year. Two hundred and thirty year-round schools were identified and a questionnaire designed to probe the characteristics of year-round schools was sent to each principal of each year-round school. One hundred and seventy-four questionnaires were returned and currently operating year-round schools were identified in seven states: California, Colorado, Florida, Indiana, Michigan, Nevada, and Oregon. Fifteen principals noted that their schools had reverted to a nine-month calendar. Information received through the use of the questionnaire was analyzed and categorized according to scheduling, financial, educational, and administrative matters.

It was determined that the 45-15 Plan, Block or Staggered, was the most commonly used plan, with Concept 6

Plan identified as the second most commonly used plan. Colorado had most of the Concept 6 schools, while California had most of the year-round schools.

The review of the literature indicated that year-round schools were in existence as early as 1837, but were discontinued (The extended school year, 1969). The questionnaire results indicated that some of the current schools began in 1969 and others were being initiated as late as 1980.

A savings in construction costs was indicated in the literature review (Muzio, et al, 1977) and confirmed by the research findings. Hollifield (1977) noted no significant savings other than construction and this was confirmed by the questionnaire findings.

When questioned about additional expenses attributed to year-round schools, the principals most frequently reported that air conditioning was an added expense. An article in Education, U.S.A. confirmed the questionnaire findings ("Previews," 1977).

One hundred twenty-seven, or 84%, of the principals noted that average daily attendance remained stable or improved in the year-round schools. The 1975 Year-Round Education Handbook noted there was less truancy according to one survey. Hollifield's summary of an administrators' survey indicated that average daily attendance did not suffer in the year-round schools.

Sixty-one, or 40%, of the principals indicated an improvement in test scores, while eighty-eight, or 58%, of the principals noted there was no change in test score results. Review of the literature reported no significant differences in achievement test scores from that of nine-month schools ("Pupils learn no more," 1975). Another published report of a survey indicated it was possible to boost achievement scores as evidenced by regular testing ("Year-round schools are alive," 1976). Hollifield's survey reported that administrators noted that year-round schools helped improve academic achievement as evidenced by standardized test scores. The impact of year-round schools on test scores has been inconclusive as evidenced by discrepancies among articles in the literature review and among principals.

Review of the literature indicated that a year-round school program lessened discipline problems and vandalism (Mussatti, 1981). Sixty-six, or 49%, of the principals reported a decrease in discipline referrals and attributed this decrease to a more rested student body and less crowding of the campus. Seventy-two, or 46%, of the principals indicated a change in the vandalism level and noted that there was less vandalism on the campuses. The review of the literature confirmed the questionnaire results.

Seventy-seven, or 51%, of the principals indicated an improvement in the attendance patterns of the teachers. Review of the literature indicated agreement with this information ("Pupils learn no more," 1975).

Review of the literature indicated several advantages, with savings in construction costs noted most often. (Partners in education, 1977). However, principals rated savings on construction costs as the fifth most important advantage. The principals appeared to feel that student advantages were more important than financial savings by listing more breaks, better retention by students, better use of facilities, and curriculum improvement as more important.

Conclusions

The questionnaire survey had updated general information about currently-operating year-round schools as of December 1, 1981.

The concept of year-round schools was feasible and workable. This was evidenced by the existence of year-round schools since 1969, with more being initiated in 1980 and 1981.

Year-round schools seemed to have met a variety of needs in different geographical areas. Overall, the plan appeared to be more workable for the K-6 school, as indicated by the scarcity of secondary schools on a year-round

program. The patrons of the year-round schools seemed to be aware of certain advantages, as shown by parental participation on committees and by community cooperation.

Year-round schools were organized differently than nine-month schools. The year-round schools had more and shorter breaks, more curriculum development and change, greater flexibility in scheduling, and better instructional advantages for the students as shown in the research findings.

The attitudes of the principals were probably a major influence on the success of the current year-round schools. It was evident that principals had a significant role in public relations. Besides educating the public, the principals also selected and trained the teaching personnel, who needed to be in agreement with the year-round school concept.

The investigator found a scarcity of literature involving comparison studies between schools, states, or calendar programs. Most of the literature was concerned only with local situations in the forms of cost-effectiveness studies or feasibility reviews. The review of the literature seemed to have a propensity for listing advantages of the year-round schools.

Because of the information provided through the use of the questionnaire, the need was generated for additional questions. These questions needed to be designed to probe further into some areas such as teachers' opinions, commun-

ity information, socio-economic patterns, available businesses and industries, climate and its effects, and parent surveys.

Year-round schools did not emerge as a major trend. Year-round schools have been a consistent trend over two centuries, and more recently, since 1969.

The principals' responses indicated fewer discipline referrals, less vandalism, and stabilized or improved attendance. Perhaps some aspects of the year-round school programs had influenced the students' behaviors.

Benefits for the students emerged as being more important to the principals than the financial savings from non-construction, as indicated in the list of benefits.

Advantages appeared to outweigh the disadvantages in the sense that more positive answers were listed by more people. There were fewer disadvantages listed and by fewer people.

Recommendations

The investigator recommends that a socio-economic study be done of the communities that have a year-round school program. Perhaps there are similar characteristics, such as the educational level of the citizens, the climate, mobility, or industry that relate well to a year-round program in the schools.

It is recommended that the 45-15 Plan be compared with the Concept 6 Plan. Comparisons of test scores, attendance patterns, and parent participation could be of interest to those who are considering adopting a year-round program.

Fifteen of the principals who responded indicated a return to a nine-month calendar. Factors causing these decisions are worthy of further study.

It is recommended that the National Council on Year-Round Education become more active in promoting the concept of year-round school. Information could be disseminated at national conventions and throughout the state education associations.

Much of the literature on year-round education appears to be centered on local school programs. It is recommended that studies be designed and researched to furnish comparisons among the year-round programs that are located in several states.

REFERENCE LIST

BOOKS

Shepard, M. and Baker, K. Year round schools. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath Co., 1977.

ARTICLES

Glines, D. The status of year-round education. Teacher, April, 1978, XCV.

Hollifield, J. What are the benefits and drawbacks of the extended school year? Today's Education, Nov. 12, 1977, 18.

Howard, L. R. and McIntire, J. T. Vacation learning in a year-round school? NASSP, October, 1980, 123-5.

Los Angeles schools . . . Education Summary, Aug., 1980, 2.

Previews. Education, U.S.A., July 18, 1977, 19(46), 8.

Pupils learn no more - or less - in year-round schools. Education, U.S.A., May 19, 1975, 17(38), 219.

The new trend: year-round schools. U. S. News and World Report, July 26, 1971, LXXI(4), 35-7.

Year-round schools are alive and well. Nation's Schools Report, Sept. 13, 1976, 2(15), 1-2.

BOOKLETS, PAMPHLETS, OTHER

Ballinger, C. Eighth annual national reference directory of year-round education programs for July 1, 1980 through June 30, 1981. San Diego: National Council on Year-Round Education, July, 1981, 3-33.

- Ballinger, C. Pamphlet advertising the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the National Council on Year-Round Education. Los Angeles, January, 1982, 1.
- Jensen, G. Paper presented at First Annual Midsouth Educational Research Association Convention. Nov., 1972.
- Mussatti, D. Paper presented at Twelfth Annual Meeting of National Council on Year-Round Education. Anaheim, April, 1981, 1-15.
- Muzio, I., Hansen, B., and Henderson, C. Year-round education. Sacramento, California: State Department of Education, April, 1977, 1-10.
- Partners in education. Gresham, Oregon: School District, February, 1977, mimeographed insert.
- The extended school year. National Education Association, March, 1969, 2.
- The impact of the rescheduled school year. Albany, N.Y.: State Department of Education, March, 1972, 3-4.
- White, W. The history of the national council on year-round education: a personal perspective. Clarion, Pa., 1976, 1-8.
- Year-round education handbook. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1975, vi - 9.
- Year-round school. Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania State Department of Education, 1972, 8.
- Year-round school plans. San Diego: San Diego City Public Schools, May, 1972, i - 25.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Richmond, Mossie J. Issues in year-round education. North Quincy, Mass.: Christopher Publishing House, 1977.

ARTICLES

- Banta, Trudy. Tradition again thwarts the expanded school year. Phi Delta Kappan, March, 1978, p. 491.
- Barker, Karlyn. Abolition of year-round plan is debated in Prince William. The Washington Post. Dec. 11, 1978, p. C1, C6.
- Barker, Karlyn. Year-round school experiment ending in Prince William. The Washington Post, Dec. 15, 1978.
- Heller, M. P. and Bailey, M. A. Year-round school: problems and opportunities. Clearing House, April, 1976, 49, 363-4.
- Holt, Howard. Year-round schools and system shock. Phi Delta Kappan, Jan., 1973, LIV(5), 310-11.
- Isotroam, John. The Furgeson plan for all-year school. Phi Delta Kappan, Jan., 1973, LIV(5).
- National school board association opposes year-round handicapped programs. Education Daily, July 18, 1980, 3-4.
- New impetus for year-round schools. Reader's Digest, March, 1972, 100(599), 115.
- Prince William schools drop year-round program. Nation's Schools Report, Jan. 1, 1979, 5(1), 1-2.

- Putting year-round schools on the shelf. Nation's Schools Report, Dec. 17, 1979, p. 4.
- Rifkin, N. S. A round-up on year-round schools. Today's Education, Nov. - Dec., 1973.
- School business. Education Summary, Nov. 15, 1977, p. 8.
- Schools for all seasons. Nation's Business, Sept., 1972, 60(9), 22.
- The pros and cons of the year-round school. OSSC Quarterly Report, Spring, 1976, 16, 18-19.
- Update on Gresham's year-round school. OSSC Quarterly Report, Fall, 1977, p. 2.
- White, William. Year-round education for K-12 districts. Phi Delta Kappan, Jan., 1973, LIV(5).
- Year-round programs for handicapped confirmed by appeals court. Michigan School Board Journal, Sept., 1980, p. 17.
- Year-round schools: how much money do year-round schools really save? Nation's Schools Report, Nov. 10, 1975, p. 2.

BOOKLETS, PAMPHLETS, OTHER

- Conner, James E. Year-round education: a solution in search of a problem? Paper presented to the Fifth National Seminar on Year-Round Education, 1973.
- Evaluations of year-round school programs. Arlington, Va.: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1974.
- Extended school year. Phoenix: National School Boards Association, Sept., 1975.
- 45-15: one approach to year-round schooling. Boise, Ida.: Year-Round School Study Committee, March, 1972.
- Grooms, M. Ann. Year-round education can make a difference. Reprint from Educational Research Service, Inc.

Hurnard, John R. Extending the scope of the school:
 consideration for reorganizing the school year.
Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, Eugene,
 Oregon, Jan., 1972, 15(5).

Status of year-round schools. Educational Research Bulletin,
 May, 1977, 4(9).

The continuous school year. Cranston, R. I.: Cranston
 School Department, March, 1972.

What is the continuous learning year cycling plan?
 Albany, N.Y.: State Department of Education.(undated)

Year-round education in Prince William County. Manassas, Va.:
 Prince William County Public School District.(undated)

Year-round schools. National Education Association, May, 1974.

Year-round schools: districts develop successful programs.
 Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations
 Association, 1971.

Year-round schools in Loudoun County, Va. Educational Research
 Bulletin, 4(3), Nov., 1976, 1.

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Scheduling

1. What type of calendar cycle or attendance period is being implemented in your school? (Descriptions from National Council on Year Round Education Directory, 1980-81.)

___ 45-15 Block Plan (all students are in school 45 days; all are out for 15)

___ 45-15 Staggered (3/4 of the students are in school 45 days; 1/4 out for 15 days at a time)

___ 45-15 Flexible (individualized; block or staggered)

___ 60-20 Plan (all students attend 60 days and are out for 20)

___ 90-30 Plan (two 90 day semesters separated by 30 days break; 3/4 of students always present)

___ Concept 8 (8 six-week blocks; students choose 6 of the 8 sessions)

___ Concept 6 (6 terms of 43 days; students attend 2 consecutively and another 2 when they choose; intersessions make up needed days)

___ Concept 16 or 12 (16 three week curriculum modules; students choose 12 - OR - 12 four week modules; students choose 9)

___ Quarter Plan (4 twelve week periods; students attend 3)

___ Quinmester Plan (5 nine week terms; students attend 4)

___ Flexible All Year (individualized; school is open 240 days; students attend 175 or more days)

___ Other: (explain) _____

2. Which grades are involved in the year-round programming?

3. In which year was year-round programming first implemented?

4. Who authorized the inception? (Check all that apply.)

___ School Board ___ State Department of Education

___ State Legislature ___ Other: _____

p.2, Questionnaire, Long

5. Rate the following to show the amount of input each had to the goals, objectives, and total organization of the year-round school program. (1=much; 5=little) (The same number may be applied to more than one group.)

School Board Administration Teaching staff
 Parents State Department of Education
 State Legislature Community Other: _____

6. Who finally determines the school calendar? _____

7. Do parents have a voice in selecting children's calendar cycle? yes Is the program mandated or voluntary
 no for parents? _____

Do parents have the option of sending their child to a nearby nine-month school? yes
 no

If yes, is transportation provided for them? yes
 no

Financial

8. Rank order the initial sources of income. (1-most; 3-least)

Local funds State funds Federal funds

9. In which budget area was there the most financial savings, if any, as a result of changing to a year-round calendar?

Buildings Salaries Equipment Utilities
 None Other: _____

Where was the most increase, if any? _____

10. What is the per pupil expenditure? _____

How does this compare with a traditional school in the area, if information is available? _____

11. As an administrator operating a year-round school, which of the following expenditures would you most likely attribute to year-round only?

instructional materials
 additional resource personnel
 air conditioning
 administrative staffing
 transportation of pupils
 innovation and change
 other: _____

P.3, Questionnaire, Long

Educational

12. Are there any difficulties implementing PL 94-142 into the year-round program? _____ If yes, explain: _____

13. Has average daily attendance (___improved; ___declined; ___stabilized) since implementing a year-round program?
14. What do you perceive is the impact of year-round schools on test scores? (___improvement; ___decline; ___no change) On what basis do you make this statement? (___data; ___judgment)
15. What personnel services, other than the usual teaching and administrative services, are available for students?

Are these same resource people on a twelve month contract? ___yes ___no Do these positions differ from a nine-month school? ___yes ___no If yes, in what ways?_____

16. Have intersession programs been provided? ___yes ___no
If yes, how were they funded? _____
17. Is there an intermural sports program? ___yes ___no How is it scheduled so that students may participate in the various programs? _____
18. Has the frequency of pupils being referred for discipline problems changed? (___increased; ___decreased; ___remained the same) To what do you attribute any change?

19. Do community agencies provide services on a year-round basis, such as Scouts, libraries, YMCA, youth or church groups? ___yes ___no

Administrative and Staff

20. The number of years as principal in year-round school? _____
21. The number of years as principal in traditional schools? _____
22. According to a basic contract, what % of the professional staff work year-round? _____ Does the staff have a choice about working year-round? ___yes ___no
23. Is there a supplemental contract for extra teaching time? ___yes ___no What is the percentage of the staff who choose to take the supplemental contract? _____

P. 4, Questionnaire, Long

24. How has year-round education influenced professional salaries? (increased; decreased; no change)
If there is a change, what is the percentage of change?
(1-5%; 5-10%; 10-20%; 20-30%; over 30%)
25. What is the work year for principals? _____
26. What is the work year for clerical workers? _____
27. Do you perceive the attendance pattern of year-round school teachers to be different from that of traditional school teachers? yes no If yes, in what way(s)? _____
28. Compared with a traditional campus, do you see the level of vandalism being different on a year-round school campus?
 yes no If yes, how? _____
29. If you, as the principal, had to make a choice, would you stay in a year-round program? yes no
30. What are the benefits of a year-round educational program, in your opinion? _____

31. What are the disadvantages, in your opinion? _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION. PLEASE SEND ME ANY PRINTED MATERIALS THAT COULD ASSIST ME IN INTERPRETING RESPONSES.