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Abstract of the Dissertation

The purpose of this study was to identify the feasibility of implementing a year-round high school program. Specific attention was given the following tasks: (1) The process used in considering the feasibility of implementing year-round program; (2) The steps taken in implementing such a program; and the effect of year-round operation on potential areas of concern. The study further identified the reasons why certain high schools dropped year-round programs.

Procedure. The basic technique employed for this study was a descriptive approach utilizing a questionnaire completed by school districts implementing year-round high school programs. Questionnaire items were developed based on an intensive review of related literature and on responses made to a letter sent to specific school districts requesting information on the topic. A model questionnaire was sent to a random sample of school districts implementing year-round high school programs. Revisions based on this model questionnaire and on reaction of several key educators produced the final version of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to the 45 school districts who were now or had implemented year-round programs at the high school level according to the 1979 Directory of the National Council on Year-Round Education. Twenty-nine respondents completed the questionnaire. The results were tabulated and interpreted as to their importance.

Findings. The greatest area of concern expressed by respondents was in the general topic of administration and scheduling. Also of great concern was area of personnel allocation for both administrators and teachers. Noteworthy concern was reflected for the areas of facilities and maintenance, curriculum and instruction. The question of financial constraints was a surprisingly low concern considering the amount of literature devoted to this topic. Other areas of concern, such as transportation, student activities, support services, and school lunch programs seemed to be of great concern to respondents. In regard to reasons why schools dropped year-round high school program, the most important constraint was in the area of administration. Personnel considerations ranked second, indicating that staff support is vital to a successful program. Certain curriculum constraints were also important.

Conclusions. The most important predictor of whether or not a district successfully implemented a high school year-round program was the attitude of teachers, administrators, parents, students and the business community. Areas of greatest concern were administration, scheduling, personnel, activities and maintenance, and curriculum and instruction. These areas of concern constitute a useful list for any school district to study if they are contemplating going "year-round". This list says: "These areas must be dealt with successfully if you hope to carry off the change to year-round school."

Recommendations. Any school district contemplating the implementation of a year-round educational program, particularly at the high school level, should make a careful study of the administrative, personnel, facility, maintenance, curricular, financial and student constraints as they apply to the specific community and school district.
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CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

"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."¹ This sentiment, expressed by Senator Charles H. Percy (R. - Ill.), is being heard more and more as school costs soar and tax increases are turned down at the polls or prohibited by State constitutional provisions. The June 20, 1977, issue of the U.S. News and World Report emphasises the increasing need for year-round education, not only to more effectively utilize schools and to reduce the cost of new construction, but to deal with the increasing energy shortage. The article states that: "In the view of many educators from coast to coast, the day is not far away when year-round schools will be in the majority."² However, this study indicates that the present trend is away from implementation of year-round programs.

Year-round school plans are not new in the United States; various such plans were developed in more than a

¹"Focus," San Jose Mercury - News, November 25, 1973, p. 1F.

dozen cities, one of the earliest dating back to 1904 in Bluffton, Indiana. Most of these early programs utilized the four quarter plan. The reasons for adoption included: assisting cultural assimilation of foreign-born immigrants, providing needed space for expanding school population growth and increasing the learning opportunities for students. According to Glines, the early year-round plans generally were successful. However, a number of societal problems erupted, such as the depression of the 1930's and the Second World War, and year-round programs slowly faded during this period.

Following World War II the needs resulting from the expanding population of the "baby boom" was met by communities which passed bond elections and tax overrides. By the late sixties, changes were occurring. Population growth patterns became unbalanced; bond issues began to fail; the economy took on a new look; education was just emerging from a decade of innovation. As a result St. Charles, Missouri; Romeoville, Illinois; Atlanta, Georgia; and Hayward, California, for a variety of reasons, between 1968-1970 led the reintroduction of year-round education with variations

---


4Ibid.

5Ibid.
of a plan now referred to as the 45-15 calendar. In the past ten years, a number of other calendar options have emerged.

The most popular plan in terms of number of schools and students in the program is the 45-15 plan with over 147,000 students in 234 schools operating on that schedule. The major reasons cited by school officials for adopting year-round programs is to save building space, although numerous schools have adopted the program to improve the quality of education and/or to adapt to parental or student preference for vacation.

The following factors need to be considered in evaluating the feasibility of implementing year-round educational programs:

1. The school plant already exists fully equipped and ready to use.
2. The overhead cost of administration continues to be approximately the same.
3. Fixed charges, such as insurance, interest, and capital outlay, remain fairly constant whether schools are open or not.
4. The teaching staff, the communities most

---

6Ibid.
7Ibid.
8Ibid.
important educational asset, is already mobilized.

5. A large percentage of students of school age (particularly in urban areas) are left without any constructive developmental programs during the summer.

6. Various personnel concerns lead many people to favor vacations other than during the traditional summer period.

7. Many special learning programs can be enhanced by year-round programs—special education, bi-lingual and multicultural as well as extended remedial programs.

8. Community education enhances the use of schools on a year-round as well as evening status.

Anyone seriously considering the feasibility of making changes in the school calendar should have a clear understanding of what he/she is talking about before he/she takes a position for or against any of the all-year school plans.

Three key questions must be answered:

1. What school time patterns or schedules will provide optimum economic efficiency?

2. What school time patterns or schedules will provide quality education, with equality in
3. What school time patterns or schedules are acceptable to the public in terms of socio­logical needs--their personal, family and community living patterns? (Life-style)

California's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wilson Riles, stated in 1974: "Year-round school scheduling is inevitable in California because taxpayers can no longer afford the luxury of abandoning school facilities for the traditional three-month summer vacation."9 The rapid growth of year-round schools from 1968-1977 in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968-71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>79,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>102,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>116,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>106,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>76,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>80,382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9San Jose Mercury - News, February 13, 1974, p. 22.
California could be seen in the figures on the preceding page released by the "California State Directory of Year-Round Education" published by the California State Department of Education in July of 1979. 10

As can be seen the growth peaked in the 1976-77 school year and then declined, stabilizing again in the 1978-79 school year. Recent national figures depict this decline from the 1976-77 school year to the 1978-79 school year. 11

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of States</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Schools</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research indicates that the most significant drop in year-round school programs is found at the high school level. The number of high school programs in California (the nation's leading state in year-round programs) has decreased from 17


11 "Updating California Year-Round Education Information, State of California, Department of Education, October 30, 1978."
in the 1976-77 school to six in the 1978-79 school year and three in 1979. According to Glines of the California State Department of Education many California districts have put year-round programs on the "back burner" due to: (a) teacher strikes and militancy, (b) collective bargaining, (c) forced busing to achieve integration, (d) the energy problem, (e) revision of state funding (Proposition 13) and (f) a thrust for alternative education. California State Coordinator of Year-Round Education, Mitchell Voydat, wrote in October of 1978: "Proposition 13 appeared to be the compelling reason for district discontinuance of Year-Round Education. The elimination of summer schools hurt Year-Round School Districts as intersessions were considered to be summer schools. No summer school funding meant no intersession program dollars and districts reacted accordingly." Such a significant trend toward the discontinuation of existing programs and rejection of adoption of new programs indicates the need for research into the problems encountered in implementing a year-round education program at the high school level.


13Interview with Don Glines, Consultant on Program Planning and Development for the California State Department of Education, February 10, 1979.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

Although a great deal has been written about year-round education, there is relatively little literature and research dealing with year-round programs at the high school level. The dramatic drop in high school year-round programs raises the question as to the practicality of such programs. Identification of problems which are encountered when implementing a year-round program at the high school level should be of great value in determining the practicality of such a program for future development.

The major purpose of this study was to identify the feasibility of year-round high school programs. Specific attention was given to the following:

1. The process used in considering the feasibility and desirability of implementing a year-round high school program.

2. The implementation of the year-round program to include (a) community relations; (b) potential school problems and public issues to be faced; (c) student assignment; (d) changes necessitated in the curriculum; and (e) in-service and other preparations for the implementation of the program.

3. A survey of the potential areas of concern in: (a) Curriculum and Instruction;
(b) Finance; (c) Scheduling of Students;
(d) Allocation of Personnel; (e) Facilities
and Maintenance; (f) Transportation;
(g) School Lunch Programs; (h) Student
Activities and Athletics.

4. A consideration of the reasons why those
high schools who have dropped a year-round
program did so.

Questions to be Answered

The study was designed to answer the following
questions regarding the implementation of year-round
programs at the high school level:

1. What was the prime motivating factor for
   implementing such a program?

2. What was the nature of feasibility study
   procedures used prior to implementation?

3. What were the major potential problem
   areas considered in making the decision
to adopt or reject the proposed plan?

4. What were the public issues which caused
   significant opposition to the adoption of
   a year-round program?

5. What was the nature of student attendance
   plan employed and the track assignment
   procedure?
6. What was the approach employed by responding districts (i.e., pilot schools, one segment of the district, or entire district)?

7. What changes were necessitated in the instructional program to accommodate a year-round program?

8. How much time was devoted to staff in-service training in preparation for a year-round school program?

9. What problems encountered in implementing a year-round program were most serious?

The study further probed areas which research indicated were of particular concern in implementing a year-round program at the high school level. These areas included:

1. Curriculum and Instruction
2. Finance
3. Scheduling of Staff and Students
4. Allocation of Personnel
5. Facilities and Maintenance
6. Transportation
7. School Lunch Program
8. Student Activities and Athletics
9. Support Services

In addition, the study identified the reasons why certain high schools dropped year-round programs. The study
focused on the following:

1. Budgetary Constraints
2. Curricular Constraints
3. Administrative Constraints
4. Facility and Maintenance Constraints
5. Personal Considerations
6. Student Considerations

Limitations of the Study

According to the National Council on Year-Round Education there were 104 active high school year-round education programs in 1976. This has decreased to 28 in the 1978-79 school year. This study was concerned with surveying the year-round school contact person in each of these schools to determine the problems faced in implementing such a program and what caused the school to drop the program in those areas where it was dropped. The following limitations were faced in making the study.

1. The study was limited to those schools listed in the latest directory of year-round schools prepared in 1978 by the National Council on Year-Round Education. This does not insure a survey of all year-round programs since the directory is not totally accurate, but it is the best source of such information.
2. The percentage of return from the many schools who have dropped the program or who considered it and decided not to go ahead with it were lower than would be desired due to the lack of interest in the program.

3. Individuals listed as contact persons in the directory were no longer in those positions or even working with the school district at this time.

4. Responses often reflected the subjective judgment of the individual answering the questionnaire and may not reflect the view of others involved in the year-round program.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Average Daily Attendance**: A state support funding system which depends on the average daily attendance of students to determine the amount of state support to each school district.

2. **Concept 6**: The school year is divided into six sessions. The students attend four of the six sessions and vacation during the other two sessions.

3. **Concept 8**: The school year is divided into eight sessions. The students attend six of the eight sessions and vacation during the other two sessions.
4. **Continuous Progress:** A concept that encourages the individual to progress at his own pace such as a *multiple trails* plan; or, a plan for rescheduling the school year that allows the student to attend classes with short vacation periods spread through the year such as a 45-15 plan. The concept is most visible in a non-graded school.

5. **Continuous School Year:** Any plans for school operation which uses the school plant all year; usually refers to plans with *staggered* attendance.

6. **Extended School Year:** Generally the school is in session for more than 200 days, or, technically, any plan which increases the number of hours or days of school instruction offered to the student.

7. **Flexible All-Year School:** The school is open 50 weeks a year. Students attend a minimum of 175 days and as much as 235 days. The program is individualized based on continuous progress.

8. **45-15:** Forty-five days of school instruction followed by 15 days of vacation continuous through the year. Student body can be divided into four groups. One group enrolls every 15 days. Only three groups are in school at one time. It is a continuous school year plan with staggered attendance. Can be rotated or run as a regular full attendance plan.
9. **Multiple Trails:** Class periods are shortened and course material is spread to cover 42 weeks instead of the regular 36 weeks. The extra class time is then used for enrichment, remediation or acceleration. It lightens the daily class loads and releases classroom space without additional cost. It can be implemented in stages and is a good transitional plan.

10. **Quadrimester:** Another term for quarter system.

11. **Quarter System:** Four terms of 60 days each. Usually three terms (180 days) required, fourth or summer term is optional. Can be rotating, sliding or staggered.

12. **Quinmester:** Nine week terms (current semesters are divided in half). Summer term of equal length. Required four out of five terms; if staggered, becomes 45-15. Can also have rotated attendance.

13. **Rotating:** When the terms have a specific starting and ending date in which all classes start and finish at specific times, students can attend the required number of terms and then vacation.

14. **Single Concept Course:** Specialized courses offering more depth instead of scanning briefly an entire subject. Usually non-sequential, i.e., not a course which is in a required series.

15. **Sliding:** Vacation for each group falling at a different season (time of year) each year.
16. **Staggered:** Part of the school enrollment is on vacation at all times. A continuous cycling plan.

17. **Trimester:** A schedule that operates three four-month terms. Attendance is required two out of three times. Can be rotated. This term is also used for the Intensified Learning Plan ("Fort Worth Plan") which has three sixty day terms with class periods extended to 80 minutes. This allows 18 week courses to be completed in 12 weeks.

18. **Year-Round School:** Includes any plan or system in which school is in operation through the year.

**Procedure of the Study**

The basic technique employed for this study was a descriptive approach utilizing a questionnaire completed by the indicated year-round school coordinator of school districts which have considered, implemented, or dropped year-round high school programs. Questionnaire items were prepared and designed to identify those problems that appeared significant in the consideration and implementation of a year-round program at the high school level.

Letters were sent to school districts which have operating year-round high school programs. These districts were suggested by Glines\(^\text{15}\) of the California State Department of Education.

\[^{15}\text{Interview with Don Glines, Consultant on Program Planning and Development for the California State Department of Education, July 10, 1977.}\]
of Education and the former President of the National Council on Year-Round Education. The districts were selected based on the fact that they have had extensive experience with year-round education at the high school level. The objective was to obtain comparative data from the national scene.

The letter was addressed in each case to the Year-Round Education Contact as listed in the "National Reference Directory of Year-Round Education" published in January of 1976 by the California State Department of Education, Sacramento, California. The letter specifically requested material regarding implementation, problems, strengths and weaknesses, and evaluative material which was available.

Preliminary letters were also sent to California School Districts which had year-round high schools in operation as of June 15, 1977. These letters were aimed at obtaining written materials to be reviewed before the research instrument was designed, and to making an initial contact with the Year-Round School Coordinator so that follow-up contacts could be made to the district. The names of the contact individuals were suggested by Glines of the California State Department of Education who allowed the use of his name in the contact.

A model questionnaire was developed and field tested, evaluated, and modified in a pilot study involving the administrators in 24 school districts which were involved in
year-round education programs at the high school level. This questionnaire, which was utilized as the basis for a paper presented to the National Council on Year-Round Education Conference in San Diego, California in February of 1979, also became the basis for the instrument developed for this study. Revisions were made based on the results of the initial survey leading to the finalized draft of the instrument.

Data were gathered by the use of the above questionnaire, which was designed for those districts presently implementing year-round high school programs as well as those which have either considered and rejected such programs or dropped them after implementation. Data collected through the questionnaire method were compiled and compared by the use of descriptive and contrasting tables based on the areas of potential problems indicated in the questionnaire.

Significance of the Study

Many experts in year-round education have called for additional research regarding high school programs. David J. Parks and Linda G. Leffel in the paper "Needed Research in Year-Round Education" call for more research on the effects of year-round schools on the organizational patterns of the institution.16 They point out:"The effects of year-round

education on decision making, communication, interaction, influence and goal setting structures of year-round education need consideration." 17 They also stressed that: "Additional effort needs to be focused on compiling and interpreting research findings into readable documents readily available to school policy makers." 18

The researcher has observed that most of the exposition on year-round schools to be found in the literature deals with the experiences of individual schools at the elementary and middle school level. A review of the literature dealing with high school programs revealed that it is of a general nature failing to consider problems encountered in any depth. The need for such research was first emphasized by Marvin Roth, Associate Superintendent, Washoe County School District, Reno, Nevada. Washoe County presently has three pilot year-round elementary schools and has considered expanding the program to meet population growth. Roth indicated that he believed there was a real lacking of any systemized study of the problems encountered in implementing a year-round school program at the high school level. This views were echoed by Paul Killian, Director of Research and Development. 19

18Ibid.
19Interviews held in Reno, NV, January 17 and 21, 1974.
T.C. Coleman, Chairman of the Department of School Administration at the University of Pacific, also stated that with the increasing interest in year-round education, such a comprehensive study of problems encountered at the high school level would be extremely valuable to any school district considering such programs.²⁰

More recently, Glines of the California State Department of Education indicated that there was great value in developing K-12 programs on a year-round schedule but that the problems encountered at the high school level must be overcome before this goal can be a reality.²¹

This study then could provide broadly useful information because it will present a compilation of the problems encountered by the target schools based on actual experiences. Since the schools studied represented a broad cross section of school districts of varying sizes and locations, it is felt that the conclusions reached will be applicable for any school district considering the implementation of high school year-round education program provided allowances are made for the variables introduced by local conditions.

²⁰Interview held in Stockton, CA, February 4, 1974.
²¹Interview held in San Diego, CA, February 12, 1979.
SUMMARY AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter One has related the background of the problem, stated the problem, given the justification for undertaking the research, outlined the general scope and limitations of the study, defined the special terms used, outlined the procedures used in conducting this study and given methods of reporting the data gathered.

Chapter Two is a report of the related literature and research which have made significant contributions to the concepts investigated in this study.

Chapter Three describes the development of the questionnaire used to gather the data and to give account of its distribution, collection, tabulation and how the data gathered are to be treated and interpreted.

Chapter Four presents the data gathered through the questionnaire sent to year-round school contacts at schools where a high school program has either been considered, implemented, or dropped. The data will be graphed, tabulated and discussed under the following headings:

1. General Questions--including the motivation, planning, and organization of the program as well as anticipated problems and concerns both in the school and in the community.

2. Potential Areas of Concern--in the areas of Curriculum and Instruction; Finance; Scheduling of Students;
Allocation of Personnel; Facilities and Maintenance; Transportation; School Lunch Program; Student Activities and Athletics; and the most serious problems encountered.

3. Reasons why year-round programs have been dropped at the high school level. This section is directed at those schools which have dropped year-round programs. Consideration is given to Budgetary constraints; Curricular constraints; Administrative constraints; Facility and Maintenance constraints; Personnel constraints and Student constraints.

Chapter Five presents a summary of the findings and the conclusions drawn from the research completed. This concluding chapter explores the implications growing out of the conclusions and practical application directed toward the improvement of high school year-round programs.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Chapter One presented the introduction and context of the problem of implementation of year-round education programs at the high school level. This chapter reviews the available literature relating to year-round school programs with special emphasis on the high school level. This chapter is divided into three sections: Introduction, Books Related to Year-Round Education, and Research Related Directly to the Study.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of year-round education is not new in the United States; various such plans were developed in more than a dozen cities, one of the earliest dating back to 1904 in Bluffton, Indiana. Other communities followed suit, among them Newark, New Jersey; Omaha, Nebraska; Knoxville, Tennessee; and Ambridge, Pennsylvania. Most of these efforts were either mandatory or voluntary four-quarter plans. The reasons for adoption included: assisting the language and cultural assimilation of foreign-born immigrants; providing needed space for expanding school population growth; and increasing the learning opportunities for students.¹

It should be noted that city school systems operated from 240 to 260 days per year in the 1800's, examples being Detroit, 259 days; Boston, 244 days; Philadelphia, 251 days; and Washington D.C., 238 days. By 1915, most of these had been reduced to 190-195 days. Most rural communities at this time had schools which operated only five or six months a year as a result of winter weather, inadequate financing, and summer harvesting.2

These early year-round plans appeared to be successful. However, a number of societal problems such as the "Great Depression" and World War II intervened, and year-round programs slowly faded. Following World War II, there was renewed interest in year-round education. By the beginning of the 1960's this interest was spurred by continually expanding school enrollments. The interest was even more intensified as school districts either reached their legal limit in bonded indebtedness or tax and bond elections were defeated by the electorate. The renewed interest in year-round education seemed to be motivated by several factors:

1. The potential of reducing school expenditures for such necessities as buildings, transportation, textbooks, utilities, maintenance, and other fixed costs.

2 Ibid.
2. The opportunity to improve and reorganize the curriculum and provide for remediation, enrichment, and acceleration.

3. The potential improvement of public relations with the year-round utilization of school facilities.

4. The opportunity to provide full-year contracts and higher salaries for teachers.

5. The prevention of the loss of learning and of study skill habits by students during the long summer vacation.

6. The potential of reducing the long summer vacation for students which often results in boredom, wasted time, and delinquency.

Actually, the term "year-round" is a misleading way to describe the experience from the student's point of view. He does not attend classes all year. In most cases, he gets as much vacation time as he ever did; it is just divided up differently. The school buildings, on the other hand, are used virtually all year long, usually with only brief shutdown periods. More accurately descriptive names for plans that do this would be "flexible school-year schedules" or "extended school-year schedules." At first these plans were simply attempts to make more efficient use of school buildings during the summer, but more recent interest has shifted its focus
to the various educational and sociological advantages inherent in the year-round school concept. Included among these are:

1. Redesigned curriculum with shorter courses offer greater variety of choices to students.
2. Students are better able to grasp the goals and objectives of shorter courses.
3. Students cannot fall too far behind in shorter courses compared to semester or full-year courses.
4. Learning retention and maintenance of study habits reduces the need for extensive review periods which are now required after the long summer vacation.
5. Over-all student attitude and achievement seem to be improved with year-round programs.

As one reviews the directories of year-round programs published by the National Council on Year-Round Education, he notes the vast variety of plans being considered. These plans include The Continuous Four-Quarter Plan, The Rotating Four-Quarter Plan more commonly known as the "45-15 Plan" with its many modifications, The "45-15 Block Plan", The Quinmester, The Trimester, The Quadramester, The Continuous School Year, The Extended School Year, The Flexible All-Year School, The Multiple Trails Plan, The Voluntary Summer Program,

An increasing volume of literature and research data became available on the subject of year-round education in the early 1970's. However, more recently the focus has shifted away from monographs and periodical articles to doctoral dissertations on specific aspects of year-round education. These will be described later in this chapter. Research available until recently consists mainly of feasibility studies, evaluation reports of implemented projects, independent studies, journal articles, and a few books. The most frequently considered topics deal with the financial aspects, attitudes toward the concept, and educational achievement studies. Empirical research is lagging in comparison to the conceptual, promotional and testimonial literature produced by school districts implementing programs. The decreasing enchantment with year-round schools as the answer to the complex problems facing education today is reflected in this trend.

Dissertations on this topic, produced more frequently in the past five years, cover a wide range of subjects including planning, administrative tasks, characteristics

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 6-11.
of school districts implementing year-round programs, and curriculum change. The group of 17 dissertations relating specifically to high schools combined with more general studies dealing with broad topics germaine to the study of year-round education programs in general provide most of the background information which is reviewed.

BOOKS RELATED TO YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

In addition to a number of studies in monograph form which have been produced by implementing school districts, state departments of education, colleges and universities, and other agencies, there are five recognized books published in the past decade which address themselves in some depth to the topic of year-round education. These books are reviewed because of their ready availability and their wide influence on the general topic of year-round education.

The Year-Round School--The "45-15" Breakthrough by Hermansen and Grove (1971) is essentially a case history written for the guidance of those interested in the "45-15" year-round school plan and its claims of bringing economy, accountability, and educational efficiency to schools.4 Using the case history of the Valley View School District of Illinois, the authors attempt to provide a chart for

---

navigating the path to pioneering the "45-15" plan. The first five chapters collect, condense and evaluate the literature about year-round education available in 1970. This presentation and the accompanying analysis are valuable in that they give the reader a general background regarding year-round education. The next six chapters record the evolution of Valley View's "45-15" plan, including the day-to-day problems which were confronted. The last four chapters are an appraisal of the program after the fact. The Valley View administrators look objectively at their solutions, failures, and successes. This work does contain valuable information for school districts considering the "45-15" plan based on the experiences of this pioneering year-round school district.

The authors stress the vital importance of teacher support for the plan which should result in reduced teacher turn-over. They indicate than an effective year-round program should result in improved learning retention and more flexibility in individualized instruction. They do stress that one should not expect to save money on teacher's salaries or on year-round operating costs.

A similar book was published in 1973. *Year-Round School Programs: A Case Study* by Servetter is a case study of the development of the implementation of the "45-15" year-round school program in Chula Vista City School District.
of California.\textsuperscript{5} The work considers the planning of the program, the implementation and operation during the first year of the program, and an evaluation including a section dealing with "What did we learn after one year of YRS?" Some interesting results included:

1. Parents favored year-round school strongly after one year of operation. (94% felt it was educationally better and 79% indicated they would support the plan.)

2. Teachers generally supported the program on educational grounds as well as their personal vacation scheduling.

3. There was no significant gain in academic standardized test scores by year-round students compared with those on the traditional schedule.

4. Administrators indicated an increased work load but they did feel that the YRS program was professionally stimulating and educationally beneficial for students.

5. Custodians indicated that there was increased wear and tear on furnishings and facilities.

\textsuperscript{5}Leonard Servetter, Year-Round School Programs: A Case Study, (Chula Vista, California: People Education and Communication Enterprises, Inc., 1973.)
Also, special schedules had to be made for special and heavy cleaning.

6. Operational costs of the program did not increase beyond that typically incurred on a per-pupil basis. The fact that a new school was not constructed saved the district $2,000,000.6

The final section of the book considers the future of year-round schools as seen by the leadership of the Chula Vista City School District. The administration presents a positive outlook in 1973 based on the overriding belief that "YRS is good for children."7 The information contained herein provides an insight similar to that included in the Valley View case study. The program developed in Chula Vista was for elementary schools, but it does give the reader some insights into year-round programs which can be of value in considering a high school program.

Perhaps the most comprehensive consideration of year-round education is Year-Round Education by McLain (1973).8 The Author, who is one of the moving forces in the National

---

6Ibid., pp. 93-144.

7Ibid., p. 150.

Council on Year-Round Education, believes that schools are obsolete and inadequate to provide the quality or quantity of education that is necessary for survival and the enhancement of humanity. His premise is that one answer is to make fuller use of existing school facilities, moving in the direction of better quality education along with the quantity of knowledge required to understand a rapidly changing environment. His consideration focuses on the significance of the taxpayer's revolt and the desire to save money.

McLain considers the meaning of year-round education and the economic, life style and instructional impact of such plans. In looking at the school of tomorrow, the author states that: "Such a school must be flexible, available at all times of the year to those who need it and able to deal with the broad spectrum of educational needs of those who use it."9

Of particular value is a section dealing with the transition to flexibility. In this section McLain deals with flexible schedules, individualization of instruction, course offerings and credit, and a self-renewing curriculum. In Chapter 10, "Strategies for Implementing Change at the Local Level," the author lists six basic steps for implementing change:

9 Ibid., p. 115.
1. "Identifying unmet needs."
2. "Identifying the resources that are available or may be made available to meet the needs."
3. "Considering the alternative ways the resources may be used to meet the needs."
4. "Selecting the most appropriate alternative."
5. "Making a commitment to a specific change."
6. "Executing the plan of action." \(^{10}\)

The first four may be described as a feasibility study, the last two as a plan for implementation. The remainder of the book considers the role of the state in year-round education and, finally, a review of the complexities of planning and implementation of such programs. Much of this work touches on valuable points which must be considered by school districts contemplating year-round school programs at any level. McLain brings together findings from various sources and draws some general conclusions which are quite valuable. Again, the author fails to treat the unique problems faced in implementing a high school level program in any depth.

Another recent work in the area of year-round education is Thomas's Administrator's Guide to the Year-Round School. \(^{11}\)

The basic theme of this work is an emphasis on economic and

\(^{10}\)Ibid., p. 167.

educational advantages of all-year school plans that can be sold to the general public. The author attempts to promote a more practical, clearer understanding of the continuous learning year as an answer to the problem of releasing classroom space and dollars while setting the stage for a more effective program of education. A cost analysis approach is used to show potential dollar savings to communities electing to adopt all-year school plans.

After reviewing the reasons given for supporting all-year school plans and those for opposing adoptions of all-year school plans, Thomas considers alternatives available. He presents an optimistic view of savings which can be realized by rescheduling the school year. The most significant areas of savings are:

1. Capital outlay since fewer school buildings and school buses are required.
2. Debt service since the need for new bond issues will be reduced.
3. Transportation since there is a reduced need for buses.
4. School plant operation and maintenance costs, particularly fixed costs.
5. Instruction resulting from staff reductions and reduced need for equipment, books, teaching tools, and supplementary material.
6. Fringe benefit costs which amount to 20-25% of most salary costs.

7. More property will be left on the tax rolls.12

While this book places emphasis on the economic objective, the point is made repeatedly that economy, in itself, will not suffice to win popular support. "Quality education is not to be sacrificed; therefore, supporters of an all-year school plan are urged to combine the educational and economic objectives," Thomas points out.13 Although more technical in nature, the author does include a consideration of the impact on teachers and students as well as on the basic issues created by year-round school programs. The focus in this work, as in the others, is more general in nature and does not deal specifically with high school programs.

The Four Quarter High School in Action by Henson is the only book dealing specifically with a year-round high school program.14 Atlanta has implemented a four-quarter program with students electing any three of the four quarters. The book discusses the benefits offered by the Four Quarter Program which include:

---

12Ibid., pp. 27-28.

13Ibid., p. 11.

1. An adequate four-quarter program must go beyond dividing the textbook material into quarter units instead of semester units. Extensive revision of educational goals and an intensive analysis of curriculum will result in productive and innovative changes.

2. With the four-quarter plan a school can offer greater flexibility both in scheduling and in curriculum options.

3. As the author states: "... once instituted, energies and creative abilities required to sustain the program in a dynamic and vibrant way exceed those required for initial implementation."

4. The four-quarter program is a process for providing quality education.

The author indicates that the motivation for year-round programs were: "(a) the impact of the knowledge explosion, (b) the need for a wider range of educational opportunities more inclusive than college preparatory, (c) the enhancing of the progression of teaching, and (d) the utilization of plants and facilities." Henson stresses later on in the first chapter that "all these reasons are important, but benefit

---

15 Ibid., p. 7.  
16 Ibid., p. 17
to pupils is the strongest argument for year-round schools. Bright pupils may broaden their educational experiences or accelerate with the possibility of completing 12 years in less time. Slow learners and pupils who fail could re-schedule unsuccessfully completed courses more frequently.\textsuperscript{17}

In reviewing the experiences of others, the author indicates that the three main reasons why districts discontinued or failed to sustain year-round programs were:

1. The public did not have adequate understanding and did not accept the program, largely because it was forced upon them.

2. Participation was compulsory, and both pupils and teachers were assigned the periods they would attend.

3. Economic savings were not immediately apparent and the motivating force of money was very high in "selling" the program.\textsuperscript{18}

The author stresses the importance of real involvement of staff, and community in preparing for the move to a year-round program. In developing curriculum the focus must be on flexibility, relevance, and individualization. The key to the program in Atlanta is to expand options through more effective scheduling and developing dynamic options in course offerings.

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid. \textsuperscript{18}Ibid.
The author also stresses the importance of adjusting the facilitating component to accommodate a year-round program. Some of the problems which must be dealt with include:

1. Redesigning the school calendar and meeting accreditation standards.
2. Maintaining class identity and meeting graduation requirements.
3. Redesigning report cards, permanent record cards, and diplomas.
4. Facilitating the conversion of credits and the placement of transfer students.
5. The provision for special activities for pupils including publications, clubs, athletics, bands, and other performing activities.
6. Teacher recruitment, contracts, and assignments.¹⁹

Henson stresses the importance of the restructuring of roles for satisfying performances in year-round programs. He feels that the principal takes the lead not only in administration but also in school climate and program implementation. The guidance counselors play a vital role in establishing a positive learning environment. Most important is the classroom teacher in dealing with individual pupils. Stress is also placed on providing help to teachers through support and supervisory personnel. In addition, in a year-round program

¹⁹Ibid.
the pupil becomes more responsible for his own learning. In Atlanta, the year-round program offers many examples of education for more self directed learning. The author cites a series of example programs developed in Atlanta high schools based on increased flexibility provided by the year-round schedule. A final chapter contains 57 pages of samples of Quarter Courses offered in Atlanta's 17 high schools.

This work offers the most significant information relating to year-round high school programs although it focuses on only one type of year-round schedule, the four-quarter plan. All-in-all, Henson's work does provide much valuable information which reflects on the subject of this study.

RESEARCH RELATED DIRECTLY TO THE STUDY

According to the National Council on Year-Round Education Research Department, there have been close to one hundred doctoral dissertations written on various aspects of year-round education.20 The majority of these dissertations tend to concentrate on the financial implications of year-round education, the attitudes of various groups toward year-round education, and historical reviews of year-round programs. Others focus on the feasibility or the projected impact of year-round education programs on specific school districts.

or geographic areas. As was noted earlier, there were 17 dissertations which dealt directly with year-round high school programs and these along with other pertinent literature is presented in this section.

This section reviews doctoral dissertations and other forms of research as they relate to the major topics considered in this study. The major topics considered include:

1. Types of Year-Round Programs Implemented
2. Motives for Year-Round Schools
3. Characteristics and Approaches to Year-Round Programs
4. Curriculum and Instruction
5. Finance
6. Scheduling
7. Allocation of Personnel
8. Facilities and maintenance
9. Transportation
10. School Lunch
11. Student Activities and Athletics

Types of Year-Round Programs Implemented

According to the National Council on Year-Round Education, high school programs which have been implemented in the United States utilize seven basic calendars. Those utilized include: The Four Quarter Plan, The Trimester, The Quinmester, The Flexible All Year Plan, The "45-15" Plan, "Concept 6", and
"Concept 8".

The Four-Quarter Plan was implemented in the high schools of Fulton County (Atlanta) Georgia in 1968. Although the Four-Quarter Plan is one of the best known plans and was the plan most frequently used earlier, the implementation of the plan in the high schools in Atlanta seemed to touch off the year-round school movement again. The plan divides the calendar into four twelve-week periods: Fall, winter, spring, and summer. Students may select or are assigned to any combination of three of the four quarters. They may attend the fourth on a voluntary basis if there is a desire. The curriculum is divided so that each quarter is a separate entity.21

The Trimester Plan has been attempted off and on over the years. The true year-round trimester version has never stuck in the public schools. The plan calls for three equal semesters throughout the year. Students select or are assigned to two of the three semesters. The major problem with this plan has been that there are not enough calendar days to provide for three 88-90 day terms.22

The Quinmester Plan was developed in Dade County, Florida including high schools in the initial program. The


22Ibid., pp. 10-11.
Quinmester offers five nine-week semesters, or terms, or blocks of time. Students attend any four of the five if it is voluntary or are assigned four of the five if mandated. This plan has been particularly popular at the high school level, especially those high schools which already have strong summer school programs which can easily be converted to a nine-week semester. Each course must be put into a nine-week package so that a student begins and ends the course within the nine-week period.23

The Flexible All Year Plan was developed in the A.B.C. Unified School District in Artesia, California, near Los Angeles. Basically, this plan calls for school to be open approximately 240 days per year. To operate this plan, teachers must be willing to individualize learning. Students, parents, and teachers have three choices under this plan.

1. They may attend only the 175 (California) required days, but these days may be spread over the 240—this is possible because the curriculum is individualized.

2. They may attend the traditional nine-month calendar, they can start by a set date in September and finish by an agreed upon date in June—175 (California) days after they start.

23Ibid., p. 9.
3. They may attend up to all 240 days if that is desirable—thus additional learning opportunities are available, although only 175 (California) days are required.24

The "45-15" Plan was developed in 1970 by the Valley View School District in Romeville, Illinois. This development has been considered for the past decade as the most significant development in year-round scheduling. The "45-15" Plan remains the most popular program to this day according to the latest information provided by the National Council on Year-Round Education.25 There are several variations on the "45-15" Plan in operation. The basic plan known is "The 45-15 Staggered Plan," which divides the school population into four equal groups either by choice or by district mandate. Each group or "track" attends for 45 school days and then takes 15 school days of vacation. Three of the four groups or "tracks" are in attendance at school and one group is on vacation at all times, thus permitting the school plant to house four students in facilities designed for three—a one-third (33 1/3%) increase in capacity of the school plant.

24 Ibid., p. 11

Utilization of "The 45-15 Block Plan" has the entire school in attendance for 45 school days and on vacation for 15 school days. Although this approach does not increase plant capacity, there appear to be educational advantages according to the Hayward Unified School District.26

"Concept 6" has been used successfully at both the elementary and secondary school levels. It is the best space-saver of the current year-round calendars, if implemented on a mandated basis.27 Students are divided into three groups. One group is always on vacation thus providing 50% more space. "Concept 6" provides for six terms of approximately 40 days each. Students attend four of the six, but attend each two of their four terms consecutively. "Concept 6" seems to have caught on as a viable approach to year-round high school programs, particularly in Florida and Colorado.28

"Concept 8" is one of the newest year-round plans. The year is divided into eight six-week blocks of time. If it is a voluntary plan, students choose any six of the eight


28Statements by administrators from Colorado and Florida, Personal interview, San Diego, California, February 11, 1979 - San Francisco, California, April 22, 1980.
terms. If it is a mandatory program, students are assigned to six terms to balance the enrollment; usually terms 1 and 5, 2 and 6, 3 and 7, and 4 and 8 are paired with students following the two assigned as their vacations. The plan requires that the curriculum be placed in six-week units. This makes it appealing to secondary programs. 29

Motivations for Year-Round Schools

A review of the literature indicates that the prime motivating factors for implementing a year-round educational program can be summarized under the categories of alleviating overcrowding, obtaining financial savings, and improving the educational programs.

Glines in a recent article in dealing with his philosophy of year-round education places his order of priority on the reasons for adopting year-round programs. First, twelve month calendars are more humane by permitting learning interests, vacations, and other activities of life to better fit the personal needs of each individual and family. Second, year-round programs extend the learning opportunities available to all students by keeping schools open more days and by increasing the learning choices offered. Third in priority he indicates a savings in human, physical, and fiscal

29Bragg, op. cit., p. 8.
resources which relate to the commonly expressed motivations of alleviating overcrowding and obtaining fiscal savings by avoiding capital outlay and in some cases making operational savings.\(^{30}\)

Malone indicated in a 1974 article that the prime motivation for Pasco County, Florida, to adopt the "45-15" concept was to avoid triple sessions, to reduce the number of new schools to be built, and to encourage schools to "open up" and improve the curriculum by individualizing instruction for the students within the district.\(^{31}\)

Caldeira in his dissertation concluded that year-round schedules have been implemented after study by parents, staff, and in most cases students in a variety of locations in California and nationwide.\(^{32}\) The major reasons for implementing year-round schedules were to conserve space, improve curriculum, and offer attendance options.

In his book regarding the first modern-day high school program in Fulton County, (Atlanta) Georgia, Henson indicates that although the more efficient utilization of school plant

---


\(^{32}\)Chester Caldeira, "Year-Round Schedules of the Secondary School (9-12) Level," Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1977.)
and facilities is an important motivating factor, the
greatest mandates for such changes are the impact of the
knowledge explosion, the need for a wider range of educational
opportunities, and the enhancing of the profession of teaching.
Henson emphasizes that "All these reasons are important, but
benefit to pupils is the strongest argument for year-round
schools.34

Many year-round school programs are pragmatically
implemented to meet the problems of overcrowding resulting
from increasing population. Others are motivated by economy
minded citizens and educators who believe that they can save
a substantial sum, particularly if major capital expenditures
can be avoided or delayed. The most commendable motivation
is well stated by Heller and Bailey: "There is much agreement
among educators that the curricular program and its results
upon the achievement of students should be the primary concern
for any school contemplating conversion to year-round
education."35

Characteristics and Approaches to Year-Round Programs

A broad spectrum of literature has been written
regarding characteristics and approaches to year-round school
programs, but very little has been done dealing directly with programs at the secondary level (9-12). The following is a review of the more significant research done dealing with year-round programs in general as well as high school programs.

Akers in his dissertation pointed out that the most important predictor of whether or not a district implemented year-round school program was the attitude of the teachers, administrators, parents, students, and the business community. He also noted that more full-scale models of year-round schools were implemented in elementary schools and more restricted models at the secondary level.36

Leffel's study determined that the actual planning styles utilized were associated with the size of the district, the wealth of the district, the amount of budget available for planning, the type of year-round calendar being considered and the individual or group who assumed primary responsibility for the planning. The study also indicated that the planning of school districts did not use a systematic planning process.37


In his study of the schools of Prince William County, Virginia, Movnie found that the implementation of a pilot program did not result in the generation of necessary data to make the decision to continue, extend, or terminate the program. He also found that additional opportunities were not provided for remedial work, enrichment, and acceleration in the pilot year-round schools.  

The importance of the individuality of each school and/or district is emphasized by the results of Saunder's dissertation. This study concluded that what could be feasible for one school district, might well be incompatable for another. It was concluded that extended school year plans should reflect the needs, objectives, and composition of the individual school district. In discussing perceptions of year-round programs by parents, students, and staff, Byrne indicates the conclusion that since resistance to any form of change can always be anticipated, districts desiring to change school calendars should take the necessary steps to assure that the individuals involved understand the reasons


for the change and how the change will be beneficial to them.  

Fifteen year-round programs in the United States were surveyed by Lyday in his analysis of certain selected programs. Some of his findings were: (1) education improved after implementation of the program with students showing positive attitudinal change; (2) generally year-round programs reported greater program flexibility, a greater capacity of individualization, and a greater variety of course offerings; (3) more money was spent in the move to year-round programs on feasibility studies than any other item, with curriculum revision second. The local community was said to be the primary source of funds.

The area of feasibility studies was investigated by McCarter in a dissertation. The results of his study was a series of recommendations which are summarized below:

1. A school board appointed committee should determine the format and procedures for a feasibility study of year-round education, administer the survey, and prepare and present the report of its findings and recommendations.

---

40 Joyce Byrne, "Year-Round Education as Perceived by Parents, Students and Staff," (Doctoral Dissertation, United States International University, 1975).

2. All segments of the school and community should be given the opportunity to become fully informed and involved.

3. In funding feasibility studies, school districts should consider investigating the possibility of obtaining state or federal funds for preparing and conducting research.

4. The possibility of a joint study with contiguous school districts should also be considered.

5. A good public relations program is very important for both planning and implementing year-round education.42

Russell conducted a study of circumstances surrounding the selection of non-traditional methods of organizing school time, i.e., split-shift and year-round schools.43 The most significant recommendations he made: (1) any decision to change from a traditional time organization should be broadly based with representation from all concerned groups; (2) a school adopting a year-round program should consider starting

---


the cycle in late August or early September to reduce problems of transferring students; (3) when considering a non-traditional time organization, a district should make careful financial projections, especially considering the financial impact of lower student attendance; and (4) schools considering adoption of non-traditional time organization should focus on education, rather than economic advantages of various plans.

Curriculum and Instruction

The area of curriculum and instruction is one of particular concern to those implementing a year-round program at the high school level. In discussing the implementation of year-round programs with line administrators in schools involved in the process, the topic of curriculum and instruction was one of the first to come up.

Caldeira noted that curriculum was modified in all but one program to offer a greater number of non-sequential courses, and a greater number of courses. He pointed out that careful analysis of teaching practices and course content was a by-product of the conversion to year-round scheduling. He noted that the curriculum should be analyzed and necessary modifications should occur at the early stages of implementation. He also noted that non-sequential courses were common and were recommended. Caldeira stressed the importance of the evaluation of secondary year-round programs. It is vital that school districts carefully design an evaluation procedure
capable of determining the effect of the schedule on learning and course content.  

Chapman in his study of operation of Illinois Township High School District 211 (Valley View, Illinois), which was on the "45-15" plan, indicated that all the high school courses had to be re-organized on a quarter (9 week) basis to implement the plan.  

Also, the tuition-free summer school program would have to be eliminated. He concluded that the elimination of the summer school program would seriously lessen opportunities for students in remedial and enrichment programs. He recommended that the district explore the re-organization of the school year into three quarters and the expansion of summer session into an optimal tuition free quarter. (Atlanta has been doing this since 1968).

Crawford considered problems of social studies teachers in quinmester extended year senior high schools in Florida. The highest priority problems were centered around the adaptability of teaching materials to the mini-course application, teaching strategies related to individualizing instruction, and faculty involvement in planning the curriculum offerings. Problems identified as unique to the quinmester program centered around lack of continuity related to non-

---

44 Caldeira, loc. cit.
45 Chapman, loc. cit.
sequential mini-courses. Emergent problems seemed to center around personal interactions in the classroom and adaption of commercially produced materials to short non-sequential courses. 46

Phillips investigated curriculum changes made by two school districts adopting a 45-15 year-round program. 47 A variety of aspects of curricular operation as well as scheduling, attendance, reporting procedures, and attitudes of parents, students and teachers were studied for three years prior to and one year following implementation of the year-round plan. It was found that considerable curricular change occurred with the change to year-round school. Curriculum guides in all areas were developed and increased, expenditures were made for instructional equipment and materials. In addition, teachers, parents and students expressed a favorable attitude toward the year-round school after its first year of operation.

46Glenda Crawford, "Curriculum Problems of Social Studies Teachers in Quinmester Extended Year Senior High Schools of Dade County, Florida, as Perceived by Social Studies Teachers and Assistant Principals for Curriculum," (Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1974).

Richetts studied the effects of Concept 6 on student achievement and attitudes as part of his doctoral research conducted in the Colorado Springs, Colorado, schools. Student achievement for those on Concept 6 calendar was neither better nor worse than those on a conventional calendar, a conclusion reached in many other studies of the same nature. Attitudes of Concept 6 students were more positive toward themselves and school than were the attitudes of students in the nine-month school. Teachers, central staff and parents all held positive attitudes toward Concept 6 over the conventional school year.

Glines in an article on year-round implementation considered "Creative Curriculum and 100 Percent Space Increase." He indicated that "if maximum space is really a problem, to the extent YRE must be mandated, yet the district wants to move toward creative living-learning systems as an option for some, while still maintaining structured curriculum for others, the following plan can increase high school capacity by 100 percent." He suggests students be divided into four equal groups. At any one time two groups would be in

---


50 Ibid.
the school building, one group would be in school but on community projects, independent study, and parkway type learning activities, while the fourth group would be on vacation. In conclusion, Glines notes, "the space age potential of YRE is truly yet ahead for creative inventors."^51

Finance

There has been more literature written about the financial implications of the year-round school than any other topic. The prime motivation for initiating year-round education programs has more times than not been financial. Creasey made a study of the Aliquippa, Pennsylvania, schools which implemented a year-round four-quarter plan in 1928.52 He found that the year-round program at Aliquippa was initiated as a result of rapidly increasing pupil enrollment, legal debt limitations restricting a building program, and a superintendent prone to seek unusual solutions to educational problems. Early cost analysis completed by La Mesa-Spring Valley School District in California and Valley View School District in Illinois indicated that there were substantial savings to be gained from the 45-15 plan. The La Mesa-Spring Valley study showed a gain in cost for Average Daily Attendance of $2.86

---

51Ibid.
the first year followed by reductions in cost per ADA of $2.68 the second year, $18.76 the third year, $22.54 the fourth year, and $25.00 the fifth year.\(^{53}\) The Valley View study showed a saving of $32.96 per pupil for the first year of operation.\(^{54}\)

Chapman in his study of Illinois Township High School District 211 (Valley View) concluded that the avoidance of the construction of an entire building would save the district about $307,900 yearly.\(^{55}\) Other savings were possible for maintenance and operational costs (about $19,000 yearly) and for equipment (about $45,000 yearly). He noted that administrator salaries, air conditioning costs, and teacher salaries would increase although savings would be gained in fringe benefits and teacher salaries if they were employed year-round. His conclusion was that economies are possible largely because the construction of a sixth high school, and resultant debt service costs could be avoided.


\(^{54}^{54}\)"Year-Round Schools - The 45-15 Plan," No. 27 in the series of PREP Reports, DHEW Publ. #(OE) 72-9, Natural Center for Educational Communication.

One of the earliest studies of the financial implications of year-round schools was done by Lloyd. His study of financial implications of a year-round school schedule in California determined that program extension costs more money but at a proportionately lower per ADA cost than that of the traditional session. Year-round plans which provide for staggered attendance on a mandated basis can preclude costs of construction, equipment and debt service, thus resulting in a less per pupil cost. There is also some indication in this limited sampling made by Lloyd that there is a significant possibility of less per pupil costs in overall operating expenditures.

In Ricketts' study of year-round schools in District #11 (Colorado Springs, Colorado) it was found that operating costs for "Concept 6" year-round schools were slightly higher than costs for schools on double session but lower than for schools with normal enrollments if teachers are allowed to teach five of the six sessions. He also determined that districts with growing enrollments will save capital costs if Concept 6 will facilitate economies of scale since a school could accommodate 150 percent of its normal capacity.57


57 Ricketts, loc. cit.
Plank made a study of selected year-round educational programs with economic objectives.\textsuperscript{58} One purpose of this study was to analyze the feasibility of plans for year-round education which had economy as a major objective. His findings indicated that one Illinois district reported spending more for air-conditioning, staff committee work, and consultant help. On the other hand, savings were recorded from postponing construction projects, grants received to study the 45-15 plan, and decreased need for classrooms. Although there was little evidence of financial savings if school days were provided in addition to the traditional school year, he reported that financial savings did result when the program featured mandatory staggered attendance patterns and great utilization of available school buildings.

In a presentation made to the 1972 National Seminar on Year-Round Education, Bauman, Professor of Finance, University of Oregon, and another long time advocate of year-round schooling, anticipated long-run savings in every budget category with the exception of Administration, where he anticipated a one percent increase. He estimated that the overall

\textsuperscript{58}Karl Plank, "A Study of Selected Year-Round Educational Programs with Economy Objectives," (Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1971).
savings in total expenditures to be 8.8%.  

Thomas contended some years ago that certain year-round plans could be adopted to achieve a measure of economy. He placed emphasis on the potential of savings in capital outlay, debt service, operation, maintenance and transportation. In his 1973 book, Administrator's Guide to the Year-Round School, Thomas devoted most of his consideration to the potential financial savings which can be realized from year-round education programs. He envisioned potential savings from year-round operations in the following categories:

1. Realizing economy objectives through releasing classroom space.

2. Cost reduction possibilities in current expense categories including: school plant operations, food service programs, school administration, and school bus transportation.

3. The dollar value of teacher staff reduction.


60 George I. Thomas, An Address, "Guidelines to Those Interested in Rescheduling of the School Year Calendar," County of Santa Clara, Year-Round Education Conference, May 6, 1971.

61 Thomas, loc. cit.
In summarizing his presentation, Thomas pointed out that: "Research shows that many of the objectives raised against all year school programs of the past stem from the refusal to introduce a measure of flexibility not encountered in regular school year programs. Administrative flexibility and teacher flexibility are prerequisites for the long range success of recommended continuous learning programs."62

The most significant research on the financial aspects of year-round education is the "Pajaro Valley Study" (California) completed in November, 1978, by Stanford Research Institute International, Menlo Park, California. One aspect of this study was to assess the economic impact of the year-round school program. The result was summarized in a recent article: "We found that the YRS program reduced PVUSD's annual per-pupil cost of education by 4.1%, producing an annual saving of more than $150,000. More than 90% of this saving resulted from more efficient use of classrooms and schools."63

The authors of the Pajaro Study in summarizing their findings provide a cogent summary to the review of the literature regarding the financial implications of year-round education:

62Ibid., p. 27.

It is difficult to say, based on this study and the flawed studies elsewhere in the literature, precisely how much a YRS program can save a school district. A few studies report increased costs of 1% to 3%; most have found savings of up to 8%. We think that a school can reasonably expect to save about 8% on its total annual budget with a carefully planned YRS program.64

Scheduling

Scheduling critics of year-round education programs at the high school level, especially the 45-15 model, hypothesize that high schools cannot adequately deal with the plan's problems, administrators or teachers. The investigator has found that most educators are very quick to question the feasibility of scheduling students. Malone, principal of Pasco Comprehensive Senior High School in Dade City, Florida, summarized his experience with scheduling with the 45-15 plan:

In summary, then, the scheduling procedures under the 45-15 plan do present a multitude of problems, necessitating the expenditure of an enormous amount of time by the guidance staff. We believe, however, with conscientious effort and continued refinement of the scheduling procedures, the student scheduling tasks are not insurmountable. One thing is sure, the larger the school population, significantly fewer problems occur in the overall scheduling process.65

64Ibid., p. 17.

Deason in his study of teacher attitudes in secondary 45-15 year-round school programs determined that there was a significant need to explore methods to improve program flexibility. In particular he found that considerable study should be made to improve the scheduling of courses such as band, chorus, drama and other performing groups. He also concluded that research to improve the scheduling of classes should be pursued by districts involved in 45-15 programs.66

In this study "Year-Round School: Feasibility and Effects of the 45-15 Plan," Moortgat concluded that a major aspect of concern in implementing the 45-15 plan was course tracking or the organization of the high school course offerings into four tracks while avoiding as much as possible, duplication of courses and at the same time offering in each track all the specific courses each student will need to meet the requirements of his chosen curriculum. He feels that this is instrumental to success for the 45-15 plan at the high school level.67


Many advocates of year-round education believe that the emphasis on the costly nature of scheduling of a year-round program may be exaggerated. Thomas notes:

The criticism is frequently made that extra costs will occur with the continuous learning year plan because schools will have to be rescheduled several times a year. In many schools computer scheduling for initial pupil placement in classes and buses can be an asset, but the computer need not be a prerequisite for implementing a continuous learning year plan.68

He goes on to note that:

Recommended continuous learning plans do not call for a major rescheduling of pupils at the elementary and secondary school levels throughout the year. Once a school system has instituted the new program it is conceivable that true continuity of learning . . . can allow a school to operate for several years with any rescheduling.69

Elk Grove Unified School District near Sacramento, California, did extensive research into the utilization of computer assisted programs in their feasibility study of year-round high school programs. Williams, the project director, described the scheduling procedure in some detail in the second draft of "An Analysis of Major Factors to be Evaluated in Changing to the 45-15 Year-Round School Program." He indicated that:

68Thomas, op. cit., pp. 151-152.
69Ibid.
The computer program developed by SRI and McClellan assigns approximately one-fourth of the students to each track. Track assignments, and consequently class schedules and vacation cycles, are a function of student course requests and not geographical area.70

It is interesting that the district decided against implementing a year-round high school program, but that scheduling was an aspect of the program which they felt would work efficiently. Henson devotes two chapters in his work to the topic of scheduling.71 In chapter four he considers "Expanding Options through Effective Scheduling in Year-Round Education." Here he showed how more effective scheduling can accomplish several goals including: match the learners and the courses, getting the most from time, space and resources, and enlarging learning possibilities through independent study and contracts-acceleration, joint enrollment, and work experience. Chapter five deals with redesigning the school calendar and meeting accreditation standards. He believes that the year-round calendar offers significant opportunities to improve the entire educational process.72


71Henson, op. cit., pp. 63-93.

72Ibid., p. 78.
It appears that although scheduling is very complex, particularly with the 45-15 Plan, a number of high schools including those from Valley View, Pasco County, and San Juan (Sacramento) have overcome the problems. Scheduling in the Four Quarter, Concept Six, Concept Eight and other plans is less complex and thus more effective.

Allocation of Personnel

The topic of Allocation of Personnel deals with two areas of concern: administration and teaching personnel. This is probably the most crucial area because if personnel are not supportive of an innovative program in education, it is doomed to failure.

Administrators are given a substantially greater workload with the implementation of a year-round program. Williams indicates that: "The 45-15 would make extra demands on the High School administration and would require a net increase of $4,959.00 in administrative salaries." In a study of administrative work load, Johnson investigated time spent on administrative tasks by elementary principals. The results of this study can be projected to the high school level. Johnson's findings indicate that year-round school

73 Williams, op. cit. p. 347.

principals reported increases in time spent in all administrative areas. The greatest increases were in the task areas of professional growth and pupil and parent concerns. Johnson concluded that year-round principals were spending more time with outside activities and less time in the areas of curriculum, instruction and staff.75

Henson in his work on the Atlanta Four-Quarter Plan discussed the role of the administrator in the year-round high school. He noted that:

Since the program operates four quarters a year, it is necessary for the principal to work full time, taking a long weekend occasionally rather than an extended rest during the summer. In addition, a week or ten days vacation, scheduled at less demanding times such as the Christmas vacation and immediately after a new quarter is running smoothly, seems to be adequate to refresh most high school principals.76

He goes on to comment on the complexity of the task, noting that assistance is needed:

Teachers, department chairmen, assistant principals, schedule chairmen, and others must have clearly defined roles and responsibilities where decisions of the standard operating procedure type can be made without the principal being present at all meetings.77

75Ibid.
76Henson, op. cit., pp. 105-106.
77Ibid., p. 106.
Webb in her dissertation concluded:

1. That the economic status of the teacher will increase as a result of the year-round school due to increased salaries resulting from extended teaching contracts.

2. That retirement benefits will not be significantly increased.

3. That teachers will not have an increased sense of financial security as a result of year-round school because of the uncertainty connected with summer employment outside of schools.

4. That the professional status of the teachers will not be improved as a result of year-round school.

5. That teachers' special skills and knowledge will be better utilized.78

Deason in his study of teacher attitudes in secondary 45-15 year-round schools concluded that there was a significant need to explore methods to improve the program flexibility of the 45-15 plan. He found that teachers felt the need to be

more involved in all levels of planning and implementation. Some of his other findings included:

1. An attitude survey of teachers should be taken annually regarding working conditions.

2. Provision for adequate in-service training should be a priority.

3. Efforts should be made to improve communications with staff.

4. Administrators must be more concerned with teacher morale and should develop more cooperative decision making procedures.

5. Teachers should be given freedom of choice between year-round programs and traditional programs when possible.

6. Any year-round program should not be implemented unless a majority of teachers fully understand and support the program.79

McCowan made a study of staff attitudes and leadership styles of Department Chairmen as they relate to the 45-15 year-round secondary school.80 His study focused on Romeoville (Illinois) High School, the first secondary school in the

79Deason, loc. cit.

80Allen McCowan, "Staff Attitudes and Leadership Styles of Department Chairmen as They Relate to the 45-15 Year-Round Secondary School," (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1976).
nation to implement the "45-15" year-round plan. Based on the results of his study he concluded that:

1. There are differences in teacher attitudes concerning the implementation of the "45-15" year-round program which appear to be related to the leadership characteristics of the department chairman.

2. There are differences in teacher attitudes concerning the implementation of the "45-15" year-round program which appear to be related to the demographic make-up of the staff.81

The conclusion is clear - it is vital that the teachers and administration have some form of vested interest in supporting a year-round education plan. Any district considering the implementation of a year-round program at any level must first obtain overwhelming support from the staff or the program is doomed to failure.

Facilities and Maintenance

Little significant research has been done regarding the impact of year-round educational programs on facilities and maintenance.

81 Ibid.
Henson in his study found that:

Cleaning and maintenance are scheduled around the instructional program. Cleaning is done at night, late afternoon, and other times when pupils are not scheduled in rooms. Maintenance and repairs are either scheduled during vacation time or, on rare occasions, it becomes necessary to close an entire wing or section of the building for major repairs. This is no different, however, from the procedures followed by airports, hospitals and mercantile companies.\(^{82}\)

An interesting view regarding facilities and maintenance and year-round education can be found in Thomas's Administrator's Guide to the Year-Round School:

In a number of school systems, the summer is a period in which maintenance work is done and the schools are thoroughly cleaned. The custodians are often assisted by part-time help in June, July and August, with the result that schools open in September literally gleaming. Without a good year-round maintenance program the buildings soon begin to show the sign of wear. A Continuous Learning Year Program will often force a school system to adopt the more costly all year maintenance approach.\(^{83}\)

In his monograph "Guidelines to Those Interested in the Rescheduling of the School Year Calendar," Thomas indicated that "Taxpayers are seldom conscious of the fact that school costs increase when a new school is opened."\(^{84}\) He goes on to

---

\(^{82}\)Henson, op. cit., p. 159.

\(^{83}\)Thomas, op. cit., p. 137.

\(^{84}\)Thomas, op. cit., p. 5.
indicate that if a school is not built or if one can be closed
the savings on school plant operation and maintenance becomes
a dollar savings which more than offsets the cost of operating
the school through all or part of the summer.

A less optimistic consideration of the question of
facilities and maintenance was expressed by Williams from Elk
Grove, California. He noted that:

With the exception of a possible two-week
school closing in June, the 45-15 schedule
leaves little time to do the jobs which can
only be done when students are not present.
Vacation relief and increased work also have
to be considered. 85

He also noted that:

It has been suggested that year-round school
would require more energy because of need
to keep buses, air-conditioners, etc.,
operating on a 12-month basis. Actually
45-15 should use less energy than any other
system. 86

There appears to be a need for more research to
determine the impact of year-round scheduling on facilities
and maintenance. It seems that although there are significant
problems in this area there are creative alternatives which
can be implemented in dealing with these problems.

Transportation

Little significant research has been done regarding

85 Williams, op. cit., p. 348.
86 Ibid.
the impact of year-round programs on transportation. McLain found that:

The number of buses needed at any one time would be reduced. However, each bus would be used longer each year and would wear out sooner. If the cost per pupil-mile remained constant, so would the cost of buses. Transportation insurance per bus probably would increase, but the number of buses would decrease so this item in the budget should be the same. 87

A significant comment on transportation costs was made by Thomas:

School systems with high transportation costs can reduce the need for buses and bus drivers. While the major saving may be in capital expense, some savings will generally be evident in operational costs. 88

He also devoted an entire chapter of his book Administrator's Guide to the Year-Round School to transportation. A summary of the basic thrust of Chapter Seven "Projecting Potential Savings in School Bus Transportation" is found earlier in the text:

Direct savings in the form of reduced need for buses will occur since fewer children will have to be transported. Indirect savings occur through reducing the number of buses operated at any one time on the over crowded highways early

87 McLain, op. Cit., p. 51.
88 Thomas, op. cit., p. 6.
in the morning and at the end of the day. Fewer drivers and supportive staff will be required as well as less garage space for storage and maintenance. 89

In his study of the per-pupil cost of a nine-month school program vs. the 45-15 continuous school year plan, Slater concluded that the 45-15 continuous school year plan did result in a savings in pupil transportation which could be applied to other budget categories. 90 However, Chapman has developed hard data in his study of Illinois Township High School District 211 (Valley View). His study indicated that greater numbers of pupils would be transported with the year-round school program and that additional pupils would increase total transportation costs to about $265,000 for the four years from 1976-77 to 1979-80. 91

In the Elk Grove Study Williams indicated that at first it appeared that transportation costs would increase under 45-15 because buses were used all year and the entire district had to be covered as it was. 92 A more careful review of transportation schedules by the transportation director indicated that a savings would occur under the 45-15 plan because fewer buses could do the job (with 25% fewer students

89Thomas, op. cit., p. 27.
90Slater, loc. cit.
91Chapman, loc. cit.
92Williams, op. cit., p. 349.
to pick-up) in the more densely populated areas.

Potential savings in the area of transportation costs depends a great deal on the situation in each district. It does appear that with effective planning and management a savings can be attained.

School Lunch

The least amount of research dealing with any year-round topic deals with the school lunch program.\(^{93}\) In discussions with administrators and teachers of year-round high schools, the researcher found that the topic of the school lunch program was rarely brought up. It appeared that the main significance was the school cafeteria had to be operated for more days seeing that the school year was extended.

Thomas deals with the topic of "Potential Savings in the Food Service Program." He noted that savings come for the most part in capital outlay and debt service when a new school does not have to be constructed due to a year-round program. He also indicated that a small saving may also accrue due to reduced operating expenses. The key point is made in that,

since most school boards try to make lunch programs a self-sustaining operation any potential savings in cafeteria operations

\(^{93}\)Thomas, op. cit., pp. 147-148.
with the rescheduling of the school year will be small and inconsequential to the taxpayer. 94

It would appear that due to the expectation that the school lunch program will be self-sustaining, this area of operation is not a significant factor in consideration of implementing a year-round program at the high school level.

Student Activities and Athletics

Among the first battery of questions asked by those trying to acquire more information about 45-15 year-round high schools is "How does the 45-15 affect athletics, band, and clubs?" Malone points out that at Pasco Comprehensive High School "vacationing" students have to volunteer to return to school to participate in athletics, band, and clubs. 95 He noted that this necessity does not appear to hinder the activity or the student. It is his opinion that: "In some cases, extracurricular activities are strengthened, while in other instances 45-15 proves to be a handicap. Only time will permit precise assessment of this situation. 96

Two doctoral dissertations suggested that administrations implementing a year-round high school program must be careful of the impact on student activities and athletics. Caldeira found that co-curricular programs were generally

94 Thomas, loc. cit.
95 Malone, op. cit., p. 20.
96 Ibid.
not affected by the change to a year-round program.\textsuperscript{97} He did recommend that the co-curricular program be designed for involvement by all students wishing to participate. Deason found that special attention should be given to improvement of the extra-curricular programs in the 45-15 schools be studied. He also saw the need to refine the scheduling of courses such as band, chorus, drama and other performing groups.\textsuperscript{98}

In her study: "Jupiter High School's Year-Round Program with Mandated Attendance by Track," (Florida) Neal uncovered some interesting information regarding the transition from the traditional calendar to Concept 6.\textsuperscript{99} First, the percentage of students participating in school clubs actually increased with implementation of a year-round program. Secondly, there was no significant differences in the mean participation in intramural sports between the year immediately preceding Concept 6 and the first year of Concept 6. Thirdly, there was no significant difference in the mean participation in interscholastic sports between the year immediately preceding Concept 6 and the first year of Concept 6.

Reflecting on the impact of the four-quarter plan in Atlanta in extracurricular activities, Henson noted that:

\textsuperscript{97}Caldeira, loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{98}Deason, loc. cit

Extracurricular activities can be greatly enhanced through the quarter program, especially if pupils attend more than three quarters each year. Service activities such as the yearbook, newspaper, drama, and similar programs can be scheduled during the school day the same as any other class.\textsuperscript{100}

In considering athletic programs he noted that:

This flexibility of scheduling permits a wide range of sports, both competitive and intramural, to be offered in seasons when inexpensive equipment and facilities may be used.\textsuperscript{101}

Regarding eligibility for athletics Henson noted that there was no real problem as long as the state regulatory agency is flexible. Thomas showed that extra-curricular activities such as band, chorus, and drama can maintain more continuity with the year-round scheduling. He also felt that the athletic program could function with little or no problems.\textsuperscript{102}

The synthesis of information available indicates that, although more research is needed, the problems initiated by year-round scheduling can be overcome.

**SUMMARY**

In summarizing this review of the literature, the research done by Baughman should be emphasized.\textsuperscript{103} He

\textsuperscript{100}Henson, op. cit. pp. 154-155.

\textsuperscript{101}Ibid., p. 96.

\textsuperscript{102}Thomas, op. cit., pp. 224-225.

\textsuperscript{103}Calvin Baughman, "Year-Round School: A Comparative Study of Successful Extended School Year Programs in the United States," (Doctoral Dissertation, Miami University, 1972).
noted in his conclusions that there are far fewer successful extended school year programs in the United States than the volume of literature suggests. He concluded that stretching the school budget dollar is no longer the primary motive for year-round school adoption and that the movement into year-round programs is being done cautiously.

The situation today is comparable to 1975 when Helton indicated that most of the claims being made for year-round schools are without the documented evidence required for general acceptance, and that further research is needed to verify the impact of year-round programs at the high school level.104

A summary of the thrust of the literature dealing with the major areas of consideration in this research follows:

1. Type of Year-Round Programs Implemented.
   The most predominant high school programs reported were the 45-15 plan, the four-quarter plan, and the "up-and-coming" Concept 6 plan. The quinmester seemed to be lagging of late while the flexible all year plan, Concept 8 and the trimester have never really caught on.

2. **Motivations for Year-Round Schools.**

The prime motivating factor for the implementation of most of the year-round school programs seemed in reality to be to meet the problems of over-crowding in districts which were experiencing an inordinate growth in school population. Several sources cited emphasized the curricular benefits of the program and the fact that such considerations should be the primary motivation for implementation of a year-round program. The impact on students was indicated as most significant.

3. **Characteristics and Approaches to Year-Round Programs.** It was clear that the most important predictor of the success of year-round programs was the attitude of teachers, administrators, parents, students, and the local community. The importance of the individuality of each school and/or district cannot be over emphasized. Year-round education offered another opportunity to improve educational programs to those educators who continually search for a media by which such improvements can be made.
4. **Curriculum and Instruction.** Obviously this is an area of vital concern in any innovative approach to education. The key step here seemed to be in the development of an individualized program to meet the needs of each student. The concept of year-round education offered those dedicated to innovation in education the avenue through which their aims might be accomplished. An important aspect of the implementation of a year-round program in the area of curriculum and instruction is the development of an effective and proscriptive evaluation process.

5. **Finance.** More literature has been devoted to the financial implication of year-round educational programs than any other. Early studies indicated some theoretical savings in specific areas when a year-round program was implemented. The over-all view indicates that financial savings of 4-8% may be attained in some operational areas with effective management. Cost savings of year-round programs seemed to be tied to the areas of capital expenditure and debt retirement.
It seemed that with some effort proponents of year-round programs can point to some gains due for year-round programs but that the real motivation for such programs must be educational gains for young people.

6. **Scheduling.** Although scheduling has been considered by many as a significant limitation to the implementation of a year-round program at the high school level, limited research indicated that this issue may have been over-stated. It appeared that a school with teachers and administrators who are dedicated to the year-round concept can overcome the technical and procedural problems of scheduling.

7. **Allocation of Personnel.** This was a very significant area of concern for those implementing a year-round high school program. The support of school personnel was vital to the successful implementation of a year-round education program. It was clear that the importance of attitudinal support for a year-round program by the teachers was vital to its success. Although administrators indicated that their time commitment
and responsibilities increased those who were really "sold" on the program welcomed the challenge and developed successful programs.

8. **Facilities and Maintenance.** There has been limited research produced in this area of concern. It seemed that, although there was increased wear and tear on facilities, those who were creative and innovative enough to adjust could implement year-round programs in spite of the traditional "anti-change" reactions by some traditionalists.

9. **Transportation.** Little research has been developed in this area of concern. It appeared that those who had taken the time to consider the cost factors of transportation felt that there was a potential opportunity for a cost savings with effective management. The impact in the area of transportation depended a great deal of each local situation.

10. **School Lunch.** This is another area where little research was done. It appeared that the area of cafeteria operation would have little impact on the decision to implement a year-round education program partly due to its self-supporting nature.
11. **Student Activities and Athletics.** Although many critics of year-round programs felt that this was an area of significant concern, the limited research in this area indicated that there was little concern regarding student activities and athletics. As with many other areas of concern, it appeared that when educators committed themselves to the year-round concept these areas of concern were effectively dealt with. The consensus of research seemed to be that care must be taken but that year-round scheduling can actually be beneficial to student activities and athletics.

Chapter Three presents the procedures of the study.
CHAPTER THREE
THE PROCEDURE

The two preceding chapters have dealt with the statement of the problem and the review of the related literature. This chapter presents the procedures used in the research. The following discussion considers the development of the questionnaire used to gather data and describes the distribution, collection, tabulation, and how the data gathered was treated and interpreted.

The purpose of this study was to identify the feasibility of year-round high school programs. Particular attention was given to: the process used in considering the feasibility and desirability of implementing the year-round high school program, the implementation procedures followed, a survey of the potential areas of concern, and a consideration of the reasons why those high schools who have dropped year-round programs did so.

It is understood that there are limitations in the use of mailed questionnaires as an effective data-gathering device; therefore, one must realize that many of the limitations of this study are related to this fact rather than to the device itself.

However, the use of a questionnaire seems justified for gathering data for this study because:
1. An earlier form of this questionnaire had been used previously to obtain data for a presentation to the 1979 meeting of the National Council on Year-Round Education which improved the validity of the instrument.

2. Due to the geographic dispersion of the year-round high school programs, a questionnaire was the only practical method for gathering data.

3. Due to the complexity of the questionnaire a telephone inventory was not practical.

Developing the Questionnaire

Six steps were followed in the development of the questionnaire for this study. The total process of this development took close to five years. The steps of development are listed below:

1. Upon deciding to focus attention on the implementation of high school year-round programs, the researcher wrote a letter\(^1\) to every school district in the United States involved with a high school level year-round education program. The needed

\(^1\)See Appendix "B".
information as to which districts were involved was gained from the Fifth Annual Directory of the National Council on Year-Round Education and in consultation with Donald Glines, then the Manager of the Year-Round Education Project of the California State Department of Education and the President of the National Council on Year-Round Education.²

Information in response to the letter was received from the following sources:

- A.B.C. Unified School District (Artesia) California
- Big Bear Unified School District, California
- Champlain Valley Unified School District, New Hampshire
- Chino Unified School District, California
- Corono-Norco Unified School District, California
- Dade County School District, Florida
- Fresno Unified School District, California
- Fulton County High School District (Atlanta) Georgia
- Jefferson County School District, R-1, Colorado
- Jefferson County School District, (Louisville) KY
- Los Angeles Unified School District, California,
  Sylmar High School

Milpitas Unified School District, California
Nevada Union High School District (Grass Valley) California
Northville Public Schools, Michigan
Pasco County Public Schools, Florida
Phoenix Union High School District, Arizona
Prince William County School District, Virginia
Rim of the World Unified School District (Lake Arrowhead) California
San Bernadino Unified School District, California
San Juan Unified School District (Sacramento) California
Sunnyside Unified School District (Tucson) Arizona
Valley View School District (Romeville) Illinois
Virginia Beach School District, Florida
West Palm Beach Unified School District, Florida

2. Based upon the information received and personal visits to four California year-round high schools: Cerritos High School (A.B.C. Unified School District), Big Bear High School, Nevada Union High School, and Mesa Verde High School (San Juan Unified School District--Sacramento), the researcher began to formulate the questionnaire. Most valuable information was also gained from time spent at Milpitas Unified School District during the researcher's sabbatical. Milpitas and Samuel Ayer High Schools were visited during their one
year of year-round operation, and it was therefore possible to gather a great deal of valuable information relating to problems encountered at the schools. At this point a rough draft of the questionnaire to be used was completed.

3. A field test was conducted of the questionnaire to obtain feedback on its format and effectiveness and suggestions for its improvement. Cooperating in the field test were:

Robert, Beale, Year-Round School Coordinator
A.B.C. Unified School District, Arcadia, California

George Caldwell, Superintendent
San Bernadino City Unified School District
San Bernadino, California

Don Glines, Manager--Year-Round Education Project
California State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

Thies Godfry, Principal
Nevada Union High School
Grass Valley, California

Paul Killian, Director of Research and Development
Washoe County School District
Reno, Nevada

Leo Murphy, Assistant Superintendent
Milpitas Unified School District
Milpitas, California

Marvin Roth, Associate Superintendent
Washoe County School District
Reno, Nevada

N. B. Triplett, Principal
Mesa Verde High School
San Juan Unified School District
Citrus Heights, California
Robert Williams, Year-Round Education Project Director
Elk Grove Unified School District
Elk Grove, California

4. The questionnaire was revised based on the response to the field test and based on additional information obtained from California's Elk Grove Unified School District and the Lodi Unified School District, each of which had made extensive studies of the year-round programs. A revised draft questionnaire was distributed to school districts indicated in item two above. There were two purposes of this questionnaire: First, to verify the direction of progress in the development of the questionnaire, and second, to obtain information for a presentation to be made at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Year-Round Education in February of 1979.3

5. The results of the draft questionnaire provided the needed information for the presentation and also assisted in the final revision of the questionnaire. At the annual meeting of the National Council on Year-Round Education, the researcher was able to confer with many of those most involved in year-round high school programs

3For Questionnaire see Appendix "B".
nationally and profit from discussions held with them regarding the finalization of the questionnaire.

6. The researcher's committee met and after reviewing the questionnaire made some suggested revisions in form and the final questionnaire was ready for distribution.

Developing the List of Respondents

All school districts in the United States that have implemented a year-round school program in the past ten years were included. The list of year-round school contact persons and school principals, including addresses and telephone numbers, was available from two sources—The 7th Annual Directory prepared by the National Council on Year-Round Education and the California State Department of Education. 4

These sources revealed that there were 45 school districts which had year-round high school programs presently functioning or which had implemented them and later terminated their operation. Because of the wide geographical distribution of school districts, and the problem of shifting personnel assignments, a direct mailing to the individual indicated as

the year-round school contact person was sent out with back-up mailings to individual school principals.

Permission to Carry Out the Study

Permission to utilize school district services was obtained from Marvin Roth, Associate Superintendent, Washoe County School District. Roth enthusiastically supported the study, feeling that it would be of value to the district which presently still operates three large elementary schools (K-6) on a modified "45-15" plan. Roth wrote preliminary letters to school districts during the gathering of the initial data and was most encouraging and supportive of the project.

Collection of Data

On February 1, 1980 the questionnaires were sent to 45 indicated year-round school contact persons with back-up letters to some principals. In each envelope was a cover letter, the questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped return envelope. The cover letter by the researcher asked that the information be returned as soon as possible and contained a personal note of thanks for the respondents' participation.5

By March 15, 1980, 22 of the 45 questionnaires had been returned. A follow-up letter6 was sent to those districts

5See Appendix "B".
6See Appendix "B".
who had not responded. This resulted in 7 more questionnaires being returned. In addition to the 29 returned questionnaires, two districts opted to respond in lengthy letter form and one referred the questionnaire to another district.

Treatment of Data

The questionnaires were had tabulated by the researcher and the results summarized.

The general information was tabulated on a percentage basis, indicating the nature of the community and the types of year-round programs being implemented. Responses to the general questions were also tabulated on a percentage basis. Generalizations were drawn regarding the utilization of feasibility studies, the type of attendance plan used, and the assignment of students to tracks. The study also indicated, by percentage, the various approaches used to implement year-round school programs and the time devoted to preparation for the year-round school program.

The latter part of the questionnaire dealt with the development and consideration of year-round programs. Responses under each heading were weighted as follows:
(4) Very Important-"VI"; (3) Important-"I"; (2) Of Little Importance-"LI"; and (1) Not Important-"NI". Applying the weighted factor to each response, a total number of points was obtained for each response. By dividing this total by the number of responses to the item, a mean response was
obtained. In analyzing the importance of each mean response, the following table was helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 - 3.25</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25 - 2.50</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 - 1.75</td>
<td>Of Little Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75 - 1.00</td>
<td>Not Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applying this table to each response enables one to determine the degree of importance each respondent places on the item. By ranking the frequency of each of several responses to each item, the degree of importance of each may be easily determined.

The same method of treatment was applied to Section V of the questionnaire which dealt with the reasons why year-round programs have been dropped at the high school level. Twenty four of the 29 respondents indicated that they had or were about to drop their high school year-round programs. Thus, in this section of the questionnaire, there were 24 responses to each item rather than 29.

As a result of the questionnaire responses, it was possible to clarify some responses and issues at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Year-Round Education held in San Francisco at the end of April 22 and 23, 1980. Discussions with national leaders of the year-round education movement were valuable in analyzing the results of the questionnaire in light of their practical experience in the field.
Summary

The description of the procedures for developing and refining the questionnaire and collecting data have been outlined. The procedure for treatment of the data in a meaningful way has also been described in this chapter. Chapter Four presents an analysis of the data collected through this process.
CHAPTER FOUR
TREATMENT OF THE DATA

INTRODUCTION

In 1978, twenty-eight states offered year-round learning opportunities involving more than 600 schools.\(^1\) Although the majority of those schools were either elementary or middle schools, an increasing number of high school programs had been developed. The growth of year-round education reached a plateau in 1977-78. Since most school systems originally embraced the concept to save space and money for construction in overcrowded districts,\(^2\) some communities lost interest when enrollments fell. By 1980, the number of year-round programs decreased by over 50\%, and high school programs had all but disappeared.\(^3\) The causes of this drastic movement away from year-round programs must be analyzed and understood.

The need for professional study is further emphasized by the lack of comprehensive research relating to the reasons why school districts have discontinued year-round programs at


\(^2\)Ibid.

the high school level. Don Glines predicted in his article in October of 1978 that:

It is expected that year-round education will plateau for the next two years. But its natural leaders expect a renewal of interest and growth in flexible scheduling during the 1980's.

It is vitally important that those who make decisions in the 1980's understand the problems attendant upon a year-round high school program and consider possible solutions to these problems should renewed interest emerge.

This chapter presents the data gathered regarding the potential problems related to the implementation of year-round scheduling at the high school level. Specific attention is given to the following:

1. The utilization of a feasibility-study before implementation.
2. The attendance pattern adopted and how students were assigned to tracks.
3. The approach to implementing the year-round school programs (i.e., pilot schools, segment of the district, or entire district).
4. Time devoted to preparation and in-service training for the implementation of the program.
5. The motivation for implementation of year-round school.

Glines, loc. cit.
6. Methods employed to inform the community of progress in the planned implementation.

7. Potential problem areas which face those desiring to implement a year-round program.
   a. School problem areas
   b. Public issues of concern
   c. Instructional changes

8. Potential areas of concern in the implementation stage.
   a. Curriculum and Instruction
   b. Finance
   c. Scheduling of Students
   d. Allocation of Personnel—Administration and Teaching Staff
   e. Facilities and Maintenance
   f. Transportation
   g. School Lunch
   h. Student Activities and Athletics

9. Problems encountered which provided serious constraints on the implementation of the program.

10. Districts which have dropped year-round programs were asked to indicate reasons for this action in the following areas.
    a. Budgetary Constraints
    b. Curricular Constraints
    c. Administrative Constraints
d. Facility and Maintenance Constraints

e. Personnel Considerations

f. Student Considerations

Basic Data and Total Group Information

Of the total forty-five questionnaires mailed, twenty-nine were returned. This represents 64.44 percent of the total questionnaires. The geographic distribution of responses indicated a wide diversity of programs scattered throughout the nation with a significant concentration in the West. (See Table 3, following page). Phoenix sent extensive information in place of the questionnaire. Dade County sent extensive information on the Quinmester. Palm Beach sent a most complete letter dealing with the issues dealt with in the questionnaire.

Nature of the Community

The majority of respondents to the questionnaire were from suburban school districts. Eighteen respondents or 62% considered themselves from suburban communities. Eight respondents considered their communities to be rural in nature. This constituted 21% of those responding. The remaining five respondents considered themselves as being from urban communities, thus constituting the remaining 17%. The results indicate that the vast majority of school districts involved in year-round high school programs were from suburban communities.
Table 3
Basic Data on Questionnaire Mailed and Returned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mailed</th>
<th>Returned</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total         | 45     | 29       | 64.44%  |

Type of Year-Round Program

Respondents to the questionnaire represented examples of seven different types of year-round programs. The most prevalent type of program was the "45-15" plan (35%). Next came the Four Quarter and the "Concept 6" (20.5% each) followed by the Quintrimester (10%), "Concept 8" (7%) and the Flexible All
Year and Trimester Programs (3.5% each). (See Table 4, below)

Table 4
Types of Year-Round Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;45-15&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Quarter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Concept 6&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinmester</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible All Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 4 indicate that the "45-15" plan and variations of that approach are the most popular among respondents. The Four Quarter plan, which is the oldest, still remains popular, while the newer "Concept 6" offers expanded opportunities in scheduling. The Quinmester has remained constant in popularity since its introduction in Dade County a decade ago. The Flexible All Year plan and Trimester remain in at least one district at this time.

Use of Feasibility-Studies

Three questions were asked regarding the utilization of feasibility-studies. Twenty-eight of twenty-nine respondents indicated that they utilized a feasibility-study in planning their year-round program. A summary of the responses of the 96.5% who indicated that they did utilize a feasibility-study is presented in Tables 5 and 6.
Table 5
Structure Of Feasibility-Study Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts Utilizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Study</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Committee</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Firm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses in Table 5 indicate that a high percentage of districts used some form of administrative feasibility-study in planning their year-round program. The utilization of a citizen's committee was an important aspect of the feasibility-studies of well over half of the districts responding. Research indicates that districts implementing a year-round high school program relied on some combination of administrative study and citizens committee in implementing the feasibility-study for their programs.

When asked how much time was taken in making the feasibility-study, respondents indicated wide variance in alternatives. Table 6, on the following page, indicates the response to that question.

It appears that the majority of districts implementing year-round programs at the high school level utilized from 9-18 months for their feasibility-study. The fact that 75% of the feasibility-studies made were of one year duration or
Table 6
Time Taken In Making Feasibility-Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Taken</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 months or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-9 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 months</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-18 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 18 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

less can be explained by the fact that the majority of such implementation plans were motivated by sudden increases in population and a dramatic impact on the fiscal position of the school district. This demanded immediate rather than deliberate action.

Attendance Pattern and Tracking

Respondents to the questionnaire indicated that they were evenly divided in regard to the utilization of a compulsory attendance plan and a freedom of choice plan. Fifteen respondents utilized a compulsory plan while fourteen selected the freedom of choice method. Three methods of student track assignments were prevalent. The most popular was based on personal choice. Fourteen respondents (48%) indicated a preference for this method. Eight preferred tracking by neighborhood (27.5%), while seven utilized tracking by family
(24.5%), both being quite similar in philosophical concept. It is evident that respondents overwhelmingly utilized a tracking method which would above all meet the personal convenience of the student and family.

Approach to Year-Round Schools

The approach to the implementation of a year-round program, as with any innovation in education, is most important. A variety of situations may mandate approaches which may not be the most desirable. Fourteen respondents (48.25%) indicated that their implementation program was done on a district-wide basis. Ten respondents (34.5%) utilized one or two pilot schools, while the remaining five (17.25%) implemented programs in one segment of the district. It appears that pragmatic considerations have led close to 50% of the districts to implement year-round education programs on a district-wide level, which may have contributed to their demise. Discussions with administrators, teachers, students, and parents in Milpitas, California, indicated that such action was a prime factor in the failure of the year-round program in that district.5

Time Devoted to Preparation for Year-Round Education

A wide variety of responses was received to the question "How much time was devoted to staff in-service training and

5Statements by Leo Murphey, Assistant Superintendent, and Don Cerripagni, Principal, Milpitas, California, November 18, 1980, personal interview.
preparation for the year-round school program?" The results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Allowed</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Week or Less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Weeks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Weeks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Weeks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine Weeks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the first four choices listed in Table 7 were provided in the questionnaire. The last three were all written in under the response "Other". As was noted above, many districts were forced to act quickly in implementing year-round programs due to over-crowding and financial crises. However, it appears that many districts (44.75%) took the time to develop an in-service preparation program which lasted from one to two years. This reinforces the generally accepted feeling that extensive preparation and in-service training are necessary to develop successful programs.
Motivations for Consideration of the Year-Round School

As was indicated in the review of the literature, the predominant reasons for implementation of a year-round program are to avoid overcrowding in existing facilities, to gain financial savings in new plant construction, to obtain financial savings in operation, and to improve educational opportunities. The motivations indicated by respondents for implementing year-round educational programs are summarized in Table 8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving Educational Opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Overcrowding of Existing Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Savings in New Plant Construction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Savings in Operation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

Respondents have indicated that, although the pragmatic motivations of avoiding overcrowding and achieving fiscal
savings are important, the overriding motivation for year-round school programs is still the improvement of educational opportunities. That conclusion reinforces the sentiments of Don Glines⁶ and E. Curtis Hanson⁷ which were expressed in the review of the literature; however, there was a strong emphasis on avoiding overcrowding and financial savings which supports the general conclusion of the review of literature.

Method to Inform the Community

The primary methods utilized to inform the community during a feasibility-study include newspapers, radio and television, newsletters, and public meetings. Table 9, below, indicates the preference for such media indicated by respondents.

Table 9
Methods Used To Inform The Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio and Television</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)


The results relating to the issue of communications reiterates the emphasis placed on the vital role of communications relating to working with any group of people. It is clear that there is a high priority placed on communications by those implementing year-round educational programs. Results show that a combination of public meetings, newspaper publicity, and newsletters are considered vital to keep the public informed. The lower ranking of radio and television may well reflect the fact that these forms of media are not readily available to many school districts and thus do not rate as high as other methods. The strongly supportive response indicates the importance of effective communications with the community in the development of year-round education programs.

Potential School Problems

In preparation for answering the main area of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate what were the major potential problem areas to be considered in making the decision to adopt or reject a year-round program. Table 10, on the following page, indicates the response to this question.

The results indicate that respondents consider the problems in the general areas of Curriculum and Instruction and Facilities as "Very Important". In addition, the concerns about Financial problems, Personnel problems, Transportation and Maintenance are considered to be "Important" by those involved in implementing year-round high school programs.
Table 10
Potential School Problem Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Lunch Program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

Of less concern are problems related to Student Activities, Support Services, and School Lunch programs.

It is clear that districts considering implementation of year-round programs at the secondary level must pay particular attention to dealing with problems in the areas of Curriculum and Instruction, Facilities, Finances, Personnel, and Transportation.

Public Issues Causing Opposition to Year-Round School Plan Adoption

Table 11, on the following page, summarizes the responses to the question "Which of the following public issues caused significant opposition to the adoption of a year-round program?"
Table 11
Public Issues Causing Opposition To Year-Round Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Frequency Distribution*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation Inconvenience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations Failure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Opposition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Recreation Programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Student Assignment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Youth Employment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church &amp; Agency Opposition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Juvenile Delinquency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

It is interesting to note that the average mean for Table 10, "Potential School Problem Areas," is 2.79 compared to 1.74 for "Public Issues Causing Opposition". This would indicate that respondents envision the problems related to school operation more important than those related to public issues. Based on this data, one could conclude that, given the rapid decline in year-round school programs at the high school level, more consideration should have been given to dealing with the public issues causing opposition to year-round programs than to the area of potential school problem areas. Neglect in this area could have contributed to the decline in favor of the year-round programs.
Changes in Instructional Programs

Several instructional programs needed to be changed to implement a year-round program. Table 12, below, indicates which instructional programs respondents found it necessary to change in the process of implementing a year-round secondary school program.

Table 12
Changes In Instructional Programs
Necessitated By A Year-Round Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency Ranking*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescheduling of Classes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Instructional Packets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Courses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescheduling of Activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modular Scheduling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiage Grouping</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Grading</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Time for Basic Subjects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

Table 12 indicates by its average mean score of 1.58 that variations in instructional programs are of "Little Importance" as a group to the implementation of year-round programs at the high school level. This indicates that,
although many of those cited in the review of the literature indicate that change in the instructional program is a prime reason for a movement toward year-round programs, change has not come to pass to the anticipated degree in those districts directly involved in such a movement.

Survey of Potential Areas of Concern

Section IV of the questionnaire is in many ways the real "meat" of the study. Following the pattern of Section III, the same analysis of data is followed. Items 11-20 deal even more specifically with potential areas of concern facing any district which is considering the implementation of a year-round program at the high school level.

1. Curriculum and Instruction

Table 13, on the following page, indicates which items were of concern to respondents in their implementation of a year-round high school program.

The results of the survey indicate that respondents consider that the sequence of courses and the continuity of courses are the most serious problems created by a year-round high school program. This supports the contentions made by other researchers in Chapter Two. Also considered to be "Important" are the need for intensive in-service training of teachers and follow-up meetings. The tracking problem created by single section classes on a multiple track schedule, forced the combination or elimination of lower enrollment
### Table 13
Problems Of Curriculum and Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing and course continuity create serious curricular problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive in-service training and follow-up meetings are needed to facilitate the program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Singleton&quot; courses can only be offered on one track, creating problems of specialized tracking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-track programs force the combination or elimination of lower enrollment specialized programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized mini-courses must be developed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers find it difficult to develop a relationship with students in the shorter time period</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer tracks tend to have low enrollment, limiting curriculum to be offered. Also, students tend to be remedial and thus limit curricular offerings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualization and mini-courses failed, due to teacher inability to change style</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers expressed concern over ability to properly supervise and monitor make-up work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum tends to be limited to basic courses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)
specialized programs.

2. Finance

As was noted in the review of the literature, the question of the financial implications of year-round programs has received a great deal of attention. Table 14, on the following page, summarizes the responses to the question, "Which of the following were of concern to you regarding year-round high school programs?"

Although literature regarding the importance of financial concerns in the year-round school is extensive, the mean average result of 2.14 indicates that there is "Little Interest" in most of the financial aspects of year-round programs. It appears that respondents realize that year-round programs will not save money and that they may even cost more. Even with such a conclusion, those responding reflect "Little Interest" in this fact. This result tends to support the contention of the majority of the literature which indicates that some minimal gain can be made in the operation of a year-round program. Also, savings which can be made due to the avoidance of capital expenditures can be quite significant.

3. Scheduling of Students

Problems relating to student scheduling constitute one of the major points brought up in opposition to year-
Table 14
Problems of Finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year-round high school programs are more expensive than traditional programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs in the initial phases of the program are higher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational costs including adequate in-service programs are higher than traditional programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of full state funding brought about by &quot;Proposition 13&quot; type tax restrictions on education will limit income for year-round school programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing enrollments in many districts remove the prime motivation for many year-round programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of summer school and other &quot;fringe&quot; funding tends to reduce income</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings may be obtained in some of the fixed areas of fringe benefits of staff salaries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)*

round education programs at the high school level. Table 15, on the following page, presents the data related to scheduling.
### Table 15
Problems Of Scheduling Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Ranking Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-tracking creates serious scheduling problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling is both costly and time consuming which increases clerical staff time and management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer assistance is vital in order to effectively schedule multi-track programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need more time for guidance in course selection and program planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scope of offerings is limited, creating scheduling problems</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students failing a part of the course have trouble being scheduled for make-up sections</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

It appears that respondents to the questionnaire feel that although the issue of scheduling of students is slightly more important than Curriculum and Instruction and Finance, it still ranks as "Of Little Importance". The responses do indicate that scheduling problems created by multi-tracking and costs in clerical and management time are of most importance.
It is clear that scheduling becomes a greater problem in those calendars which involve the staggered multi-tracking approach contrasted to those schedules which tend toward a more blocked approach. This conclusion supports the majority opinion of researchers in this area discussed in the review of the literature.

4. Allocation of Personnel

The question of allocation of personnel involves two aspects—administration and teaching staff. Tables 16 and 17 summarize the responses to questions dealing with personnel problems which might be faced in these vital areas of concern for those considering the implementation of a year-round high school program.

Results of the survey indicate that potential problems in the area of allocation of personnel are more likely in those relating to teaching staff as compared to those relating to administration. Responses in both areas (2.31 Administration and Teaching Staff) indicate that they are both "Of Little Importance". The greatest concern expressed under "Allocation of Personnel—Teaching Staff" is the acknowledgement of the fact that teacher opposition will "kill" a year-round school above all other personnel factors.

Administrative problems seem to focus around four areas which may be summarized as: (1) needs for additional secretarial support, (2) increased instances of administrator
Table 16  
Problems Of Allocation Of Personnel-Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for additional secretarial staff in order to deal with increased paper work with year-round programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators must serve a longer school year which results in administrative &quot;burn-out&quot; and loss of effectiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased paper work due to scheduling and managing of a multi-track program requires additional district administrative support services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little time is allowed for planning by the administration. Such planning is done during &quot;down-time&quot; periods in the summer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to add a &quot;Floating administrator&quot; which can create a problem in administrative continuity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a lack of support services during the &quot;off year&quot; periods unless the whole district is on year-round</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)*

"burn-out", (3) increased paper work related mainly to scheduling and (4) lack of "down time" for administrative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above all, teacher opposition will &quot;kill&quot; a year-round program, so obtaining strong teacher support is of vital importance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although teachers favored expanded financial opportunities for extended contracts they experienced &quot;burn-out&quot; with time and by the end of two years reduced the length of their contracts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists and specialty teachers tend to be spread very thin and become tired and less effective on a year-round schedule</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate in-service training and regular planning sessions reduces the effectiveness of teachers working in a year-round program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of substitutes or &quot;follow teachers&quot; assigned to tracks results in problems with course continuity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational growth was limited for teachers on year-round contracts due to conflicts with graduate courses and special institutes and workshops</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)
planning. These areas of concern have means of 2.66 to 2.41 which indicates that they fall somewhere between the bottom range of "Important" and the top of "Of Little Importance". Administrators in several year-round high schools, who the researcher interviewed, indicated these same areas as concerns to them.

The greatest area of concern under the topic "Allocation of Personnel-Teaching Staff" was the need for teacher support which must be obtained in order for the program to be successful. This confirms the results of other researchers in the area of personnel. Other areas of concern which ranked in the higher end of the "Of Little Importance" classification were: (1) teacher "burn-out" related to extended contracts, (2) lack of adequate support from district level specialists and specialty teachers, and (3) lack of in-service training and regular planning sessions to deal more effectively with the year-round program.

5. Facilities and Maintenance

Many administrators who were interviewed indicated that a major concern was the upkeep of facilities and time to perform the maintenance function. Theis Godfrey, Principal of Nevada Union High School, indicated that this was a particular problem with her school of 2,500 students. Table 18, on the following page.

---

8Interviews on August 20, 1978, held at Nevada Union High School, Nevada City, California.
page reveals the attitude of year-round high school administrators toward the problems related to facilities and maintenance.

The results of the questionnaire indicate that respondents felt problems related to facilities and maintenance should be considered at the very high end of the category "Of Little Importance". Major concerns seem to center around increased wear and tear on the buildings, lack of time for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is substantially more wear and tear on buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major cleaning is difficult and must be scheduled on weekends and in the evenings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of &quot;down time&quot; for preventative maintenance creates serious problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional personnel must be hired to maintain the building</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facility is usually not fully utilized during the summer, reducing the space saving factor (allowing for) adequate cleaning and maintenance time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)
major cleaning, and lack of "down time" for preventative maintenance. It is interesting to note that respondents did not believe that many year-round school facilities not being fully utilized during the summer was as serious a problem as might be expected. This concern was given a mean rating of 1.48 which is extremely low and tends to support the views of those considered in the review of the literature.

6. Transportation

Interviews with various year-round school administrators indicated that transportation was not one of the more important problems of year-round school operation. Table 19, on the following page, presents the data related to transportation concerns.

The data from Table 19 confirms the fact that respondents feel that transportation is "Of Little Importance" (mean of 2.07) compared to other concerns in developing a year-round high school program.

7. School Lunch Program

In many school districts, the school lunch program is an important aspect of daily operation. Table 20, on the following page, indicates the response of year-round high school administrators regarding the degree of problems created by year-round operation for school lunch programs.
Table 19
Problems Of Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The operation of transportation system for 235 to 240 days compared to 175 to 180 days increases costs disproportionately</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling of transportation services for year-round programs creates serious problems due to changing schedules with each track change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are significant problems in the area of transportation relating to the implementation of a year-round high school program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

Table 20
Problems Of The School Lunch Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is little effect on the school lunch program except for the fact that there is an extended period of operation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased additional costs for summer operation of the school lunch program is magnified by unbalanced enrollment during the summer months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)
The results of Table 20 indicate that the impact of year-round operation on the school lunch program is minimal except for more days of operation per school year.

8. Student Activities and Athletics

When one discusses the implementation of a high school year-round program with educators and laymen who have not been involved in such programs, the immediate response tends to be that school activities and athletics would be a real problem. Based on interviews with those who are involved in such year-round high school programs, it appears that this problem is overstated. Table 21, on the following page, indicates the responses of school districts involved in year-round high school programs regarding student activities and athletics.

Respondents to this question indicate that problems encountered in student activities and athletics when implementing a year-round high school program are "Of Little Importance" (Mean response - 1.92). This indicates that schools implementing year-round programs have been able to schedule such activities with minimal problems. Of most concern seemed to be the performing arts groups and activities (band, chorus, and drama) which confirms findings related in the review of the literature. Less participation in student government and some decline in school spirit may also result. It is interesting to note that of least concern
Table 21
Problems Of Student Activities and Athletics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Ranking Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts programs suffer and there is an increasing cost to maintain rehearsals on a year-round basis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities, including band, chorus, drama, student council, etc., are particularly hard hit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of activity programs is very weak during the summer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students tend to be pulled away from school in the year-round program and there is a decline in school spirit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District support services are over-taxed by the year-round school program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations for students to return to school for activities and athletics have created serious problems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must provide their own transportation when they are &quot;off cycle&quot; which creates problems and lack of attendance even when activity buses are utilized</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility creates a serious problem for interscholastic athletic programs for schools which are on the year-round high school calendar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)
is the question of eligibility for interscholastic athletic programs which has, in most cases, been dealt with through various state activities and athletic associations.

Summary of Section IV, Items 11-19

Table 22, below, is a summary of the mean responses to items 11-19 of Section IV of the questionnaire which deals with a survey of potential areas of concern in the implementation of a year-round high school program. The main topics are listed followed by the rank, the mean response, and the range of responses on sub-items under each topic.

An analysis of this table indicates that the mean responses to these potential problem areas all fall short of the rating "Important" and all are included within the range designated "Of Little Importance". The greatest concern in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Problem</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Range of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel-Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.90-2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.86-2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel-Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.66-1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.41-1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.79-1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.45-1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.24-1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Lunch Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.38-1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities &amp; Athletics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.21-1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
implementing a high school year-round program seems to be in the areas of personnel both teaching and administrative and student scheduling. Some concern is also expressed in areas such as facilities and maintenance, curriculum and instruction, and finances. It appears that problems in areas such as transportation, the school lunch program, and student activities and athletics are relatively minimal and can be overcome.

Problems Encountered

The last question in this section of the questionnaire is a summary question relating to serious problems encountered for a district implementing a year-round high school program. Items included were suggested by those field testing the questionnaire and through discussions at the National Council on Year-Round Education annual meeting in San Diego in February of 1979. Table 23, on the following page, summarizes the responses to these specific items.

The results of this summary question indicate that the overriding concern of administrators of year-round high school programs is related to the significant increase in administrative tasks, particularly in the area of scheduling. It has become evident that in order to implement an effective year-round high school program, operational expenditures will increase rather than decrease. Immediate savings are more likely to be found in the postponement of capital expenditures and other associated factors. Although the problems associated with
Table 23  
Specific Problems Encountered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Frequency*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year-round programs result in a significant increase in administrative tasks particularly in the area of scheduling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.76 9 10 3 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased rather than reduced expenditures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.45 7 8 5 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts between year-round school scheduling and traditional scheduling due to transfer students and extracurricular programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.24 6 7 4 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher opposition based on lack of staff unity and communications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.24 7 3 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of &quot;hard data&quot; evidence relating to student achievement under the year-round program compared to the traditional one</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.10 5 5 7 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with summer recreational and church activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.10 2 10 6 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher opposition based on too many preparations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.07 5 4 8 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student activity programs are disrupted</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.03 3 5 11 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption is created by conflicts with family life and vacation plans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.00 4 4 9 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher opposition based on lack of opportunity for professional improvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.93 4 3 9 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23
Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Ranking Frequency*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower summer attendance tends to disrupt the curricular offerings and reduce financial gain from year-round programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.83 4 1 10 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer job options are limited by the year-round school program</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.83 3 4 7 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher opposition based on lack of staff involvement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.73 3 3 8 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

extracurricular programs seem to be under control, the management of transfer student records is of significant concern. As has been noted before, teacher opposition is a powerful force in any school district. Many teachers involved in year-round programs have indicated a real concern with maintaining staff unity and communications. This concern is also reflected by the results in the questionnaire. Conversely, the impact of lower summer attendance on curricular offerings and reduced financial gain seems to be of minimal concern. Limited summer job options and teacher opposition based on lack of involvement seem also to be of limited concern to respondents.
Reasons for Dropping Year-Round High School Programs

Section V, the last section of the questionnaire, addresses the reasons why school districts have dropped year-round high school programs. The same data treatment method was employed. Twenty-four of twenty-nine surveyed responded to this question because they either had dropped a year-round program or were in the process of doing so. This high percentage of retreat certainly says something about the difficulties encountered and the trauma of dealing successfully with them.

The six areas of constraint (Budget, Curricular, Administrative, Facility and Maintenance, Personnel Considerations, and Student Considerations) were developed during the field testing procedure. Tables 24-30 provide the data based on responses to these items by twenty-four respondents.

Respondents indicated that the most important budgetary constraint is the lack of full state funding. Such funding was available in the early 1970's, when the state and federal governments were encouraging alternatives to scheduling patterns. High per-pupil cost is also a concern of those implementing year-round high school programs. It is interesting that decreasing enrollment is rated at the lower end of the "Of Little Importance" category when many districts use this reason publically as the justification of dropping year-round programs.
Table 24
Budgetary Constraints Related To Discontinuance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of full state funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High per-pupil cost</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for balanced tracks ±5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreasing enrollment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support services if not for whole district</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area of curriculum constraints relating to year-round school implementation at the secondary level (9-12) appears again—the complexity of scheduling students with a truly effective year-round program there is a need for more individualization which requires extensive in-service training and regular planning meetings. The limiting factor of multi-tracking has long been recognized by those involved in year-round programs, and it is reaffirmed in this study. The lack of concern with the restricting impact of low summer enrollments and with the "back to basics" movement tends to eschew the importance of this constraint.

It is of interest to note that administrative constraints receive by far the highest mean ratings of any of the six
Table 25
Curricular Constraints Related to Discontinuance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of scheduling students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for individualizing causing extensive in-service training and regular planning meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited curriculum with multi-tracks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling of transfer students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of hard statistical data to support increasing academic achievement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summer track is small restricting curriculum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The impact of the &quot;back to basics&quot; movement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be concluded that the fact that most respondents to this questionnaire were administrators might have something to do with the result. However, it does appear clear that the operation of a high school level year-round school program does create a significant impact on the administration of the school and the district. The combination of an overload of paperwork and administrative "burn-out" due to a significant increase of days devoted to
### Table 26
Administrative Constraints Related To Discontinuance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Frequency*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overload of paper work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative &quot;burn-out&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of planning time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling of teachers and administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing demands on district support services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation more complex and costly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

"hands-on" administration and fewer "down-time" days devoted to planning seem to be the crux of the problem for most administrators involved in year-round high school programs. It is interesting that Mesa Verde High School near Sacramento has overcome these areas by increasing the administrative staff allocation to the level which successfully deals with these constraints.⁹ Scheduling of teachers and administrators,

⁹Visitation by the researcher to Mesa Verde High School in August, 1978, and interview with N.B. Triplett, Principal, April, 1980.
Table 27
Facility And Maintenance Constraints Related To Discontinuance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of &quot;down time&quot; for preventative maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra wear and tear on buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wear and tear on buses and other equipment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased costs in transportation and food services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

like student scheduling, also creates an important problem in year-round high schools. Even increasing demands on district support services and on transportation services seem to constrain the high school year-round program.

Respondents indicate that constraints provided by facilities and maintenance in districts where year-round high school programs are implemented are "Of Little Importance". The increased use of plant facilities will obviously produce increased wear and tear on the building and will reduce available down-time for preventative maintenance. Increased use of facilities, equipment and buses will obviously cost
Table 28
Personnel Consideration Constraints Related To Discontinuance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and contracting teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher &quot;burn-out&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of &quot;complete faculty resulting in lack of communica-tions and involvement&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of opportunity for professional improvement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of long-term contracts and economic advantages</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

more, but these areas do not seem to be important factors in the decision to discontinue high school year-round school programs.

As was noted under administrative constraints, it is clear that matters relating to personnel are very important in implementing year-round high school programs. Scheduling, contracting, and teacher "burn-out" are prime factors of concern when districts consider dropping year-round programs. Much has also been said about the faculty communications and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desire to work in summer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict with vacations so students are still taken out of school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics and other student activities are not successful but still limited</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities suffer a great deal when students are &quot;off-track&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Code: VI (Very Important), I (Important), LI (Of Little Importance), NI (Not Important)

involvement problems, particularly in multi-track year-round programs. The lack of opportunity for professional improvement is a real problem and must be worked out with state and local educational institutions, and this can be done. Long term contracts for teachers seem to be losing popularity in many year-round districts.

It appears that student consideration constraints were of least importance in the decision to drop year-round high school programs according to respondents. All constraints considered in this section are rated "Of Little Importance".
Table 30

Summary Of Tables 22-27
(Reasons For Dropping Year-Round
High School Programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint Category</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Range of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.88-2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.71-1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.29-2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.63-1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.46-1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.04-1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Curricular category is skewed due to the fact that the first four responses range from 2.13 to 2.63 and the last two are 1.54 and 1.42.

It would appear that any adverse impact of year-round programs on students and their families was not a highly motivating factor in decisions regarding the alteration or abandonment of a year-round high school program in the majority of those districts surveyed.

The results of Tables 24-29 indicate that the two most important constraints which resulted in school districts dropping year-round high school programs were administrative and personnel in nature. Due to the skewing of the mean on Curricular Constraints, the researcher believes that this area was also important particularly in the areas of scheduling, individualizing,
planning, in-service, training, and the impact of multi-tracking. The constraints of facility and maintenance, budgetary, and student concerns have had less of an impact on such decisions. It is interesting that the only "Important" area according to data treatment was that of administrative constraints, while the five others were all rated as "Of Little Importance". The real reasons for dropping year-round high school programs are not readily apparent from this data, but most likely relate to public attitudes.

Chapter Four reviewed and analyzed the results of the questionnaire. Chapter Five gives the summary, conclusions, and a recommendation for consideration for districts studying the implementation of year-round education programs.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study related to year-round programs was to determine:

1. What was the prime motivating factor for implementing a year-round program?
2. What was the nature of the feasibility-study procedures used prior to implementation?
3. What were the major potential problem areas considered in making the decision to adopt or reject the year-round plan?
4. What were the public issues which caused significant opposition to the adoption of a year-round plan?
5. What was the nature of the student attendance plan employed and the track assignment procedure?
6. What was the approach to implementing year-round programs employed by responding districts?
7. What changes were necessitated in the instructional program to accommodate a year-round program?
8. How much time was devoted to staff in-service training in preparation for year-round school programs?
9. What problems encountered in implementing a year-round program were most serious?

Responses to the questionnaire dealt with the above questions in addition to a section focusing on the reasons why twenty-four of the twenty-nine respondents had dropped year-round scheduling at the high school level.

The data for this research were obtained from an analysis of a questionnaire returned by 29 out of 45 school districts listed as implementing year-round education programs at the secondary level (9-12) in the United States and Guam. This data came from a limited response, all of whom were administrators. Professional literature and numerous interviews related to year-round high school programs also served as guidelines in plotting the areas of this study. It is the purpose of this chapter to summarize the data gathered into conclusions and recommendations relating to the findings of the study.

**Basic Data and Total Group Information**

Of the 45 school districts listed by the National Council on Year-Round Education as having high school year-round programs, 29 responded. The geographic distribution is indicated in the table on the following page.

**Summary of the Findings**

Information gathered by the questionnaire relating to the purposes indicated above are summarized in the following section:
Table 31
Geographical Distribution Of Year-Round School Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western States</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern States</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern States</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern States</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents indicated that the most important motivation for implementing a year-round high school program was to improve educational opportunities. Avoiding overcrowding was the second choice while financial savings made in delaying capital outlays and in operational economies were third and fourth.

The most popular method used to inform the community of the program was public meetings followed closely by newspapers and newsletters. Least used was radio and television.

All but one of the respondents indicated that they utilized a feasibility-study. The most common structures for those studies were either the Administrative Study (86%) or the Citizen's Committee (69%). The majority of districts took nine months or more to make their study; this represented 63% compared to 27% who took from three to nine months and only 10% who took less than three months.
When asked to identify potential school problem areas when implementing a year-round secondary program, the respondents indicated in order of importance: curriculum and instruction, facilities, finances, personnel, transportation, maintenance, student activities, support services, and school lunch. It is of interest to contrast this response to the summary of the results of the next section of the questionnaire which dealt with the same basic topics.

When considering public issues which might cause opposition to year-round high school plan adoption, respondents indicated the following in order of importance: vacation inconvenience, special interest groups, public relations failure, teacher opposition, need for recreational programs, geographic student assignment, lack of youth employment, church and agency opposition, and increased juvenile delinquency.

The most significant public issue which caused public opposition to the adoption of a year-round program was vacation inconvenience. Opposition of special interest groups was of limited importance. Most other areas of public concern were considered of little importance or not important. Those issues which were of little importance were public relations failure and teacher opposition along with need for more recreational programs. Other issues such as youth employment, geographic assignment of students, church and agency opposition, and increased juvenile delinquency seemed to be of concern to very few of the respondents.
The attendance patterns employed were fairly evenly divided between compulsory (52%) and freedom of choice (48%). It should be noted that the respondents indicated when tracking students, a combination of personal choice (48%), neighborhood tracking (27.5%), and family unit tracking (24.5%) was utilized. All of these were designed to maximize the personal convenience of the student and family.

The survey requesting the type of plan used in implementing year-round programs indicated that the most common was some modification of the 45-15 plan (35%): Ranking second in popularity were the four-quarter plan (20.5%) and Concept 6 (20.5%). The Quinmester (10%) seemed on the decline and little interest was shown in Concept 8 (7%), the Flexible All-Year plan (3.5%), and the Trimester. In discussing the approach utilized, 48.25% implemented on a district-wide level, while 34.5% employed one or more pilot schools, and 17.25% implemented a program in one segment of the district.

The majority of respondents did not feel that it was important to make extensive changes in the instructional programs in order to implement a year-round high school program. Changes considered most frequently included: Individualization of instruction, rescheduling of classes, self-instruction packets, and mini-courses. Those least affected by the year-round program were simulated learning experiences and team teaching.
A wide variance in time was utilized for preparation for year-round schools. The greatest number (44.75%) utilized from one to two years in the process. Two to four weeks were utilized by 34.5% while one week or less was used by 17.25% of respondents.

Information gathered by the questionnaire was summarized in 28 tables. Two summary tables, numbers 21 and 28, have been reproduced to facilitate analysis of the priority placed on areas of concern related to the implementation of year-round programs at the high school level. They are compared with Table 10, an earlier analysis of problem areas, in an attempt to prioritize the levels of concerns represented by respondents to the questionnaire.

Table 31
Comparative Index Of Areas Of Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Comparative Ranking</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>Table 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Lunch Program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scheduling included under "Administration" in Table 8.
The greatest area of concern expressed by respondents was in the general topic of administration and scheduling. Also of great concern was the area of personnel allocation for both administration and teachers. Significant concern was reflected for the areas of facilities and maintenance and curriculum and instruction. The question of financial constraints was rated surprisingly low considering the amount of literature about this area. Other areas of concern, such as transportation, student activities, support services, and school lunch programs seemed to be of limited concern to respondents.

Survey of Potential Areas of Concern

Section IV of the questionnaire dealt with the impact on various aspects of school operation of the implementation of a year-round secondary (9-12) program. Those topics included were Curriculum and Instruction, Finance, Scheduling of Personnel-Teaching Staff, Facilities and Maintenance, Transportation, School Lunch Program, and Student Activities and Athletics.

Curriculum and Instruction: The survey indicated some concerns with sequencing and course continuity, in-service training and follow-up, "singleton" offerings with multi-track programs, and the impact of multi-tracking on lower enrollment specialized programs. Other concerns in curriculum and instruction were of much less importance.
Finance: Respondents indicated greatest concern over the fact that year-round high school programs are more expensive than the traditional program. Concerns were also expressed in the areas of initial "start-up" costs of the project and the higher costs of adequate in-service programs necessitated by the year-round program. Respondents tended to feel that savings from reduced fixed costs and from staff fringe benefits were of little importance.

Scheduling of Students: This area appeared to be one of the most important. It was clear that multi-tracking created serious scheduling problems as was also indicated under Curriculum and Instruction. Scheduling of a year-round program was both costly and time-consuming, due to increased clerical time and administrative effort. It was agreed that computer assistance was helpful to effective scheduling. In addition, students tended to need more time and guidance in course selection, and the scope of offerings was limited which created additional scheduling problems.

Allocation of Personnel: The two questions included under this topic were both indicated as major areas of concern in the implementation of year-round high school programs. The area of administration was of particular concern. The increased paper work and additional planning necessitated additional secretarial staff as well as administrative staff. The increased amount of "hands-on" time for administrators and lack of "down time" to do planning led to increasing administra-
tive "burn-out". In the area of teaching staff allocation, there were equal, if not more concerns. It was made clear in this study that teacher opposition would kill a year-round program and that obtaining strong teacher support was vital to success. Respondents indicated that most teachers refrained from extended contracts regardless of increased financial gain due to "teacher burn'out". Other problem areas indicated were inadequate numbers of specialists and specialty teachers and over-tiring of those on extended contracts. Also of concern was the lack of in-service training and regular planning sessions.

Facilities and Maintenance: This vital area in school operations was of moderate concern to respondents. The obvious increase in wear and tear on the buildings and the needed rescheduling of major cleaning and preventative maintenance was of concern, but these could be overcome according to the data obtained.

Transportation: Respondents indicated minimal concerns relating to transportation. The main area of concern was that of operating fewer vehicles over a longer period of time and revising schedules with each track rotation.

School Lunch Program: Again, in this area, the main concern was in the increase in the number of days of operation with a year-round program.

Student Activities and Athletics: The most significant problems in this area related to performing arts programs and
classes which do tend to suffer under a year-round program. The impact was not as great as one might think. Interscholastic athletics were not damaged significantly by the switch to the year-round calendar at the high school level.

Problems Encountered: This item included a summary of the most significant problems faced in the transition to year-round secondary school (9-12) programs. The most significant concern was in the area of increased administrative tasks with particular emphasis on scheduling. The financial concern of increased rather than reduced expenditures ranked second, while problems related to scheduling was also important. Extracurricular activities, teacher opposition, and conflicts with summer recreation and church programs were of some concern. Teacher professional improvement, lower summer attendance, and limitation of summer job opportunities were of least concern to respondents.

Reasons for Dropping Year-Round High School Programs

The last section of the questionnaire dealt with the reasons why 24 of 29 respondents dropped the year-round high school concept. Reasons were divided into six categories of constraints on effective year-round education operation at the secondary level. The categories considered were budgetary constraints, curricular constraints, administrative constraints, facility and maintenance constraints, personnel considerations, and student considerations. Results were as follows:
1. Administrative Constraints—received the highest average mean rating by respondents (2.63) with particular concern with overloading of paperwork, administrator "burn-out", lack of planning time, and scheduling.

2. Personnel Consideration Constraints—ranked second in average mean rating (2.37) with most concern being focused on scheduling of personnel and contracting of teachers, teacher "burn-out", lack of "complete" faculty resulting in problems in communications and involvement, and lack of opportunity for professional improvement.

3. Facility and Maintenance Constraints—received an average mean rating of 2.13. Primary concern was focused on lack of "down time" for preventative maintenance and extra wear and tear on buildings.

4. Curricular Constraints—the average mean received by this category (2.09) may well have been skewed lower than it should due to the fact that several high ratings were off-set by two inordinately low ratings (1.54 and 1.42). Items of high concern were: complexity of scheduling students; need for more individualization which, in turn, required more in-service training and planning; limitation of curricular offerings by multi-tracking; and scheduling of transfer students.
5. **Budgetary Constraints**—it was surprising that this usually vital issue was ranked so low (2.01) by respondents. The main concerns reflected here were related to the lack of full state funding, and the high per-pupil costs. The need to keep tracks balanced and decreasing enrollment did not receive as much attention as one might have expected.

6. **Student Consideration Constraints**—this area of concern received a relatively low mean response (1.95). This was surprising since concern for students is what the educational process is all about. The main concerns expressed were for: desire to work in summer, conflict with family vacations, and conflicts with student activities and athletics.

**Conclusions**

1. As Walter Akers pointed out in his dissertation "Characteristics of School Districts Related to Implementation of Year-Round Schools,"¹ the most significant predictor of whether or not a district implemented year-round school was the attitude of

---

the teachers, administrators, parents, students, and business/industry. This research supports Akers' study.

2. The areas of greatest concern reflected by respondents were administration, scheduling, personnel, facilities and maintenance, and curriculum and instruction.

3. It would appear that, although financial concerns were not as important as the areas indicated above, the cost of implementing a new high school program was such that the motivation must be to improve the educational program and not financial savings.

4. Most practical "nuts-and-bolts" aspects of year-round operation such as transportation, student activities, support services, and school lunch programs were of limited concern to respondents.

5. The reasons for abandonment differed from expectations based on the literature and on general public comment indicated in Chapter Two. The order of priority for abandonment was: (a) Administrative Constraints; (b) Personnel Considerations; (c) Facility and Maintenance Constraints; (d) Curricular Constraints; (e) Budgetary Constraints; (f) Student Considerations.
6. The areas of concern were clearly defined, and they constitute a useful list for any school contemplating going "year-round". This list says: "These areas must be dealt with successfully if you hope to carry off the change to year-round school."

7. Regarding funding, if no source of funding, national, state, or local was available, the year-round program failed. Without support the program could not succeed.

8. One should not overlook the importance of the process involved in the consideration of implementation of a year-round program. Even a program that ultimately must be abandoned resulted in a total re-examination of the school's curriculum and instructional program. This, in itself, was worthwhile.

9. School people have, perhaps, tried to "sell" year-round schools for the wrong reasons and have experienced failure from the wrong direction. Selling the program should be related to improved education.

**Recommendation**

Any school district contemplating the implementation of a year-round educational program, particularly at the high school level, should make a careful study of the administrative,
personnel, maintenance, curricular, financial, and student constraints as they apply to the specific community and school district.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE

High School Year-Round Programs

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of School District: ________________________________

Name of High School: ________________________________

Name of Person answering questionnaire: __________________

Position of Person Answering Questionnaire: ______________

Address: __________________________ Telephone # __________

Nature of Community: Rural ______ Urban ______ Suburban ______

Type of year-round program implemented or considered: ______________

(Note: If year-round program not implemented, please complete questionnaire indicating why the program was not implemented.)

II. GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Was a feasibility study utilized in planning the year-round program:
   Yes _____  No _____
   a. If yes, what structure was used in making the feasibility study:
      1. Citizens Committee
      2. Consulting Firm Study
      3. Administrative Study
      4. Other: ______________________________

   b. If yes, how much time was taken in making the feasibility study:
      1. 3 months or less _____  4. 9-12 months _____
      2. 3-6 months _____  5. 12-18 months _____
      3. 6-9 months _____  6. More than 18 months _____

2. Do you use a compulsory student attendance plan or a freedom of choice plan?
   Compulsory _____  Freedom of Choice _____

3. How were students assigned to their tracks?
   a. Randomly _____  d. By Neighborhood _____
   b. Personal Choice _____  e. By Family _____
   c. Alphabetically _____  f. Other: ______________
4. How did you approach year-round schools?
   a. One or two pilot schools
   b. One segment of the district
   c. Entire district implementation
   d. Other:

5. How much time was devoted to staff in-service training in preparation for the year-round school program?
   a. One week or less
   b. Two weeks
   c. Three weeks
   d. Four weeks
   e. Other: (Comment)

III. DEVELOPMENT AND CONSIDERATION OF YEAR-ROUND PROGRAM. Please circle the appropriate letters if you consider the item -- Very Important (VI), Important (I), Of Little Importance (LI), Not Important (NI).

6. What were the most important motivations for your consideration of the year-round school?
   a. Avoiding overcrowding of existing facilities
   b. Improving educational opportunities
   c. Financial savings in new plant construction
   d. Financial savings in operation
   e. Other:

7. What methods did you employ in order to keep the community informed during the feasibility study?
   a. Newspapers
   b. Radio and T.V.
   c. Newsletters
   d. Public Meetings
   e. Other:
8. What major potential school problem areas were considered in making the decision to adopt or reject the proposed plan?

   a. Curriculum and Instruction
   b. Personnel
   c. Facilities
   d. Financial
   e. Maintenance
   f. Transportation
   g. School Lunch Program
   h. Student Activities
   i. Support Services
   j. Other: ________________________________

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you. ________________________________

9. Which of the following public issues caused significant opposition to the adoption of a year-round education program?

   a. Vacation inconvenience
   b. Geographic assignment of students
   c. Need for more recreation programs
   d. Public relations failure
   e. Increased juvenile delinquency
   f. Lack of youth employment
   g. Church and agency opposition
   h. Teacher opposition
   i. Opposition of special interest groups
   j. Other: ________________________________

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you. ________________________________
10. Which of the following instructional programs did you find it necessary to change to implement a year-round program?

a. Individualization  
   b. Team Teaching  
   c. Modular Scheduling  
   d. Multiage Grouping  
   e. Contract Grading  
   f. Self-instruction  
   g. Simulation  
   h. Inquiry  
   i. Mini-courses  
   j. Teaching time for basic subjects  
   k. Rescheduling of classes  
   l. Rescheduling of activities/athletics  
   m. Other: __________________________

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you. __________________________

IV. SURVEY OF POTENTIAL AREAS OF CONCERN. Please circle the appropriate letters if you consider the item — Very Important (VI), Important (I), Of Little Importance (LI), Not Important (NI).

11. Curriculum and Instruction—which of the following were of concern to you regarding year-round high school programs?

   a. Curriculum tends to be limited to basic courses  
   b. Multi-track programs force the combination or elimination of lower enrollment specialized programs  
   c. Intensive in-service training and follow-up meeting is needed to facilitate the program  
   d. Sequencing and course continuity create serious curricular problems  
   e. Specialized mini-courses must be developed  
   f. Teachers find it difficult to develop a relationship with students in the shorter time period
g. Teachers express concern over ability to properly supervise and monitor make-up work
h. Individualization and mini-courses failed due to teachers inability to change style
i. "Singleton" courses can only be offered on one track, creating problems of specializing tracking
j. Summer tracks tend to have low enrollment, limiting curriculum to be offered. Also, students tend to be remedial and thus limit curricular offerings
k. Other

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you.

12.

Finance—which of the following were of concern to you regarding year-round high school programs?
a. Year-round high school programs are more expensive than traditional programs
b. Operational costs including adequate inservice programs are higher than traditional programs
c. Costs in the initial phases of the program are higher
d. Savings may be obtained in some of the fixed areas of fringe benefits of staff salaries
e. Lack of summer school and other 'fringe' funding tends to reduce income
f. Lack of full state funding brought about by "Proposition 13" type tax restrictions on education will limit income for year-round school programs
g. Decreasing enrollments in many districts remove the prime motivation for many year-round school programs
h. Other

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you.
13. Scheduling of Students

a. Multi-tracking creates serious scheduling problems
b. The scope of offerings is limited, creating scheduling problems
c. Computer assistance is vital in order to effectively schedule multi-track programs
d. Scheduling is both costing and time consuming which increases clerical staff time and management
e. Students need more time for guidance in course selection and program planning
f. Students failing a part of the course have trouble being scheduled for make-up section
g. Other: ________________________________

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you. ________________________________

14. Allocation of Personnel—Administration

a. Administrators must serve a longer school year which results in administrative 'burn-out' and loss of effectiveness
b. It is necessary to add a "floating administrator" which can create a problem in administrative continuity
c. Little time is allowed for planning by the administration. Such planning is done during "down time" periods in the summer
d. Increased paper work due to scheduling and managing of a multi-track program requires additional district administrative support services
e. There is a need for additional secretarial staff in order to deal with increased paper work with year-round programs
f. There is a lack of support services during "off school" periods unless the whole district is on year-round
g. Other: ________________________________
Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you.

15. Allocation of Personnel—Teaching Staff

a. Use of substitutes of "follow teachers" assigned to tracks results in problems with course continuity  
   VI I LI NI

b. Although teachers favored expanded financial opportunities for extended contracts they experienced "burn out" with time and by the end of two years reduced the length of their contracts  
   VI I LI NI

c. Educational growth was limited for teachers on year-round contracts due to conflicts with graduate courses and special institutes and workshops  
   VI I LI NI

d. Specialists and specialty teachers tend to be spread very thin and become tired and less effective on a year-round schedule  
   VI I LI NI

e. Lack of adequate in-service training and regular planning sessions reduces the effectiveness of teachers working in a year-round program  
   VI I LI NI

f. Above all teacher opposition will kill a year-round program, so obtaining strong teacher support is of vital importance  
   VI I LI NI

g. Other:

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you.

16. Facilities and Maintenance

a. Lack of "down time" for preventative maintenance creates serious problems  
   VI I LI NI

b. Major cleaning is difficult and must be scheduled on weekends and in the evenings  
   VI I LI NI

c. There is substantially more wear and tear on the buildings  
   VI I LI NI
QUESTIONNAIRE

17. Transportation

a. Scheduling of transportation services for year-round programs creates serious problems due to changing schedules with each track change.

b. The operation of a transportation system for 235 to 240 days compared to 175 to 180 increases cost unproportionally.

c. There are no significant problems in the area of transportation relating to the implementation of a year-round high school program.

d. Other: ____________________________________________

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you. ____________________________________________

18. School Lunch Program

a. Increased additional costs for summer operation of the school lunch program is magnified by unbalanced enrollment during the summer months.

b. There is little effect on the school lunch program except for the fact that there is an extended period of operation.

c. Other: ____________________________________________
Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in
the first two columns were of major concern to you.

19. Student Activities and Athletics

   a. Students must provide their own transportation when they are "off cycle" which
      creates problems and lack of attendance even when activity buses are utilized
   b. Support of activity programs is very weak during the summer months
   c. Activities, including band, chorus, drama, student council, etc., are particularly
      hard hit
   d. Students tend to be pulled away from school in the year-round program and there is a
      decline in school spirit
   e. Performing arts programs suffer and there is an increasing cost to maintain rehearsals
      on a year-round basis
   f. Eligibility creates a serious problem for interscholastic athletic programs for schools which are on the year-round high
      school calendar
   g. Motivation for students to return to school for activities and athletics have created serious problems
   h. District support services are over-taxed by the year-round school program
   i. Other:

   Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in
the first two columns were of major concern to you.

20. Problems Encountered—which of the following have created serious problems for your year-round
    high school programs?

   a. Increased rather than reduced expenditures
   b. Lack of "hard data" evidence relating to student achievement under the year-round program compared to the traditional one
c. Conflicts between year-round school scheduling and traditional scheduling due to transfer students and extra-curricular programs  
   VI I LI NI

d. Teacher opposition based on:  
   (1) Too many preparations  VI I LI NI
   (2) Lack of opportunity for professional improvement  VI I LI NI
   (3) Lack of staff unity and communications  VI I LI NI
   (4) Lack of staff involvement  VI I LI NI

e. Lower summer attendance tends to disrupt the curricular offerings and reduce financial gain from year-round programs  
   VI I LI NI

f. Student activity programs are disrupted  VI I LI NI

g. Disruption is created by conflicts with family life and vacation plans  VI I LI NI

h. Year-round programs result in a significant increase in administrative tasks particularly in the area of scheduling  
   VI I LI NI

i. Conflict with summer recreational and church activities  VI I LI NI

j. Summer job options are limited by the year-round school program  VI I LI NI

k. Other: ________________________________

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you. ________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

V. REASONS WHY YEAR-ROUND PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN DROPPED AT THE HIGH SCHOOL LEVEL.
Please circle the appropriate letters if you consider the item — Very Important (VI), Important (I), Of Little Importance (LI), Not Important (NI).

1. Budgetary Constraints

   a. High per-pupil costs  VI I LI NI
   b. Lack of full state funding  VI I LI NI
   c. Decreasing enrollment  VI I LI NI
   d. Need for balanced tracks ±5%  VI I LI NI
   e. Support services if not for whole district  VI I LI NI
   f. Other: ________________________________
Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you.

2. Curricular Constraints

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Lack of hard statistical data to support increased academic achievement</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Complexity of scheduling students</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Limited curriculum with multi-tracks</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Scheduling of transfer students</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Need for individualization: causing extensive in-service and regular planning meetings</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>The summer track is small, restricting curriculum</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>The impact of the &quot;back to basics&quot; movement</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you.

3. Administrative Constraints

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Overload of paper work</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Lack of planning time</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Administrative &quot;burn out&quot;</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Scheduling of teachers and administrators</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Transportation more complex and costly</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Increased demands on district support services</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you.
4. Facility and Maintenance Constraints

   a. Lack of "down time" for preventative maintenance  
   b. Extra wear and tear on buildings  
   c. Wear and tear on buses and other equipment  
   d. Increased costs in transportation and food services  
   e. Other: ________________________________

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you. ________________________________

5. Personnel Considerations

   a. Scheduling and contracting of teachers  
   b. Lack of "complete" faculty resulting in lack of communication and involvement  
   c. Teacher "burn out"  
   d. Lack of opportunity for professional improvement  
   e. Lack of longer term contracts and economic advantages  
   f. Other: ________________________________

Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you. ________________________________

6. Student Considerations

   a. Activities suffer a great deal when students are "off track"  
   b. Athletics and other student activities are not as successful but still limited  
   c. Desire to work in summer  
   d. Conflict with vacations so students are still taken out of school  
   e. Rotation of student assignments  
   f. Other: ________________________________
Of these items, please describe why those which were indicated in the first two columns were of major concern to you.__________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

EARLIER QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE
High School Year-Round Programs

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of School District: ________________________________

Name of High School: ________________________________

Name of person answering questionnaire: ________________

Address __________________________ Phone # ____________

Nature of Community: Rural _____ Urban _____ Suburban _____

Grades Included in High School: __________________________

Type of year-round program implemented or considered: ____________

(Note: If year-round program not implemented, please complete questionnaire indicating why the program was not implemented.)

II. GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. What was the most important motivation for your consideration of the year-round school?

a. Avoiding overcrowding of existing facilities _____
b. Improving educational opportunities _____
c. Financial savings in new plant construction _____
d. Financial savings in operation _____
e. Other _____

2. Was a feasibility study utilized in planning the year-round program? Yes _____ No _____

a. If yes, what structure was used in making the feasibility study?

1. Citizens Committee
2. Consulting Firm Study
3. Administrative Study
4. Other:

b. If yes, how much time was taken in making the feasibility study?

1. 3 months or less _____
2. 3-6 months _____
3. 6-9 months _____
4. 9-12 months _____
5. 12-18 months _____
3. What major potential problem areas were considered in making the decision to adopt or reject the proposed plan?
   a. Curriculum and Instruction ____
   b. Personnel ____
   c. Facilities ____
   d. Financing ____
   e. Maintenance ____
   f. Transportation ____
   g. School Lunch Program ____
   h. Student Activities ____
   i. Support Services ____
   j. Other: ____

4. Which of the following public issues caused significant opposition to the adoption of a year-round education program?
   a. Vacation inconvenience ____
   b. Geographic assignment of students ____
   c. Need for more recreation programs ____
   d. Public relations failure ____
   e. Increased juvenile delinquency ____
   f. Lack of youth employment ____
   g. Church and agency opposition ____
   h. Teacher opposition ____
   i. Opposition of special interest groups ____
   j. Other: ____

5. Do you use a compulsory student attendance plan or a freedom of choice plan?
   Compulsory ____  Freedom of Choice ____

6. How were students assigned to their tracks?
   a. Randomly ____
   b. Personal Choice ____
   c. Alphabetically ____
   d. By neighborhood ____
   e. By Family ____
   f. Other: ____

7. How did you approach year-round school?
   a. One or two pilot schools ____
   b. One segment of the district ____
   c. Entire district implementation ____
   d. Other: ____
5. Did you find that it was necessary to change the instructional program for year-round school?

   Yes _____ No _____

If so, what changes were introduced?

   a. Individualization _____
   b. Team Teaching _____
   c. Modular Scheduling _____
   d. Multiage grouping _____
   e. Contract grading _____
   f. Self-instruction Packets _____
   g. Simulation _____
   h. Inquiry _____
   i. Mini-courses _____
   j. Other: _____

III. Please give as much information as possible regarding the problems encountered in the areas listed below. What was done to overcome these problems?

1. Curriculum and Instructional Programs:

2. Scheduling of Students:

3. Allocation of Personnel

   a. Administrative
   b. Teaching
   c. Certified and Maintenance
4. Facilities and Maintenance:

5. Transportation:

6. School Lunch Program:

7. Student Activities and Athletics:
9. Support Services:

9. Finance - (Does a year-round program cost more per student?)

10. Other comments:
APPENDIX C

PERTINENT LETTERS
242 Denslow Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90049
July 20, 1977

Mr. Glen Maurer, YRS Contact
Sunnyside Unified School District
420 East Valencia Street
Tucson, Arizona 85706

Dear Mr. Maurer:

I have been involved in year-round education in Nevada and California for several years. I am presently writing my doctoral dissertation on year-round high school programs. Although my study will focus on California, I need to obtain comparative data from the national scene.

Don Glines of the California State Department of Education suggested yours as one of the districts to contact in order to obtain information on year-round high school programs. I am particularly interested in information regarding implementation, problems, strengths and weaknesses, and any evaluative material which is available.

I will deeply appreciate any information that you can send me and will be glad to inform you of the results of my study.

Sincerely,

David J. Mussatti
December 15, 1978

Ms. Charlene Houghton
Dade Co. Public Schools
1410 NE Second Avenue
Miami, FL. 33132

Dear Ms. Houghton:

I am making a survey of high schools which have considered or implemented year-round programs at the high school level. We are interested in what problems are encountered in the year-round programs at the high school level.

Please take the time from your busy schedule to respond to the attached questionnaire. The results will be of extensive value to us in determining the feasibility of a year-round program.

I will be happy to send the results of our study.

Sincerely,

Dave J. Mussatti
Vice-Principal

jec
January 21, 1980

Dr. Bill White
Jefferson County School District, R-1
1208 Quail Street
Lakewood, CO 80215

Dear Dr. White:

I am involved in a research project to determine the problems encountered in implementing a year-round high school program. Our location at Lake Tahoe lends itself to the year-round concept and our elementary school is on a modified year-round program presently. In order to most accurately assess the feasibility of implementing a year-round program at the high school level I need your help. School districts which have either considered or implemented year-round high school programs know better than anyone else what the problems and constraints are and how they might be met.

Please take a few minutes to complete and return this questionnaire to me right now. I need your immediate response since time is fleeting for us. Your response will be of great value to us. We must make a determination regarding the direction we follow soon. Your cooperation on this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

David J. Mussatti
Vice-Principal
March 27, 1980

Dr. Bill White
Jefferson County School District, R-1
1208 Quail Street
Lakewood, CO 80215

Dear Dr. White

In early February I sent you a questionnaire dealing with Year-Round High School Programs. I have not received your response and would appreciate it if you could complete it and return it to me. In order to have a valid picture of such programs, we do need your response.

I am including another copy of the questionnaire in case you misplaced the one originally sent. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

David J. Mussatti
Vice-Principal
APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF RESPONDENTS
RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. Robert Arc, Principal
Chalmette High School
St. Bernard Parish School Board
East Chalmette Circle
Chalmette, LA 70043

Mr. Robert Beale
A.B.C. Unified School Dist.
16700 S. Norwalk Blvd.
Cerritos, CA 90701

Dr. Ty Blount, Principal
Nevada Union High School
Ridge Road
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Dr. James C. Bradford
Buena Vista City Public Schools
2039 Sycamore Avenue
Buena Vista, VA 24416

Dr. Tim Buchanan, Principal
Rim of the World High School
P.O. Drawer 430
Lake Arrowhead, CA 92352

Dr. William Collins
Superintendent
Greater Lowell Regional Vo-Tech District
Pawtucket Blvd.
Tyngsboro, MA 01879

Mr. John Colson
Prince William County School District
P.O. Box 387
Manassas, VA 22110

Dr. Harold Fielding
Superintendent
Corona-Norco Unified School District
300 Buena Vista Street
Corona, CA 91720

Dr. Mary Giella
Pasco School District
2609 U.S. Highway North
Land O'Lakes, FL 33539

Dr. Roslyn Grady
Doherty High School
Colorado Springs Public Schools
1115 North El Paso Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Dr. E. Curtis Hansen
Atlanta Public Schools
224 Central Ave. S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30303

William W. Harrison
Chino Unified School District
5130 Riverside Drive
Chino, CA 91710

Dr. Matthew Hosie
Superintendent
Rochester Area School District
540 Reno Street
Rochester, PA 15074

Mrs. Nell Lucas, Principal
Jupiter Middle & High School
601 W. Taney Penna Drive
Jupiter, FL 33458

Dr. D. P. Knuppel
Tenafly School District
27 West Clinton Avenue
Tenafly, NJ 07670

Mr. Glen Maurer
Sunnyside Unified School District #12
2238 E. Ginter Road
Tucson, AR 85706
RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE
(continued)

Dr. H. G. McCracken
Superintendent
Spartanburg Co. School
District #7
P.O. Box 970
Spartanburg, SC 29304

Dr. James Mounie
Virginia Beach City Public
Schools
P.O. Box 6038
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

Dr. Russell R. Reynolds
Superintendent
Bear Valley Unified School
District
P.O. Box 1529
Big Bear Lake, CA 92315

Dr. William R. Rutter
Superintendent
Valley View Public Schools
636 Dalhart Avenue
Romeoville, IL 60441

Dr. Jeff Shafer
Government of Guam
Department of Education
Box DE
Agana, Guam 96910

Mr. John L. Stremple
Superintendent
San Juan Unified School
District
3738 Walnut Avenue
Carmichael, CA 95608

Dr. Belton R. Taylor
Rock Hill School District
#3
P.O. Drawer 10072
Rock Hill, SC 29730

N. B. Triplett, Principal
Mesa Verde High School
7600 Lauppe Lane
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Dr. Alfred Warner, Principal
Big Bear High School
41275 Big Bear Blvd.
Big Bear Lake, CA 92315

Dr. Donald E. Weber, Principal
Bolingbrook High School
350 W. Blair Lane
Bolingbrook, IL 60439

Ms. Norma Whisler, Superintendent
Parma-Western School District
1400 South Dearling
Parma, MI 49269

Dr. William White
Jefferson County School
District R-1
1208 Quail Street
Lakewood, CO 80215
NON-RESPONDENTS

The following school districts did not respond to the questionnaire or to follow-up contacts.

Brevard County Public Schools (Titusville, FL)
Butler Area School District (Butler, PA)
Dade County Schools (Miami, FL)
Franklin Pierce School District #402 (Tacoma, WA)
Fredericksburg City Public Schools (Fredericksburg, VA)
Hudson School District (Hudson, NH)
Knox County Public Schools (Knoxville, TN)
Long Branch School District (Long Branch, NJ)
Memphis Public Schools (Memphis, TN)
Missoula County High School District (MT)
Naperville Public Schools (Naperville, MI)
Northville Public Schools (Northville, MI)
Nova Schools (Ft. Lauderdale, FL)
Orleans Parish School District (New Orleans, LA)
Phoenix Union High School District (Phoenix, AR)
York County Public Schools (Grafton, VA)