This report is intended as a summative overview of the current research and program information related to the rescheduled school year. As such, it deals with (1) present models of rescheduling, (2) the school vacation, (3) basic comparative cost analysis, (4) busing requirements, (5) curriculum design requirements, (6) career opportunities for professional staff, and (7) conclusions and recommendations. The plans considered are those that limit the number of students in attendance at any one time to less than the total enrollment and those that accelerate completion of school to less than the traditional 12 years by extending the length of the school year. In the first group, the report covers the four-quarter plan, the four-quarter plan with rotating vacations, the twelve-four plan, and the 45-15 plan. The continuous four-quarter plan and the 11-month plan are discussed as representative of the second group. Some of the specific plans representative of a combination of the two principles are discussed: the New York Multiple Trails Plan, the New York Continuous Progress Plan, the Metro-Atlanta Plan, and the Flexible All-Year School Plan. A useful table compares the characteristics of major plans on the basis of the length of the school year and school day; divisions in school year; grade levels; time required to effect savings in classrooms, number of teachers, and dollars; vacations (other than Christmas and Spring Break); advantages; and obstacles to change. (Author/DN)
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I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of a 12-month-school year is becoming a point of major interest in contemporary American thinking. This interest has been discussed broadly both within and outside the educational community. It has attracted special attention in the business and professional world. Voiced under various headings such as better utilization of buildings, flexibility and economy in organizing and staffing, and development of educational systems in keeping with the times, the recurring theme appears to be a strong concern for achieving educational economy without sacrificing educational quality. Inherent in this concern and the related discussions is the still uncrystalized but fast developing conviction that a major organizational change in the whole educational scheme is necessary. Additionally, among many educator and parent groups is a strong concern for extending and improving educational opportunities for children.

Given the reality factors mentioned above, the central problem seems to be reorganization of the educational process which will accommodate the changing social and economic restraints while continuing to ensure quality instruction for all students. Restructuring and reorganizing the school year seems to be a logical approach to solving some of the problems.

Rescheduling the school year is a very complicated issue. Historically there have been many types of programs in extending the school year. The
majority of these have failed; no one reason can be cited because of the nature of its complexity. The successful programs were founded because of definite descriptive needs of a particular system. These needs were assessed by school and community involvement in extensive planning and continuous evaluation.

It is imperative to examine the student's needs and his place in tomorrow's society. Such examination will include all facets of the factors and forces that are involved in public education today. The economics of education are of major concern. The educational program is of strong interest to all groups and individuals in and out of the educational arena. The educators themselves must collectively and individually work together in searching for solutions to problems. Last, but not least, the many publics that are served and lend assistance to education should be clearly identified and involved in the process of making educational change.

Effective ways must be found for attacking educational problems. Educators must provide leadership with skills in communication, group process and problem solving so that publics and educators, cooperatively, can work for common solutions.

Consideration of a 12-month-school year involves the reorganization of the total school program. Such educational reorganization challenges family living patterns including work, vacations, and traditions. Problems must be approached through a process involving all facets of society in working toward an educational program to correct existing inadequacies and to meet the demands of a changing world.

In an examination of the year-round school, Nation's Schools suggests:

Like fashions of the Forties, the extended school year is an
whose time has come once again. If 1971 goes down in educational
history as the year of the big push for year-round schools, it won't
be without reason. More districts than ever—the National Education
Association estimates 600—are seriously studying proposals that
would extend the school year beyond its current nine-month calendar.
Only a handful actually have adopted year-round plans, but scores
may follow suit before the school year's end.

The article continues by asking, "Why all this revival of interest in year-
round operations?"

While the questions asked regarding the potential of the rescheduled school
year vary, four basic questions seem reoccurring:

1) What, if any, rescheduled school year plans offer the most potential
for reducing the particular problems or needs of "our" school district?
2) Does there appear to be actual economies in a 12-month school operation
when comparing increased operation maintenance costs with the costs of
additional facilities required to maintain or improve the educational
opportunities for students?
3) What are the community needs for and attitudes toward the traditional
summer vacation?
4) Would a rescheduled school year provide additional career opportunities
for professional staff?

This Task Force Report is intended as a summative overview of the current
research and program information related to the rescheduled school year. As
such, this Report deals with: 1) present models of rescheduling, 2) the school
calendar, 3) basic, comparative cost analysis, 4) bussing requirements, 5)
curriculum design requirements, 6) career opportunities for professional staff,
and 7) conclusions and recommendations.
II. RESCHEDULED SCHOOL YEAR PLANS

While there are many patterns of the rescheduled school year presently being experimented with by individual school districts, the majority of these patterns evolve from one or both of two basic approaches:

The first approach is to limit the number of students in attendance at any one time to less than the total enrollment by scheduling vacations on a rotating basis in such a way that part of the students will be on vacation at all times. The four-quarter plan is based on this approach. Other plans which are a "spin-off" of the four-quarter plan are: the four-quarter plan with a month's vacation after each quarter of study (the Twelve-Four Plan), and the four-quarter plan with each quarter divided into a quarter (the 45-15 Plan).

The second approach is to accelerate completion of school to less than the traditional twelve years by extending the length of the school year, thus reducing total enrollment by narrowing the age range of students served at any one time. The Continuous Four-Quarter Plan and the Eleven-Month School Year Plan are based on this approach.

New York's Multiple Trails and Continuous Progress plans, and the Metro-Atlanta Plan are plans using a combination of these two approaches. Another plan, the Flexible All-Year School Plan, is based on the concept of adapting the time in school schedule and the curriculum on an individual student basis.

Plans Based on Limiting Attendance by Rotating Vacations

Four-Quarter Plan

Students are divided into four sections. Each section goes to schools three quarters and is on vacation one quarter as illustrated in Table 1. Each section is on vacation at a different quarter, but gets its vacation on the same quarter each year.
TABLE 1
FOUR-QUARTER PLAN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Sections in School</th>
<th>Section on Vacation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>ABD</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>ACD</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>BCD</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four-Quarter Plan with Rotating Vacations

In order to give each student a chance to have his vacation in the summer his "share" of the time, the vacations are shifted each year. This cannot be done in such a way that there will be three quarters of study between each quarter of vacation. Sometimes a student will have a vacation after two quarters of work, and sometimes he will go to school six semesters between vacations. Table 2 illustrates a twelve-year school schedule for one section of students, showing how the vacations would be shifted from one quarter to another. Detailing schedules, following the same pattern, would be worked out for each of the other three sections, making sure only one section was on vacation at a time.

TABLE 2
FOUR-QUARTER PLAN WITH ROTATING VACATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: S Indicates in School V Indicates Vacation
The Twelve-Four Plan

Another take-off of the quarter plan is the twelve-four plan, with the basic idea that the school operates twelve months of the year on a four-quarter basis but with a one-month vacation after each quarter of study. A variation of this is the 45-15 Plan whereby each student goes to school 45 days, or nine weeks, then has 15 days, or three weeks, vacation.

These plans are based on the same concept of limited enrollment but try to make the off-season vacations more acceptable by dividing them up throughout the year. They, too, can be modified to change the months or weeks each student is on vacation similar to the idea in Table 2, but periods of time would be in weeks rather than quarters of a year. Table 3 illustrates the Twelve-Four Plan.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: S Indicates in School V Indicates Vacation

All kinds of variations can be worked out altering the length of vacations and how they are scheduled during the year, but still retaining the basic principle of limited enrollment. This could be done also by varying the number of sections and portions of the year. For example, three groups could rotate on a trimester basis or five groups could rotate on a fifth-year basis.
Plans Based on Acceleration by Extending School Year

The Continuous Four-Quarter Plan

The continuous four-quarter plan is designated to have all students in school four quarters of the year instead of three. In this way, a student could complete four years of regular work in three. (Four quarters per year times three years equals twelve quarters of school time.)

The Eleven-Month Plan

This plan proposes to operate the school eleven months instead of nine for all students. In this way, a student would complete school more rapidly. Since the standard public school is twelve years and standard school year is nine months, the standard time in school is a total of 108 months. A student attending school eleven months per year for ten years would complete 110 months of school.

Plans Combining the Two Principles

New York Multiple Trails Plan

New York's Multiple Trails Plan proposes a 210-day school year with the same amount of "learning time" as the 180-day school year, but fewer minutes per day, releasing 25 percent of the classroom space for expanded enrollment. Extra (E) time may be used for acceleration.

New York Continuous Progress Plan

New York's Continuous Progress Plan also provides a 210-day school year, using part of the Extra (E) time for acceleration and part for release of classroom space by modular scheduling.
### Characteristics of Some Regular School Year Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Continuous School Year Plan</th>
<th>Multiple Trials Plan</th>
<th>Multiple Variations Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PLAN</strong></td>
<td>The plan calls for the completion of the regular year's work in 180 instructional days, with the remaining days spent on the next school's work. By the end of the sixth year, or basic level, some regular grade will have completed. This plan is based on the philosophy that continuous progress will become a reality.</td>
<td>May be implemented in a single school year, without an extended fall or winter. Through use of multiple two-month and extended months, this plan meets the needs for varying lengths of time. It provides classroom space, teacher and pupil hours immediately, in addition to special classes. In Stage 2, use of the extra pupil time is used for acceleration. Stages three and four are designed to add time for educational objectives.</td>
<td>Stages require little in the way of additional preparation or curriculum development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LENGTH OF EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR</strong></td>
<td>155 days to save 1 year in 5 &lt;br&gt; 255 days to save 1 year in 7 &lt;br&gt; 275 days to save 1 year in 8</td>
<td>210 days</td>
<td>174-178 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LENGTH OF SCHOOL DAY</strong></td>
<td>Normal hours, September to June &lt;br&gt; 4-4½ hours, July or August</td>
<td>Normal hours</td>
<td>Normal hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVISIONS IN SCHOOL YEAR</strong></td>
<td>7-12, 1-8, 1-8</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Students in 45 school days, and 45 school days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADE LEVELS</strong></td>
<td>7-12, 1-8, 1-8</td>
<td>7-12, 1-8, 1-8</td>
<td>7-12, 1-8, 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME REQUIRED TO EFFECT SAVINGS IN CLASSROOMS, TEACHERS, AND DOLLARS</strong></td>
<td>In 4-year plan, 6 years &lt;br&gt; In 7-year plan, 6 years for average pupils, 3 years for bright pupils</td>
<td>Stage 1 - does not occur immediately &lt;br&gt; Stage 2 - for grades 1-12, 5 years &lt;br&gt; Stage 3 - for grades 1-12, 3 years &lt;br&gt; Stage 4 - depends on student and needs</td>
<td>Immediate savings, 15 percent of existing space in the first year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VACATIONS BEYOND NORMAL CHRISTMAS &amp; SPRING BREAK</strong></td>
<td>6 to 7 weeks</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>15 days following each 45-day instructional period, in addition to regular local holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADVANTAGES</strong></td>
<td>Saves elementary school year in 6 or 7 without division in school year. Pupils have fewer teaching changes. Pupils have more time in formative years to master skills and concepts required for later studies.</td>
<td>May be implemented in various forms to meet economic, instructional, social, familial patterns, or similar patterns. Before normal classes are modified, full acceleration is not necessary. Full acceleration and one other hour, or similar pattern.</td>
<td>Provides 15% for the construction plus 15% of work thereof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBSTACLES TO CHANGE</strong></td>
<td>Curriculum must be reorganized. The concept of continuous progress should be adopted and implemented.</td>
<td>Implementation of this plan, with its multiple time periods, requires careful evaluation and revision of teaching periods. The current and prospective concepts of Stage one need for such preparation and continuous effort.</td>
<td>Curriculum after reorganization with revisions of material, teacher, and pupil adjustment to facilities, staff, and student needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Adapted from Thomas, George E. "Emphasis and Emphasis: Educational Opportunity Through Extended School Year Programs." Albany: University of the State of New York, State Education Department, October 31, 1940.
### Scheduled School Year Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extended Summer Plan</th>
<th>Trimester Plan</th>
<th>Quarter Plan</th>
<th>Extended K-12 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three weeks</td>
<td>Three months</td>
<td>Three terms</td>
<td>Three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1 to 6/14</td>
<td>6/1 to 6/14</td>
<td>6/1 to 6/14</td>
<td>9/1 to 6/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59 hours</td>
<td>20 to 23 hours</td>
<td>15 to 18 hours</td>
<td>180 to 200 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credit Restrictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Credit Restrictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Credit Restrictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Credit Restrictions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No credit</td>
<td>No credit</td>
<td>No credit</td>
<td>No credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required credit</td>
<td>Required credit</td>
<td>Required credit</td>
<td>Required credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attendance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full attendance</td>
<td>Full attendance</td>
<td>Full attendance</td>
<td>Full attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grading System</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grading System</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grading System</strong></td>
<td><strong>Grading System</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass/fail</td>
<td>Pass/fail</td>
<td>Pass/fail</td>
<td>Pass/fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Extended K-12 Plan is based on a standard four-year program.*
The Metro-Atlanta Plan

The metropolitan area of Atlanta has initiated a basic four-quarter plan with attendance of the fourth (summer) quarter optional. In the future, Atlanta expects to permit students to select any three of the four quarters to attend (which will reduce attendance to less than the total enrollment) or attend the four quarters (which will accelerate progress toward graduation).

The Flexible All-Year School Plan

The Flexible All-Year School Plan is based on the concept that two basic needs in education are emerging as a result of technological change: the need for quality education for all students, requiring instruction to be individualized; and, the need for adapting the school time schedule to the work force schedule, thereby requiring student time schedules to be individualized.

The All-Year School Plan is designed to operate year-round, with no beginning or ending of the school year. Each student can take his vacation any time of the year he needs to, and for whatever length of time is needed (providing legal requirements are met).
III. THE SCHOOL VACATION

One reality underlying most, if not all, rescheduled school year plans is the requirement of new school vacation scheduling. Since such vacation scheduling does affect all students and their parents in some manner, vacation scheduling has been a subject of research by nearly all school districts initiating a rescheduled school year plan.

While vacation rescheduling requirements have tended to cause consternation among a segment of the population in each community where a rescheduled school year plan has been introduced, some current shifts in business and industry which change the vacation schedules of the work force from predominately summertime vacations to rotating vacation schedules may reduce such concern:

1) Many parents are now getting their vacations at different times of the year.

2) In some industries workers are splitting their vacations, taking two vacations at different times of the year instead of one.

3) Management has become less dependent upon a temporary work force of teachers and older students during summer months.

Such shifts in business and industry, and ultimately, in parent vacation schedules, may require the school calendar to become flexible enough to adapt to changing family needs. The three-month, traditional summer school vacation, called by some writers "a relic of the horse and buggy day" may, in fact, be detrimental and incompatible with family and community living patterns.

In their evaluation report of the 1971 summer Quinmester Program (Dade County, Florida), researchers found that 36 of the largest 43 businesses in Dade County responded neutrally (19) or positively (17) when asked if the Quinmester Program would make their vacation scheduling easier. Similarly,
284 of 317 small businesses sampled were neutral (197) or positive (87) regarding the question of vacation scheduling. Approximately 36 per cent of students sampled and 40 per cent of parents sampled indicated a willingness and ability to take their vacation at some time of the year other than in the summer.

The Valley View 45-15 Continuous School Year Plan (Lockport, Illinois) stresses that family vacation opportunities will be made more flexible under their plan. In the Valley View 45-15 Plan, every family has a vacation of 23-28 days during each season of the year. No research data are available regarding business and community reaction to such vacation scheduling, however.

Of the various rescheduled school year plans either proposed or operational, the All-Year School Plan is undoubtedly the most adaptive to the changes in family vacation patterns and family vacation needs. Since each student is left free to choose his own vacation schedule and the length of that schedule, the number of possible vacation schedules is limited only by the number of students actually enrolled in the schools operating under this plan. The value of the flexible, All-Year School Plan with regard to vacation scheduling must be weighed against the potential problems created by the required, individualized instructional program.

The Continuous Four-Quarter Plan and the Eleven-Month School Year do not seem to offer substantive relief from the problems associated with shifting family vacation patterns. Instead, these two plans actually narrow the time of year a family can have a vacation together.
IV. BASIC COMPARATIVE COSTS

On July 30, 1969, Governor Raymond P. Shafer, of Pennsylvania, signed into law a bill designed to promote more efficient use of Commonwealth public school facilities through flexible school year scheduling. At that time, Governor Shafer stated:

Flexibility in scheduling will allow for year-round school programs which, after a period of transition, can provide relief to our spiraling school costs through a more efficient use of classrooms and teachers, relief from the need to build additional schools and reduction in transportation costs.

Despite these obvious, hoped-for results, a review of the research related to the rescheduled school year does not suggest such a sizeable, year-by-year saving. In fact, depending upon individual district circumstances and the particular plan selected, the rescheduled school year may actually cost more than the traditional, nine-month school year.

In August, 1971, Plymouth Joint School District #8, Plymouth, Wisconsin, completed an eleven-month study comparing cost variables for their present 180-day program with those for a projected 45-15 Plan over a five-year period. While the actual dollar estimates by line-item are not generalizable, the potential significant variable factors identified by this study are important. The Plymouth Study Council concluded:

1) Increased administrative costs will be necessary as payroll and bookkeeping staff will now have additional work computing the varying length of teacher contracts, changed salary schedules and extra compensation for extra duties.
2) Four principals in the district are not on 12-month contracts. Their contracts must be extended and relief provided for vacations while school is in session.

3) In specialized instructional areas where there is only one instructor per subject or grade level, these instructors would have to be employed year-round or a "specialist" substitute would have to be found to provide vacation opportunity for the regular teacher.

4) Special subject area teachers who instruct in more than one school will be traveling more days, requiring a larger travel reimbursement.

5) Added costs of plant operations under the year-round plan will be due to three factors:
   a) summer, building cleaning will not be possible with school in operation all year (more custodial help will be needed),
   b) additional personnel must be hired to cover vacation periods for regular custodians, and
   c) utility costs will increase with greater building use.

6) Existing classroom space plus enrollment projections require construction of the equivalent of 18 classrooms by 1976. The average annual payment required to retire this expense ($621,000) in 20 years at five percent interest will result in a cost addition under a traditional school year plan.

7) Since the high school is the only air-conditioned building in the district, other buildings will have the cost of alteration and installation of air-conditioning equipment as an expense of year-round plant operation. This cost ranges from $2.75 to $3.10 per square foot of floor space.
Since the 45-15 Plan is essentially a derivative of the Twelve-Four Plan, the cost factor associated with instructional staff salaries is generalizable to most Four-Quarter Plans. In the regular school year, four teachers teaching three quarters of work each for a total of twelve quarters would cost the same as three teachers teaching four quarters each or twelve quarters on the all-year plan. However, if all teachers choose to work the fourth quarter (a possibility), with their combined teaching responsibilities representing a one-third increase in contract length, there would be a 20 to 30 percent increase in salaries.

Since consumable supplies are directly related to the number of students served, there should be no savings in this category. Textbooks, however, could be used by 25 percent more students, but the books would wear out sooner. Again, there will probably be no saving in this area.

To estimate the impact of the four-quarter operation on the total school budget, the possible impact of each category must be converted to a percent of the total budget. For example, if there is a 20 percent savings on Insurance and Fixed Charges, and that category represents 7 percent of the total budget, the savings on the total budget would be 20 percent of 7 percent or 1.4 percent.

In rescheduled school year plans not specifically designed to provide greater economy such as the voluntary year-round plan in Fulton County (Atlanta), Georgia, cost factors may show a substantial increase. In the first quarter of operation, the voluntary Atlanta Plan cost Atlanta an additional $1.8 million. Since the Atlanta Plan does not yet receive state financing, a portion of the added operating expenses is paid for by students who opt for four continuous quarters of instruction. In the final quarter,
the student is required to pay $20 for the first subject and $18 for each additional subject, or $96 for a full course load.

Irrespective of the actual rescheduled school year plan being studied, basic cost comparisons are difficult to analyse and compute. Because the needs of each school district initiating a rescheduled school year plan vary to some extent and because each district has acted on the basis of some needs assessment, actual costs may vary substantially. Generally, districts faced with increasing student enrollments and the need for a substantial, new building program may derive some short-range savings by implementing a rescheduled school year plan. If enrollments should continue to increase beyond the capability of the rescheduled school year plan to absorb the increase, however, and future building is required, this new building program will likely be more expensive.

In those districts now using some form of the rescheduled school year to bring flexibility and individualization into the instructional program (and not to reduce the need for a substantial building program), there tends to be cost increases. Such increases in cost, however, are not really attributable to the rescheduled school year plan. Rather, the cost increase is related to the nature of the new instructional program.
V. BUSSING REQUIREMENTS

In most rescheduled school year plans, student scheduling into the instructional program is done by residence or neighborhood. In the Four-Quarter Plan, four groupings of students (each group with a different vacation schedule) are designated by sectoring the school population drawing area. In this design, essentially the same number of busses are required as were required in the traditional nine-month school year. Under the Four-Quarter Plan, busses rotate around the sectors, with one sector always on vacation.

In the yet unoperational 45-15 Plan at Champlain Valley Union High School (Champlain Valley, Vermont), grouping for student transportation proposes not to take into account residence, grade level, courses selected or friends. Each bus is assigned four-thirds of a busload. If the bus capacity is 60 students, bus routes are established for 80 students. Because of the variation in vacation schedules among the 80 students, no more than 60 students will actually be attending school at any one time.

In voluntary rescheduled school year plans and in the All-Year School Plan, bus schedules and bussing requirements are more difficult to preplan. As a result, transportation costs may increase if standardized "pick-up" points are not prearranged which give maximum coverage throughout the population drawing area.
VI. CURRICULUM DESIGN

While it is not always true, in most cases, movement to some form of the extended or rescheduled school year does require adjustment in the nature and/or length of curricular programs implemented within a district or an individual school.

The Trimester, Quarter and Extended K-12 Plan each will require or need lengthened daily class periods beyond the length of class periods in the traditional, nine-month school year program. In the Trimester Plan, the year is divided into three terms, while in the Quarter Plan, the year is divided into four terms. Lengthened class periods may act to equalize the time assigned to individual course offerings.

Trimester, Quarter and Extended K-12 Plans should provide added opportunity for both accelerated and remedial curricula without requiring total programming revisions. Extra (E) time can be granted to students for additional enrichment courses, work experience or early college entry at times other than September.

The Continuous School Year Plan, the Multiple Trails Plan and the Multiple Variations Plan will all require substantial curriculum revision and reorganization. Because of the "continuous progress" and individualized nature of these three plans, better means of student accounting, individualized scheduling and individualized instruction must be adopted and implemented. A revision in teaching materials and teaching procedures may also be required.

The Valley View 45-15 Plan (Lockport, Illinois) was implemented by adjusting the traditional instructional program into four 45-day terms. No major curriculum revisions were made, although scheduling is now done
by computer. Comparatively, Atlanta, Georgia's voluntary Four-Quarter Plan required near-total curriculum redesign. Traditional textbooks become obsolete. Teachers designed and assembled their own materials for totally new quarter courses. More than 800 courses are now offered to Atlanta secondary students each quarter; approximately 70 percent can be taken in any order desired.

By planning their programs three or four times a year, Atlanta students have a wide variety of enrichment options. Students interested in in-depth study of a subject can schedule blocks of course time concurrently. By enrolling in all four quarters, early graduation is possible.
VII. CAREER OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Most rescheduled school year plans do provide some teachers with career opportunities that are not usually available under the 9-month school year. These opportunities include: increased salaries, curriculum development opportunity, adjustable vacation schedules, allowances for continued schooling and the possibility of more individualized instruction.

In the Molalla, Oregon, 12-Month Elementary School Plan, it is possible for teachers to take 3-month vacations back-to-back and return to school for a 6-month period with full pay. For women seeking to raise families, vacation periods can be arranged to coincide with the termination of their pregnancies.

In Stevenson, Washington, all teachers are on an extended summer contract. One-third of the staff teaches summer school, one-third works on curricula and one-third attends school.

The 45-15 Plan at Becky-David, St. Charles County, Missouri, offers teachers three choices: The 45-15 Plan, a regular nine-month schedule or a twelve-month teaching schedule. Special teachers in art, music and physical education generally work twelve months. A majority of the primary teachers have followed the 45-15 Plan, which permits them to stay with the same students for the full year. Junior high teachers have generally chosen to work nine months. During the summer, they are replaced by teachers from nearby districts. All salaries are prorated on the basis of a 185-day contract.

The Eleven-Month Plan in Rochester, Minnesota, offers teachers an opportunity to work an extended contract year. At first, 92 percent of the district's teachers volunteered for this option. Presently, only teachers with three years' experience in the district are eligible for extended employment.
Valley View's 45-15 Plan allows teachers many choices in the actual length of their contract. During the first operational year, some contracts extended to 274 days, with 184 days being the shortest contractual period. Salaries are prorated on the basis of a 184-day contract.

The Valley View Plan required adaptations in district policy:

1) Professional growth requirements were abolished;

2) Extra duty assignments were made only with the consent of the teacher, and

3) Annual sick leaves were increased for teachers working an extended school year.
VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As this Task Force Report suggests, there are numerous designs now available of rescheduled school year plans. While some of these plans are currently operational, many plans have not evolved beyond basic planning and discussion models. Unfortunately, very little evaluative data exists on any of those plans which are operational.

The successful implementation of any rescheduled school year plan depends largely upon its acceptance and support by students, teachers and the total community. All involved persons must have a clear understanding of the primary purposes of the rescheduled school year.

The major goal of any rescheduled plan should focus on providing greater educational opportunities for students. Students, parents and teachers must know exactly the degree of flexibility in scheduling, schedule options, courses leading to early graduation, and possibilities for a variety of educational programs, including career and community-related experiences.

Teachers should know what the rescheduled school year plan will do for them and exactly what the plan may expect of them. The public should be appraised of the cost justifications for the plan and, in the case of parents, the educational benefits that may accrue to their children.

The Oregon Education Association Task Force on the Rescheduled School Year encourages all Oregon school districts contemplating the rescheduled school year to:

1. Study the relative advantages and values of differing types of rescheduled school year plans with great care. Goals for selecting a single plan from among the available rescheduled school year plans can easily become confused. Any plan
selected should be selected on the basis of clearly defined educational goals and purposes. The most important goal to be considered is one of improving educational opportunities for youth.

2. Make use of broadly based study councils involving interested staff, lay persons, students, parents and community groups. These study councils or committees must be clearly representative of the community which the proposed rescheduled school year plans will affect.

3. Develop a plan of action which identifies and establishes priorities, implementation steps, preservice and inservice program needs, curricular and instructional processes and resource needs.

4. Consider all potentially critical aspects of the proposed rescheduled school year plan. Determine ways to maintain good communications throughout the community, focusing on the plan's affect upon students, parents, teachers and the larger community.

5. Develop a plan for assessment. Using stated goals and objectives as assessment criteria, analyse the effectiveness of the plan selected during each developmental and operational stage. There is need for substantially more research on the effectiveness of all operational plans.
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