ABSTRACT

These two papers review research on year-round elementary and secondary school, noting that although proponents of year-round schooling emphasize cost savings, student achievement gains, and increased attendance, many studies and reports contradict these claims. Most of the studies reviewed found no significant increase in the educational benefits of year-round calendars. The first paper discusses quality and claims of relieving overcrowding in year-round schools. It is observed that year-round schooling costs more than traditional schooling, and that other disadvantages of year-round schools include difficulties posed for teachers and families, administrative difficulties, prohibiting teachers' professional development, and negative effects on community businesses. Many districts that implemented year-round school calendars found that parents complained of family disruption, and teachers and administrators complained of overwork. The bulk of the second paper consists of quotations and excerpts from research and newspaper reports in 26 states that have debated the concept of year-round schools. (MDM)
Introduction

Broadly defined, a year-round school restructures the school calendar, eliminating the traditional summer vacation and replacing it with shorter, more frequent breaks. Although year-round schools hold classes 12 months a year, students on year-round schedules usually attend school the same number of days as those on traditional school calendars, an average of 180 days a year. Some year-round calendars actually operate fewer days in order to schedule in the frequent vacations.

There are a variety of year-round calendars, including, but not limited to, the following: 90/30, 45/15 and 60/20. In the 90/30 calendar, for example, students attend school for 90 days, then are on vacation for 30 days. Variations of the schedules exist.

Year-round scheduling was first considered to relieve overcrowding. On a "multi-track" calendar, students are divided into tracks. The tracks rotate in and out of school with one track always on vacation, theoretically enabling a facility to accommodate more students.

Year-round schools are considered to improve education, to be innovative, to relieve overcrowding or to save money. If these are the goals, year-round schools may not be the answer.

Quality of Education

The most important question is "Do year-round schools improve education?" Many studies conducted on year-round schools suggest the answer is no. Changing the days that students attend school does not address what many believe are the real problems in education which include lack of parent involvement, curriculum that needs restructuring, teacher continued education, and effectiveness of teaching methods.

Proponents claim that with the shorter, more frequent breaks of a year-round calendar, students retain more of what they've learned. But psychologists believe this is an unproven and illogical claim. Randall Engle, a University of South Carolina psychology professor specializing in human memory, says children forget most of what they learn in the first three weeks after a lesson. Therefore, shorter, more frequent breaks would give children more opportunities to forget and increase the need for review. (The State, May 10, 1992)
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Few comprehensive studies are available to prove the effectiveness of year-round schools. Educators caution that research supporting year-round schools is scant and unscientific. From the country's 2,000+ year-round schools, a National Association for Year-Round Education researcher could find only 13 comprehensive studies on the issue. Ten of those studies show year-round students performing better; only seven show significant improvement. Tom Payne, a year-round consultant for the California Department of Education, says each study is flawed in some way, using improper methodology, or lacking control groups and breadth. (Winston-Salem Journal)

Proponents refer to test scores from San Diego year-round schools. However, in February, 1993, the San Diego School Board imposed a moratorium on single-track, year-round schools because the district was losing money on the year-round program. In addition, in an in-depth evaluation of the five year-round school reports, the district found the research weak, lacking and inadequate and called it "advocacy research - finding what you're looking for." (letter of evaluation, 3/3/93)

An objective evaluation of the research from San Diego found:

- achievement differences between year-round and traditional schools are inconclusive
- year-round school will not yield higher achievement scores
- achievement gains cannot predictably be expected

Test scores from year-round schools show little significant increase, indicating psychologists may be right:

• "There is no confirmation from empirical research that student learning retention increases under year-round education programs," according to a study by the Texas A&M Center for Business and Economic Analysis (1992). Not only is there not sufficient research to prove the desirability of year-round schools, the research that supports the concept is often flawed and methodologically inaccurate.

• A Los Angeles Unified School district evaluation found that the average verbal Scholastic Aptitude Test scores for year-round students were much lower than at traditional schools and somewhat lower in math. Based on the SAT mean scores, students on the year-round calendar were not as prepared for university-level work as those on a traditional calendar. The study also reported more student burnout for high school students on the year-round calendar. (1989 Integration Evaluation Report, publication #548.)

Year-round school "is not a program for academic achievement," confirms Floraline Stevens, research director for a Los Angeles study. (Chronicle, 4/10/91)
After five years of mandatory year-round schools, the Los Angeles School Board scrapped the controversial year-round calendar in all but one of its 544 single-track, year-round schools after parents and administrators voted to return to the traditional calendar. The year-round calendar cost $4.2 million per year to implement and education returns were insignificant. (*Los Angeles Times*, 5/28/93)

- Phi Delta Kappa's Center on Evaluation, Development and Research studied year-round schools and concluded:

  "Despite the claims that long summer vacations lead to lessened achievement, year-round schools are not associated with great leaps in academic achievement. Standardized testing shows that year-round programs have little impact on scores one way or the other. If a district is looking to show major increases on standardized tests, year-round schools are not the answer."

- A study for the National Education Association concludes that "... year-round school generally does not have significant positive effects on achievement ...

Some studies may show slight increases in test scores for students in year-round schools but administrators emphasize those increases are not necessarily the result of the year-round calendar.

- In the Lodi School District (east of San Francisco), CAP (California Assessment Program) test scores "increased significantly" in year-round schools. Bev Lacey, Lodi year-round coordinator, says the improvement is a result of better learning tools, interested parents, concerned teachers and students who were eager to learn - not necessarily because of year-round schools. According to Lacey, there is nothing to determine that year-round schools have helped and most parents would rather be back on a traditional schedule. (Interview, November, 1991)

- A 1991 evaluation of the three year-round elementary schools in Orange County (Orlando) Florida reports that "although test results are positive, it is impossible to isolate exactly how much effect implementation of year-round education had on the test scores. (Orange County Year-Round Program Evaluation Office, Report of Results, August, 1991)

**Relieving Overcrowding**

School districts often consider implementing year-round schools to solve an overcrowding problem. In some cases, year-round schools have provided temporary relief. However, several districts report year-round schools did not accomplish this goal or were merely a band-aid solution to a long-term problem. If overcrowding is a long-term concern, new construction is inevitable and postponing construction merely increases future construction costs.
The Bethel (Washington) school district used multitrack from 1974 to 1981 to handle overcrowding but returned to the traditional calendar when a construction bond was passed. There was no difference in test results and the district accommodated enrollment without new construction for seven years. "It did what is was supposed to do - house students in existing facilities. But the district had increased costs for food service, transportation and administration, some teachers suffered burnout and the district felt out of sync with others in the state. It ultimately built new facilities at inflated costs. (Peninsula Daily News, 8/15/93)

• In 1990, the school board of the Los Angeles Unified School District mandated conversion of all schools to the year-round calendar by June, 1991 to relieve severe overcrowding.

The Los Angeles Times reports several school administrators believe "there is no way year-round schools are going to solve the problem of overcrowding." "Administrators say the solution is to build more schools. Everything in between is a Band-Aid." (LA Times, April 29, 1990)

• The Houston, TX school district reports on its year-round school experiment in the mid-1980s:

  - Year-round schools in Houston failed to ease overcrowding. In fact, a crowding problem was created in some schools because of the intersessions. Many parents sent their children to intersessions because schools provided free or reduced price lunches.
  - Crowding became such a drastic problem in some schools that classes were held in auditoriums, civic centers and outdoors.

Despite cutting the year-round program because it was far too costly, Houston and area school districts are again implementing several year-round programs. The Conroe year-round schools report improvements in academic achievement have not been dramatic. Conroe will continue the year-round program although Imogene Geisinger, assistant schools superintendent concedes "The results did not show major improvements as we had hoped." (Shreveport Times, January 19, 1992)
Cost of Education

"Are year-round schools less costly to operate than traditional schools?" School districts have rejected the idea of year-round schools because taxpayers know the answer is "no."

"Many hear that all-year use of facilities can reduce or postpone new building costs. This leads them quite unrealistically to expect that annual budgets will decline. While new construction cost can be saved temporarily, year-round use of buildings will increase maintenance costs … annual budgets will go up. [Unpleasant financial problems] cannot be met simply by more intensive use of existing facilities," says Gordon McCloskey of Washington State University, in a study for the U.S. Department of Education. (Seminole County cost effectiveness study, 1989)

Phi Delta Kappa reports, "Cost savings which result from the avoidance of new construction are reduced by higher operating and maintenance costs. In growing districts, savings may be entirely offset if inevitable new construction is completed about original estimates, due to inflation. A district should not consider implementing year-round school simply to save money."

Several California year-round school districts, including Oxnard, report that operating costs per year-round student do not even reach the "break-even" point with costs per students on traditional schedules unless the year-round school operates multi-track and increases student capacity to 115%. The cost per student does not decline until the year-round school capacity exceeds 120%. (Weppner Report, Florida Atlantic University)

- The Albuquerque (New Mexico) Public Schools Board of Education commissioned an independent analysis of the cost to convert all district schools to a year-round schedule through 2005. The study reported the total costs of the conversion to be $60 million. The study calculated expected savings from converting to year-round to be only $50 million, thus costing the district over $10 million to implement year-round schools district-wide. (Architectural Research Consultants, Inc., Dean Johnson, III, CPA).

- A study for Lewisville, TX concludes: There is no financial benefit to operating a single track system because of the increase in operational expenses. The bottom line is there are no significant tax savings. The Committee is unaware of any instructional benefit of year-round school that justifies an increased expense. (Lewisville Year-Round Education Study, 11/1991.)

- It costs Los Angeles $4.2 million per year to operate their year-round programs. (Los Angeles Times, 4/6/94). The Los Angeles study reports: "Initially, the year-round school calendar will save money; however, the wear on the facilities is greater. thus shortening building life-span. This suggests that short-term savings can be achieved, but there will be higher, long-term replacement costs."
A cost effectiveness study for Seminole County (Florida) concludes, "There are no estimated cost savings - either short-term or long-term which can result from providing year-round operation of schools. Modified calendars will produce an immediate increase in available capacity of existing schools, all long-term savings in construction costs will be more than offset by increased operating costs.

Other Disadvantages of Year-Round Schools

Difficult on Families and Teachers

According to Payne, this is the issue that is most troubling of all: ".The paramount problem is that (year-round) has the potential to break the family apart." (Chronicle, 4/10/91)

School administrators in Davis, Utah regret switching four secondary schools to a year-round calendar, saying "they were sold a bill of goods" they hate. One school principal says, "The disruption to the families is just too great. We'd like to get back to the traditional schedule as soon as possible." (Deseret News, February 26, 1993)

In addition:

- Teachers rotate classrooms each session, moving materials in and out of classrooms.
- Families find it difficult to schedule vacations when children are on different tracks.

Administrative Difficulties

- In Houston, "schools were turning into day-care centers." Many parents sent their children to intersessions, often because of the free and reduced breakfasts and lunches.
- The HISD report states, "scheduling was a logistic nightmare -- everything from assigning classes to delivering and accounting for classroom materials."
- Principals and program administrators are highly susceptible to "burnout".
- Students and teachers must be reoriented every session instead of once in the fall.
- Teachers must "gear up" and "wind down" more often

Prohibits Teachers' Professional Development

- Year-round school teachers do not have summers to pursue their own education -- Master's degrees, recertification courses of further education
- Teachers lose the additional income of summer jobs.

Effects on Community Businesses

- With children in school year-round, many businesses lose money and a labor force.
- High school students attending year-round schools are unavailable to work during the summer or any season for more than several weeks at a time, affecting community businesses as well as the students' opportunity to gain work experience.
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Trying Year-Round Schools - Returning to a Traditional Schedule

There are over 2,000 schools nationwide who have implemented a variation of the year-round calendar. Some have done so successfully with little resistance; others operate year-round despite heated protests from parents, teachers, administrators or the community. Hope Coleman of the NAYRE says, "Year-round schools have caused controversy in nearly every district that has considered them." Some schools tried the calendar but returned to the traditional schedule. Like Lewisville, Texas, many communities chose not to implement a year-round calendar after thorough analysis showed the cost was too high and it didn’t improve education.

"Case after case has documented that the public, while willing to support a year-round program to avoid tax increases or double sessions, is unwilling to support the continuation of the program on a long-term basis once they experience the inconvenience and disruption" of year-round schools. (Seminole County, FL study)

- Albuquerque planned to implement the year-round calendar in 17 schools. In the most recent school board elections, angry voters rejected the year-round calendar by replacing pro-year-round school board members with candidates who promised to eliminate year-round schools. In addition to public opposition, the program was costly and studies showed attendance was poorer and more students were flunking in year-round schools. The same study found no evidence that student achievement improved. (Albuquerque Tribune)

- Marion County piloted Florida’s most recent year-round school experiment in three elementary schools. After operating year-round for five years, the school board put an end to year-round schools saying "the expected benefits never were realized." The Board reports "test scores did not increase, it was tearing families apart, and we had teacher burnout." (Florida Times-Union, 3/2/93)

- Schools in Jefferson County, Colorado abandoned the year-round calendar in 1989 after 13 years of year-round operation in approximately 50 district schools. Despite community protests, half of the district’s schools went year-round beginning in 1974 to relieve overcrowding. The district reports no educational improvement or increased test scores. In fact, the decline in test scores in one high school led to the decision to return to the traditional calendar. (Jefferson County School District information, 1991)
Conclusion

Although proponents of year-round schools emphasize that the calendar increases cost savings, student achievement and student attendance, many studies contradict these claims. Most studies find no significant increase in educational benefits in the year-round calendar. Reports from around the country, including Texas, Virginia, California, North Carolina, New Mexico and Florida, found that student achievement did not increase and that year-round schools are more costly to operate.

Schools districts that estimated costs of a year-round program rejected the concept after analyzing the increased costs. Other districts found out the hard way - year-round schools cost more to operate.

Although some parents and teachers find the year-round schedule more convenient, many who have experienced year-round schools -- students, teachers, parents and administrators -- have expressed frustration and dissatisfaction.

Some look to year-round schools as an innovative change in education. Change for change sake, or merely shifting the days of a calendar year, does little to change to quality of education.

Before anyone experiments with the school calendar, it is important to learn all sides of the issue. It is questionable whether year-round programs enhance learning and save money. It is not questionable that quality education is essential to the well-being of our children, state and nation -- nor that improving educational standards is a commendable constant goal. But year-round education is not an effective approach.

Increasing student achievement, controlling the cost of education and eliminating overcrowding are excellent goals. But year-round schools have not been proven to meet these goals. To the question of how to improve education, year-round schools may not be the answer.

Revised: December, 1993
YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLS: MANY FIND IT’S NOT THE ANSWER

Schools and communities around the country are rejecting year-round schools after trying the calendar or thoroughly examining the concept. "Case after case has documented that the public is unwilling to support the continuation of the program once they experience the inconvenience and disruption of year-round schools." (Seminole County, FL study of year-round schools)

Year-round school is not a new concept. In fact, it’s been experimented with since before World War II. Since then, many have rejected year-round schools because study of, or experience with, a year-round calendar often shows:

- no evidence of significant impact on quality education or academic achievement
- year-round schools are more costly to operate
- little community support for the calendar
- concern for disruption in family life with few benefits

For example:

- Three Marion County elementary schools were the first Florida schools in recent history to experiment with the year-round calendar. After five years, the school board put an end to year-round schools. "Our test scores did not go up. It was tearing families apart. We had teacher burnout and more busing. The expected benefits were never realized," says Jan Cameron, school board chairman. *(Florida Times Union, March 2, 1993)*

- Albuquerque planned to implement the year-round calendar in 17 schools. In the most recent school board elections, angry voters rejected the year-round calendar by replacing pro-year-round school board members with candidates who opposed the concept. The Board immediately imposed a moratorium on conversion to year-round schools. Staffers and parents in the 17 year-round schools soundly rejected the calendar.

In addition to public opposition, an independent consultant analyzed the cost to convert all district schools to a year-round schedule through 2005 to be $60 million. School studies showed attendance was poorer and more students were flunking in year-round schools. The same study found no evidence that student achievement improved. *(Albuquerque Tribune)*

- Schools in Jefferson County, Colorado abandoned the year-round calendar in 1989 after 13 years of year-round operation in approximately 50 district schools. Despite community protests, half of the district’s schools went year-round beginning in 1974 to relieve overcrowding. The district reports no educational improvement or increased test scores. In fact, the decline in test scores in one high school led to the decision to return to the traditional calendar. The community passed a $93 million school construction bond six years ago to get rid of year-round school. When the year-round issue threatened again in 1992, the community soundly defeated it, based on past experience. *(Jefferson County School District information, 1991)*
Other examples:

California

- The Los Angeles School Board scrapped the controversial year-round schedule at more than 540 schools after all but one of the 543 schools eligible voted to switch back to the traditional calendar. The district's multi-track schools did not have the option due to overcrowding. Opposition was based on the cost ($4.2 million per year) and the "heat factor" - a high school football player died during August football practice last year. The number of year-round schools now drops by 25% to 1505. *Los Angeles Times, May 4, 1993*

- The San Diego school board imposed a moratorium on year-round schools, barring district schools from switching to the year-round calendar. The district already operated 27 single-track year-round schools which lost $1.4 million in average daily attendance allocations between July and September, 1992. *San Diego Union-Tribune, 3/11/93*

- Oxnard High School rejected a plan to move the year-round calendar after a survey showed parents and students opposed the idea. *Los Angeles Times, 10/29/93*

- Ventura voters rejected a ballot proposal that would have put most district schools on a year-round calendar. *LA Times, 11/4/93*

- Several schools in Lodi implemented year-round schools in 1990 but returned to a regular calendar after two years. Teachers complained that instruction was crammed into shorter blocks and the rotating system prevented them from keeping their own rooms, and administrators were overworked. The district's superintendent predicted anything saved by not building would be eaten up by added costs in 15 years. *Bakersfield Californian, 1/18/92*

- The superintendent of the Kern County High School District doesn't want year-round schools, saying they're costly, complex, educationally inferior and they promote tracking by ability. *Bakersfield Californian, 1/18/92*

Colorado

- The Boulder School Board shelved year-round schools and will ask voters to raise taxes for new schools. A survey of 2,260 parents and school employees showed strong opposition against the concept. *Boulder Daily Camera, June 25, 1993*

- Schools in Cherry Creek went year-round about 10 years ago, but returned to the traditional calendar to save money and cut costs. *Aurora Sentinel, 12/11/91*

Connecticut

- The Trumball school district decided not to pilot a year-round program, to the relief of concerned parents. *May, 1993*
**Florida**

- Faced with a surge of opposition, the Osceola School Board agreed it would not put two high schools on the year-round calendar. More than 200 parents, teachers, coaches and students complained about the proposal. *(Orlando Sentinel, 11/4/93)*

- In 1990, five Pensacola schools considered the year-round calendar but dropped the idea because of a lack of community support. Officials considered the idea again in 1992 but it failed again. *(Pensacola News Journal, 10/27/93)*

- The St. Lucie school board voted against year-round schools, citing budget constraints. Naples schools defeated the year-round calendar citing protests from parents as the primary reason. *(May, 1993)*

- Dade County started a year-round program in 1969 to deal with an overcrowding problem. By 1973, the program ended. Because of problems such as scheduling extracurricular activities and teacher training, the concept was not appealing and did not work. "Year-round schools are not a solution to a fiscal shortfall. They are a way of postponing the inevitable expense of educating more students. History of year-round school is one of expensive and dismal failure." *(Paul Kretzschmar, News and Observer, 7/19/92)*

- 18 people running for the Orange County school board said the district should take a second look at year-round schools before continuing with the plan to put all 88 elementary schools on year-round by 1995. They say the plan is too expensive and inconvenient for families. *(Orlando Sentinel, 8/10/92)*

- Pasco County tried year-round schools from 1973-1978 but abandoned the program after 54% of the voters urged return of the traditional school year. High school teachers bitterly opposed the program. *(St. Petersburg Times, 8/16/92)*

- A Collier County task force exploring year-round schools concluded there is not enough evidence of good to be gained to warrant launching a year-round program. The academic achievement committee found most studies show no significant change in achievement. The economic concerns committee expressed concern about the high cost of year-round and said converting could save money on new buildings but would increase operational expenses. *(Naples Daily News, 8/7/92)*

**Georgia**

- The Effingham County school board was forced to rescind a decision to implement the year-round calendar in K-8 when more than 1,200 citizens protested the plan. After voting to implement the plan, board members were deluged with calls from parents complaining about the plan. *(Savannah Morning News, 12/21/93)*

- Significant opposition from parents and cost defeated YRS in four communities: Fulton, Carrollton, Rockdale County and Columbia County.
- Year-round school is apparently dead in Marietta, according to the schools superintendent. Parent support was minimal and the concept needs more study. *(Marietta Daily Journal, 11/20/93)*

- In May, 1993, year-round school failed to win enough votes at the five Fulton County schools that were considering the calendar. Parents said there was not enough evidence that proved the calendar increased student achievement. When the issue was considered again eight months later, South Fulton County parents rejected the idea again, and by a larger margin. *(Marietta Daily Journal, 11/20/93)*

- A year-round schedule would cost Columbia County $2.5 million per year, according to a committee study. The idea was scrapped because "YRS was not cost-effective at this time," said the committee chairwoman.

- Carrollton parents voted against the proposal (December, 1993). Opponents believe "these defeats should put the YRS issue on the backburner in the state for a few years."

**Idaho**

- No new students signed up for the Meridian district's year-round program, indicating the program may be shelved. *(May, 1993)*

**Illinois**

- The Haugan School Council dumped the year-round school idea due to "violent" opposition. The Juarez Council postponed a decision on the calendar when faced with "overwhelming opposition." "Angry parents and students overwhelmingly refused to accept a radical change in the school year." *(May, 1993)*

- In 1972, Romeoville, Illinois, a Chicago suburb, implemented a multi-track program in 16 schools to relieve overcrowding. According to John Lukancic, assistant superintendent of Valley View schools, they abandoned the schedule after eight years because of high operational costs of air conditioning and maintenance, difficulty in filling year-round administrative positions, and scheduling problems at the high school level.

- After a year of studying the issue and public meetings, parents at two elementary schools in Muscatine voted "no" to year-round schools, defeating a proposal to implement the calendar in 1994. *(Muscatine Journal, 10/13/93)*

**Iowa**

- Two Muscatine schools voted against implementing a year-round calendar after studying the issue and gathering information. *(Muscatine Journal, 10/26/93)*
Louisiana

- Lafayette postponed a decision to go year-round after a poll showed divided public opinion. A majority of those polled opposed year-round schools and favored a tax increase to build new schools. (*Advertiser*, 8/28/93)

Massachusetts

- Year-round school is a "dead issue" with the Timberlane school board because there was not enough voter support. Estimated costs for the program were $880,000 for facilities and $650,000 per year. (May, 1993)

Michigan

- Parma operated a mandatory, district-wide year-round program for two years, 1973-1975, to improve education and handle the increasing student population. The district discontinued the program due to "very heavy problems," such as:
  - operations costs increased 9%
  - capacity at the high school level increased only 12%, although the literature indicated an increase of 33.3%.
  - class scheduling was extremely difficult
  (Letter from David Collins, Principal, Warner Elementary)

Missouri

- With organized community opposition, Park Hill dropped all efforts to pursue year-round schools on a district-wide basis saying "many questions and areas of concern require additional study." (*Platte County Gazette*, June 2, 1993)

Montana

- "I don't want to be on the cutting edge of a dumb idea," (year-round high schools) says the Bozeman school superintendent.

New Hampshire

- The Derry school superintendent says year-round school doesn't work and estimates that start-up costs for Derry's year-round program are $2.1 million.

New Jersey

- Englewood trustees rejected year-round schools after studying the concept for the past year and much controversy. (May, 1993)
Ohio

- Year-round school was studied and rejected as a solution to overcrowding by five Fairfield City school groups comprised of district officials and community members. The district will build a new high school instead. (November, 1993)

- Parents in the Sycamore school district (Cincinnati) defeated year-round schools before it even became an issue. The idea was quickly rejected soon after the school board proposed the idea, and before they could distribute information about the concept and seek community input. (May, 1992)

- The Coventry school district again defeated year-round schools. "Controversy over the merits of year-round education and a lack of support by the board members" prompted them to put the idea on hold. The district must return funds from the Knight Foundation and the GAR Foundation, which were supporting the modified calendar. (May, 1993)

- The Xenia Board of Education axed the year-round school plan. Parents had formed Parents Against Year-Round Schools to push the Board to prove the advantages of the calendar before implementing it. (May, 1993)

- A Hicksville Committee put the year-round school issue on hold after hearing arguments against the concept. The Committee found no documentation of benefits for its students. (June, 1993)

Oregon

- Corvallis said "No way!" to year-round schools in a survey by the Gazette-Times. 80% of the respondents voted against implementing a year-round calendar for concerns about summer jobs for the children, child care, and quality of family life. (4/19/92)

Pennsylvania

- Thirty volunteers in Pleasant Valley formed a committee in 1993 to study year-round schools. The committee has dwindled to four active members and the chairman reports "year-round schools won't happen in Pleasant Valley any time soon because it doesn't have enough support." (Ponoco Record, 12/93)

- After intensively studying year-round schools for 18 months, the Warwick School Board nixed the idea of switching to a year-round calendar. The study committee found that year-round education offered no significant cost savings and little promise of academic improvement. (New Era, 5/93)

- Citizens Against Year-Round Education who are Seneca Valley parents opposed to year-round schools, celebrated when the district curtailed the study of year-round education. The group opposed YRE for numerous reasons but the main argument was the potential to disrupt family life. (The News Weekly/Cranberry Eagle, 8/19/92)
The North Penn school board rejected YRS as a solution to increased enrollment. The district did not want to be "a guinea pig; it would fail miserably." (May, 1993)

After considering the concept two years in a row, the Pocono Mountain School District rejected year-round schools because of strong opposition from parents. Parents said the proposal would complicate extracurricular activities, vo-tech classes, day care and summer employment opportunities for their children. (Pocono Record, 9/29/92)

South Carolina

After a two-year study that sparked interest around the state, a Columbia district school board rejected a plan to start four year-round schools. The vote could stall momentum for the idea statewide. When the district began exploring the concept in 1991, other districts showed an interest. Myrtle Beach implemented two year-round schools but idea "went nowhere" in Greenville and Charleston. (The State, 10/28/93)

65% of parents in another Columbia elementary school "gave the thumbs down" to trying a year-round calendar. The calendar needed 65% approval to be adopted. (State, 11/93)

South Dakota

An editorial from the Watertown Public Opinion expresses frustration with the information on year-round schools: "In our research we were told that year-round education produces better utilization of facilities, better staff utilization, better learning retention of the students. However, documentation to these theories was lacking." (6/93)

Tennessee

More than half of the Nashvillians surveyed prefer the traditional calendar over year-round schools and do not want a longer school year.

The Hamilton County (Chattanooga) superintendent believes sentiment in his town is running against year-round schools.

The 1992 Student Congress on Policies in Education, a statewide group of high school students, opposed year-round schools and the longer school year. (Oak Ridger, 5/6/92)

The Franklin school district's attempt to implement a year-round calendar failed, largely due to community protest. (The Review Appeal, 10/27/93)

Texas

Houston abandoned its first experiment with year-round schools after eight years, concluding the program was extremely expensive, it failed to relieve overcrowding and student achievement did not increase. School officials planned to save $6.9 million by eliminating funding necessary for the program.
After extensive study of the academic benefits, cost savings and community support, Lewisville tabled year-round schools. The study found little community for the plan and no financial benefits from implementing the calendar. Projected increases in operation costs far exceed the costs of construction necessary to stay with the traditional schedule. The Superintendent says year-round is not cost-effective.  

(Lewisville Leader, 6/28/92)

Quitman school trustees in Tyler tabled a motion to implement year-round schools because 65% of parents surveyed opposed the switch. The superintendent reports "there just wasn’t enough data available to prove year-round education will make a difference in the education of students." (Tyler Morning Telegraph, 5/13/92)

Most schools in the Yselta School District rejected year-round schools when they looked for 70% approval from parents but found 70% rejected the idea. 31 of the 33 elementary schools offered the chance to switch calendars will stick with the traditional calendar. (El Paso Herald-Post, Times, 5/10, 5/18/92)

The Garland School District said no to year-round education. A study committee found benefits and savings of YRS would not be as great as initially anticipated and said that although it is perceived that there’s less learning loss, there’s no documentation of that. Committee members say, "The option just doesn’t save any money." (News, 6/21/92)

Utah

Silver Mesa Elementary in the Jordan School District (Sandy) returned to the traditional calendar, ending a year of intense community controversy. A decline in the number of students at the school made the program no longer feasible. (10/28/93)

Cache County abandoned its controversial year-round junior high school policy just four years after it was installed. Parents fought the change to the year-round calendar and begged the school board to remain on the traditional calendar. (Salt Lake Tribune, 3/28/93)

School administrators in the Davis School District say they were sold a bill of goods that they hate and would like to get back to the traditional schedule as soon as possible. They were forced to cancel some courses and "the disruption to families is just too great." (Deseret News, February 26, 1993) One teacher said, "No amount of (state incentive) money is worth the hell we've gone through." (Ogden Standard-Examiner, 4/8/93)

Virginia

After two years of research and months of vigorous opposition, the Franklin School Board turned down the controversial year-round proposal, despite a favorable recommendation from a study committee. Franklin parents and teachers oppose year-round schools, citing research from the state Department of Education, which says: "the alternative calendar reveals no consistency impact on student achievement," and Phi Delta Kappa, which reports: "Despite the claims that long summer vacations lead to lessened achievement, year-round schools are not associated with great leaps in academic achievement." (Franklin Tidewater News, June 20, 1993)
After operating year-round schools for nine years, Prince William County, Virginia returned to a traditional calendar, basing their decision on little academic improvement, few cost benefits and parent reaction. According to Dr. Mary Weybright, supervisor of programs and planning, "There were not enough advantages to outweigh the disadvantages."

When school officials in Chesterfield County tried to implement year-round schools to relieve overcrowding, the response was adamant and emotional. The community protested they did not have all the information and the calendar was being forced on them. In July, 1991, following significant study and debate, residents voted down year-round schools. They chose instead to build additional schools, believing this to be the only solution to overcrowding.

**Washington**

- 42% of the parents at an Edmonds elementary school voted against year-round schools in a survey in Spring, 1993; only 27% favored the calendar. In November, 1993, the school’s PTA recommended against year-round unless two-thirds of the parents and staff support the concept. Many believe the first survey settled the issue but the administration continues the push by sending out another survey. *(Seattle Times, 12/93)*

- The Pasco school board voted unanimously to shelve the controversial year-round schedule. *(Tri City Herald, June 23, 1993)*

- Bethel K-9 schools operated year-round from 1974-1981 to handle overcrowding. The district returned to a traditional calendar after a construction bond was passed. There was no difference in test scores, costs increased for food service, transportation and administration, some teachers felt burnout, the district felt "out of sync" with the rest of the state and it ultimately built new facilities at inflated costs. *(Peninsula Daily News, 8/15/93)*

**Wisconsin**

- "The year-round school idea earns a well-deserved 'F'," says the *Waukesha Freeman*. "We've heard no reasons thus far that are compelling enough to even study the matter, let alone implement it. Let's learn from Los Angeles' mistake." *(June 18, 1993)*

- "We have sufficient data to conclude there is no evidence of substantial academic improvement as result of changing to a year-round calendar" is the conclusion of a Plymouth study committee. After a year of study, the committee did not recommend switching to the year-round calendar. *(Sheboygan Press, 3/12/93)*

- Appleton shot down year-round school after careful study and debate. After studying the issue, the district noted that while year-round schools doesn’t hinder learning, it does not significantly improve it either. The district estimated year-round schools would be more expensive because of hefty annual operating costs. *(Appleton Post-Crescent)*
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