

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### FINAL THREE-YEAR REPORT EVALUATION STUDY OF FLORIDA'S EXTENDED SCHOOL YEAR PILOT PROGRAM, 2000-2003

As part of a strong commitment to high standards for education, Appropriation 93 of the General Appropriations Act passed by the 2000 Florida Legislature created the three year Extended School Year Pilot Program. According to the Proviso Language, "The purpose of the Extended School Year Pilot Program is to provide schools an opportunity to extend the school year by 30 days and then assess its effect on student performance. Participating schools must extend the length of the academic year for students beyond 180 to 210 days." Further stipulations in the Proviso Language required schools to plan for full participation in the program by all students enrolled in the school. The "additional time-on-task for students will be used to provide additional content." The schools were prohibited from using the funds to extend the school day or support traditional summer school programs.

The Florida Department of Education contracted with Evaluation Systems Design, Inc. (ESDI) to conduct an *Evaluation Study of Florida's Extended School Year Pilot Program*. The three-year study examined the curriculum, instructional methods, and strategies employed in the Extended School Year Pilot Program and the effect of the efforts on student performance, teachers and school staff, and parents and the communities. This *Executive Summary of the Final Three-Year Report* provides an overview of the findings in the Final Three-Year Report. The Final Three-Year Report documents the comprehensive evaluation of three years of implementation of the Extended School Year Pilot Program from July of 2000 to June of 2003 that was conducted by Evaluation Systems Design, Inc. (ESDI) of Tallahassee, Florida. Two previous reports documented the initial implementation during the 2000-2001 school year and the second year of implementation in 2001-2002.

### PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

The Proviso Language specified 21 schools in 9 school districts that were eligible to receive grant awards from the DOE for the Extended School Year Pilot Program. One school district opted not to participate in the program at all. A total of 8 school districts and 19 schools received funding to implement the Extended School Year Pilot Program in the 2000-2001 school year.

For the 2001-2002 school year, 6 school districts with 14 schools participated in the program, and 5 districts with 13 schools completed all three years of the pilot program. Table 1 identifies the districts and schools participating in the Extended School Year Pilot Program over the three years.



<b>Table 1</b>			
<b>Participating Extended School Year Pilot Program Schools by School Year</b>			
<b>District</b>	<b>School Year</b>		
	<b>2000-01</b>	<b>2001-02</b>	<b>2002-03</b>
<b>Broward</b>	Colbert Elementary McNicol Middle	Oriole Elementary	
<b>Miami-Dade</b>	Charles R. Drew Elementary North Miami Elementary Opa-Locka Elementary Toussaint L'Ouverture Elementary	Charles R. Drew Elementary North Miami Elementary Opa-Locka Elementary Toussaint L'Ouverture Elementary	Charles R. Drew Elementary North Miami Elementary Opa-Locka Elementary Toussaint L'Ouverture Elementary
<b>Duval</b>	North Shore Elementary Saint Clair Evans Academy ( <b>Did not implement</b> )		
<b>Escambia</b>	A.A. Dixon Elementary Spencer Bibbs Elementary		
<b>Hillsborough</b>	Oak Park Elementary Robles Elementary Sulphur Springs Elementary	Oak Park Elementary Robles Elementary Sulphur Springs Elementary	Oak Park Elementary Robles Elementary Sulphur Springs Elementary
<b>Orange</b>	Engelwood Elementary Ivey Lane Elementary	Engelwood Elementary Ivey Lane Elementary	Engelwood Elementary Ivey Lane Elementary
<b>Pinellas</b>	Frontier Elementary Gulfport Elementary Maximo Elementary	Frontier Elementary Gulfport Elementary Maximo Elementary	Frontier Elementary Gulfport Elementary Maximo Elementary
<b>Sarasota</b>	(declined to participate)		
<b>Sumter</b>	South Sumter Middle	South Sumter Middle	South Sumter Middle
<b>Total Number of Participating Districts/Schools</b>	8/19	6/14	5/13

For the first year of implementation (by July of 2000) schools selected to participate in the pilot program for the 2000-2001 school year had to submit implementation plans for each school. Implementation plans had to include, but were not limited to:

- ◆ Teacher training;
- ◆ Individual and collaborative teacher planning time;
- ◆ Innovative use of technology as a key element of the school's implementation of an extended school year; and
- ◆ Student performance data for use at the end of the school year to evaluate the extent to which an extended school year is associated with student performance.

The major thrust of the program in all schools, however, was to extend school for an additional 30 instructional days.

### **EVALUATION PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS**

The major purpose of the *Evaluation Study of Florida's Extended School Year Pilot Program* was to examine the curriculum and instructional methods and strategies employed in Extended School Year Programs to determine the effect of the efforts on student performance, teachers and school staff, and community members, and parents. The intent of the three-year study conducted by ESDI was to make recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of the pilot programs during the first two years and to examine the successes and barriers to success for the Extended School Year Pilot Program in Florida schools and school districts with recommendations on overall worth to Florida schools at the conclusion of the three-year pilot study.

Four evaluation questions were generated to guide the data-gathering and analysis procedures for this *Evaluation Study of Florida's Extended School Year Pilot Program*:

1. How did the pilot schools enhance the curriculum and provide additional time-on-task for students and additional content? Provide qualitative and quantitative data to describe how this was done.
2. What are the perceptions of teachers and school staff at pilot schools about the benefits of implementing an extended school year?
3. To what extent did the community and parents participate in the planning and implementation of an extended school year at each school?
4. What is the effect of implementing the Extended School Year Pilot Program on student performance at each pilot school?

## **EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation of the Extended School Year Pilot Program incorporated five major data collection methods:

- ◆ **surveys** of major participants in the grants;
- ◆ **site visits** to all school districts and schools receiving grants;
- ◆ **interviews** with district staff, principals, teachers, parents, and School Advisory Council chairs in all selected districts and schools;
- ◆ **observations** in selected classrooms in all selected schools; and
- ◆ **school** and student achievement data collection.

Methods used in the two previous years are described in detail in the two previous annual reports for the study. For the 2002-03 school year, surveys were conducted of the principals and staff of the 13 participating schools and of the district staff person responsible for the program in the funded school districts. A final site visit was conducted to the funded Extended School Year sites to observe the programs in action and to interview the principal and staff implementing the programs at the schools as well as district staff responsible for the programs. Overall, the three-year evaluation incorporated multiple data collection methods with input from more than 1,000 program participants.

## **EVALUATION FINDINGS**

### **Demographics of Participating Schools**

- ◆ 12 of the 13 (92%) schools completing all three years of the ESY program were elementary schools and one was a middle school serving students in grades 6-8.
- ◆ Seventy percent (70%) of the schools had populations ranging between 600 and 999. The average student population for the 13 schools in October, 2000 was 759 students, and a total of almost 8,700 students participated in the pilot ESY program in the final year of the pilot.
- ◆ A total of 62% of the funded ESY schools had 90% or higher of their students in the Free-Reduced Priced Lunch Program, another 15% had levels of 70-89%, and 15% of the schools had levels between 50% and 69%. The median rate for the Free-Reduced Priced Lunch Program in these 13 schools was 94%, far higher than the state median rate of 53%.
- ◆ Almost 70% of the 13 schools served populations that had 70% or more of their students from minority backgrounds. The median minority rate for the 13 schools in the pilot project was 92% in 2000-01 and 94% in 2002-03, far higher than most other schools. Minority rates for the schools remained essentially the same for the three-year life of the pilot project.
- ◆ Sixty-two percent (62%) of the participating ESY schools had less than 10% of their student populations being served by the LEP program, 15% had 10-29% in the LEP program, and two schools (8%) had student populations with 30% or more of the students in LEP programs. The project median was 4.4% across the 13 final ESY schools, and the statewide median LEP rate in October, 2002, was 9.9%.
- ◆ Thirty-one percent (31%) of the participating ESY schools had less than 10% of their student populations being served by the ESE program, 38% had 10-19% in the ESE program, and 31% had 20% or more of the students in ESE programs. The project median was 15.9% across the 13 final ESY schools, and the statewide median ESE rate in October, 2000, was 19%. These rates remained relatively stable over the three-year life of the pilot project, with the October, 2002 project median at 16.9%.

- ◆ Only 4 of the 13 final ESY schools had stability rates above the statewide median of 93.7%, indicating that most of their populations remained in the school for most of the school year. Almost one-half of the schools (46%) had low stability rates of less than 90%, evidence that a substantial portion of their school populations do not remain in the school for the entire school year.
- ◆ Many of these schools also received funding to implement other major programs during the 2000-2001 school year. Seven of the 13 elementary schools implementing the Extended School Year Pilot Program in 2001-2002 received grants through the federally funded FLaRE (Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence) program. Two schools received grants in the 2000-2001 school year from Specific Appropriation 5A funds to implement the Direct Instruction reading program, and one was funded to implement the Failure Free Reading/Bridges programs. Four of the schools received federally funded Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Grants (CSR) to make massive schoolwide changes.

### **Planning for the Extended School Year Pilot Program**

Adding 30 additional instructional days to the school calendar amounting to 1/6<sup>th</sup> additional school time is a major change for a school and school district. Such change can only occur smoothly if there is extensive planning and notification of the school community about the purpose and logistical details of the new calendar and its effects on all members of the school community. Recognizing the need for advanced planning to effect such major school change, during the 1999 Legislative Session the Florida Legislature allocated \$12 million dollars to local school districts to plan for a possible Extended School Year calendar in some selected schools. A total of 20 school districts, four university laboratory schools, and the Florida School for the Deaf and Blind were funded through the allocated planning dollars at a rate of approximately \$100,000 per school involved in the planning. Approximately \$6 million was dispersed by DOE for the Extended School Year planning from the funds allocated by the Legislature.

### **Patterns of Implementation**

Through the legislation on the Extended School Year Program, school districts had flexibility to determine when the additional 30 days were added to the school calendar and adjust the calendar accordingly. Given the very short time between the legislation becoming law in June of 2000 and the opening of most schools in early August, most of the districts opted to add the 30 days to the end of the school calendar, resulting in 11 of the 19 schools (58%) extending their school years into July in the first year of implementation. Two school districts, accounting for six schools, split their additional days between the beginning and end of the school year. Broward School District chose to implement the ESY Pilot Program in an elementary and middle school that were part of a feeder pattern. These schools had previously implemented a year-round 180-day calendar successfully. The additional 30 days were spread throughout the three 3-week "break" periods, reducing these breaks to one-week. Pinellas School District chose to implement the additional 30 days at the end of the school year. This district, however, has a summer schedule of a 4-day work week with 10 hour days. Consequently, they implemented a similar schedule for the students with six weeks of extended days in four-day weeks.

## **Participant Reactions to the ESY Pilot Program**

Surveys of implementation of principals, teachers, and district staff for each of the three years asked them to document their perceptions of the value of continuing and expanding the Extended School Year Pilot Program. Responses were positive from respondents of all three groups. In the final year of the pilot program, 100% of the responding district staff and principals, and 64% of the responding teachers agreed or strongly agreed that state support for the Extended School Year Pilot Program should be continued for the schools currently implementing the program. The same results were found on expanding the program: 100% of the responding principals and district staff, and 64% of the responding teachers agreed or strongly agreed that state support for the Extended School Year Pilot Program should be expanded to include other schools serving high levels of children in poverty. It should be noted that there were some dissenters to these views among teachers with disagreement rates between 22% and 24%. Overall, teachers and principals expressed the belief that the Extended School Year Pilot Program had good potential for closing the achievement gap between high and low poverty schools and increasing the educational opportunities for many children.

## **STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IMPACTS**

Eight of the thirteen selected schools were "D" schools in 1999, 2 received "F" grades, and 3 schools had received a grade of "C." In 2000, the two "F" schools had raised their grades to "D," and one "D" school had raised its grade to "C." Two of the three "C" schools had raised their grades to "A." One "C" school and seven "D" schools did not change assigned grades in 2000. The distribution of grades for the selected schools in 2000, the first year of the ESY pilot program, was nine "D"s, three "C"s, and two "A"s.

Statistical analyses documented statistically significant increases for students in ESY schools at the third grade level in the first year of the program in both reading and mathematics. These successes were confirmed through three types of analyses (using FCAT developmental scale scores, the percent of students making learning gains, and Stanford 9 NCE scores). First year results were also statistically significant in reading at the fourth grade level in favor of the ESY program on FCAT developmental scale scores. Second year results were not statistically significant in favor of the ESY program, but were statistically significant in favor of the Non-ESY students at the fourth grade level. These results demonstrated the strength of the ESY program in closing the gap in student achievement levels for students in the first year of the program.

### **BENEFITS OF ESY**

- ◆ **More Instructional Time.** Teachers had more time to ensure that students were meeting the Sunshine State Standards and to instruct students on the curriculum prescribed by the district and state.
- ◆ **More Continuous Learning.** In addition to the 30 added instructional days, teachers gained instructional time by avoiding the month of reviews at the beginning of each new school year.
- ◆ **Reducing/Eliminating the Summer “Learning Loss.”** Research has documented the phenomenon of the loss of learning over the three-month summer break in a typical 180-day calendar.
- ◆ **Increased Student Learning.** Many teachers and all administrators noted that students were learning more as a result of the increased instructional time.
- ◆ **Reduced Adjustment Problems in the Fall.** Principals and teachers reported that the adjustments of students to school routines in the fall were reduced by the shortened summer break.
- ◆ **Increased Learning for ESOL Students.** Teachers and principals reported even higher academic gains for students whose native language is not English.
- ◆ **Increased Safety of Students.** Most of the schools selected for the ESY Pilot Program were located in inner-city neighborhoods with high crime rates.
- ◆ **Increased Health of Students.** The high poverty levels of most of the ESY schools usually are associated with reduced levels of nutrition and health care, and increased rates of illnesses and health problems.
- ◆ **Averting Parent Costs for Summertime Child Care.** Working parents of children in the ESY program received an unanticipated benefit of not having to pay for summertime child care during the extra 30 days.

### **ISSUES AND CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTING ESY**

Some of the issues and challenges in implementing the Extended School Year Pilot Program were:

- ◆ **Insufficient Planning Time.** Some of the schools implementing ESY on a pilot basis in 2000-2001 received \$100,000 planning grants during the 1999-2000 school year, but others did not.
- ◆ **Recruiting and Staffing for ESY.** All of the ESY schools implementing the program for the first time experienced some challenges in staffing for the program.
- ◆ **Maintaining Student Attendance.** Maintaining student attendance was an issue encountered during the first year of implementation, but was a diminishing issue in the second and third years.
- ◆ **Student Transfers.** In the second year of implementation, some parents wanted their students to attend school the extra 30 days and went to great lengths to get their children transferred into the ESY schools. Other parents were very upset about the program and withdrew their children from school, either to transfer to another school or simply wait until the new school year started again.
- ◆ **Maintaining Teacher Attendance.** Some schools experienced some burn-out of their teachers because of the additional 30 teaching days. Even in schools where teachers had opted to teach under the 210-day calendar, at the end of the three-year pilot some teachers were expressing concerns about burn-out and questioning their capacity to continue working under these conditions.

- ◆ **Professional Development.** The district schedules for professional development are built around the traditional 180-day school calendar with extensive offerings at the beginning and end of the school year and over the summer break when teachers do not have children in the classroom. For the ESY schools, however, these are instructional days.
- ◆ **Logistical/Operations Issues.** In the first year, all schools encountered challenges in the logistics of operating the schools an extra 30 days. These issues encompassed virtually all aspects of school operations including transportation, clerical services, food services, custodial and maintenance services, guidance and psychological services, and computer services.
- ◆ **Report Cards and Grading Decisions.** Placing schools on a 210-day school calendar created a disjoint with school district policies on grading. Most districts have set dates on when report cards are released. The new ESY calendars forced school staff to reorganize their grading periods, and in some cases redesign report cards.
- ◆ **Promotion/Retention Decisions.** The new calendars also impacted the dates on which promotion and retention decisions had to be made. Districts establish for schools the dates by which schools must determine which students will be retained in grade for the following year.
- ◆ **Continuation.** The original legislation specified 9 school districts and 21 schools. One school district declined to implement the program at all, and another district substituted two schools for the listed three schools. At the end of the third school year, of the 19 schools beginning the program, 13 completed three years of implementation for a success rate of 68%.
- ◆ **Changes within the Schools.** Over the three years, the 13 schools completing three years of the pilot experienced major changes. The principals in 9 of the 13 schools (69%) changed either at the beginning of the ESY program or during the three-year period, causing disruption in the program and additional adjustment issues within the schools. Also, several of the schools received major grants or implemented major curricular changes.
- ◆ **Uncertainties of Continued Funding.** Schools and districts expressed again at the end of the third year of funding their concern in coping with the uncertainties of the continuation of funding for the Extended School Year program each year. The schools had applied for and received what they thought would be a three-year program, only to discover that funding must be approved each year. Teachers who had left other schools to come teach in an ESY school were upset, as well as teachers who did not want to continue teaching in an ESY school and were facing a decision about placing themselves into the employment pool. Parents who had relocated their children into the school zone because of ESY were now concerned that the program would be dropped. Principals were facing the challenge of calming all of the anxieties of teachers, staff, and parents.

Although many challenges and issues arose with the initial implementation of the ESY Pilot Program, most of these issues were resolved during the first year of the pilot.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Extended School Year Pilot Program was planned as a three-year trial of a major school-wide systemic change of increasing the number of instructional days from the typical 180-day calendar to 210 instructional days. Extensive research has documented that systemic changes in schools take several years to implement and demonstrate impacts. The following conclusions and recommendations are based on site visits to each ESY school and three years of surveys of multiple program participants including teachers, parents, principals, and district staff during the three years of the pilot program implementation:

- 1. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the schools that began the ESY Pilot Program continued for the full three years of the pilot.** Two school districts withdrew a total of four schools from the program. A third district withdrew two schools but added a new school to begin implementation in July of 2001. The remaining 13 schools remained committed to completing the three-year pilot. Ten of the schools were very interested in ongoing funding to continue a 210-day calendar. Two factors appeared to be most directly related to the decisions to terminate the ESY Pilot Program: lack of advance notice so that schools could plan for the ESY program, and concern by bargaining units that the contractual rights of the faculty might be compromised.
- 2. Although some pilot schools enhanced the curriculum and provided additional content and additional time-on-task for students during the first two years of ESY implementation, the most important change occurring in these schools was the addition of 30 more days of instruction for students.** Most of the ESY schools implemented curricular and content changes during the extended school year. For the most part, these changes consisted of spreading the 180-day curriculum across the 210-day calendar, or spiraling the content to provide intense, skills-based instruction through February and more conceptual development for the remainder of the school year. Some teachers expressed that they were able to increase concept development in addition to skills instruction throughout the whole school year. Principals, teachers, and district staff agreed that schools had sufficient human and material resources to implement the ESY Pilot Program. Staff development was provided in all of the participating schools, but was primarily training that had already been planned prior to the ESY Pilot Program. A few schools used planning dollars to provide stipends for teachers to work together to develop integrated instruction units and to provide continuous cooperative planning and implementation of diverse instructional strategies. One school implemented a planning system that facilitated grade-level planning by arranging for a day of planning for each grade level for each grading period.
- 3. Perceptions of teachers and school staff at pilot schools about the benefits of implementing an extended school year during the second year of implementation was primarily positive, with principals and district staff expressing more positive views than teachers.** In most schools, teachers and school staff were very positive about the pilot program, but reactions were primarily negative in several schools that then withdrew from the program. A total of 64% of the faculty responding to the survey administered at the end of the final school year agreed or strongly agreed that state support for the Extended School Year Pilot Program should be continued for the schools currently implementing the program, and 64% also agreed or strongly agreed that the program should be expanded to include other schools serving high levels of children in poverty. Agreement rates for principals and district staff were 100% on continuing and expanding the ESY Pilot Program. Benefits of the Extended School Year Pilot Program identified by teachers, principals, and district staff included:

- ◆ more instructional time for students to ensure they learn the entire curriculum during the school year;
  - ◆ more continuous learning as the demarcation of the end of one school year and the beginning of the next year is less pronounced;
  - ◆ reduction or elimination of the summer “learning loss;”
  - ◆ increased student learning that teachers were already observing at the end of the school year;
  - ◆ reduced adjustment problems at the beginning of the new school year;
  - ◆ increased learning for ESOL students who receive more exposure to the English language vocabulary and syntax;
  - ◆ increased safety of students who are in school instead of on the streets exposed to or involved in violence, drugs, and crime;
  - ◆ increased health of students who receive 30 additional days of nutritious breakfasts and lunches; and
  - ◆ averted costs to parents for daycare that would have had to be provided over the summer break.
4. **To the extent that schools were provided time for planning the Extended School Year Pilot Program, parents and community members participated in the planning process, primarily through representation on the School Advisory Council.** Eighty-three percent (83%) of the parents who responded to the survey administered at the end of the second school year agreed that they were informed about the ESY Pilot Program, but only 34% agreed that they had participated in planning for the program. Community members were involved primarily through their participation on SACs.
5. **Parents were generally positive about the ESY Pilot Program and supportive of its implementation in the schools their children were attending.** Eighty percent (80%) of the responding parents on the final parent survey agreed that the ESY Pilot Program was good for the community, and were in agreement that the ESY Pilot Program was good for them as parents.
6. **The Extended School Year Pilot Program appears to have potential for impacting student achievement levels in high poverty schools.** Nine of the 13 schools implementing the ESY Pilot Program added the extra 30 days to the end of the school calendar. Consequently, the spring of 2003 FCAT scores and district standardized achievement measures reflect only two years of operation. Almost two-thirds (62%) of the ESY schools, however, increased their school grades by 1-3 letter grades from 2001 to 2003. Two schools maintained an “A” grade for two years, representing an increase of two or three grade levels during their first year in the ESY program. Five schools (38%), however, did not change their school grade during the first two years of implementation. These grade shifts represented 11 grade level increases for ESY schools. Note again that the impacts of the grants would just beginning to be reflected in school grades in the 2002-2003 school year. Reports from many teachers and principals indicated that they have seen considerable student academic gains.

- 7. Statistical analyses documented statistically significant increases for students in ESY schools at the third grade level in the first year of the program in both reading and mathematics, and at the fourth grade level in reading.** Statistical analyses documented statistically significant increases for students in ESY schools at the third grade level in the first year of the program in both reading and mathematics. These successes were confirmed through three types of analyses (using FCAT developmental scale scores, the percent of students making learning gains, and Stanford 9 NCE scores). First year results were also statistically significant in reading at the fourth grade level in favor of the ESY program on FCAT developmental scale scores. Second year results were not statistically significant in favor of the ESY program, but were statistically significant in favor of the Non-ESY students at the fourth grade level. These results demonstrated the strength of the ESY program in closing the gap in student achievement levels for students in the first year of the program. Note that the impacts from such major systemic change may take several years. In fact, some initial changes may cause a decline in outcome measures as students, teachers, administrators, and parents adjust to the new 210-day schedule.
- 8. The evaluation of the ESY Pilot Program should include a one-year post study to capture the full impact of the program on student achievement.** For nine of the 13 schools that implemented the extra 30 days at the end of the school year, scores on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) that is administered in the spring before the ESY extra instruction, are lagged in terms of impact. Spring 2002 scores reflected only one 30-day instructional period conducted in the summer of 2001, and spring 2003 scores reflected only a two-year implementation. To capture the impact of three years of implementation, the evaluation should include data analysis and reporting for the spring 2004 and examined retention rates for students who participated in ESY programs.
- 9. Planning time and funds facilitate successful implementation of the ESY Pilot Program.** Those schools that received funds for planning and advance time to plan were more successful in implementing the Extended School Year Pilot Program than those without the planning time and funds.
- 10. Logistical and operational issues that were identified in the initial implementation year were primarily the consequence of start-up problems and were reduced in the second year of operation.** Major changes in large administrative systems require extensive planning and time for a smooth implementation. The issues identified related to the first year implementation of the ESY Pilot Program addressed virtually every aspect of the functioning of the school from student attendance to curriculum issues to maintenance and support services. The most pressing issue in several schools was insufficient notice of their involvement in the program that resulted in virtually no planning time for what was to be a major systemic change in the school. Another troubling issue was an apparent increased use of substitutes in some pilot schools caused by teacher absences during the extra 30 days, disrupting the continuity of instruction and probably reducing the instructional benefit of the program. Other issues encountered included:

  - ◆ recruiting and staffing teachers for ESY, especially in schools that received little notice of the requirement to have teachers teach 30 extra days;
  - ◆ maintaining student attendance during the extra 30 days when their siblings and friends were not in school;
  - ◆ maintaining teacher attendance in the face of burn-out from the additional teaching load;

- ◆ addressing the increased number of requests for transfers of students, either into the school for the additional 30 days, or out of the school as parents removed their children for the summer to attend other summer programs, for family travel, or for custody issues;
- ◆ arranging and conducting professional development when the school was on a different calendar and district training was scheduled during times the other schools were not in session;
- ◆ determining teacher incentives and rewards to engender and maintain support for the 210-day calendar;
- ◆ addressing conflicts that arose with the teacher bargaining units related to the negotiated teacher contracts;
- ◆ solving the logistical and operational issues associated with transportation, clerical services, food services, custodial and maintenance services, guidance and psychological services, and computer services;
- ◆ re-examining the timing and rationales for report cards and grading decisions on a 210-day calendar;
- ◆ determining the timing and process for student promotion and retention decisions;
- ◆ addressing issues related to articulation with other schools in the feeder pattern, particularly for students in the highest grades in the schools who would be attending another school the following year; and
- ◆ coping with the uncertainties of continued funding. At the end of the school year, principals, teachers, and parents were most concerned about the uncertainty of continued funding for the ESY Pilot Program. Schools had been informed initially that the ESY Pilot Program was a 3-year program, but staff realized in the spring of 2001 that funding was allocated annually with no assurance of continuation. Planning for the next school year for most schools begins in the spring of the previous year. Schools again were faced with decisions about staffing for the school that had to be made prior to any assurance of funds to support ESY.

Overall, the Extended School Year Pilot Program demonstrated in the three-year implementation in 13 schools that it is a viable model for providing a safe, academic environment for students in high poverty schools with widespread support from the school districts, principals, teachers and staff, parents, and community members. A final year of a rigorous data analysis will provide the Department of Education and all stakeholders with sufficient data to determine the effectiveness of the program and potential for use in other schools and districts.