EDUCATIONAL CHANGE AND YEAR-ROUND SCHOOLING: THE ROLE OF TRANSFORMATIVE LEADERS

by

STEVEN LYNN OBERG

BS (1980) University of Utah
MEd (1996) University of Utah

A THESIS COMPLETED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(EDUCATIONAL STUDIES)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

July 2005

© Steven Lynn Oberg, 2005
ABSTRACT

This study examines whether there is a relationship between transformative leadership with its constituent ideas of agency, moral purpose, and power, and the ability to successfully introduce sustainable school change. The central tenet of the conceptual framework is transformative leadership as informed by the literature on year-round schooling and educational change. Through a series of interviews, I examine why and how educational leaders, at school and district levels, continue to promote and introduce school-calendar change (commonly known as year-round schooling) in the face of what are often substantial political and social battles. My respondents came from four jurisdictions in the United States and three in Canada, some in which the reform was mandated and others in which it was voluntarily instituted by school leaders. They came from schools with various calendars—multi, single, and dual-track that had been implemented between 1969 and 1999. The impetus for the reform (whether voluntary or mandated) had little to do with its viability, but the implementation processes and procedures used by the school leader were critical. A calendar change was implemented to accomplish various goals, from accommodating more students in existing buildings to bettering the learning experience of children to achieving equity. Not only were explicit goals realized, many unanticipated outcomes were also found. Findings relate to the three-part conceptual framework. First, participants report that year-round schooling is a viable educational reform with the ability to provide fiscal and educational benefits to the whole school community. It can
garner the support of the parents and wider community and make a difference beyond the school itself. Second, successful educational reform requires goal clarity, attention to processes, and an understanding that the forces of tradition (habitus) are powerful but may be overcome. Third, transformative educational leaders may surmount resistance and introduce successful educational change if they understand the interconnections among agency, moral purpose, and power. All three are simultaneously necessary to achieve reform that has the ability to decrease inequities in educational performance and thus to be transformative.
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GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Critically low list—A list established by some state boards of education to identify schools in which the students are performing well below average on three or more measures of academic achievement.

Effective—This term suggests that a school or district meets its defined educational goals for academic and non-academic student outcomes.

Intersession—In a year-round school, this is the period of time between formally scheduled academic terms for given groups of students or teachers. Although no compulsory schooling occurs during intersession, individual schools may opt to introduce programs for remediation, enrichment, or acceleration that students may take on a voluntary basis.

Socio-economic status—This term is a combination of the words social, economic, and status and recognizes that in our North American society, we often assign status according to these characteristics. Low socio-economic status (SES) is associated with low levels of income, lack of formal education, and student “at-risk” characteristics, while high SES suggests that children come from advantaged homes with well educated parents and higher than average income levels.

Track—This is the term used to designate the schedule of a group of students and teachers on a single calendar, who rotate in and out of school together.
Traditional calendar—Also known as the agrarian calendar. This is the academic schedule that usually begins after Labor Day and ends early in the summer, with a break at Christmas, designated statutory holidays, and a long summer vacation.

Year-round schooling—Also referred to as alternative, balanced, or modified school calendar. There are numerous different models, but those mentioned here are:

Single-track: The whole school adopts a calendar in which some of the summer vacation time is redistributed as regular breaks throughout the school year. This permits the use of intersession programming if desired.

Dual-track: Some of the classes and teachers remain on the traditional school-year calendar, while other classes and teachers in the same school adopt a modified school year, such as the 45-15. This offers flexibility of scheduling and accommodates a variety of preferences.

Multi-track:
- 45-15: This is one of the most common four-track schedules. Students attend school for 45 days (or nine weeks), followed by 15 days (or three weeks) of vacation. Each group of students is assigned to a track that rotates in an overlapping configuration so that at any given time, ¾ of the students are in school, and ¼ on vacation, thus providing a potential for 33% more students to be accommodated in the building.
• 60-15: This is the schedule used by Stephen Lewis Junior High School. Students are assigned to five tracks, each of which attends school for 60 days (or 12 weeks), followed by 15 days (three weeks) of vacation. At any given time, \( \frac{4}{5} \) of the students are in school, and \( \frac{1}{5} \) on vacation, thus providing a potential for 25% more students to be accommodated in the building.
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</tr>
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CHAPTER 1. THINKING ABOUT EDUCATIONAL REFORM

For most of the last 50 years, the educational landscape in North America has been marked by numerous initiatives directed at educational reform and restructuring. On one hand, restructuring initiatives have increased decentralization of educational decision-making, including site-based management and new governance structures. On the other hand, they have focused on increased centralization with an emphasis on accountability that includes developing new fiscal arrangements and expanding standardized testing of both students and teachers. Some structural changes such as open classrooms have been intended to facilitate changes like team teaching and multi-age groupings, while others have focused on pedagogical changes like new math and whole language.

Many of these educational change initiatives have experienced a surge of interest followed by a backlash of often-virulent protest and a subsequent early demise. Some of those that did not die quickly seemed doomed to quiet failure. Gidney (1999) talked about educational change in the last half of twentieth century Ontario. He said that change was largely unsuccessful in that, "A succession of 'reforms' have not abolished the effects of social class, or at least the effects of income, on student achievement or life chances" (p. 283). In recent years, with the advent of standardized testing and international comparisons of student achievement, the organization of the school year has become a topic of interest to policy makers seeking to improve the achievement of all students.
Although the discussion has predominantly centered on the length of the North American school year compared to that in many other industrialized countries, there is also an emerging debate about the distribution of in-class and vacation time. The focus of the latter conversation is a calendar adaptation called year-round schooling (YRS), and more recently, modified, balanced, or alternative calendars.

My interest in year-round schooling was the impetus for this study. I wanted to explore the possible relationships between transformative leadership and school reform with a particular emphasis on YRS. This led me to interview school and district leaders who had been involved in the implementation of a school-calendar change in seven selected regions in the United States and Canada. The study was guided by a conceptual framework that emphasized the values inherent in moral purpose, agency, and power as key elements of transformative leadership. It was also informed by the literature related to school reform and year-round schooling and by a desire to understand the relationships among these bodies of literature.

**Background**

The history of year-round schooling has been marked by advocacy or adversarial literature and considerable confusion over the purposes and forms of year-round education. Although forms of year-round schooling (YRS) have been implemented in North America since the beginning of common schools, the first modern year-round schooling occurred almost simultaneously in Illinois, California, and Missouri. In 1968, Hayward, California, implemented a program at
Park Elementary School, which became the first YRS following WWII. The next year, Francis Howell School District in St. Charles, Missouri, introduced the first multiple-track (MT) calendar in the nation (History..., 2005). While there is some dispute as to which jurisdiction first made the decision to implement a year-round schedule, there is no doubt that Becky David Elementary School in Missouri was one of the first, and remained the longest running multi-track year-round school in North America until 1999 when it moved to a single-track schedule—one in which all students once again attended school at the same time (Shields & Oberg, 2001). At the beginning of the twenty-first century in North America more than two million students in approximately 600 districts and more than 3000 schools are being educated in schools with modified school-year calendars.

As with many educational initiatives, changes in the school calendar have often swung on a wild pendulum between public enthusiasm and disdain. For example, the State of Florida rode a tempestuous five-year implementation change cycle for year-round schooling. Although it had had no year-round schools (YRS) in 1992, a few years later, Florida had placed 164 of its schools on modified calendars. By 1997, only 38 YRS were left (Rasberry, 1994). On the other side of the continent, seven British Columbia school districts, after having been given a grant to investigate year-round schooling in 1995, decided that the climate for school calendar change was too politicized to implement even pilot programs. In both instances, explanations for the failure of the initiatives varied widely, depending on the source of the opinion.

From approximately 1996, interest in what are now often called
alternative, modified, or balanced calendars spread throughout the world. In 1996, New Zealand mandated a four-term school year with terms of ten weeks interspersed with three balanced vacation periods of two weeks and a six-week summer/Christmas vacation. In December 2001, the Independent Commission on the School Year in Britain recommended that Britain move to a six-term year consisting of two seven-week and four six-week terms, interspersed with five two-week breaks and one longer four-week holiday period (Price, personal communication). In 2002, the British Columbia government introduced Bill 28, that contained a clause called Extended day and year-round schooling. Section 78 of the Bill states that no collective agreement can limit the power of a board to vary the “days of the week or months of the year on or within which educational programs are to be provided.” The bill states that such a move requires consultation with parents and employee representatives.

Implementation of a new calendar occurs in two main ways. The first is as a result of a legislated mandate of some kind, generally at the state or provincial level. In this instance, schools are required to consider a structural calendar change to address a specific challenge to fiscal or facility resources. More common in recent years, is the implementation that occurs at a school level when the principal, teaching staff, and/or parent community initiate conversations about a calendar change. In this case, the principal’s ability to take the concept forward, to resolve conflict, and to facilitate decision-making is critical. While both formal and informal leadership at all levels may be involved in this latter type of implementation, without the support of the school leader and at the very least,
the willingness of district leaders not to block the initiative, a calendar change could not occur.

Any leader proposing consideration of a calendar change, as we shall see in more detail later, needs to be aware that the debate may be intense. Despite (and perhaps because of) the continued interest in year-round schooling, whenever it is proposed as a reform initiative, its mixed reputation precedes it. Some parents support it with almost missionary zeal because the long summer holiday is redistributed in more evenly placed breaks throughout the school year. Others fear that their family routines, holiday schedules and summer vacations will be disrupted. Communities resist changing the school year because they are concerned that there will be more youth unemployment, disruption of recreation programming, and a detrimental impact on the traditional norms of community and family. Summer camp owners and directors, amusement park operators, and child care providers join the fray, all fearing that a change in the school year will negatively affect their livelihoods (Shields & Oberg, 2000). Moreover, some would argue that structural change is not only met with resistance, but that it rarely makes a difference to student achievement (Levin, 2001; Ungerleider, 2003).

**Theoretical Framework**

This study was informed by three separate bodies of literature that appear relevant to the topic and purpose of the inquiry. In Chapter 3, I started with the literature specific to year-round schooling itself. Although there are reported challenges in implementing calendar reform, in the YRS literature the benefits
seem to clearly outweigh the negatives related to the change. When one turns to the wider literature on change (Cuban, 1998; Fullan, 1993; Levin, 2001) there is (perhaps surprisingly) no mention of school-calendar reform, despite the fact that it represents a relatively widespread and long-standing educational change.

My more general examination of educational reform was twofold; first I explored literature related to school change itself and then widened the lens and concentrated on two theories: Bourdieu's concept of habitus (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) and Bakhtin's (1986) notion of outsidedness. Bourdieu's explanation of habitus helped to show why educational reform seems so difficult to accomplish while Bakhtin's understanding of outsidedness provided an explanation of how change does and can occur. The most important lens, however, through which I approached this study, was that of transformational leadership. Although there was little mention of leadership in the literature related to educational reform (see for example the works of Goodlad & McMannon, 1997; Lieberman, 1986), I found increasing interest in education in ethical and purposeful leadership (see for example Bogotch, 2000: Furman & Shields, in press; Sergiovanni, 1992; Starratt, 1991, 1995) and in the concept of transformative (as opposed to transformational) leadership. Thus, it seemed to me critically important to attempt to discern whether there is a relationship between transformative leadership with its goals to "enhance equity, social justice, and the quality of life" (Astin & Astin, 2000, p. 6); some constituent ideas like agency, power, and moral purpose; and the ability to successfully introduce sustainable school change.
Purpose

My conceptual framework, elaborated in Chapter 3, led me to ask whether transformative leadership helps educational leaders to successfully implement change. To answer that overarching question, I wanted to examine and understand more clearly the role of educational leaders in introducing school reform, in particular the structural change of YRS. I wished to learn why and how, at both school and district levels, educational leaders continue to promote and introduce school calendar change in the face of the substantial political and social battles that often need to be fought. My objectives were:

1. to understand the impetus of educational leaders for introducing YRS,
2. to comprehend leaders’ implementation procedures and processes,
3. to identify what the leaders hoped to accomplish by enacting YRS,
4. to determine the leaders’ perceptions about the extent to which their goals were realized, and
5. to describe the leaders’ perceptions about unanticipated outcomes of YRS.

Through this examination of the motivations and experiences of educational leaders related to school calendar change, I wanted to make some recommendations to educators and policy makers regarding the relationships between their various purposes for implementing year-round schooling, the outcomes they anticipated, and those they achieved.

The topic is an important one because, despite the prevalence of YRS,
there has been little research into why educational leaders choose to implement a new school calendar, how they proceed, and what they hope to accomplish. This focus on YRS offers a unique opportunity to better understand why educational leaders choose to adopt a structural change as well as to explore whether there is transformative motivation or potential in such activity. It will also inform policy makers at both district and regional levels about some critical considerations relative to the implementation of school-based change (such as a change of school calendar).

**Personal Interest**

My interest in this topic stems from my years as a teacher and administrator in elementary schools that experimented with various structures in order to accommodate more children in existing classrooms and to enhance their learning opportunities. I have worked within the traditional school-year calendar, an elementary extended-day calendar, and multi-track year-round school (MT-YRS) calendars. Until I facilitated a study in Davis School District in Utah, I had come to accept the MT-YRS as the way we had been forced to organize for instruction, but had no knowledge of the impact of the MT-YRS calendar in my district on student achievement (see Shields & Oberg, 1999). Additionally, because my district had implemented multi-track year-round schooling to alleviate overcrowded schools, I had originally been unaware of other reasons why districts might opt for year-round schooling.

As I began to work with Dr. Shields as her research assistant in various projects related to YRS, I became increasingly interested in the potential of a
calendar change to promote social justice. We studied schools in which a calendar change had been mandated at a state or district level to accommodate more children in the buildings, but in which academic achievement was reported to have improved. In some schools, the calendar change had been introduced, we were told, to enhance opportunities for the least successful and often the least advantaged socio-economically, and in which educators raved about the results. In a few schools, we were also told about how the calendar change had been associated with changes in the wider community, both in terms of structures like new programs for more children and in terms of increased parental involvement in and support for the school. This study arose from my desire to investigate these transformations and their relationship to the approaches to educational leadership of those that implemented them.

**Definitions**

My study requires the clarification of terms related to year-round education. It also necessitates an understanding of how I am using the terms leader, initiation, implementation, continuation or sustainability, success, and restructuring. Here I define the terms used most frequently throughout the study, with a more comprehensive glossary included in the introductory pages.

*Year-round schooling (YRS)* is the term given to the redistribution of the normal school year to shorten the long summer vacation and insert more regular vacation periods throughout the school year. In most cases, no compulsory in-school time is added to the school year. To contrast with YRS, I frequently refer to what I call the *traditional* calendar. This is the most commonly recognized way
of organizing the school year in North America, one in which students generally begin school in late summer and continue, with few breaks, until late May or June when they enjoy a summer vacation of two to three months. Although there are many, and often more accurate, synonyms for year-round schooling (such as alternative, modified, and balanced calendars), in this study I tend to use the most commonly used term “year-round schooling” as the more generic label, and others when they refer to specific and identifiable modifications.

*Single-track (ST) YRS* is most often introduced for educational purposes and is a form of calendar change in which the whole school modifies its schedule.

*Multi-track (MT) YRS* is most often introduced to place more students in existing buildings, either to alleviate overcrowding or to defer capital expenses related to building new schools (see diagrams in Appendix A).

*Dual-track* is the term applied to a school in which part of the school remains on a traditional calendar and part moves to a form of single-track YRS.

*Intersession* is the name given to the vacation periods, usually from one to four weeks, inserted between educational terms. Optional instructional activities, including remedial, enriched, or accelerated, are often provided during intersession.

*Leader* may refer either to a person formally appointed to a position of responsibility in a school or district or to any educator or community member who takes on informal leadership roles. For the most part in this study, my focus is on those in formal leadership positions, especially the principal.
Initiation is a term used by Fullan (1993) to refer to the first phase of a change initiative, sometimes also known as the adoption phase. This includes the data collection, planning, and decision making up to and including a formal decision to implement a specific strategy.

Implementation is the term used to refer to the actions taken subsequent to the formal adoption decision, including planning for start-up as well as the start-up phase of an innovation. For the purposes of a change to year-round schooling, this phase would include the time sometimes spent in a “pilot” situation, prior to a decision to continue the calendar modification on a permanent basis.

Continuation or sustainability are terms often used to indicate that a reform initiative has not only been successfully introduced, but that it has become more or less entrenched in the culture of the institution and the community it serves. The change therefore persists for at least several years beyond the pilot period.

Success is an elusive concept and means different things to different people. When I write about the success of a reform, I am referring to its continuation over time accompanied by fulfillment of stated goals as well as support, acceptance, and expressed satisfaction by the school and wider communities it serves.

I use the term restructuring in a specific way, not as a theoretical lens as in structuralism or post-structuralism, but to identify a type of change that, at least in its formal features, is structural in nature. When talking about schooling,
structures might include decision-making structures and mechanisms, the facility itself, the organizational chart (with lines of command and departments identified), as well as the school calendar and timetable. These structures provide a framework within which the daily activities of teaching and learning occur. Changing the in-school and vacation periods changes the framework for learning, but does not necessarily involve any concomitant changes in pedagogy or school culture. It should be noted, however, that the introduction of a change that is primarily structural does not necessarily preclude other changes from occurring simultaneously, nor does it limit the potential of a structural change to act as a catalyst for other types of changes.

Transformative leadership is sometimes confused with transformational leadership. While transformational leadership seeks to transform the unit in which leadership takes place (for example, the school), transformative leadership also seeks changes in the quality of life in both the institution and the larger community.

Limitations and Delimitations

The study is limited by the number and availability of year-round schools. There is a wide choice in the United States that made it necessary for me to delimit my study to selected districts in three states. There are fewer participating schools in Canada, thus limiting the range of communities from which I could identify educational leaders for this study. I was also limited by financial and time resources as to the number of schools and distances to which I could travel to conduct interviews and by the willingness of principals to participate. I have
chosen to delimit my study to focus on principals and their experiences and perceptions, but to include district administrators and informal teacher and community leaders where appropriate.

Overview

Since I began doctoral studies, I have become interested in understanding why school administrators choose to introduce a calendar change despite the substantial hurdles associated with this innovation. To understand why the school calendar seems so entrenched and why there is so much resistance to changing it, one first needs to be aware of the development and evolution of our current school year. In the next chapter, to provide a context for this study, I provide a brief overview of the history of common schooling in North America, followed by a description of the evolution of the current “traditional” school calendar. In chapter three, I provide a conceptual map and an overview of relevant literature; chapter four describes my methodology; while chapters five and six contain the findings of this study. In chapter seven, I sum up the research findings with respect to my guiding questions. In the final chapter, I identify some implications of these findings, discuss the role of transformative leadership in educational change, and make some recommendations for practice.

Significance

This is a study of leadership for educational change and educational reform. The vehicle I have selected to explore the challenges and potential of structural changes in schools is the calendar change known most commonly as
year-round schooling. Given the renewed interest in transformative leadership, educational reform, and school calendars, it seems timely to acquire a deeper understanding of the various reasons for a calendar change, the underlying motivations of educational leaders, their expectations, and the outcomes of their initiatives. Identifying the patterns of motivation and purpose, agency and implementation, and outcomes that are either sustained and successful or that have been discontinued or unsuccessful, may help administrators and policy makers to adopt calendar changes in ways that will promote improved educational experiences for both students and teachers.
CHAPTER 2. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW—SOME FAMILIAR TENSIONS

In this chapter, I provide an overview of schooling in North America, with an emphasis on the development of the most commonly used school calendars. It shows how some key educational leaders worked to achieve their vision of education; it demonstrates how they exercised their power to both implement their vision and to resolve conflicts; it explains how consensus around the school calendar was eventually achieved in order to implement the goal of a common curriculum. This overview permits us to understand that the traditional calendar, although apparently enshrined in history, was formed out of tensions that are as old as public schooling itself. This chapter allows us to understand some of the trends in the development of the calendar and the competing purposes and underlying tensions that not only existed historically but which persist to the twenty-first century. I demonstrate that the use of school calendars to address social inequities is not simply a current challenge, but one that has existed for almost two centuries. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to put this study of leadership and year-round schooling in a broader historical context.

The Role of Education

Since the time of Pericles, whose idea of democracy in some ways approaches current concepts of meritocracy (Kreis, 2000), there has been a belief that democracy cannot exist without an educated and informed populous. Not surprisingly, the quest for free common schooling has been an underlying
theme in the development of public education in many democratic societies. Cubberley (1920) provided an overview of how Western public formal education emerged from five different phases of what he called "eighteenth century liberalism" (p. 472). He argued that the various forces that emerged from the Reformation and the Enlightenment began to wrest the institution of education from the control of the church and enabled it to benefit those other than the elite. In this process, education became liberalized and democratized.

In the United States, the constitutions of seven of the sixteen states that belonged to the Union by the early 1800s included provisions for public education (Cubberley, 1920, p. 522). The model of "local control" that became the norm in North America did not emerge easily from its democratic roots. The weakening of the Puritan monopoly in New England "materially affected both the support and the character of the education provided in the colonies" (1920, p. 519-520). Almost everywhere, people disagreed over the goals of public education as well as what strategies should be employed for implementation and governance. These tensions between local control and legislation still present challenges for school reform, as the most recent initiatives to modify the school year calendar in British Columbia demonstrate.

During the nineteenth century, the rural school belonged, in a real sense, to the local community where it was often the center of most of the community's social interactions. In one room schools "all over the nation, ministers met their flocks, politicians caucused with the faithful, families gathered for Christmas parties and hoe-downs, ... and neighbors gathered to hear spelling bees and
declamations" (Tyack, 1974, p. 16). Village schools, often run by local churches and parishes, were subjected to pressures for consolidation and conformity from the "common school crusade of the 1840's and 1850's" (Tyack, 1974, p. 29). Because schools today are still often perceived to be local defenders of cherished ways of life and family values, "life style" and "family value" arguments are often central to resistance to attempts to change the school calendar.

Crusaders such as Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education (the first state board of education), were influential in the development of universal, free, non-sectarian, and public education. Cubberley (1920) says that Mann "soon became the acknowledged leader in school organization in the United States" (p. 689). "He not only started a great common school revival in Massachusetts... but one which was felt and which influenced development in every Northern State. He will always be regarded as perhaps the greatest of the 'founders' of our American system of free, public schools" (p. 690). Also influential was J. D. Philbrick who, in 1885, published a comprehensive survey of City School Systems in The United States. His purpose was to hasten that 'uniformity of excellence' in urban education which he foresaw as a product of a new enterprise and an intensified emulation among American school managers. (Tyack, 1974, p. 39).

To systematize and perfect urban education, the superintendency was introduced and incumbents were given considerable authority to introduce "controls over pupils, teachers, principals and other subordinate members of the school hierarchy" (p. 40).

In Canada, much of the credit for establishing a common school system has been given to Egerton Ryerson, who assumed the position of Upper Canada
Assistant Superintendent of Education in 1844. The following year he traveled abroad to over 20 countries and returned with a vision for common schools, common textbooks, normal schools for teacher education, and a system of universal, free, elementary education. His classic *Report of 1846* consolidated his ideas and proposed the blueprint that has been the basis for public education in Ontario (and subsequently for most of the rest of Canada) through the Common School Acts of 1846 and 1850.

While the 1850 Act made possible free common schooling for all children if the districts imposed a property tax, there was for some time considerable reluctance on the part of the local authorities to levy the tax. Many people objected to contributing to the cost of educating children other than their own. As one irate taxpayer wrote to Ryerson, "I do not wish to be compelled to educate all the brats in the neighbourhood." Ryerson's reply was that "to educate all the brats in the neighbourhood is just the very object of the clause" (Johnson, 1968, p.39).

Over the next century, social pressures affected the shape of society and the emerging education system. Increased immigration and industrialization led to a perceived need to socialize new immigrants to democratic principles and practices, to teach them English, and especially, to assimilate them into North American society. While the parochial schools that existed to educate the wealthy did not disappear, a new type of school was introduced, intended primarily to educate the working class both to contribute to the good of society and to enable the common man to more intelligently participate in the democratic
process. Today, the increase of charter schools and school voucher programs are attempts to bridge the boundaries that still exist between private and public education. (A recent illustration is Ontario's, May 2001, proposal for a tuition rebate program for private school attendance.)

As the urban areas grew in size and industrialization increased in importance, civil control came to be perceived as a pressing issue. Along with a strong police force, public education was seen as a means of maintaining social order and "stringent legislation [was passed] to force truants to go to school" and remove them from the decadent influence of "the streets" (Tyack, 1974, p. 68). Tyack describes how, in 1852, even before the compulsory education law of Boston, Massachusetts, schools had become institutions for sorting and segregating various social groups in society: "The school committee had created de facto segregation by establishing intermediate schools catering to poor and immigrant children" (p. 69). In the 1880's, the state superintendent in California wrote that "citizens should support compulsory education to save themselves from the rapidly increasing herd of non-producers ... to save themselves from the wretches who prey upon society like wild beasts" (p. 69). Arguments for year-round schooling today often focus on the needs of poor or immigrant children, not labeling them as "wild beasts" but attempting to find ways to ensure that they achieve to the same level as their peers.

Early education programs in the United States, while ideally founded on democratic and egalitarian principles, often turned to a mechanism for class separation and social control. Likewise, as late as 1940's Canada, Gidney (1999)
maintained that the primary secondary school mission in grades 12 and 13 was to prepare students for universities. Because of the highly academic bias of the programs, 80% either dropped out or failed (p. 14-15). Civil control and the best way to promote a civil society from diverse school populations are still topics of heated debate (Bloom, 1987; May, 1998; Schlesinger, 1988). These tensions are also seen in the ongoing debate about the relative value of liberal or so-called practical education.

In the last half of the 1800's, similar pressures developed in agrarian North American society. The Homestead Acts of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the US and Canada brought new waves of immigrants, enticed by the offer of free land. Although most of the immigrants were of European extraction, many were not English speaking. Education was seen as the means of assimilating them into the wider society. As the population of rural areas changed, the role of education became more visible and more important and the concomitant problems more apparent. Although the focus is no longer explicitly on assimilation, the introduction of a modified school calendar is sometimes explained as a way of assisting immigrants and non-English speaking students today.

By the end of the nineteenth century, rural and urban life became more interrelated as farming and industry became more mechanized. Disparities in the educational experiences and opportunities of rural and urban students became evident. The “bookish curriculum, haphazard selection and supervision of teachers, and voluntary character of school attendance” (Tyack, 1974, p. 21),
combined with generally substandard school buildings and woefully inadequate instruction, were seen to be symptoms of an inability of rural folk to administer education that was appropriate for their place in an increasingly complex society.

In the 1890's United States, the National Education Association Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools articulated its proposed solutions:

Consolidation of schools and transportation of pupils, expert supervision by county superintendents, 'taking the schools out of politics,' professionally trained teachers, and connecting the curriculum 'with the everyday life of the community.' (Tyack, 1974, p. 23)

It is fascinating to note the contemporary nature of these proposals made more than a century ago.

It is important to recognize that the evolution of the North American school year into its present state was never straight-forward, rapid, or smooth. In fact, it took almost a century and a half of meandering, even tortuous, negotiation for educators to arrive at the standardized-calendar compromise we currently have. In the following section, the discussion of the fixing of the school-year calendar illustrates the tensions that were, and are still, present in effecting educational change in North America.

Institutionalizing the School Calendar in North America

Although standardization was slow, the creation of a generally accepted school year was influenced by the mandate for compulsory education in North America. As with many other aspects of educational innovation, Massachusetts was pivotal in the development of the school calendar. It was the only state in the US to have compulsory education prior to the American Civil War. A statute
passed in 1852 required that children between the ages of eight and 14 attend 12 weeks of schooling annually, although only six of these weeks needed to be consecutive. Over the next 40 years, the requirements in Massachusetts changed frequently, with modifications relating to children of different ages and varying situations. For example, in 1860, a bill stipulated that children under 12 could not be employed in manufacturing unless they had attended school for 18 weeks in the preceding year. By 1902, all grammar school children were required to attend school for 32 weeks—a period roughly equivalent to the current 180 days mandate.

Another leader in American compulsory education was the state of New York. By 1874, children between the ages of eight and 14 were required to attend school for fourteen weeks, eight of which had to be consecutive. However, in this state as elsewhere, there were great discrepancies between the rural and urban school years.

In the cities, the school was the means for providing a vocational education for workers as well as for the assimilation of immigrants who had come seeking a better life; hence the length of the school year was progressively increased until it exceeded 200 days. By the middle of the nineteenth century, several different calendars had been developed. While in many urban areas, the school year operated on an eleven or twelve-month basis, in rural areas, the school year lasted for five to six months (from the last harvest to the first planting) to accommodate the needs for children to work on the farms.
Rapprochement between the two calendars occurred largely as a result of curriculum standardization and a movement towards more uniform assessment procedures. In 1847, curricular modifications to address the newly implemented grade-level organization of schools were introduced (Glines, 1988). In order to offer the standard curriculum, urban schools reduced the length of their year and rural areas increased the number of school days to what we have come to know as the traditional or "agrarian" calendar, a year with approximately nine months of schooling and a three-month summer break.

By the end of the century, the shorter urban school year had brought a number of critiques. When the U.S. Commissioner of Education compared the school years in several major cities for 1891-92 with those of fifty years earlier, he found that "in New York, the school year had gone down from 245 to 202½ days; in Chicago, from 240 to 192 days; in Philadelphia from 251½ days to 201 days" (Rakoff, 1999, p. 11). Around this time, a US Commissioner of Education, William T. Harris, lamented the reduced number of school days in this way: "The boy of today must attend school 11.1 years in order to receive as much instruction, quantitatively, as the boy of 50 years ago received in eight years" (National Education Commission, 1994, p. 31).

The development of the school year in Ontario, Canada, closely paralleled the US experience. Although the Upper Canada School Act of 1841 made no mention of school holidays, the two-week summer vacation established in 1846 was gradually changed until, in 1913, the present two-month holiday was

1 It is interesting, again, to note how the twin drivers of assessment and a standardized curriculum drove schools then as they do now.
adopted (Brown, 1999, p.1). In 1871, Egerton Ryerson reported that most schools were open almost all year, with an average time of opening of eleven months and six days—twice the average time of either Pennsylvania or Ohio. This period of staying open, of course, did not imply that children needed to be in school for that length of time, instead that they were able to choose to attend school during that period. In 1871, Ryerson, the Assistant Superintendent of Education, introduced the Compulsory Education Act of Ontario, that for the first time, made mention of a specified summer vacation of one month for common schools and six weeks for secondary schools.

In Canada, too, there were discrepancies between urban and rural calendars, this time with rural dwellers urging a longer school year than that desired by the cities. Evidence for this interpretation is found in petitions from various county councils in 1886 located in the Ontario Archives (Series RG 2-42, cited by Brown, 1999, p. 8) in which rural schools sought permission to remain open in the summer. In support, they petitioned:

That many of the pupils, by reason of their age, the long distance from school, and the storms of the long winter, are unable to attend except in summer;

That present Holidays take out of the time for their attendance a large part of the best portion of the year, as regards time and weather.

That a general feeling exists among the parents of our constituencies that the Vacations are too long;

Your petitioners therefore pray that you will cause such alterations as will materially shorten the mid-summer Vacation for Rural Schools...

Although it appears that it was the majority urban populations that ultimately won the day in terms of the school year calendar and the standard two
to three month summer vacation, the calendar is still popularly and mistakenly considered to be a reflection of agrarian needs for a summer planting and harvest period. Interestingly, the school calendar devised for compulsory education prior to the beginning of the Twentieth Century was usually based on a mandated minimum required length of summer vacation, rather than a minimum daily attendance.

Ultimately, the summer holiday was fixed at approximately two months and the fall term set to begin in early September. This was, in part, due to common beliefs that both children and teachers needed time for the regeneration of their mental and physical energies. The long summer vacation was, perhaps, also a response to the common belief, expressed in a petition circulated by the city of Guelph, Ontario (in about 1886), that cited a large number of Canadian, as well as American, medical journals that warned of "injury done to the bodies and brains of children 'by the overstrain of their brain at too early an age,' and at one when it is rapidly and actively developing and easily excited to take on disease" (Brown, 1999, p. 17).

A Press for Change

Despite the general standardization of school calendars at the end of the nineteenth century, changes continued to occur. What some regard as early year-round schools were introduced in Bluffton, Ohio, in 1904; Newark, New Jersey, in 1912; and Minot, North Dakota, in 1917. Glines (1988) indicates that they were begun for many reasons. Newark did it to help immigrants learn English and to enable students to accelerate; Bluffton did it to improve curriculum and learning and to provide
family and student options ... and Minot did it to meet the needs of the 'laggards.' (p. 17)

Brinkerhoff, an educational researcher of the 1930s, reported the success of what were then called "all-year schools." They graduate "a higher percentage of their pupils; they show a lower grade age; they have less retardation; they lose fewer pupils before graduating." Moreover, Brinkerhoff saw "no evidence of 'brain fatigue, loss of mental health, or impaired physical development'" (cited in Doyle & Finn, 1985, p. 31). Due to new economic and social pressures, these early forms of year-round schooling did not persist beyond The Great Depression and World War II.

**Summary of Historical Overview**

Recognizing that the present "common calendar" was the result of a negotiated conciliation to address the changing needs of society might help us to accept a similar process of negotiation today. The so-called "traditional" calendar is not commonly seen as the constructed compromise that it is. Because the traditional calendar is enshrined in the perceived profound insight and sacred customs of times wiser and more grounded than ours, the traditional calendar is often seen as an objective "best system" (Tyack, 1974). This often makes change exceedingly difficult. Suggestions for modification are perceived not as ways of addressing needs in society, but as challenges and threats to the roots and stability our culture and social system.

The preceding overview of the development of the "typical" school year, and discussion of the current thinking about year-round schooling, demonstrate that the development and evolution of the present education system in North
America were shaped by tensions—tensions between socializing goals and educative goals of the educational system, between professionalism and bureaucracy, decentralization and centralization, rural and urban interests, societal mandates and individual rights, rich and poor, vocational and academic purposes and by emotional as well as rational arguments.

Nevertheless, in spite of a period of dormancy following World War II, interest in year-round schooling continues to recur. This study is an attempt to understand and explain this phenomenon from the perspective of educational leaders.
CHAPTER 3. LITERATURE

In this chapter I provide an overview of some strands of literature that combine to provide a foundation for this study. I first examine the topic of year-round schooling in general with particular focus on its reported benefits and challenges. Then, I investigate literature related to educational reform more generally, with a focus on some of the challenges in implementing change. Here I concentrate on theoretical perspectives that help to explain why educational change and reform often appear so difficult and consider ways to move beyond the constraints. Finally, I examine the literature related to transformative leadership and its relation to the introduction of successful educational change. This conceptual framework is schematically depicted in Figure 1.

Research about Year-Round Schooling

Although year-round schooling has existed in some form or other in North America for almost a century, there is no coherent body of literature that explains why one should introduce year-round schooling as a structural reform. For the most part, the literature focuses on various reasons given by principals in separate locations for choosing their unique YRS calendars. What follows is an overview of some of the most common reasons for changing school calendars. One will note, however, that there are no underlying conceptual frameworks, and no unifying threads; indeed, the reasons range from educational to political to fiscal and even personal.
Figure 1. Conceptual framework.

A literature map showing the relationships between literature on year-round schooling, educational change, and transformative leadership.
Impact on Student Achievement

Many studies have found that year-round schooling is associated with improvements in student academic achievement (Baker, 1990; Bradford, 1993; Grotjean & Banks, 1993; Kneese, 1996; Los Angeles Unified School District, 1982-83; Mutchler, 1993; Peltier, 1991; Perry, 1991; Winters, 1995). Other careful reviews of the literature (Goren & Carriedo, 1986; Hazelton et al, 1992; Merino, 1983; Zykowski et al, 1991) have identified studies in which there was either a slight gain or, at minimum, no difference when the academic achievement of students in traditional and year-round schools was compared. It should be noted that while the finding of “no difference” has frequently been used as an argument against proceeding with YRS, Shields and LaRocque (1997) posited that a finding of "no difference" with respect to student achievement should be interpreted in a relatively positive light, in that it demonstrates that it is possible for structural change, increased facility use, and cost benefits to occur without negative consequences to important student outcomes.

There is compelling evidence that the positive effects of YRS are enhanced for students in at-risk groups (Capps & Cox, 1991; Gandara & Fish, 1994; Perry, 1991; Serifs, 1990). One apparent exception, frequently cited in the literature, is the study by Quinlan and associates (1987). They found that student achievement in multi-track year-round schools in the large, urban community studied was lower than in other schools; however, they qualified this finding by saying that it was neither unexpected nor attributable to YRS, but likely due to a number of other factors inherent in the setting.
A few other studies show a mixed impact on student achievement. Harlan (1973) found that students with IQs below 100 were negatively affected by the YRS calendar. A San Diego study conducted in 1994 (Fass-Holmes & Gates) found that YRS had a negative impact on its experimental middle school, while having a positive impact on the achievement of its elementary single-track schools.

**Motivation and Burn-Out**

The literature also indicates that students in YRS seem more ready to learn and to maintain their motivation throughout the year than their peers in traditional schools (Hazelton et al., 1992; Zykowski et al., 1991). Most children indicate that the summer vacation associated with the traditional calendar becomes long and often boring and many report they are ready to return to school earlier (Shields & Oberg, 2000). The three-week breaks distributed throughout the school year appear to be almost ideal for a reprieve from the routine of schooling. Teachers and parents, as well as students report that just as motivation was dwindling, school breaks occurred; likewise, everyone seemed ready to return following the breaks. Hence, increasing student motivation and lessening burn-out is another reason often given for introducing YRS.

**School Attendance and Drop-Outs**

There is a consensus in the literature that YRS reduces the student dropout rate, facilitates retention in school, and increases student attendance rates (Baker, 1990; Bradford, 1993; Brekke, 1983; LAUSD, 1983; White, 1987; White, 1988). This finding seems to relate to the previous notions that higher and
more sustained levels of motivation, increased school success, and sustained involvement in extra-curricular activities may be associated with better attendance and completion rates. If a student has missed an extended period of time due to family circumstances or personal illness, sometimes he or she is permitted to attend a class on a different track during a break (Shields & Oberg, 2000). The opportunity to spend time during the break to catch up may facilitate moving ahead with peers.

The benefits may be increased in high schools where students sometimes become discouraged and drop out of school or where loss of credits sometimes delays graduation or prevents entry into subsequent programs. Where intersession offered the opportunity for a student who has failed a class to retake it and not repeat a whole year, the benefits were perceived to be considerable. Thus, the increased opportunities offered by both ST and MT-YRS for enrichment, for catch-up, and for remediation offered by the more regular pattern of schooling and vacation, and sometimes enhanced by intersession programs, seems to have an indisputably positive effect on student attendance and course completion (Shields & Oberg, 2000).

Decrease in Vandalism and Delinquency

Many year-round schools also report a decreased incidence of student vandalism and communities noted a concomitant decrease in juvenile crime (Ballinger, 1987; Brekke, 1983; Hazelton et al., 1992; Merino, 1983). Some hypothesize that decreased vandalism may be associated with increased use of school facilities over a longer portion of the school year. Others suggest that
decreased juvenile crime may be attributed, in part, to reduced student boredom and to smaller numbers of students not in school at any one time.

**Benefits to Teachers**

Although administrators generally tout the advantages to students, there is little doubt that often the impetus for a calendar change comes from teachers who have heard about the benefits related to their own quality of work life. The research clearly indicates that teachers with experience in both year-round and traditional calendar schools (TCS) are overwhelmingly positive about the relative merits of YRS compared to TCS (Brekke, 1983; Christie, 1989; Gandara, 1992; LAUSD, 1983; Merino, 1983; McNamara, 1981; Peltier, 1991; Webster & Nyberg, 1992). Some reasons for general satisfaction relate to perceptions of higher student enjoyment and motivation (Hazelton et al., 1992; Zykowski et al., 1991), higher personal levels of motivation (Shields & Oberg, 1995), and sometimes, higher salaries (Goren & Carriedo, 1986).

Prior to working in YRS, teachers expressed concerns about whether there would be an opportunity to complete university courses and other professional development activities. They also wondered whether there would be difficulties associated with family vacations. These concerns have been found to be unwarranted. Some teachers reported increased opportunities for professional development (Herman, 1991) and many others indicated a preference for the resulting vacation schedule (Shields & Oberg, 1995). Especially convincing was the finding that after three years on the complex Orchard Plan, in which students
actually rotate in and out of classes, only one of 57 teachers had requested a transfer and 95% stated a continuing preference for the plan (Gandara, 1992).

**Fiscal and Physical Benefits**

Another reason for choosing to introduce the multi-track version of year-round schooling is its reputed ability to avoid capital cost expenditures, to save on district per pupil operating costs, and to reduce overcrowding by accommodating more children in a rotating schedule in existing buildings.

Denton and Walenta (1993) cite the example of a district in California, and say that when the district factored in the capital costs it would have expended for new buildings, YRS does save money. Goren and Carriedo (1986) identify increased costs largely due to inclusion of transitional expenses such as new district forms, increased rubbish disposal, and new vehicles required by the transportation department.

Although some studies suggest that year-round schools are more expensive to operate than traditional calendar schools. White (1992) identified the unanticipated costs when Jefferson County, Colorado, after 14 years on a MT year-round calendar, returned to a traditional calendar. He clarified the need to distinguish between the costs for an individual school and those that are district expenditures by saying, “even though each school’s total operating costs rise when the school switches to a year-round schedule, the district’s unit costs drop” (p. 30). He added,

When Jefferson County built and opened new schools to displace the year-round operation, the district’s total operating costs far exceeded the costs for serving the same enrollment on a year-round calendar. Yet no one had ever made a convincing case to
the public that explained the savings involved in the year-round approach." (p. 30)

Although there are numerous district studies in which there is detailed analysis of parent, student, teacher satisfaction, few assess the costs or fiscal benefits of year-round schooling. This is particularly interesting in view of one of the stated purposes: to save money. Brekke (1983, 1985) presented extensive cost analyses of YRS in Oxnard School District. In each analysis, the general findings were similar, that

YRE within the Oxnard School District has shown a very substantial saving in operational and capital expense... [It] has, in the absence of school building funds, kept the District from a massive program of double/half-day session classes. (1985, p. 16)

The Negative Consequences of Year-Round Schooling

The previous overview of various aspects of research into YRS has focused on its positive attributes and outcomes. To attempt to "balance" this overview with a discussion of its negative aspects is extremely difficult in that most of the negativity related to YRS stems either from pre-conceived pre-implementation concerns or from difficulties associated with implementation procedures. There is very little in the literature to suggest negative outcomes when implementation has been careful and ultimately successful.

That said, there is certainly a body of literature that expresses concern, often raising questions about the relative merits of putting more students in existing buildings or about the conclusiveness of research indicating academic benefits (Ascher, 1988; Naylor, 1995). For example, some authors suggest that even putting additional students in existing facilities with a concomitant finding of "no difference" (Carriedo & Goren, 1989; Zykowski et al. 1991), to student
learning is negative (Naylor, 1995). Others argue that fiscal accountability and savings with no detrimental effects on student learning are not negative but responsible (Shields & LaRocque, 1997). Although some authors claim that YRS does not effect fiscal-savings, it is because they have considered school operating expenses rather than overall district costs including capital expenditures (Denton & Walenta, 1993; Hough, Zykowski, & Dick, 1990; Zykowski et. al., 1991). Sometimes, too, as Denton and Walenta (1993) and Zykowski and colleagues (1991) have demonstrated, increased wear and tear on existing buildings is considered as a cost, but the parallel savings in capital outlay are not considered.

There is an additional body of literature that raises questions about the need for change given that the “traditional” calendar seems to have been so enduring and to have served previous generations well. In fact, it is this literature that prompted my focus on change in the next section. It is fair to say that the concerns relate to the need to reconceptualize such activities as summer vacation and daycare and with their underlying values and traditions (Smith, 1992; White, 1990).

Sometimes, in an apparent effort to discredit YRS, authors provide a list of schools and districts that have chosen to discontinue the YRS calendar, without including a parallel list of newly implementing schools and districts. For example, Rasberry (1994) included in her article, the name of one Utah school that had discontinued the calendar but failed to note that in the same year, a dozen other schools moved to the YR calendar.
The one limitation and challenge of YRS that some say cannot be addressed is the challenge of organizing schedules if children are in schools with different calendars. This is once again, more an issue of competing schedules, than a specific problem with the YR calendar; nevertheless, for some families, it constitutes a real barrier to acceptance of a modified calendar. This seems to be particularly true in that the balanced calendar is prevalent at the elementary level, thus requiring families with children in both elementary and secondary school to juggle schedules. It must however, be noted that in districts like Chandler District, Arizona or San Marcos District in California in which secondary schools are all on a YR calendar, the problem does not arise (Shields & Oberg, 2000).

For the most part, the literature suggests there are challenges rather than negative aspects—challenges most frequently related to issues of implementation such as consultation, decision-making, communication, community relations, change, and the persistence of tradition. Perry (1991) sums this up in this way:

Economic considerations...do not have the persuasive power to foster exploration of the savings to be gained by alternative scheduling. The barriers that predominate are those of habit and tradition—vacations, summer employment, collective agreements—with less consideration of issues relative to learning—integration of the school and the community, access to programs, and remedial and instructional innovation. (p. 15)

Summary of YRS Literature

In the foregoing section I have examined literature related to the benefits and challenges related to YRS calendars. For the most part, research has demonstrated that a school calendar change may be associated with higher
academic achievement for many students, increased motivation (and less burn-out) for teachers and students, better overall attendance, lower student drop-out and lower rates of vandalism and student suspensions. Other benefits relate to items sometimes considered to be non-educational, such as increasing the capacity of existing buildings and avoidance of capital outlay during periods of rapid growth or fiscal restraint.

The literature addressing challenges is less conclusive, focusing more commonly on attitudes than on findings. Yet for any school leader wanting to implement a calendar change, attitudes are no less real and present significant challenges during the adoption and implementation stages of the reform and resistance is often encountered. Because YRS is a type of educational change that falls under a more general rubric of educational reform, in the next section I examine the literature related to educational change to determine whether it sheds light on the challenges of implementing YRS.

Educational Change: Challenges and Perspectives

Despite a huge body of literature that examines educational reform, I was unable to find any studies of large scale reform that included mention of year-round schooling. For example, in the edited book by Leiberman (1986), there is a section entitled “new images and metaphors” in which “fresh ways to think about school improvement” (p. vii) are examined, but school calendars are notably absent. Likewise in the examination of the purpose of public education and schooling by Goodlad and McMannon (1997) there is extensive discussion of democracy and school reform, again with no mention of school calendars.
Perhaps even more telling is that in two recent handbooks related to educational leadership and administration (see English, 2005; and Leithwood & Hallinger, 2002), there is still no mention of calendar reform, despite several articles addressing the current reform climate. Despite the lack of mention of YRS, I first examine some literature related to educational reform and then extend my gaze to literature more broadly addressing the challenges of overcoming resistance in order to implement change.

**Changing Educational Structures**

Change literature seems to de-emphasize structural change and to promote cultural change as the primary focus for lasting change, one that promotes capacity building and collaboration. Hargreaves and Fullan (1998) assert that it is important to place “a high priority on *reculturing* your school ... and not merely *restructuring* it” (p.118). Structures, such as school buildings, school organization, or school calendars, many believe (see also Levin, 2001) have little to do with student learning.

Further, many educators are suspicious of structural change, believing it is a form of tinkering with the façade of the organization and leaving the central core of teaching and learning intact. Failing to recognize that current structures reflect past cultures, they claim that structural change does not really reach areas where the major changes need to occur. Hargreaves and Fullan (1998), for example, state that restructuring which refers to “changes in the formal structure of schooling in terms of organization, timetables, roles and the like [has a] terrible track record” (p. 118). On the other hand, they assert that “reculturing does make
a difference in teaching and learning” (p. 118). Levin (2001), in his analysis of reform in five jurisdictions, supports this perspective. He studied structural reforms related to school choice, charter schools, increased testing, stricter curriculum guides, and changes in governance in England, New Zealand, Canada (Manitoba and Alberta), and the United States (Minnesota). Overall, he found that the changes had little significant impact on student achievement. Levin supports his argument by citing Elmore who wrote in 1995, “Changes in structure are weakly related to changes in teaching practice, and therefore structural change does not necessarily lead to changes in teaching, learning, and student performance” (in Levin, 2001, p. 27).

There is some research to support Levin’s (2001) claim. There is, for example, little convincing evidence that a change on the part of a high school to or from block scheduling or semestering, without any concomitant changes in pedagogical strategies, has any significant or lasting effect on student learning (Brake, 2000; Pisapia & Westfall, 1997). Likewise, if we change the levels of responsibility or the lines of communication in a district office, there is little reason to think the new organization will have a more direct impact on student learning than the previous one. If we move the site of funding decisions from a district committee to a school committee, there may be a better chance that local conditions and needs will be considered, but unless the decision relates to classroom equipment or learning materials, it is unlikely to be noticed by the students or to have any identifiable impact on their learning environment.
Changes that have a direct impact on the lives of teachers and students may be more likely to affect classroom practice and hence the core functions of learning and teaching. Yet even here we need to be cautious. Despite considerable research into class size, an aspect of schooling that definitely pertains to the classroom, more than 50% of all studies have found an inconclusive impact on student performance (Hanushek, 1998). Nevertheless, a new math curriculum, for example, is more likely to change the way in which math is both taught and understood than including more parents on a committee. A change from segregated programming for ESL or learning disabled students will change the classroom relationships and the norms of instruction. Moreover, changes that impact teaching practice are not the only reforms that have the potential to affect student performance.

Sleegers, Geijsel, and van den Berg (2002) specifically address the structural-functional perspective on educational innovation which they say has, over the past several decades, “dominated in research, policy, and practice” (p. 78). They explain:

Within this model of school organization, the role of the principal becomes essentially managerial in nature.... Innovation is construed as a strategy through which the school controls teacher behaviors toward achievement of desired outcomes of the organization.... In fact, the structural-functional perspective is entirely consistent with the traditional way of thinking about management in industrial settings. (p. 78)

Here, educational change is seen in terms of control, with a governing body having the power, not only to initiate and mandate the change, but to identify input controls that are designed to produce the anticipated outcomes. If YRS were introduced according to this model, inputs related to teaching, learning, and
attendance, for example, would be tightly prescribed. Because there are no such prescriptions identified in the literature on YRS, despite the reported benefits to students described previously, this approach to educational change does not seem useful for this study.

The primary contribution, therefore, to this study by the structural-functional literature on educational change is not that it explains how change should occur, but that it offers numerous descriptions of the difficulty of introducing change. Cuban (1998) observed, for example, that “schools are more likely to change imposed reforms than imposed reforms are likely to change schools” (cited in Kowalski & Brunner, 2005, p. 159). Fullan (1993) attributed the difficulty in achieving educational change to the intrinsic conservatism of today's schools:

> On the one hand we have the constant and expanding presence of educational innovation and reform. It is no exaggeration to say that dealing with change is endemic to post-modern society. On the other hand, however, we have an educational system that is fundamentally conservative. The way that teachers are trained, the way that schools are organized, the way that the educational hierarchy operates, and the way that education is treated by political decision-makers results in a system that is more likely to retain the status quo than to change. When change is attempted under such circumstances, it results in defensiveness, superficiality or at best short-lived pockets of success. (p. 3)

Fullan's sense of conservatism is basically a recognition of homeostasis, a recognition that without continuous attention and effort, social systems tend toward equilibrium and maintenance of the status quo rather than to change. For that reason, it is the wider literature on change that offers the most useful contribution to my conceptual framework, particularly elements of Bourdieu's sociological theory and of Bakhtin's literary theory of culture and outsidedness.
Change through the Lenses of Habitus and Outsidedness

Bourdieu's (1993) theory of *habitus* and the relationships between *cultural fields* such as education and *organizational structures* (such as school-year calendars) explain how people are constrained by their social, political, and cultural realities (see also Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Here, I do not purport to adopt Bourdieu's theory wholesale or to adequately represent the body of his work. I simply take the explanatory potential of *habitus* as useful for this study of educational change. Bourdieu is widely recognized for his Framework that addresses the agency/structure problem in contemporary social theory. He in fact was one of the first poststructuralist sociologists to bring actors back into the structural models of stratification by showing that the idea that structures reproduce and function as constraints is not incompatible with the idea that actors create structures. (Swartz, 1997, p. 290).

Despite the originality of his approach to the agency-structure dilemma, he is still critiqued for lacking an institutional perspective on agency (see for example Lamont, 1989). Yet, as Swartz points out, he has “consistently maintained that practices derive from the *intersection* of habitus with structures” (p. 121).

Bourdieu believes that culture is composed of a variety of fields (such as education, the state, religion, and political parties) which “define the structure of the social setting in which habitus operates” (Swartz, 1997, p. 117). Each field occupies positions that have developed over long periods of time and which reflect their possession of various forms of capital. The recognition of social, economic, and cultural capital has led to the study of each field's own traditions, rules, and practices. Bourdieu used the term *habitus* as a way of explaining the norms that have developed in each specific field. He argues that "a system of
dispositions common to all products of the same conditionings" (1990, p. 59) explains why members of the same institutions tend to share cultural and social experiences that shape them and constrain their understandings and ability to change. The implication is that choice is therefore bounded by what we know.

Bourdieu's explanation of habitus is relevant to our understanding of change in education. He writes:

Habitus tends to generate all the 'reasonable' and 'commonsense' behaviours (and only those) which are possible within the limits of these regularities, and which are likely to be positively sanctioned because they are objectively adjusted to the logic characteristic of the field, whose objective future they anticipate. At the same time...it tends to exclude all 'extravagances' ('not for the likes of us'), that is, all the behaviors that would be negatively sanctioned because they are incompatible with the objective conditions. (p. 55-56)

With respect to the school calendar, therefore, any modification from that which people have experienced first hand themselves often seems to be an extravagance that should be “negatively sanctioned” in that it is incompatible with the norm. Bourdieu tends to focus on fields as the product of relationships and struggles situated in history, a view which leads to a "finalizing" of a particular cultural artifact. Bourdieu's (1990, 1993) theory of fields promotes understanding of change and continuity in social institutions and is helpful in understanding why educational change is so difficult. He does not, however, provide much assistance regarding how change may occur. Indeed, this is one area (although not the only one) in which critiques have been leveled at Bourdieu's thinking (see for example Swingewood (1998).,

In contrast, Bakhtin's (1986) concept of outsidedness, an analysis of the material realities that have shaped the culture and that may lead to
understanding, seems more able to embrace change. As with Bourdieu, I do not intend to address, examine, or incorporate the body of Bakhtin's thinking, with its foci on literary criticism, chronotopes, dialogism, and carnival. I take the concept of "outsidedness" to suggest one way (among many possible approaches) of conceptualizing educational change. Outsidedness explores how people with different beliefs and experiences come to see one another as outsiders.

Exploring this concept, Bakhtin believes that

The truth is not born and does not reside in the head of an individual person; it is born of the dialogical intercourse between people in the collective search for truth (Bakhtin & Volosinov, 1973, p. 90)

The concept of outsidedness is complemented by his better known notions of dialogue and dialogism through which people come to understand each other, to identify possible change, and hence, to move beyond the forces of culture and tradition.

For Bakhtin, dialogue is not simply talk. It is not speech at all but an ontology, a way of life. Dialogue is living in openness to new concepts, not as reified things, but as ever changing meanings. He writes,

A meaning only reveals its depths once it has encountered and come into contact with another, foreign meaning: they engage in a kind of dialogue, which surmounts the closedness and one-sidedness of these particular meanings, these cultures. (1986, p. 7)

For Bakhtin, despite enduring cultural structures, the boundaries are always permeable, always fluid, and never static. Hence, as Shields (2003) states, his concepts "permit us to move forward, to open the boundaries, to overcome the inertia of a fixed notion of culture or power, and to recognize the fluidity and ever changing nature of an educational community" (p. 323).
Bakhtin argues that no meanings are fixed, but that they constantly need to be negotiated and renegotiated for different times and contexts. He says:

There is neither a first nor a last word and there are no limits to the dialogic context (it extends into the boundless past and the boundless future). Even past meanings, that is, those born in the dialogue of past centuries, can never be stable (finalised, ended once and for all) -- they will always change (be renewed) in the process of subsequent future development of the dialogue. (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 170)

Bakhtin's theory therefore supports the need to examine how educational leaders approach the difficult process of understanding their communities, of negotiating new meanings that have the potential to move people beyond the current *habitus* of education, and therefore, how they understand education itself and thus, how they introduce and lead educational change in their contexts.

The foregoing theories suggest the inextricably interrelated nature of culture and structure. They help to explain the findings of many educational researchers that "educational reforms have often been thwarted by the robust nature of established school practices" (Silins & Mulford, 2002, p. 567). Both Bourdieu and Bakhtin recognize that cultural artifacts, when entrenched over time, become embodied in societal structures. In turn over time, the structures themselves become embodied in the cultural artifacts. In short, despite many current educational theories to the contrary, it is unproductive for educational reformers and policy makers to attempt to separate culture from structure or to determine which is the more important lever for educational change. Given that there is a strong and endurable interactive effect, it is important to examine both simultaneously.
In the following section I briefly examine literature that addresses the role of the principal (or formal leader) in implementing educational change. Some of this literature addresses change, but remains silent on the issue of its impact on students. At the same time, there is also a body of literature that suggests that the primary reason why a principal might choose to implement change is transformative—to enhance the academic climate and outcomes of her student body and to enhance social justice in the wider community. As we shall see, this is particularly true of educational leaders introducing a form of year-round schooling.

**Transformative Leadership and Educational Change**

I take as a starting point the statement of Silins and Mulford (2002) that “the contributions of school leadership to past and current ... school reform efforts have been found to be undeniably significant, even if these contributions are indirect” (p. 564). Some have suggested that one of the most promising approaches to leadership that makes a difference to student outcomes is transformational leadership. Sleegers, Geijsel, and van den Berg (2002) state that “transformational leadership has emerged as one alternative model with potential for enriching our understanding of innovation in schooling” (p. 84). Drawing on the work of Leithwood and colleagues, they identify six dimensions of transformational leadership (vision building, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, fostering the acceptance of group goals, creating high performance expectations, and modeling important values and practices) (p. 86). Although these dimensions may well be part of the motivation of educational
leaders introducing change, their focus ends with the school and hence did not seem to me to be adequate to inform this study. I wanted to look at impact that educational leaders had on both the school environment and the wider community beyond it. For that reason, my focus here is transformative leadership, described by Astin and Astin (2000) in the following terms:

We believe that the value ends of leadership should be to enhance equity, social justice, and the quality of life; to expand access and opportunity; to encourage respect for difference and diversity; to strengthen democracy, civic life, and civic responsibility; and to promote cultural enrichment, creative expression, intellectual honesty, the advancement of knowledge, and personal freedom coupled with responsibility. (p. 6)

It is this emphasis on leadership that enhances equity and social justice that is interested in enhancing the quality of life for students and their families and for increasing access and opportunity that is the overarching guiding concept for this study.

Traditional ideas associated with what are most commonly considered rational and technical approaches to leadership including measurement, organizational management, and administration of material and human resources are well known and have been extensively discussed in educational leadership literature (English, 2003; Fairholm, 2000; Hoy & Miskel, 2004). Moreover, these aspects of educational leadership are almost universally derided but are extensively practiced and regularly attended to because of their enduring importance (Foster, 1996; Fairholm, 2000, Starratt, 1995). In this overview, I take these traditional approaches as well understood and as needing no further explication. Instead, I focus here on a composite picture of transformative leadership as it emerges from some recent studies and theoretical writing. This
broader conception of leadership becomes the touchstone against which I examine the leadership of the participants in this study.

One current definition of leadership is proposed by Bogotch (2000), "Deliberate intervention that requires the moral use of power." This definition is consistent with the discussion of Astin and Astin in that it is value-based and focuses on purposeful change. Moreover, it suggests three sub-themes that have bearing on this study of leadership for educational reform: agency, moral purpose, and the use of power. It is these three aspects of leadership I investigate in more detail here.

**Agency**

The agency—the deliberate intervention—identified in Bogotch's quotation is intriguing because it does not situate leadership in a particular person or position, but rather leaves the door open for leadership to occur at any level of the organization and by any member of an institution. Moreover, this "agentic" intervention may be initiated by an individual or by a group. Agency, as I am using it, implies both the desire and the ability to act in order to achieve one's mission, goals, and objectives in a proactive way.

Although Bourdieu's theory of habitus allows for an element of agency, he is clear that agency is limited, confined by the enduring structures of habitus, because the "individual mind is socially bounded, socially structured. The individual is always, whether he likes it or not, trapped" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 126, emphasis in original). Ogawa (2005) writes on the concept of
agency and takes it a little further, although he also suggests that agency is held
in balance by forces outside of individual control. He uses

Human agency as a heuristic for examining theory and research on
educational leadership. Agency involves the control that people
exert over their destiny, which is matched against deterministic
forces assumed to lie largely beyond their control. (p. 90)

Ogawa further states that much current theory treats organizations as a
constraint on leadership, but argues for the alternative approach of Katz and
Kahn (1966) who think of leadership as “outside the bounds of organization’s
routine directives, or structures” (2005, p. 93). He goes on to quote Schein
(1992) who defines leadership as “the ability to step outside the [organization’s]
culture” (p. 93). Rather than think about leadership as constrained by the norms
of the institution in some way, an agentic perspective on leadership takes the
leader outside the bounds of the organization’s culture in such a way as to take
deliberate action that may make a difference. In Ogawa’s terms, an exceptional
leader exceeds “the limits established by the norms and values embedded in
existing organizational structures” (p. 93). Ogawa explains:

Individuals do not lead when they gain the compliance of others by
virtue of the organizational roles they occupy. Rather, leaders gain
compliance by employing personal, rather than organization
resources. (p. 93).

This is consistent with Bakhtin’s perspective that change requires *outsidedness*,
dialogue, and encounter with different perspectives and experiences.

In this study, thinking about who actually exercises agency in the selection
and implementation of an educational reform such as year-round schooling, who
has control over which aspects of the situation, and to what extent elements of
the reform process lie beyond any educational leader’s control is an integral part
of being able to answer my guiding questions. Most importantly however, is a consideration of if or how the leaders in my study may step outside the limits of their organizational structures in order to implement the desired reform.

**Moral Purpose**

The idea of agency itself has moral implications. If we have the ability to make choices and to determine a course of action that not only affects us as individuals but has a wider and perhaps more enduring impact on others, we must not only choose, but choose thoughtfully and wisely. It is, of course, quite possible to make choices that are neither in our best interest nor that of others, but when we knowingly make such decisions, we are not acting with moral purpose. This is consistent with one the theory of moral philosophy that holds that “right action must be understood in terms of human good or well-being.” It is also informed by virtue ethics in that it suggests the need to be sensitive to various contexts and situations. It is not simply a matter of “happiness,” but also of reducing inequalities and of ensuring that people are treated respectfully and equitably (see Honderich, 1995, p. 593).

Although many people use the term “moral purpose,” definitions are hard to come by. At its core, it combines concepts related to morals, ethics, or morality with the notion of goals or purpose. Fullan, one of the few who is willing to attempt a definition, shows up repeatedly in the educational literature. He defines what he calls "moral purpose writ large" in the following way: “principled behavior connected to something greater than ourselves that relates to human and social development” (2002, p. 15). While discussions of moral purpose is may vary
according to context, I will adopt Fullan's (2003) definition and guidelines. Fullan identifies four levels of what he calls the moral imperative—the individual, school, regional, and societal (p.30). In talking about what connotes a moral purpose for schools, he states:

The criteria of moral purpose are the following: that all students and teachers benefit in term of identified desirable goals, that the gap between high and low performers becomes less as the bar for all is raised, that ever-deeper educational goals are pursued, and that the culture of the school becomes so transformed that continuous improvement relative to the previous three components becomes built in (p.31).

Fullan sums up what this means by saying, "Moral purpose of the highest order is having a system where all students learn, the gap between high and low performance becomes greatly reduced, and what people learn enables them to be successful citizens and workers in a morally based knowledge society" (p. 29).

Once again I recognize that in adopting terms such as "moral" or "purpose," I am using ideas embedded in long and contested historical, epistemological, philosophical, and theoretical perspectives. Fullan's approach begs for clarity and consideration of terms such as "all students," "high and low performance" and "successful citizens." It is not my purpose here to delve into his underlying assumptions, simply to note that prominent educational writers and theorists have taken up the topic and recognized the importance of moral purpose.

Purpose itself suggests a clear relationship between the goals of educational leadership and the ways in which it is practiced. Brown (2005) declares that "at times there has been little relationship between the expressed
goals of education and actual educational practices" (p. 110). Leading with moral purpose would require a groundedness in which there is congruence between expressed purpose and practice. Some (for example Evans, 1996; Terry, 1993) call this authentic leadership. Terry says that authentic leadership is not just action but ethical action—being “true to ourselves and true to the world, real in ourselves and real in the world” (p. 139).

Dantley (2005) summarizes many of the themes I have been discussing when he says that

Moral leadership, therefore, is broader than traditional school management. It demands a deep investment of the genuine or authentic self of the educational leader. Moral leaders have the courage to locate their work in a broader as well as deeper space as they work to bring about societal transformation. Moral leadership is problematic because it interrogates what school systems and communities have essentialized. It is problematic because it dares to demystify those structures and rituals that have become almost reified after so many years of acceptance. (p. 45).

Here we have the concept of leadership as outside the institution, combined with the sense of moral purpose, and the courage to examine structures and rituals (like the school calendar) that may have become entrenched over time).

It is important to recognize, however, as Fairholm (2000) does, that moral leadership is not new. He explains: “the problem is we have not thought of our leadership in values terms. So the idea of values leadership is "new," while the practice is much more common” (p. xxi).

The Power of Educational Leadership

The final element in Bogotch’s definition of leadership is power. It is important to recognize that power has a creative and generative function as well
as a potential for misuse. It is neither inherently good nor evil, but without power, educational leaders would not be able to exercise agency. They would not be able to make moral choices or to influence others to introduce educational change. By definition, the ability to act and thus act morally requires power. Thus, examining how educational leaders conceptualize the power they have and how they actually put their beliefs into practice may be an important element of this study of educational change.

For the most part, power has become perceived as a negative element of human interaction. Senge and colleagues (2000) believe that today too much of the discussion around school reform takes place in a power-coercive framework. State legislatures announce that, in effect, "These children will achieve." Regardless of whether they have been fed well, live in safe neighborhoods, have parents at home, have good medical care, or live in a peaceful and tranquil environment, they will be judged against children who have those things. Teachers, similarly, are told, "You will have high test scores or we will close you down." ... The results they want are laudable but they show no awareness of the process that must occur naturally to produce those results. (p. 393-394).

Obviously, this is not the use of power that generates successful educational reform. But it is the type of power, too often seen in educational reform processes, and the one that gives the term power itself negative connotations and implications.

One of Foucault's contributions to our understanding of power was the notion that "the effective exercise of power [may] be disguised" (in Seidman & Alexander, 2001, p. 72). He asserts that power is exercised, not just through sovereignty, but also through techniques and discourses. Power, as Foucault
Conceptualized it, is neither inherently negative nor positive. His argument is that
its discourses must be interrogated to determine who is served and who is
oppressed. To understand power, one must examine its social and historical
contexts, the regimes of “truth” of any given society (Rainbow, 1984, p. 73).

There is little doubt that power, whether personal, positional, or discursive
may perpetuate inequities. Shields (2002) states that understanding how “forms
of power operate in an organization is a complex task, compounded by issues of
class, language, socio-economic status, levels of education, and historical
position” (p. 226). In 1999, Bishop and Glynn proposed a model from which to
examine the impact of power imbalances on educational change. They posit the
need to explore any reform effort by investigating the five areas of initiation (who
establishes the goals), benefits (who will benefit directly or indirectly),
representation (whose reality is depicted), legitimization (whose realities and
experiences are considered legitimate), and accountability (to whom reformers
are accountable) (p.55). These are important aspects to keep in mind when
conducting any study that examines the perceptions and practices of school
leaders introducing educational reform.

At the same time, Silins and Mulford (2002) summarize leadership studies
that found that

research describing productive forms of leadership has referred to
aspects of a transformational model of leadership, for example:
leadership which is empowering (Blaise & Blaise, 2000; Reitzug,
1994), sensitive to local community aspirations (Limerick & Nielsen,
1995), supportive of followers (Blaise, 1993), builds collaborative
school structures (Deal & Peterson, 1994), and emphasizes the
importance of a shared vision (Mulford, 1994). (p. 565)
These findings suggest that productive school leaders not only use the power they have, but also empower others. They develop professional learning communities, build capacity among all members of the community, and develop shared vision. They also suggest that educational leaders are transformative.

Fraser (1995) adds to our understanding of leadership that is transformative. She asserts that different strategies need to be used to address different forms of inequity that systematically disadvantage some groups of people vis-à-vis others. She proposes to distinguish two broadly conceived, analytically distinct understandings of injustice. The first is socioeconomic injustice, which is rooted in the political-economic structure of society... The second kind of injustice is cultural or symbolic and is rooted in social patterns of representation, interpretation, and communication. (p. 70-71)

Fraser posits that a form of redistribution is called for to redress economic injustice and also says that the remedy for cultural injustice is some sort of cultural or symbolic change. Both types of change require a two pronged approach involving affirmation and transformation. She explains:

By affirmative remedies for injustice I mean remedies aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes of social arrangements without disturbing the underlying framework that generates them. By transformative remedies, in contrast, I mean remedies aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes precisely by restructuring the underlying generative framework. (p. 82)

Educational leaders who exercise their power to make a difference, not only to the learning climate within the school, but to the lived experience of students and their families beyond the schoolhouse door are engaged in transformation. Those who take the time and expend the energy required to introduce a calendar
change, convinced that it has a positive impact on several aspects of school life as well as on the wider community, may actually be engaged in transformation.

Summary of Literature

In this chapter, I have provided an overview of some of the literature related to year-round schooling, to educational reform, and to leaders' roles in these processes. Although the concept of transformative leadership provides a unifying thread, there are some significant gaps in the literature I have reviewed—gaps that I hope this study can help to address.

The literature on year-round schooling with which this chapter opens suggests that the benefits of a calendar change may make it worth the effort, despite the difficulties educational leaders may face. Some of these benefits include enhancing student achievement; improving motivation and school attendance; decreasing burn-out, drop-out rates, vandalism, and delinquency; enhancing the working conditions and quality of life for teachers; and increasing accountability related to expenditures and facilities.

It is curious, therefore, that there are no conceptual links in the literature between a change of school-year calendar and other educational reforms. The literature on education change, however, helps to inform this study by demonstrating not only that change is difficult, but by providing some explanations for the challenges. Some theorists believe it is better to initiate change by modifying the culture than by addressing the structure. I have pointed to literature that suggests that the notions of structure and culture are intricately interwoven and have suggested that modifying either may impact the other. The
concept of habitus helped to explain the difficulties of educational change, but did
not provide a way forward. For that, I turned to the work of Bakhtin (1986) related
to how dialogue can create more permeable boundaries.

Although there are some conceptual links in the literature between
educational reform and leadership, most studies focus either on managerial or
transformational approaches to leadership. I have found the conceptual lens of
transformative leadership to be the most promising way to both ground and guide
this study. To elaborate this concept, I have used a complementary definition of
leadership by Bogotch (2000) as well as the three related sub-categories of
agency, moral purpose, and power in educational leadership. All three are issues
that confront those who are concerned with making a change in any context, but
are particularly relevant for those who want to introduce transformative change.
Because they are interconnected, they all play important roles in the successful
enactment of any educational change initiative.

Curiously, although there is ample evidence of benefits, none of the
literature explicitly addresses the underlying leadership approaches, the
motivation or sense of purpose that might prompt leaders to take the social and
political risks and to engage in the struggles that a calendar change usually
involves. It is for this reason that I have chosen to attempt to understand, not only
the explicit reasons given by educators, but their underlying motives, and the
resultant outcomes. It is my hope that this study will address these gaps in the
educational change literature as well as provide some guidance to educational
leaders wanting to engage in meaningful educational reform.
CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I describe the methods of this study including my relationship to the topic, my data sources and participants, and my strategies for data analysis. I conclude by providing an overview and rationale for the decisions I made regarding the presentation of my findings in the subsequent two chapters.

My dominant approach in this study is qualitative. A wide range of methodological approaches comes under the heading of qualitative research. It embraces methods such as narrative, archival analysis, discourse analysis, ethnography, case studies, surveys, interviews, and even descriptive statistics. Denzin and Lincoln (1999) state that, overall, qualitative research is multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (p. 3)

This approach has the advantage of presenting respondents' viewpoints and permitting us to confront multiple and sometimes conflicting perspectives on a single topic. This research does not result in generalizability but it can help to inform both theoretical and practical understanding of a particular topic.

My research uses various qualitative methods, with an emphasis on interviews, observations, and appropriate document analysis; however, I rely primarily on information that was gained through interviews with school principals and district administrators who have been associated with the implementation of a change to some form of year-round schooling.
Personal Positioning

In 1992, I began a master’s of educational administration program (MEd) at the University of Utah where I met Dr. Carolyn Shields, then an assistant professor in the department. At that time, she became aware that I was an administrator in a multi-track year-round school in Davis School District. Dr. Shields moved to the University of British Columbia in 1994, a time when a number of schools and districts in BC were considering the introduction of a form of year-round schooling. She and colleague Dr. Linda LaRocque from Simon Fraser University won a contract to work with the Ministry of Education, developing a literature review on year-round schooling and helping to plan a provincial conference on the topic. In 1994, Drs. Shields and LaRocque invited several educators whom they knew to be involved in various modifications of the school calendar to participate in the conference and they asked me if I could join them as a member of the planning committee. This conference was the culminating event in a pilot program established by the BC Ministry of Education in which seven school districts had been given grants to explore the possibility of a calendar change. When no school or district proceeded to implement the reform, Dr. Shields and I were both curious as to why.

During her time in Utah, Dr. Shields had never heard discussion of the constraints and disadvantages that came to the forefront during the BC period of exploration. As we talked, we determined that a small research project in my district would help us to better understand the difficulties and possible benefits of a year-round calendar. I was as intrigued as she was and helped to arrange
access to the district for what became a preliminary study for what became an ongoing SSHRC-funded investigation of various aspects of school calendar reform.

Because of the unanticipated academic benefits we found in that pilot study, when Dr. Shields received her first SSHRC grant, she inquired about whether I was interested in completing a doctoral program and working with her as a research assistant. After being accepted to UBC, I worked as a research assistant to Dr. Shields from 1996 to 2002. With her, I collected data from many extant sources, including examination of documents and achievement results, and traveled to numerous sites where I assisted in the conduct of interviews.

While the overarching research project is Dr. Shield's, she was clear from the outset that I should identify a specific area of interest and focus that would constitute my doctoral research. While many of the interviews that form the basis of this dissertation were conducted jointly, the specific questions of this study and the analyses for the purposes of this dissertation are mine. Where I have worked with Dr. Shields in data analysis and writing of research articles or where I have drawn on her work, the published material is referenced. The interpretations and understandings contained in this dissertation are not only new, but are solely mine. The details of this project are described in the rest of this chapter.

Data Collection and Sources

For the purpose of this specific project, the primary data sources were school and district administrators. Administrator interviews included all principals assigned to a given school during the period of our data collection (1995-2003),
and when available, the district personnel responsible for the implementation of YRS. These interview data were supplemented by interviews with teachers, and often by data collected from parents and students by means of surveys. We also examined available student achievement results, including school reports of state-wide standings, and, in some places, results for individual students, classes, and schools on statewide, standardized achievement tests.

The research team usually consisted of Dr. Shields and myself but at times included other interested academics and graduate students. We interviewed over 80 educators—administrators and teacher leaders—who were instrumental either in the decision to adopt a calendar change or in the implementation of the change process itself.

The respondents were each interviewed on at least two occasions, for a minimum of one hour each time. These semi-structured interviews were taped (with respondents' permission), transcribed, and then coded for subsequent analysis. As a team, we used a semi-formal interview protocol, with open-ended questions, covering a range of topics (see Appendix B). In each interview, all topics were covered, but not necessarily in the same order, as we engaged the respondents in a relatively free-wheeling conversation.

In each interview, we asked administrators questions about their explicit and implicit motivations and goals: why they had implemented a year-round calendar and whether it had been mandated or chosen. If chosen, we wanted to know what the impetus had been, where the idea had come from, and what the procedure had been from initiation to implementation. If it had been mandated,
we were interested in the origin of and rationale for the mandate. A second set of questions related to their expectations and concerns. We wondered what they had hoped to accomplish, and the extent to which their goals had been realized. We tried to understand the outcomes of the change, by asking about anticipated and unanticipated results and the perspectives and responses of various community and policy groups. For the most part, these administrators and leaders welcomed the opportunity to talk about the structural change; hence the interviews often seemed to take on a life of their own, and very little probing was needed to elicit a great deal of information.

The team approach to conducting the interviews was particularly effective in that one person generally took the lead role while the other was able to monitor the interview guide, ensuring that all questions were covered and that follow-up probes were used as necessary. This technique also permitted one person to engage in conversation while the other reflected more on the underlying meaning and checked periodically for understanding.

The respondent group included at least one district level administrator from each of Western Canada, Ontario, Florida, Missouri, and Utah. At least four school principals from each jurisdiction were interviewed. In addition, we often interviewed teachers to extend our understanding of what had occurred. Sometimes this resulted in confirmation of what the principal had said. At other times, we found considerable disparity; always there was clarification about the implementation of year-round schooling. Chronologically, the respondents represent people who implemented a form of year-round calendar in each
decade from the 1960s to the present. Additionally, they represent various models of year-round schooling, including multi-track, dual-track, and single-track versions of the calendar as well as the dynamics of both mandated and voluntary change in a variety of cultural and socio-political contexts.

**Sites Selected for This Study**

My data are representative of various time periods and geographic locations (see Table 1). These educators were chosen purposefully in order to include educators involved in year-round schooling from its inception in North America (about 1969) to the present time, to include those involved in a mandated as well as a voluntary reform initiative, as well as single, dual, and multi-track calendars. Respondents were also chosen from various geographic locations across Canada and the United States. This was to ensure that the effect of different socio-political and cultural contexts was accounted for in my analysis. I decided to select seven districts, separated in time and place, each with a story that needed to be told, and to recount that story by focusing primarily on one or two schools and the colorful people associated with them within each district.

In the United States, I chose the district with the first and longest running year-round schools, Frances Howell, Missouri; Delphi District in Utah, a district that was a relatively early implementer with a large number of mandated multi-track schools; and several Florida districts. The latter were selected because they constituted a geographic cluster in which the districts expressed mutual influence and in which the implementation and outcomes varied considerably.
Table 1. Participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>CALENDAR</th>
<th>INITIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Henderson (GH)*</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Frances</td>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>MT-YRS</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Howell*</td>
<td>David</td>
<td></td>
<td>decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilma Cole (WC)*</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Snider (HS)</td>
<td>Teacher-leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keri Zane (KZ)</td>
<td>Assit. Super.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>Assoc. Super.</td>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td></td>
<td>MT-YRS</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Pearson (SP)</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lightfoot</td>
<td></td>
<td>mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rob (SR)</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Best (DB)</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Brian (KB)</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wycliffe</td>
<td>ST &amp; MT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Lougheed (DL)</td>
<td>Assist. Super.</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>ST &amp; MT</td>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>MT-YRS</td>
<td>mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Marion (BM)</td>
<td>Assist. Super.</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td></td>
<td>MT-YRS</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Child (DC)</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Harwood</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>Jerico</td>
<td>MT-YRS</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Bowes</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>ST-YRS</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Popper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONTARIO, CANADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Patterson*</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>Dual track</td>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John May</td>
<td>Vice-Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Smart (JS)**</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Kate Smith**</td>
<td>Dual-track</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwen Dolan (GD)**</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Sweet-water</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dual track</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lakota**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty Knowles</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Taylor (ST)**</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN CANADA**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naomi St. John</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Kelvin</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>MT-YRS</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lewis Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SLJHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Duschene</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Daley (JD)**</td>
<td>Learning Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Roland (BR)**</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All names are pseudonyms except those with asterisks that are a matter of the historic record.
** In some instances to promote confidentiality, I developed a composite of several regions, schools, or individuals, identified here with **.
The Canadian sites were selected to be representative of what was happening in Canada at the time of this study and because the Canadian situations were uniquely different from what had been observed in the United States. The choice of Stephen Lewis Junior High School is obvious in that it represented Canada's only experiment with a multi-track secondary year-round calendar. The Ontario schools, with their predominantly dual-track calendars, were also unique; they were clustered in several districts which permitted the development of composite images to ensure confidentiality, while the other possible Canadian schools in Dr. Shields' wider study were so isolated it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to ensure confidentiality.

Data Analysis

Consistent with normal procedures of qualitative analysis, data analysis began informally as soon as each interview was completed. I also reflected on the similarity or differences of themes and approaches and engaged in ongoing discussion with other research collaborators involved in studying YRS.

Formal analysis made use of triangulation, coding of interview transcripts, field notes of observations, and analysis of documents collected during each site visit. Each researcher followed a coding strategy identified by Tesch (1990) in which data are decontextualized for preliminary themes and topics and then recontextualized for meaning. To assist with this analysis, I made use of a computer program called NVivo that permits various levels of coding and sorting and assists with thematic analysis of the data.

All but one of the respondents in this study were white, making any kind of
analysis related to ethnicity difficult. There was a roughly 50% gender breakdown, with both male and female principals, teachers, and district educators participating in this study. Because ethnicity was not a consideration for identification and selection of participants and because some of the respondents are presented in the findings chapters as composites, this study does not examine the relationships among gender, ethnicity, or other socio-cultural background factors as they might influence educators' beliefs, perceptions, and practices. These are important topics, however, and worthy of consideration in a future study.

Although much of the data collection and analysis were conducted collaboratively, each researcher also identified topics and themes of particular individual interest and worked independently on the pursuit of the topics and questions so identified. This dissertation is therefore the result of my individual inquiry.

**Organization of Findings**

In order to help make sense of the reams of data, I explored various means of data presentation. At first I thought I would use the guiding questions as an organizing principle; then I thought I would identify various types of leaders—transactional, charismatic, transformative, and so forth. I reflected on organizing the data based on the type of calendar innovation—single-track, multi-track, with intersession or without. I thought about a geographic order, moving from west to east or vice versa. Finally, I decided to present the US cases in chronological order, starting with the earliest implementation. In Canada, I also
presented the elementary schools in chronological order (starting from the earliest) and then finished with the one secondary school in the study.

Though I tell the story of year-round schooling in these seven districts, I also at times bring in data and interviews from other (usually neighboring) jurisdictions with the purpose of establishing a richer context for the study. In all but a few identified cases, the names of districts, schools, and people are pseudonyms, in order to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of participants. Quotations from educators are shown with initials that represent the pseudonyms I have assigned to each educator.

In the following chapter, I present the stories of four American districts. Frances Howell School District in Missouri represents one of the first districts that implemented a multi-track calendar, in Becky David Elementary School. At the turn of the century, it was the longest continually running multi-track year-round school in the US. Because of the historic significance of this school and district, I have chosen (with permission) not to use pseudonyms for the sites or for the instigating principal or district superintendent, Wilma Cole and Gene Henderson, respectively.

I then focus on Delphi School district, located in Utah, a district in which school administrators were required to find a structural solution to address the overcrowded conditions that developed in many urban schools. This account is followed by an examination of two contiguous districts in Florida, with quite different histories related to year-round schooling. In Vista District, the environment was relatively hostile, while in Taft District, the onus was mostly on
individual schools to make decisions about school calendars. Here I examine the case of Jerico and Martin Popper Elementary Schools.

In the Chapter 6, I write about several examples of year-round schooling in Canada, where the earliest implementation experiment began in the early 1990s in Huntsville, Ontario. I then move to Albert District to visit Kate Smith Elementary School's successful experiences with year-round schooling. Next I examine Sweetwater Elementary School and the more problematic experiences of Lakota School District. I conclude by looking at Stephen Lewis Junior High School, Canada's only experiment with multi-track schooling.
CHAPTER 5. THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

The first year-round school (YRS) in the United States opened in Bluffton, Indiana, in 1904 for the purposes of increasing school building capacity and student achievement (Glines, 1995). A small number of other schools followed suit (for example, Newark, NJ; Minot, ND). With the economic and social pressures of the Depression and the Second World War, the first instances of year-round schooling in North America came to an end. It was not until the late 1960s, when fiscal pressures and burgeoning populations resulted in overcrowded schools and classrooms, that multi-track year-round school was almost simultaneously introduced in California, Illinois, Minnesota, and Missouri (Glines, 1988, p. 17).

Although there is some dispute as to the first year-round school, one of the first and the longest running experiment with year-round education, was that of Frances Howell School District in St. Charles, Missouri. In this chapter, I first examine how district educators there retrospectively made sense of their experience. I then examine the implementation in one district in Utah, one of the states with the highest incidence of multi-track year-round schools. In the third part of the chapter I turn to Florida, where some would say that year-round schooling has failed, to examine and better understand the very mixed, often tortuous process experienced by several districts.
Frances Howell School District: Where Change Began

In many ways, Missouri seems to be a strange place for multi-track year-round schooling to have begun. To the east and the west are the state's two major cities, Saint Louis and Kansas City, both with the dichotomy of sophistication and urban decay that populate most contemporary North American cities. These modern metropolises bracket fertile farmlands and the rolling hills of the Ozarks, where every small town seems to have a white clapboard Baptist church and an undersized all-purpose Wal-Mart. A solidly Midwestern state that is also a part of the South and "the gateway to the West," portions of the Missouri political debate of the 1990s revolved around whether or not cock-fighting should be banned and what role riverboat gambling revenues should play in funding education.

Missouri's Frances Howell School District boundaries are congruent with those of Saint Charles County, a once-rural area that has become a suburb of Saint Louis. White flight and the growing affluence of the middle class led to its rampant and almost uncontrolled growth in the 1960s. Farmland was being bought up and converted into subdivisions and single housing units. New homes meant families—and families meant more children for the schools (GH).

Year-Round Schooling: A Risk That Paid Off

The growth rate was phenomenal. The school district was in a bind. It literally could not build schools fast enough because the board was not allowed to. It wasn't that they didn't have the will—they simply didn't have the way. There were two reasons for this. One, the property tax rate (that was by far the largest
mandated support for education) was not as high for residential property as it was for industrial and commercial property. Saint Charles had plenty of residential and farm land, but very few businesses. Second, the school board was restricted on the amount that it could increase revenues by borrowing money or raising taxes. By state law, the district was limited to borrowing no more than ten percent of its assessed evaluation. So Frances Howell District borrowed money and built schools—as quickly as allowed. What was allowed just wasn't fast enough. Schools and classrooms were exploding with new students (GH).

Gene Henderson had been hired by Frances Howell District as superintendent in 1965. He had inherited a problem that seemingly had no solution. He said of the time, "When I arrived, there were only 2500 students in the whole district. From the outset we had a terrible growth problem. I don't remember the figures but it seems like we had a 30% growth increase in one year." He had too many students, no place to house them and the inability to go after the funds required to build new schools. So he did what anyone in his place would do. He rented spaces from local churches. Henderson again: "We had been renting space from churches and still needed more. One church seemed quite supportive of us." He qualified this, "Using churches was a horrendous experience for everyone." They even considered double sessions but "some students would have had to leave home as early as 4:30am and others arrive home as late as 8:30pm."

Gene attended conferences, read the literature, and brainstormed with district personnel. At one district meeting a math teacher who was also an acting
principal attended. Harry Snider, a teacher who had taught in the district at the
time, described what happened, "Mr. Mathematics said, 'Well you know, there
really is a better solution to this. If you use the facility twelve months a year and
you cycle the students' attendance, you could increase the capacity of the
building by a third.' And the principals all looked at him like, 'What the hell do you
know? You're a math teacher'." But Gene Henderson was intrigued and called
the math teacher back in to discuss the idea. When asked if the plan was in
place anywhere else, he was told that they had already enacted it in Valley View
Elementary, near Chicago. Gene wanted to go and look at how it was working,
but after making some queries, found out that it hadn't actually begun yet. "They
had some kind of federal grant and all kinds of money and time investigating it.
But we actually started first, because we couldn't afford to wait."

**Becky David: Chosen for Innovation**

The district could have chosen to experiment with the new calendar in any
number of schools. They settled on the 1000 student Becky David Elementary for
one reason—the potential for air conditioning. Gene Henderson said, "The
contractor told me that the hot water pipes were large enough to be converted to
cold water so that the school could be easily cooled. It just wasn't true." A
principal at the school said that they "had two full years of sweating" before air
conditioning arrived.

Wilma Cole had been the "lower grades principal" at Becky David
Elementary since 1963. She used to joke with Gene that she didn't have enough
work to do to justify her eleven month contract and, in the long, dead summer,
that she used to stop in at the school on her way to play a little golf. "That's the last time I ever said I was under worked, because the next year we introduced year-round schooling."

Approval was not difficult. The school board was happy to have a possible way to solve the problem. After a "number of public meetings" the parent council decided that a vote was needed. So Wilma Cole sent home a survey to her patrons. "We let each family have one vote. The mother could be for it and the father against it, but whoever was the most persuasive got to vote." They had two thirds in favor, but those against were very vocal, even threatening lawsuits against the district if they proceeded. The state legislature had to modify some language that defined beginning and ending parameters of the school year. Last of all, the teacher's union had to give approval. Tempted by the opportunity of optional alternative teacher contracts (read: more days in the classroom for more pay)—the union gave its blessings.

Despite a loud minority of parents, angry about the introduction of a YR calendar, the district went ahead with its plans, promising that if the new calendar didn't work they would return to the traditional calendar in the following year. Besides, it was only being introduced in one school and parents could take their children to a different facility if they wished. Wilma Cole remarked that "it was amazing that we got state, teacher, and parent approval within a few months."

She also stated, "People have to understand that the model we look at today was something that happened by a series of changes. Year-round school, as most people know it, is quite a different animal from that beast we had first."
Opening day arrived with a great deal of trepidation and anticipation. Gene and Wilma wondered whether any students would show up that first day. Wilma says,

We were kind of amazed they showed up—dismayed almost. They loved it, too. They just came in leaps and bounds. We had more than we expected. I thought that some would move away as they were so vocally opposed to this concept.

Gene Henderson reflected, “Looking back, it was a wonder parents didn’t rebel. ... It’s kind of interesting. The boys and girls came to school, enthusiastic about learning and the teachers were scared to death because no one had the answers in terms of the one million questions that our new schedule generated.”

He continued: “I think the parents and children enjoyed it because they were on TV now and then.” Both he and Wilma vividly recalled how in the first interview, a television reporter was out on the playground interviewing students. The first three she interviewed said, of the new schedule, “Yes. I love this calendar” and “I don’t care” and “I hate it.” They indicated that the press was quite favorable and often showed pictures of the school and children getting on and off buses. Gene and Wilma were also on talk shows and call-in sessions and there was an article, “Year-round schooling: An idea whose time has come,” published in 1970 in the Readers’ Digest about Gene and Wilma and the school. Although much of the coverage occurred at the outset of the new calendar’s implementation, additional but more sporadic attention by the press continued for years. Wilma described how they still got some interest, especially over the summer, when they were “still the only game in town.” She said that all of a sudden there would be a report that suggested that “They have discovered year-round school in the St. Louis
area." One such example was the summer the Missouri River crested and the newspapers contacted them to see how many schools had been flooded out. (Of course, none had been.)

The four calendar tracks were divided up according to bus routes—a true serendipity. Instead of taking parental requests (as we will see happens in other districts implementing multi-track year-round schooling), tracks were assigned according to geographic areas and buses simply picked up all neighborhood children at one time. Though not much thought was given to this plan, this strategy worked well, avoiding the track request booby-trap that was to sabotage many rotating track schooling programs in other locales. This option offered the advantage of keeping neighbors together on one track. It eliminated the time and tension experienced by many administrators who attempt to fulfill parental requests. Most of all, they said, it eliminated inequities due to differences in socio-economic status or ethnicity. They explained that, as the demographics of the district changed, they simply shifted the track boundaries by slicing the pie differently. It is ironic that the relatively trouble-free and relatively equitable plan of one of the first multi-track districts is still rarely adopted by schools or districts implementing the year-round school calendar today—districts perhaps overly anxious to accede to parental requests and to keep their public happy at all costs.

At first, teacher contracts were creative. Wilma: "Even our contract options turned out to be a nightmare. I'm glad it only took a couple of years to get that ironed out." Most teachers taught all year-round with the students rotating to new
teachers every time they came back on track. It didn't take long for everyone to conclude that this wasn't the best thing for the students and was also a nightmare for teachers.

Harry, a teacher-leader, remembered that first year in Becky David in this way:

There was one group that just really sticks out in my mind because it was such a bizarre collection of kids... Each teacher was relieved they were only going to be the group's teacher for 45 days. After the first day they would shake the group like a wet dog and say, ‘Thank God, there's only 44 more days.’ ...As this year progressed, and all of us watched these kids, I think we pretty much said to ourselves that if schools are for kids and schools are supposed to meet the needs of kids, then this plan may or may not be in the best interest of children. (HS)

Changes over Time

In this first year, teachers taught as if they were in a traditional school but with extended contracts. As children rotated in and out of school, they changed teachers each new term. Harry elaborated: "We changed kids every quarter, which was really awful...I had more than 400 students assigned to me that first year."

By the second year, the teachers had met to determine what they hoped would be a better way. Each teacher was assigned a group of kids and the day was departmentalized. With only three groups in attendance, a teacher could teach the kids math and science or social studies or the language arts block. Harry continued,

When they went off on their vacation, another group came in, but you had previous experience with that group as their math and science teacher. So the only thing that changed was the time of day that you met the group. And we kept that for another five years, and that was cool, I mean it worked, we got to know our kids.
Although this concept worked for the intermediate students, the primary grades, especially kindergarten, could not stand the transitions. Those working with the lower grades soon moved to what is now the most common multi-track schedule, 45 days in class followed by 15 days of vacation (known as 45-15) in which students and teachers rotated together. Thus, after two years of experimenting, only three options were left. The primary teachers opted for the 45-15; some teachers, such as art and music specialists, worked extended contracts that covered the whole year; and the intermediate grades stayed with their departmental system, but dropped it a few years later.

One factor that helped them over the initial hump was that, in 1969 when the year-round calendar was instituted, there was a shortage of teachers in the state. By working at Becky David, a teacher could earn a full year's pay working for twelve months. At that time, Becky David had a faculty of 60 people, 18 of them were men, something that was very unusual for an elementary school. It was the economic pheromone of increased earning power that made the job attractive to males.

Changes occurred very quickly. As teachers began to change rooms every cycle, the district developed the concept of having a cart on wheels for each teacher to help alleviate the headache of moving all their materials. The air-conditioning problem was eventually solved, although for the first two years, Wilma remembered that "parents even had to lend them fans and that each room had two or three fans that ran day and night." And the district procedures for ordering materials were refined to take account of the needs of the new school.
I asked my respondents if there had been any impact on student learning. Gene and Wilma recalled that a Danforth Study had been conducted at a cost of a quarter of a million dollars to investigate that question. But they lamented that the study had been ill-conceived, had focused primarily on statewide standardized test results, and had found little if any difference.

The new calendar grew rapidly. In the second year, another school came on board, with a third school the following year. Soon the whole district adopted the schedule up to the sixth grade. Year-round schooling became simply the way education happened in Frances Howell School District. When, in a given year, the enrolment for a specific school dropped, the school moved to a single-track schedule, locally referred to as E Track. When the school's population grew again, it returned to a multi-track calendar.

In Frances Howell, this situation continued for over thirty years, with constant experimentation and modifications. They learned to accommodate small, remote schools as well as their largest suburban elementary school of approximately 1800 students (the largest in the state and one of the three or four largest in the nation). They experimented with various track configurations, track principals, and executive principals. The schedule permitted Becky David to grow to accommodate over 1600 students by 1998.

Only after the turn of the 21st century, did the district find itself able to move away from large multi-track elementary schools. Nevertheless, it did not return to a traditional calendar, but placed all schools, where they are today, on Cycle E—the district's term for its single track year-round school calendar. This is
consistent with the preference the incumbent superintendent reported to me in the late 1990s. When I asked, in the best of all worlds, what his preference would be, he replied, "No question. Cycle E. K-12. With intersessions." An assistant superintendent added, "Everybody just loves it. That's the single track and it's the best of all worlds" (KZ).

Summing up the Frances Howell Experiment

The strong and colorful leadership of Gene Henderson and Wilma Cole, with their spirit of experimentation, flexibility, and willingness to change led Frances Howell into the year-round school experiment in 1969 and carried it through periods of legal action, parental unrest, changing fiscal, social, and demographic realities. In Frances Howell, people said proudly that the year-round calendar is the way schooling works for their district. Never mandated by state legislation, year-round schooling nevertheless has offered solutions to major problems for over 30 years. By making year-round schooling the "way education was done" in the district, Gene and Wilma permitted the district to be not just successful, but a flagship for the state. Moreover, they did so in a transformative way, ensuring equity of educational opportunity and services and creating numerous opportunities for community involvement.

I move now to Utah, a state in which the same calendar was introduced a little later, also to address some pressing problems of overcrowding and lack of capital funds.
Utah: A Mandated Reform

Utah’s dominant population is Mormon. Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints believe in large families. Typically they reject birth control and the mother stays home or works a relatively low-wage job. The largest minority is Hispanic Catholic—also a group that tends to have large families. Thus, in Utah, per capita income is relatively low because of the large families. Rothstein (2000) reported for example that out of the 50 states and the District of Columbia, Utah ranked 51st in total per pupil spending ($4620 per pupil), while New Jersey which ranked first, spent almost twice that amount ($8470). Because of the low tax base and the large number of children, Rothstein explained that “citizens of Utah must make the greatest sacrifice to provide for public education—PIPS\(^1\) is only 59% of the national average” (p. 43).

Year-round schooling in Utah was introduced in the late 1980s to counteract some of these specific problems related to education in the state. The State Legislature, following California’s decision to offer incentives to districts that instituted year-round schooling to reduce overcrowding (Zykowski et al., 1991, p. 18), informed school districts that funding for new school buildings would only be forthcoming if districts introduced some form of efficiency calendar. Delphi District first responded to this mandate in some pilot elementary schools by introducing what it called “extended day schools.” In this model, one principal explained, half of the students arrived at school at 7 am and left at 2 pm, with the others arriving at 9:30 am and returning to their homes at 4:30 pm. The 2.5 hour

\(^1\) PIPS = personal income per student.
blocks at the beginning and end of the day provided time for "core subjects" to be taught by "core teachers" "in classes that were kept as small as classes ever are in Utah" (SP). The more "general" subjects—science, art, music, and physical education—were taught to double sized classes in the middle block of the day (one can only imagine the challenge of teaching science to a classroom of 70 mixed grade elementary students). Many teachers taught the full day and hence were paid more, something that never fails to please.

The district also appreciated unexpected benefits of the extended-day calendar, in that it did not have to hire as many teachers and benefits and other peripheral costs were kept stable. The sole group for whom the experiment really did not work was the students. In particular, "parents felt as if younger children were lost in these large classes" (SP). Although students still performed well in their core classes, the rest of the day became essentially "a baby-sitting process" (SR). Few, if any, art or science concepts were taught and students learned little. Even after trying to supplement the classroom instruction with teachers' aides, students did not perform as well as they had before.

Although the model did not work for students, teachers who were earning an additional 30% by working the full day were reluctant to give up the new calendar. One principal, who in adopting a year-round schedule was happy to be rid of extended day, said, "It carried us through until we came up with a better model" (SP). Another principal summed the extended day up by saying that it was "a horrible thing to put kids through" (DB).
In 1988, Delphi District decided to end the experiment with the extended day calendar and chose instead to implement multi-track year-round schooling in schools that were grossly overcrowded. By this time, additions had been made to some of the elementary schools originally built for 450 students and still more space had been acquired through the installation of portable classrooms to provide for up to 600 students. However, at that time, some schools enrolled as many as 1200 students. At the time of data collection, the district served over 58,000 students in seven high schools, 13 junior high schools, seven alternative programs, and 48 elementary schools. Of the 48 schools, 34 followed the traditional school-year calendar, 12 used a multi-track year-round calendar, and two schools, which opened in August 1995, began with a single-track year-round calendar and changed to a multi-track calendar in the fall of 1996.

The 12 original multi-track year-round schools, some of which have been operating on that schedule since 1989, represent 25% of the elementary schools and hold approximately 36% (11,160) of the elementary students.\(^2\) The facilities are relatively large, housing between 410 and 1242 students. However, the traditional calendar schools are also quite large with student populations between 366 and 854 students.

For schools that had piloted the extended day, parents and students were eager to try something else. For those packed elementary schools that had become used to overcrowding, the change to a multi-track school proved to be much more challenging (perhaps in part because any move away from the

\(^2\) The only experiment with year-round schooling beyond the elementary level only lasted one year in this district.
"traditional" in Utah is viewed with suspicion). Nevertheless, the state and district remained adamant and multi-track year-round schooling became a way of life for a large number of Delphi District parents and students.

Implementation in Delphi District was varied. At first, there was little institutional support for the change and little district recognition of the special needs of year-round schools. One principal recounted his first comment to a new superintendent:

You've got to stop treating year-round school like an ugly adopted child. You need to appoint an administrator at the district level who is only responsible for year-round school so we don't keep calling down there and hearing, "Oh, the warehouse is closed for inventory. We forgot about year-round school... Oh, in-service? You're off-track? We forgot about you." (DB)

As years passed, the district matured in its approach to implementation. A district administrator was assigned to be responsible for year-round schooling. Separate meetings were added for principals of year-round schools; additional office help was provided; the testing schedule was compiled to accommodate the year-round school schedule; a compensatory salary stipend was added for year-round school principals and a TSA (Teacher on Special Assignment) position\(^3\) was added to provide administrative support and relief for principals. The district learned to offer two school opening institutes as well as to offer professional development activities during year-round school track breaks. The effect of these

\(^3\) In the words of one principal, this position is a "mix between a teacher and administrator" (DB). Those assigned to the position were generally experienced teachers who taught half the day and for the other half took over some administrative tasks (testing, discipline etc.). They were also officially in charge of the school when the principal was absent for any reason.
changes over time was to increase the status of a multi-track elementary school principal to something roughly equivalent to that of a junior high school principal.

In the beginning, however, Delphi District required its principals to do almost all the implementation and design of the year-round schooling programs in their own schools. Reminiscent of the early days in Frances Howell, one principal described how he had to “literally run and get pencils and bring them back” before the warehouse closed for the season. He recognized, however, that part of the problem was his own lack of organization and added, “Maybe we should have done that in December when ordering was at a minimum.”

The main question principals were faced with was not if they were going to implement year-round schooling but how. Moreover, there was little guidance or assistance from a district that was as “green” as the principals about the new concept. At the time, Utah had school councils, each of which was empowered to make decisions for its respective school. Principals, therefore, had the task of generating a consensus in their respective parent and teacher communities to ensure that the required vote worked out positively in favor of year-round schooling. The problem, as one principal stated, “was primarily with parents who did not know how they would manage without the whole summer off” (SP). Another put it more bluntly. He said that year-round schooling had been “a tough pill to swallow,” but added that he thought anything “so new in education always is” (DB).

Despite this requirement, the greatest challenge for principals of year-round schools in Utah was not gaining acceptance for the concept, but
assignment of teachers and students to tracks. This too was left to each principal and accomplished differently from school to school. Often, assignment was done, not in the systematic fashion of Frances Howell School District, but in a first come, first served basis. Parents were often asked to prioritize their choice of track; they were also guaranteed that if they so desired, all children from one family could be on the same track. Unfortunately, lower socio-economic status (SES) parents often failed to submit a track request form. Ultimately this led to a sort of socio-economic streaming. In Lightfoot Elementary, one of the schools that piloted both extended day and year-round schooling, one vice-principal described the difficulties in this way:

Initially everybody wanted track A or track D which replicated the traditional schedule... There were parents that weren't on the PTA board and that weren't really aware of what was happening in the school who were getting the last choice or weren't making a choice and so they would be assigned to tracks that were less popular. So we have track C for example with a majority of our Hispanic kids. (SR)

One principal stated that "it is almost a school district philosophy that we try to honor parent requests as much as possible" (KB). The fulfillment of parents' wishes was often taken to such an extent that classes were unevenly distributed across tracks. For example, at one point, there were three track A first grade classes in Lightfoot elementary school, with one additional first grade class on each of the other three tracks. When Sally Pearson took over as principal of the school, she found that "when track A was off, we had to rattle through the halls looking for kids ... when track A was here, the computer labs were over-crowded and there were safety hazards on the playground and buses."
However, in another school in Delphi District, parents believed that keeping neighbors on the same track was most appropriate. Karen Brian reported that parents said:

We don't care. We think you have wonderful teachers. We aren't worried about which teacher. We really aren't so worried about which track. What we want here is to have our neighborhood together.

This sentiment seemed similar to the track assignment policy that had been established (almost by default) in Frances Howell School District.

In one school of only 600 students, one of the school principals opted for only three tracks—a decision that later caused problems in the school community. Although he stated that this was so that four times during the year everyone would be there at one time, it was undoubtedly due to parental pressure. The eliminated track C was by all accounts the least popular of the four tracks used in the district. At the same time, he complained that when all students were in attendance, "It took 40 minutes to get them all into an assembly." He described how at first he had not equalized the enrollments on each track, but had finally come to the conclusion (in spite of parental pressure) that it was best to have two teachers and classes at each grade level on each track.

The need to manage parental and staff opinion was also problematic for this principal. Although he was critical of the district for not taking the year-round schedule into account, he himself admitted that he had "blown it a couple of times." For example he had forgotten "that D track was not in session when guests were invited to the school" (DB). More importantly, David Best reflected
that he had not yet developed the appropriate skills and mind-set required of a year-round school principal. When one prominent parent chose to withdraw his children from the school, David put him on the school council, hoping that involvement would bring support for the schedule. Instead, the parent drummed up so much support for a return to a traditional calendar that David decided he needed a veto over who would be members of the PTA Board. Ultimately a surge in enrolment made his point moot and the school remained on a multi-track schedule.

Over the years, the district learned, as one associate superintendent said, "that it was important to assign their best principals to year-round schools" (CW). By 1995, when the district required further expansion, all new elementary schools that were built opened as single-track year-round schools, with the proviso that as enrolment inevitably increased, they would become multi-track year-round schools. Moreover, they were designed with the multi-track schedule in mind, with additional storage rooms, teacher workspaces, classroom pods, and air conditioning. Karen Brian, a principal with prior experience in both traditional and multi-track schools, was assigned to one of these new schools.

In the first year, she indicated that opening as a single-track school was "wonderful":

It has been especially helpful for a brand new school because it's given all of us a chance to get to know each other. The teachers get to know each other and bond and the same for the kids. (KB)

She described how rapidly the community was growing and the decision process involved in choosing to move to a multi-track schedule the following year. The decision to remain on single track for another year or to move to multi-track was
really up to the community. Karen indicated that she had informed the community that they "might be able to survive one more year staying single track." However, most of the parents who had previously experienced multi-track schedules rejected the idea. They wanted multi-track because they "liked having more access to the computer labs" and "fewer students at a time." She indicated that she may have helped them to see these advantages, but that "it was unanimous in support from the parent group." Teachers also opted to move to the multi-track schedule the second year. When they voted, 22 of the 28 teachers "voted to go with the multi-track and six said they would prefer to stay single-track another year." The decision reflected the understanding of both principal and teachers that despite their enjoyment of the year on single-track, the multi-track schedules offered some "real pluses" (KB) such as increased availability to computer labs, restrooms, to the media center. They noted that the playground was not as crowded, thus reducing potential conflicts, and that other activities were smoother, for example, "lunch does not take as long to serve" (KB).

The idea of both individuals and the district maturing into the concept was both implicitly and explicitly mentioned in Karen's comments. She described her first year as a multi-track principal in another school by saying, "The first year on multi-track... I was blind-sided many times. Oh darn, you know, you've got to do that." But she added that you quickly "start to pick up an anticipatory sense of being multi-track." She described how she actually colored her planner and marked colored bands across the top with the colors of the tracks in session:

I went though my planner and marked along... so this week would have yellow, blue, and green, and then maybe this week would
have yellow, blue, and red... when I was at a district meeting, somebody thought I had too much time on my hands and was sitting there coloring.

She talked about how there had been a strong pool of applicants for positions in her school, although legally, she had to draw from teachers whose positions had been made redundant when they had downsized due to district demographic changes. Here, Karen's assistant principal, present for the interview, supported the notion that the district had learned the importance of having a strong principal, particularly in a year-round school, and said, "One reason for the large applicant pool was they had named the principal...it's very true. It was a turning point for a lot of teachers I was working with." As soon as teachers learned who had been appointed principal, they began to apply for the school.

By the second year, the school was running smoothly on a multi-track schedule. Karen described the transition as having occurred "very well" with the most taxing issues, as always, being assignment of teachers and students to tracks. Here, once again, experience paid off. Karen took advantage of the "once in a lifetime chance" to set up new procedures. With her teachers, she developed a process that was not purely based on having the most senior teachers always getting their track preference. For the first year, seniority determined track assignment, but in the following years, selection rotated so that the person who had their first choice one year, had the last choice the following year. Although this process is equitable and gives teachers equal opportunity to change track, Karen indicated that she felt teachers at some grade levels would not change,
while other teachers would opt for a change. This process, although not always the most popular with parents, prevented teachers from becoming entrenched.

In terms of student assignment, although Karen supported the district policy of trying to honor parental requests, she was not strictly tied to it. She and the teachers “highlighted some students” that, in spite of parental requests, they would not move. They:

went though and looked at all of the resource kids and all of the kids that can have behavior issues. Then we pulled their cards and... divided them up first and put them into the computer by hand. We did not leave it to chance. And then we put in all the other names after that. That equalized it. We’re not telling parents we did it because they may not get the track they wanted, but [it’s] for the good of the child and the class...It impacts the learning of all the kids in the class and it impacts those kids tremendously.

Here, we find an experienced principal using the multi-track schedule to override general district guidelines and parental requests in the best interests of all students.

In Delphi School District, year-round schooling was not a choice. It was not instituted because teachers or parents wanted a new or different or better way of educating students. Instead, it was implemented to solve the problem of too many students in too few buildings with too little money. There was a relatively steep learning curve, with little support from the district during the initial stages. Over time, however, both district and principals learned how to both support and make good use of the multi-track schedule. Despite these factors, and despite the fact that implementation took place in different ways at each school, there was general consensus on the part of the Utah principals about the advantages and disadvantages of the schedule.
Perceived Advantages

For the most part, principals believed that the schedule offered a better use of school buildings, and of educational resources. One summed it up:

We really utilize every inch of space. The school is the community center. We’re using taxpayer money wisely. We’re housing 25% more children than we could before. It happens smoothly and happily as well. It’s easy to do and gives us the ability to maximize our space and our materials. (SP)

The nature of the calendar helped teachers to plan in structured units that seemed to facilitate planning and teaching together and to encourage sharing of ideas. They reported that during breaks many teachers traveled but still reflected on the upcoming units. "I do hear them saying things like 'while we were off-track, I thought about this....' they've traveled; they've done other things and they bring things back to their grade level, to their group" (DB). Karen reported that "one teacher had been to Alaska and brought back some books and some things that she picked up there about a unit they were doing in reading" and shared them with the other grade level teachers (KB).

David indicated that "year-round school is a catalyst to thinking." They also talked about reduction of tensions and disciplinary incidents in the school. Sally reported having "less discipline problems." Karen elaborated:

Sometimes kids that really constantly harassed each other were not there together. You could split them up. ... I could see the teachers get to a point where they were ready to lay on hands and then they were apart for three weeks. They’d come back and they could regroup and handle it again. (KB)

Both teachers and students returned from breaks refreshed, enthusiastic, motivated, and ready to learn. "About the time that the teachers energy and enthusiasm starts to wane, it's time to go off track and take three weeks and
become invigorated and excited and the teachers come back enthusiastic, about
to start again and so are the kids" (SP).

Some of these benefits had been unanticipated when the MT schedule
was first introduced with the aim of finding ways to house Utah's burgeoning
population. For example, the reduction of the principal's isolation through the
presence of the TSA was a pleasant surprise. Sally indicated that it "makes all
the difference in the world."

Another was the positive impact of the calendar on younger students
whose parents report that "year-round gives kindergarten children and even first
grade children a chance to come in, get their feet wet, and then be back home
with Mom and Dad a bit and then come back in. It's not such an abrupt thrust into
the cold, cruel world of schooling" (SP).

An additional response from the wider community was also perceived as a
benefit. Daycare providers adjusted their schedules to accommodate children
throughout the year and reported that the new schedule was not only beneficial
in terms of providing year-round employment for them, but also in spreading the
payments throughout the year. This helped parents who struggled to meet the
costs. Flexible and responsive changes were also made by caring and
responsive community leaders. Community groups such as parks and recreation
and sports associations adjusted their schedules to provide activities for children
during the school breaks. Because the district was on a multi-track schedule,
there were always some children participating in community activities while their
peers were in school. This change permitted them to offer classes, courses, and
activities such as swimming lessons or soccer camps in three week blocks, thus permitting more children to be involved in smaller groups, and hence with more individualized attention.

**Perceived Disadvantages**

Disadvantages were also identified by my respondents, although most related to the ways in which the schedule was implemented rather than to the calendar itself. The inequitable allocation of students to tracks because of the policy of acceding to parental requests was by far the most important of these. Other disadvantages noted were the kind of "rental mentality" related to the sharing of textbooks and spaces: "That is a problem with room maintenance too because they may be moving to a different room, so why keep this one up....There's no ownership, you know"; so in addition to the need to track textbooks, there is damage to desks, and a certain amount of depreciation of classroom equipment.

Another was the problem of communication with teachers who were off track and of ensuring that special activities were available to all students. For example, assemblies with special guests often needed to be offered twice to ensure that all students benefited from the information.

There were also some comments about how the track breaks were difficult for a few children because of their special need for continuity. For these children, principals were careful to assign them to the tracks with the shortest summer vacation and the fewest breaks. Despite the general enthusiasm for year-round schooling, Karen qualified her response:
I do have one child that this does not work well for. Justin is a little boy with severe anxieties, very frightened to come to school and any break is hard for him to come back after. We were even trying to figure out some way to have him come into the school a couple of times while he was off track just to keep that going....So you know for the great majority I think it works very well. You'll always have one or two that that's not true for. (KB)

Summary of the Utah Experience

Utah's unique population and economic issues required the implementation of year-round schooling. In an earlier study I conducted with Dr. Shields, we found that not only had the new calendar accomplished its goal, but that based on district norm-referenced, standardized-test data, academic achievement in multi-track year-round schools is statistically as good or better than student achievement in traditional schools. When we adjusted for socio-economic status, our analysis of the performance of fifth grade students in schools with different calendars ... added considerable weight to the perception that multi-track year-round schools may actually enhance student achievement for their respective populations. (Shields & Oberg, 1999, p.150).

Overall, we found that students in multi-track schools met state expectations for achievement seven times more often than those in traditional calendar schools. As we elaborated in our article, some of the comments of the principals cited here, as well as other perceptions beyond the scope of this study, help to explain these findings.

The interviews I conducted with leaders in this district both supported and extended the findings of Dr. Shields' study. Not only did they tell me that YRS had increased student achievement, and provided numerous related educational
benefits, but also that they had experienced increased support from both parents and the wider community.

In Delphi District, despite a rocky start, these principals have demonstrated how educators and parents worked together to make the change work. Their flexibility and willingness to consider individual and community needs, to persevere, to make changes, to spend extra money as needed, resulted in an innovation that has become institutionalized as one normal way to educate children—an innovation that has lasted almost two decades.

**Florida: From Mandate to Choice**

From this brief overview of one of the early implementing districts and my examination of a district in which year-round schooling was a fiscal necessity, I move to Florida—a state in which the successful implementation of year-round schooling has been mixed at best, but a state in which there is also a relatively long history of various implementation attempts. When I first visited Florida in 1997, newspaper articles had reported the rapid rise and equally rapid demise of year-round schooling in the state. The fact that in a span of five years Florida districts had gone from no schools on a year-round calendar to 164 and then back to 38 seemed quite convincing evidence of the non-viability of year-round schooling (Rasberry, 1994). I visited four counties to attempt to understand what seemed to be a counterbalance to the positive reports from the districts I had studied in Missouri or Utah. Here I provide a brief overview of policy issues in three districts and then examine in more detail the experiences of two principals.
in Taft District in which year-round schooling was determined to have primarily pedagogical and educational benefits.

In the Shadow of the Mouse

Central County seems to have been the birthplace of year-round schooling in Florida. Yet it was there that YRS also experienced its greatest demise—a fall that was instrumental in the discontinuation of year-round schooling in many other Florida districts (fieldnotes). In fact, the district year-round school representative informed me that “as Central goes, so goes Florida” (DL), an indication that the demise elsewhere was not particularly surprising to anyone.

Central County is the largest county in central Florida—home of both Disney World and Universal Studios. These tourist attractions were so dominant in the economic and social context in this area that I was often told as I interviewed school leaders, that they existed “in the shadow of the mouse.” The phrase indicated both pride and frustration—pride in the Disney establishment itself, but frustration that many schools in the area were not able to benefit from the fiscal resources that had transformed Central Florida. The elaborate new brick multi-storied office building owned by the district was both an indication of the wealth and grandeur of the district as well as a fiscal liability. The initial commitment to year-round schooling was so strong that the district appointed a year-round schooling coordinator who quickly became widely known as “Ms. Year-Round Schooling.” When I interviewed Dana Lougheed, she told me there had been a five-year plan to convert all elementary schools to YRS—some to a single-track schedule because it was perceived to have strong academic
benefits—and others, for reasons of space, to a multi-track schedule. She told me that the first schools implemented as single-track schools were located in poorer, inner city areas where the intersession periods were also used for remediation and enrichment. These schools seemed to be enjoying both support and success, but when it came the turn of schools in more affluent areas to implement the new calendar, resistance developed and YRS began to die. Parents just didn’t see the need for it and mustered strong opposition. One of the major problems was that promises of improved academic benefits had been made, but when the district tried to document these improvements early in the first year of implementation, it could not show the promised change. Although this should not have been surprising since the reform had not been given time to prove itself, a subsequent election found the incumbent superintendent defeated on the issue of year-round schooling and the reform died a rapid and unnatural death.

One of the principals I spoke with in Central District, who had opened two different schools on a year-round calendar, told me that she really missed YRS in that she enjoyed the opportunity to work with smaller groups of staff and students in a more focused way. She believed that many of the other Central County principals who had YRS experience felt as she did, while some others shared the view of a colleague who welcomed the opportunity to have all of her school community together on a traditional calendar again. This principal said that many year-round school administrators had gone to a board meeting at which the decision was to be made whether to continue, expand, or discontinue YRS. They
were frustrated with the fact that, despite a request to be put on the agenda, the decision was taken without giving any of them a chance to speak on behalf of YRS.

Following the lead of Central District, a neighboring county, Sage School District, had implemented year-round schooling in one elementary school and then added a middle school and its three feeder elementary schools—all on multi-track schedules. The intention was to provide a cluster of schools in which the calendar offered parental choice and an anticipated improved learning environment. Educators had carefully planned the innovation, and had included intersession and daycare activities. The assistant superintendent stated that the collapse of Central District's program was followed by a general climate of suspicion about the year-round calendar. Fearing that it would not be re-elected, the board there also decided that all schools should return to the traditional calendar. Nevertheless, one of the district principals, as enthusiastic as a stereotypical used-car salesman, spoke in glowing terms about his experience with year-round schooling. With verve, he seemed to really want to sell me on the benefits of YRS, especially for the students. Despite its demise, there too, the educators I spoke with expressed a belief that year-round schooling would soon return because the economic benefits were too good to pass up.

A visit to the small neighboring Vista District provided further insight into the failure of year-round schooling in Florida, despite the temporary continuation of the calendar in several schools I studied. There, I learned that year-round schooling had been introduced as a temporary measure. Schools there were told...
they would only have a year-round calendar for a period of four years and that the district would then solve the problem of rapid growth and crowded facilities in another way. There was no buy-in or commitment to the concept which had been sold as a temporary inconvenience.

The assistant superintendent accompanied me as I studied the schools. She was surprised to learn that the negative response of many principals to YRS was unfortunately connected more to a betrayal and broken promises on the part of the district than to a problem inherent in the concept of year-round schooling itself. She stated that "it was supposed to be an interim solution to address an overcrowded situation, and it has become more of a permanent solution" (BM). She agreed that no other solution to district problems had been sought. One assistant principal stated: “They sold us when we started in on this, we were overcrowded then; we're overcrowded now. The idea was that it would buy us four years. This is our seventh year" (DC). Moreover, several polices related to year-round schooling had strongly contributed to the negativity of the educators as well as the general public. For example, in that district, those who worked 240 days were considered to be working full-time and eligible for a different wage and benefit package. Principals of multi-track year-round schools were assigned a workload of 239 days—“one day shy of accruing vacation days" (DC) and hence, despite their heavy load, were not eligible for vacation pay or additional benefits.

Dick continued:

I just came from the county office where we were having a meeting on incentive pay and so forth... Ok, take someone right now that works 239 with no vacation days accrued. Give them 2 weeks vacation to where they could take some of that time off during the
course of the year and so forth that would have some feeling of relief, some feeling of giving you time to get rested up, get your batteries rejuvenated and so forth to go again. Right now, they have no vacation days.

In general, disillusionment with year-round schooling was strong and everyone agreed that although the district might not have been intentionally unsupportive, those schools on the new calendar were “just forgotten.” There was still a sense that if properly introduced and supported, the year-round schedule could be better for kids. In fact, Dick concluded, “There's a lot of people who do not like the present system, but would be more agreeable to a single track.”

In another adjacent county, Taft District, year-round schooling had been introduced in the mid 1990’s for two reasons. One school adopted a year-round schedule due to the initiative of the principal who seemed in part to want to enhance the profile of her school. Because of her strong advocacy and the commitment of her staff and parent group, the school was successful for over a decade. Other multi-track year-round schools were introduced in response to overcrowding caused when boundaries were redrawn to comply with court-ordered integration, but by the time of the data collection for this study, only three schools persisted as models of YRS for the district. Two of these principals, Esther and Jane, are exemplars of leaders who demonstrate the ways in which YRS can be enacted as a reform to benefit student achievement.

Jerico Elementary School

Newly-appointed African-American principal Esther Harwood found a sprawling, overcrowded school with two new wings and 28 portable classrooms.
According to a district mandate that if a school exceeded its designated capacity by at least 20%, the principal was to introduce multi-track year-round schooling. Although the mandate had not been enforced in more affluent areas, it was enforced for Jerico Elementary School, a low performing school in a low SES area. The school's population included 50% Hispanic students and a large group (33%) of children whose parents who were migrant workers. Jerico Elementary School was included on Florida's list of "critically low performing schools."

Esther threw herself into the change, believing it might be a way of shaking up the staff and helping the teachers think about new approaches to instruction and to involving the community in the programs of the school. She stated:

I said to my teachers, "Do you think kids can learn? Do you believe we can teach? Well then let's do it. ... We have real challenges. I don't want to deny we have real challenges, but we I won't accept excuses even though some of the migrant kids are in and out and in and out—5 times a year as they follow the apples and the tomatoes." (EH)

At Jerico Elementary School, teachers also decided to introduce intersession programs, for regular remediation or enrichment, to meet individual needs as an added and ongoing benefit of year-round schooling— even when it meant finding a room in an adjacent apartment complex or church basement because there were no spare facilities on the school premises.

Esther used the calendar as a catalyst for numerous changes that included such activities as GED tutoring for parents, Drive-Through Fridays when parents could drop off their children and pick up a cold breakfast with an accompanying sheet of parenting tips, Wonderful Wednesdays when breakfast
was served to both parents and children, Make-and-Take—a room in which parents could make educational materials to use with their children. Although Esther and her staff worked to make the school (now open year-round) the center of the community, she said it was the schedule itself that provided the most significant impetus for academic improvement.

Recognizing the need for a great deal of academic support, Esther set out to change the students' performance. Among other changes, she used some of her Title 1 money to reduce class size, particularly in the problem area of math. She assigned her special education teachers to a four-day week, and then asked them to teach intersession classes to small groups of students who needed remediation. Students were identified who were in particular need of assistance and invited to attend for one week's intensive instruction during their three-week. Intersession instruction was supplemented by a three-hour school held on Saturday mornings and staffed by teachers Esther hired from around the district (her husband, however—also a teacher at another district school—taught for free).

After one year, Esther submitted her school's test results, as required, to the State Office of Education. Although not every principal whose scores increased considerably was asked to do so, she said she was "called to Tallahassee" to defend her results. She explained that she thought part of the reason was that the other principals were white and there was still a lot of racism in the state and district. She recounted the dramatic tale:

I took a van to Tallahassee with some teachers, our test scores, enrollment lists, and videos of the school, and I responded to their
concerns by saying, 'You told us to do it, you told us we could do it, and we did it and now you don't believe us!' I told them to come to see for themselves and not waste my time driving all that way. Only two of them ever came. (EH)

The state did, however, send a team to her school because her math scores had gone "over the top" (EH), even higher than most other state math scores. She continued,

They came in one day and told me to take a day off and go to Orlando and shop. While I was in Orlando, unsuspecting, they took 12 of my fourth graders and re-tested them. They thought I had cheated but they tested just as well as they had before! (EH)

I asked Esther whether, given her success, she thought many other schools would be moving to a year-round calendar. Her response was that she believed the future of YRS schooling in the district was "null and void" because other administrators saw how hard she and her staff had worked at Jerico School and didn't want any part of it. They were also discouraged by Central County's failure. Nevertheless, she told me of one school principal who had decided to introduce a single-track calendar the following year.

**Martin Popper Elementary School**

I made contact with Jane Bowes, and arranged to visit her school the next year. Martin Popper Elementary School is in a starkly appalling high poverty area in the state. As one drives through the neighborhood, one sees camper trailers set up as permanent dwellings on cinder blocks, abandoned dilapidated warehouse buildings, cracked blacktop, and no sidewalks. When I first visited the school, litter was everywhere. Although the area now seems clean, there is still a pervasive sense of grinding poverty. The school serves a highly transient, largely migrant population, with an increasing proportion of the students coming from
Spanish-speaking families (from Mexico). The total student population is roughly 680, but due to the constant changes, tracking the actual enrolment of individual students has become one of the major tasks of the vice-principal.

My first impression of Jane was that she seemed an unlikely candidate as someone who would initiate reform. The small, quiet-spoken, almost “frumpy” principal greeted me warmly and took me to a meeting room where, as we spoke, many other teachers joined the conversation.

Jane and her teachers talked about how hard everyone had been working over a number of years and how they believed they had gone as far as they could with the tools they had to help their children. They were all completely enthusiastic about the new calendar. Unlike other principals I had interviewed, Jan had had to beg and plead with the district to be permitted to introduce it. In each other case, there had been a financial or capital need on the part of the district. In her case, the only impetus was to help her students.

Jane described her philosophy and that of her teachers in the following way:

We know that the home situations sometimes can affect the way a child comes to school, how he feels that day and you know mother’s in jail or you know stories that could just make you sit down and cry but our job is to always focus. We have to remind ourselves everyday and we have to focus. Our job is just to give them the best that we can give them—in academics, in love, and emotional strength. While they’re with us, we just do the best we can and it’s like being on a mission field... You just teach them the best you can when they’re here and we do believe that you can teach these children that come from poverty home situations. You can teach them.

When the school staff first decided that a single-track year-round school calendar might serve the needs of their population, they took the request to the
board where they were met with resistance and skepticism. They persisted by saying that if the new calendar did not work, they could always return to a traditional one. After a period of several years, Martin Popper School was permitted to institute their proposed calendar. Part of the impetus, perhaps, was the high stakes testing system in Florida which had first labeled the school "low performing" and then categorized it as a D school.

Jane, in typical Jane fashion, gave the credit to her teachers. She explained that it was a group of teachers that had began to explore the option of year-round schooling:

The teachers started reading about it and giving me pamphlets. At that time I really wasn't interested in it. The more I read—and then when I went to the year-round conference out in Houston—I came back sold because I could not believe there were so many schools like ours where their achievement had gone up. I thought, "This works for these schools and some of them were much higher free and reduced lunch than we are." I said we're going to try it. So we decided to go before the school board and request permission to do it. They said wait and study it another year. We had to study it another year and then finally some of the school board members really got it and said, "This might be good." So they let us try it.

During the first year on the single-track schedule, Jane and her team of teachers instituted numerous changes. They indicated that the primary reason for implementing the single-track schedule was to offer intersession support to the students, 88% of whom qualify for free and reduced lunch. Because of this high proportion of students who qualify for Title 1 funding, they made several choices. Title 1 funding was used to provide two resource teachers, one in reading and one in writing, to work with other teachers in the school. (By the third year of the new calendar, they added a math resource teacher as well). The resource teachers went into regular classrooms, modeled instruction, and pulled out those
students who needed additional work for one-on-one or small group instruction. They stated that if you “focus on those areas, you are eventually going to have good results” (JB). Additionally, the intent was to develop school-wide emphases related to reading, writing, and math because Jane had developed a firm belief that “we have to do things school-wide.” She said, “I’m a real believer in that in all the years that I’ve been in education I’ve learned that what you do school-wide is going to be effective.”

Summer school money was used to fund intersession programs. During the three week breaks in October and in February, teachers offered two weeks of additional instruction, providing for example, academic skill-building combined with fun activities. In general, attendance was approximately 150 fourth and fifth grade students. The children “want to come” to intersession so much that they always had more students show up than the number enrolled. Even though parents may not have signed them up, they still attended. Sometimes they used a theme such as a pioneer theme, or, as in the October session:

The fifth graders had a novel and I did writing prompts associated with whatever they were reading that day...they kept journals on what they were reading...the type of thing where they are doing reflective thinking.... We've found our kids really need to have more non-fiction-type material to read... we find that non-fiction is a high interest for these kids anyway. (JB)

As the principal and specialist teachers spoke, I learned that their intersession instruction used an integrated curriculum approach based on the current events topics identified in the Scholastic News Weekly Readers. As an example, students not only read and talked about ideas, they developed math graphs to explain and interpret the information. In this way, teachers tried to help
students broaden their horizons while learning the type of information they would need to be successful on the F-CAT test. But the focus was not just on testing. Jane described how they were

learning as teachers to do what they did during intersession and take that non-fiction stuff called science ... and put it as part of your daily lesson and make it part of your writing and make part of your English and make it part of your reading...

In other words, intersession not only provided additional support for students, but was the catalyst for a change in the pedagogical emphasis of the regular classes as well.

Jane stated that “because of the high percentage of free and reduced lunches, they had basically not really expected to see a lot of change in the first year.” Nevertheless, principal and teachers alike waited impatiently for the results of the state-wide testing in their first year on their new schedule. Jane reported what she described as a “funny story.” In her own words:

I was in Massachusetts on vacation and everybody’s calling me and I’m calling my daughter who is a teacher at another school in [Taft County] and I asked if the grades had come out yet. She tried to find out by checking on the computer, but I still didn’t know. I arrived back at the airport and she greeted me at the airport with the newspaper and she said, ‘I think you’re going to want to see this.’ There I was praying for a “C” because we’re a “D” school, right? She hands me the paper and I’m looking at Martin Popper School and I see a “B.” I went ballistic right there. We were just coming out of the gate with people all around. I didn’t even know another person was there because I’m screaming and hollering ‘Hallelujah!’ We were so thrilled that we were a “B” that we had a big celebration breakfast with the teachers.

What an accomplishment for the school to move from a D to a B in just one year. The district would have to permit them to continue their calendar experiment. But the story did not end there. Jane picks it up again.
Then I started looking at the criteria because as a principal you do look at who else got A's and B's and determine what we would have had to do to get an "A." The criteria said we had to test 95% of the children and we had met that criteria although the report said we had only tested 92%. I called in the vice-principal and said, 'Okay Lenny you're in charge of testing you were supposed to test every kid.' He replied, 'We tested every single one. I'll show you.'

Lenny calculated and recalculated which children had been eligible for testing, which children had transferred in and out of the school, and who had actually withdrawn from the school. He found 10 children who were listed on the state's record as being part of the school who had officially moved out, just enough to meet the 95% criteria. Jane then submitted the correct information and an appeal to the district, excited at the prospect of showing that they had actually attained an “A” status. The district then called them and “threw a damper” (JB) on their excitement. The message was:

You might want to rethink this, you know. You might want to go slowly. Once you get an A, it's hard to maintain. You might want to wait and see if you get an A next year. (JB)

Jane’s response was, “You know something we may never be an 'A' again.” They pursued the appeal so the kids and their parents could have the experience of knowing they were an "A" school. It had the additional effect of raising teachers' expectations for the children. She explained that following this amazing achievement, they keep telling kids, that “You're an 'A'. We expect you to do better and better all the time.” She added, “And the teachers need to keep those high expectations. That's one of the things that is a challenge in this type of school.”

Teachers reportedly appreciated the fact that children had not forgotten as much over the summer as they usually did. They came "back in July and I can
remember the teachers just being so amazed. They said, 'They remember stuff. They remember. We don’t have to do this review again...I mean they were so excited.” She added that even children’s behavior had changed and they no longer had to re-teach routine procedures such as walking down the hall. “They take a three week break and they come back like they have never been away.”

Another unanticipated consequence of the new calendar and the intersession initiatives was a decrease in transience from 74 to 61%. Parents recognized that the school was making an effort for their children and said, “You know, we really don’t want to move them out of this school because we like the calendar.” Moreover, Jane described how the calendar actually benefited the neighborhood:

I think our parents really like it because the children aren’t home for long periods of time. They are all in survival mode. They love their children but they are so busy surviving that it makes it nice for them when they are only home for a short time in the summer. And they can handle them being home for a shorter time when we have our little breaks.

The next year, the school did slip to a “B”, but the emphasis on students, on school-wide initiatives, and on excellence is maintained. In fact, as I write, Martin Popper School, still on a single-track year-round school calendar, is reported to have once again (in 2004) received an “A” standing, with scores above the state average in both math and writing. It still tries to maintain a low profile and not to make waves with the district. Despite their success, there is constant concern that the district will ask them to return to a traditional calendar for the sake of uniformity. As new superintendents and board members are elected, the process of re-educating them begins again.
Summary of the Florida Experience

The experience of Florida schools and districts with the implementation of YRS was varied. Influenced by the strong and charismatic leadership of Dana Lougheed, many schools took up the implementation challenge in the early 1990s. Over time, however, as districts experienced various political and fiscal realities, Dana's influence lessened and individual differences in district experiences with YRS came to the fore.

The initial motives in both Central and Sage Counties were mixed while in Vista the goals were clear but the implementation processes problematic. In each case, the new calendar was discontinued. Although it had been hoped that year-round schooling would reduce capital costs, there was also a vague sense that it would reduce burnout and tensions and improve academic achievement. In Central and Vista Districts, YRS was mandated at first in lower SES schools identified by the district, while in Sage, implementing schools did so on a voluntary basis. The impetus did not seem as important to the outcomes as the lack of goal clarity or unfulfilled promises. More than anything else, one or both of these two factors seemed to be associated with the failure of the calendar in these counties.

In Taft, the picture changed. There the implementing principals of the continuing schools, regardless of whether the change was mandated or sought after, had a clear academic purpose, solid goals for improving student achievement, and a vision for how the calendar change could help to accomplish those goals. For that reason, based on reported improvements in test scores,
YRS in Taft district was particularly effective in making a difference in high poverty, high needs schools and their surrounding communities.

Much can be learned from the experiences in Florida about educational leadership for school change. Here I have learned from these educators much about how to avoid premature discontinuation of an innovation as well as how to promote enduring change with the potential to have a transformative impact on children and their communities.

Summary of US Implementation

This brief overview of some of the experiences of educators in several districts in three states demonstrates that, since 1968, year-round schooling has had a bumpy and varied track record. In some places it has been mandated with success, while in others an unsupported mandate has resulted in disaster. Likewise, some voluntary implementation has ended quickly while in other sites, the change has persisted. Moreover, these cases have shown that the specific calendar selected (i.e., single or multi-track) does not determine the extent of educator enthusiasm, academic achievement, or community support.

In Frances Howell, where YRS was a necessary, multi-track reform, little information was available about student achievement, although I learned much about implementation processes and community involvement and support. State records indicate, however, that students in the year-round schools continued to perform as anticipated, with scores that were historically typical for the county and comparable to those in surrounding districts.
In Delphi District, the reform was instituted to put more children into existing (and later new buildings), and easily fulfilled this goal. In part because of strong and responsive district and school leadership, it also had the unanticipated outcome of improving student achievement in those schools that changed to a multi-track year-round school schedule.

In Florida, where the experiences with YRS were much more mixed, there can be no easy summary of the situation. Nevertheless it is fair to say that the integrity and goal clarity of the leaders and their implementation processes had much to do with the success or failure, endurance or discontinuation of the calendar.

In the next chapter, I look at several Canadian situations, each of which is voluntary in nature, but in which there are also mixed results.
CHAPTER 6: THE CANADIAN EXPERIENCE

Year-round schooling in Canada is much younger than in its American neighbor. Here, all implementations of a modified school calendar were not only voluntary, they often were completed in the face of considerable resistance and challenge. While several of the innovations I examined in the US date from the 1970s, the first year-round school in Canada was established in a small vacation community in Ontario in 1992. With the single exception of Stephen Lewis Junior High, opened in July 1995 as Canada's first multi-track year-round school, the Canadian experiments took the form either of single-track schools or of dual-track models.

When studying the Canadian schools, the problems of confidentiality increase dramatically. I treat the first implementing school, the elementary school in Huntsville, Ontario, as I did Frances Howell in Missouri, in that its identity and that of its initiating principal cannot be hidden. It is therefore presented as a foil for the discussion of the other Ontario schools. In Ontario, there have been at no time more than seven schools on a year-round schedule. There too, individuals may be easily identified particularly because the implementation varied considerably from district to district. There, as elsewhere, I interviewed all principals and vice-principals involved with the reform over time as well as a number of teachers and district administrators in each area. Although all data are correct, I have chosen to develop composite images of schools in each district, to attempt to preserve the confidentiality of my respondents. Thus, for example, I
conducted interviews with a number of people in two schools in a single district I call Albert. In each case, the selected dual-track model was the same, the implementation policies under which the reform was instituted remained constant, and the outcomes were similar in that both schools' innovations persisted over a period of time (and still exist in 2005). However, I speak as if there were only one school studied and call the school Kate Smith Elementary School. In a second district, identified as Sweetwater, I follow the same process, for the same reasons; however, as we shall see, success in Lakota Elementary School was much more elusive.

I want to include the only multi-track year-round school in Canada. Although its identity and location are a matter of record, I still use a pseudonym for the school and avoid specific naming of its province so that the story, and not the actual identity of the school, takes precedence. I call the school Stephen Lewis Junior High School and have taken pains to conceal the individual identities of my respondents. Thus I have included "track leaders" as well as vice-principals and principals and will refer to all of them interchangeably as educators or administrators.

I begin at the beginning—with Huntsville Elementary School.

**Huntsville Elementary School**

Huntsville Elementary School is a small K-8 school located on a pristine lakeshore in one of Canada's most popular summer playground and vacation areas. Many of the children's parents work in jobs related to the tourist industry. Dan Patterson, the visionary principal, had learned in the late 1980s about the
increasing popularity of the year-round school model in the United States and taken an opportunity to attend the annual conference of the National Association for Year-Round Education (NAYRE) in San Diego. Upon his return he sought permission within his board to implement a pilot project. Unlike the implementation initiatives I examined from the United States, this one was on a very small scale.

It began with only one class of fourth, fifth, and six graders on what the district called an “alternative, dual-track schedule” and grew to four classes representing approximately one-third of the school’s total population, with an annual waiting list for the alternative schedule classes. These classes were still combined grades: one comprised grades 1, 2, and 3; the next three contained two grades each: a 4th and 5th, one 5th and 6th, and one 7th and 8th grades. The school itself was very small, with a total of approximately 365 students. To make the alternate schedule work, the school adopted what is now known in Ontario as a “dual-track model.” Those students opting for the alternative (or year-round calendar) began school in roughly the second week in August and ended (with the rest of the students) about June 30. There was a two-week vacation period in October, two weeks at Christmas, and a final three-week break in March. The rest of the students were in school for the normal period between Labor Day and June 30. Thus for all students in the school, there were two weeks in August, October, and March and a few additional days at Christmas during which the school had either one third or two thirds of its students in session.
These periods offer relief to the school, reducing tensions in the halls, and offering additional access to the gym and computer lab for the students that are present. Teachers report, for example, “It is amazing how fewer kids on the playground make it a much more manageable group for supervising at recess.” Another said, “I love the month of August... because you have more room to spread out, you can do different things with kids, ...my husband can come in and do some woodworking with the kids, and things like that.”

Although the calendar was introduced with virtually no cost to the district, there have been some “political” costs in the form of decreased support for the school based on concern about split-grade classes. Those teachers and educators who have been involved with the program, however, report considerable benefits and seem less concerned about the difficulties of teaching split grades. Likewise, some parents seem to feel the benefits outweigh the disadvantages.

Dan said that the school opens on an annual basis with an opening breakfast in August when parents come with their kids, and we provide all the students and parents with a breakfast of fruit and muffins and things. We all have a big hello and all stay together for a few moments, and then in time the kids take off to their classes ... (DP)

At first, there was also a large media presence.

When we expanded, the media that came was almost unimaginable. We had television crews and we asked them if they would wait until the end of the first week of school. The kids knew that it was pretty neat and pretty important. (DP)

The principal believed that students on alternative calendars were the only ones in the country who were ever consulted about when they wanted to begin
school and hence had made the choice to begin before their peers. The fact that there had been family dialogue helped to provide a “tremendous positive start.” Others reported that a real sense of bonding and community occurred among the students who began together in the summer and said that the “feeling...lasts throughout the year.”

One of the teacher-leaders, commenting on some of the benefits, stated:

I teach in the program as well as I'm an administrator, and you know obviously I teach, but I found after the two-week break in the fall, at Christmas I found myself far more able, healthier, keener. ... I do notice that other staff who teach in the alternate year remark in the same way, that the rest in the fall is invaluable to how you reach Christmas and you can certainly contrast it with our colleagues who don’t have that break, who typically drag through December struggling with, you know, the burden of all the Christmas concert stuff and all the rest of it. (JM)

Others reported less time needed for review after the breaks. Still others commented on the opportunity for families to take vacations together in the fall—something that was impossible in the summer due to the heavy demands of the parents' work in the tourist industry.

Administrators in this district indicated that although there were a few issues with the Teachers Federation at the outset, the new calendar was not seen as an issue. One said, “I heard it expressed this way: that when they lobbied to the director, he threw them out of his office and said it was a non-issue and they didn’t need to worry about bothering with a grievance” (JM). For the most part, they believed the dual-track calendar worked because parents who wanted to remain on the traditional schedule could do so, while those who wanted an alternative had the opportunity to choose it. He concluded: “I think if
the government comes down and lays it on for parents they'll balk and the specialness of it will be gone and it won't be as successful as it is."

Word about the popularity and success of this small program in Huntsville began to spread, as the implementing principal spoke with almost missionary zeal to colleagues. Soon other schools in his and neighboring districts wanted to experiment to achieve similar perceived benefits: flexibility of vacation time, reduction of tensions and review time, increased interest and motivation for learning, and perhaps above all parental and student choice. They, too, became known as innovative and pioneering principals.

**Albert School District: Implementing a Successful Dual-Track Model**

At about the same time as Huntsville's principal was beginning his experiment, another Ontario principal also attended some annual meetings of NAYRE and became a convert to the principle of year-round schooling. When Albert School District announced that it was ready to build a new school at the east side of a major city, Joseph marshaled his forces and lobbied for the position.

Kate Smith Elementary School opened in 1996 in a reasonably affluent area of a rapidly growing Ontario community of about 100,000 people. It was a spacious brick building with wide hallways, and a curving entry foyer. Joseph Smart talked openly about his hopes for the new school, his implementation processes, and the benefits he sees in the year-round schedule.
The Dream: A New School is Announced

When the new school was announced, Joseph had been principal of a neighboring school built for 450 students, but which had burgeoned to over 700 students with 15 portable classrooms to accommodate. Joseph indicated he had long been interested in a year-round school calendar—since the days when he and his wife had taught on a Cree Indian Reserve in Northern Manitoba in a school that modified its calendar to meet the needs of the community. There he says, he had “a taste of the modified calendar” where they started school a week early and then took a week off in the fall for hunting.

And I thought it was a marvelous concept. It was a good time period, and I thought, as a matter of fact, you could extend it because you can have shorter academic periods with breaks at the end of them. And true to form, as we’ve experienced here, you come back refreshed from those breaks.

He was also aware that his district had examined the topic five years earlier and had abandoned it because “there was a lot of controversy at that time, quite heated debate about year-round school.” Six pilot schools had been identified at that time, but because of the vote that occurred in each school, year-round schooling had been turned down in the district. Joseph saw his chance when the position as principal of the new school opened up, so he made a proposal to the board. He expressed interest in the position and asked that it be coupled with permission to open the school on a single-track year-round calendar. The board accepted his proposition and Joseph’s work started.

He describes how he began:

I just talked to the superintendent about the concept, and it started me going. I got excited about it, and I pulled together 12 people that I called the dream team. Dream because they were important
people from the community, from the school community, and staff and so on, it was a cross-representation of the community. So we had this series of meetings, we talked about the school motto, the mission statement, the calendar, everything was done with the community after this dream team had been established and it was presented to the admin. council of our superintendents.

Joseph's appointment as principal was tied to his proposals for the school, with the calendar as an integral part of the package. Once he had been approved, his team worked tirelessly. Members sent newsletters out to the public and held monthly meetings which attracted an increasingly large and vocal number of participants each time. At each meeting, there was a large group of interested parents, but also a "segment of the vigilant community protectors. So there was always a challenge to deal with that aspect of it and at the same time promote the idea of a modified calendar and be excited about it." Joseph remembered:

And I kept beating the bushes, I had displays at the local malls, we had our teachers going door to door with flyers. And the other group went door to door as well with their own agenda, trying to convince people not to register.

Every parent that attended a meeting was made an official member of the committee and given a proposed calendar and an information package to share with their friends and neighbours. Joseph indicated, "Once they saw the concept of eight weeks or nine weeks at school and two weeks off, they were immediately converted. By the end of that 45 minutes to an hour meeting, many parents said, 'Well that's a system I was on in Britain or in Europe, or wherever.'"

To ensure the success of the new school, Joseph had also convinced the district to authorize open boundaries for the school to permit those parents who wanted a year-round calendar to take advantage of it. Initially the plan had been to have one track—with all students on a single-track calendar; however, parents
"voted" as they registered their children and it became apparent that there was enough demand for a dual-track school, but not for a wholesale change. During the two-week window when registration was open, Joseph contacted parents who had not indicated a preference, ensuring that everyone was aware of the possible choices and the potential benefits of each.

The Opening

The school opened with about 300 students, about 150 on each schedule. Of these 300 students, about 40 transferred from a neighbouring Montessori School, 20-30 from Catholic Schools, in Ontario called "separate schools," and some whose parents drove them up to half an hour from adjacent communities. This large group from outside the original catchment area represented parents who were very knowledgeable and concerned about their children's education, who had not taken the decision to join Kate Smith Elementary School lightly. For example, Joseph indicated that 75% of the parents from the Montessori School interviewed him personally before making their decision.

Joseph's original intent was to introduce a calendar he believed would be beneficial to students: "I believe in looking at change as a way to improve the academic potential of a school and not change for the sake of change, and I felt that this was a really valid proposal." Although Joseph's initial objective was not to have a dual-track school, he became a convert. It offered the best of all worlds as far as he was concerned. He thought that if people understood the benefits of a single-track year-round calendar, there would naturally be a demand, but at the same time, having an option for a traditional track would address the concerns of
the nay-sayers. Even though some might argue that having a dual-track calendar requires more split grade classes, Joseph is convinced that is not a drawback. He explains that his teachers "come armed with information extolling the virtues of split-grades too... When it is just 2 grades in one, we call it a split grade, but when we get into 3 way splits we call them multi-aged or family groupings."

**Continuing Innovation and Implementation Issues**

Joseph soon began to talk about the possibility of implementing additional tracks in his school that would maintain the dual-track calendars but add specific programs, that might, for example, emphasize the fine arts, offer a gifted program, science, or French Immersion. He said that it was in no way his intent to create an elite school, but one that met the needs of all children. Joseph and his wife (the special education teacher in the school) were firmly committed to the benefits of the alternate calendar for children with special needs. This was one of the groups that Joseph perceived the extended calendar benefitted the most.

Joseph reported that the allocation of district-sponsored special-education classes to specific schools had become an issue, with some teachers wanting to avoid having an increasing number of special needs children in their school. But Joseph took an opposing position. He believed that "there is every single argument for having those classes on the modified calendar." At one point, Joseph offered to split the costs with the Board of bussing special needs children from around the district because he "believed so fervently that that's what it is all about. The special needs kids should be on a modified calendar." So he took
money from his school budget to support this belief. This was not a change that
came easily. Joseph reports that

sitting at a meeting with parents, trying to convince them that their
child needs to be in a behaviour class is a large block. To put
another roadblock in there by suggesting that it's a modified
calendar, I see as an enticement, they see it as a roadblock.

Some of the specific benefits of the calendar to children with special needs were
summed up by their teacher in these words:

I felt the special education kids were really sharp again after the
breaks on the modified calendar. The routines were still established
in their heads and there was no down time. That was great to see
because these little guys have so many problems. Learning is such
a challenge for them anyway.

Joseph and his team of teachers were enthusiastic about the benefits to
all children offered by the dual-track calendar. For those who opted for the
modified track, school started at the beginning of August and then benefited from
"two weeks off in October, two weeks at Christmas, two weeks at March break
(as opposed to one on the regular calendar) and another week in May." In
August, however, there were also some modifications made to the daily schedule.
School began slightly earlier in the morning; the lunch period was shortened; and
students finished classes by about 2:30 to enable them to enjoy the warm
summer weather and still have time with their friends from traditional tracks.
Instruction during the month of August was different as well. The school arranged
to take advantage of a regional Pioneer Village.

Half go on one week, and the other half on the other. And then we
do the same thing for the regular calendar in the fall... We're
permitted to do that in the fall only because we have participated in
the summer. Other schools in the district only get a day at a time at
the Pioneer Village.
When Joseph told me they also had an Olympic week, a program at the zoo, and other high interest activities, I asked if teachers thought this kind of programming made it more difficult to cover the curriculum. Joseph responded:

Well, I think they have the foresight to realize that that is the curriculum, and they can integrate it and really any experience that brings interest to it can be modified to deliver the prescribed curriculum. I think it's more palatable to deliver it that way, too.

For the ten weeks when only half of the school is in session, students benefit from additional access to specialized areas (computers, music, gym, playground equipment, etc.), from additional space, and hence enjoy fewer tensions and conflicts. For that reason, Joseph believes everyone benefits and no one is disadvantaged. At the same time, it is important not to “make a distinction between modified and regular.” Joseph elaborated,

We’re one school, it just happens like any business, that people take holidays at different times. We have the same mission statement; we have the same goals, same curriculum, same number of school days. Everything else is the same.

When one first visits Joseph’s office, one is struck by the bulletin boards covered with press releases about the school, with headlines like, “School’s in for the Summer!” Yet, not everything was positive. He showed me a binder that he called “Storm”—full of articles about the school and the year-round calendar. He admitted that there had been initial problems and that

the local media did whip up things... We had a picket line out here at one point, and they really picked up on that. So did the television station. But by and large, I believe that the media swung over to our side because it simply made sense. I think that the big factor that 150 children were registered on the modified calendar, spoke for itself. How are you going to argue with that? You’re not going to say to parents, well, we don’t like the concept so de-register your kids!
Joseph seems to thrive on conflict and new challenges. He indicated that he had been "invigorated by the whole challenge of bringing in a new concept, and was thrilled to be a part of it. And all the way along," he said, "I didn’t take any of this personally. I understand that people have a lot of trouble with change." When it was a concept he believed in, the benefits outweighed any of the challenges of implementation.

Joseph responded in the same way to the need for accountability that comes from having such a high profile calendar. I asked Joseph to sum up his belief about the year-round school calendar. He responded:

You can’t depend on a modified calendar to deliver a good program. It’s a great schedule, but you still have to have the substance. And we were really cautious, and it was a really important mandate for us to provide an innovative program because we’re so accountable. That’s what I love about this, is that if we’re not delivering a good program, people are not going to choose to come here. And right now, our population is here by choice... So, I love accountability!

Another aspect of accountability that should not be forgotten is Joseph’s involvement with the community and the role of the school council. He enthused: "The beauty of having school community councils is that they can make cooperative decisions." He elaborated, "And when you have parents that are purely motivated to do the right thing, not out of self-interest, the decisions are usually good ones and with this process, when you get consensus, it is an overwhelming, strong consensus." There seems to be little doubt that the ways in which Joseph worked to build consensus with his communities were especially helpful in building support for his innovative approach to education.

Joseph was not only persuasive, but inclusive and committed to working for what he believed. At the same time, he was able to tolerate opposing
viewpoints and the challenges that come from conflict and ambiguity. Perhaps for these reasons, he was able to attract others to his school and to his way of thinking. One of the vice-principals who worked with him talked about the way Joseph was thought of in the district. He said the superintendent and central office recognize that “no question Joseph is a visionary. He plants the seed and cultivates it.”

The Dream Expands

I indicated at the outset that this description of Joseph and Kate Smith Elementary School is a composite. Although this is true, it is also important to report that four years after one of the principals opened the first new school in the district as a dual-track school, he had the opportunity to implement the same process in a second new school, with similar successful outcomes. One of his vice-principals stated that “about five staff members from the original team that came with Joseph.” Adding that “people seem to follow him around,” he indicated that in fact Joseph’s appointment had been his own incentive for applying at that school.

Joseph’s influence, however, in his district goes well beyond the opening of two dual-track calendar schools. School Community Councils are mandated by the government of Ontario for every school. One of their mandates, undoubtedly influenced by Joseph’s pioneering efforts and his high profile as an innovative educator, is to examine school calendars. More specifically, as a result of his commitment and success within the district, Albert School District enacted a policy that whenever a new school is about to open, the School Community
Council must consider (but not necessarily implement) the potential benefits of a dual-track and other alternative calendar options.

In Albert School District, although the expansion of the year-round calendar may not have been as rapid or as extensive as Joseph wished, it has become widely accepted as both viable and desirable as an alternative approach to educating students. This successful implementation was due in large part to the dedication and commitment of Joseph Smart, an innovative and persistent educational leader.

I turn now to a second composite district and school in which the implementation of alternative calendars did not meet such a happy fate.

Sweetwater School District: A Less Successful Implementation

Following closely on the heels of the first year-round schools in Ontario, Huntsville and Kate Smith Elementary Schools, the principal of Lakota Elementary School in Sweetwater School District determined to introduce a similar calendar. Sweetwater District, like that of the Huntsville Elementary School, is located in a resort and vacation area in Ontario, with a predominantly tourist based economy. If the calendar had worked for Huntsville, surely it would bring credit to Lakota! Fuelled by her enthusiasm about the reports of the first two schools, in particular her conversations with Dan Patterson “founding father” of YRS in Ontario and the initiating principal of Huntsville Elementary, Gwen presented a request to the board. She had initially been interested, not only because of her conversations with Dan, but also because the calendar seemed to be very similar to the British calendar—one she had grown up with. She was
supported in her request by a former local Teachers' Federation president who had also worked with the "founding father." At the time, several schools were competing for the honor of implementing a modified calendar in the district, and she won out over the principal of a neighboring school, who in due time was also able to implement the calendar. It is the story of these two implementers that I tell under the rubric of Lakota Elementary School.

Permission Granted

An information meeting was first held at one of the competing schools, with a turn-out of approximately 60 people who seemed interested in the proposal. However, Gwen explained, "The community here is very small-c conservative and quite traditional and they don't like change, any kind of change. And I think they were afraid that it was going to affect the rest of the school. Actually, it affects the rest of the school in a positive way."

Once Lakota School was given the go ahead, a month was designed for pre-registration. Those involved were disappointed that there were not long lines of people wanting to register. In fact, even after the school had been on a dual calendar for several years, she said that in the registration month, she would like to have seen long line-ups, but that they did not get them. She commented, "Unfortunately, this indicated to me that a) it's slow in catching on or b) perhaps we were not doing a good enough job here from this school."

Implementation Struggles

Although the initial intention here, unlike at Kate Smith, was to open as a dual-track school, Gwen had hoped for more interest. The result of the lukewarm
enthusiasm (75 students opting for the modified calendar), combined with the already relatively small size of the school (462), was that classes on both calendars became multi-grade situations (a 1, 2, 3 grouping; one class of 4th, 5th, and 6th graders, and a 7th and 8th grade class). This was, of course, no different from Kate Smith’s implementation, but seemed to have been less well received. Also, like Kate Smith Elementary School, the summer schedule was modified to permit maximum enjoyment of the out-of-doors. One teacher described an exchange overheard among some students:

I had three girls sitting talking once in my modified class with two that aren’t, and that was the concern, like, “Well, we’ll be at the beach and you won’t be.” And the girl in my class said, “Well, what time do you normally go?” And they said, “Well, sometime after two,” and she said, “So I’ll be ten minutes late. That’s all.”

Because the day began at 8:30 and ended at 2:30, with a shortened lunch period and the elimination of the afternoon recess, students who started school in August were still able to enjoy time at the beach with their friends.

Unlike the processes used to introduce the alternative calendar at Kate Smith—the months of meetings, the eagerness to bring the whole community in to the conversations, the openness of the public debate, the willingness to listen to opposing viewpoints, the tolerance of ambiguity, the embrace of the media, and the general commitment of the educators—the process at Lakota School was confined to the principal’s report to the staff and community that the alternative calendar would be implemented.

One teacher told us that the decision was made because the principal had requested it, but that there had been no consultation among the staff, and
certainly no vote on the part of either teachers or the parent community. She stated,

    We were just told this is happening. I don't ever remember being asked if we were interested in having it or not…. We were asked if we were interested in teaching in it and if you were interested in teaching in it, you could apply to do so.

Another teacher described it as Gwen's "little baby." She continued, "She sort of said, 'I'd like to do this and this. Are there teachers that would be interested and parents and students?'" Still another told us it had been:

    sort of laid on us because Gwen had made the decision that she was going to try it. It was going to be a pilot project, and I mean, even if we had voted against it, I think, she probably sort of would've overruled it and said, "Well, we're going to try it anyway."

In addition, there had been no opportunity to explore the rationale or the pros and cons of the proposal. Teachers reported that the principal pressured them “not to say anything negative about it” an approach that many felt was “a little restricting” when they wanted to examine all the issues.

Although in Kate Smith the project opened with the involvement of approximately 50% of the school, in Sweetwater, administrators appeared satisfied with a bare minimum of students. Moreover, they did not encourage media attention or public debate that might have generated additional support. One said, “I didn’t encourage it. I mean, not that I said no, but I didn’t go out looking for it. I just wanted it to go nice and smoothly” (GW). One wonders if there was fear that the media would be negative; nevertheless, the low key approach was less than satisfactory and is indicative of many of the ensuing implementation problems.
When I interviewed administrators, all teachers on the modified calendar,
and some of the teachers on the traditional schedule, I heard many complaints
about how the calendar had been implemented, but none about the concept itself.
Although I sensed that there had been difficulties, it was only after several visits,
several rounds of interviews, and strong assurances of confidentiality—
particularly that what teachers reported would not be taken back to the principal,
that I began to understand some of the real issues at Lakota School.

Problems of implementation quickly came to the forefront. Teachers stated
that because the three modified class teachers do their own supervision in
August, they are exempt from duties the rest of the year. Because the music
teacher, Rusty, happened to be on the modified schedule, the rest of the school
lost five weeks of music instruction while he was on break. There was obvious
jealousy and concern on the part of the other teachers about the programming
for the modified classes. This was particularly pointed against Rusty's handling
of his own senior grade class. One teacher stated that:

what happens is his students get a really good start in music, and
have the computer lab to themselves, so they do more computer
work, and then they go on more field trips as well because in
August you know they should be outdoors more, so they do more of
an outdoor program in August.

Although this does not seem very different from what we heard in Kate
Smith, here, there is no sense of this being curriculum with an integrated and
thematic approach. Instead, it seemed that Lakota School operated in August
with a series of special days—fishing, golf, etc.—separate in almost every way
from the regular curriculum. Unlike in other dual-calendar schools, having some
students absent during the regular term did not permit the use of additional space
by teachers. One teacher described how she wanted to use an adjacent room for a drama project, but could not, "because they locked it."

The allocation of teachers is particularly illustrative of the problems experienced in Sweetwater District. Gwen said:

I had four teachers who wanted the three positions, which made it difficult to choose! I did it by, first come, first served, as to who got there ... I asked them to put in a letter as to why they would want to teach the alternative, and which grades. I looked at flexibility. Some of them said they wouldn't mind either junior or intermediate, or primary or junior. And I also looked at whether the three would be compatible, so that entered into it, too.

Gwen's statement appears to encompass contradictory criteria. Moreover, it suggests a unilateral rather than a collaborative process, one that increased competition and divided the staff, rather than unifying it around an exciting experiment.

Class size was another major issue. On the modified schedule, classes ranged in size from 18 to 22 students, while the traditional calendar classes had 29 students in the middle grades, with over 30 in the 7-8 class. In fact, I was told by a teacher that "Parents can't choose teachers, but they can choose whether they're going to have traditional or the year-round program, and so de facto, they can choose teachers."

This was complicated even more by the fact that the senior teacher in the modified calendar was one who was described as "not being appropriate for all kids." One sixth grade teacher on the regular calendar stated,

Probably, the biggest problem I have with the modified calendar looking at it from my standpoint of having a grade 6 class going to the 7th grade, is who is teaching it. I don't like to be negative towards Rusty Knowles. He's extremely well educated but in his program, you have to work independently. So those two students
from my class that are considering going to his, they would be fine. They would sort of survive that sort of trip, but a student who is weaker and needs the teacher focused all the way along, would have problems in that classroom simply because of his style.

Another reported: "I'm sorry to have to say it, but Mr. Knowles has very limited behaviour control management skills within his classroom." In fact, the two sixth grade teachers had rejoiced when Mr. Knowles was placed on the modified calendar, saying, "Phew, we don't have to send our kids on to Mr. Knowles because he's going to be doing the alternative year."

Putting your weakest teacher in the senior class of a pet project might look like a sure way to kill it, but Gwen, perhaps unwittingly, made the situation even worse. Because not enough students had pre-registered for the next year of the modified calendar at the 7th grade level, she introduced a new plan. Students were told that

if 8 or 9 of them didn't volunteer, at least that many students would be placed in that classroom in September. So the alternative year would start in August, and then 8 or 9 kids would be placed in that room in September after the class had been running, and in October, then those 8 or 9 would be split up into another classroom. They wouldn't start in August, because, of course, that wouldn't work out with the parents' schedule. They would start in September, but they would be in that classroom, so they would've missed all the August program. They would start in September. (ST)

In this way, students not opting for the modified calendar would not have to begin before September, but when the rest of their class went on the modified breaks, they would be placed in other regular classes and forced to make up the time. Teachers said that students looked puzzled and asked, "Like could it be me that's forced to go in there?" One teacher, summing this new plan up, made the understatement of the year: "I don't know how this is going to work."
Then she elaborated, "They were keen on some of the selling points." The principal promised these students they would have "no French for a month and hour-long physical education and extra instrumental music and computer lab every day" (not to mention the day trips discussed earlier).

**Discontent and Discontinuation**

It is little wonder that after the plan had been communicated to the students, one teacher told me she had been:

greeted in the hall, the first thing the next morning by a parent who said, "I'm tired of having this rammed down my throat. It's in the paper. It's spoken about at every assembly, you know. Now, my daughter wants to be involved in the program because it was sold to her, you know, with a hard sell, and we know it won't work for our family. We know about the program. Forms have come home. We're informed. We can't be involved in it." And so she was upset.

In Sweetwater District, the modified calendar caused disruption of classes, and as enrolment declined, increased hard feelings, as schools experienced program cuts and lost specialist teachers like librarians. Nevertheless, a series of different superintendents permitted the dual-track calendar to exist for five years because it offered an element of choice to a small group of parents. No other educational benefits were identified, and as I have reported, many problems developed around the ways in which the innovation was conceptualized and introduced here.

In the sole multi-track year-round school in Canada, we will see next how, despite much more initial success than in Lakota School, some similar implementation problems ultimately also led to its demise as a year-round calendar school.
Stephen Lewis Junior High: A Dream Gone Awry

In July 1995, to great media fanfare and enormous public interest, Stephen Lewis Junior High School opened as Canada’s first multi-track year-round school, comprising grades 7, 8, and 9. The new school building had been approved by the district over two years before to meet the needs of a growing low socio-economic, highly ethnically-diverse area of a large metropolitan city in Western Canada, described in the school handbook as “a community rich in human resources and ethno-cultural groups.” The community was also one with associated social problems such as unemployment, crime, and youth violence. Because students had previously been bussed out of their neighbourhood and dispersed among existing schools in other parts of the city, there had been no real junior high community in the area. As a result, the new school quickly took on a considerable level of importance as a focal point for community activities. (Shields & Oberg, 2000, p. 52)

Planning Multiple Innovations

Eighteen months before the building was to be opened, the new principal, Naomi St. John, was appointed with a mandate to work with the architects, to develop an innovative school program, and to hire her staff. The result was not only a five-track year-round school, but one in which each track constituted a “learning community,” in which assistant principals were replaced by “learning leaders,” teachers worked collaboratively to integrate the curriculum around

---

1 Because this study was conducted after Naomi St. John had left the school, I was unable to conduct a formal interview with her, or to include direct quotes from her in this section (although on several occasions I tried unsuccessfully to schedule an interview). Nevertheless, she participated in the British Columbia conference on year-round schooling in 1995 and I had the opportunity to meet with her and discuss the school at that time. My informal interactions with her were consistent with the comments made by my respondents (her successors, as well as teachers and learning leaders who had remained at the school).
thematic units, parents and students participated widely in governance, and in which students were grouped and regrouped in multi-age classes. So many innovative ideas were combined under one roof that one mantra of the school, one that was an attempt to encourage continued innovation and prevent reversion to traditional approaches, became, "If it hasn't been tried in Stephen Lewis, then it hasn't been tried." This attitude of innovation is reflected in phrases in the student handbook, such as "uniqueness, risk-taking, and personal excellence are valued in our young people" and "we encourage collaboration through mutual trust and respect." Moreover, the foundation statement itself is "meant to be flexible in the sense that it is continually questioned and re-examined." This sense of innovation, flexibility, experimentation, and excitement pervaded the early years of Stephen Lewis Junior High School. But at the same time, these elements foreshadow some of the difficulties that would soon become apparent.

The impetus behind the 60-15 calendar and programs at Stephen Lewis School was to provide an innovative, participatory, community-owned, and caring environment for the population of relatively high needs students. There was a sense that the population would grow and that Stephen Lewis School would need to have a multi-track calendar to accommodate the potential ultimate enrolment.

The decision to open with five learning communities was a way to bring smaller groups of students together with a group of caring teachers in the hope that no student would fall through the cracks. Each learning community consisted of a leader, a resource teacher, and one generalist teacher for approximately
thirty students. The school also had a core group of specialist teachers who taught all of the art, music, computing, drama, physical education, and home economics to all communities of students. For the most part, the school-day was organized around a series of flexible groupings, including grade-level groupings, multi-age or cross-grade groups, ability (or cross-ability) groups, or interest groups. At times large groups of students were taught by one or two teachers, freeing the other teachers to work with smaller groups or individuals. At other times, communities were divided more equally. Although officially named a “junior high school” the school had more of a “middle-school” feel to it. The plan was that students and teachers would stay together for three years, that a bond of caring, friendship, and support would develop and that individual student needs could be identified and met in a warm, respectful community-like learning environment.

Thus, the multi-track calendar was more or less a container for the school program. It had contributed to the physical design of the building in which four learning communities were clustered around the central core, requiring communities to relocate after each track change. Within each pod, learning spaces had also been flexibly designed, with large L-shaped classrooms, and a number of small work-rooms clustered around each one. These design features, although intended to enhance the flexibility of the instructional program, later became seen as restrictive and problematic.

Prior to the opening of the school, much planning had occurred. However, most of the planning had related to “big picture” issues, to concepts like school
philosophy, mission, and vision statements. One teacher described the effect of the lack of attention to detail in this way:

Before, when we were hired, we worked on mission statements. We worked on outcome-based assessment. We worked on philosophy and tried to get everyone in agreement, on board or on side. We walked into the first day of school and we were asked, "Can kids wear hats?" We found we were divided right down the middle on the simplest issues because we had never brought them up. It was depressing. Outcome-based assessment was three months away before we were going to argue about that. We decided we knew all about it. You know. How do we take attendance? We didn't know. Report cards came around and where are the report cards? We don't have one. So we have to make one. Let's decide to make one. What do you want the report card to look like? So now we have fifty professionals in the building fighting over what the report card would look like. (BR)

School Opening and Ongoing Change

When the school opened, many structures, including governance structures had not been finalized, again, with the intent of encouraging wide participation and input into their development. The administrative team held weekly meetings, alternating between before and after school hours. In the first year, a school council was established with representation from parents, students, teachers, and the community at large. When students discovered that provincial legislation required that parents hold the majority of voices, they complained that their point of view would be lost.

Once the school opened, there were staff committees (staff development, teaching and learning, communication, assessment, governance, fund-raising, technology, special events, student activities, and awards and recognition) involving teachers from different Learning Communities whose work established the policies and practices of the school. It was necessary to have two chair-persons per committee to ensure continuity as the Learning Communities rotated in and out of the school. (LaRocque et al., 1998, p. 38)
The parent assembly, which worked through eight additional committees, met monthly. A student assembly also met regularly, first as a participatory council, but later as a representative council. Everything was up in the air and to be discussed and decided by committees. A teacher remembered a discussion about whether the student washrooms should be co-educational or not in this junior high school: “They decided to have the washrooms co-ed. Anyone could go into any washroom. Well it didn’t take long—a week—before a little girl said, ‘We’re not going into the washrooms.’” The policy was quickly reversed.

Problems arose, not only because so much was left undefined at the outset, but because changes continued to occur, almost on a monthly basis. Moreover, so much time was taken up making collaborative decisions about topics like the wearing of hats (for a while the only rule in the school that was enforced), that little time was left for discussions of how to implement the innovative pedagogical ideas. Specialist teachers who had been hired struggled with how to teach thematic, integrated concepts, in a more “generalist” way. Teachers initially had too many roles and change was constant.

The problem with scheduling the music program is illustrative. The music teacher indicated that he had been invited to join the district steering committee, because originally, there had been no-one representing fine arts. His task, during the eighteen months planning for the school, he said, was to constantly ask “What about fine arts? What about fine arts?” At one point he left the committee in frustration, but later accepted the position as music teacher at the school. I asked how the music program had been organized in the first year, and he stated,
"I can't tell you because it's been five years. It changes every year, absolutely every year. A new challenge. I've been here five years and I've had four calendar years and five schedules."

Tensions soon appeared as it was generally unclear which group had the power to make and enforce which decision. Moreover, so much time was taken up by meetings, that many teachers quickly became disenchanted with the participatory processes. In fact, by the third year, only 13 of the original 40+ teachers remained, with one learning community having lost all of its teachers. Perhaps more influential in the ultimate demise of the innovative approach was the fact that new staff who were hired had no orientation to the philosophical underpinnings either of the year-round calendar or the pedagogy that formed the foundation for the creation of the learning communities.

Despite the many changes that occurred at Stephen Lewis over the years, and the very large staff turnover, by the fifth year, some of the original staff were still holding on to the dream. One original learning leader stated that

It was exciting. The teams were working together. The administration was working together. There were all the things that when you open a brand new school. There were no traditions. So expectations had to be set. Our principal was a strong advocate of stewardship and collaborative decision making. Then that process tends to take a little bit of time. ... We didn't have any infighting on the admin team. We're still close friends.... I still believe in it. I believe in the learning community approach. I believe in year-round schooling. (JD)

Others, however, did not remember the early days in such a positive light.

"The philosophy of the school looks so good on paper, total integration, total inclusion, total integration of subjects. We tried to do everything all at once ... one of the philosophies of the school was 'student voice, student choice'. Many found
it overwhelming and reported that student choice did not always work. One
recalled:

I could not believe, again it was not just with my personal
belongings, but even the school itself. There was such destruction
the first year. The walls, everything. Six months and the school
looked like it had been lived in for thirty years. And that is improving
as well. But wow for the first three years. (BR)

Naomi St. John left the school during its second year of operation to take
a high profile executive position in a national organization in the community.
Teachers were not particularly surprised as they had seen her, not only as an
"experienced principal" but as a "mover and shaker."

**New Directions: A New Principal Arrives**

A new principal was chosen by the district, one equally experienced, and
who had also been an original member of the district design committee. She
accepted the position with the intent of making the school work. She was "a risk
taker, so it was interesting ... it captured my imagination. I also felt I was
needed." But the cracks that had begun to open quickly became chasms.

Even though Lydia shared the initial vision for the school, she soon
experienced difficulties working in the unstructured and fragmented environment.
She described the challenge of "walking into a multi-track with constant change."
For the first year, she tried to work within the established system but found she
was constantly being blind-sided, often by the learning leaders who had their own
status as quasi-administrators, and their own autonomy in terms of making
decisions for their communities. She described them, a year later, as

Cowboy learning leaders. They were running their own private
schools and the attitude was that they could do whatever they
wanted. ...So Thursday afternoon, when most of the school is doing final exams before Christmas, one books the drama room and has a dance going on. And you can hear the thud, thud, thud of the bass throughout the school. (LD)

Overall she found that the building was in "chaos, with each learning centre being different unto itself." Every track did its own thing and it was like "five mini-schools"—a situation that did not help to create a cohesive school.

After her first year in the school, Lydia gained permission from the board to change the five learning leaders' positions and to hire a vice-principal. William Smith came on board, worked with her through the implementation of a number of changes, and eventually was appointed principal upon Lydia's retirement.

When Lydia went into the school she implemented a number of changes to address some of the problems with fragmentation, decision-making, communication, and scheduling of classes (such as music and drama). Overall, William said, she

came in and started tightening the reigns and bringing back a more curriculum focused, grade appropriate approach. The perception of some of the parents in the community started to change for the better. (WS)

Changes had an impact on both students and parents. William continued, "We cleaned house. We had kids who had been there three years and had virtually run the school. And we had to tell them we were running the school. Not them. That was an interesting scenario."

Lydia described how parents had believed that track choice was a "god-given right" that was difficult to violate. Nevertheless, it quickly became apparent (as I have found elsewhere) that permitting parents to choose the track resulted in inequity. She learned that there was a disparity in the academic achievement
scores across the different tracks. She learned that the "red" and "purple" tracks had the highest scores in language, math, science, and social studies—above the school average. For example, in language arts, the range across the tracks went from 55.2% on the "orange" track to 90.7% on the "red" track. Interestingly, virtually all the parent council had children on the same track. Lydia explained that because parents request only certain tracks and certain teachers, then parents who don't make a request get what is left over. These are often places on what are considered to be less desirable tracks; further, the resulting particular grouping of students sometimes achieve disparate test scores. "So certain tracks get a bad reputation and get ghettoized as teachers that are not so good get left on those tracks" (LD).

Lydia took pains to try to equalize allocation to tracks. When she had incoming students, she still asked what track they would prefer, but tried to distribute them more evenly (according to ability, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status) across the tracks.

Challenging instances of autonomy and independence presented themselves. Lydia talked about how one learning community had organized a fundraiser without having talked to her. "All of a sudden boxes of candy were coming into the school that kids were going to sell. I could not believe anyone would do that." She continued, "If it wasn't fund raising, it was heading off on a field trip without filling out the proper forms."
This was her way of raising a significant break-down of communication that resulted in tragedy. She explained, “We had one child die on a fieldtrip.” She described how one track organized a camping trip through the local “Y.”

Parents were supposed to come into a meeting. Only three parents came. It was done through the Y. Of course they didn’t tell me when they had the meeting. It was very interesting how that all went together. And then on the day that she drowned the learning leader was supposed to be there, but she wasn’t. (LD)

This incident caused a lack of confidence, but was, of course, only one of many reasons why Stephen Lewis Junior High School had moved completely away from its multi-track and multi-age programs by the fall of 2001. In some ways the drowning was the last of many high profile incidents that not only attracted press attention, but gave creditability to the increasingly vocal critics of the school.

Teachers and learning community leaders alike talked about how from the outset, the school had been besieged by requests for visits from educators from all over North America, from researchers, community volunteers, and the media. One said,

We had television cameras in here everyday. We had every research student (no offense), everyone doing a paper in our school from day one. For the whole year it was a fishbowl. And it was not directed from Naomi. But from people saying we’re coming in. We’ll be sending someone over to your school. The school board will be sending someone over to your school. (JD)

All of the attention was flattering but made it particularly difficult either to make decisions, to achieve consistency, or paradoxically, to enact necessary change. In some ways, they had to live up to the mythic reality created for and about them.
At the outset, the district did everything in its power to ensure that the experiment worked. It provided extra funding, additional staffing, and ongoing support for the teachers and administrators in the school. After her first year as principal, Lydia went to the superintendent wondering if it would be better to move away from the multi-track calendar all together. Her area superintendent told her "not even to anticipate the possibility of not keeping it." However, a year later, following Lydia's retirement, the district came to reluctant agreement and most of the innovations at Stephen Lewis School, including the multi-track calendar and the learning communities were scrapped.

To some extent, the outcome is reflective of a battle between different leadership styles. Naomi was described as "one of those people who made me kind of think beyond what I was," a principal who would empower teachers and her administrative team. One former learning leader stated,

She would empower somebody and trust them and be able to take a break. As principal, you have to be able to do that. Lydia had difficulty letting go. Some people do.

What some on the staff described as "having trouble letting go," others lauded as taking appropriate charge, creating a more accountable and calmer system, and making necessary changes. Despite her popularity and exciting vision, one person said of Naomi that "the administration can really set the tone of the school. Not to say that Naomi didn’t have the best interest of the students in mind, but I think she was too idealistic."

As I concluded my data collection, William was preparing for the school to open, in August of 2001, on a single-track modified calendar. His hope was that
this would preserve many of the benefits of the previous multi-track system and also overcome a number of the existing deficits.

**Summary: From Multi-Track to Single-Track**

Although the close bonds that had developed among students and teachers in the learning communities had many positive aspects, they also helped to fragment the school and to prevent a sense of "schoolness"—a concept mentioned repeatedly in the interviews as central to the vision of the school. As he considered how to assign students to classes and classes to the various pods in the building, William determined not to permit the existing tracks to remain intact, but said he would throw all the names "in a hopper and see what came out."

William was convinced that "people are starting to see the benefits of the modified year-round program with its shorter summer holidays and the breaks in between," and thought that they were "going to see some high schools moving in that way fairly quickly." "I don't think it will be long," he concluded. Although he expressed hope that the benefits of the year-round calendar would soon be more widely recognized, many of the more innovative (and perhaps more idealistic) aspects of the initial vision of Stephen Lewis School were lost.

With the move away from the multi-track calendar, there was a fear that the benefits of the learning communities would also be lost. Jim, a former learning leader, described how:

The feeling of community was a lot stronger and opportunities for good relationships with students. Also the teachers worked together
with a common planning time. There was support for teachers who were not working in isolation. There was empowerment for teachers who could get ideas through interaction with others. There was always a chance for new things to be happening. From the year-round, you get more charged, more frequently during the year. Kids come back pumped for another first day of school.

He added, "Because we believed in cooperative learning, and because we also implemented multi-aging, you could get a lot of peer support for the kids....You almost needed it there to make the system work."

The multi-track year-round calendar in Stephen Lewis Junior High School was an interesting, innovative, and high profile change that garnered attention from many other educators over a six-year period. It began with vision and enthusiasm, with Naomi’s personal charisma being instrumental in building commitment for her innovative ideas. It began to flounder when teachers were overwhelmed with the time and energy demanded to translate the vision into reality. It began to die when she left the school and a new leader, with a different style, and a different interpretation of the vision came on board so early. Perhaps the vision was too idealistic; perhaps it was an idea whose time had come but that needed more follow-through than she was able to give it. One cannot help but wonder what might have happened had Naomi not left so soon and if the initial vision and enthusiasm she seemed to engender had been able to have been maintained.

Summary of Canadian Implementation

In every instance in Canada, the introduction of a modified, alternative, or year-round calendar occurred on a voluntary basis and because a school leader took up the challenge of implementing a modified school calendar.
In Albert District, Joseph began with a vision of what a year-round school could do for students. He was willing to adapt his initial vision of a modified calendar to a dual-track calendar in order to gain public support. He demonstrated commitment to a goal as well as a vision and was willing to work to make it happen. His zeal and commitment became legendary. The flexibility of his approach, the clear focus on academic achievement for students, the provision of parental choice were factors in making his dream a reality. He was able to work with School Councils; he empowered parents and garnered widespread support. And he was able to see some of the fruits of his efforts as he established two new schools on the same model and perhaps more importantly, influenced policy in both his board and the province. It is not an overstatement to call the innovations in Albert School District an unqualified success.

In contrast, one cannot help but describe the similar innovation in Sweetwater District as a failure. Begun with similar hopes and also influenced by the successful story of Huntsville's small scale implementation, the calendar in Lakota School did not reap the benefits found in Kate Smith Elementary School. Gwen's failure to treat the school as a community, to consult with the teachers, to communicate openly with her students, their parents, and the community at large, spelled doom from the outset. She seemed to lose sight of the goal of benefiting students. Despite her initial vision and enthusiasm, not only did she fail to build the support necessary to implement a new calendar, she made a number of unwise decisions that seemed more and more manipulative. Her choices of the
weakest, least popular teacher in the school combined with her threat to place children in modified classes on a traditional schedule during breaks (resulting in the worst of both worlds) were not only unwise but appear to border on the unethical. It is difficult to see how, given these factors, the reform could have had a more positive outcome.

The implementation at Stephen Lewis Junior High School is in some ways the most interesting and most complex of any schools and districts I studied. Begun with collective optimism and creativity, extensive resources of time, intellect, and money, it still did not work. Probably overly ambitious, the complexity and time-consuming nature of the planning and implementation soon took their toll. In some ways, the educators at this school may have wanted to do too much too fast to support their high-needs student body. They wanted to educate, empower, nurture, and include students and parents, but found themselves unable to fully accomplish these goals as they had hoped. It is difficult to know whether it was the realization that the project could not work that lead Naomi to leave prematurely or whether her early departure led to the failure of the project.

All told, the stories about the Canadian experience make a narrative that is, at times inspiring, at times frustrating. It provides insight into leadership for change and helps us to understand how to make the implementation of reform, and especially of year-round schooling, successful; at the same time it offers some cautions about what not to do.
In Chapter 7, I re-examine the questions with which I began this study and revisit the experiences of both the American and Canadian educational leaders and identify some insights gleaned from the data.
I began this study because of my own experience as an administrator in a multi-track year-round school. As a research assistant to a professor examining the topic of year-round schooling, my interest was piqued to try to better understand the complexities and challenges, the successes and failures of an innovation I had originally thought to be quite straight-forward. I began to wonder about the impact of a reform that was voluntary or mandated, about the importance of district support, community dynamics, and about the impact of the reform on students and their families. One district assistant superintendent had told me that central to all of this was the school principal (KZ). Another district superintendent (CW) had stated that the major factor in the success or failure of educational innovation, especially something as demanding as year-round schooling, was administrative leadership. Further, I had been intrigued by the concept of transformative leadership (Astin & Astin, 2000).

Informed by my personal experience with YRS and by a conceptual framework focused on transformative leadership, supplemented by the literature on YRS and educational reform, I set out to investigate whether a transformative approach to leadership helps educational leaders to successfully implement structural change. To answer that overarching question, I wanted to examine and understand more clearly the role of educational leaders in introducing school reform. I wished to learn why and how, at both school and district levels, educational leaders
continue to promote and introduce school calendar change in the face of the substantial political and social battles. My specific objectives were:

1. to understand the impetus of educational leaders for introducing YRS,
2. to comprehend leaders' implementation procedures and processes,
3. to identify what the leaders hoped to accomplish by enacting YRS,
4. to determine the leaders' perceptions about the extent to which their goals were realized, and
5. to describe the leaders' perceptions about unanticipated outcomes of YRS.

In this chapter, I draw on my data to answer these five questions, but to avoid redundancy, I combine the responses to questions three and four under the heading of "anticipated goals and achieved outcomes."

**The Impetus for Year-Round Schooling**

There is little research that attempts to examine either the impetus for starting a year-round school or the impact that differences in the impetus might have on the outcomes and the long-term success of the reform. Some talk in passing of a legislative mandate for change (Donato, 1996; McDaniel, 1993) or of a district's need to accommodate more children in existing buildings (White, 1992; Zykowski et al. 1991), while others (see for example, Gandara, 1992; Pyron, 2004; Shields & Oberg, 2000) describe implementations that were voluntarily implemented. Table 2 summarizes the impetus I discovered in this study for the introduction of the reform initiatives.
Table 2. Impetus for YRS and the success reported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIST. &amp; SCHOOL</th>
<th>CALENDAR</th>
<th>INITIATOR</th>
<th>IMPETUS</th>
<th>SUCCESS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances Howell</td>
<td>MT**</td>
<td>District initiated</td>
<td>Overcrowding, Bond restrictions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>State mandated</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida Central</td>
<td>Both MT &amp; ST</td>
<td>District mandated</td>
<td>Overcrowding, Desire to raise scores</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Voluntary at school level</td>
<td>Provide choice</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>District mandate</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerico</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>District mandate</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Popper</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Teacher initiated</td>
<td>Low achievement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Dual-Track</td>
<td>Principal initiated</td>
<td>Belief in YRS benefits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater</td>
<td>Dual-track</td>
<td>Principal initiated</td>
<td>Desire for choice</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Lewis</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>District, principal &amp; staff</td>
<td>Low SES Potential area growth</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Success here refers to my working definition as outlined in Chapter One and implies a combination of goals met and support and satisfaction achieved.

** MT = multi-track, ST= single-track, YRS= year-round school

Facility Issues

In several school districts, the impetus for the year-round calendar came from various ways of explaining the lack of fiscal and physical resources. Due to overcrowding, some talked about the need to accommodate more children in existing buildings; others spoke about restrictions in terms of bond limitations or lack of capital funding that limited new school construction.

In Frances Howell School District, when the district was unable to raise bond money quickly enough to increase capacity, the superintendent introduced year-
round schooling to address the needs of a rapidly growing population. Three years later, he added another multi-track school. From then on, as elementary schools became overcrowded, they changed to a multi-track calendar. Soon, the district had such success with the new calendar that even its under-populated elementary schools were charged to operate on a modified calendar, albeit, a single-track one which they called E-track. This district is still recognized as a "year-round school" district as well as for having had the longest running multi-track year-round schools in the United States.

Two decades later, Delphi District implemented a similar approach. Although some educators attended the annual year-round school conference, most decisions were internal rather than influenced by the experience of others, such as Frances Howell. Hence, the district leaders experienced a learning curve in some ways similar to that of leaders in Frances Howell. The implementation of YRS in Delphi District took a slightly more convoluted route. In response to a legislative decision not to provide new capital funds to over-crowded districts until necessary "efficiency" schedules had been introduced, Delphi District began experimenting. After a few tough years of trying out an extended-day, over-lapping student-body formula, Delphi District opted to try multi-track year-round schooling in the mid 1980s.

After years of trial and error, the solution provided by widespread implementation of YRS still exists in the first decade of the 21st century and shows no evidence of decline in the foreseeable future. All new elementary schools that are built in Delphi District are designed and constructed as year-round schools, with new
buildings opening on single-track calendars and switching to the multi-track mode when they become too crowded to accommodate all students at one time.

**Complex Interplay of Reasons**

The situation in Florida was (and still is) more complex. Central District took an early lead and hired Dana Lougheed, a district YRS coordinator who mandated year-round school in the district's poorest neighborhoods in order to accommodate more students, but who also nurtured the belief that the new calendar implementation would result in improved test scores. For that reason, the district coordinator originally anticipated a wholesale change to year-round schooling. Ultimately, however, the outcomes of implementing the calendar failed to meet her high expectations. Test scores were not as high as the district had promised and a newly elected school superintendent eliminated the year-round school calendar.

The demise of the project in Central District negatively influenced the situation throughout the state. In Sage District, several school principals and a district superintendent had been quick to catch the vision of Dana Lougheed in Central District, in each case, hoping for a calendar that would provide parental choice and educational benefits. When YRS began to lose public support in neighboring Central District, some Sage District decision-makers seemed as eager as those in Central had been to dismantle the calendar. At a meeting of the school board, despite enthusiastic support for YRS from participating principals, teachers, and parents, the decision was made to discontinue the alternative calendar.

The impetus for introducing the YR calendar in neighboring Vista District was the existence of several dilapidated buildings coupled with a low tax base and more
than a few over-crowded schools. There, the superintendent had ordered the implementation of the MT-YRS calendar in several schools; he promised that the schedule would be a temporary solution to the district's woes and that the calendar would be replaced by a new yet-to-be-determined solution within a few, short years. In part, YRS quickly magnetized opposition when no other solutions were found and when implementation procedures seemed inequitable.

Year-round schools in Taft District were implemented for several different reasons. In Jerico Elementary School, year-round schooling had been mandated because of overcrowding. There, however, the principal took what was, for the district, a cost-saving formula and turned it into a school-saving formula—the catalyst for changing how the teachers thought about and delivered education. Her success with her high needs, low socioeconomic and disadvantaged families brought not only the attention of the state officials but the notice of some teachers in other district schools. Notable was Martin Popper Elementary School, where the teachers persuaded the principal to investigate year-round schooling as a partial solution to their own "critically low" and failing school status. Once convinced of the potential of the calendar to address some of the needs of her challenging school population, Jane forged ahead. The outcome, there, was not only a voluntary implementation, but one that was hard won through persistent lobbying of the district. Thus, in Florida, I found a range of compelling reasons for implementing year-round schooling and a concomitant range of outcomes.
An Impetus for Choice and Learning

In Canada, no school has adopted the year-round calendar as a cost-saving measure or to accommodate more students in less space. In every instance in Canada, the stated reason for implementation was either to offer parental choice or to improve the learning environment for students—and sometimes both.

In Albert District, the "choice" and "learning" motives were both present. Joseph, the instigator and visionary who successfully introduced the calendar, was clear about both goals. There was no sense in which it was a simple "change for the sake of change," in Albert District’s schools.

In Sweetwater, there seemed to be more emphasis on doing something new and different, with the most frequently stated reason for the dual-track schedule, being to offer choice to families. There the principals seemed to have been influenced by the success in other areas, perhaps without wholly understanding the potential challenges and benefits. In some ways, they seemed to have wanted to be on the crest of a wave of innovation they thought would gain considerable public support and expressed disappointment that "more people did not line up" when given the opportunity.

Although for a while it was thought that Stephen Lewis’s population might grow to the point where a multi-track school was absolutely necessary, the first principal conceptualized the school in that way to permit the accommodation of the learning community concept. The calendar became a vehicle for a larger, more grandiose plan that involved extensive and dramatic changes in organization and
pedagogy—changes that were expected not only to benefit student learning but to empower the community and to "put it on the map."

**Summary of Findings about Impetus**

Multi-track year-round school calendars were introduced in both Frances Howell and Delphi District because neither district could find a better solution to overcrowding and because both lacked the capital funds to meet their populations' needs. In these districts, educators introduced year-round schooling initially as the lesser of possible evils. In Florida, the schools in Vista District and Jerico Elementary in Taft District were originally confronted with a district mandate to implement a year-round calendar. In the other sites (Sage, some schools in Central, and Martin Popper School in Taft District), the implementation was voluntary and intended specifically to address the learning needs of students. All of the Canadian sites introduced a version of a modified or year-round calendar on a voluntary basis, again intended to offer choice to families and to enhance the educational environment for educators and students alike.

Although Michael Fullan (1993, p. 21) states that "you cannot mandate what matters," my respondents have reported that the mandate to introduce a year-round calendar was in some cases the catalyst, not only for cost savings, but also for improving student achievement. While a mandate did not in and of itself improve student learning, in some cases, it certainly helped to create the conditions under which improved pedagogy and learning took place. At the same time, the mandate in Vista District (although it undoubtedly saved the district money) seemed to result in little more than frustration and hard feelings.
The initial impetus did not predict the success or failure of the reform. What this study has demonstrated is that a successful innovation may be mandated or voluntarily implemented as can an unsuccessful reform. In some ways, the explanation for this finding comes from the second guiding question for this study, an examination of administrators' implementation procedures and processes.

According to my earlier definition of success—successful implementation referred to schools that not only met the leaders' explicit goals for the calendar change, but in which the reform endured and garnered support from both the school and wider communities served. The least successful calendar changes were associated with the leaders' implementation procedures and processes; further, these calendar changes did not last more than a few years.

**Implementation Procedures and Processes**

While mandated multi-track schools were originally instituted to solve accommodation problems, my respondents also reported many benefits to the academic learning environment—benefits that became the impetus for some of the single-track, voluntary programs in other schools and districts. Hence the single-track programs I found in Florida and the dual-track programs in Albert District in Ontario were impelled, not by the need for cost savings or for more space for students, but by a vision for supporting and enhancing student achievement.

There were as many different approaches to implementing a new school-year calendar as there were educational leaders in this study. Nonetheless, a close analysis of the data demonstrates some commonalities among the more successful implementers as well as some similarities in approach among those who failed.
Table 3 summarizes the implementation processes and also repeats the column from Table 2 indicating success or failure.

Table 3. Implementation processes and procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIST. &amp; SCHOOL</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION PROCESSES &amp; PROCEDURES</th>
<th>SUCCESS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances Howell</td>
<td>Constant review &amp; revision, adequate support &amp; fiscal resources, widespread consultation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>District modified support &amp; processes as needed, parent consultation, careful appointment of principals</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida</td>
<td>Missed promises, uneven implementation, mixed message, unwillingness to take political risks</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Vista Central</td>
<td>Copycat approach, lack of understanding, desire for uniformity</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagelarcus</td>
<td>Promise YRS was temporary, little support, lack of district understanding of school situation, political campaign stance</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>Consistent learning opportunities, parental communication &amp; empowerment, calendar was part of overall improvement plan, use of intersession, widespread support of faculty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerico &amp; Martin Popper</td>
<td>Alternate summer pedagogy &amp; schedule, widespread consultation, enthusiastic support of principal, collaboration with policy makers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert/Kate Smith</td>
<td>Begun with lack of support, few policies related to staffing or enrolment, unilateral decision making</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater/Lakota</td>
<td>Too much consultation, too many meetings, lack of firm decision making, autonomous learning communities, failure to generate adequate in-school support, principal turn-over</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Failing" Implementation Processes

Let me start with those that seemed to be the least successful either because the goals were not fulfilled or because the goals were met but there was expressed dissatisfaction on the part of the school staff or wider community. To be clear, these are the schools in Central, Vista, and Sage Districts in Florida as well as Sweetwater District and Stephen Lewis School in Canada.
Central and Sage Districts suffered from what I am calling "lack of goal clarity" and lack of political will. In each of these districts, the position of superintendent of education is an elected position, with the incumbent particularly attentive to public response to educational change. Because these positions are normally up for election (or re-election) every two years, there is little time to institute meaningful reform in the district. This makes it difficult to institute a reform and to give it a chance to succeed before there is a public outcry against change which may be unpopular, at least in "my backyard."

The innovation in Central District was led by Dana Lougheed with the best of intentions—to improve student achievement as well as to alleviate overcrowding in some schools. Implementation proceeded by requiring schools that were in the more overcrowded areas to be the first to move to a multi-track schedule. Because these schools just "happened" to be in the least educated, most disadvantaged, and most ethnically diverse neighborhoods, Dana reported that the reform was instituted there without much public notice or agitation. When the promised first-year improvement of test scores failed to materialize, the outcry became a crescendo when it came time for schools in more affluent areas to implement the calendar. Armed with the ammunition of "broken promises," parents argued that if the reform had not been successful in lower performing schools, there was no need to change their schools—schools that were already working well.

The failure in Central District is, in part, that educational leaders made the argument based on improving test scores, when in fact, the early implementation, at least, had been designed to provide cost savings and to accommodate more
students in existing buildings. The message was mixed and the elected officials could not take the risk of continuing the program.

In nearby Sage District, there had been more ambivalence, with individual educators citing the experience of Central District and opting to introduce a modified calendar with few clearly stated goals for the project. When Central moved away from year-round schooling, Sage trustees again cited their neighbor's experience and opted to discontinue the experiment for the same reason, this time, however, in spite of extensive support from participating educators and parents. By the time those who were involved in a year-round school went to their board meeting to request permission to continue on their calendar, they were told the board had already voted and was not willing to consider more than one calendar. Here again, political will and lack of goal clarity ruled the day.

In Vista District, while there were both political will and goal clarity, there were still significant problems with both promises made and the processes of implementation that were selected. At the outset, the promise was made to implementing schools that year-round schooling would be a temporary measure (lasting at most three years). For that reason, educators said they initially accepted the innovation but became increasingly disillusioned by the lack of district support. After five years, they had become resentful of district policies such as the one that resulted in administrators working harder, but with no vacation pay or full-time benefits. The lack of understanding of the situation on the part of the relatively newly appointed assistant superintendent supported principals' perceptions that after the calendar had been introduced in several schools, they had been "forgotten" by the
district. Indicative of this lack of attention was the fact that the newly elected superintendent had actually run on a campaign of "no more year-round school."

Sweetwater District also suffered from an acute case of lack of goal clarity. In this district, however, this was compounded by questionable policies and practices. The district permitted Lakota School to begin its program with too small a base of support, with a lack of consultation, and with no policies to address staffing or enrolment issues. The principal forged ahead with something that seems so clearly (from my outside perspective) to have been her own agenda. Nevertheless, although she said she believed in the calendar and had experienced similar benefits in England, Gwen made some serious mistakes. Her unilateral selection of faculty, the appointment of a seventh-grade teacher perceived to be incompetent, her coercion of students, her lack of oversight of the curriculum—all proved to be stumbling blocks to the implementation of a new calendar. This kind of approach seems to support the literature that suggests that a structural change does not necessarily affect teaching and learning (Levin, 2001).

In Stephen Lewis Junior High School, the reasons for the failure were somewhat different, although one could argue that there was still a strong element of lack of goal clarity in the profusion of innovation and lack of specific policy when the school opened. Here, the initial idealism and enthusiasm were mistaken for vision and clear goals. Because everything was up for grabs including a decision about whether or not to have mixed-gender washrooms, the task was simply too all encompassing and too vast for busy educators who were also trying to develop curriculum and figure out how to teach three years of content to multi-aged
groupings of various shapes and sizes. The loss of the initiating principal certainly contributed to the failure of the program. But there were other factors that also came into play. The autonomy of the learning communities and the learning leaders led to a loss of the "schoolness" they were so concerned about at the outset. Attempting to be so participatory that all parents and students were invited to their respective governing assemblies meant, in this specific community, that few people actually participated. While at the outset, the approach seemed promising, it quickly became an exercise in frustration with very few parents ever attending meetings. Teachers, too, became disillusioned about the amount of time required to make decisions and later complained that:

We'd go to endless meetings and never feel decisions were being made. Suddenly we were sitting down, discussing decisions that were just there.... you would discuss, discuss, and discuss and nobody would arrive at anything. Then you would sit down working on it. And you would say to yourself, "I don't remember deciding to do this. I remember this being an option, but why are we working on this. I didn't like this to begin with."

The case of Stephen Lewis School demonstrates that even when people want to be part of an innovation, good intentions are not enough. It takes clear goals, excellent communication and coordination, and sound leaders with at least one foot in reality to make an idea a success.

Overall, both the successful and the less successful projects in this study were introduced in similar communities for somewhat similar reasons. The less successful projects were those in which goals were not met or were only partially met, as indicated in Table 3, or in which there was widespread dissatisfaction with the implementation processes. Yet, it is clear that the major factors contributing to
their lack of success were unfocused or inappropriate implementation procedures of the district or school leaders.

“Successful” Implementation Procedures

Those schools and districts I consider to have been successful include Frances Howell, Delphi, and Taft Districts in the United States and Kate Smith Elementary School in Albert District in Canada.

In Frances Howell School District, the introduction of a multi-track year-round school calendar spread from Becky David to other schools and ultimately became the district calendar. Despite a number of surprises in the initial years, the district superintendent and initiating principal had a clear vision of the needs and how to address them. Although schools could not be constructed quickly enough to accommodate the growing population, the year-round school calendar was not really instituted as a cost-saving measure (but because of a capital outlay restriction) and over the years, the district was willing to put adequate money, effort, and support into the program for it to succeed. As we saw, in the initial years, Gene and Wilma constantly reviewed and revised the innovation, always modifying it in ways that would better meet the needs of students, teachers, and the broader community. Consultation was widespread and those who were to be involved in a calendar change were apprised of the situation all along the way.

Delphi District also initiated the year-round school calendar to address physical needs and to alleviate overcrowding. Schools were given very little choice in the matter but there, too, the implementation was not only successful but became the way educators structured new schools and thought about education in the district.
There, too, educators from the district were willing to learn how to support the new calendar (additional principal meetings, assistant principals, district coordinators, changes in district schedules, etc.), thus alleviating some of the initial problems and showing those who participated that their concerns were taken seriously. When district leaders learned that changes were needed, they added support to make the calendar work. Principals said that as teachers and parents became more familiar with the year-round calendar and with its benefits in terms of increasing motivation and learning and reducing stress and tension, it became well known within the district that both parents and teachers increasingly wanted to be part of year-round schools. Although principals reported that academic benefits were anticipated (and ultimately realized), there were no false promises made and no hidden agendas on the part of either district or school-based administrators. In fact, the district appointed what they considered to be their strongest and most innovative administrators to positions in year-round schools (CW).

In Taft District, the success of the year-round schools was perhaps even more surprising given the more negative experience of so many neighboring schools and districts. Here, I found that it was primarily the clear vision and hard work of the principals that made the innovation work in both Jerico and Martin Popper schools. “Working” here, however, did not simply (or even primarily) mean accommodating more students (although the calendar did facilitate that for Jerico Elementary), but “making the innovation work” meant giving additional and more consistent opportunities for learning to students whose home lives were often difficult and whose families were often disadvantaged socio-economically.
In this case, the district was virtually absent. Respondents said that there was little district support for the innovation, aside from permitting it to occur, but neither did the district inhibit or block the principals from fulfilling their vision for improved student support and achievement. It basically "did no harm." The success here was largely due to the transformative ways in which the principals conceived of using the calendar, especially the intersession time, to provide additional support to those students who most needed it. Additionally, Esther and Jane took steps to ensure that the pedagogical benefits of intersession transferred to the regular school program.

In Kate Smith Elementary, Joseph described how the pedagogy of the August alternate calendar program spilled over into the regular classrooms and teachers began to see how fun-filled thematic activities could be the curriculum rather than an addition to the required curriculum. The main reason, however, for the success of Albert District, was the vision, energy, and commitment of Joseph himself. He used extensive consultative processes with the community, became a strong advocate for the benefits of the program, especially to students with special needs, and "sold" the program to policy makers at every level. There too, although his original vision was a single-track school, he was willing to be flexible and innovative, almost single-handedly popularizing the dual-track calendar and making it work.

Overall, I found those schools in which the year-round calendar was successful to be heavily dependent on the skill, knowledge, commitment, vision, and ability of the school-based administrator to make the innovation work. Regardless of whether it had been deemed necessary by the district or not, regardless of what the district hoped might be accomplished, regardless of whether there was district
support or not, it was the principal who determined the success or failure of the calendar.

Those principals who were successful took seriously their roles as transformative school leaders (Astin & Astin, 2000; Fraser, 1995); they were committed to including and to empowering their staffs (Silins & Mulford, 2005). They encouraged agency, shared power, and consulted about the leadership tasks involved in implementing the reform with their teachers and often with parents and other members of the wider community. As Ogawa (2005) defined agency, he talked about having a sense of control over one's environment. This is one of the factors that made the difference between those innovations that were not successful, where educators believed they had no support and no control, and those in which the success was apparent. Moreover, those successful principals not only listened to their staffs and wider community, but reported that they took seriously the potential of YRS to effect academic benefits for all students (Baker, 1990; Bradford, 1993; Grotjean & Banks, 1993; Kneese, 1996). Thus, they took measures that helped to transform not only their schools but the wider community (Fraser, 1995).

**Anticipated Goals and Achieved Outcomes**

In this section, to avoid repetition and clarify the relationship between what individual educators hoped to accomplish, what they perceived they had accomplished, and the extent to which their goals were realized, I take my third and fourth research questions together. These data are summarized in Table 4. There is, of course, a close relationship between the impetus for the new calendar and what administrators hoped to accomplish, especially when the implementation was
voluntary and originated from the school itself. In this section, I differentiate between the innovations that needed to occur for capital reasons and those that were voluntary or sought after.

Table 4. Goals and the extent to which they were realized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIST/SCHOOL</th>
<th>IMPETUS</th>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th>REALIZED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances Howell</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>More students in existing buildings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bond restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postpone building</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No degradation of academic achievement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>More students in existing buildings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No degradation of academic achievement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>More students in existing buildings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Raise scores</td>
<td>Improve academic achievement</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>Provide choice</td>
<td>School clusters on YRS calendar</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>More students in existing buildings</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>More students in existing buildings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerico</td>
<td>Low achievement</td>
<td>Consolidate programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Popper</td>
<td>High transience</td>
<td>Improve academic achievement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low achievement</td>
<td>More instructional time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Belief in YRS</td>
<td>Support at-risk students</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benefits</td>
<td>Better climate for all</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>Gain more support for school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater</td>
<td>Desire for choice</td>
<td>Implement YRS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Lewis</td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>More instructional time</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for community</td>
<td>Better serve community</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential area</td>
<td>Be innovative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>growth</td>
<td>Be responsive</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals and Outcomes in Involuntary Programs

Frances Howell, Delphi District, and some Florida Districts (Central, Vista, and Taft, aside from Martin Popper School) are examples of programs that were
initiated outside of individual schools. Districts that were faced with overcrowding
and needed to find ways to accommodate additional students in existing buildings
mandated calendar change. In this instance, the goal was implied in the impetus for
the change. For example, if the impetus was overcrowding, the goal was to
accommodate more children in existing buildings or as Gene Henderson put it, to put
more “bums in seats.”

While principals may have understood and sympathized with district
challenges related to budgets and capital outlay, they were primarily concerned with
how the calendar would affect their schools and with such issues as the welfare of
their teachers, the accomplishments of their students, and the support of their parent
community. Here, the question was not so much what principals hoped to
accomplish, but what they hoped to avoid (or at least maintain) with the
implementation of year-round schooling.

In terms of teachers, these principals wanted to ensure they would not have a
massive exodus of good teachers, indeed, that they would still be able to attract
those teachers they wanted to add to their programs. They wanted teachers to be
satisfied, not to experience additional stress and burn-out when they shortened the
long traditional summer vacation. They also wanted teachers to find that planning
and delivery of instruction was at least no more difficult on the new schedule.

With the exception of Vista District, where there was not only a lack of district
support but district policies that actually subverted the program, principals found
these goals were achieved. In fact, teachers found the more regular breaks to be so
beneficial that they reported never needing the long “downtime” often required by
"regular" classroom teachers. They reported that if anything it was easier to plan and teach on a modified calendar because it provided natural beginning and ending points for instructional units and assessment. Teachers found they were planning for blocks of three, six, or nine weeks more naturally than they had before. After having experienced some form of year-round calendar for at least a year, all respondents in this study consistently reported that they preferred the YRS calendar. Hence principals found very few teachers who wanted to leave their schools and a large number of applicants for any rarely available position.

In terms of students, principals obviously wanted to maintain their enrollments and their academic standings, perhaps even to improve them. At the very least, they wanted the new calendar to result in a finding of "no difference" when academic achievement was analyzed. In Frances Howell, the only formal analysis of student academic achievement before and after the new calendar was done during the first year of implementation—a time when others would suggest that it would be too early to anticipate any significant changes (Fullan, 1991). Over time, there was a sense in the district that, student achievement was "consistently somewhat above the state average," and relatively similar to that of neighboring districts. In Delphi District, a systematic analysis of achievement over a six year period found significant improvements on the part of the year-round schools (Shields & Oberg, 1999).

The parent communities in both Frances Howell and Delphi District were not particularly upset by the implementation of year-round schooling. There were initial vocal minorities, but as families experienced the new calendar they found it did not detract from opportunities for family vacation, day-care, or student employment. In
fact, it did not significantly interfere with their established lifestyles. Hence, as time went on, the parent community became increasingly supportive of the new calendar.

When enacted with clear vision as to what was to be achieved and reasonable processes to carry out said vision, calendar reform in so-called involuntary implementations worked well. Districts were able to meet goals by paying attention to the needs of members in the schools and the larger communities. Alternatively, the lack of district support doomed the calendar change to failure, as did the lack of communication with teachers, parents and the wider community.

**Goals and Outcomes in Voluntary Programs**

Under this heading, I include all of the Canadian schools and Martin Popper School in Taft District. Jerico School is an anomaly because, although the calendar was mandated by the district to alleviate overcrowding, Esther, the principal, found ways to make use of it to accomplish other explicit goals. Thus, although it was mentioned in the previous section, it also belongs here.

In those schools in which a year-round, modified, or alternative calendar was voluntarily chosen, principals had specific goals and concerns. As with the other group, all principals were determined to garner the support of their teachers and wider community. Further, the experience of teachers was similar to that in the previous group—once they had tried it, they were overwhelmingly positive about the new schedule.

Parents responded in various ways. It was particularly important, for example in the Canadian schools, to gain parental support. Where the implementation was done well, as in Albert District, parental support was very strong. Indeed, principals
reported, in part because of all of the consultation and attendant empowerment, that parents became more knowledgeable and supportive of their schools than they had been prior to the new calendar. Sweetwater District appeared to have decided that, because the new calendar offered a choice, there was little need for parental empowerment or education. Although there was no parental outcry, parents were less knowledgeable about the disadvantages and/or benefits of the new calendar. Moreover, because of some of the implementation problems, parents became disillusioned and there was no increase of initial support for or interest in, the new calendar. The increased enrolment hoped for and anticipated by the principals did not materialize.

In the two implementing schools in Taft County, Florida, because of the highly transient and low socio-economic base of the school communities, principals were less concerned about building parental and community support because of the disconnected and generally uninvolved nature of their parent community. Nevertheless, they took care to inform the parents about the new calendar. Here the principals were mostly focused on student achievement and used this focus as a way of gaining parental involvement and support.

In the year-round school programs in Taft District, the focus was on improving student achievement. Neither Esther nor Jane would have considered the change had they not believed that the more regular rhythm of schooling and the additional instructional time afforded by intersession were right for their respective student population. Even though the initial year-round calendar in Jerico School was mandated by the district, the principal treated it as an opportunity rather than as a
mandate, and hence I include it with my discussion of neighboring Martin Popper School. Each principal with almost alarming speed (at least to state officials) described how she moved her school off the critically low list and demonstrated tremendous gains in student achievement on Florida's high stakes testing program. Here, they said that their goals for the innovation—to use YRS as a catalyst for improved student learning—were unequivocally met.

In Albert District, the principal articulated multiple reasons for wanting to experiment with the new calendar. He believed he could offer choice, improve the learning environment, free up learning resources, and achieve increased community support and involvement—all by implementing an alternative calendar. All of these were achieved, he believed, by his selection and refinement of the dual-track approach.

In the less successful Canadian voluntary projects, Sweetwater and Stephen Lewis, the principals’ initial focus was less clear. In the former, there was little talk of student achievement or community empowerment, but rather an emphasis on offering choice. Perhaps it is for that reason the calendar did not grow and choice of calendar was not only limited, but ultimately eliminated.

In Stephen Lewis, I found the opposite phenomenon: too many goals, too much consultation, too much talk, too little decision making and focus. The initiating principal had wanted a school unlike any other—one that would serve the needs of the unique student population and bring recognition to the school and its broader community. Perhaps because of the overly ambitious nature of the plan itself, the goals were partially realized at first, in that there was a great deal of public interest in
the school and many educators from across both Canada and the United States who apparently touted it as an example of education innovation and reform. Nevertheless, my data suggested that the seeds of its failure may have been present from the outset and the very broad-ranging nature of the experiment and the lack of leadership stability led to its demise.

It is likely fair to say that where year-round school was introduced with a clear vision and appropriate levels of community participation and involvement, the principals' original goals were met, regardless of the impetus for the new calendar. What is perhaps even more interesting, however, were the unanticipated outcomes I identified in response to my fifth research question. Some were relatively minor; others were much more far-reaching.

**Unanticipated Outcomes**

The unanticipated outcomes are, in some ways, among the most interesting findings. No matter how much research, development, and consultation went into the processes, implementation of year-round schooling plans always had unforeseen results that were related to the specific local contexts. Needless to say, where planning was haphazard, the unanticipated outcomes were usually even more dramatic—and at times, tragic.

The unanticipated outcomes (summarized on Table 5) can be discussed under the following headings: resources and support, impact on students, equity issues, trust and public image, and new and transformative norms.
Table 5. Unanticipated outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT &amp; SCHOOL</th>
<th>UNANTICIPATED OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances Howell</td>
<td>Media attention, YRS became the district norm, Training ground for administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>Need for extra support, More teacher applications-ease of finding substitutes, Better achievement in YRS, More conversation about teaching and learning, more collaboration, Improved student achievement, Potential for inequity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida</td>
<td>Parent backlash, Impact of elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Sage</td>
<td>District decision without school input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>Backlash regarding district policies, not YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft – Jerico</td>
<td>Off critically low list, More parental involvement, Dispelling of deficit mentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Popper</td>
<td>Test scores moving from D to A (F-CAT), Increased parental support, Reduction in transient rate, Dispelling of deficit mentality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Sweetwater</td>
<td>Increase in at-risk student applications, Impact on district policy, Lack of parental support, Impact of teacher reputation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Lewis</td>
<td>Difficulty making decisions-failure of participatory processes, Lack of participation in committees &amp; decision making, Lack of support for the innovations, Negative response to the structure, Inequitable outcomes by track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resources and Support**

Some unanticipated consequences emerged quite quickly. In both Frances Howell and Delphi Districts, the district found it necessary to introduce additional support structures. Additional storage space, large storage cabinets on wheels for every teacher, and air conditioning were ways of gaining support and alleviating some of the inconvenience of a multi-track schedule. District administrators soon found that multi-track year-round schools required some additional days of secretarial time. Small payments to teachers for “track change days” were instituted in Delphi District although I found no mention of monetary rewards elsewhere.
In several districts, for example in Florida and in Delphi District, when teachers who were off-track were selected as substitute teachers, there was more reported consistency in the educational program. One administrator stated, “Finding substitutes has never been easier, and the quality is better than we used to have because the off-track teachers know the kids” (SR).

Related to the topic of resources was the way in which the actual physical building was perceived to facilitate or inhibit learning. In Stephen Lewis School, many teachers, although they had asked to teach there, found they did not like the combination of large classrooms and smaller, more individualized spaces. Some complained that they could not see their whole class at one time while sitting in the L-shaped classroom, and soon even walls in the school were moved or added. In Frances Howell, however, individual tracks became learning communities—almost like schools within a school—and an increased sense of community was reported to have emerged.

Impact on Students

Unanticipated pedagogical and educational outcomes were identified by parents, teachers, and school administrators—some positive, some negative.

The vast majority of positive outcomes related to perceptions of a much improved learning climate including better attendance, increased motivation, decreased burn-out and fewer tensions, as well as to improvements in the academic achievement of students. Teachers reported that there was more conversation about teaching and learning in year-round schools. As teachers came back, refreshed from
breaks, they shared what they had been thinking about their upcoming units while off-track and talked about their holiday experiences:

I definitely think that we as teachers collaborate a lot more on this system than we did before. We're coming back a little bit rejuvenated and every three weeks somebody is coming back who is fresh and full of ideas and grabbing us all together on that Friday, prep day and saying okay, "I've thought about this, how about this?"

Improved teacher and student attendance as well as the reduction of disciplinary incidents and tensions were also unanticipated benefits. One said:

We actually have fewer discipline issues, behavioral issues, because children reach that level of "I'm sick of it; I'm frustrated. Get me out of this place." They do "get out of this place" and come back refreshed, so I think I have fewer discipline problems. Teachers look forward to having their three weeks off, they come back refreshed, too. (SP)

Principals reported that when they saw the test data for their YRS schools they were surprised that there had been considerable improvement in student achievement (CW, SR). Initially introduced simply to address some of Utah's unique educational challenges, the fact that they saw that student achievement in the year-round schools had improved considerably provided welcome support for the district's need to make use of the year-round calendar to alleviate overcrowding and fiscal limitations. Improved achievement was not only one impetus but a desired and anticipated outcome for Jane and Esther in Taft District, but the extent of the improvement in both cases was surprising to the educators involved (CW).

Jane had hoped that the change in calendar would make some difference in student achievement and said she was surprised when the calendar (along with her other initiatives) generated what could only be described as a dramatic improvement. She had hoped to get her school off the state's critically low "D" rating and said she would have been satisfied in the first year with a "C." She had not been ready for a
move from a "D" to an "A". Esther, too, had expected improved academic performance, but said she had not anticipated the results would be so dramatic she would be summoned to the state capital to defend them.

In two schools, however—Stephen Lewis Junior High School and Lakota Elementary School—there were also some unanticipated negative consequences for students. This was largely due to some of the ways in which the school and its programs were organized.

Stephen Lewis's experience, as previously indicated, was mixed. It opened with great fanfare and success, with no one anticipating that in three years things would begin to unravel, and that in six, all but the single-track year-round calendar would have disappeared. There were unanticipated outcomes related to multi-age and grade grouping, to the initial decision not to have students compete competitively against other schools in the district, to the extensive discussions in multiple committees, to the design of the building, and to the consultation processes themselves. Senior students, looking forward to being the “top dog” in their 9th grade year, were not happy being grouped with 7th and 8th graders; moreover, teachers had not determined how to instruct at a multi-grade level and, at the same time, how to ensure that the 9th graders were adequately prepared for high school. Believing that it was more important for junior high school students to engage in cooperative rather than competitive activities, “the admin team had made the arbitrary decision to keep the school out of district sports competitions and only to play in exhibition games” (JD). The refusal of the students to go along with this decision seemed to come as a shock to the administrators.
In Lakota, the assignment of teachers and students to classes and grades proved not only challenging, but almost impossible because there had been so little general support for the alternative (dual) track. This meant that there, too, three grades of students were allocated to one classroom, a situation that was met with considerable student and parent resistance. Moreover, the assignment of a teacher perceived as particularly undesirable to the alternative track was not only detrimental to the survival of the YR program, but also had a negative impact on the students themselves.

Equity Issues

One potentially negative and unanticipated consequence related to whether equity issues had been explicitly considered and addressed during the conception and implementation of the new calendar in multi-track schools. This related to the potential inequities that might arise if track assignments resulted in all children from a specific ethnic or socio-economic background or academic orientation were grouped together on a track in ways that advantaged some tracks and disadvantaged others. This potential for inequity had been addressed successfully in Frances Howell District when students were allocated to tracks by neighborhoods, with the boundaries being shifted slightly when demographics changed. In this district, parents were never asked for track preferences, but children were assigned to tracks and therefore to school sub-communities by the school and district policy. The way this was accomplished was the distribution of students according to convenient bus routes (rather than parental request). Of course, allocating students to tracks according to bus routes could result in inequities. But in Frances Howell, as
demographic shifts in the population occurred, the bus routes were adjusted slightly.\(^1\)

I was told that wherever parental requests for specific track assignments were permitted there was a potential for inequity. In Delphi District and in Stephen Lewis Junior High School, although intended to offer choice for parents, unmitigated track choice resulted in inequity. Educators from both districts reported that parents who were the most educated and knowledgeable about the processes of schooling, and therefore likely already the most involved in their children’s education, tended to select tracks first, opting for the track most like the traditional calendar and choosing those teachers that were reputed to be the “best.” Other parents then had to take what was left over. Unfortunately, this tended to segregate students by ethnicity, home language, socio-economic status, and parental background.

This inequity was particularly noticeable in Stephen Lewis Junior High School when student test scores were analyzed by track, with one track having a mean score as much as 40% below the mean scores of another track. The problem, as in Delphi District, was that parents had a choice of track, and the school had no policies to mitigate demographic inequities that resulted. Parents necessarily make choices in the best interest of their children and their family, but may be unaware of the whole picture of the needs of the school. Thus, the principal must have the ability

\(^1\) For example, if the 360° "pie" were divided with the first track beginning at 0° and going to the 72°, the next going to 144° and so on, with the population shift, the first track might begin at 15° with each of five tracks still comprising 72°. Hence the change in the angle of the line would result in a redistribution of the route that is more equitable.
to use procedures that override, when necessary, the ability of parents to make choices that would be detrimental to others.

**Trust and Public Image**

Many of the unanticipated consequences seemed to relate to the ways in which the implementation of a YRS calendar mobilized public opinion either in favor of or opposed to the innovation. This is true whether the innovation was voluntary or mandated, small or large scale, or implemented early in the life history of YRS or considerably later.

Overall, principals reported that regardless of the impetus for the implementation, as they provided information to their parent and community groups, surveyed their communities, and prepared (in some cases) for a decisive vote, they garnered not only some opposition, but considerable support for the school. What they seemed not to have anticipated was that this support would persist beyond the initial implementation and result in a more informed and more involved parent community.

In Frances Howell, another initial unforeseen outcome of implementing a multi-track year-round school calendar in 1969 was the extensive media attention as well as attention from educators from school districts around the country. This was also true for Kate Smith Elementary School in which I was shown large posters and extensive binders of media reports covering the first year of the school. Educators from Stephen Lewis Junior High School reported a similar phenomenon in that not only had the school opening received extensive media coverage, but they had also received visitors from across Canada and throughout the United States.
In Frances Howell, there was a unique unanticipated consequence. A superintendent told us that because their year-round schools were often so large, the district always had available positions for assistant principals, positions that no neighboring district had. She explained that this resulted in Frances Howell District providing the training ground for neighboring districts' administrators, for often after serving an assistant principal position in Frances Howell, a leader returned to his or her home district to a principalship (KZ).

In Florida, particularly in Central and Vista Districts, I learned that when numerous promises were made that were not fulfilled, year-round schooling became symbolic of an uncommitted and unsupportive district office. The implementation of policies that were seen to achieve cost savings on the backs of the teachers and school-based administrators led not only to frustration but to outrage. The complication of the elected superintendency contributed to the problem but the major issue was the lack of trust because of the apparent lack of attention paid to the wishes of the educators and parents. While the failure of reform implemented with untenable promises is likely not to be unanticipated, the educational leaders in these districts somehow failed to foresee the consequences in terms of public backlash.

Another important unanticipated outcome was the failure of the extensively consultative and participatory processes introduced at Stephen Lewis Junior High School. Teacher-leaders told us there was too much consultation about too many things. Too much voice was time consuming but resulted in few decisions. Many things were "made up" as they went along, with people "finding themselves working on strategies and then wondering when a related decision had been made" (BR).
Learning team leaders had so much power and autonomy that the sense of "schoolness" dissipated. Because all of these processes required excellence in communication skills and strategies, when communication broke down, the results were both tragic and shattering for the innovative program itself.

In Lakota Elementary School in Sweetwater District, as in Vista District, most of the unexpected outcomes were unanticipated by participants, but do not come as a surprise to anyone who hears the story of its implementation. There, what was unanticipated by the school principal, was the limited interest in and support for the calendar. Yet, I have argued previously that this was due in large part to lack of communication and promotion as well as to a lack of clarity with respect to goals and implementation procedures. Perhaps the most surprising outcome I identified here was the extent to which having a good (or in this case a poor) teacher involved in an innovation makes it successful or unsuccessful.

Overall, it was the implementation processes and procedures of the school and district leaders, more than any specific feature of the YR calendar itself that prompted the school community to offer either support or resistance. Where educational leaders were open, consultative, and flexible, they normally generated trust; where they were secretive or offered misinformation, the community responded negatively. In order to transform the school and larger communities, school leaders needed to be willing to use their power and to do so in morally responsible ways.
New and Transformative Norms

A central tenet of the conceptual framework that informed this study was transformative leadership. It was, nevertheless a surprise to me to discover the extent to which, in some cases, the introduction of YRS had actually had a transformative impact on a school or neighborhood.

In some cases, the new calendar simply changed the way people thought about and practiced “schooling”; in other cases, it brought about significant change to the wider community itself. For example, the fact that Frances Howell School District became known for having the longest running multi-track year-round school in the United States gave it a mark of notoriety that was unanticipated. The expansion of the calendar throughout the district permitted it to maintain a unique status (although unsought and largely unrecognized). Because the calendar has been so entrenched, educators said it promoted a more flexible and more natural rhythm of schooling and family life throughout the district. Although they had not expected to remain on a year-round calendar, year-round became, as one principal told us “the way we do education in Frances Howell School District” (WC). Delphi District in Utah found the same thing. Although the YR calendar had not been instituted throughout the district, it became accepted as the way in which all new schools and many existing schools operated. Neither district found it necessary to conduct studies, to compare its attendance or achievement with that of neighbors; rather, there was simply a deep belief that the calendar was better for students and teachers and helped the district to offer quality educational programs.
Joseph's approach in Albert District led to an unanticipated consequence of a different sort—a change in district policy. While Joseph had no doubt in his mind about the positive impact of a year-round school calendar for his school community, he had not anticipated that it would become district policy to require the school council of all new schools to examine alternative calendars before settling on the appropriate one for their school. This led to a greater awareness of the constraints of the traditional (so-called agrarian) calendar and to increased conversation throughout the district about various aspects of organizational structure and school programs.

The most significant unanticipated consequences of this study, at least in terms of the transformative potential of the innovation, related to the dramatic impact not only on student outcomes, but also on community involvement, identified in both Martin Popper and Jerico Elementary Schools. The extent of the impact warrants its inclusion here rather than in the previous section that addressed other impacts on students.

In Martin Popper, the introduction of a ST-YRS calendar was accompanied by a dramatic decrease in the transient rate (from 74% to 61%) which Jane stated had also had a positive impact on student learning. Here, I discuss it here as an issue of transformation. The change was explained by Jane in terms of parents seeing that the school was making a difference, feeling accepted, believing that the school cared about their children, and was doing everything possible to make a difference. Jane reported that not only was the rapid increase in student achievement and test score results unanticipated, but also the fact that parents tried to find jobs in the
neighborhood so that their children could continue to attend the school. Several years later, the parents were not only more involved in the life of the school, but had also taken pains to improve the community itself, forming committees to clean up the neighborhood and to provide support for families in need of assistance.

Esther had a similar experience with her school. Her ingenuity (based around the calendar change) had included many activities that involved the community. Because of these, the highly transient and largely uninvolved community itself began to take an interest in the life of the school. She had a volunteer translator in the office to help Spanish-speaking parents to negotiate the bureaucracy of their children's education. Parents took advantage of her GED programs and were learning to tutor their children in critical subjects. They volunteered at school “fairs” and helped the school to raise needed monies to fund their intersession and after-school programs. She had not anticipated the degree of reciprocation that the community would show when the school demonstrated a commitment to it.

Moreover, in both cases, institutional responses to significant improvement in test scores on the part of populations that had not normally been high performing magnetized support for the school. We have seen that in Jerico School, the scores improved so much that Esther was suspected of “cheating” by the Florida State Office of Education. We noted that in Martin Popper School, Jane had to argue with her district to have her status changed from a “B” to the “A” that the school had earned. Each case suggests the extent to which the school district and the state office responses implied a deficit mentality. Nevertheless, these two school principals said they had been surprisingly instrumental in changing public awareness
and attitudes as they demonstrated that students from minority and socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds could perform as well as students in higher socio-economic areas of the state. Hence, the major unexpected outcome of the year-round calendar in Taft district (and in the wider study) was the extent to which it helped to dispel the common mythology that children from disadvantaged homes would always perform at a lower standard than their more advantaged peers.

Because they were willing to act, to use and share power, and to function with sense of moral purpose, both Jane and Ether had had a profound impact on their schools and the wider communities. Each is a good example of a transformative leader.

Summary of Findings

Taken together, this study of leaders' implementation of year-round schooling, a reform generally thought to be limited to a change of school-year calendar, has demonstrated the complexity of change (Bakhtin, 1986; Bourdieu, 1993) and specifically of educational change (Fullan, 1993; Levin, 2001, Shields, 2002). I have found that even a reform that seems as straightforward as changing the school calendar may be introduced for a variety of reasons. The educational leaders I studied used, with varying degrees of success, many different implementation procedures and processes. Educators across the country chose to implement the same reform as a response to different challenges in their contexts and in order to accomplish different outcomes. Further, they perceived that the implementation of a form of YR calendar, not only permitted the accomplishment of their goals, but was often accompanied by unanticipated outcomes. The combination and interplay of
these factors resulted in some new understandings that permit me to identify, in
Chapter 8, some of the lessons learned from this study and to make some
recommendations related to the successful implementation of educational change.
CHAPTER 8: LOOKING FORWARD

In previous chapters, I have presented the background and rationale for this study, a brief history of the development of the school calendar, the guiding questions and conceptual framework, and the findings based on interviews of many educators in schools and districts throughout North America. Here I recap the study and then revisit my overarching question in the light of the findings as well as the conceptual framework developed in Chapter 3. I conclude by identifying some lessons learned from this study and making some related recommendations.

Overview of the Study

I set out to investigate whether there is a relationship between transformative leadership with its constituent ideas of agency, moral purpose, and power, and the ability to successfully introduce sustainable school change. Through a series of interviews, I examined why and how educational leaders, at school and district levels, continued to promote and introduce school-calendar change (commonly known as year-round schooling) in the face of what were often substantial political and social battles.

In Chapter 1, I introduced the study and defined some of the most commonly used terms, among them single-track, dual-track, multi-track calendars, and intersession. Chapter 2 provided a historical overview that demonstrated that some form of modified calendar has been a part of the educational landscape in North America since the mid 1800s and that it recurs with increased intensity and interest.
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at various times in the history of education, each time with a different impetus. Chapter 3 provided a review of the literature related to year-round schooling, including some of the commonly perceived advantages and disadvantages. There I also reviewed some of the literature on educational change and identified some current perspectives relevant to transformative educational leadership. Here I argued that in part, it is the ways in which we are used to thinking about education (our habitus) that may inhibit educational change such as the introduction of year-round schooling (Bourdieu, 1993). I also posited that looking from the borders and the outside, as Bakhtin suggests (1986), might provide a new lens for understanding. Most importantly, I developed the hypothesis that successful educational change (change that is enduring and supported) might best be introduced by transformative educational leaders acting with agency, moral purpose, and ethical use of power.

For the focus of this study, I decided to look at leaders in schools that were changing their school calendars to what is often referred to as year-round schooling. In this, I had something of an insider/outsider status—as knowledgeable about year-round schooling but as an outsider to the specific schools studied. The approach I took is described in Chapter 4, where I identified my personal position, outlined my data collection sources, described my analytical processes, and reported how I chose to present the data through the stories contained in Chapters 5 and 6. My respondents came from three jurisdictions in the United States and three in Canada, some in which the reform was mandated and others in which it was voluntarily instituted by school leaders. They came from schools with various calendars—multi, single, and dual-track that had been implemented between 1969 and 1999.
Through a series of interviews, I examined why and how educational leaders, at school and district levels, continue to promote and introduce school-calendar change (commonly known as year-round schooling) in the face of what are often substantial political and social battles. Chapter 5 presented the stories of selected schools and districts in the United States and Chapter 6 told the stories of schools in several Canadian jurisdictions. In chapter 7, I revisited my guiding questions and discussed my findings. There I demonstrated that the impetus for the reform (whether voluntary or mandated) had little to do with its viability, but the implementation processes and procedures used by the school leader were critical. A calendar change was implemented to accomplish various goals, from accommodating more students in existing buildings to bettering the learning experience of children to achieving equity. Not only were explicit goals realized, but many unanticipated outcomes were also found.

On the basis of the insights gleaned from the analysis and discussion of my data, I now discuss some of the major lessons learned from this study and make some related recommendations both for further practice and subsequent research.

Lessons Learned

In this section, using as an organizer the conceptual framework developed in Chapter 3, I draw together the findings from my five research questions to consider some of the major lessons that may be drawn from this study. Here I revisit the framework to determine what has been learned about year-round schooling itself, about educational reform more generally, about transformative educational leadership, and about the inter-relationships among these three parts of my
framework. In each section I also make some recommendations that emerge from the lessons learned.

Lessons Learned about Year-Round Schooling

This was not specifically a study of year-round schooling, but rather a study in which the calendar change was the vehicle for examining and understanding the motivations and accomplishments of school leaders in introducing the calendar. YRS in this study was conceived of as an instance of more general educational reform. I started with the literature on year-round schooling to determine what I might anticipate from educators in terms of their goals and the potential outcomes they might have identified. However, as I reviewed this literature, it appeared that the purported benefits clearly outweighed the disadvantages and that they tended to fall into three categories: fiscal accountability, educational benefits, and community impact. Principals' expressed convictions about these benefits and their commitment to make positive change provided reasons for them to persist with change efforts, sometimes in the face of opposition.

Fiscal and facility benefits. One lesson learned from this study is that educators implement YRS because they are convinced it is an educational reform that has the potential to provide benefits in terms of fiscal and facility economies. When the goal in selecting YRS was fiscal benefits, the calendar change was always initiated from outside the school, mandated at the state or district level. This outside mandate was not directly associated with the success or failure of the reform; it rarely involved efforts to develop collaborative structures within schools (Fullan, 1999) or to develop learning organizations (Senge, 1990). Nevertheless, all
participants recognized its ability to accommodate more children in existing buildings and averted or postponed the need for new buildings. Further, as in the cases of Frances Howell and Delphi Districts the reform persisted until it became a normal part of the educational fabric. This study has found, as have others reported extensively in the literature, that when the goal of implementation was to achieve fiscal savings, YRS was successful (Denton & Walenta, 1993; Hough et al., 1990; Zykowski et al., 1991).

Educational benefits. Generally success had more to do with the way in which the reform was implemented than with the location of the impetus. Although Hargreaves and Fullan (1998) downplayed the importance of structural change, I learned from my analysis of my participants' comments and experiences, not only that YRS can accomplish the goal of increasing the capacity of existing facilities, it can be a catalyst for positive changes in teaching and learning as well. As numerous studies had previously found (Baker, 1990; Bradford, 1993; Grotjean & Banks, 1993; Kneese, 1996; Los Angeles Unified School District, 1982-83; Mutchler, 1993; Peltier, 1991; Perry, 1991; Winters, 1995), my respondents were also convinced of and committed to the educational benefits of a change to year-round school, a change they found can be of particular benefit to "at-risk" students (Capps & Cox, 1991; Gandara & Fish, 1994; Perry, 1991; Serifs, 1990). This was evident in both multi-track sites (Frances Howell and Delphi Districts), and also in single and dual track implementations (Albert and Taft Districts).

Sleegers, Geijsel, and van den Berg (2002) suggested that a structural change is often a reflection of a desire to control behaviors toward desired outcomes
For the most part, this did not seem to be true among my respondents where a calendar change was most often associated, not with additional control, but with increased flexibility and freedom. Moreover, where the implementation seemed to go hand in hand with a desire for power, a lack of communication, and excessive control (as in several Florida Districts and the situation in Sweetwater), the positive outcomes found elsewhere did not materialize.

**Transformative benefits.** The literature reports that a change to YRS can enhance the quality of school life by reducing absenteeism and burn-out and increasing the attendance and motivation of teachers and students. It can decrease transciency, vandalism, and student tensions and it can prompt a change in the ways in which teachers think and talk about teaching and learning (Baker, 1990; Bradford, 1993; Brekke, 1983; LAUSD, 1983; Shields & Oberg, 2000; White, 1988).

It can also, as discovered through the interviews with my respondents, provide a new context for educational activities in which the renewed enthusiasm and increased conversation may help to change the ways in which teachers think about the abilities of specific groups of students, learn to reject deficit thinking, and to be more inclusive of all members of the school community. As these changes occur, educators often reported that there was increased support and involvement on the part of the wider community. This is consistent with the Fullan's (2003) assertion of the importance of changing context. He states that “to change immediate context, even in small ways can result in new behaviors—in short order” (p. 27). He makes the connection between such a change and transformation of outcomes by saying that contexts may be hard to alter but transformative change by
definition means changing the context. Individual backgrounds can't be fixed because they are in the past; contexts can be because they are now. (p. 27)

Educators report that implementing a form of new school-year calendar changes the educational context for the school and its community in small but significant ways that I have found in this study to be transformative.

Summary. All school leaders in this study (even in what might be considered as failing implementations) believed that YRS had the potential to make a positive difference to the educational experiences of children and to the educational climate of their school. Moreover, this was true whether the idea and impetus for the change had been theirs or had come from elsewhere. In general, I found that the impetus for the introduction of a year-round school calendar played relatively little role in determining its success. Regardless of whether the reform was mandated or voluntary, single, dual, or multi-track, it sometimes garnered considerable widespread support and at other times provoked strong dissatisfaction. Sometimes it succeeded (as defined in Chapter 1) in that it was continued over time, fulfilled the stated goals, and was widely supported and accepted by the school and wider communities it served. Sometimes it failed, in the sense that it did not fulfill the original explicit goals and was not accepted by the school and wider communities.

Regardless of the extent to which benefits were realized, the educational leaders who successfully implemented a calendar change were always conscious that the calendar itself was not a panacea. The recognized its potential to create a schedule within which other changes could also be introduced to improve student learning. The implementation and outcomes were positive or negative depending
primarily on the skills, focus, processes, integrity, and commitment of the school principal, in short, depending on his or her leadership style and approach.

The potential for YRS to be beneficial to students, educators, families, and the wider community was determined to be so compelling that Albert District, strongly influenced by Joseph’s enthusiasm, conviction, and success, developed an innovative policy. It required the leaders and councils of all new schools to carefully consider which school calendar would be most appropriate for their specific community and school. A further lesson, therefore, to be learned from this study is that YRS might profitably be included in discussions about school policy.

Lessons Learned about Educational Reform

Given the extent of current YRS implementation with over two million North American students enrolled in some form of balanced or modified school calendar, and given the findings of extensive possibilities for educational change, it is surprising that there is little mention in the educational reform literature of school calendar change. Moreover, studying the motivations and experiences of educational leaders as they bring about such a change can inform educational change initiatives more generally. In this section, I identify some of the lessons learned from this study that can also have wider implication. In general, these lessons fall under the headings of the importance of process, the need for goal clarity, and overcoming resistance and habitus.

The importance of process. One key feature of the success or failure of each educator was his or her awareness of processes that were appropriate for the specific context of the school and district in question. In each successful case,
adaptation was ongoing in recognition of changing circumstances over time. This is consistent, of course, with much thinking about educational reform that focuses on change as a journey (or a series of processes) rather than an event (Fullan, 1993). It is also congruent with current thinking on the importance of understanding complexity theory (Fullan, 2003; Morrison, 2002). Morrison asserts that complexity comes from a Latin word meaning "to entwine" and states that one key concept is "the notion that an organism interacts dynamically with its environment, influencing and, in turn, being influenced by its environment" (p. 5). Fullan (2003) emphasizes the importance of understanding this intricate relationship, saying:

You cannot get to new horizons without grasping the essence of complexity theory. The trick is to learn to become a tad more comfortable with the awful mystery of complex systems, to do fewer things, to aggravate what is already a centrifugal problem, resist controlling the uncontrollable, and to learn to use key complexity concepts to design and guide more powerful learning systems. You need to tweak and trust the process of change while knowing that it is unpredictable. (p. 21)

Thus, both theory and practice provide evidence of the need to attend to—"to tweak"—processes while at the same time realizing that the outcomes may be unpredictable. The more successful leaders in this study understood this. They recognized the need for open and honest communication, for building support through this communication, for accepting and dealing with conflict, and for persevering to accomplish their goals. They were flexible and adaptable, willing to take risks, to try things that had not been tried before, but were able to keep their perspective.
I have learned how Wilma, Gene, and the Utah educators had to learn how to adapt the reform to their respective contexts and cultures. Each had to develop schedules, determine bus routes, ensure the availability of supplies, and provide support for schools on the new calendar within the framework of district norms and possibilities. Joseph, Esther, and Jane constantly revised their processes, communicating with their publics, and finding strategies to build support and involvement for the decisions they were taking. In other words, they asked, "How can we make the vision of year-round schooling work?" They did not, however, ask the public's permission to implement their reforms. They did not assume support, nor make untenable promises, but worked with their school staffs and communities, never abrogating their positions as educational leaders.

Successful principals in this study paid particular attention to the specifics of their context. In order to implement a calendar change, they attended both to the school culture and to the details of the structural change. This is consistent with the finding of Fullan and Hargreaves (1998) that "without structural change, community pressures and educational innovations just overwhelm [teachers]" (p. 25). Thus, they have taught me that the introduction of year-round schooling was often the catalyst and impetus for changing cultures—including the ways in which teachers thought about planning, the ways in which parents thought about vacations and child-care, the ways in which administrators thought about scheduling, equity, and community involvement, even the ways in which community agencies delivered services. Especially when the implementation was done carefully and developed and adapted to the local context (see for example Frances Howell, Delphi, Albert, and Taft
Districts) respondents deemed that the structural change had a positive impact on the culture of the school and often the district. In those cases in which implementers failed to consider the local situation, and tried to impose a sort of “cookie-cutter approach” from elsewhere (as in Vista, Central, and Lakota Districts), the change had a toxic impact on cultures, and consequently on the reputation of the innovation itself. The failure of the implementation in Central County, for example, was said to have had a chilling effect on surrounding communities such as Sage District, indeed, on the rest of Florida. It is this cultural outcome that educators such as Jane and Esther fight against in order to improve the education they offer to their students.

At times, the processes of consultation and collaboration also seemed problematic. Gwen failed to recognize the importance of building a base of support. Perhaps because it had worked elsewhere, it seemed natural that the reform would be widely embraced. Stephen Lewis’ example demonstrates most clearly the result of taking the concepts of participation and collaboration to the extreme, leaving every decision to be made by a committee, and ensuring frustration, and time-consuming debates about the most inconsequential of issues and processes. One of the implications of this study is that there are limits to the amount of collaboration and participation that reform can endure before it becomes so watered down or so extensively modified that the original vision is lost.

Although there is no doubt that consultation and the institution of consultative and participatory processes may build support and commitment for an innovation, they may also backfire. As I saw in Stephen Lewis Junior High School, too much involvement may lead to a lack of decision making and end up in endless and time
and energy-consuming discussions. More importantly, consultation does not ensure either balance or equity. This is particularly true if parents make decisions that benefit them without consideration of the impact on others. For example, I found that the seemingly innocuous decision to allow parental choice in track selection tended to result in the ghettoization of certain socio-ethnic or cultural groups. For that reason, it is important for educators and policy makers to include and enforce policies that consider the good of the whole school community. As found earlier (Shields & Oberg, 2001), choice must be bounded in the interests of equity if reform is to be successful. Moreover, once parents or students have chosen a particular calendar, they cannot continue to expect to attend all assemblies, for example, or to have the same vacation benefits as those on a different calendar.

The need for goal clarity. One specific difference between successful and unsuccessful principals and reforms appears to have been the degree to which the principals understood the goals of the implementation and were able to communicate them clearly. As Barth (1990) says, "In order to move a school from where it is to where one's vision would have it be, it is necessary to convey what the vision is" (p. 134). Thus, in the first two instances, Frances Howell and Delphi District, the principals worked with the district to accommodate children in existing buildings. They did not make additional promises, but accepted the need for fiscal accountability. At the same time, as they discovered the benefits to teachers and students, they were tireless in their willingness to communicate them. The potential benefits identified previously—improved academic achievement, increased motivation, reduced stress, less vandalism, decreased review time, and more
balanced opportunities for structured lessons and learning—were all outcomes that were constantly communicated in the educators' ongoing work to maintain support for the calendar.

There was an apparent lack of clarity in the implementation of Central, Vista, Sage, Lakota Districts, and even Stephen Lewis School. They were "reforming" or "temporarily solving a problem" or "providing choice" without clarity about what kind of choice, the reasons for it, the problems to be solved, or the reasons for the reform. In these cases (with the possible exception of Vista District), reform for the sake of reform seemed to be the norm.

The best examples of goal clarity resulting in successful implementation were those led by Joseph, Esther, and Jane—each of whom chose (or in Esther's case used) the particular form of calendar (dual track, multi-track, or single-track) in order to improve the learning environment, opportunities, and outcomes of their student populations. Moreover, where the reform was instituted with the explicit goal of making a difference to student achievement, principals reported that the YRS calendar was successful in helping the school attain its goal. Therefore, one of the most important, and perhaps least anticipated, outcomes of this study is that goal clarity is essential to a successful structural change.

**Overcoming resistance and habitus.** We saw in Chapter 2 that the current "traditional" school calendar was developed over a long period of time and as a result of compromises designed to permit the development of common curriculum. However, in part because of the structuring processes ascribed by Bourdieu (1993) to fields such as education, the compromise calendar over time became the
calendar enshrined in and perpetuating various aspects of North American culture. It became part of the habitus of schooling. As much of the population moved from rural to urban areas, the long summer vacation became anticipated by families and organizations alike and soon became inviolate. As with any cultural artifact, numerous interests, such as camping associations, marketing divisions of large retail outlets, and many workplaces, developed stakes in perpetuating the so-called agrarian calendar—developed around the rhythm of a long summer vacation followed by back-to-school times and the general public accepted the calendar as normative, or as Tyack (1974) it as the "one best system" of organizing schooling.

This concept of habitus also helps to explain why, in almost every implementation, participants identified tensions and conflict related to the introduction of YRS. For the most part, the fears and concerns originating from parents and sometimes constituents in the wider community were symptomatic of the educational habitus—the educational culture (or fields) that had become traditions over time. This resulted in a hesitancy to embrace change but also to misperceptions that later often proved to be straw men. Thus, successful educational leaders understood resistance to a new calendar as a normal part of the change process and took steps to address and overcome it. As people acquired more experience with the new school-year calendar, earlier misperceptions disappeared and acceptance grew.

Bakhtin (1986) explained this as outsidedness or learning on the margins, whereby people learn that boundaries are permeable and develop new understandings as they come into contact with ideas from the outside. Because he
saw society in a state of constant flux and change as being a natural process, he advocated the use of dialogue to develop new meanings and promote ongoing change.

For Bakhtin, dialogue is not simply talk. It is not necessarily speech at all, but an ontology, a way of life. Dialogue is living in openness to new concepts, not as reified things, but as ever changing meanings. He writes,

*A meaning only reveals its depths once it has encountered and come into contact with another, foreign meaning: they engage in a kind of dialogue, which surmounts the closedness and one-sidedness of these particular meanings, these cultures.* (1986, p. 7)

As people who had only experienced traditional calendars came into contact with and experienced a different way of organizing the school calendar, beliefs changed and acceptance grew.

Most early implementations of YRS were mandated because of fiscal and physical challenges within a district, but as awareness increased about the potential benefits of a calendar change, school leaders tended to initiate the reform in the belief it would make a positive difference to their schools and communities. Although they knew in advance they would face resistance, they said they met the challenge willingly, convinced of the benefits of the new calendar, and they initiated dialogue with parents, teachers, and the wider community to gain support and develop new understanding. Each started with the same goal, but as I explore in the next section, those who implemented successful change took on the mantle of transformative leadership in order to push the boundaries of the habitus of education and create new and more effective structures of schooling in their contexts.
Summary. I have learned that various elements of educational reform are intricately interrelated. To implement change in structures that have become normative over time requires an understanding of their complexity.

The processes in which implementers of reform engage are crucial to their success. When educational leaders attempt to predict and control all aspects of the change, or paradoxically, when they permit consultation and discussion to go on without closure, effective change cannot occur. Process is central but one unmistakable lesson from this study is that leadership is not simply a matter of effective communication and consultative processes. Educational leaders wanting to effect meaningful change must have a clear sense of the context and what they want to accomplish. They must communicate the goals unambiguously and develop shared commitment to these goals. When the goals are vague or co-opted by others the processes become ends in themselves and the change fails. In order to overcome the inertia of the habitus of education in North America, educational leaders need to be willing to face conflict and take up the challenge of dealing effectively with resistance to change.

Lessons Learned about Transformative Leadership

Leadership at many levels is critically important for successful educational reform. Some studies have found that the formal leader plays a particularly important role in effecting change (Born, 1996; Burns, 1978; Furman & Shields, 2003; Silins & Mulford, 2005). Others suggest the importance of more distributed, team leadership. Fairholm (2000) states that

leadership is ... a task of creating teams unified by a common mind-set about a purpose and values that both leader and led can use to
measure group and personal progress. The leader-created culture embodies institutional purpose. Leaders preach it to others and behave personally according to it. They attain follower support because the attitudes and purposes they articulate come to mean as much to group members as they do to the leader. (p. 85)

Thus, successful change relies not only on the efforts of a leader, but on the extent to which the team is empowered.

When I explored the concept of transformative leadership in Chapter 3, I identified the three topics of agency, moral purpose, and power as constituent parts. Here I return to these concepts as a way of focusing the lessons learned about leadership.

Agency. This is a term that implies both the desire and the ability to act in order to achieve one's mission, goals, and objectives in a proactive way. Despite the importance of agency on the part of school leaders (Ogawa, 2005), they cannot always overcome the impact of unwise policies, ill-advised school practices, or pressures from outside forces. The examples of Central, Vista, and Lakota show the detrimental effects of district involvement (or lack thereof) that does not understand or adequately support the desired change.

Although principals were able to implement reform without district support, no district was successful without principals who exercised agency at the school level. These leaders are critically important. Wilma Cole in Frances Howell School District was an innovative and forward-thinking leader who rose to the challenge provided by Gene Henderson and began a process that became “the way” education happened in the district. Joseph, Esther, and Jane acted almost single-handedly to prove, not only that year-round schooling could work, but that it could be good for communities, families, and especially for children. Joseph and Jane accomplished this in spite of
initial resistance from their districts. Esther worked to overcome the general belief that although the calendar might permit the accommodation of more children in school, there was no way it could help facilitate such a dramatic improvement in student learning.

Although individual principals in Delphi District were not given a choice as to whether to implement or not, the district soon learned (as the assistant superintendent told me) that they had to put their strongest and best principals in the schools they wanted to change to multi-track year-round schedules. Despite the fact that these principals were not responsible for taking the initial decision, the district relied on their sense of agency in order for the implementation to be successful.

The principals of the less successful change efforts also exercised agency. Gwen in Lakota School and the succession of principals at Stephen Lewis Junior Secondary School almost equally single-handedly spelled the failure of their respective reforms. Their actions related to implementing the goals of the reform resulted in failure. In Lakota District, the problem was that, although the superintendent knew the implementation in Sweetwater School was not successful, he permitted the principal to exercise agency beyond a reasonable length of time. This disadvantaged parents and students, and ultimately resulted in the discontinuation of the calendar district-wide. In Central and Vista Districts, unrealistic promises and lack of attention to detail caused the demise of year-round schooling.

The vital role of the principal in each of these cases—for good or ill—is incontrovertible. Yet it is clear that agency in and of itself is not enough to effect
successful educational change. It is for that reason that agency must be accompanied by a sense of moral purpose if reform is to proceed in desirable ways.

**Moral purpose.** Moral purpose suggests a clear relationship between the goals of educational leadership and the ways in which it is practiced to effect positive change or to bestow positive benefit on the school community. Indeed it is the moral purpose or lack of moral purpose that explains and accounts for our actions. In this study, one of the major lessons learned is the importance of moral purpose for those who would introduce beneficial educational change.

This is consistent with the current mantra of education expressing the need for moral leadership (Fullan, 2003; Furman & Shields, 2003; Sergivanni, 1992; Starratt, 1991, 1995). The positive outcomes I have identified were associated with transparent goals and an unambiguous sense of purpose. Open, honest, modest, purposeful changes were instituted by the leaders that were the most successful. As Shields (2003) states, "Good intentions are not enough." Good intentions, as evidenced by leaders like Gwen in Canada and Dana Lougheed in Florida, and by Naomi St. John, the initiating principal of Stephen Lewis Junior High School, did not result in positive or lasting outcomes. In each case, the visions were cloudy, the goals were imprecise, and to some extent, personal ambition got in the way of success. Where principals worked tirelessly with their teachers and wider school communities for the good of the children, seemingly giving little thought to personal advancement or glory, their moral purpose helped them to achieve successful reforms.
This is particularly evident in the stories of people like Gene Henderson who faced a lawsuit and the possible loss of his job or Joseph who dealt as kindly with picketers outside his school as with the media who supported his reform, or Esther who took her van of data to the state capital, or even of Jane who fought long and hard to gain the “A” status the school was entitled to, despite the district’s misgivings. Clear vision in and of itself did not bring about their success, but backbone, and a strong sense of moral purpose were required.

Power. Agency and moral purpose, however, may still not result in transformative leadership. One may have the will to act (agency) and a clear sense of moral purpose but still not have the power, either formal or informal to turn one’s intentions and desires into positive outcomes. Further, this study has demonstrated that productive school leaders not only use the power they have but also empower others (Silins & Mulford, 2002).

This was evident in the failed implementation of Vista District in which the school leaders had the will and sense of agency as well as the knowledge and moral purpose required to implement positive reform, but the district had acted in ways that disempowered them. School leaders could not make modifications relevant to their specific context; they were not able to introduce processes to garner support; and they were unable to take power to change the negative district policies. In neighboring Sage District, the superintendent implied that he had had the power (evidenced by the fact that he had introduced the YRS program) and he had knowledge that seemed to reflect moral purpose in that he explicitly talked about the benefits of YRS. When the issue came before the school board, he failed to exercise
the power vested in him by virtue of his position and his conviction to make an argument for what he told me was the best educational option.

Although power was sometimes seen as negative (Seidman & Alexander, 2001), and especially in the implementations of YRS that did not last, for the most part power in this study was found not only to be positive but essential for leaders wanting to introduce change. Power in this sense is equated with the ability as well as the desire to act in order to influence others and accomplish one's goals. Gene and Wilma took advantage of the pressures for change and used their power to implement a reform that was, at the time, only partly conceptualized. Nevertheless, it was their willingness to take their sense of purpose and agency and to use power ethically that made it possible for Frances Howell School District to become one of the early implementers of the reform. I have argued earlier that Joseph, Esther, and Jane were motivated by a sense of moral purpose—a desire to improve the educational experiences of the students in their respective school. Yet, without taking action, in the face of resistance, their reforms would never have come to fruition. They had to actively choose to use the power they had and to build on it in order to achieve their desired outcomes. In fact, Joseph, Jane, Esther found that community and parental support increased because of the consultations related to the implementation of year-round schooling; in turn each had gained more power to convince the district of the importance of the new school calendar.

Sharing power in terms of inviting the involvement of and collaborating with members of the wider community was also found to be an important factor in the ethical use of power. Delphi District shared power by empowering its YRS principals
by instituting special processes and giving some additional resources to them.

Joseph empowered his school-community to make the decision about whether to go forward with a calendar change and to determine which type of calendar to implement. Jane empowered her vice principal to analyze the test data and make the case for being an "A" school with the district; she also empowered her teachers to make decisions about how to conduct intersession. Power sharing was not only an important element of the success of these leaders, it is increasingly evident in the literature. Hargreaves and Fullan (1998) state that "parents and other community members are crucial and largely untapped resources who have ... assets and expertise that are essential to the partnership" (p. 68). Senge and others (2000) talk about the importance of "administrators sharing more and more power" (p. 400). The findings of this study not only support the need for an educational leader to share power but demonstrate that when it is shared, one often acquires more power.

Summary: Transformative educational leadership. When agency, moral purpose, and power are used together they provide the basis for not only ethical but transformative leadership. As Bogotch (2000) suggests, they permit deliberate intervention that uses power morally for the good of the wider community. Part of transformation, as we saw in Chapter 3, is the ability to identify inequities and to distribute and redistribute resources to redress them.

Fraser (1995) says that to redress inequities in resource allocation, we must redistribute resources. She goes on to say that if the inequities are cultural or social, we must engage in what she calls the "politics of recognition" (p. 82) to identify and address them. Redistribution and recognition may be manifest in either affirmative or
transformative ways. Affirming the need for a single-track calendar, for example, in order to provide more continuous learning for her students, is an example of the ways in which Jane tried to overcome the inequitable opportunities often provided for her students to learn successfully. I have already noted that this attitude is quite rare among educators who often succumb to the difficulties of making a positive difference for those who are disadvantaged, reverting to a sort of "blame the victim" or deficit mentality. Yet the schools in this study in which the calendar change was introduced with clarity in order to improve student learning, received an additional unanticipated benefit. Not only did educators show me their state test results; they claimed the improvement was due, in large part, to the calendar. They also reported, again attributing it to the new calendar and to its opportunities for more continuous programming throughout the year, that there had been transformation within the teacher, parent, and student communities themselves.

This study has shown how educators have used the year-round school calendar to offer additional and ongoing support to students most in need of help, to provide stability and continuity for children and families whose lives are often traumatic and unstable. The examples of Martin Popper and Jerico Elementary Schools offer dramatic evidence that educators can also combine a clear focus on instruction with structural changes in the school-year calendar to enhance the academic achievement of students whose home or community environments are not generally seen to be particularly supportive.

We have seen that transiency was reduced as parents responded to the efforts of the school, made efforts to remain in the school catchment area, and
further, began to take pride both in their school and in their community as well. As the structural change affected the culture of the school, it also changed the culture of the community. Teachers began to believe students could learn; they made more efforts to visit families and to work with them. Students took pride in their ability and their school and lined up for additional classes during intersession. Thus, one critically important finding of this study is that educational reform may be transformative; it may be implemented in such as way as to have a positive social impact.

Educators who want to make a difference through the implementation of a change that has the potential to enhance the academic performance of children from the least advantaged groups in their schools must chose a reform carefully. The use of intersession, for example, may provide the additional learning time and support that helps children to be successful. As parents see their children's increased success, communication between home and school may also increase.

Transformative jurisdictional, district, or school leaders adopt the right choices for the right reasons. Both district educators and school-based administrators talk about and model moral leadership. No one abrogates his or her educational leadership responsibilities to the community or to a superior. This implies, for example, that choices made about the implementation of an educational reform should not unduly disadvantage some people in order for the reform to be perpetuated. It also means that outcomes should be carefully considered and monitored during the implementation of a reform.
The lessons learned from this study support the importance of the transformative educational leader, working with moral purpose, clear goals, and a strong sense of commitment to the children in their care, to institute processes and practices that made the reform work. In the next section, I make some recommendations based on these findings—recommendations that I hope will help policy makers and educational leaders alike as they institute reforms to meet the various and complex needs of students.

Recommendations

This study has found that successful policy reform may be initiated at different levels—by geo-political jurisdictions, districts, or schools. Policy and procedures may originate from top-down or from bottom-up (Fullan, 1993), but the origin is really not particularly important to a successful outcome. I have found that successful reform may be instituted by principals or by district personnel and that it may be mandated or voluntary. For that reason, it does not seem useful to differentiate the recommendations that arise from this study. They are applicable to all who are involved in creating policies and implementing educational reform. In particular, they are critically important for those wanting to introduce reform that will have a positive impact on student achievement. I present my recommendations to be consistent with my lessons learned under the headings of my conceptual framework: year-round schooling, educational reform, and transformative leadership.
Recommendations Related to Year-Round Schooling

1. If educators identify a need to enhance the capacity of existing buildings in order to achieve fiscal efficiencies, there is no significant reason to avoid mandating multi-track year-round schooling.

2. Despite some persistent negative beliefs about YRS, educational leaders who want to create conditions under which improvements in academic achievement may be realized might carefully consider a form of balanced school year calendar. This may be particularly true for students often considered to be “disadvantaged” or “at-risk.”

3. School leaders who want to make a difference in the quality of life of their teachers and students and to have a positive impact on the wider community, may want to reflect on how a balanced calendar might help to facilitate the desired transformation.

Recommendations about Educational Reform

1. Because contexts vary widely, educational change should be adapted to specific situations and constantly tweaked. Educational leaders should, however, recognize that the outcomes are unpredictable.

2. In order for people to understand and support a reform and assess its outcomes, a proposed reform should have clearly communicated and explicit goals.

3. To build support, it is important to inform, consult with, and involve the wider school community. At the same time, educational leaders must ensure that they never lose sight of their goals.
4. Current ways of organizing schooling are not sacrosanct. They are cultural artifacts that should not be underestimated in their power but at the same time should not be overestimated in their usefulness.

Recommendations about Transformative Leadership

1. Educational leaders need to understand the essential interconnections among agency, moral purpose, and power. Each requires the others for both effective educational reform and the practice of transformative leadership.

2. Educators introducing structural reforms to meet the needs of a specific community should determine how to adapt the reform to meet the needs of a specific community.

3. In the press to achieve support and community involvement and to introduce “voice and choice,” educational leaders must ensure that the needs of those who are absent or silent are also addressed.

4. Educators do not necessarily need to set out to transform society but should recognize that what happens in the school can and indeed, will, have an impact on the wider community.

Questions Raised: For Further Research

I have begun to understand through this research the power and potential of transformative leadership and would encourage other educational leaders and researchers to use and explore the concept more fully. I believe this study has demonstrated some connections between the separate the parts of my conceptual framework (see Figure 2). This study has therefore made a contribution to helping to bridge the gaps between what have been separate and discrete bodies of literature
Figure 2. New conceptual framework.

A literature map showing the relationships between literature on year-round schooling, educational change, and transformative leadership.
related specifically to year-round schooling, to educational reform, and to transformative leadership. I have found that year-round schooling is a viable and useful educational reform with significant benefits and transformative potential and hence deserves to be given a more central place in the literature of educational reform. In like fashion, considering educational change through the lens of transformative leadership with its interplay of agency, moral purpose, and power, helps to demonstrate the importance of taking these elements into consideration when initiating or studying educational reform.

This study not only developed a better understanding of some issues related to the successful implementation of educational reform, and particularly of the role of transformative leadership, it also raised some questions that might profitably be investigated further. These relate both to my findings and conceptual framework and include the following:

- How can educators bring the potential of YRS to the attention of those who are concerned with implementing educational reform that has the potential to have a positive impact on student outcomes?

- How can moral purpose be understood in a complex reform such as calendar change when sometimes the wishes of parents need to be over-ridden in the interests of a whole school community? Who defines it and how can this type of action be explained?

- What, if any, are the limits of such highly regarded processes as choice, participatory decision making, and collaboration?
• What is the relationship between formally appointed leaders and informal teacher-leaders in a reform process and what does power sharing actually look like?

• How do educational leaders achieve goal clarity when implementing a reform that is constantly changing, in part because of the need to be responsive to outside political forces?

• Is it possible for an educational leader to consciously set out to be transformative and how can we better understand the interactions of agency, moral purpose, and power?

There are, of course, other issues that I was not able to investigate in this study that cry out for further exploration. One of these relates to the issue of diversity and how (or whether) the ethnicity or gender of the school leader plays into the successful reform initiative. Although I would have liked to have broken down my data in this way, it was impossible, in that only one of my respondents was other than Caucasian, and because I chose to present composites to preserve some of the confidentiality of my respondents, thus possibly masking gender effects. These and likely many other questions come to mind on reading this study.

Concluding Comment: Looking Beyond

It is difficult to make recommendations about beliefs and attitudes, but one of the most important findings of this study, one I hope all educators and educational reformers and policy makers will take to heart, is that schools can make a difference to the educational achievement of all students and to the communities from which they come. Although this study did not attempt to demonstrate the academic benefits
of YRS and thus offers no proof that a year-round school calendar improves student achievement, the potential is there. Sometimes we tend to believe implicitly, if not state explicitly, that poor children, or children from single-parent households, or children of migrant workers, or those whose home language is not English (or another high status language) cannot learn as well as their middle or upper class counterparts, this is not true. Schools do not need to find excuses for lower achievement on the part of high needs populations. Educators do not necessarily need more money. Schools do not necessarily need more teachers or more resources. Districts do not necessarily need more or better school buildings. Parents do not necessarily need more consultation.

What this study has shown is that transformative educational leaders can make a difference to the learning environment of all students. I have examined various ways that educational leaders implemented a form of year-round, modified, or alternative school year calendar. I have found that whether the calendar was introduced to accommodate more children in school buildings, to provide choice for families, or specifically to improve student achievement, where the reform was implemented with agency, moral purpose, and ethical use of power, it was successful in accomplishing the intended goals. The reform also opened the door for other changes that helped to improve the learning opportunities and achievement of students who often fare the least well in traditional schools in which the rhythm of learning is not as balanced. I have also shown how transformative educational leaders, by carefully implementing educational reform, were sometimes able to have a positive impact on the wider community.
It is my hope that this study will lead educational leaders and policy makers to take seriously the relationships between transformative leadership and the potential of year-round schooling to have a positive impact on student learning. It is my hope that they will examine more carefully the role of habitus in inhibiting educational reform and thoughtfully consider ways to overcome it. It is my hope that they will take to heart the finding that agency, moral purpose, and ethical use of power must go hand in hand to bring about successful change.

I do not intend to suggest that a new school-year calendar is magic, that it will address all of the challenges of modern education, or that it will overcome all of the difficulties of educating our least advantaged or least successful students. I posit that, based on the findings of this study, educators should take seriously the lesson that a change of structure can bring about other positive results. I further argue that the importance of transformative leaders cannot be overstated in making the reform a success. It would be my hope that this study will provide the impetus for other educators to take the risks involved in initiating an educational reform they believe will make a difference in student lives.
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APPENDIX A

DIAGRAMS OF ALTERNATE SCHOOL-YEAR CALENDARS
Appendix 1.1 Single-track 180 day calendar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Calendar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Calendar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Calendar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Calendar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Calendar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Calendar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Calendar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Calendar" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Calendar" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S = Single-track
Appendix 1.2 Irregular single-track calendar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S = Single-track*
Appendix 1.3 Dual track calendar.

T = Traditional calendar schedule
M = Modified calendar
Appendix 1.4 Multi-track 45-15 calendar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A, B, C, D = Tracks
Appendix 1.5 Five track secondary calendar.

July

August

September

October

November

December

January

February

March

April

May

June

O = Orange  R = Red  P = Purple
B = Blue    G = Green
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Interview Questions

Initial Impetus:
Tell me about how YRS started in this district.
Does the district have a policy on YRS?
What was the view of the superintendent? The Board members?
How important was their role?
What was the impetus for YRS? (probe regarding perceived and anticipated cost savings, facility issues, educational benefits)
Were there outside consultants?

Context
Tell me about your school (probes: size, demographics, academic success, socio-economics, ethnic mix, etc.)
Are there special circumstances in this school/area that made it more or less desirable/difficult, etc?
Demographics of the staff (follow-up—How do you staff?)

Principal’s role:
Did you, as a principal, have a choice?
Where did the idea come from? Whose idea was it?
Did you attend any meetings of NAYRE? Other organizations?
If you had a choice, why did you implement YRS? If not, how did you feel about it?

Implementation:
How was the decision made?
Did you do a survey?
Was a vote required?
What specifically did you do? ie How did you proceed?
Was there opposition? (If so, how did you handle it?)
What was the original reception (real estate agents, media, etc.)

Ongoing Issues:
What kind of support do you get from the district?
What kind of support do you get from the community?
What problems does YRS pose for you? For parents? Students? Etc?
What benefits (anticipated or unanticipated) have you found? (same probes)
Do you have intersession? (If so, why, how, who, support, etc.)
Are there other programs in the school that this facilitates?
Ongoing community response and support?
Ongoing district issues (scheduling, funding, continuation of calendar, etc.)
Has YRS made any difference to the school? (probes re academic achievement, community involvement, demographics, attendance etc.)
Do you have any data to support these perceptions (test info etc.)
What do you see as the future of YRS?
If you had a choice of MT-YRS, ST-YRS or traditional calendar, which would you choose and why? (probe re impact on holidays, burn-out, who benefits most, etc.)
If you could chose one calendar that you think would be most beneficial to student learning, what would it be?