Analysis of Issues Concerning Extended Learning Time

(name redacted)
Specialist in Education Policy

May 8, 2009

Congressional Research Service
7-....
www.crs.gov
R40568

CRS Report for Congress
Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress

Summary

School reformers have pointed out for decades that schools operate on a nine-month agrarian calendar that is seen as no longer relevant. The idea of extended learning time captured national attention in 1983 with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* by the National Commission on Excellence in Education. The report recommended that the amount of school time be increased from 180 days to between 200 and 220 seven-hour school days. More recent reports and reformists have agreed that some students require more time to meet academic standards, but few schools have moved away from the standard schedule. Policymakers, however, have recently expressed more interest in extended learning time. For example, during the 110th Congress, a number of bills were introduced that focused on, or had provisions concerning, extended learning time. Additionally, the Obama Administration has repeatedly talked about the importance of extended learning time.

This report begins with a brief review of past extended learning time initiatives, instructional time in other countries, and research on extended learning time. It provides examples of extended learning time programs and discusses barriers to implementation. It then covers current federal support for extended learning time before concluding with summaries of recent action by the Obama Administration and the 110th and 111th Congresses concerning extended learning time. S. 804 of the 111th Congress is included in the summaries.

Contents

Contacts

Introduction

School reformers have pointed out for decades that schools operate on a nine-month agrarian calendar that is seen as no longer relevant. The idea of extended learning time captured national attention in 1983 with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* by the National Commission on Excellence in Education.[1] The report recommended that the amount of school time be increased from 180 days to between 200 and 220 seven-hour school days. More recent reports and reformists have agreed that some students require more time to meet academic standards, but few schools have moved away from the standard schedule. Policymakers, however, have recently expressed more interest in extended learning time. For example, during the 110th Congress, a number of bills were introduced that focused on, or had provisions concerning, extended learning time. Additionally, the Obama Administration has repeatedly talked about the importance of extended learning time.

This report begins with a brief review of past extended learning time initiatives, instructional time in other countries, and research on extended learning time. It provides examples of extended learning time programs and discusses barriers to implementation. It then covers current federal support for extended learning time before concluding with summaries of recent action by the Obama Administration and the 110th and 111th Congresses concerning extended learning time.

Overview of Extended Learning Time

Most students are in school for 180 days a year for 6.5 or 7 hours per day. Many school reformers do not believe this is enough time for all students to meet learning standards, and they support the lengthening of the school year or the school day to allow for more learning time. Extended learning time could allow for a deeper understanding of core subjects, a broader curriculum in non-core subjects, and stronger adult-child relationships. Teachers could also have more time to collaborate and plan together. Following a historical overview of federal initiatives regarding extended learning time, this section examines instructional time in other nations and the impact of instructional time on student achievement. It continues with examples of extended learning time programs currently being implemented in the United States and concludes with a discussion of the costs of implementing such programs and other barriers to implementation.

History of Federal Initiatives Regarding Extended Learning Time

Then Secretary of Education T. H. Bell created the National Commission on Excellence in Education in 1981 to examine the quality of education in the United States and how it could be improved. The commission's landmark report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, published in 1983, included five recommendations to improve education in this country. Four of the five recommendations—content, standards and expectations, teaching, and leadership and fiscal support—have received substantial attention in subsequent years. A fifth recommendation until very recently has not received as much attention. It called for "significantly more time be devoted to learning the New Basics. This will require more effective use of the

[1] The National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, April 1983, http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html.

existing school day, a longer school day, or a lengthened school year."[2] Specifically, the commission recommended that local educational agencies (LEAs) and state educational agencies (SEAs) consider seven-hour school days and a 200- to 220-day school year.

A decade after the National Commission on Excellence in Education was formed, a more specific commission on instructional time was created by P.L. 102-62—the National Education Commission on Time and Learning. In 1994, the commission reported that schools typically offered 5.6 hours of classroom instruction time per day and that most states required students to attend school for 180 days per year. The commission found that students were "prisoners of time.... If we genuinely intend to give every student an equal opportunity to reach high academic standards, we must understand that some students will require unequal amounts of time, i.e., they will need additional time."[3] The commission believed that added time could be an academic equalizer, and that without additional time some students would not be able to meet academic standards. The commission's recommendations included reinventing schools around learning and not time, using time more efficiently, keeping schools open longer to meet the needs of children and their communities, and providing teachers with the professional development they need to teach effectively.

Fifteen years after the National Education Commission on Time and Learning's report was published, most school calendars have not significantly changed. Since 1980, 14 states have increased their minimum number of school days, with the majority of states requiring a minimum of 180 days (30 states). Additionally, 11 states set the minimum between 160 and 179 days, two states set the minimum above 180 days,[4] and nine do not have a minimum number of days (though eight of these set a minimum number of instructional hours).[5] LEAs and schools are allowed to offer additional days of school above their state minimum, as well as to lengthen their school days, although a majority of LEAs and schools adhere to state minimum requirements. In addition to individual SEA, LEA, or school initiatives, there is some federal support for extended learning time included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB; P.L. 107-110). These ESEA programs will be discussed later in the report.

Instructional Time in Other Countries

Some conventional wisdom suggests that nations performing better on international assessments of students offer more instructional time than the United States. However, findings from research on "instructional time" are not entirely clear about this. Comparing the amount of instructional time in different countries is a difficult task due to the inconsistent ways in which "instructional time" is measured. For example, Germany and Japan distinguish between the "academic day" (hours devoted to core academic studies) and the "school day" (hours devoted to extra-curricular activities or other non-core subjects).[6] In addition to the instruction that takes place during the

[2] The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983.

[3] The National Education Commission on Time and Learning, *Prisoners of Time*, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC, April 1994, http://www.ed.gov/pubs/PrisonersOfTime/index.html.

[4] In Kansas, the minimum number of instructional days is 186 days for students in grades K-11 and is 181 days for students in grade 12. In Ohio, the minimum number of instructional days is 182.

[5] Ashley Zaleski and Nichael Colasanti, *Number of Instructional Days/Hours in the School Year*, Education Commission of the States, Denver, CO, June 2008, http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/78/24/7824.pdf.

[6] The National Education Commission on Time and Learning, 1994.

school day, in some nations many students engage in other instructional activities that are not included in their countries' counts of "instructional time." Many Japanese students, for instance, attend additional private tutoring lessons called *jukus* (20% of elementary students and over 60% of middle school students attended *jukus* in 1993). *Jukus* are also described as "academic cram schools."[7]

The Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), a cross-national data collection of mathematics and science achievement tests, attempts to address the "instructional time" issue by asking specific questions about instructional time, including asking questions about specific subjects. While this offers the most current international data we are able to find, it is worth noting that all of the data presented on the United States is from before NCLB was passed or during the early years of implementation. It is possible that NCLB had an effect on the amount and concentration of instructional time that is not presented here.

The 1999 TIMSS, which included 38 countries, found that 8th grade students in the United States received an average of 1,065 hours of instructional time per year and 4.2 hours of mathematics instruction per week. The international mean was 1,028 hours of instructional time per year and 3.5 hours of mathematics per week. Ten countries offered more total instructional time per year for 8th grade students than the United States and three countries offered more hours of mathematics instruction per week. Other international surveys from 1999 and 2000 showed that the United States offered more hours of instruction in 10th grade math, science, and language arts and 8th grade civics than the average offered by other countries.[8]

An independent analysis of the 2003 TIMSS also found that the United States offered more instructional hours than the average offered by other countries. However, the analysis found that the United States offered an average of 13 fewer days of school per year than the international average of 193 days, and the United States offered far fewer days than Korea (225 days), Japan (223 days), and China (221 days).[9] Note that TIMSS data examine the instructional time in 8th grade only. The National Education Commission on Time and Learning estimated that in 1992 American students in their four years of high school were required to spend 1,460 hours on core academic study (native language and literature, mathematics, science, social studies, the arts, and foreign languages). The Commission estimated that students in Japan, France, and Germany spent between 3,170 and 3,530 hours on core subjects during their final four years of education.[10] The 2003 TIMSS analysis and the Commission's estimates indicate that schools in the United States use their instructional day and instructional time differently than other nations. It also indicates that core academic standards and expectations play an important role in how time is utilized.

Given the limitations and lack of clarity around instructional time, it is not surprising that researchers who examined 1999 TIMSS and other international surveys did not find a significant relationship between achievement test scores and the amount of instructional time across countries. For example, of the 18 nations that had higher average 8th grade TIMSS mathematics

[7] Hiroyuki Numata, "What Children Have Lost by the Modernisation of Education: A Comparison of Experiences in Western Europe and Eastern Asia," *International Review of Education*, vol. 49, no. 1/2 (March 2003), pp. 241-264.

[8] David P. Baker, Rodrigo Fabrega, and Claudia Galindo, et al., "Instructional Time and National Achievement: Cross-National Evidence," *Prospects*, vol. XXXIV, no. 3 (September 2004), p. 311–334.

[9] National Center on Time & Learning, *International Comparisons*, http://www.timeandlearning.org/resources/International%20Data.ppt.

[10] The National Education Commission on Time and Learning, 1994.

scores in 1999 than the United States, only two of those nations, Korea and Taiwan, offered more total instructional time per year (1,067 and 1,370 hours, respectively, compared with 1,065); and neither Korea nor Taiwan offered more instructional hours in mathematics per week (3.0 and 3.4 hours, respectively) than the United States (3.5 hours).[11] Rather, researchers found that a country's economic, health, and educational indicators had a much stronger association with achievement test scores. Researchers theorized that curriculum and instructional quality are more important educational inputs than time, whose positive impact is dependent on the former two inputs.[12]

The Impact of Extended Learning Time on Student Achievement

Similar to international findings on the relationship between instructional time and student achievement, little to no relationship has been identified between these two variables within U.S. schools. Understanding that learning does not take place every minute of the instructional day, researchers have also studied the relationship between student achievement and "time-on-task" and "academic learning time." Time-on-task is defined as the amount of time that a student participates in a learning activity; this excludes time for classroom management, announcements, and other non-learning activities. Academic learning time is defined as the amount of time during which a student is actually learning; this excludes time devoted to a lesson that is well above or below a student's current understanding of the subject. Researchers have found that there is some relationship between time-on-task and achievement and a larger relationship between academic learning time and achievement. This indicates that simply adding time to the school day or school year will not automatically improve student achievement. However, some researchers believe that if the additional time is properly managed and used to increase academic learning time, student achievement could improve.[13]

As the National Commission on Excellence in Education pointed out in 1994, increasing the amount of instructional time may benefit low-performing students the most, as these students may need additional time to catch up to their classmates. This additional learning time could take place in the summer months. Educators and researchers often point to "summer learning loss" (i.e., the loss of academic skills or knowledge during summer vacation) as a key factor in the achievement gap between socioeconomically disadvantaged students and their classmates. A meta-analysis of 13 studies found that children lost an average of 2.6 months of grade-level equivalency in math skills over the summer. Though there was no difference in the loss of math knowledge between students from low and middle socioeconomic status (SES) families, the study found that students from low SES families lost ground on reading skills, while students from middle SES families showed a slight gain. This resulted in a gap of three months in reading skills.[14] Some research suggests that summer learning loss compounds over time. A recent study of students in Baltimore,

[11] This statement is based on instructional times listed in Baker, et al., 2004 and the 1999 TIMSS results located at http://nces.ed.gov/timss/results99_1.asp. Baker, et al., 2004 includes a graph of a country's mathematics achievement scores plotted by mathematics instructional hours per week that does not demonstrate a relationship between the two variables.

[12] Baker, et al., 2004.

[13] Jane Aronson, Joy Zimmerman, and Lisa Carlos, *Improving Student Achievement by Extending School: Is It Just a Matter of Time?*, WestEd, April 1998, http://www.wested.org/online_pubs/po-98-02.pdf.

[14] Harris Cooper, Barbara Nye, and Kelly Charlton et al., "The Effects of Summer Vacation on Achievement Test Scores: A Narrative and Meta-Analytic Review," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 66, no. 3 (Autumn 1996), pp. 227-268.

for example, found that the achievement gap at the beginning of 9th grade between high and low SES students was primarily due to differences in summer learning over the elementary years.[15] Not surprisingly, research has demonstrated that summer school can increase student achievement.[16]

Though research is relatively robust on the effects of summer school on student achievement, there is little research on the effects of year-round schooling or extended school calendars on achievement. Some research indicates that a modified, year-round school calendar that does *not* add additional days to the school year has a small, positive effect on student achievement. Some research also indicates that the effects of a modified calendar are larger in schools with higher proportions of low SES students and in schools with lower proportions of white students.[17]

Another option for extending learning time is lengthening the school day. Most schools that have decided to extend the school day also have extended the school year,[18] so there is little research that isolates the effects of lengthening the school day.[19] The provision of afterschool programs could be considered a lengthening of the school day, but only if the programs are strongly aligned with the academic instruction that their participants receive during the school day and all students in a school are served by the program. However, most afterschool programs are *not* structured in such a way and most afterschool programs should *not* be thought of as extended learning time, as the term is used in this report. Existing afterschool programs vary widely in content, staffing, the number of students served, and the number of hours students receive services.

Another potential benefit of extended learning may stem from a possible increase in student achievement in non-tested subjects. Based on a nationally representative survey of LEAs, the Center on Education Policy (CEP), an independent advocate for public education and for more effective public schools, found that 62% of districts reported increasing instructional time in elementary school for reading or mathematics between the 2001-2002 school year and the 2006-2007 school year. By extended the school day or school year, students could receive such increased instruction in reading and mathematics without receiving fewer hours of instruction in other subjects; the CEP survey found that 44% of LEAs reported cutting instructional time in elementary school from social studies, science, art and music, physical education, lunch, recess, or some combination of those subjects. The decrease in instructional time devoted to those subjects averaged almost 30 minutes per day. Additionally, LEAs with at least one school in improvement status (i.e., failing to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years or more) were more likely than LEAs with no identified schools to report reducing instructional time for social studies, science, and art and music.[20] In contrast to the CEP findings,

---

[15] Karl L. Alexander, Doris R. Entwisle, and Linda Steffel Olson, "Lasting Consequences of the Summer Learning Gap," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 72, no. 2 (April 2007), p. 167–180.

[16] Harris Cooper, Kelly Charlton, and Jeff C. Valentine, et al., "Making the Most of Summer School: A Meta-Analytic and Narrative Review," *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, vol. 65, no. 1 (2000), p. 1–127.

[17] Harris Cooper, Jeffrey C. Valentine, and Kelly Charlton et al., "The Effects of Modified School Calendars on Student Achievement and on School and Community Attitudes," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 73, no. 1 (Spring 2003), pp. 1–52.

[18] Elena Rocha, *Expanded Learning Time in Action: Initiatives in High-Poverty and High-Minority Schools and Districts*, Center for American Progress, Washington, DC, July 2008, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/07/pdf/elt1.pdf.

[19] Massachusetts ELT schools, discussed later in this report, only extend learning time through lengthening the school day. This initiative is currently being evaluated to understand the effects of lengthening the school day.

[20] Center on Education Policy, *Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era*, (continued...)

however, a U.S. Department of Education (ED) survey of elementary teachers found that most teachers reported no change from 2004-2005 to 2006-2007 on the amount of instructional time that they spent on various subjects.[21]

Existing Extended Learning Time Programs

An ED study found that, during the 2004-2005 school year, 72% of schools in a nationally representative sample reported implementing tutorial or instructional programs before or after school or on the weekends. In schools that implemented afterschool programs, 17% of students participated in the programs and they received an average of 134 additional hours of instructional time per year. [22] While these programs increase instructional time for some students, extended learning time proponents believe extended learning time programs should increase instructional time for *all* students in a school.[23] And, in fact, 26% of sampled schools in the ED study reported increasing the length of the school day or school year for all students.[24] A 2008 report by the progressive think tank Center for American Progress identified over 300 high-poverty, high-minority schools increasing learning time for all students in a school by at least 30%, or about 360 hours per year. Charter schools tended to provide more instructional time than traditional public schools and also were more likely to expand both the school day and the school year.[25] A few examples of extended learning time are included below.

Massachusetts Expanded Learning Time Initiative (ELT)

The Massachusetts ELT is a state-sponsored, multi-district effort to improve student achievement through extended learning time. Specifically, additional time is used to provide more opportunities in math, literacy, science, and other core subjects; integrate enrichment opportunities into student learning; and provide teachers with increased time for planning and professional development. During the 2006-2007 school year, ten schools in five urban LEAs added between two and three hours to their school days, at the cost of about $1,300 per student, or an additional 5%-12% of districts' regular per pupil expenditures. ELT is funded through a partnership between the Massachusetts Department of Education and Massachusetts 2020, a private non-profit organization dedicated to expanding learning time. Other nonprofit

(...continued)

Washington, DC, December 2007, http://www.cep-dc.org/_data/n_0001/resources/live/07107%20Curriculum-WEB%20FINAL%207%2031%2007.pdf. Also, see CRS Report RL33371, *K-12 Education: Implementation Status of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-110)*, coordinated by (name redacted).

[21] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service, *Title I Implementation—Update on Recent Evaluation Findings*, Washington, D.C., 2009, http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#title.

[22] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service, *State and Local Implementation of the* No Child Left Behind Act, *Volume III—Accountability Under* NCLB*: Interim Report*, Washington, DC, September 2007, http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/nclb-accountability/nclb-accountability.pdf.

[23] Rocha, 2008. In addition to *all* students in a school receiving additional learning time, the Center for American Progress and the National Center on Time and Learning would like schools to add *significantly* more time to their school days—between one and two hours per day.

[24] U.S. Department of Education, 2007, *State and Local Implementation of the* No Child Left Behind Act, *Volume III—Accountability Under* NCLB*: Interim Report.*

[25] Rocha, 2008.

organizations partner with individual schools or districts to help implement ELT. During the 2008-2009 school year, 26 schools in 12 LEAs serving over 13,000 students are implementing ELT.[26]

An evaluation of ELT is currently underway. Preliminary findings based on the first year of implementation (ten schools during the 2006-2007 school year) indicated that ELT schools had similar attendance, truancy, in-school suspension, and out-of-school suspension rates to non-ELT comparison schools.[27] Findings based on the second year of implementation (19 schools during the 2007-2008 school year) found that teachers were able to go more in depth with their lessons and provide more individualized learning opportunities to students. Teachers in ELT schools were also more positive about their teaching environment than teachers at comparison schools. However, students in the ten original ELT schools did not demonstrate achievement levels that were significantly different from the achievement levels of comparison students in non-ELT schools for six of the eight Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System outcomes. ELT had a statistically positive effect for 6th grade mathematics achievement and a statistically negative effect for 8th grade mathematics achievement.[28]

Renaissance 2010 (Chicago Public Schools)

In 2004, Chicago Mayor Richard M. Daley and then Chicago Public Schools (CPS) CEO Arne Duncan launched the Renaissance 2010 initiative, which aims to open 100 new schools with increased autonomy and accountability—mostly charter schools—by 2010. As of the 2008-2009 school year, the CPS had opened 76 new Renaissance schools. Renaissance schools are not required to increase instructional time, but many do so. Renaissance schools reported offering over 180 days of instruction per year, compared with CPS offering 170 days of instruction during the 2007-2008 school year. Elementary Renaissance schools reported offering 317 minutes of core instruction per day, compared with 239 minutes in Chicago elementary schools; Renaissance high schools reported offering 349 minutes of core instruction per day, compared with 280 minutes in Chicago high schools. CPS funds most of this initiative, but private funding helps schools in their initial two years with start-up costs.[29] There is currently no published research on the effectiveness of Renaissance schools.[30]

[26] For more information on Massachusetts ELT, see http://www.doe.mass.edu/redesign/elt/ or Massachusetts Department of Education, *The Report to the Legislature on School Redesign: Expanding Learning Time to Support Student Success*, Malden, MA, January 2008, http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/0108eltlegislature.pdf.

[27] Beth Peabody, Megan Horst, and Fran O'Reilly, *Evaluation of the Expanded Learning Time Initiative: Year One Report, 2006–07*, Abt Associates, Cambridge, MA, http://www.mass2020.org/files/file/ese-year-one-report.pdf.

[28] Beth Peabody, Megan Horst, Rachel Luck, et al., *Year Two Report: 2007–08,Executive Summary, Evaluation of the Expanded Learning Time Initiative*, http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/0309elt_yr2execsum.pdf

[29] For more information on Renaissance 2010, see Rocha, 2008; CPS: Renaissance 2010, http://www.ren2010.cps.k12.il.us/index.shtml; or the Renaissance Schools Fund, http://www.rsfchicago.org/.

[30] The Renaissance 2010 website notes that during the 2005-2006 school year, Renaissance schools had higher attendance and graduation rates and lower transfer out rates than district schools. From a methodological standpoint, it is inappropriate to compare Renaissance schools to all schools in the district and these "early indicators of success" should not be interpreted as causal.

Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP) Charter Schools

During the 2008-2009 school year, there were 66 KIPP schools[31] operating in 19 states and the District of Columbia serving more than 16,000 students. The majority of KIPP schools serve students in 5th-8th grade and the majority of students are African-American or Hispanic and qualify for free or reduced-price meals. One of KIPP's "five pillars" is "more time"—KIPP schools typically are open from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm during weekdays, every other Saturday, and for three weeks during the summer. This results in KIPP students potentially receiving 60% more instructional time than the average public school student.[32]

Individual KIPP schools have been the subject of numerous experimentally designed studies, many of which have found that certain KIPP students made significant achievement gains in certain subjects. In two studies published in 2008, KIPP appears to be of more benefit to younger students (i.e., 5th or 6th grade students, as opposed to 7th or 8th grade students) and to improve mathematics achievement more often than reading achievement. In 2008, a five-year study was awarded to an independent contractor to experimentally evaluate the impact of KIPP.[33]

Costs of Implementing Extended Learning Time

Providing extended learning time is expensive, and a report from the Center for American Progress has identified long-term funding as one of the critical issues facing extended learning time programs.[34] For example, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) estimated that the additional cost of extending the school year by a single day is between 0.5% and 0.6% of total expenditures for public schools. In California, this equates to an estimated cost of over $308 million per additional day of school. At the other end of the spectrum, North Dakota could add an additional day of school at a cost of around $4.5 million.[35]

Few data are available on the costs of extending the school day and the resulting increase in instructional time. Some data are available, however, from the Massachusetts ELT initiative. Schools in the Massachusetts ELT program yielded a larger percentage increase in learning time than the percentage increase in cost. As mentioned above, ten schools in Massachusetts extended their school day for between two to three hours at an average cost of $1,300 per student; one school spent slightly more than $1,500 per student. Of three district-run Massachusetts ELT schools studied, each added between 15% to 45% more instructional time at an additional cost of between 7% and 12%. Charter schools in the ELT program had costs similar to non-ELT traditional schools, yet had over 25% more instructional time.[36]

[31] Of the 66 KIPP schools, 65 are charter schools.

[32] For more information on KIPP, see http://www.kipp.org/.

[33] For more information on KIPP evaluations, see http://www.kipp.org/01/independentreports.cfm.

[34] Rocha, 2008.

[35] Michael Griffin, *Cost Per-Day for Extended School Year*, Education Commission of the States, Denver, CO, February 2008, http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/77/67/7767.pdf. The ECS estimates were derived by dividing the total expenditures in each state during the 2006-2007 school year by the number of school days in each state. That is, the estimates assume that the cost of a day of school remains constant.

[36] David Farbman and Claire Kaplan, *Time for a Change: The Promise of Extended-Time Schools for Promoting Student Achievement*, Massachusetts 2020, Boston, MA, Fall 2005, http://www.mass2020.org/files/file/Time-for-a-change(1).pdf.

The exact cost of an extended learning time program would depend on how staff are structured and how their compensation changes. A Center for American Progress report estimated that the cost for a high-poverty, low-performing school to increase instructional time for all students by 30% could range from $0 for reallocating staff time, to around $300 per student for increasing the salary or offering stipends to existing paraprofessionals, to around $600 per student for offering stipends to existing teachers or certified staff, to $720 per student for increasing the salary of teachers or certified staff.[37] These costs range from 6% to 16% of an average school budget.[38]

The costs of extended learning time can be covered through a variety of sources, including state or federal funds, private funds, partnerships, or shifting resources from other initiatives. A more detailed discussion of federal programs is included below, but some Massachusetts ELT schools utilize 21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC) funds or Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I funds to cover increased costs. The ELT schools also rely on private funds—up to $600,000 per school per year—and partnerships to provide enrichment activities.[39] If enrichment activities are provided by partner organizations, the school may be able to shift some of its resources formerly used to cover enrichment activities, such as music and art, to staffing for extended learning in core subjects. Finally, funds could be shifted from other initiatives, such as reducing class sizes, to expand instructional time.[40]

Non-Financial Barriers to Implementing Extended Learning Time

The prior example of possibly funding extended learning time by increasing class sizes illustrates two potential non-financial barriers to implementing extended learning time—public opposition and opposition from teachers. Reducing class sizes has been a goal of districts for over a decade, and many districts spent time convincing the public that smaller classes are more conducive to learning than larger classes and such a policy is worth its cost. It may be difficult to convince the public that increasing instruction time is *more* important than reducing class sizes. Similarly, many teacher contracts specify class sizes, work schedules, and compensation structures that might have to be renegotiated if the school day or year is extended.[41]

Even if funds are not diverted from popular existing programs, there will likely be some opposition to lengthening the school day or school year. The idea of lengthening the school year or school day is not new, and the fact that the strategy is not widely implemented raises the possibility that most people involved may not *want* to expand the school day or school year. Some teachers may enter the profession, in part, because they like having their summers off. High school students often participate in athletics and other extracurricular activities after school and work during the evenings and summer. Businesses may worry that high school-aged staff would no longer be able to work and, if the school year were lengthened, summer camps may have to

[37] The cost estimate for increasing salaries is more expensive than the estimate for stipends because the estimates assumed stipends would reflect the hourly rate already set for after school time, while salaries would be increased by the same percentage by which time increased. In particular, senior teachers (i.e., those with higher base salaries) would be much more expensive under a scenario that increases salaries.

[38] Marguerite Roza and Karen Hawley Miles, *Taking Stock of the Fiscal Costs of Expanded Learning Time*, Center for American Progress, Washington, DC, July 2008, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2008/07/elt_report2.html.

[39] Farbman and Kaplan, 2005.

[40] Roza and Miles, 2008.

[41] Roza and Miles, 2008.

restructure. Parents of younger children may worry that the amount of family time will decrease if their children are in school for more time.

An example of public opposition to changes in school schedules occurred recently in the Fairfax County (VA) Public Schools (FCPS), the 12th-largest LEA in the nation. In response to parents' worries that middle and high school students were not getting enough sleep, FCPS proposed beginning the school day earlier for elementary schools and later for middle and high schools. This change would not have affected the length of the school day or school year. Even with these relatively minor changes to school schedules, an on-line FCPS survey found that less than 30% of students, staff, and community/business leaders supported the proposed schedules, with a slightly higher percentage of parents supporting the proposed schedules (37%).[42] Many of the concerns were similar to the aforementioned non-financial barriers, and FCPS decided not to revise its school schedules.

Though FCPS decided against changing the schedule for every school due to opposition from the public, staff, and businesses, FCPS has successfully implemented schedule changes—and extended learning time—in individual schools. FCPS has implemented a modified, year-round calendar at seven elementary schools and three secondary schools.[43] This indicates that non-financial barriers may best be addressed by implementing extended learning time as a targeted initiative. Similarly, Massachusetts ELT is a state-sponsored targeted effort, with 26 schools in 12 LEAs implementing the program.

Extended Learning Time Provisions in the ESEA

Provisions in the ESEA support extended learning time and schools, such as the Massachusetts ELT schools, are using funds available through these ESEA programs to implement extended learning time strategies.

Relevant Provisions Included in Title I-A

Most Title I-A programs are schoolwide programs, where all enrolled pupils are served by the program. Such schools must have a student population that is at least 40% low-income.[44] Targeted assistance schools target services to specific students. Under Sections 1114 and 1115, both schoolwide Title I-A programs and targeted assistance Title I-A programs are allowed to use extended learning time as a reform strategy. Extended learning time could be provided through an extended school year, before- and after-school programs, or summer programs.[45]

In addition, a number of accountability requirements apply to public schools in a state that participates in the Title I-A program, including assessing pupils annually in reading and math in grades 3-8, plus at least once in grades 10-12. States participating in Title I-A must use results of the required reading and math assessments to make annual adequate yearly progress (AYP)

[42] Fairfax County Public Schools, *The FCPS Proposed Bell Schedule: Results from the Online Survey*, March 2009, http://www.fcps.edu/news/start/onlinesurveybellscheduleresults.pdf.

[43] For more information on FCPS modified school year calendars, see http://www.fcps.edu/about/modifiedcal.htm.

[44] Generally this determination is made based on student eligibility for the free and reduced-price lunch program.

[45] ESEA, Title I, Sec. 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II) and Sec. 1115(c)(1)(C)(i).

determinations. AYP is defined primarily on the basis of the percentage of pupils scoring at a proficient or higher level of achievement. AYP standards must also include at least one additional academic indicator; in the case of high schools, this must be the graduation rate. Section 1116 of the ESEA requires states to identify LEAs and schools that fail to meet AYP standards for two consecutive years for improvement. Pupils attending these schools must be provided with options to attend other public schools that make AYP. If a Title I-A school fails to meet AYP standards for a third year, pupils from low-income families must be offered the opportunity to receive instruction (i.e., free tutoring) from a supplemental services provider of their choice. Schools receiving Title I-A funds that fail to meet AYP for a fourth year are required to take one or more additional "corrective actions," such as implementing a new curriculum or extending the school year or school day. Additional requirements apply to schools that fail to meet AYP for additional years; such schools are identified for "restructuring."[46]

An ED survey of supplemental educational service providers in 16 districts found that participants received an average of 45 hours of services during the 2005-2006 school year. In 2006-2007, about 14% of students eligible for supplemental educational services received services.[47] This indicates that supplemental educational services increases total learning time for some students, but not for enough students or for enough time to be considering extended learning time, as the term is used in this report.

Another ED study found that, during the 2004-2005 school year, schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring reported implementing tutorial or instructional programs before or after school or on the weekends at a higher rate (86%) than did non-identified schools (70%). Additionally, when asked about strategies for school improvement, 51% of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring reported a "major focus" on using extended learning time programs, compared with 31% of non-identified schools. Identified and non-identified schools implemented the extended learning time programs in similar ways; there was no statistical difference between the hours of additional instructional time offered or the proportion of students served by extended-time programs. Note that most of these extended-time programs are not mandatory for all students and may not occur every day. For example, in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, an average of 17% of students were served by their school's afterschool tutorial or instructional program and they were offered an average of 134 hours of service.[48]

[46] For more information about AYP or actions that must be taken by schools or LEAs identified for improvement, see CRS Report RL33371, *K-12 Education: Implementation Status of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (P.L. 107-110)*, coordinated by (name redacted).

[47] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service, *Title I Implementation—Update on Recent Evaluation Findings*, Washington, D.C., 2009, http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#title.

[48] U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, Policy and Program Studies Service, *State and Local Implementation of the* No Child Left Behind Act, *Volume III—Accountability Under* NCLB*: Interim Report*, Washington, DC, September 2007, http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/nclb-accountability/nclb-accountability.pdf.

Relevant Provisions Included in Title IV-B

ED uses a formula to distribute 21st Century Community Learning Center funds to SEAs.[49] SEAs then award grants competitively to LEAs, community-based organizations, other public or private entities, or consortia of one or more of the preceding entities. Subgrantees must serve students attending schools eligible for schoolwide programs under Section 1114 or schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families. 21st CCLC funds support programs that provide instruction in core subjects and opportunities for enrichment during nonschool hours, including before and after school and the summer months. 21st CCLC activities should complement the regular academic instruction received by program participants during the school day.[50] Most schools that are served under this grant program provide optional afterschool programs that should not be considered extended learning time, as the term is used in this report. However, at least one of the Massachusetts ELT schools integrates their 21st CCLC funds into the school budget to support their extended day.[51]

Relevant Provisions Included in Title V-A

The Innovative Programs block grant program, authorized by Title V-A of the ESEA, provides aid to SEAs and LEAs that can be used for an especially wide range of educational services and activities. For example, LEAs may use funds for promising education reform projects or for programs to improve the academic achievement of disadvantaged students. Thus, if an LEA considered implementing an extended school year or day an education reform project or as a means to improve academic achievement, funds provided under Title V-A could support these efforts. In addition, LEAs may also use funds for school improvement activities authorized under Section 1116 of the ESEA. As previously mentioned, extending the school year or school day is one of the corrective actions that may be implemented under Section 1116. The Innovative Programs block grant program, however, has not received funding since FY2007.[52]

Recent Congressional Action Concerning Extended Learning Time

Though the idea of extended learning time has been on reformers' minds for decades, the issue recently has received increased attention from policymakers. During the 110th Congress, a number of bills were introduced that focused on, or had provisions concerning, extended learning

[49] For more information on the 21st CCLC program, see CRS Report RL31240, *21st Century Community Learning Centers: Background and Funding*, by (name redacted).

[50] ESEA, Title IV, Part B.

[51] Farbman and Kaplan, 2005.

[52] Title VI of the ESEA authorizes a Local Flexibility Demonstration program (Local Flex) for LEAs. Under this authority, LEAs may consolidate any funds received under the Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund (Title II-A), State and Local Technology Grants (Title IID-1), Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities (Title IV-A-1), and Innovative Programs block grant (Title V-A) programs, and use these funds for any purpose authorized under any ESEA program. While LEAs no longer receive funds under the Innovative Programs block grant, they could transfer funds from the aforementioned programs to use under Title V-A. To date, however, only one LEA (Seattle Public School District) has received Local Flex authority. For more information about this program, see http://www.ed.gov/programs/localflex/index.html.

time. At least one bill has been introduced in the 111th Congress that addressed the provision of extended learning time. Additionally, officials in the Obama Administration have repeatedly talked about the importance of extended learning time. After a brief overview of the Obama Administration's comments on extended learning time, this report will conclude with examples of ways in which the 110th and 111th Congress have attempted to address the provision of extended learning time.

Obama Administration

On March 10, 2009, President Obama gave a speech covering his views on education reform and education policy. The President outlined a five-part strategy for improving education in America, and the fourth part—promoting innovation and excellence in America's schools—included the need for schools to consider providing longer school days and school years.[53] Similarly, Education Secretary Arne Duncan has called for longer school days, weeks, and years in interviews with the press.[54] Duncan's emphasis on extended learning time is consistent with his experience as the CEO of CPS, where he promoted increased instructional time through the Renaissance 2010 initiative. Additionally, in guidance on the use of Title I-A funds provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), ED highlighted extended learning time as an allowable use of funds: "Establishing or expanding fiscally sustainable extended learning opportunities for Title I-eligible students in targeted assistance programs, including activities provided before school, afterschool, during the summer, or over an extended school year."[55] In fact, ED has said that schools and districts that use the ARRA's State Fiscal Stabilization Funds for extended learning time would likely receive additional funding from the $5 billion "Race to the Top Fund," the Secretary's discretionary fund to implement innovative programs.[56]

Congress

Several bills were introduced in the 110th Congress that addressed the provision of extended learning time, though none were reported out of committee. The 111th Congress also has demonstrated interest in this issue. Below are examples of ways in which the 110th and 111th Congresses have attempted to address the provision of extended learning time.

- *Provide incentives to extend learning time.* Amendments to Title I-A of the ESEA would establish incentives for states to extend the minimum length of the school year to 200 full days by 2014 (see, for example, S. 804 of the 111th Congress).
- *Create competitive grant programs for extended learning time at high-needs schools.* Various competitive grant programs would have required recipients to add 360 hours to their school year; increase the number of school hours by 30%;

[53] March 10, 2009 speech to the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. A transcript can be found at http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/10/us/politics/10text-obama.html?ref=politics.

[54] For example, see Susan D. Sparks and Frank Wolfe, "Duncan urges extended time, creative use of stimulus funds," *Education Daily*, vol. 42, no. 55, March 25, 2009 or "Education chief favors longer school year," February 27, 2009, http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/02/27/education.school.year/index.html#cnnSTCText.

[55] U.S. Department of Education, *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009: Title I, Part A Recovery Funds for Grants to Local Education Agencies*, March 7, 2009, http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/factsheet/title-i.html.

[56] Frank Wolfe, "States encouraged to adopt extended learning time," *Education Daily*, vol. 42, no. 58, March 30, 2009.

or specifically expand the school day, week, or school year (see, for example, H.R. 3642, S. 3431, and S. 2157 of the 110th Congress).

- *Create competitive grant programs for extended learning time for specific groups of students.* One competitive grant program would have funded extended learning time programs that provided additional language and civics education for middle and secondary school English language learner students. A second competitive grant program would have allowed innovation funds to be used for extended learning time programs for high school students (see, for example, H.R. 6617 and H.R. 3763 of the 110th Congress).
- *Require extended learning time in certain schools designated as in need of improvement.* Certain schools designated as in need of improvement would have been required to implement extended learning time programs and other schools designated as in need of improvement would have been allowed to choose to extend learning time (see, for example, H.R. 6632 of the 110th Congress).

Author Contact Information

(name redacted)
Specialist in Education Policy
#redacted#@crs.loc.gov, 7-....

Acknowledgments

Erica S. Lee, Presidential Management Fellow, was the primary author of this report.