



The Four-Day School Week: Nine Years Later

Jonathan A. Plucker, Katherine Cierniak, and Molly Chamberlin

VOLUME 10, NUMBER 6, FALL 2012

CONTENTS

Introduction 1
Logistics 2
Advantages and Disadvantages . . . 3
Examples 4
Conclusions and Recommendations 5
Authors 6
Acknowledgements 6
References 7
Web Resources 8

UPCOMING POLICY BRIEFS . . .

- Trends in Virtual Learning in the U.S. and Indiana
Charter Schools: Charter Revocation Procedures
What Do We Know About EMOs?

INTRODUCTION

As school districts face increasing budget cuts, district leaders must make decisions on how to best adjust expenditures to handle decreased funding. Some districts have chosen to move to a four-day school week as a means of balancing their budget by cutting transportation and operation costs. For many districts, the move to a four-day week provided an alternative to more drastic budget-balancing measures such as closing schools or cutting extracurricular programs.

A small number of districts across the country have adopted a modified school week, with approximately 120 districts across 21 states operating on a four-day week (Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009). Over the last 10 years, this number has not changed dramatically, likely due to a balance of new districts adopting a four-day schedule and other districts choosing to return to a five-day school week. To date, this schedule has predominantly been implemented in rural school districts and mostly in Western states such as Colorado, Montana, and Wyoming (Dam, 2006; Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Reeves, 1999; Ryan, 2009). Transportation costs tend to be considerably higher in rural districts, as they often serve a student population that is scattered over a large geographic area, with buses traveling long distances in order to transport students to and from school (Griffith, 2011). Though discussions about moving to a four-day week have also begun to occur in urban areas like Milwaukee, no large metropolitan areas have yet adopted the modified school week (Richards, 2011; Turim, 2011).

Existing literature on the topic indicates that there are a number of advantages and disadvantages to the shortened week. For example, while the four-day week allows for an additional free day for students and teachers each week, it means longer days at school, which can be a challenge for some students (Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Fager, 1997). Additionally, though districts tend to experience savings by going to a four-day week, it is often less than originally anticipated (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Gaines, 2008; Hewitt & Denny, 2010; Juneau, 2009). Finally, there is no strong evidence that the four-day week has either a positive or negative effect on student achievement. Rather, the majority of evidence suggests that the schedule does not strongly impact student achievement (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Hewitt & Denny, 2010; Ryan, 2009).

As Indiana schools continue to face budget cuts and explore ways to reduce expenditures, some may consider the four-day week as an option. In 2003, the Indiana Education Policy Center (now CEEP) released an Education Policy Brief, The Four Day School Week (Chamberlin & Plucker, 2003). In the current brief, the discussion of the four-day week continues, including advantages and disadvantages of the modified schedule, the steps a school might take to make the switch, and recommendations for districts considering the change. Examples of districts that have made the switch are also included. This brief intends to provide information and guidance for school districts and policymakers considering the possibility of a four-day school week.

LOGISTICS

Districts moving to a four-day week must take a number of factors into account, including revised school hours, state requirements for instructional time, teachers' collective bargaining agreements, and schedules and wages for classified and support staff. Many districts also choose to actively seek out input from the community as they consider moving to a four-day week. Given the complexity of such a change, districts often invest months in making the decision to adopt a modified schedule.

Schools adjust the length of each school day most often by adding between 60 to 90 minutes each day, in order to provide the same number of instructional hours as a traditional, five-day schedule (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Dam, 2006; Reeves, 1999; Ryan, 2009). Some districts make other adaptations as well, such as shortening a long lunch period. At the secondary level, individual class periods are extended during each school day. For elementary students, blocks of instructional time are increased. The adjustment in the school schedule also impacts extracurricular schedules. With the school day ending later, after-school activities also end later in the evenings. For example, in Minnesota's MACCRAY school district, extracurricular activities end at 6:15 PM most nights of the week (Schmidt, 2011).

Districts typically choose Monday or Friday as the day off from school, with school in session for four consecutive days. Each district makes the decision about which day to take off by considering several factors. For example, in Webster County, Kentucky, schools are closed on Mondays, minimizing the need to further adjust the schedule for federal holidays which primarily fall on Mondays (Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). However, in other districts, students do not attend school on Fridays, in order to more closely align with the school's athletic schedule and extra-curricular calendar (Dam, 2006; Reeves, 1999).

With an additional day off each week, the four-day schedule offers flexibility for professional development and teacher collaboration days. Webster County delegates 12 Mondays each year for mandatory teacher planning days, in addition to the 4 professional development days the dis-

trict requires. With Mondays off of school, teachers have found that they rarely need to meet after school, and that they can use these days for grade-level meetings, research teams, committees, and group planning (Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006).

In addition to schedule adjustments, considerations for school personnel and support staff must be made. While teachers, principals, and secretaries may work the same or an increased number of hours, support staff may see a decrease in work time with a shortened week. On the modified schedule, bus drivers and lunch room workers lose a number of working hours each week and potentially face a cut in wages (Chmelynski, 2002; Gaines, 2008). Some districts have adopted measures to protect the salaries of these employees. Webster County in Kentucky, for example, increased wages for classified staff to compensate for the loss of salary from shortened work weeks (Weldon, 2008). As a means of keeping up morale, Shelly School District in Idaho chose to keep the salaries of support staff and hourly employees the same after the schedule change, instead of cutting their wages (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Sagness & Salzman, 1993).

Given that childcare is one of the most frequently voiced concerns among parents, some schools have chosen to offer programming on the fifth day or to provide childcare training for older students, who are potential babysitters.

While a large number of districts adopt the four-day week for the entirety of the school year, some choose to implement the modified schedule during parts of the year. In some districts, schools operate on a four-day week only during the winter months, due to higher energy costs in the winter (Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009). In

Webster County, Kentucky, schools were in session nine Mondays during the 2008-09 school year, primarily in April and May, to allow students extra time to prepare for standardized achievement tests (Weldon, 2008). Even in districts that follow the four-day week for the entire school year, a fifth day may be added to some weeks to make up for snow days or other school cancellations (Schmidt, 2011).

When making the change to a four-day week, districts must also consider state requirements for instructional time and whether they will need to get permission from their state's department of education to make the change (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Dam, 2006; Gaines, 2008). Some states allow a degree of flexibility with the school schedule that does not require additional approval. In other states, however, districts must get permission from the department of education. For example, districts in Colorado wanting to hold less than 160 days of school in the school year must get such approval (Dam, 2006). Some states, such as Montana and Idaho, require a minimum number of instructional hours, rather than a required number of instructional days. This gives districts room to adjust their schedules and adopt a four-day week, without needing to seek additional special permission. Other states, like Oklahoma and Kentucky, have provisions for both a minimum of instructional days and hours (Bush, Ryan, & Rose, 2011). In both cases, states often outline minimum instructional hours for different grade levels. For example, in Idaho, grades 1-3 must have a total of 810 hours, grades 4-8 must have 900 instructional hours, and grades 9-12 are required to have a total of 990 instructional hours within a school year. Montana requires students in full-day kindergarten through grade 3 to have a total of 720 instructional hours per year and grades 4-12 to have 1,080 hours total (Bush, Ryan, & Rose, 2011). Because teachers' schedules also change when a four-day week is adopted, districts are often required to work with teachers unions to make appropriate adjustments to collective bargaining agreements (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Gaines, 2008; Juneau, 2009).

Schools implementing a four-day week utilize the fifth day in a variety of ways (Dam, 2006; Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Gaines, 2008; Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). Given that childcare is one of the

most frequently voiced concerns among parents, some schools have chosen to offer programming on the fifth day or to provide childcare training for older students, who are potential babysitters. Beesley and Anderson (2007) recommend districts strive to find ways to implement programs to address the need for childcare. For example, Webster County’s Child Care Program provides babysitting and first aid training for secondary students. Other districts offer supplemental academic programming on the fifth day for students. Midland High School in Louisiana, for example, offers three hours of remediation on Fridays for students with failing grades (Chmelynski, 2002). Beauregard Parish in Louisiana offered “Fabulous Fridays,” a voluntary program in which students can work with tutors or practice for standardized tests (Johnston, 1997). Some districts have enlisted the help of local community organizations to implement and fund programming on the fifth day, which helps to keep costs down for school districts that may not otherwise be able to afford to provide programming on the fifth day (Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Herring, 2010; Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). While some districts utilize the fifth day for extracurricular activities, others keep buildings open to allow for maintenance or teacher planning (Callahan, 2011; Dam, 2006). Districts must balance the need to provide childcare with the need to cut operating costs.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

With a change in the schedule to a four-day week, districts have noted a number of advantages and disadvantages (see Table 1). Having one weekday off of school each week allows more flexibility for teachers and families, as they are able to schedule appointments during the fifth day rather than during the school week. It has been noted that this is especially advantageous in rural areas, where doctors’ or dentists’ offices may be a considerable distance from the community (Dam, 2006; Reeves, 1999). Many districts have experienced increased student and teacher attendance with this schedule because appointments and other personal matters can be attended to on the fifth day rather than during school hours (Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Johnston, 1997; Juneau, 2009, 2011; Sagness & Salzman, 1993; Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). As a result of increased teacher attendance, school districts have found they are able to save on expenditures for substitute teachers (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Juneau, 2011; Sagness & Salzman, 1993; Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). Additionally, a number of districts have reported increased morale among teachers and students as a result of the shortened week (Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Juneau, 2011). Perhaps related to this increased morale, a number of districts have

also noted fewer behavior problems and experienced a drop in discipline referrals (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Chamberlin & Plucker, 2003; Chmelynski, 2002; Dam, 2006; Koki, 1992).

Some districts have also noticed positive impacts on instruction and the use of classroom time, as teachers find they must teach material more efficiently with the compressed schedule (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Sagness & Salzman, 1993; Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). In the Custer school district in South Dakota, teachers reported that they felt they were able to provide 20% more instruction on the adjusted schedule, given the longer class times and drop in absences (Kingsbury, 2008). With fewer opportunities for interruptions in addition to extended instructional periods, some teachers and administrators report increased on-task time in classrooms with a four-day schedule. To prepare for the change, some districts have provided professional development and training for teachers, enabling them to adjust instruction to fit the needs of the new schedule (Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Juneau, 2009). Although the effect of the four-day schedule on student achievement has not been comprehensively addressed, one preliminary study provides evidence of achievement gains (Anderson & Walker, 2012), which may be partially explained by the factors listed above.

Table 1.

Potential Benefits	Potential Drawbacks	Unknowns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased attendance rates for teachers and students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Difficulty finding childcare on fifth day 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on student achievement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boosts morale among teachers and students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actual savings often less than anticipated savings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectiveness and appropriateness in large school districts and urban school districts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional time available for professional development and teacher planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May have negative impact on at-risk students, students with special needs 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Savings on transportation, heating and cooling costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer day may be difficult for younger students 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decreased need for substitute teachers; savings in substitute teacher wages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wages decrease for cafeteria workers, bus drivers, who lose one day of work per week 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More efficient use of classroom time 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fewer discipline problems 		

In addition to the benefits of the four-day week, there are also a number of potential drawbacks. One of the main concerns regarding the four-day week is childcare during the fifth day when students are not in school (Dam, 2006; Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). Despite this concern, many districts have found that parents are able to arrange childcare for that fifth day, sometimes looking to high school students in the community to provide childcare services. However, childcare may be more of a challenge in urban districts, where more parents are working outside the home. Childcare is also a concern, as some students may be home alone and unsupervised on the fifth day (Chamberlin & Plucker, 2003; Chmelynski, 2002; Post, 2008; Turim, 2011). Additionally, there is some concern that the four-day week is not appropriate for at-risk students and for students with special needs, who may struggle more to retain academic information with one less day of reinforcement in school (Dam, 2006; Fager, 1997; Gaines, 2008; Juneau, 2009; Reeves, 1999).

Despite the overwhelming number of districts that cite budgetary concerns as the primary reason for changing to a four-day week, most districts do not see the savings that they had originally anticipated. The Montana Department of Education noted this point in the 2009 evaluation of their experience with the four-day week. Data from the Education Commission of the States (ECS) also supports this claim. The ECS notes that the maximum potential savings for any district is 5.45%, with most districts experiencing a savings of .4% to 2.5% (Griffith, 2011). Despite this small percentage of savings, ECS notes a number of districts have found it to be significant enough to continue with a modified schedule. For example, Peach County, Georgia reports that they were able to save 39 teaching positions as a result of switching to a four-day week (Dixon, 2011). MACCRAY superintendent Schmidt noted in 2008 that though they were only saving \$85,000 in an annual budget of \$7 million, it was a significant savings (Post, 2008).

ECS reports that the largest savings can be seen in transportation, operations, and maintenance; student support services, food services; and school administration (Griffith, 2011). Schools that offer programming such as academic or childcare services on the fifth day, consequently, do

not experience the same kind of savings as districts that entirely close their schools on the fifth day (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Dam, 2006; Gaines, 2008; Griffith, 2011).

EXAMPLES

Jackson County and Webster County, Kentucky

Between 2003 and 2006, a handful of districts in Kentucky made the move to a four-day school week. Two of these districts included Jackson County and Webster County. Despite the similar characteristics of the two districts—both rural districts with a high percentage of low-income residents—they had very different experiences implementing the four-day week. Both Jackson and Webster Counties adopted the modified schedule after budget shortfalls in their district. Jackson County abandoned the four-day week after roughly three months (Weldon, 2008). Webster County, on the other hand, is in its eighth year of implementation (Dixon, 2011; Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006).

Additionally, there is some concern that the four-day week is not appropriate for at-risk students and for students with special needs, who may struggle more to retain academic information with one less day of reinforcement in school

The differences between the experiences of the two districts can be attributed to a few factors. In Jackson County, local media reports from 2005 point to community concerns over the district's move to a four-day week and its communication with parents and community members about the change. According to the media reports, families in Jackson County felt

that the district had failed to adequately communicate with them as stakeholders, and residents felt they were not informed of the decision prior to the school board's vote on it. Community members also felt the district had not indicated how the four-day week would work or what it would look like in their district. Many also felt that the district had reached the decision to make the change much too swiftly (Matthews, 2005; Niemi, 2005).

Additionally, the majority of the school's students received free and reduced lunch at the school. Cutting back one day that the students would receive school lunch was a concern for the district (Callahan, 2011; Weldon, 2008). While there is no explicit indication from the district of the specific reasons behind their switch back to a five-day week, it appears that community concerns over the district's communication, the speed of change to a four-day schedule, and providing meals for low-SES students contributed to Jackson County's return to a five-day week (Callahan, 2011; Matthews, 2005; Niemi, 2005; Weldon, 2008).

Webster County began using the four-day school week in 2003. The district spent nearly a year researching the four-day week prior to implementation (Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). They report that teachers have been satisfied with the change and that teachers feel more focused and able to teach material more efficiently (Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). To address some of the community concerns over childcare on the fifth week day, the district initiated a program to train high school students in child care. The Child Watch Program provided training in babysitting, CPR, and first aid for high school students, as they were potential babysitters for younger students. In addition to the school district, a community family resource service center, 4-H extension staff, and local community emergency responders contributed to the program (Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). Webster County continues to follow a four-day schedule.

Saratoga, Arkansas

Of the districts that have adopted the four-day week, some have seen diminishing returns over the course of time. Saratoga School District in Arkansas implemented a four-day week in 1995 and returned to the traditional five-day week in 2002 (Delisio, 2004). Despite reported initial success with the four-day week, they found that the

long days took a toll on students, and that they were not as productive in the afternoons (Delisio, 2004; Guigon, 1998). Like many districts, Saratoga pursued the four-day week because of a budget shortfall. After making the switch, they experienced a savings of \$30,000 to \$40,000 per year in transportation; utility and fuel costs; and substitute teacher fees. Once the district's financial situation improved, they chose to return to a five-day week. Saratoga went to the four-day week under superintendent Lewis Diggs, who strongly supported the implementation of the four-day week in Saratoga, and changed back to the five-day week under superintendent Kenneth Muldrew, who served as superintendent from 1999-2002 (Delisio, 2004).

MACCRAY School District, Minnesota

The MACCRAY school district in Minnesota served as the state's leader in the change to a four-day week. In 2007-08, the district, which covers a total of 320 square miles and includes the communities of Maynard, Clara City, and Raymond, faced yet another round of budget cuts (Schmidt, 2009). Prior to making the change, district officials explored a number of options for accounting for the shortfall, such as reducing staff, closing an elementary school building, offering early retirement or leave of absence incentives for veteran teachers, and switching to a four-day week. When it came to the four-day week, the team invested nearly two months researching the potential schedule change by speaking with districts implementing the four-day week, visiting schools, and examining the existing literature. As part of the planning process, the school board and administrative team also held meetings in each of the three communities to get feedback from the constituents. After getting feedback from community members and the district's transportation provider, MACCRAY applied to the Minnesota Department of Education to get approval for a "flexible school year," and received approval in July 2008 (Schmidt, 2009).

Upon implementing the change, the district adjusted the schedule of its schools, adding 65 minutes per day to the schedule. They found the change added a total of 17.28 instructional hours per year. To align with the change in the school schedule, the district also adapted its after-school schedule. Extra-curriculars ran until 6:15,

except on Wednesdays, which was community night, when they ended at 5:45 (Schmidt, 2011). MACCRAY chose Mondays as the "off day." In 2008-09, they had four five-day weeks and in 2009-10, they had three five-day weeks. While no five-day weeks were scheduled in 2010-11, two were added due to snow days (Schmidt, 2011). The district found that students reported using the Mondays for doing homework, working a part-time job, or completing the district's 20 hours of required service learning. When events were held at the school on Mondays, the thermostats were not turned up (Schmidt, 2011).

MACCRAY found that one of the main concerns, childcare, worked itself out as they made the switch to the four-day week. Families in the MACCRAY communities pitched in to help one another. Local community education organizations as well as the local 4-H partnered together and began to train students as babysitters. The YMCA also offered Fun Day Mondays and a number of community education classes and special events were held on the "off day" (Schmidt, 2011).

The district has found that while the days are longer for students, they return home from school at nearly the same time as their parents Tuesday through Friday. On the other hand, given the distance that buses need to travel to pick up students, some students are picked up as early as 6:44 AM, and some elementary students return home around 5:00 PM. While the schedule means later evenings for students and teachers on school days, the district reports that the overwhelming majority are happy with the change and enjoy having Mondays off. Additionally, both teachers and students at the secondary level indicated that they enjoy having longer class periods. Of the drawbacks of the four-day schedule, elementary students reported there was not enough recess time and that they were hungrier during the day. Parents also noted that the new schedule meant later evenings for students, which made it challenging to complete homework (Schmidt, 2011). MACCRAY continues to follow the four-day schedule and additional districts in Minnesota have explored or implemented this modified schedule.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Though over 100 districts across the country operate on a four-day week, there is a lack of peer-reviewed research on the topic and on the outcomes associated with changing to a four-day school week (Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Gaines, 2008). Most of the existing research is anecdotal and has been conducted by districts themselves or by state departments of education. Consequently, recommendations come from districts themselves rather than from scholarly research.

Existing data on the effect of the four-day week on student achievement have been inconclusive. Some districts report student academic gains after moving to a four-day schedule, while others report only slight increases or no change at all. Webster County, Kentucky, experienced a continued improvement in standardized test scores after switching to a four-day week, reflecting the trend they had seen in prior years. Yarbrough and Gilman (2006) state that the trend suggests that the four-day schedule did not have a negative effect on student achievement and that it probably contributed to continued improvement. Slight gains in student achievement have also been noted in Merryville, Louisiana (Chmelynski, 2002). While there has been some evidence of improvement in certain districts; there is stronger evidence that the four-day week simply does not negatively impact student learning (Dam, 2006; Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Gaines, 2008; Hewitt & Denny, 2010). A study conducted by the Colorado Department of Education found little difference in student achievement between districts on a four- or five-day school calendar (Lefly & Penn, 2009). The superintendent of Custer School District in South Dakota, which has been operating on the four-day schedule since 1995, also reports that test scores have not changed significantly (Kingsbury, 2008). The majority of studies and literature about the four-day week suggest that there is no direct link between student achievement and the implementation of a four-day calendar. "The broadest conclusion that may be drawn from the limited research on the impact of the four-day week on student achievement is that it has no negative impact," Donnis-Keller

and Silvernail (2009) at the University of Southern Maine report.

For districts considering implementing a four-day week, different studies and reports on the topic offer a number of recommendations. First, communication with stakeholders is consistently recommended for districts considering moving to a four-day schedule (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Juneau, 2009, 2011; Sagness & Salzman, 1993). “Devise a collaborative plan for gathering teacher, staff, student, parent, and community input. At all costs, avoid the appearance of unilateral decision-making, and leave plenty of time for the entire decision process so that no one feels rushed” (Beesley & Anderson, 2007). Montana recommends holding open-forum meetings with all constituents, and states simply, “communicate, communicate, communicate” (Juneau, 2009, 2011). Montana’s Department of Education encourages districts to make the process as transparent as possible.

According to Dr. Michael Kaplan, director of the alternative education unit in the New Mexico Department of Education, the Department of Education recommends that districts spend one year planning the change and discussing it with community members. When a district has 75-80% community support, the Department of Education is in favor of the district making the shift. In other words, the New Mexico Department of Education strongly feels that the move to a four-day week requires the input and support of the community (Delisio, 2004).

Careful decision-making is also recommended for those districts considering the switch to a modified schedule (Beesley & Anderson, 2007; Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009; Sagness & Salzman, 1993). Taking time to research the four-day week and considering ways to tailor it to the district’s specific needs appear to be keys to its success (Dam, 2006; Juneau, 2009, 2011; Yarbrough & Gilman, 2006). The majority of Montana’s districts invested between one and six months in researching and planning for the change, while others took over six months or even over a year to research and plan (Juneau, 2011). Many Colorado districts visit four-day districts as part of the decision-making process, and the research team in MACCRAY visited schools operating on the four-day week as they considered the change for their dis-

trict (Dam, 2006; Schmidt, 2010).

Recommendations:

- Gather information about the four-day week, including other districts’ experiences with the modified schedule; conduct adequate research.
- Communicate with parents, teachers, and community members about the potential change. Gather input and feedback before moving forward.
- Consider district-specific characteristics and needs when deciding on a calendar.
- Carefully consider costs and benefits of offering programming on the fifth day.

Conclusion

Districts adopting a four-day week have noted a number of advantages to the schedule, including increased attendance for both students and teachers, a boost in morale, and more efficient use of instructional and planning time. Concerns related to switching to a four-day schedule include arranging childcare on the fifth day, potential negative impact for at-risk students, and decreased wages for cafeteria workers and bus drivers. Additionally, many districts have not experienced the savings originally anticipated. Rather, districts have saved between .4 to 2.5% of their budget by switching to a four-day week. There is no conclusive evidence regarding the impact of the four-day week on student achievement, other than that it appears to have no detrimental effects (Donnis-Keller & Silvernail, 2009).

Districts considering switching to a four-day week should be sure to gather a great deal of information regarding the potential schedule change and dedicate time to planning the change. Additionally, they should plan for sharing this information with the community and actively seek input. Adequate research and communication with stakeholders is key in making the decision to adopt a modified school week. In preparing for the change, districts should provide professional development for teachers, so that they may incorporate instructional

strategies that address the demands of the new schedule. A four-day week may not be appropriate for all school districts, though a number of districts have found it to be a viable option when facing budget cuts.

AUTHORS

Jonathan A. Plucker (jplucker@indiana.edu) is Director of the Center for Evaluation & Education Policy and Professor of Educational Psychology and Cognitive Science at Indiana University.

Katherine Cierniak (kciernia@indiana.edu) is a Graduate Research Assistant at the Center for Evaluation & Education Policy.

Molly Chamberlin (mchamberlin@che.in.gov) is the Associate Commissioner for Information and Research at the Indiana Commission for Higher Education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank **Greg Schmidt**, Superintendent of MACCRAY school district, for communication and consultation provided in the writing of the brief.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, D.M., & Walker, M.B. (2012). *Does shortening the school week impact student performance? Evidence from the four-day school week*. Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies.
- Beesley, A.D., & Anderson, C. (2007). The four day school week: Information and recommendations. *The Rural Educator*, 29(1), 48-54.
- Bush, M., Ryan, M., & Rose, S. (2011). *Number of instructional days/hours in the school year*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/95/05/9505.pdf>
- Callahan, J. (2011). *How does the four-day school week work elsewhere?* Ocala.com. Retrieved from <http://www.ocala.com/article/20110618/ARTICLES/110619694>
- Chamberlin, M., & Plucker, J. (2003). *The four-day school week*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation & Education Policy.
- Chmelynski, C. (2002, October 20). *Small schools save money by switching to a four-day week*. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association. Retrieved from <http://www.nsba.org/site/doc.asp?TRACKID=&VID=2&CID=313&DID=8209>
- Dam, A. (2006). *The four day school week*. Denver, CO: Colorado State Department of Education.
- Delisio, E.R. (2004). Could four-day weeks work for you? *Education World*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationworld.com/admin/admin/admin279.shtml>
- Dixon, A. (2011). *Focus on the alternative school calendar: Year-round school programs an update on the four-day school week*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. (www.sreb.org)
- Donnis-Keller, C., & Silvernail, D.L. (2009). *Research brief: A review of the evidence on the four-day school week*. Portland, ME: University of Southern Maine, Center for Education Policy, Applied Research and Evaluation.
- Fager, J. (1997). *Scheduling alternatives: Options for student success*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved from www.nwrel.org/request/feb97/article4.html
- Gaines, G.F. (2008). *Focus on the school calendar: The four-day school week*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board. Retrieved from http://www.buenabands.org/4-day/articles/gaines-08S06_Focus_sch_calendar.pdf
- Griffith, M. (2011). *What savings are produced by moving to a four-day school week?* ECS Finance: Scheduling/School Calendars. Retrieved from <http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/93/69/9369.pdf>
- Guigon, A. (1998). Is the four-day school week coming your way? *Education World*. Retrieved from http://www.educationworld.com/a_admin/admin/admin073.shtml
- Herring, C. (2010, March). Schools' new math: The four-day week. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704869304575104124088312524.html>
- Hewitt, P., & Denny, G. (2010). *The four-day school week: Impact on student performance*. Paper presented at the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration Annual Summer Conference, Washington, D.C., August 4, 2010. Retrieved from http://edle.uark.edu/Four-Day_School_Week_NCPEA_2010_2ndEd.pdf
- Johnston, J.C. (1997). A matter of time: Schools try four-day week. *Education Week*. Published online November 19, 1997.
- Juneau, D. (2009). *Four-day school week report in Montana Public Schools: October 2009*. Helena, MT: Montana Office of Public Instruction.
- Kingsbury, K. (2008, August). Four-day school weeks. *Time Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1832864,00.html>
- Koki, S. (1992). *Modified school schedules: A look at the research and the Pacific*. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Lefty, D.L., & Penn, J. (2009). *A comparison of Colorado school districts operating on a four-day calendar*. Retrieved from http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeassess/documents/res_eval/2009_Colorado_districts_4day_school_week.pdf
- Matthews, P. (2005, October 20). Jackson's 4-day school week survives challenge. *The Lexington-Herald*. Retrieved from http://www.redorbit.com/news/education/277955/jacksons_4day_school_week_survives_challenge/
- Niemi, L. (2005, September 24). Jackson County, KY, school week cut to 4 days. *The Lexington-Herald*. Retrieved from http://www.redorbit.com/news/education/249970/jackson_county_ky_school_week_cut_to_4_days/
- Post, T. (2008, May 13). Maccray school district plans for 4-day week to save money. Saint Paul, MN: Minnesota Public Radio. Retrieved from <http://minnesota.publicradio.org/display/web/2008/05/13/maccray/>
- Reeves, K. (1999, March). The 4-day school week: Originally intended for cost savings, the shorter week struggles now to find academic benefits, too. *The School Administrator*. Retrieved from <http://www.aasa.org/SchoolAdministratorArticle.aspx?id=14858>
- Richards, E. (2011, March). MPS considering a 4-day school week? *Journal Sentinel Online*. Milwaukee, WI. Retrieved from <http://m.jsonline.com/118101864.htm>
- Ryan, M. (2009). *Four day school week*. ECS State Notes: Scheduling/School Calendar – Week. Retrieved from www.ecs.com
- Sagness, R.L., & Salzman, S.A. (1993, October). *Evaluation of the four-day school week in Idaho suburban schools*. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Northern Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Jackson, Wyoming.
- Schmidt, G. (2009). MSBA 4-day week presentation 2009 [PowerPoint presentation]. Retrieved from MACCRAY School District website: <http://www.maccray.k12.mn.us>
- Schmidt, G. (2010). MSBA 4-day week presentation 2010 [PowerPoint presentation]. Retrieved from MACCRAY School District website: <http://www.maccray.k12.mn.us>
- Schmidt, G. (2011). MSBA 4-day week presentation 2011 [PowerPoint presentation]. Retrieved from MACCRAY School District website: <http://www.maccray.k12.mn.us>
- Turim, A. (2011, April). Year-round vs. 4-day-week schooling. *Journal Sentinel Online*. Milwaukee, WI. Retrieved from <http://www.jsonline.com/news/opinion/119285319.html>
- Weldon, T. (2008). Dark days at school: Some states allow school districts to shorten week to cut costs. *State News*, 50(10), 30-33.
- Yarbrough, R., & Gilman, D. (2006). From five days to four. *Educational Leadership*, 64(2), 80-85.

WEB RESOURCES

MACCRAY School District

<http://www.maccray.k12.mn.us/>

Montana Department of Education

<http://mt.gov/education/default.mcp>

Webster County School District

<http://www.webster.k12.ky.us/>

Education Commission of the States

www.ecs.org

Southern Regional Education Board

www.sreb.org

“The Four Day School Week: Why Less is Really More”

An editorial piece written by an Oregon superintendant

<http://crosscut.com/2012/02/16/education/21873/The-fourday-school-week-why-less-really-is-more/>

Education Policy Briefs are executive edited by Jonathan A. Plucker, Ph.D. and published by the
Center for Evaluation & Education Policy

Indiana University
1900 East Tenth Street
Bloomington, IN 47406-7512
812-855-4438

More about the Center for Evaluation & Education Policy
and our publications can be found at our Web site:

<http://ceep.indiana.edu>



INDIANA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION