



The High School Block Schedule

vs.

The Seven Period Day

An Analysis of Differences

Presented to the
Parkrose School District

By

David S. Halstead, Ed.D., Consultant

January 24, 2011

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
THE BLOCK SCHEDULE VS. THE SEVEN PERIOD DAY	4
COURSE CALCULATION SUMMARY	6
CURRENT PARKROSE HIGH SCHOOL BELL SCHEDULE	7
WHAT WOULD A 7-Pd. day SCHEDULE LOOK LIKE?	8
CALCULATIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL TIME IN THE BLOCK AND 7-PERIOD DAY	10
LOSS OF PLANNING TIME	12
CALCULATIONS OF PASSING TIMES	13
COMPARING CLASS SIZE IN THE TWO SCHEDULES	13
CLASSROOM SPACE	14
CAFETERIA SPACE AND LUNCHTIME	15
A WORD ABOUT CAMPUS SUPERVISION	15
IS THERE A SAVINGS HERE?	15
A WORD ABOUT STUDENT SCHEDULING	15
STUDENT IMPACT	16
CONTRACT ANALYSIS	19
CONCLUSIONS	29
REFERENCE MATERIALS	30
APPENDIX A – PARKROSE HIGH SCHOOL BELL SCHEDULE	31
APPENDIX B – GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS	32
APPENDIX C – COURSE CONVERSION CALCULATIONS	33
APPENDIX D – CENTENNIAL SCHOOL BOARD MINUTES, MTG. APRIL 8, 2009	34

INTRODUCTION

The Parkrose School District, located in East Multnomah County, is composed of four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. As a district, its total student population is approximately 3,500 students. Parkrose High School is a comprehensive high school, but students are also provided alternative learning experiences, both through the general high school curriculum and through the opportunity of participating in a number of off-campus programs, including the relatively new ACE Academy. The high school consists of four grade levels, grades nine through 12.

Like most school districts in Oregon, the Parkrose School District has been facing significant financial and budgetary challenges for quite some time, but even more critical levels of funding have hit the district the last few years. With a \$31 Million budget, the district was forced to consider program and personnel cuts of up to \$5 Million for the 2010-11 school year with the likelihood of similar cuts for the 2011-12 year, as well. The district has already drawn its contingency funds to very low levels in order to backfill what has not been provided by the state, putting it in an even more precarious position. Despite prudent and conservative fiscal accountability, Parkrose will continue to be challenged to meet all of its fiscal demands due to long-term likelihood of reduced state funding of education. In addition, in the spring of 2011, Parkrose will be involved in collective bargaining with its two major unions, OEA and OSEA, at a time when it has few available resources to enhance current employee contracts. Though this news may seem bleak, it pales by the fact that the district's future gives no sign of immediate or long-term relief for the School District due to continuing revenue issues with the State of Oregon.

As one long-term view and option for addressing these fiscal challenges, the district is considering the conversion of Parkrose High School from its current four-period block schedule to a traditional 7-Pd. day. Currently, the high school is organized around a daily student schedule, consisting of four 90 minute classes taken every other day and totaling eight such classes per semester. Students attend four of their eight classes on one day and the other four classes the following day. When originally adopted, the block schedule was intended to provide greater in-depth learning in subjects, since students would attend four classes for approximately 90 minutes every other day. In addition, it was felt that the block schedule would be less stressful for students, since there would be less passing times between classes and students would only be faced with four different classes per day. Parkrose was not the only school district to adopt the block schedule concept at that time. Many other school districts in Oregon and across the country did the same, including all the larger neighboring school districts located in East Multnomah County (Centennial, David Douglas, Gresham-Barlow, and Reynolds School Districts). But, as financial resources have continued to diminish, districts have begun asking themselves the same question; namely, can we continue to run such an expensive high school educational program of instruction that has not been shown to significantly improve student learning, while one-fourth of our teachers are not teaching at any one time? Centennial High School converted to the 7-Pd. day two years ago and the neighboring districts of Gresham-Barlow and Reynolds are also considering dropping the block schedule for cost purposes, as well.

The purpose of this paper is to provide the Parkrose School District with an analysis of its current block schedule and the scenario of a 7-Pd. day that can be used to assist it in determining the future direction the Parkrose School District and Parkrose High School should take. Should the high school remain in the block schedule or convert to the 7-Pd. day? How much can be saved by the District in such a conversion? What are the issues and challenges the District will face, should it decide to drop the block schedule?

This paper will not spend significant time debating the advantages and disadvantages of the block schedule vs. the 7-Pd. day, though it will be part of the analysis. Volumes of literature filled with various arguments and support for either side are available. At this point, though, it is not a debate over which instructional deliver system is the most efficient or shows the most student gain. Rather, this analysis will provide the facts of both its current structure and what options it might face in a 7-Pd. day. With this information in hand and with the knowledge the District administration possesses of its schools, it is hoped that the leadership of the Parkrose School District will be able to determine what direction is in the best interest of the students of the district, while maintaining financial responsibility to the community served by the district.

THE BLOCK SCHEDULE VS. THE SEVEN PERIOD DAY

As previously mentioned, one could spend countless hours comparing the block schedule against the more traditional high school schedule in determining which of the two is best for students, teachers, and parents. And when all is said and done, it is possible that no definitive answer to that question will be found, since both sides have data supporting their positions.

A brief review of the literature has shown that, though many districts within the Pacific Northwest are considering movement away from the Block Schedule primarily due to constricting school budgets, some school districts in other parts of the country are now moving in the opposite direction; adopting the block schedule. Dover High School (N.H.) is just one such district. Dover's decision was based on reasons often cited when districts move to the block:

“...creating a scheduling format that allows students to explore more options during their four-year high school experience. Usually moving from a seven period day with 28 credits possible, schools in the block allow students to earn up to 32 credits over the four years. This change allows students more opportunity to take advanced level, elective and exploratory classes. It also provides a greater cushion for students who have trouble in their high school experience and have failed several classes. Finally, by concentrating on only four subjects at any given time, it is often felt that students and staff develop a closer and more in-depth working relationship.”

Other research has shown that, although not all schools experience significant success in the block, some proponents have found the following benefits in the block:

- The number of discipline referrals to the office is reduced significantly.
- Initially, there is greater stress for teachers until they learn how to plan and to teach in a larger block of time, but eventually the school environment becomes less stressful for both teachers and students.

- About 80 percent of the teachers in the school lecture less and gradually engage students in more active learning structures; therefore, students become less passive in their learning.
- The number of class tardies is reduced.
- The majority of students will say they like school better.
- Some students often labeled "at-risk" may more likely stay in school.
- In some courses, such as mathematics, teachers probably will cover less material; however, they report that the material which they do teach is taught better and taught in greater depth.
- Both student and teacher attendance may improve.

However, not all the research is positive. As with any configuration there may be winners and losers in the block:

- Foreign language teachers report difficulty covering the equivalent of two classes of material during a double-length period.
- Curriculum adjustments need to be made with block schedules to accommodate pacing issues and the more in-depth study that hopefully occurs. For example, some students may need to be expected to take additional math courses.
- Teachers do not get to see students on a daily basis.
- Creating a balance in the A/B schedule can be quite difficult, particularly for students who may be attending school on a partial basis or for those who might be attending other programs off-campus.
- There is inconsistent data relative to the amount of homework completed in block-scheduled schools. Some teachers report more, and some report less.
- Unless special plans are in operation, students experience difficulty in recovering from absences. There are, however, some indications that because of this factor "the more motivated students" have fewer absences.
- There is some evidence that math performance under a block schedule may drop initially and then improve.
- Some teachers see the block as too long of an instructional time for many students and will not plan to use the entire length of time.
- There is evidence that AP scores will hold or improve with block schedules.

In spite of some challenges which block scheduling presents to teachers, research shows that the majority of them report that, after experiencing it for two or more years, they are favorable to it, and students are overwhelmingly positive, as well. But, not definitive research supports any significant improvement in student academic performance in the block schedule vs. the 7-Pd. day.

Also, researchers in support of the block schedule will support it based on the premise that its advantage is time. It is often stated that there is not enough time to complete many activities within the shorter class time of a 7-Pd. day, particularly lab courses. Block schedules are designed to emphasize depth of knowledge over breadth of information covered. So, the belief is that not as much material can be covered, but it can be covered in greater depth; in other words, quality over quantity. It is also claimed that the day in between classes can afford students extra time on homework and the ability to find their teacher for help before an assignment is due. However, if this is not what schools actually see happening, then the practicality is not aligning with the philosophy.

On the other side, antagonists of the block schedule will claim that the disadvantage is the same as its advantage; time. The claim may be that a 90 minute block is too long for students to sit in a classroom, listening to a teacher lecture. Or, one might also hear that the block is only providing students with more study time so that they do not have to study outside the school day in the evenings. Further, one will also hear from some departments (e.g. foreign language) that daily exposure to language development has been shown to increase language acquisition in a second language.

Just as there are proponents for the block, there are also proponents for the 7-Pd. day. Research in some school districts has found that the traditional 7-Pd. day offers many advantages for their students, as well:

- Students have daily contact with each teacher, something that is missing in the block.
- Students with special needs (e.g. ADD, etc.) are better able to focus during shorter periods and benefit from daily teacher-student interaction.
- Continuity is an important factor with traditional school scheduling. Students immediately establish a consistent pattern to their day.
- It is cheaper than the block schedule because it requires fewer teachers.
- One researcher stated that block scheduling proponents point to a higher graduation rate with block scheduling schools. What they fail to mention is the “watered down” diploma their students receive. They graduate more because there are more classes available. They cram eight classes into what was intended to be a six or seven period schedule.
- Teachers are better able to work with short-attention span students.
- Keeps teachers from watering down the curriculum because they have less daily time to teach.
- Students feel like the day goes faster.
- In one school, the dropout rate decreased because students weren’t bored in longer classes.

Despite those in favor or opposed to the block, it is important to recognize that the question is not always the length of the class, but the effectiveness of the instruction. So, what kind of schedule is more effective; the traditional seven-period day, or the block schedule? The answer depends on what a district is trying to achieve.

In reality, one can argue either side of the argument as to the advantages and disadvantages of either schedule. But, like most things, the key to success lies in one component; the quality of the teacher and the act of teaching. It may be argued that it really doesn’t matter what the configuration is; what truly will matter will be the quality of the teacher who is delivering the instruction.

COURSE CALCULATION SUMMARY

Parkrose High School’s course offerings were compiled and analyzed to determine the number of total teachers generated by student enrollment and course offerings (See Appendix C for a breakdown of department sections and data related to much of the work in this analysis). This takes into consideration the number of teaching sections in the school to determine the number of full-time teachers (1.0 FTE) needed to teach the number of course offerings. There are many other non-teaching sections assigned to the high school for a variety of programs (e.g. athletics, counselors, department chairs, teach consult periods, coaches, etc.) None of these are included in these calculations, though the district is encouraged to also review these non-teaching sections relative to cost effectiveness for the

district. The total number of instructional course offerings in the current block schedule for the high school is listed in the table below. The course offerings include all courses in creative arts, science, foreign language, language arts, social studies, vocational arts, mathematics, health and physical education, special education, and AVID. All courses with enrolled students that would not normally be found in one of these categories were included in the "Miscell." Category. In addition to course offerings, Appendix C also includes calculations, based on the school's enrollment for 2010-11 and the projected enrollment for 2011-12. It is important to note that the high school enrollment is projected to grow from 1033 (2010-11) to 1075 (2011-12).

To calculate the FTE Staff Generated, the number of course offerings was divided into the number of classes taught (6/FTE). This calculation arrives at the teacher FTE with a normal teaching schedule of six classes over the two day block schedule.

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>ENROLLMENT</u>	<u>COURSE OFFERINGS</u>	<u>FTE STAFF GENERATED</u>
2010-11	1033	283	47.17
2011-12	1075	290.4	49.08

These calculations and more use of this data will be found in COMPARING CLASS SIZES IN THE TWO SCHEDULES, later in this report.

CURRENT HIGH SCHOOL BELL SCHEDULE

Although Parkrose High School utilizes five different bell schedules, for the purpose of this analysis, the Regular Daily Schedule was used for calculative purposes. For students, the first bell for the day rings at 7:50 a.m., at which time students have five minutes to get to their first block class for the day, which begins at 7:55 a.m. With the exception of the second block in the day (Block $\frac{3}{4}$), the remaining three blocks run 90 minutes in length. The reason for the reduction in the second block (block $\frac{3}{4}$) is for the daily announcements to be disseminated to students and staff and other such activities that may be associated with the "home room" concept. In essence though, students report to their second Block (Block $\frac{3}{4}$) at 9:30 for the announcement time. The high school schedule on a normal school day is listed below, with the total calculated daily instructional time at the far right of the table. I did not include the announcement time in the instructional day, though the high school probably does count that into its instructional time.

<u>START TIME</u>	<u>BLOCK 1/2</u>	<u>PCTV Announce</u>	<u>BLOCK 3/4</u>	<u>BLOCK 5/6 with LUNCH</u>	<u>BLOCK 7/8</u>	<u>DISMISSAL</u>	<u>TOTAL INST. TIME</u>
7:55 a.m.	7:55 – 9:25 a.m. (90 min.)	9:30 – 9:35 (5 min.) (Not calculated into instr. time)	9:35 – 11:00 a.m. (85 min.)	11:05 – 12:35 (90 min.) and lunch 12:40 - 1:10 p.m. (30 min.) or lunch 11:03 – 11:35(30 min.) and class of 11:40 -1:10 pm (90 min.)	1:15 – 2:45 p.m. (90 min.)	2:45 p.m.	355 min/day

When reviewing this schedule in relationship to a full-time teacher (1.0 FTE) it can be seen that a teacher has between 270 and 275 minutes of student contact time per day, depending upon when the planning time is located in the instructional day. This one block of planning time each day is 90 minutes in length, regardless of which block is the planning block. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (Article 11.6.3) speaks to the availability of 85 minutes per day for “individual employee’s preparation to develop and organize curriculum, instructional strategies, individual student strategies, and materials for instructional delivery.” It also provides the use of some of this time for building responsibilities, as long as a weekly average of 225 minutes is available for individual planning. This would account for approximately 200 minutes per week that the building could utilize for activities other than individual planning. This is common language in contracts for high schools in a block schedule, yet it is also common practice for few schools to use this time for building activities. More will be discussed on this item in the chapter on the analysis of the Collective Bargaining contract.

This is not the only time within the school day that a high school teacher is not in direct contact with students. Since the Teacher Contract defines a teacher work day from beginning to end as eight hours (including lunch, breaks, etc.), an additional 85 minutes/day (40 minutes before and 45 minutes after the student school day), are also provided for planning for all full-time teachers, as well. Calculated on a weekly basis, and including this 85 minutes/day before and after the student day, a full-time high school teacher (1.0 FTE) is provided anywhere between a minimum of 650 minutes to a maximum of 875 minutes of non-instructional or individual planning time per week, depending on whether the additional 200 minutes/day is used for building activities. The actual teacher-student contact time for a week, teaching three blocks per day would be a total of 1,350 minutes per week. More discussion on this will be covered in the section on the review of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. It is important to note that some of the time before and after the student day may, on occasion, be utilized for faculty meetings, IEP meetings, and other meetings.

WHAT WOULD A 7-Pd. DAY SCHEDULE LOOK LIKE?

Converting from a four block to a seven period day schedule has both benefits and disadvantages, as was previously mentioned. This section will provide several different schedules that the School District and High School might consider if it decided to go to a 7-Pd. day. Each of these varies, based upon the High School’s philosophy with an extended Home Room (announcements, etc.) and the amount of passing times around the lunch period.

A key question for the school district and the high school is: How long/short should the instructional class time be in each of the seven periods? These options should provide some ideas on this issue; and although in the scenarios there exists a difference of just one or two minutes per period, when one looks at a class length of 48 to 50 minutes, even that little difference can become significant. It is therefore extremely critical for teachers to realize the shortness of class periods in a 7-Pd. day and the important need of utilizing every minute for instructional purposes up to the bell at the end of the period.

One of the issues schools face when converting to the 7-Pd. day is that more time within the day is devoted to passing time than was in the block schedule. In most cases, this accounts for a loss of up to ten minutes more for passing time per day and can make a difference if the school day is so short that it hardly meets state minimum instructional requirements. In looking at this, the options below include an effort to maintain instructional time while reducing passing times to a minimum. It should be noted that very few high schools can successfully move their student bodies around a large high school campus in less than five minutes of passing time between classes.

OPTION 1: 50 Minute Class Periods. Using the current 7:55 a.m. – 2:45 p.m. school day being used at Parkrose High School in their block schedule and building a 50 minute 7-Pd. day schedule with five minutes passing time between classes, one possible schedule could look like the one in the table below. This schedule does not affect the current length of the school day and it places all classes, including the Pd. 2 Home Room, at 50 minutes, which would impact the possible length of instruction in that period. It also reduces the length of time for lunch period from 40 minutes (5 passing, 30 lunch period, and 5 passing) to just 35 minutes (5 passing, 25 lunch period, and 5 passing). This reduction can be accomplished, since the union contract only provides for a 30 minute lunch period with no mention of additional time for passing to and from the lunch period, as sometimes appears in union contracts. It would be important, for contractual purposes though, for the high school to refer to the time as Lunch/passing or vice versa, so as not to engage in an argument defining what is meant by a “30 minute lunch period.” (Note: See also, Calculations of Passing Time later in this document.) Also, it is important for the high school administration to consider this in determining whether or not it can successfully move ½ of the student body through the lunchroom with this amount of time. (This can also be said for the other scenarios, as well.)

<u>Pd. 1</u>	<u>Pd. 2</u>	<u>Pd. 3</u>	<u>Lunch 1</u> <u>Pd. 4B</u>	<u>Pd. 4A</u> <u>Lunch 2</u>	<u>Pd. 5</u>	<u>Pd. 6</u>	<u>Pd. 7</u>
7:55 – 8:45 (50 min.)	8:50-9:40 (50 min.)	9:45-10:35 (50 min.)	10:40-11:05 (30 min. incl. passing) 11:10-12:00 (50 min.)	10:40- 11:30 (50 min.) 11:35-12:00 (30 min. incl. passing)	12:05-12:55 (50 min.)	1:00-1:50 (50 min)	1:55-2:45 (50 min.)

As can be seen, if this schedule were adopted, each class period would be identical in length. However, the current additional five minutes used in second period for announcements and Home Room activities would be eliminated.

OPTION 2: 49 Minute Class Periods. This option reduces the length of the class periods from 50 to 49 minutes so that an additional five minutes can be built into the second period Home Room class for announcements and other home room activities, extending it to 55 minutes in length. During the rest of the day, classes would be 49 minutes in length, except for seventh period, which would run for 50 minutes for balancing out the day. This extra minute could be placed elsewhere in the schedule, as well. As in Option 1, the length of the lunch period/passing time has been reduced to 35 minutes.

<u>Pd. 1</u>	<u>Pd. 2</u>	<u>Pd. 3</u>	<u>Lunch 1</u> <u>Pd. 4B</u>	<u>Pd. 4A</u> <u>Lunch 2</u>	<u>Pd. 5</u>	<u>Pd. 6</u>	<u>Pd. 7</u>
7:55 – 8:44 (49 min.)	8:49-9:44 (55 min.)	9:49-10:38 (49 min.)	10:43-11:08 (30 min. incl. passing) 11:13-12:02 (49 min.)	10:43- 11:32 (49 min.) 11:37-12:02 (30 min. incl. passing)	12:07-12:59 (49 min.)	1:01-1:50 (49 min)	1:55-2:45 (50 min.)

OPTION 3: 48 Minute Class Periods. Option 3 provides for an extended second period Home Room of 55 minutes for announcements and other activities. It also provides the current lunch time of 40 minutes from class to class, with passing time on each end of the lunch period. The result is that classes, with the exception of Pd. 5 are all now reduced to 48 minutes. The two extra minutes in Pd. 5 could also be assigned to other class periods, as well.

<u>Pd. 1</u>	<u>Pd. 2</u>	<u>Pd. 3</u>	<u>Lunch 1</u> <u>Pd. 4B</u>	<u>Pd. 4A</u> <u>Lunch 2</u>	<u>Pd. 5</u>	<u>Pd. 6</u>	<u>Pd. 7</u>
7:55 – 8:43 (48 min.)	8:48-9:43 (55 min.)	9:48-10:36 (48 min.)	10:41-11:11 (30 min. incl. passing) 11:16-12:04 (48 min.)	10:41- 11:29 (48 min.) 11:34-12:04 (30 min. incl. passing)	12:09-12:59 (50 min.)	1:04-1:52 (48 min)	1:57-2:45 (48 min.)

Parkrose School District is fortunate relative to the lack of additional contract language around the length of the lunch period. This lack of language certainly provides the High School with more options than some school districts face when they attempt to convert to the 7-Pd. day. (For more information on this, see the section which discusses the Collective Bargaining Agreement.)

In all three of these options, before adopting one option, it would be wise for the high school to calculate its amount of instructional time in each scenario to be assured that state instruction time is being met.

One other option, though somewhat difficult to attain, is to extend the High School day. This however may have significant impact, both on transportation, extra-curricular activities, and on the Collective Bargaining Agreement. It is doubtful that any school district in today's economic times would be successful in extending either the work day or the work year without providing some form of compensation to union members. However, it is important to mention this for District consideration and discussion, given the current concerns being expressed on the length of school days and year, particularly given these issues in the State of Oregon.

CALCULATIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL TIME IN THE BLOCK AND 7-PERIOD DAY

This section will compare the amount of instructional time between the two schedules. The current Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Parkrose School District and the PFA/ECBC defines the

length of the school year as follows (See Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 23 – Work Year and Article 24 Hours and Workload, pp. 49 – 55):

Length of work year:	191 Days (192 Days for new licensed employees)
Paid Holidays:	<u>5</u>
Total on-site workdays:	186 Days
Annual In-Service workdays:	4
Annual grading days:	2
Annual progress reports days:	2
Annual Parent Conference days:	<u>1</u>
Actual Student Contact Days:	177 Days

The length of the Block in a regularly scheduled school day at Parkrose High School is 90 minutes (NOTE: this includes the additional five minutes in the second block for announcements, etc.). Recognizing that the block schedule consists of alternate day classes (A and B Days), and that the “average” block will meet a total of 88.5 times during the 177 Student Contact Day (see above) school year, the teacher-student contact time in the block schedule is calculated below. For the sake of balance and for consistency in comparative purposes, the calculations below will be based on 176 student days, or 88 class meetings/block. Using these same figures, the actual annual teacher contact time for all classes (assuming a teacher teaches a total of six blocks during the school year) is calculated as well, in the table below:

<u>Total Sch. Days</u>	<u>Total Block Meets</u>	<u>Length of block</u>	<u>Actual Class time/Block</u>
176	88	90 min.	7,920 minutes (132 hrs.)
<u>Total Block Meets</u>	<u>Actual Block Classtime/Yr.</u>	<u>Actual Blocks Taught/Yr.</u>	<u>Actual Annual Classtime</u>
88	7,920 minutes (132 hrs.)	6	47,520 minutes (792 hrs.)

(NOTE: this does not take into consideration any early release or late start days for staff development or in-service purposes).

This same process can also be used for comparative purposes in the 7-period day. If one were to calculate a full time teacher (1.0 FTE) teaching six classes for the entire year in a 7-period day, with the assumption that there would be an average of 49 minutes of instruction per period, annual calculations would be as follows:

<u>Total Sch. Days</u>	<u>Total Class Meets</u>	<u>Length of Class</u>	<u>Actual Class time</u>
176	176	49	8,624 minutes (143.7 hrs.)
<u>Total Class Meets</u>	<u>Single Pd. Classtime/Yr.</u>	<u>Actual Classes Taught/Yr.</u>	<u>Actual Annual Classtime</u>
176	8,624 minutes (143.7 hrs.)	6	51,744 minutes (862.4 hrs.)

(NOTE: this does not take into consideration semester classes, which would meet 88 times in a school year and result in .5 of the calculations. Nor does this take into consideration any early release or late start days for staff development or in-service purposes. It is assumed that a similar number of such activities would occur, regardless of whether a school was in the block or 7-Pd. day.)

Based upon this data, when comparing actual instructional time between a teacher teaching six blocks of 90 minutes during the school year compared to a teacher teaching six periods of 49 minutes during that same school year, the difference in actual teacher-student contact time over the length of a course (semester block compared to a 7-Pd. day year-long) is an increase of 11.7 hours of instruction in the 7-period day (143.7 hrs. – 132 hrs. = 11.7 hrs.). In essence, students receive the equivalent of two more days of instruction over the school year in a 7-Pd. day.

Calculating the increase of instructional time for students from a single teacher teaching six periods per day over a full year, a teacher will provide an increase of 50.4 hours in the seven period day (862.4 hrs. – 792 hrs. = 50.4 hrs.). Dividing that number into a six-hour day of instruction gives us an increase of 8.4 hours, or 1.4 instructional days at six (6) hours per day.

LOSS OF PLANNING TIME

That being said, where does this extra instructional time come from? The answer is quite simple; teachers in a 7-period day have significantly less planning time than teachers in a block schedule. When one compares the actual teacher planning time in a block schedule to be one-fourth of the student day when compared to the one-seventh of the student day in the 7-period day, it is easy to see where the gain is for students in actual teacher contact time. In addition, when one compares the 90 minute block every other day for one-half of the year with the 49 minute period every day for the full year, it is also easy to see that on the average, students are receiving about 40 minutes more of instruction over the same number of instructional days. Another way of looking at this is to note that in a block schedule, at anytime during the day, 75% of the teaching staff is involved in direct student contact compared to 85.7% of the teaching staff in a 7-Pd. day. The table below demonstrates this difference. Based on the 176 day school year, calculating the amount of annual planning time is quite simple (Total days X length of planning time/day = actual annual planning time).

<u>Total Sch. Days</u>	<u>Length of Block Planning Time</u>	<u>Annual Planning Time</u>
176	90	15,840 minutes/hrs. (264 hrs.)
<u>Total Sch. Days</u>	<u>Length of 7-Pd. day Planning Time</u>	<u>Actual Annual Classtime</u>
176	49	8,624 minutes (143.7 hrs.)

NOTE: These calculations only pertain to planning time within the block or a class period and do not include the additional teacher planning time before/after the student day.

So, while students are engaged in a total of 360 minutes of instructional (student-teacher contact of 4 blocks X 90 min/block per day) time during the school day, the full-time teacher's workday while students are present will consist of 90 minutes of planning time and 270 minutes of instructional (student-teacher contact) time. The calculation shows the difference between the block schedule and the 7-period day to be a loss of teacher planning time over the length of the school year of 120.3 hours

($264 - 143.7 = 120.3$), or, based on a six hour instructional day, a loss of planning time of 20.5 days per year, which would be primarily funneled into instructional time.

CALCULATIONS OF PASSING TIMES

Not all of the time “saved” in the conversion from the block schedule to a 7-Pd. day can be funneled into instructional time, though. A block schedule consists of students moving from class to class three times, with lunch included in one of the moves. A 7-Pd. day requires student movement to occur six times, with lunch included in one of the moves. Since students remain in class in the block for a longer period of time, almost 90 minutes, schools will often extend the passing time to give students more “down time.” This is not always the case in the 7-Pd. day. In most 7-Pd. day schedules, which are much tighter, even on the largest high school campuses, students are afforded the minimum amount of passing time, usually five (5) minutes, so as to not lose any more instructional time than is necessary. In addition, the longer the time allotted for passing, the greater the demand on the school’s administration and security for student supervision during passing times.

The current minutes of passing times in the block schedule at Parkrose High School are as follows:

<u>SCHOOL</u>	<u>BLOCK 1-2</u>	<u>BLOCK 2-3</u>	<u>LUNCH PASSING</u>	<u>BLOCK 3-4</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
PARKROSE HS	5	5	10	5	25 min.

If the District were to assign the same passing time (five minutes) between classes in the 7-Pd. day, the calculation for passing time would be as follows:

<u>Pd.</u>	<u>Pd.</u>	<u>Pd.</u>	<u>Pd.</u>	<u>Pd.</u>	<u>Pd.</u>	<u>Pd.</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<u>1-2</u>	<u>2-3</u>	<u>3-Lunch</u>	<u>Lunch-4</u>	<u>4-5</u>	<u>5-6</u>	<u>6-7</u>	
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35 minutes

So, it is necessary to recognize that there is some loss of the gained instructional time with the increased passing time, though the district can still run classes from 48 to 50 minutes in length in the 7-Pd. day. Also, and as mentioned earlier and in the analysis of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, five minutes of this passing time could be regained if it was not assigned as additional passing time during the lunch period. (Note: see also the previous section, What Would a Seven Period Day Schedule Look Like?). On a daily basis, with a difference between the current passing time and the increased passing time in the 7-Pd. day, the amount of passing time over the entire school year will total an increase of from the current 73.33 hours/year to 102.67 hours/year. So, it can be calculated that up to almost 30 hours (29.34 hours) of “gained” teacher contact time when converting to the 7-Pd. day, would probably be lost due to increases in student passing time.

COMPARING CLASS SIZES IN THE TWO SCHEDULES

Although all of this is meaningful, the real question is: What are the differences for Parkrose High School between the two schedules. This next section will provide comparisons between the current Block Schedule and a 7-Pd. day using existing data from Parkrose High Schools’ student/teacher schedules for calculation purposes.

BLOCK SCHEDULE CALCULATIONS. The following table utilizes data taken from Parkrose High School's current teacher schedule and eSIS schedule to calculate the number of staff in the block schedule. If one assumes that this staff is teaching three classes per day and students are taking four classes per day, this number divided by the number of teaching sections would indicate the approximate class average in the current block schedule for Parkrose High School and the average teacher case load for each teacher. We know that all students are not taking a full load of classes, particularly seniors who have/are close to meeting graduation requirements. However, if we see this as a constant, regardless of whether we are looking at the block or 7-Pd. day, the numbers should remain relatively constant, as well. (See also Appendix C.)

INST. STAFF	TEACHING SECTIONS	STUDENT NEEDS/DAY	CLASS AVERAGE	AVG. TCHR CASE LOAD
47.17	141.5	4132	29.2	175.21

This table shows that, based on gathered data, 47.17 FTE teach a total of 141.5 teaching sections. Based on the current enrollment of 1033, students hypothetically need 4,132 "desks" per day, resulting in a class average of 29.2 students per class and a total of 175.21 students per teacher as a case load.

7-PERIOD DAY CALCULATIONS. Using this same method of calculations on the 7-Pd. day of 47.17 instructional staff multiplied by the six periods of instruction, we see the following. (See also Appendix C.):

INST. STAFF	TEACHING SECTIONS	STUDENT NEEDS	CLASS AVERAGE	AVG. TCHR CASE LOAD
47.17	283.02	7231	25.55	153.3

This table shows that applying the previous block schedule data, in the 7-Pd. day, the instructional staff would generate 283.02 sections to accommodate the needs of 7,231 students, creating a class average of 25.55 FTE and a teacher case load of 153.3.

The difference between the two calculations is that in a 7-Pd. day, the Class Average is reduced by approximately 3.7 students per class. Average Teacher Case Loads are reduced by almost 22 students in the 7-Pd. day; just three students less than the average of an actual regular class.

CLASSROOM SPACE

When high schools convert from a block schedule to a 7-Pd. day it is also important to determine whether or not there exists enough classroom space for such a conversion to occur. Though this work was not included in this study, before final decisions are made, the high school administration is encouraged to review its room usage to determine if it possesses enough classroom space for this conversion. It is possible that some teachers may lose the luxury of possessing a vacant room during their planning time, as this often can occur in such conversions.

CAFETERIA SPACE AND LUNCHTIME

As with classroom space, this study did not include a review of issues associated with cafeteria space and lunchtime issues. Both of these can be major concerns for high school administrators and should be reviewed carefully in light of adequate time for lunch to occur and for supervision issues in this complex area of the high school.

A WORD ABOUT CAMPUS SUPERVISION

One concern expressed in the research regarding the 7-Pd. day is that of student supervision during their movement between classes and noted increases in student tardiness and discipline referrals. This can be a significant issue for administrators and consume significant time within their workday that could be used in more constructive ways. Parkrose High School should review the issue of student supervision/security, including in that discussion the role of the classroom teacher in assisting in overall student safety/security throughout the workday. With the exception of the duty-free lunchtime, teachers should recognize, embrace, and be held accountable for student supervision throughout the regular work day.

IS THERE A SAVINGS HERE?

The answer to this question is both yes and no. If Parkrose decided to adopt a 7-Pd. day schedule in order to reduce class sizes and if the teaching staff remained at the same level, class sizes would be reduced, but there would be no savings. If, the district adopted the 7-Pd. day and kept class sizes at their current levels in the block, then fewer teachers would be needed, resulting in savings. As with such savings, the larger the high school, the greater the savings. If this process is used to reduce the high school staff, the district would lose its ability to state that going to the 7-Pd. day schedule would maintain class sizes at a smaller number. However, given the cuts that are forthcoming, the argument might also be that the conversion keeps class sizes lower than they would be if the high school remained in a block schedule.

Utilizing the calculations found in the tables above (See COMPARING CLASS SIZES IN THE TWO SCHEDULES), if the high school was to convert to the 7-Pd. day and keep the average class size at approximately its current calculated level of 29.2, it could conceivably reduce the teaching staff by 6.2 teachers, which would result in a class size average of 29.39 and a case load of 176.37 in a 7-Pd. day, all of which are relatively small compared to other local school district averages during these tight fiscal times.

Using the calculations above with the goal of maintaining the current block schedule class sizes in the 7-Pd. day, it is conceivable that up to 6.2 high school teachers could be cut from the current high schools while maintaining the calculated class sizes that exist within the block schedule. If calculated at approximately \$75,000/FTE, this could save the district approximately \$465,000.

However, the most recent projected enrollment numbers for 2011-12 indicate a growth of 42 students in the high school. This leads one to wonder whether or not future growth needs would demand a larger teaching staff of one or two additional teachers for next year. If the district does not add new teachers to the staff, it still has the option of determining whether to make reductions on various levels from the 6.2 teachers listed above to less or more, depending on what the district feels it can adequately afford to do.

A WORD ABOUT STUDENT SCHEDULING

When a high school converts from the block schedule to the 7-Pd. day, it also has to spend considerable time determining the impact this will have on student scheduling requests. In most cases, the classes most adversely affected by the conversion are elective classes, given that students have less available electives opportunities while graduation requirements remain at the current level or are increased. This will initially be felt by Freshmen and Sophomore students. And, if State Graduation Requirements change during this process, requiring students to take a more rigorous schedule (i.e. added year of science), such changes can further complicate the scheduling demands and board building by high school administrators. This is particularly critical in times of Highly Qualified Teachers in NCLB and endorsement issues if the district decides to reduce its teaching staff. So, it is very important that accuracy in the forecasting process occurs and that such a decision on whether or not to convert to the 7-Pd. day is made in plenty of time to assist the high school in its efforts to develop an effective class schedule for its students.

STUDENT IMPACT

Were it not for pressing budget issues, the most important question of this analysis should be what is best for the students in the Parkrose School District? What impact would the conversion from a block schedule to a 7-Pd. day have on students?

One of the most significant changes with the conversion is that it will result in a reduction of course offerings for students over their four-year high school experience from 32 credits (block schedule, with eight credits per year over four years) to 28 credits (7-Pd. day, with seven credits per year over four years). In essence, there will be considerably less flexibility in student schedules and greater challenge for students with performance difficulties graduating on time with their classmates, unless those who fail classes are able to catch up with their peers outside of the regular school day. With that being said, many questions and concerns may arise from parents and students about the conversion, particularly from those who have demonstrated academic difficulty in the high school environment.

Some of these questions might be:

- What general impact will this have on students?
- What impact will this have on graduation requirements?
- What impact will this have on students who need to make up classes?
- What impact will this have on the college-bound student?

- What general impact will this have on students?

Schools that have gone through this or similar changes have found themselves in a difficult transition during the first year, primarily due to the inability to project and prepare for problems that arise from the transition. In most cases, such difficulties diminish over time as staff, students and parents get used to the new structure. Such a change in a schedule is more difficult than one realizes from the outside. In fact, adjustment difficulties may be more severe for the adults on the campus, than for the students. But, this is not to say that such changes will not be difficult for the students as well. Such a change will definitely impact the remaining 3/4ths of the student body who return from the previous year. No longer will a student only be focusing on four classes per day. Something as simple as carrying more materials and more textbooks from class to class may become a hassle for students, at least initially. Anxieties over one's work schedule or the ability to take classes elsewhere (e.g. ACE) may become issues; though all will probably be resolved in time. No longer will classes last 90 minutes in length. Instead, classes will only last approximately 48-50 minutes. Initially, this may cause teachers to feel rushed and pressured to cover the course material in a shorter period of time; that is until teachers realize the difference in the class length and make the necessary adjustments, as well. Although this change in schedule will be different initially, it will probably be similar to the kind of schedule students experienced in their middle school years where classes are significantly shorter. To some students who have a greater ability to maintain longer attention spans, this change may seem substantial. But, for many students whose attention span is significantly shorter, they will find the 7-Pd. day schedule more enjoyable and beneficial.

Some studies of the block schedule have stated that fewer discipline referrals may occur in the block schedule and student conduct is improved. Some studies also support the fact that with less student movement around the campus, there are less social issues and discipline problems. This may be true, but effective campus supervision can always be looked at as a way to address this issue.

Students have claimed that when they are in the block schedule, they have found it easier to focus on four classes within a day, as opposed to seven classes. This also may result in concerns with "keeping up" with one's studies, since each class meets each day, which can result in more homework on a daily basis. However, student scheduling is one of those areas that should be closely monitored to determine how many "solid" classes a student takes at one time in a 7-Pd. day; though it may not be possible to address this, given graduation requirements, student class loads at various levels, etc.

- What impact will this have on graduation requirements?

The number of graduation requirements listed in this year's Student Handbook (p. 22) is 26 credits, of which 10.5 are elective credits. This may be problematic for academically challenged students in a 7 Pd. Day schedule. Students on a full schedule will only be able to earn a total of 28 credits in a 7-Pd. day over their four year high school experience. There is no mention of students earning additional mathematics credits if they take accelerated mathematics courses in the middle school; something that

many high schools are now doing, particularly as they move toward the 7-Pd. day. So, for the struggling high school student, there will not be much flexibility for making up failed classes. Additionally, the reduction in options may significantly impact the number of students who are able to enroll in elective classes, as well.

- What impact will this have on students who need to make up classes?

Most research on high school drop outs states that such students drop out because they do not adjust to the rigor of the high school schedule, they have attendance issues, or they fall behind in classes and are unable to catch up before it is too late. Drop outs are predominantly high school freshmen or sophomores, as well. It is not uncommon to find students in the first two years of their high school experience failing a number of classes, due to their inability to adjust to the rigor of the high school experience. This can be attributed to a variety to reasons, more than this study is designed to discuss.

Suffice it to say, that for the struggling student, there will not be much flexibility or availability to make up failed classes during the school day and still be on schedule to graduate from high school on time, unless the school district provides significant support for such students, including drop-out prevention programs and credit recovery programs. If the District decides to move to the 7-Pd. day, it is strongly encouraged to give attention to this issue and address the challenge of failing students or students experiencing academic difficulty. If not, this issue may become a complaint/concern heard from both parents and students who find themselves in this situation with few alternatives. In addition, it is very important that administrators, teachers, and counselors continue to remind students of the need to stay up to date with their studies so that it is fresh in the students' minds long before it becomes a reality when one is into his/her third year of high school and has fallen far behind in graduation planning.

- What impact will this have on the college-bound student?

The college-bound student will find plenty of space within the school day to take the number of courses necessary to meet college requirements. However, most college-required courses could consume the remainder of student's elective choices, which may impact the ability for students to explore other options or participate in some popular courses, such as music and drama. Teachers of some college preparation courses (e.g. AP courses, advanced science and mathematics courses) may find it challenging to cover some of the material in the shorter 48-50 minute period. However, this is not an impossible task, since many very successful schools across the country that run the 7-Pd. day schedule also offer successful AP programs. Like many high school programs, success is dependent upon the quality of the teacher and his/her ability to make the necessary curricular adjustments for students to be successful. There do not appear to be any qualitative/quantitative analyses that support one schedule over the other relative to college preparatory classes and the success of students in college readiness and later success in college courses.

CONTRACT ANALYSIS

This section will analyze the current 2008-2011 Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Parkrose School District and the PFA/ECBC relative to any possible language that would need to be reviewed and perhaps bargained in order for the district to adopt the 7-period day. Language in each article will be listed, followed by comments about the language.

Not long ago, the District notified the PFA/ECBC of its intent to bargain the 7-Pd. day, since this change could impact working conditions relative to the contract. In so doing, and under the advice of legal counsel, the district is utilizing Oregon Revised Statute 243.698 that provides for what is referred to as “expedited bargaining” (See ORS 243.698). This statute establishes the bargaining process to be completed within 90 calendar days after the date of notification, rather than the standard 150 calendar days in the traditional bargaining cycle.

243.698 Expedited bargaining process; notice; implementation of proposed changes. (1) When the employer is obligated to bargain over employment relations during the term of a collective bargaining agreement and the exclusive representative demands to bargain, the bargaining may not, without the consent of both parties and provided the parties have negotiated in good faith, continue past 90 calendar days after the date the notification specified in subsection (2) of this section is received.

(2) The employer shall notify the exclusive representative in writing of anticipated changes that impose a duty to bargain.

(3) Within 14 calendar days after the employer’s notification of anticipated changes specified in subsection (2) of this section is sent, the exclusive representative may file a demand to bargain. If a demand to bargain is not filed within 14 days of the notice, the exclusive representative waives its right to bargain over the change or the impact of the change identified in the notice.

(4) The expedited bargaining process shall cease 90 calendar days after the written notice described in subsection (2) of this section is sent, and the employer may implement the proposed changes without further obligations to bargain. At any time during the 90-day period, the parties jointly may agree to mediation, but that mediation shall not continue past the 90-day period from the date the notification specified in subsection (2) of this section is sent. Neither party may seek binding arbitration during the 90-day period. [1995 c.286 §13]

In utilizing the expediting bargaining process for the 7-Pd. day, the district is trying to put in place the conversion within the timeline and not get bogged down with the regular collective bargaining process that requires 150 prior to implementation. That will come later, when the current contract will be bargained, beginning this spring.

It is important to note that the union has 14 days from the time of notification in which to file a demand to bargain. If it does not file a demand to bargain within that time, the right to bargain has been waived. Further, at the conclusion of the 90 calendar days, the district may choose implement the proposed change(s) without further obligation to bargain. If it were to do so, however, the union would have recourse in the form of a teacher strike; something that would be highly unlikely, given the comparative planning time with the elementary and middle school levels and the fact that such a change would only impact 1/3 of the entire union membership.

ARTICLE 2 – GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

Comment: Since the district has given notice to the union in advance of its intention of converting to the 7-period day, employees would not have the right to utilize the grievance procedure because the conversion was negotiated and, therefore, not a violation of the contract. If, however, the language in the MOU/agreement does not provide inclusive coverage of the conversion, it is possible that a member might attempt to grieve the conversion. Even though a member might attempt to grieve, such efforts would probably not be successful, given an MOU or new contract language is an agreement between the District and the union and it is the union who carries forth a grievance on behalf of a member. In short, it would not make sense for the union to support a grievance on an agreed upon change in working conditions.

ARTICLE 4 – ASSOCIATION/COUNCIL RIGHTS

- 4.13 INPUT INTO BOARD POLICY REVISIONS. The PFA/Council shall meet monthly during the school year, or as needed, with District administrators. The PFA representatives may schedule for discussion at this meeting any policies that had been sent to the Board for first reading that provide for addition or change in educational, budgeting, and personnel policies that impact members. The PFA/Council may make recommendations to the Superintendent prior to the final Board adoption, and those recommendations will be provided to the Board.

COMMENT: It is possible that the results of the conversion to the 7-Pd. day may result in changes in some School Board policies. But, since the district is bargaining the 7-Pd. day with the Association, the language in Article 4.13 should not apply or should not be an issue. However, it is recommended that the district review School Board policies to determine if this conversion impacts any existing policies and necessitates the revision of said policies to comply with this change in instructional delivery/scheduling at the high school.

ARTICLE 5 – EMPLOYEE RIGHTS

5.6 SHARED DECISION MAKING

- 5.6.1 Shared decision making is a joint planning and problem solving process. It is a bilateral sharing of power, authority, and responsibility. The purpose is to promote cooperative problem identification and problem solving and to provide education employees with an expanded role in making building or program level decisions.
- 5.6.2 The Board recognizes employees as partners in the design, planning, development, and implementation of the above process.
- 5.6.3 Any shared decisions shall not alter, amend, or modify this Agreement.

COMMENT: The intent of this language is to encourage open dialogue with union members on issues that could impact the instructional program. However, Article 5.6.3 supersedes any such unilateral action on the 7-Pd. day without collective bargaining, since it will alter, amend, or modify the agreement in the area of working conditions. And, with the bargaining process with the union on this issue, there is no need to conduct additional shared decision making on this topic with members. However, since discussions have occurred at Parkrose High School on this issue, it does not preclude the building

administration from continuing such dialogue with teachers, as long as it is understood that the final decision rests with the bargaining process.

ARTICLE 8 – ASSIGNMENT, TRANSFERS, AND VACANCIES

8.1 ASSIGNMENT

8.1.1 Employee assignments in the high school/middle school are limited to three fields of teaching preparation for which teaching endorsements are required. When preparing building schedules and assignments, the District will attempt to equalize the number of different subject/course preps among staff in the department/building. Within five (5) workdays of notice of assignment, an employee who is concerned about the number of his/her preps may submit a written appeal for relief. The principal shall meet with the employee to discuss the concerns and shall provide a written response within five (5) workdays.

COMMENT: Converting from the block to the 7-Pd. day can be challenging for the high school administration, particularly when building the schedule for students. It is highly likely that this language will be a concern by the union and be included in any proposed agreement by them in an effort to place limits on teacher preparations. However, there is enough leeway here that the high school administration should be able to accommodate this language, except in rare circumstances. And, the HQ language in NCLB could further make this a moot point. However, the high school administration is encouraged to review the HQ status of teachers relative to the conversion in order to determine where there may be problems with teacher schedules and conflict with this language.

It is also important to note the impact the conversion has on some course offerings for students, but more about that is discussed in the section on Students.

ARTICLE 8.3 EMPLOYEE INITIATED TRANSFERS

8.3.1 Employee initiated transfers are those in which an employee requests a transfer from one building to another.

COMMENT: Does not apply, since the district has just one high school. However, it might come into play if properly licensed teachers request transfers from the high school to the middle school or if the conversion results in reduced high school staff who want to maintain employment by replacing less senior teachers in the middle school. More about this will be discussed in the section on Article 10 Reduction in Force.

8.6/8.7 MOVING COMPENSATION and ROOM OR SUBJECT ASSIGNMENT CHANGES

COMMENT: Special attention should be paid to this language, since it is possible that there may be some required movement by teachers in their “office,” subject or room assignment. However, there are specific timelines within which a member is eligible for reimbursement. If the district stays within these timelines, it may not need to provide any compensation. On the other hand, some compensation may be demanded by the Association, and, even though it may not be provided in the contract, agreeing to offer it in rare occasions may assist in reaching a settlement.

ARTICLE 10 – REDUCTION IN FORCE

COMMENT: This article speaks to the reduction of teachers, based upon the District’s lack of funds to continue its educational program at its anticipated level or results from the elimination or adjustment of classes due to administrative decisions. The purpose of the conversion to the 7-Pd. day certainly meets

the criteria and is a definite effort to provide educational programs for students in a cost-cutting manner. There are specific time/notification requirements (e.g. Article 10.1.2 Official layoff notice will be given to the Council and to affected employees no later than May 1st...If the layoff is to occur...due to a financial shortage, the notification shall be forty-five (45) calendar days.) that might be necessary if a Reduction in Force is the result of the conversion. The earlier these notifications occur the greater advantage to the District, since notifications can become costly if they result in teachers continuing on the district payroll during the time of the notification (i.e. if the notification occurs midsummer, running into the following school year, requiring compensation into the new school year).

The High School administration and the Human Resources Department will need to work very closely when implementing Article 10.1.4, which is the process of determining what employees are actually laid off. For Human Resources, the personnel file of each teacher in the High School should be analyzed to determine not only seniority, but competence (See Article 10.1.8 for the definition of competence), as well. Article 10.1.5 places the burden of retention for less senior employees on the district. For example, in teaching positions that are not related to HQ or that do not require TSPC licensure (i.e. Computer Applications, Yearbook, Student Government, etc.), district employees with more seniority who have been notified of layoff may challenge decisions on selecting less senior teachers, even though such teachers may have taught these courses and already established competence. The district should be prepared in advance for this to occur and previously decided its course of action in such circumstances.

10.1.8 As used in this section, “competence” means the ability to teach a subject or grade level (either elementary, middle high school) based on recent teaching experience related to the subject or grade level within the last five years, or educational attainments, or both, but not based solely on being licensed to teach. The District may consider a member’s willingness to undergo additional education in deciding upon questions of competence.

As mentioned above, some high school staff members may request transfers to the Middle School, but the language on approval of such requests rests with the School District. On the other hand, when positions are reduced, some high school staff members may attempt to maintain employment by requesting movement to the middle school, replacing less senior teachers, even though such teachers have been working with middle school students. Article 10.1.8 is quite beneficial for the District, since it does include language on recent experience within the previous five years. So, just because a teacher possesses an endorsement making him/her eligible to teach at the middle school level, if that endorsement has not be used within the previous five years, placement in the middle school need not occur.

If the district considers reducing the high school teaching staff (Reduction in Force) in the conversion of the block to the 7-Pd. day, contract language is present to allow such action in article 10, while keeping licensed/endorsed teachers in their teaching areas. In other words, such action can occur without resulting in non-endorsed senior teachers being assigned to critical curricular areas. The language does, however, favor seniority and one’s ability to demonstrate competence in the assigned area(s). Article 10.1.5 states:

If the District desires to retain an employee with less seniority than an employee being released under this section, the District shall determine that the employee being retained has more competence than the employee with more seniority that is being released.

So, the burden of proof rests on the District's shoulders. In most cases when teachers are rified, school districts seldom choose to try to defend selection, based on competence, due to its difficulty. The result is greater reliance on seniority as the determining criteria.

With current rules relative to NCLB's "Highly Qualified" requirements, the district is able to keep teachers in curricular areas where they meet state and federal guidelines/standards. Areas that do not require TSPC licensure endorsements or that are not subject to the requirements set forth in NCLB (e.g. health/physical education, elective courses, non-vocational computer courses, yearbook, leadership, etc.) could result in district challenges and questions/demands relative to the use of CAPS (Conditional Assignment Permits, See Article 12 Conditional Assignment, Collective Bargaining Agreement) by the District to preserve employment of senior teachers over less senior teachers.

It is interesting to note the language in Article 10.1.4.1, which states, "Determine whether employees to be retained hold proper licenses **at the time of layoff** to fill the remaining positions." This is very important and valuable language because it places a "time-certain" on the decision when an employee is deemed competent and does not leave the door open for laid off employees to go back to school and obtain additional endorsements after being laid off in the spring and then attempting to obtain additional endorsement(s) in the summer prior to the beginning of the school year. However, this language may be problematic when compared with the language in Article 14 Professional Growth; but that will be discussed later.

ARTICLE 11 – CALENDAR AND WORKDAY

11.2.8 Parent Conferences

11.2.8.4 High School: One half (1/2) day in the fall plus one half (1/2) day in the spring. Half days shall be scheduled contiguous with either student day or in-service. The total hours worked shall not exceed eight (8).

COMMENT: This section of Article 11 is the only one in which high school teachers are not provided with a full day for planning, grading, or progress report preparation. Given that the conversion to the 7-Pd. day results in seven classes offered each day, it would be important for the high school to consider an alternate schedule for class instructional time balance, if more than one or two days per semester resulted in loss of instructional time for am or pm classes. This may also pertain to late arrival and early dismissal days, as well. This may not be critical, but does merit consideration by the high school administration.

11.4 CLOSURE OF SCHOOLS FOR WEATHER OR OTHER EMERGENCY REASONS

11.4.2 On days when late starts are announced, employees shall arrive at work as soon as possible consistent with safety, but not later than fifteen (15) minutes prior to scheduled student arrival time.

COMMENT: I mention this only as a reminder that on days when the high school has late starts or early releases, it is important to consider whether or not to run an adjusted bell schedule. Keeping in mind that the class periods are notably shorter than in the block schedule, consideration must be given on whether it makes sense to run an entire day's schedule if the class periods are too short to really make them "worthwhile."

11.5 Workday

- 11.5.1 The length of the employee workday including preparation, lunch, relief periods, and time before and after school, shall be eight (8) hours.
- 11.5.3 School schedules shall be developed with input from the site administrators and the affected staff, and shall not exceed forty (40) hour week.
- 11.5.4 All employees shall have a duty-free lunch period of not less than thirty (30) minutes each day.

COMMENT: Article 11.5 sets forth the extent of the teacher workday, including that it shall not exceed eight hours. This language is quite advantageous for the district, particularly since there are no limitations on the use of the eight hour day, except the length of planning time for high school teachers. In reviewing the length of a student day in the 7-Pd. day, even with the length of the day being slightly longer for students, it is still within the eight hour day, so compliance with this requirement would not be an issue. More information on this can be found in other sections that discuss day length, instructional time and passing time. However, changes in the work day (i.e. student contact, planning time, etc.) have been previously associated with working conditions, thus subject to collective bargaining.

Another interesting point is found in Article 11.5.4, with the duty-free lunch period of not less than thirty (30) minutes. The current Regular Daily Schedule at Parkrose High School provides a 30 minute lunch period with an additional five minutes of passing time on each side of the lunch period. With the language as it is now found in the contract, time could be taken away from the passing time and placed into the student day. The main reason for this is that the conversion to the 7-Pd. day results in more passing times which results in a loss of approximately ten additional minutes of instruction per day. Reducing the passing time on one side of the lunch period would recoup five minutes of this lost instructional time (see also the previous sections on passing time and on what a 7-Pd. day would look like).

It should also be noted that the length of the teacher workday, set at eight hours in the contract, should have no negative impact on the length of high school faculty meetings, unless they were to go beyond 3:30 p.m. If students continue to be excused at 2:45, that still leaves the high school administration with time at the end of the day to conduct faculty meetings, if needed.

- 11.6 DAILY AND WEEKLY PREPARATION TIME
All employees shall receive a weekly average of at least 320 minutes of preparation time per five (5) day week including the following amounts:
 - 11.6.1 High School (9-12)
Under the block schedule, each employee shall have a block of 85 minutes per day that shall be available for individual employee's preparation to develop and organize curriculum, instructional strategies, individual student strategies, and materials for instructional delivery. Building-level responsibilities and group planning and preparation activities may also be assigned for this block, as long as weekly average of two hundred twenty-five (225) minutes is available for individual employee planning.

COMMENT:

On paper, and as shown in Article 11.6.1, the current high school day provides for time before and after school, plus the added planning time within the block of 85 minutes per day. If, however, and as is the case in most high schools, the high school does not use the other half of the block for "building-level responsibilities," high school teachers actually have 85 minutes within the school day for individual planning in addition to any non-structured time before and after school. The language goes on to provide a total of 225 minutes of planning time per week, if portions of the planning time are used by

the building (giving the building 200 minutes per week). The union might argue that this language means that high school teachers only realistically (according to Article 11.6.1) have 40 minutes of planning time within the workday; but if they do, they are admitting that the district has the right to utilize the other half of that time. Further, the District could also argue that the conversion to the 7-Pd. day would give teachers more planning time per day of 49 minutes vs. 40 minutes). On the other hand, the union could also argue that since the high school has not previously used that time, past practice provides for the block to be solely the use of teachers as planning time, but it would be a weak case, given the contract language. In either case, the district has the advantage of demonstrating how much time in individual planning teachers “enjoy” within the regular teacher workday.

11.6.4 Employees will have eight (8) hours per month, (one full day or two half days per month in High School, early release/late start in Elementary and either schedule for Middle School) for building in-service and employee planning.

COMMENT:

Article 11.6.4 should not present a problem, except it does mean that in order to maintain instructional learning time across all classes in a seven period day, the high school administration may have to develop several scheduling options, keeping in mind the challenges such changes might have on students who are engaged in off-campus learning experiences.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The general review of Article 11 indicates that there is no contract language present in the negotiated agreement that would preclude the district from converting the high school to the 7-pd day. Some school districts have such language, which has made the conversion difficult, if not virtually impossible. Parkrose is fortunate to have not bargained any such language into its contract in the past, thus allowing the conversion to be significantly less challenging. Several distinct advantages are: (1) lacking from the contract is any mention of the use of unassigned time within the contract day (for example, for faculty meetings); (2) there is no mention of limitations on when teachers are asked to remain beyond the contract day, though the day is defined as eight hours in length; and (3) no mention is made to provide passing time for teachers before and after lunchtime. This has been found in other contracts and is problematic when such time is added to passing time in a 7-Pd. day.

ARTICLE 12 – WORKLOAD

12.1 Prior to any amendments of the School Board Policy regarding class size, the School Board will provide for input from the Association regarding the proposed amendments.

COMMENT:

It is likely that given the current status of school funding and the reduction in staffs statewide that work load in the Parkrose School District will change and may impact class sizes at the high school. This may be the result of issues larger than just the implementation of the 7-Pd. day, though. The language in Article 12.1 does not preclude the District from such changes; it only provides the opportunity for union input in such changes, which will, in essence, occur at the bargaining table.

12.2.2 An employee who is concerned about their workload and/or student assignments may submit a written appeal for relief to their principal. The principal shall meet with the employee to discuss the concerns and shall provide a written response within five (5) workdays.

COMMENT:

It is highly likely that the conversion to the 7-Pd. day may have an impact on teacher workload in several ways; (1) an increase in actual teacher instructional time on a daily and weekly basis; (2) a decrease in actual teacher preparation time, both daily and weekly; and (3) an increase in student numbers, both in the class period and in the overall daily number of students that are seen by a teacher. However, it is also highly likely that class size will remain the same or be reduced, as also will the number of daily student contacts. What is more likely though, is that some teachers in some departments will see reductions, while teachers in other departments may see increases. This is due to the number of courses that students will take, the graduation requirements, and the reduced number of courses offered to students over a four-year high school experience. More information on this may be found in the section titled "Student Impact."

It is also possible that the union may demand the district provide in-service training for the High School staff, due to the conversion from the block to the 7-Pd. day. This has occurred in other districts that have made this transition, but through discussions between teachers and high school administrators, it has usually fallen "off the table." In fact, most districts found the challenge of providing in-service occurred when converting the opposite way; to the block schedule, since it demanding more innovation in teaching students for longer periods of time. Were the district to face this demand, it would be important for it to determine what the need truly was and why highly trained professionals would need such in-service, or is such a demand just a road block to success in the transition.

ARTICLE 14 – PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

14.4 STAFF RETRAINING

During each year of this Agreement the District will budget not less than \$3,000 that will be used to pay tuition, books and fees for college courses for employees whose positions are to be eliminated. The District will provide these funds to employees in accordance with the following provisions:

- 14.4.1 The employee whose position is to be eliminated may apply for use of these funds if additional college courses would:
 - 14.4.1.1 Prepare a classroom teacher to teach in another area (two (2) or more areas in the secondary schools); or
 - 14.4.1.2 Prepare a specialist to work in a broader area of his/her specialty.
- 14.4.3 When an employee's position is to be eliminated, the employee will be notified in writing and by conference of such action by March 15th, or as soon thereafter as the Superintendent has knowledge that the position is being eliminated.
- 14.4.4 The employee whose position has been eliminated and who has applied for a known vacancy for which he/she is not certified shall develop with the District an approved plan for qualifying for the vacancy by the start of the new school year. Periodically, the employee shall report back progress toward attainment of the required certification.
- 14.4.5 If, by the start of the school year, the employee completes his/her qualification for at least a Basic certificate for the available position in the designated subject area, he/she shall be allowed to fill the existing vacancy that school year.

COMMENTS:

This Article contains some confusing language that might merit further study by the administration and further discussion with the union. Though this article is addressing the retraining of employees whose

positions have been/are being eliminated, it also speaks in Article 14.4.4 to the placement of displaced employees into vacant positions. This may become an issue if a high school teacher is displaced and seek retraining for a vacant position in the middle school or a vacant elementary school position. A caution is given to the Human Resources Department on the possibility of this happening; however, unless the displaced teacher has other previous study in a curricular area and is close to an additional endorsement, it is quite doubtful that s/he can gain additional endorsements and meet both NCLB and TSPC requirements within one summer. In fact, in cases where teachers wish to receive added authorization levels (i.e. primary, intermediate, middle level, or high school level), such authorizations usually now require an additional practicum or “student teaching experience,” something not easy to attain during the summer months when schools are not in session.

The first sentence (“...not less than \$3,000...”) can also mean “not more than \$3,000” as well. So, funding for retraining of teachers has built in limitations relative to the district’s responsibility in this article.

Article 14.4.5 is significantly out of date, since a “Basic certificate” has not been issued by TSPC in over ten years. Regardless, this language should be cleaned up in the next round of collective bargaining for clarity.

There is also a conflict in language between this Article and Article 10.1.4.1 in Reduction In Force, which speaks to “at the time of layoff.” In Article 10.1.4.1, the layoff is determined, based on competence at the time of notification of RIF. Yet, Article 14.4 provides District support for retraining if the employee can obtain that retraining by the beginning of the next school year (see also Article 10.1.8). Perhaps, since Article 14.4 speaks to vacancies and RIF is a determiner of who is reduced, based on comparisons of existing employees, it may not be a problem. But, it still leaves the door open for such employees to strive for added competence to fill vacant positions, even when no existing employees are qualified.

Further, Article 14.4.3 mentions March 15 as the date of notification, but the sentence does go on to state, “...or as soon thereafter as the Superintendent has knowledge that the position is being eliminated.” So, the March 15 date is not consequential in the notification process. However, at what date the point of notification occurs, the employee still has 45 days prior to being a member of Reduction in Force.

Finally, Article 14.4.2 (not listed here), speaks to a Retraining Advisory Committee, who approves the applications of displaced employees. Since three of the five members are administrators, including the Superintendent, the strength of the decision for application of the Article rests with the administration.

Article 21 GENERAL PROVISIONS

21.3 MAINTENANCE OF STANDARDS

No employee, during the life of this Agreement, shall suffer any loss of compensation or established conditions of employment with respect to mandatory subjects of bargaining which have been enjoyed by a majority of employees in similar job assignments. Alleged violations of this paragraph shall be subject to grievance up to and including Level Two.

COMMENT:

In some cases and in some contracts, the language found in the Maintenance of Standards requires that nothing can be changed in any way that would reduce existing practices. For example, if the high school did not use the other half of the teacher planning time for other building responsibilities, than it could not do it now, thus making a move to a 7-Pd. day impossible. The language found here is really not Maintenance of Standards language and is not restrictive from allowing the district to move forward.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon this analysis, it is highly possible for the Parkrose School District to convert its current block schedule to a 7-Pd Day. This conversion, though challenging for the high school administration, will result in significant financial savings for the district and does not have any contract language that would make it impossible to accomplish.

The main advantage in adopting the 7-Pd Day schedule is financial. Calculations between the existing block and the hypothetical 7-Pd. day indicate that the 7-Pd. day would reduce class sizes by approximately four students/period and caseloads would be reduced by approximately 20 students. If the district saw this as a cost-cutting measure, the maintenance of existing class sizes and case load could result in reducing current teaching staffs at Parkrose High School by approximately 6.2 FTE.

There is little difference between the daily amount of instructional time for the block (355 min/day) and the 7-Pd. day (345-350 min/day, depending on the class period length). There is, however significant difference in annual teacher contact time in the block (teaching six blocks equals 792 hrs/year) when compared to the 7-Pd. day (teaching six classes equals 862.4 hrs/year). This is due to the fact that teachers are spending less time in planning and more time in teaching.

The block takes less non-instructional time for passing and lunchtime than the 7-Pd. day; approximately 10 to 15 min/day less. This is due to the reduced number of times that students are moving while on campus.

The amount of planning time lost by teachers over a school year in the conversion to the 7-Pd. day would amount to approximately 120 hours. Most of this would be used for instructional time, but some of it would also have to be used for passing time.

Most significant for students will be the reality of reduced courses (from 32 to 28 over four years), which could impact electives, college-bound students, and students who need to make up classes due to previous class failures.

There are no significant contract issues that would impede the movement by the district to the 7-Pd. day, though special attention to detail occurred in the review of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

As a final concluding comment, and in answer to the most important question, yes, the district can adopt a 7-Pd. day and that conversion will result in savings for the district. It will, though, require some bargaining, due to the changes in working conditions at the high school. But, it should not be a difficult process to complete.

REFERENCE MATERIALS

Building Master Schedules, 2010-11

Collective Bargaining Agreement, Parkrose School District – PFA/ECBC, 2008-11

- Article 2: Grievance Procedure
- Article 4: Association/Council Rights
- Article 5: Employee Rights
- Article 8: Assignments, Transfers, & Vacancies
- Article 11: Calendar and Work Year
- Article 12: Workload
- Article 14: Professional Development
- Article 21: General Provisions

Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 243.698 Expedited bargaining process

Parkrose School District Graduation Requirements – Student Handbook

High School Bell Schedules, 2010-11

High School Enrollment Summary by Teacher, 1/14/2011

APPENDIX A
SCHOOL BELL SCHEDULE – PARKROSE H.S.
2010-2011

REGULAR DAILY SCHEDULE

AM 7:10 – 7:50

1st or 2nd Period 7:55 – 9:25 (90)
PCTV (Announcements) 9:30 – 9:35 (5)
3rd or 4th Period 9:35 – 11:00 (85)
Lunch/5th or 6th Period 11:05 – 11:35/11:40 – 1:10 (30),(90)
5th or 6th Period/Lunch 11:05 – 12:35/12:40 – 1:10 (90),(30)
7th or 8th Period 1:15 – 2:45 (90)

PEP ASSEMBLY

AM 7:10 – 7:50

1st or 2nd Period 7:55 – 9:15 (80)
Assembly 9:20 – 9:50 (30)
3rd or 4th Period 9:55 – 11:20 (85)
Lunch/5th or 6th Period 11:25 – 11:55/12:00 – 1:20 (30), (80)
5th or 6th Period/Lunch 11:25 – 12:45/12:50 – 1:20 (80), (30)
7th or 8th Period 1:25 – 2:45 (80)

LONG ASSEMBLY

AM 7:10 – 7:50

1st or 2nd Period 7:55 – 9:15 (80)
Assembly 9:20 – 10:00 (40)
3rd or 4th Period 10:05 – 11:25 (80)
Lunch/5th or 6th Period 11:30 – 12:00/12:05 – 1:20 (30), (75)
5th or 6th Period/Lunch 11:30 – 12:45/12:50 – 1:20 (75), (30)
7th or 8th Period 1:25 – 2:45

ADVISORY SCHEDULE

AM 7:10 – 7:50

1st or 2nd Period 7:55 – 9:15 (80)
3rd or 4th Period 9:20 – 10:40 (80)
1st Lunch/2nd Advisory 10:45 – 11:15 (9th & 10th) (30)
2nd Lunch/1st Advisory 11:20 – 11:50 (11th & 12th) (30)
5th or 6th Period 11:55 – 1:20 (85)
7th or 8th Period 1:25 – 2:45 (80)

WEDNESDAY IN-SERVICE DAYS (Half Days)

AM 7:10 – 7:50

Period 1 or 2 7:55 – 8:45 (50)
Period 3 or 4 8:50 – 9:40 (50)
Period 5 or 6 9:45 – 10:35 (50)
Period 7 or 8 10:40 – 11:30 (50)

Lunch 11:30 - 12:00

APPENDIX B PARKROSE HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS (Student Handbook, page 22)

In order to graduate from high school in the district, a student must successfully complete 26 units of credit. The state of Oregon requires all students to complete a certain series of courses. A student in the regular high school program is required to complete the following courses

- Language Arts 4.0 credits
- Applied Arts: Fine Arts 1.0 credit
- Mathematics 3.0 credit (min. requirement of Alg.1)
- Future Focus .50 credit
- Social Sciences 3.0
- Electives 10.5 credits
- Science 2.0 credit
- Physical Education 1.0 credit
- Global Studies 1.0 credit
- Health education 1.0 credit

Note: Classes of 2008 & 2009 require only 2.0 of Mathematics and 11.5 electives.

Total of 26 credit units are required to graduate from Parkrose High School

Mandatory Certificate of Advanced Mastery Requirements:

1. Develop an Education Plan and build an Educational Profile.
2. Meet performance standards for extended application through a collection of evidence. The Senior Project consists of a Research paper, a Project and a Senior Board Presentation.
3. Demonstrate career-related knowledge and skills.
4. Participate in Career-Related Learning Experiences as outlined in the Education Plan. Beginning with the Class of 2007, graduates will be ranked by Grade

Point Average alone. Students taking A.P. classes have the opportunity to earn a GPA higher than 4.0. The student (s) with the highest GPA

APPENDIX C -COURSE CONVERSION CALCULATIONS

NOTE: Listed below is the number of course offerings in each department for the Fall 2010 semester in the block schedule to determine the number of generated instructional staff. The second row is based on the project enrollment growth from 1033 in 2010-11 to 1075 for the 2011-12 school year. The projected numbers are calculated, using similar ratio and do not take into consideration any changes in graduation requirements or projecting changes for any other reasons.

PARKROSE H.S.	ENROLL	CREAT. ARTS	SCI.	FOR LANG.	LANG. ARTS	SOC. STU.	VOC. ARTS	MATH	PHYS. EDUC.	AVID	SPEC. EDUC.	OTHER	TOTAL	INSTR. STAFF
2010-11	1033	26	38	20	40	31	18	38	21	3	16	32	283	47.17
Proj. 2011-12	1075	27.1	39.5	20.8	41.6	32.3	18.7	39.5	21.9	3.1	16.7	33.3	294.5	49.1

NOTE: Based upon the above data, calculations are made as to the block schedule and the 7-Pd. day to determine class averages for both the block and 7-Pd. day.

PARKROSE H.S.	BLOCK SCHEDULE CALCULATIONS:				7 PD. DAY CALCULATIONS:			
	TEACH SECTIONS	STU. NEEDS	CLASS AVG.	AVG TCHR CASELOAD	TEACH SECTIONS	STU. NEEDS	CLASS AVG.	AVG TCHR CASELOAD
2010-11	141.5	4132	29.2	175.2	283.02	7231	25.55	153.3
Projected 2011-12	147.3	4300	29.2	175.2	194.53	7525	25.55	153.3

additional 1.5 million dollar reductions, it is reaching the point where there is no question that everyone in the district will be affected in some way including the students in the classroom.

Last week Dr. Halstead and CEA President, Eric Perkins, went to each building where 64 letters were issued to licensed employees notifying them that their jobs may be in jeopardy. Experience wise, when cutting 38.6 positions, we have to look at a higher level when we start the RIF process on the licensed side. In addition, building principals passed out 62 letters to classified staff members. Here again, these individuals could be impacted in a significant way simply because of the bumping process.

Another letter was sent to both CEA and OSEA today. In this letter Dr. Halstead clarified what the district means by concessions as stated in the last letter. Separate discussions would occur based on a memorandum Dr. Halstead sent out a week ago regarding converting from the high school block schedule to a seven-period day. This is a stand alone issue in that it is not in the contract. Changing to a seven-period day will not save positions, but it will have a significant impact on class size. The CEA union could simply choose not to open the contract or discuss these issues with the district. If they did that, it would set forth the removal of the listed positions through the RIF process. If they decide to discuss these issues with the district and there is some sort of freeze or reduction in salary that occurs, some, though not all, of these positions could be preserved.

In Article 21 of the OSEA contract there is a miscellaneous clause that says: *"If the estimated revenue from all sources as established in the adopted 2009/2010 of June 2009 is less than 102 percent of the total revenue of the 2008/2009, according to the Business Manager's calculations as of the same date, the entire contract or any part of the contract may be reopened by OSEA or the district."* A letter was sent to them today indicating that we are prepared to begin that discussion. Though we are not yet at June 2009, we realize we will be well below that range and would like to begin meeting as soon as we can limiting discussions to salary and benefits reductions. Even though there is currently a total of 12.4 FTE listed on the proposed reductions list, that isn't even close to the number of people being affected. We are also looking at reduced days and reduced hours in order to preserve more funds. OSEA membership will meet on Thursday, April 9, to discuss the cuts.

Dr. Halstead and Mr. Larson will meet tomorrow with Catherine Alexander, CEA UniServ Rep. to go over the budget. He had a good meeting today with Eric Perkins and is aware that they have a couple of meetings planned in the near future to begin discussing things from their standpoint. He feels that it is very important that the union leadership be allowed to look at the budget to verify what we are facing.

Dr. Halstead responded to questions and comments from the board.

5.4 CHS Seven Period Day Report

Mark Baier, principal of Centennial High School (CHS), and Zach Ramberg, assistant principal at CHS reported on a proposal to convert to a seven period day from the current block schedule.

Mr. Baier said when discussions began on potential budget reductions for the 2009/2010 school year and we were faced with considering the loss of staff the question at the high school level was: what is the impact when you begin losing staff. Knowing what we know about the block schedule, it was incumbent upon us to think about another model that would allow us to more efficiently use staff in the event of budget cuts.

This report was meant to inform the board about the impact of a seven period day. At this point in time they are not advocating either schedule that will take place in other discussions. CHS had a seven period day schedule until 13 years ago when they went to a block schedule.

In moving to a seven period day it is really about the more efficient use of staff and increased instructional time compared to a block schedule. In a block schedule students have four classes every day and are on an alternating A/B schedule. On any given day teachers teach three of four periods. Thus during any period you have roughly 75 percent of your teachers are in the classroom while 25 percent of teachers are on prep. In a seven period day with teachers teaching six out of seven periods a day, 14.2 percent of staff members are on prep during any given period, which puts roughly 86 percent of the teachers in the classroom. The results are that in a seven period day there are approximately 65.5 classes going on during any one period while in a block schedule you have 55.5 classes a period. The end result is that in a seven period day you have smaller class sizes than during a block schedule.

Mr. Ramberg said in the interest of getting as accurate of numbers as possible they took an estimated enrollment of 1850 students excluded special education and ELL staff due to the size of the population of students they serve. They currently have 78.5 teachers. Class size for the current block schedule averages 31.42 students. On that same schedule, if we were to agree to a seven period day with their current staffing the result would be a class size average of 27.47 students. Average teacher caseload during a block schedule is 188.52 students while an average teacher caseload during a seven period day would be 164.82 students. If we were to lose 8 FTE, average class size during a block schedule would be 34.98 students while average class size during a seven period day would be 30.58 students. Under this scenario, the average teacher caseload during a block schedule would be 209.88 students, while the average teacher caseload during a seven period day would be 183.48 students.

Effects on students by going to a seven period day are that:

- Students will have three additional classes each day.
- Students will have one less credit per year.
- Classes will meet every day.
- Students will receive additional instructional time per credit.
- Students will have additional passing times each day.
- Students will have the same schedule every day.

Effects of staffs by going to a seven period day are that:

- Teachers will teach six classes each day and have one planning period per day.
- Teachers will see each of their classes every day.
- Teachers will see more students per day with reduced prep time.
- Teachers will have additional instructional time with students during each course.

Instructional Time results are that:

- Student contact time per week on a seven period day equals:
 - ❖ One week – 255 minutes per class
 - ❖ Two weeks – 510 minutes per class
- Student contact time per week on a block schedule equals:
 - ❖ One week – 170 minutes per class
 - ❖ Two weeks – 255 minutes per class
 - ❖ Total for two weeks – 425 minutes
- With a seven period day there are 85 more instructional minutes over a two week period per class compared to that received during a block schedule.

With 11 percent more teachers teaching every period the result would be a smaller “case-load” for each teacher. In the event of staff reductions it may serve to approximate a current teacher caseload.

- Average class size presently is 31.0 student totaling an average of 186 students for each teacher’s case-load.
- During a seven period day each teacher class size reduces to 27.48 and the average teacher case-load reduces to 165 students under current staffing.
- These numbers would change depending how many teachers there are.

Mr. Baier and Mr. Ramberg responded to questions and comments from the board particularly whether there are other districts considering a seven period day, its impact on CAL and the ACE Academy, more or less options for students during the day, and how this might affect ASC (Academic Support Classes).

Mr. Baier emphasized that there are no perfect schedules. Basically it comes down to choices and what you are trying to accomplish with the schedule. There is also no definitive research or data that suggests any one schedule is better for student learning than another.

5.5 Student Representative’s Report (taken out of order prior to 5.3)

David Ketch, CHS Student Representative, reported that:

- Prom is Saturday, April 11, at the Tiffany Center from 8:00 to 11:00 p.m.; pictures are being taken at the high school prior to prom.
- CHS graduation has been moved to the Expo Center on June 2.
- The senior all-night party is Saturday, May 30, at the Cascade Athletic Club.
- CHS Dance Team placed fourth in state at the recent state dance competition held at the Memorial Coliseum.