The Case for Summer Learning
Why Supporting Students and Families All Year Is Vitally Important

BY SARAH PITCOCK

For many people, the word “summer” evokes easier days, a time when life slows down. So does the term “summer break,” a time parents, teachers, and students alike value as a well-deserved respite from the labor of the school year. Unfortunately, a growing body of evidence shows that summer is far from a time to recharge for many families. Instead, it’s a time of loss and lack, a time of struggle and stress. With half of all public school children today living in low-income households, the reality is that summer is actually no vacation at all.

The truth is, public schools are a critical lifeline for low-income students and families. When they are open, students of different income levels—rich, poor, and middle class—achieve at roughly the same rate. When they are closed, achievement gaps widen and a variety of academic, health, and social-emotional outcomes decline. So why are schools closed in the summer?

A Brief History

It’s a question we hear journalists and commentators discuss from time to time. Many claim that the school year’s origins lie in our outdated agrarian school calendar, that our summer break is a vestige of a past when children’s responsibilities to the family farm trumped their educational needs. It turns out this is one of many myths associated with summer vacation. In reality, crops are planted in the spring and harvested and sold in the fall, making summer and winter historically good times for children in rural areas to attend school, which they did until the early 20th century.

Instead, the summer break as we know it today came from a desire to reconcile what were very different school calendars for urban and rural students. In 1842, New York City schools were open 248 days a year, significantly more than the 180 days or so they are open today. In many cities, school was essentially open...
year-round. Children came when they could; it was difficult to mandate attendance.

By the late 19th century, a variety of social and economic factors made standardizing the calendar seem prudent. The summer heat made schools uninhabitable in many parts of the country. Affluent and middle-class residents often left cities during the sweltering summer months, resulting in schools closing while they were away.¹ In addition, public health advocates at the time said it was unhealthy to be inside so much. President Teddy Roosevelt was pushing the benefits of exercise and getting outside, and the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts were taking root in the United States, adding to the nation’s growing interest in nature and exploration.

So a compromise was made to standardize urban and rural calendars around a long summer break. The time would give teachers an opportunity to train and students a chance to get outside and recover from the school year.

With more students on the same calendar, it didn’t take long for the issue of summer learning loss to arise. In 1906, William White tried to determine how much students forget academically during their summer break. White, a math teacher in New Paltz, New York, tested seven fourth-graders and eight seventh-graders on their recall of math facts before and after summer break. He found decreases in their learning, but didn’t attempt to explain the decline, writing that “neglect for three months may blur the memory; but three months of open-air life may give an increased vitality that quickens the memory.”²

White was the first known researcher of what is now called the “summer slide.” Since he completed his small experiment, many researchers have taken on the issue in a similar way, comparing students’ knowledge and skills before and after summer.

Barbara Heyns is one such researcher. With her 1978 book Summer Learning and the Effects of Schooling, she demonstrated that the achievement gap widens when disadvantaged children are cut off from the learning resources available to them at school. Her research of Atlanta schoolchildren from low-income families found that poor African American children came close to keeping pace with their more-advantaged counterparts during the school year but fell back during the summer months.³

As Karl Alexander, Matthew Boulay, and I wrote in the introduction to our edited volume, The Summer Slide: What We Know and Can Do About Summer Learning Loss, Heyns’s “findings fundamentally altered our understanding of the forces that impinge on poor and minority children’s learning.”⁴

In 1996, Harris Cooper’s meta-analysis of 39 summer school program evaluations first quantified summer learning loss in terms of months of grade-level skills. He found that all students lost at least a month of math skills every summer, with an average loss of 2.6 months. Cooper’s findings confirmed what Heyns found: that children in lower-income families lost more than their middle- and higher-income peers.⁵

Cooper revealed a personal impetus for the work in a published interview:

While I was serving as a school board member, there was a threatened federal reduction in summer school support. I didn’t think that seemed like a good way to save money, so after the meeting, I talked to some graduate students and said, “Let’s look at what happens over the summer.” …

When public schools are open, students of different income levels achieve at roughly the same rate.

As researchers such as Cooper have pointed out, middle-class students experience better outcomes from summer learning programs than their less-affluent peers. One reason is attributed to the “faucet theory”: public schooling creates a flow of resources to all students during the school year—books, meals, teachers, and organized activities, among others—that keep all students learning and growing. In the summer, the faucet continues flowing for middle- and higher-income students because of their home environment and/or the enrichment their families provide. But the faucet runs dry for lower-income students, who lose access to critical services altogether when the school doors close. That inequity at home makes it harder for low-income students to keep up academically in the summer, even if they attend the same programs as their higher-income peers.

Three researchers at Johns Hopkins University, Doris R. Entwisle, Karl Alexander, and Linda Steffel Olson, introduced the faucet theory in their book, Children, Schools, and Inequality, published in 1997.⁶ Based on spring and fall test scores from their longitudinal Beginning School Study in Baltimore, they found that the difference in reading comprehension abilities between low-income children and middle-income children grew from half a school year in the fall of first grade to three school years by the spring of fifth grade. The real revelation, however, was that almost all of the increase in the achievement gap over the elementary school years could be traced to differences across social lines in

Researchers have observed that the difference in reading and math outcomes over the summer is likely related to the fact that reading is more naturally embedded in a child’s life and that parents are natural reading teachers. On the other hand, math may not be a naturally occurring part of day-to-day life in many households, making math knowledge and skills more difficult to practice and quicker to decline.
summer learning experiences. They found that two-thirds of the ninth-grade reading achievement gap could be attributed to how students spent their summers in elementary school.6

In 1992, Matthew Boulay, one of Alexander’s students, founded Teach Baltimore, a summer reading program, which paired Johns Hopkins undergraduate students with low-income elementary students from Baltimore City Public Schools. An evaluation of Teach Baltimore showed that participating students returned to school in the fall with a learning advantage instead of the typical learning loss. With growing recognition of the issue, Teach Baltimore became the Center for Summer Learning in 2001, known today as the National Summer Learning Association.

Research and Advocacy in Recent Years
In 2009, the National Summer Learning Association began convening school districts as part of the New Vision for Summer School (NVSS) Network, a group of districts committed to transcending the remedial, punitive model of summer school. Spurred by stimulus funding from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, member districts were ready to use the summer months to serve more students in more innovative ways and test out teacher professional development and new curriculum and instructional strategies. New strategies included testing project-based learning5 approaches in the summer, partnering with community-based organizations to co-deliver programs, and pairing new teachers with veteran teachers for mentorship and training.

In 2011, five urban school districts, some of them members of the NVSS Network, joined with the Rand Corporation and the Wallace Foundation to answer two important questions: Can voluntary summer learning programs combining academics and enrichment help students succeed in school? And if so, how?

By reviewing existing research and interviewing providers, Rand found several aspects critical to successful summer programming. These included offering small class sizes and individualized instruction, engaging students in fun enrichment activities, providing transportation to and from the program, offering full-day program options, and notifying parents early before they make other plans for the summer. Rand also found that partnerships between school districts and community-based organizations were mutually beneficial and cost less than separate programs.7 (For more from Rand’s researchers on summer learning, see the article on page 10.)

In 2013, Rand began conducting a randomized controlled trial in five school districts—in Boston; Dallas; Duval County, Florida; Pittsburgh; and Rochester, New York—to evaluate summer learning outcomes. There were 5,600 third-graders who applied to summer programs and were randomly assigned to one of two groups—those selected to take part in the programs for two summers (the treatment group) and those not selected (the control group). The study analyzed outcomes for 3,192 students who were offered access to the programs.

The programs combined academic instruction from certified teachers with a variety of enrichment offerings from community partners, including dance, theater, martial arts, swimming, woodworking, cooking, and kayaking. Program leaders received substantial support from the Rand team through formative feedback that enabled them to strengthen and enhance their programs each summer.

Researchers found that students who attended a five- to six-week summer program for 20 or more days in 2013 (deemed “high attenders”) performed better on state math tests than similar students in the control group. This advantage was statistically significant and lasted through the following school year. The results were even more striking for “high attenders” in 2014: they outperformed control-group students in both math and English language arts (ELA) on standardized tests in the fall and spring. The advantage after the second summer was equivalent to 20 to 25 percent of a year’s learning in math and ELA. Regardless of attendance rate, students who received at least 25 hours of math or 34 hours of ELA instruction during the summer did better than control-group students on tests in fall 2013 and fall 2014.8

Rand’s work has contributed tremendously to the research base on summer learning. The findings qualify as promising evidence, also known as “Tier 3” under the Every Student Succeeds Act. The Every Student Succeeds Act offers many funding streams that are only available to districts if used to support activities that are evidence-based, which the law defines in four tiers based on the rigor of the research. The availability of qualifying research on which to base program design should make it easier for states to use federal funding for this kind of summer learning.

Additional research shows us that summer learning loss involves more than math and reading. When students do not attend engaging and enriching summer programs, the summer months can result in losses in health and well-being, college and career opportunity, and the support needed to break cycles of intergenerational poverty and move young people and their families forward.9

In fact, 84 percent of young people who qualify for free and reduced-price meals do not access them in the summer.10 Reasons may include lack of availability, stigma associated with going to meal sites, or lack of awareness. In addition to hunger, food insecurity has other consequences. For example, some young people gain weight twice as fast during the summer. A recent analysis of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class of 2010–11, shows a stark difference between school year and summer weight gain. The prevalence of both obese and overweight children increased signifi-

---

5 For more on project-based learning, see “Project-Based Instruction” in the Fall 2016 issue of American Educator, available at www.aft.org/ae/fall2016/duke.
cantly between the start of kindergarten and the end of second grade, with all of the increase occurring during the summers.13

For many youth ages 14 and up, particularly those from low-income homes, earning an income in the summer is a necessity. Subsidized summer jobs were once an accessible reality for many, but the primary federal funding stream for such programs was eliminated in 2008, leaving cities to take up much of the responsibility. This loss of funding has contributed to a nearly 40 percent decline in youth employment in the last 12 years and a deficit of 3.6 million teen summer jobs. The decline has most affected low-income and minority youth. In 2013, white male teens from high-income families were five times more likely to be employed than African American male teens from low-income families.14

In addition to the loss of funding for summer jobs, other factors have made summer as much about family economic success as academic success. On July 6, 2009, then President Barack Obama declared the first National Summer Learning Day. His declaration reads, in part: “Families and community members play the most important role in the lives of their children. Demands at work and home mean that many parents have less time to spend with their children, but this time, care, and instruction is critical to children’s academic success.”15

Indeed, the composition and well-being of families and our workforce have changed dramatically, with major implications for summer learning, health, and safety. Today, more children are living with single parents. The share of children born outside of marriage now stands at 41 percent, up from just 5 percent in 1960. Since 1996, most recipients of public assistance must work in order to qualify for benefits, taking them out of the home year-round. Minimum wage has not kept pace with inflation, so parents are working longer hours for less pay. In short, there is no one home to care for kids in the summer and less money to pay for care inside or outside the home.16

Former Massachusetts Secretary of Education Paul Reville has been a vocal advocate for a radical reimagining of public education to catch up to the changing family and economic circumstances. Citing the growing achievement and opportunity gaps, Reville writes:

I believe we need a national campaign for a new concept: making summer learning, in effect, a third education semester each year. ... This concept is not about prescribing more formal schooling, but rather about providing enrichment, stimulation, and learning opportunities that are often, though not always, aligned with academic goals. ... Such an entitlement would ... guarantee that every child, irrespective of financial means, would have access to at least 6 weeks of high-quality summer learning and enrichment. ... We can no longer treat summer learning as incidental, an accident of birth; rather, we must see it as an essential ingredient in achieving student success at scale.17

**Why Summer Learning Is Not a Priority**

The Hatcher Group, a public affairs and communications firm, has been tracking coverage of summer learning loss in the media for a decade. What started as 1,000 stories on the issue in 2007 grew to more than 30,000 stories in 2015, a more than tenfold increase in just eight years. The term “summer slide” is increasingly well understood and used to describe the phenomenon. Perhaps as a result of steady media coverage, educators and parents seem to recognize the importance of the issue.

The Afterschool Alliance, a policy and advocacy organization,1 conducts its *America After 3PM* national survey every five years to document participation in and perceptions of afterschool and summer programs among a representative sample of households. In the most recent survey, from 2014, 85 percent of families said they support public funding for summer learning. The figure is no surprise, given that the average reported cost of a summer program nationally was $288 per week—putting fee-based programs out of reach of many low- and middle-income families.18

Where does that leave us? Research tells us that summer learning loss is a problem and a considerable factor in the achievement gap. Yet despite growing understanding of the issue and support for summer learning, it is still not a priority. Why? One (unsurprising) answer is funding. It’s no secret that school districts have struggled to fully fund their schools since the Great Recession. From 2007 to 2009, state funding fell sharply, and local funding didn’t make up the difference. Most states still provide less support per student for elementary and secondary schools than they did prior to 2007. Even today, some states continue to make cuts.

---

1For more on the Afterschool Alliance, an AFT partner, see www.afterschoolalliance.org.
Regardless of state and district budgets, the lack of dedicated federal funding for summer learning makes the issue easy to ignore. Most offices within a school district and agencies within a city or state are directly tied to a public funding stream. As the saying goes, what gets measured gets done.

A variety of federal funding streams allow—but don’t require—money to be targeted to summer learning, so such spending is rarely prioritized or tracked. One step in the right direction: nearly half of states now require or prioritize summer learning for their federal 21st Century Community Learning Center programs, which are partnerships between schools and community-based organizations to offer academic enrichment programming before and after the school day and during the summer. Still, little local infrastructure exists for summer learning. For instance, in many districts, summer programs are often run by teachers on special assignment with little time for preparation or coordination across departments or agencies. Although summer learning is really everyone’s problem, in practice, it’s no one’s responsibility.

Another common challenge for expanding access to summer learning involves physical infrastructure. Today, many schools still lack air conditioning, making them too hot for use in the summer. Moreover, summer is the favored time for improvements, repairs, and upgrades to be made to facilities, also taking many schools out of consideration for summer programming.

In his 2010 article for *Time*, writer David Von Drehle points to yet another common barrier to expanding summer learning programs: “Leaders in a number of states have tried to add days or even weeks to the academic calendar, but they quickly run into barriers of cost and culture. … Entire industries depend on the rhythms of summer—think travel, camping, sports and theme parks. They use their influence to keep summers as long as possible.”

Indeed, a simple Google search for “tourism lobby and school calendars” yields news stories from multiple states covering the struggle between school systems and powerful tourism interest groups for more local control over school calendars. North Carolina has had a particularly hard-fought battle since the state passed a school calendar law in 2004. The law requires schools to start on the Monday nearest August 26 and end on the Friday closest to June 11. In that time, districts must fit 185 school days, nine teacher work days, several weeks of holidays, and makeup days for weather.

The superintendent of the Vance County Schools in North Carolina, Anthony Jackson, has criticized the calendar law, pointing out that an earlier start date would reduce summer learning loss and enable the district to align the calendar to the local community college, which, in turn, would help high school students enroll in classes there. And he is not alone. In Virginia, a school calendar law was signed in 1986, and school administrators have been trying to overturn it ever since. A 2005 law requires Michigan schools to start after Labor Day, and a 2016 Maryland executive order that went into effect in 2017 requires the same.

While these laws exemplify the cultural value and perceived economic value of summer, they are ultimately shortsighted. The achievement gap, to which summer learning loss makes a significant contribution, suppresses high school graduation and college completion rates. It also results in long-term economic and social costs to society that far outweigh the benefits of one or two additional weeks of summer break.

With a swing toward more local control of federal education funding and meaningful evidence to support summer learning, perhaps more districts will take a serious look at the potential of these overlooked months. After all, young people who are behind need more time for learning, and more time during the school year alone will never solve the complex inequities of summer or close the achievement gap.

School districts should look to the wide-open space of the summer months to test their new approaches and partnerships, and they should have help along the way. Fortunately, parents overwhelmingly support summer learning, and community-based organizations stand ready to support districts in this cause.

Parents overwhelmingly support summer learning, and community-based organizations stand ready to support districts in this cause.

School districts should look to the wide-open space of the summer months to test their new approaches and partnerships, and they should have help along the way. Fortunately, parents overwhelmingly support summer learning, and community-based organizations stand ready to support districts in this cause.

With more than 100 years of research on the academic setbacks related to students’ unequal summers, and newer research on the employment and health implications of this disparity, it’s clear that the summer slide is everyone’s problem. Still, we’ll only make progress against this outdated cultural and institutional norm when school districts, parents, employers, and state and local leaders agree that the summer slide is also everyone’s responsibility.

*For more on community schools, see “Where It All Comes Together” in the Fall 2015 issue of American Educator, available at www.aft.org/ae/fall2015/blank_villarreal.
On the Need for Summer Learning

A Q&A with Shauntell Dunbar

For the last three years, Shauntell Dunbar has taught first grade at Young Achievers Science and Math Pilot School in the Boston Public Schools. Last year, she taught reading and math in one of the school district’s summer programs. Below, she shares her experience supporting student learning during the summer.

Q Tell us about the summer program where you taught.

A In recent years, the school district has revamped its summer programs so that students can not only strengthen their academic learning but also participate in enrichment activities. One of these programs is Early Focus, where I taught math and reading to 12 first-graders. Early Focus is designed to help students who are almost, but not quite, meeting benchmarks in numeracy and literacy.

The program runs for six weeks. I taught during the academic part of the day, from 8 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. After that, students participated in activities, such as arts and crafts, sports, and games, offered through the YMCA. Literacy activities and time for independent reading were also built into the afternoon. The fact that the program lasted until 5 p.m. was great for families, since many parents work and need full-day child care in the summer.

Boston’s summer programs take place at sites throughout the city. I taught at an Early Focus site located at another school, Mildred Avenue K–8 School, which is down the street from Young Achievers. Because many school buildings are old and lack air conditioning, programs only operate in schools that have it, such as Mildred.

Q How do students qualify for Early Focus?

A Teachers at each grade level from Boston elementary schools select four students from their classrooms to enroll. The number of students is capped because funding is limited. Early Focus is for students in kindergarten and first and second grades. The city also runs summer programs for a variety of student populations—English language learners, homeless students, and upper elementary students, as well as those in middle and high school.

In my class at Young Achievers, I would have loved to recommend six or seven students for Early Focus, but there wasn’t enough room. These are middle-of-the-road students who work hard but have not met certain benchmarks by the end of the school year. And I know they could, if I just had a few more weeks to work with them.

Q Do you know how your students who do not have access to Early Focus spend their time during the summer?

A They’re probably just hanging out and watching TV. They’re not engaged in activities. The community where Young Achievers is located is low-income. All students at my school receive free or reduced-price meals because so many qualify for them. A lot of times, it’s unsafe for students to be outside because of violence in the community. Since parents work, students often spend time on electronic devices at home. The neighborhood just does not have many programs for young children in the summer.

Q When you start the school year, in what ways do you see that summer learning loss has affected your students?

A Many are behind because they’ve done little or no reading over the summer. So, if students were meeting the standard for literacy in kindergarten but did not build on their skills or their knowledge base over the summer, we must catch them up. That’s what we do for the first two months of school—we review phonics and math just to catch them up to where they were when they finished kindergarten.

Q At the end of the school year, what do you do to help students continue learning in the summer?

A As a school, we send home books with our students. Many teachers at Young Achievers actually provide the books themselves. For instance, I buy each of the 20 students in my class at least three books. That money comes out of my own pocket. I also give students a packet of materials to review what we did in first grade. And the school continues to give them free access to online literacy and math programs, such as Raz-Kids, MobyMax, and Lexia Learning.

Q For the first two months of school, we review phonics and math just to catch students up.

A I often check in with her teacher, who says her academic and social skills have flourished. She used to be a student who threw a tantrum practically every day. And I know the improvement in her behavior and academics is because of the work we did during the summer.

Q However, what students really need is a summer program, where the day is devoted to academics and enrichment. That enrichment piece is very important, especially for young children, because it enables them to continue building social and emotional skills.

A I had one student last year who had a very tough time during the school year. She didn’t make any significant learning gains until April and May. But then the school year was over. I selected her for Early Focus, and, fortunately, I was also her teacher for the summer, and she maintained and built on those gains. Now she’s in second grade and performing above benchmark.

I often check in with her teacher, who says her academic and social skills have flourished. She used to be a student who threw a tantrum practically every day. And I know the improvement in her behavior and academics is because of the work we did during the summer.
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Effective Summer Programming
What Educators and Policymakers Should Know

BY ANDREW McEACHIN, CATHERINE H. AUGUSTINE, AND JENNIFER McCOMBS

A
s many educators and parents know all too well, the summer is a key time in students’ social and cognitive development, and it plays an important role in the development of achievement gaps. As a result, summer interventions have the potential to not only mitigate summer learning loss but also reduce persistent achievement gaps.

In our chapter from The Summer Slide: What We Know and Can Do About Summer Learning Loss, from which this article is drawn, we reviewed a foundational meta-analysis of summer learning programs conducted by researchers as well as evidence from 25 studies of such programs since 2000. The programs covered in our review included voluntary at-home summer reading programs, voluntary classroom-based summer programs, and mandatory summer programs that students must attend to avoid in-grade retention.

The evidence suggests that many types of summer learning programs have the potential to reduce summer learning losses and perhaps create learning gains. However, implementing a summer program does not guarantee positive effects on students’ learning. A key question then is: What factors make a summer learning program effective?

Components of Quality Summer Learning Programs

Small Class Sizes

Research has found that small class size is associated with summer program effectiveness. One study found that summer programs with class size capped at 20 students were more effective than others in producing achievement gains. In another study, researchers found no statistically significant relationship between class size and program quality, but they found positive effects when small classes were combined with significant program resources (defined as class sizes of no more than 13, at least four hours of participation per day, and at least 70 hours of total participation). They analyzed 12 studies with enough detail to investigate whether program resources mediated students’ learning. Of those 12, the five studies that met these criteria had large statistically significant, positive effects on students’ learning, and the seven studies that did not meet the criteria had no statistically significant effect on students’ learning.

Other researchers similarly combined instructional hours with class size to test whether more individual attention offered due to smaller classes might improve results. Although they found a positive relationship between the number of hours of instructional time and math achievement, they did not find a relationship when it was further combined with class size. This may be because prevailing class sizes across the five studied districts were all small, ranging from an average of eight to 14 students per teacher. Furthermore, researchers found large positive effects of an intense summer literacy program on students’ reading outcomes. The program used daily small-group (three to five children), research-based instruction.

To sum up, programs with small classes and significant resources provide teachers with more time to work individually with students and to create greater opportunities to differentiate instruction based on student needs. Such programs may also be particularly beneficial during the summer, when teachers have much less time to get to know the students in their classrooms.

Aligned to Student Needs

Learning science recommends that in order to maximize the benefit of academic experiences, especially in literacy, students’ assignments should be well aligned to their interests and needs. Summer learning programs should therefore align instruction to school-year activities, and instruction should be tightly focused on addressing students’ needs with high-quality instruction. The findings from the many replications of Project READS, an at-home summer literacy intervention, clearly show that students are not only more likely to read over the summer when books are aligned to their interests and matched to their reading levels, but they are also more likely to comprehend what they are reading, and these comprehension effects persist into the following school year.

The results from Project READS also suggest that sending students books matched to their reading levels and interests over the summer with the expectation that they will read them is not enough. In the absence of a structured school setting, struggling students also need continued support during the summer. For example, researchers tested whether students who were given resources meant to mimic school-year learning opportunities outperformed students who were just given basic prompts to read books over the summer. They found that an approach that included a scaffolded summer reading intervention and prompts to read over the summer increased the amount of time students spent reading and improved their comprehension, relative to students who were either just mailed books home or not given any treatment (e.g., no scaffolding or books).

Finally, the Project READS work also tested whether incentives to read over the summer enhanced students’ summer reading habits and comprehension. Researchers tested two different treatments. In the first, students were supplied with books to read over the summer aligned to their skills and interests. In the second, students were given books and points for each book they read (that could
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be redeemed for toys, games, etc.). At the end of the summer, the intervention was effective only for motivated students (as measured by baseline surveys), and the use of incentives actually widened the achievement gap between motivated and unmotivated students. As such, it is important not only to align students’ work with their interests and ability levels, but also to build structures to support learning during the summer, especially for at-home programs.

Qualified Teachers
One study found a positive, statistically significant association between prior teaching experience and reading outcomes. Specifically, it found that students who had summer teachers who had just taught either their sending or receiving grade performed better than other students on a fall reading assessment. In order to recruit and hire the right teachers, researchers recommend developing rigorous selection processes to recruit motivated teachers and, to the extent possible, taking teachers’ school-year performance into consideration. They also stress the importance of hiring teachers with not only grade-level but also subject-matter experience and, if possible, familiarity with the students.

High-Quality Instruction
In addition to the importance of recruiting qualified teachers, the teachers’ instruction of the curriculum is important. In one study, researchers observed and evaluated instructional quality for each classroom in their study. Their analysis found a positive association between quality of instruction and better student performance in reading. (They did not find a relationship between quality of instruction and student performance in mathematics.) Furthermore, researchers examined voluntary and at-home literacy programs that used research-based instruction, such as guided repeated oral reading, that related readings to students’ prior experiences and explicitly modeled strategies for students. Programs that included these practices had significantly larger positive effects on students’ reading outcomes than programs that did not use such instructional practices.

In efforts to ensure high-quality instruction, researchers recommend anchoring summer literacy programs in an evidence-based curriculum; providing professional development to teachers; tying small-group instruction explicitly to learning goals; and providing teachers with instructional support, such as coaching, during the program.

Site Culture
Researchers expected that students in more orderly sites would have better outcomes because they and their teachers would be less likely to be distracted by misbehavior. To evaluate student discipline and order in the districts programs they studied, they created a scale for each site within each district based on teacher survey data. On the survey, teachers were asked for their observations of student bullying,* physical fighting, and other indicators of orderliness. They found that students who attended more orderly sites outperformed other students on the fall reading assessment.

Policies to Maximize Participation and Attendance
Consistent attendance is crucial not only for school-year learning but for summer learning as well. Researchers did not find differences in program effectiveness between summer programs that did and did not monitor attendance, so tracking attendance, while a good policy, is likely insufficient to increase attendance. To promote consistent attendance, researchers recommend setting enrollment deadlines, establishing a clear attendance policy, and providing field trips and other incentives for students who attend. They also found that it is not necessary to disguise academics to boost attendance: the district with the highest attendance rate in the study ran the most “school-like” program, with the most explicit academic instruction.

Sufficient Duration
Researchers generally distinguish between allocated time (the time on the school calendar for a given content area) and academic learning time (the amount of time students spend working on rigorous tasks at the appropriate level of difficulty). Academic learning time is more predictive of student achievement. Furthermore, research also suggests that spaced practice (once a day for several days), as opposed to one long, concentrated lesson (all day long for just one day), appears to be more effective in facilitating learning. When focusing on boosting students’ literacy skills, researchers recommend that students receive at least two hours of teacher-directed daily instruction blended between whole-group and small-group (three to five students) lessons and that the program meet regularly during the week (four to five times) for at least five weeks.

Similarly, researchers recommend that school districts plan for programs to run at least five weeks and schedule 60–90 minutes of mathematics per day to maximize effectiveness. Because instructional time on task is reduced due to student absences and inefficient use of time during the day, researchers suggest special efforts to promote consistent attendance, maintain daily schedules, and ensure teachers maximize instructional time in the classroom.

For educators, administrators, and policymakers looking to strengthen their summer learning programs, we suggest they keep the following information in mind. First, research shows that the effectiveness of summer learning programs is inconsistently influenced by students’ backgrounds and the grade level of the intervention. This implies that there is no “best” target population of students for summer programming. Furthermore, simply offering a program does not guarantee it will benefit students.

Second, research indicates that for summer programs to be effective, they must be of sufficient duration (i.e., at least five weeks long or 70 hours of academic programming) and achieve consistent student attendance. Students also benefit from individualized and aligned instruction and class sizes smaller than 20 students.

In addition, high-quality instruction (promoted through careful hiring and professional development) by teachers who have recently taught the sending or receiving grade contributes to positive student outcomes, as does providing that instruction in orderly summer sites with low levels of physical fighting or bullying.

It is our hope that this research encourages districts and providers to enact quality components and ensure effectiveness in carefully planning for summer programming.

Spark Self-Directed Summer Learning

The struggle is real. Summer learning loss, or the “summer slide,” creates a need to reteach material and reorient students to academic learning at the start of each school year. While unstructured time to run and play is valuable, many students could also benefit from intellectual stimulation during the summer.

Program-based summer learning can be quite effective at preventing summer learning loss. But it is costly and certainly does not reach all students. Thanks to dozens of free resources from Share My Lesson and our partners, teachers can inspire students with self-directed—and joyful—summer learning.

Make It Fun

Would your students jump at the chance to take photographs of their community? Make and launch a rocket? Evaluate the reliability of news reports on current events? For resources on helping students engage in activities like these, visit Share My Lesson’s “Summer Learning at Home” collection, where you’ll also find lessons devoted to baseball. An entire collection covers the sport’s significance, across nearly all subjects and grade levels, which lets a parent or teacher bring learning right to the ball field.

Students vacationing at the beach can learn more about ocean tides or the phases of the moon while gazing at the night sky by visiting the “Celebrate Science” lesson collection. Content-rich lessons and handouts are perfect to give students to take home before summer break. You might also e-mail ideas for summer learning directly to students and parents. Encourage them to post pictures and reflections on your class web page or your school’s Facebook page.

Harness Screen Time

Most students will spend lots of time on electronic devices during summer break, so help them use screen time productively. If your students like to watch movies, find films they might enjoy, such as Finding Dory and Pirates of the Caribbean: The Curse of the Black Pearl, and distribute the corresponding reflection activities from Share My Lesson’s collection of “Teacher Resources Inspired by Films.”

One of our partners, Storyline Online, features famous actors reading stories. For instance, Karan Brar of the Diary of a Wimpy Kid films reads The Kiss That Missed, and Betty White reads Harry the Dirty Dog. Which actors do your students admire? Take advantage of these performers’ appeal to demonstrate that reading is cool. Each video comes with a home activity sheet.

Interested in learning how to use digital resources to foster students’ love of reading and build their literacy skills? Watch our webinar with the authors of Tap, Click, Read: Growing Readers in a World of Screens.

Involving Parents

A recent study* revealed that simply text messaging tips to parents of third- and fourth-graders at risk of summer learning loss is a powerful strategy for increasing reading scores. Try sending a newsletter, e-mailing, or calling home to let parents know about ways they can support students’ summer learning. Or incorporate these resources at your next parent-teacher conference. Better yet, curate several ideas geared toward the ages and interests of your students and let us know so we can feature you and your efforts on our blog.

We can also create a collection of resources specifically designed for you and your students. Simply send an e-mail to content@sharemylesson.com to let us know which Share My Lesson resources would be most useful.

Have a great summer!
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