TIME · AN EVIDENCE-BASED ESSAY FOR PARENTS

A School Day Runs on Three Clocks. Only One Rings.

The bell, his attention, and the work clicking. A seat-hour is not a learning hour.

14-minute read Every figure sourced below By George Weber Nothing here is for sale

Picture a Thursday in February. Your son has a cough. Not a fever, just the kind of cough that keeps a child home without keeping him down. By the end of the morning you will feel a little guilty, and you won’t quite know why.

At 8:15 his teacher emails the day’s work: a math page, a reading log, a short paragraph about the book his class is reading. You set him up at the kitchen table with a mug of warm water and honey, and you go to answer your own email.

At 9:05 he says, “Done.”

You check. The math is right. Two of the problems are messy, so you ask him to explain one, and he does, out loud, a little impatient with you. The paragraph is short, but it is about the book. Then he is on the living-room rug with a bin of building bricks, humming, and he stays there until lunch.

You feel two things, one right after the other.

The first is relief. He’s fine. He can do the work.

The second is harder to name. Something close to guilt. A school day is supposed to be long. A day that ends at 9:05 feels like a day off, and you have the uneasy sense that you just let him take one.

Then a third thought arrives, the one you would never say out loud at pickup. *If the work took fifty minutes at this table, what happens in the other six hours?*

You feel disloyal for thinking it. His teacher is kind, and she works hard. You have seen her car in the lot at seven in the morning. So you put the thought away. You tell yourself that a sick day at home is not a real school day, which is true.

But the question doesn’t leave. What is a school day actually made of?

• • •

A day built for a room

Start with the plain facts.

In 2011–12†, US public schools told a federal survey that their day ran about 6.7 hours, a little under seven, and their year about 179 days. That comes to roughly 1,200 hours of school a year.

That is the whole day. Lunch is inside it. So is recess, and the walk to music, and the line at the door.

The law counts the day the same way. Most states write their school requirement as a number of days or hours in the building, often 180 days. In a 2018† federal table, 28 of the 50 states and the District of Columbia listed exactly 180. The rule counts time. It can’t count learning, because learning doesn’t show up on a clock.

Now think about what those hours have to hold. One adult and a roomful of children, in a building with hundreds more. Before anyone learns anything, the children have to arrive, be counted, hang up their coats and find their seats. Someone needs the bathroom. Someone was absent yesterday and needs to catch up. The intercom comes on. The class lines up for art and walks down a hallway built for many classes at once. Lunch has to feed hundreds of children in shifts.

Every one of those jobs is real. None of them is anyone’s failure. They are what it costs to run a day for many children at once.

That is the design. It was built to keep a great many children safe, fed and taught in one place, and it does a lot of that well. But a day built for a room spends many of its minutes on the room.

And you can’t see the minutes. You see drop-off and pickup. In between is a building you are not in. So the hours become the thing you trust. Seven hours sounds serious. A full day sounds like work. A short day sounds like slacking, for a child or for the parent who allowed it.

That is the weight you carry into any conversation about a different kind of day: learning at home, a shorter program, a morning at your own table, or simply a better use of the day he already has. You are being asked to judge learning, which you can’t see, by hours, which you can.

Underneath that sits a quieter worry. If you ever chose a shorter day, people might think you had chosen the easy thing. Your mother might think it. Your spouse might. On a bad night, you might think it yourself.

That isn’t a flaw in you. The clock is the only measure the design ever handed you.

The belief that keeps the clock on the wall

Here is the belief, the way it sounds in your own head:

More hours in a seat means more learning. A short day is a lazy day.

It deserves respect. It comes from something true about work. Nothing good gets built without showing up. Maybe you learned that at your first job, or watching your father leave the house before it was light. A child who practices more usually gets better. A morning that ends at 9:05 can look like the start of a habit you don't want him to have.

And the research gives this belief more than you might expect.

In a 2024 review, two researchers, Matthew Kraft and Sarah Novicoff, pulled together the strongest studies of time in school, the kind designed to show cause and not just a pattern. They found "a clear positive effect" of added time on achievement, usually small and sometimes medium, depending on how much time is added, how it is used, and where. For US schools, they estimate that adding 10 percent or more to total school time would most likely bring a gain of less than 0.05 of a standard deviation. (A standard deviation is a yardstick for how spread out children's scores are. A gain of 0.05 is a small nudge.) Each added hour also tends to help a little less than the one before it.

A federal review of 30 strong studies of added learning time, most of them after-school or summer programs, found "insufficient evidence" that more time helps "all students in all settings." The gains were small on average. They were largest for children already behind in reading, a moderate gain of about half a standard deviation, though that rests on only three studies. And the results depended on who taught and how.

Cutting time works in reverse, and it costs something too. When districts in Oregon moved to four-day weeks, children lost nearly three and a half hours of teaching a week. Compared with similar districts that kept five days, their math and reading scores dipped slightly. A RAND study of mostly rural districts in several states that made the same switch found that the children kept learning, but more slowly than they would have on five days. Those districts had about 58 fewer hours of school a year. And in the RAND districts, the families liked the schedule.

Hold on to that last part. A schedule can feel better and still cost a little learning. Your wariness about a short day is not snobbery, and it is not fear. In these studies, time counted.

So the belief has a true part, and nothing ahead asks you to give it up. It only asks a smaller question.

Which hours?

Three clocks inside one day

The idea that time in school and time spent learning are different things is not new. Since the 1960s, researchers have described school learning in terms of time: the time a child needs to learn something, and the time she actually spends learning it.

In the 1970s, a research project in California, the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, went into classrooms to measure the second kind of time. Three of its researchers, Fisher, Marliave and Filby, described what they found in 1979. They had watched six children in each of 46 classrooms, second grade and fifth grade.

What they found, in effect, was three clocks running at once.

The first clock is the schedule. How much of the day is set aside for a subject. Even that varied more than you might guess. Some classrooms scheduled more than twice as much time for a subject as others did. In second-grade math, it ran from around 25 minutes a day in one class to around 60 minutes in another.

The second clock is attention. How much of that scheduled time the children were actually engaged. In some classrooms, average engagement during reading and math was about half the time. In others it came close to 90 percent.

The third clock is the one the researchers were really after. They called it “academic learning time”: the time a child spends “engaged in an academic task that he/she performs with high success.” Not staring at a page he can’t read. Working, on the right work, and getting it. Children who built up more of that time generally scored higher on achievement tests. That is a pattern, not proof that one caused the other.

You have been watching these clocks for years without naming them. The bell is the first. The look on his face over the page is the second. The third is the moment he gets it, and moves on. Only the first one can be read from the parking lot.

Where the rest of the day goes

If only part of the scheduled time is engaged, where does the rest of the day go?

In 1984, Nancy Karweit, a researcher at Johns Hopkins, reviewed the classroom time studies of the 1970s and early 1980s, most of them in elementary schools. She found “strong agreement among the studies that, at most, about half of the school day is actually used for instruction.”

Read that slowly, because it is easy to hear it wrong. It does not say half the day was wasted. She called the rest “noninstructional activities,” planned and unplanned. Think of what a school day holds besides lessons: lunch and recess, moving from room to room, taking attendance, handing out papers. Some of that is the best part of a child’s day. It just isn’t teaching. A 1989 research summary for schools looked at a different measure, the class time left over beyond the minutes children were engaged, and listed where it tended to go: procedures, transitions, discipline, “dead time” and off-task activity.

Those studies are now more than forty years old, so the fair question is whether anything like that still holds. The plain answer is that no modern study we found measured the same thing. What newer research offers is two separate windows, each onto a different part of the day, and neither adds up to a modern “half.”

The first window opens before a child even reaches the desk. In their 2024 work, Kraft and Novicoff followed one US city district through its own records. Students lost about 16 percent of their scheduled teaching time in elementary school, 21 percent in middle school and 25 percent in high school. Absences were the largest share, and an absence costs time on any schedule. And the total is a floor, because a child who is daydreaming at her desk still counts as present.

The second is the classroom door. A related study in the same district, as reported by the Fordham Institute, counted interruptions from outside the classroom: intercom announcements, visitors at the door, phone calls. They came about three times an hour, which added up to nearly ten school days a year. If you have ever signed a late slip at the front desk while the morning announcements played over your head, you have heard a few of them yourself.

• • •

When attention held, and when it drifted

The second clock, attention, is the hardest one to see from the outside. In the 2010s, a research team led by Karrie Godwin set out to watch it directly.

Trained observers sat in kindergarten through fourth-grade classrooms in one region of the US over a school year, in two studies: 22 classrooms in the first and 30 in the second. Again and again, they looked at one child at a time and noted whether that child was on task.

Children were off task in about 29 percent of the moments observed in the first study and 26 percent in the second. Roughly a quarter to nearly a third.

The more useful finding is *when*. Children were most on task in small groups and least on task in whole-class lessons. And their attention faded as an activity went on: “On-task behavior tended to decline as the instructional duration increased.” By the researchers’ estimate, a child’s odds of being on task were about 1.4 times higher in a 10-minute activity than in a 30-minute one.

If you have ever sat through a long meeting that ran past its hour, you know the feeling from the inside. These were children of five to ten, but the shape is familiar.

The researchers were careful about what this shows. Where a child is looking is “not a perfect measure” of attention: a child can stare at the board and be somewhere else entirely, or glance at the window and still be thinking. And not every quiet minute is lost. A 1987 research review found that when teachers waited more than about three seconds after asking a question, classroom talk changed, and students did better on higher-level thinking in science. Silence can be thinking.

None of this is a verdict on a teacher. A much larger observation, of 737 American fifth-grade classrooms, found that what children were offered had little to do with the measured traits of their teachers or schools. Our reading of these studies, taken together, is that they point less to the person at the front of the room than to the shape of a group day. Children held their attention best in small groups and short activities, and let it drift as a long whole-class lesson wore on.

• • •

Necessary, not sufficient

When hours are the only measure, the easiest way to look serious is to fill them. It is tempting to stretch a day until it is long enough to feel respectable, and to judge any day, at school or at home, by when it ended rather than by what happened in it. The bell gets the attention the third clock deserved.

Now go back to Karweit’s review of the 1970s and early-1980s studies, because she asked a plainer question underneath the one you asked at the kitchen table: how much does the time itself explain?

Across the studies she compared, more time did go with higher achievement, though how closely varied a great deal from one study to the next. But time by itself explained only a sliver of the differences in achievement between children: about 1 to 4 percent. Her conclusion is the sentence this whole question turns on:

“Time is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for learning.”

Necessary. The true part of your belief stands. A child who never gets time for math will not learn math. Cutting hours from an ordinary day costs a little. Adding good hours helps a little.

Not sufficient. The hour on the clock was never the learning itself. The learning is what happens inside the hour.

A seat-hour is not a learning hour.

So the question you can carry from here is not only “How long was the day?” It is “How much of it was he engaged, on work that fit him, and getting it?” The 1989 summary put it in one phrase: the time that predicts learning “refers as much to a kind of instruction as it does to time per se.”

This changes what a long day and a short day can tell you. A long day is not proof of learning. It may hold a great deal, or a great deal of waiting. A short day is not proof of laziness. It may be thin, or it may be dense. The length alone can’t tell you which. You have to look inside.

It does not mean a short day is enough. No study we found tests how few hours of core teaching a child needs. The best-known “two hours” claim comes from a private school’s own marketing, not from an independent study.

And it changes what happened on that Thursday in February. The guilt said a day that ends at 9:05 is a day off. The other voice asked what happens in the other six hours. Both were asking the clock a question it can’t answer. The fifty minutes at your table stood on teaching he had already had in that classroom. What you saw looked like a stretch of the third clock: work that fit him, finished and right.

• • •

A morning, a year from now

Picture your own kitchen a year on. A Tuesday this time, not a sick day.

Maybe he is still at the school down the road. At pickup you have stopped asking, “What did you do all day?” You ask, “What was hard today, and did you get it?” Some days he shrugs. Some days, somewhere past the second stoplight, with his backpack on his knees and the heater ticking, he tells you about a fraction problem that wouldn’t come out, and then did. You have stopped judging his day by the bell. You listen for the third clock.

Or maybe your family has made a different choice, for this year, and the mornings happen at your table. Then it is something you can watch.

The math page is open at nine. The kitchen smells of coffee and toast. You can see the moment his pencil slows, and the moment his eyes go to the window. You don’t fight the window. He stands up, gets a drink, and sits back down. You keep the work where the classroom studies found learning time lived: work he can do, and get right. When he gets it, he moves on. You don’t make him do twenty more of the same.

Some mornings run long, because a hard idea takes the time it takes, and that is the work too. Some go quickly, and on those you look harder at what happened in them, not less. Either way, you are not watching the clock on the stove. You are watching for the moment his pencil speeds up again.

On either Tuesday, the question you ask at the end of the day has changed. Not “How long?” but “What did the time hold?”

The clock on the wall still runs. It just isn’t the one you’re reading anymore.

ABOUT THE WRITER

Who wrote this, and why

My name is George Weber. My wife, Jaclyn, and I have five children, all under eleven.

My second son is Jordy. When he was seven, we sat at the kitchen table after dinner, and I asked him to explain why reading and discussion were so hard. This is a boy who will stand at a workbench for hours without looking up. He taught his little brother and sister to ride a bike, and then to use a screw gun. He builds things I could not build. That night he kept his head down. Twice, all he gave me was “I don’t know.” Then he said it:

> “I’m just not good at school.”

He was not describing a difficulty. He was describing himself.

Here is the part I would rather not say. I had seen it coming for a while. That night I was interrogating a seven-year-old for a reason he did not have, when what he was really carrying was shame. And I kept sending him, because I could not see what else to do.

For years, Jaclyn had told me the truth about the other option. She would not become the entire staff of a school with five children in it, and if we did this, I would have to free at least fifteen hours a week. She was right on both counts, and I could not find the hours. So I know the arithmetic in these essays from the inside.

Before this work, I made more than $4 million building six personal-training studios. I have stepped away from them. I have given the next twenty years to two things: helping parents make the right choice for their own children, whatever that choice turns out to be, and helping lead what I believe is a coming change in how families educate their children.

I am not an academic. The research in these essays belongs to the people named in the sources. My job was to read it carefully and tell you what it says, and what it does not. That is why every essay ends with what it does not claim.

I wrote them for the parent I was that night at the kitchen table.

George Weber

FATHER OF FIVE

READ NEXT

Will Younger Classmates Hold My Eight-Year-Old Back?

If you have ever wondered why every child in that classroom was born the same year

WHAT THIS ARTICLE DOES NOT CLAIM

- No study we found compared a short, focused core day with a full ordinary day for the same children, and no study we found tests a minimum number of core hours. Alpha School, a private school, says in its own marketing that its students complete their academics in about two hours a day. We found no independent study that compared its students with similar children.
- Every study here ran in schools, with children from kindergarten through high school. No study we found tested any of this at home. What we suggest for a family is reasoning from those studies, not a result.
- The time studies show patterns, not causes. A moment off task is not a moment of learning nothing, and where a child is looking is an imperfect sign of attention. The academic-learning-time link was uneven: when Karweit went back over the California study's results, its parts showed a clear link to achievement in only about a third of the analyses.
- Karweit's 1 to 4 percent is time's unique share of the differences in achievement: what time explained after the other factors the studies measured. Separately, the correlations she reported between time and achievement varied widely from study to study; after allowing for prior ability they ran from .09, where the link nearly vanished, to .60. The two figures summarize the studies in different ways and are not two readings of one result.
- The "at most about half the school day" figure comes from a review of 1970s and early-1980s studies, mostly in elementary schools. The modern figures measure different things (one district's records, K–4 classrooms in one region, a survey of lower-secondary teachers) and are not added together. Karweit also warned that findings from ordinary school days may not hold where school time is greatly extended. Her warning was about longer days; we think the same caution applies to much shorter ones, but that extension is ours, not hers.
- Adding time helped a little on average, and cutting a day each week cost a little each year. Those costs can add up: in the RAND districts, after about eight years, the gap had grown to a small one, about 0.15 to 0.23 of a standard deviation in English and 0.14 to 0.19 in math. In the federal review, added time for middle-school literacy showed a small negative effect (four studies), and apart from full-day kindergarten, no study of a longer regular school day met its bar. When Florida added a daily hour of reading in its lowest-performing elementary schools, reading scores rose a little in the first year (about 0.05 of a standard deviation). The RAND four-day schools kept the same kind of classroom, on fewer, longer days. The Oregon study found the dip larger for boys and, in reading, for low-income students, and it named earlier start times, as well as lost hours, as the likely causes. The RAND districts were mostly rural; a later multi-state study (read at abstract only) found similar small drops, larger in non-rural schools and possibly growing over

time. Another Oregon study, which followed young children to third grade, found minimal differences on average, though some groups did slightly worse.

- Teacher surveys give a third, rougher window. In an international survey in 2018†, lower-secondary teachers (roughly the middle-school years) said about 78 percent of a typical lesson went to teaching, the rest to keeping order and paperwork. That is teachers' own report, averaged across countries, covering lessons only; no US figure turned up in our search. A newer 2024† round of the same survey, read only in a secondary report (Bett Brasil), put the share of class time spent keeping order at about 15 percent, up 2 points since 2018. The interruption figures were read in a secondary report. Several studies were read at abstract only (marked in Sources).
- No peer-reviewed study of homeschool hours turned up in our search.
- The sick day and the morning a year on are composites, not real families.

SOURCES

- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *Digest of Education Statistics 2016*, Table 203.90 (Schools and Staffing Survey, 2007–08 and 2011–12). 2011–12: average school day 6.7 hours, 179 days a year, 1,203 hours a year; school-reported, not state requirements. School-reported survey. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_203.90.asp
- NCES, *State Education Reforms*, Table 5.14, "Number of instructional days and hours in the school year, by state: 2018" (from the Education Commission of the States). Our count: 28 of 51 jurisdictions (50 states and DC) list exactly 180 days. Policy compilation. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/statereform/tab5_14.asp
- Kraft, M. A., & Novicoff, S. (2024). "Time in School: A Conceptual Framework, Synthesis of the Causal Research, and Empirical Exploration." *American Educational Research Journal*. Synthesis of causal studies, plus administrative records from one district (Providence, Rhode Island): 16, 21 and 25 percent of scheduled instructional time lost in elementary, middle and high school (a lower bound; absences the largest share); typical US day about 6.9 hours (from the federal 2017–18 National Teacher and Principal Survey, per the working paper); "a clear positive effect of additional time on student achievement typically of small to medium magnitude depending on dosage, use, and context"; 10-percent-plus expansions "most likely to produce small increases" (under 0.05 SD); diminishing returns. Read at abstract (publisher/SCALE page) and the February 2024 working paper in full. https://scale.stanford.edu/publications/time-school-conceptual-framework-synthesis-causal-research-and-empirical-exploration ; https://edworkingpapers.com/sites/default/files/Kraft%20Novicoff%20-%20Time%20In%20School%20-%20Feb%202024_1.pdf
- Thompson, P. N. (2021). "Is Four Less Than Five? Effects of Four-Day School Weeks on Student Achievement in Oregon." *Journal of Public Economics*, 193, 104308 (IZA Discussion Paper 12204, 2019). Difference-in-differences, Oregon students 2007–2015: math and reading scores slightly lower; lost instructional time of "nearly three and a half hours a week." The abstract names earlier school start times and the lost instructional time as the primary mechanisms. Abstract only. https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/12204
- Kilburn, M. R., et al. (2021). *Does Four Equal Five? Implementation and Outcomes of the Four-Day School Week*. RAND Corporation, RR-A373-1. Matched comparison: survey and implementation work in 36 districts in Idaho, New Mexico and Oklahoma; achievement data from seven states. Four-day districts had 58 fewer hours a year; achievement grew more slowly than it would have on five days; high satisfaction among parents and students. Research brief read in full; main report not read. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_briefs/RBA300/RBA373-1/RAND_RBA373-1.pdf
- Morton, E., Thompson, P., & Kuhfeld, M. (2023). "A Multi-State, Student-Level Analysis of the Effects of the Four-Day School Week on Student Achievement and Growth." EdWorkingPaper 22-630, Annenberg Institute at Brown University. Difference-in-differences, NWEA MAP Growth data, several states: small negative effects (about −0.06 to −0.07 SD), larger in non-rural schools, possibly growing over time. Abstract only. https://edworkingpapers.com/ai22-630
- Thompson, P. N., Tomayko, E. J., Gunter, K. B., Schuna, J., Jr., & McClelland, M. (2023). "Impacts of the Four-Day School Week on Early Elementary Achievement." *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 63, 264–277. Oregon administrative data, kindergarten entrants 2014–2016

followed to grade 3: “minimal differences” in third-grade scores on average; negative effects concentrated in some groups. Abstract only. https://scholarworks.montana.edu/items/951fd029-e176-42a4-be29-49b9b8782e98/full

- Carroll, J. B. (1989). “The Carroll Model: A 25-Year Retrospective and Prospective View.” *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 26–31. Theoretical review. Abstract only. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0013189X018001026
- Fisher, C. W., Marliave, R., & Filby, N. N. (1979). “Improving Teaching by Increasing ‘Academic Learning Time.’” *Educational Leadership*, October 1979, 52–54. Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, California; six students in each of 25 second-grade and 21 fifth-grade classes. Observational, correlational. Full text. https://files.ascd.org/staticfiles/ascd/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_197910_fisher.pdf
- Karweit, N. (1984). “Time-on-Task Reconsidered: Synthesis of Research on Time and Learning.” *Educational Leadership*, 41(8), 32–35. Review of 1970s and early-1980s observational studies, mostly elementary: “at most, about half of the school day is actually used for instruction”; 1 to 4 percent of variance uniquely attributable to time; components of academic learning time significant in 41 of 116 BTES analyses (“about 35 percent”); “Time is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for learning.” Full text. https://files.ascd.org/staticfiles/ascd/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198405_karweit.pdf
- Cotton, K. (1989). *Educational Time Factors*. School Improvement Research Series, Close-Up #8, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Research summary; its list of where class time goes cites earlier studies we did not read. Full text. https://educationnorthwest.org/sites/default/files/EducationalTimeFactors.pdf
- Kraft, M. A., & Monti-Nussbaum, M. (2021). “The Big Problem With Little Interruptions to Classroom Learning.” *AERA Open*. Observation and teacher survey, one district: about 2.9 outside interruptions per hour of class; “nearly ten days” a year. Read only as reported by the Fordham Institute. https://fordhaminstitute.org/national/commentary/short-classroom-interruptions-add-big-time-losses
- OECD (2019). *TALIS 2018 Results (Volume I): Teachers and School Leaders as Lifelong Learners*. Teacher survey, lower-secondary teachers in participating countries: “only 78% of a typical lesson is dedicated to teaching,” the rest on keeping order and administration (self-report). Read in a copy of the OECD text hosted by the Buenos Aires education ministry repository; the oecd.org page did not load. https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en ; https://bde-ueicee.bue.edu.ar/documentos/550/download
- OECD (2025). *Results from TALIS 2024: The State of Teaching*. Teacher survey, lower-secondary, 55 education systems (US participation not confirmed): about 15 percent of class time keeping order, OECD average, up 2 points since 2018 (self-report). OECD landing page read; figures read only as reported by Bett Brasil. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/results-from-talis-2024_90df6235-en.html ; https://brasil.bettshow.com/en/bett-blog/professor-brasileiro-perde-21-tempo-de-aula-para-manter-disciplina
- Godwin, K. E., Almeda, M. V., Seltman, H., Kai, S., Skerbetz, M. D., Baker, R. S., & Fisher, A. V. (2016). “Off-Task Behavior in Elementary School Children.” *Learning and Instruction*, 44, 128–143. Two observation studies, K–4, one US region: 22 classrooms (off task 29.3 percent of observations) and 30 classrooms (26.4 percent); on-task odds 1.42 times higher for a 10-minute than a 30-minute activity. Observational. Full text (authors’ accepted manuscript). https://learninganalytics.upenn.edu/ryanbaker/Godwin-LI.pdf
- Pianta, R. C., Belsky, J., Houts, R., Morrison, F., & NICHD Early Child Care Research Network (2007). “Opportunities to Learn in America’s Elementary Classrooms.” *Science*, 315(5820), 1795–1796. Observation of 737 fifth-grade classrooms. Abstract only. https://rti.org/publication/opportunities-learn-america-elementary-classrooms
- Tobin, K. (1987). “The Role of Wait Time in Higher Cognitive Level Learning.” *Review of Educational Research*, 57(1), 69–95. Review. Abstract only. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/00346543057001069
- Figlio, D., Holden, K. L., & Özek, U. (2018). “Do Students Benefit From Longer School Days? Regression Discontinuity Evidence From Florida’s Additional Hour of Literacy Instruction.” *Economics of Education Review*, 67, 171–183. Regression discontinuity, low-performing Florida elementary schools: 0.05 SD in reading, first year. Abstract only. https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/ecoedu/v67y2018icp171-183.html
- Kidron, Y., & Lindsay, J. (2014). *The Effects of Increased Learning Time on Student Academic and Nonacademic Outcomes: Findings From a Meta-Analytic Review* (REL 2014–015). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Meta-analysis, K–12, 30 studies kept from more than 7,000; 26 of 30 out-of-school or summer programs; no study of expanded-time or year-round schools met the criteria “(except studies of full-day kindergarten).” Students performing below standards, literacy, g = 0.56 (three studies); certified-teacher programs small positive effects; middle-school literacy g = −0.21 (four studies). Full text. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/appalachia/pdf/REL_2014015.pdf
- Alpha School, homepage (company marketing; no independent evaluation cited), accessed October 4, 2026. https://alpha.school/
- Illustrative composites: the sick day in the opening and the morning a year on.