



RETURN TO SCHOOL

Results from the
Family and Staff Surveys

Office of Research and
Strategic Improvement

June 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Return to School surveys gathered information about family and staff preferences for returning to school and about distance learning to gain a better understanding of strengths and challenges, and to make improvements for next school year. Findings will be used to inform decisions regarding the reopening of schools.

The Family Survey was disseminated through an online link to encourage participation of families, especially those who typically do not participate in surveys and received 124,271 responses. The online surveys were sent to all FCPS staff and had a response of 66 percent, which reflects 18,398 staff of the 28,003 who were sent a survey invitation. Both surveys were administered from June 13 to June 19, 2020.

The information below represents the conclusions drawn about the survey findings in the attached report. This report includes results for the most pertinent subset of questions from these surveys for return to school decision-making. Specifically, the results reported on here cover survey questions that asked about the return to school scenarios, amount of synchronous and asynchronous instruction, and access to technology. (Analysis of survey questions not contained in this report will be presented in future ORSI study reports on FCPS' approach to Distance Learning).

Return to School

- The survey asked families about three return to school scenarios (virtual instruction, partial return with social distancing in place, opting into virtual instruction if schools are re-opened). Of the return to school scenarios proposed, none stood out as an obviously favored approach in either family or staff responses.
- For all scenarios, both families and staff responses indicated a relatively even split between feeling comfortable and uncomfortable with each scenario. In particular, the Family Survey showed a relatively even split, garnering 40 to 51 percent of comfortable and uncomfortable responses. Staff responses to scenarios demonstrated slightly more discomfort.
- A majority (60 percent) of parents indicated they were unlikely to opt into virtual learning if in-school instruction resumed. However, a large proportion (40 percent) also indicated they were likely to opt into virtual learning for their child.
- These findings are similar or at times more positive than available information about parent and teacher perspectives across the United States about returning to in-school instruction.¹
- Any re-opening scenario that attends to only one type of start, either virtual or in school (even with social distancing), is likely to meet resistance from a substantial segment of the FCPS community.
- Subgroup disaggregations of data indicated consistency of family and staff responses across most groups on each scenario. Subgroup differences categorized as large in magnitude included families of White students showing greater willingness to return to in-school instruction than families of students from other racial/ethnic subgroups and families of English learner or economically disadvantaged students showing greater likelihood to opt into virtual instruction than families of English proficient or economically advantaged students.
- The interest of families of economically disadvantaged students to opt them into virtual learning indicates current meal delivery might need to continue to ensure these students receive adequate food and nutrition during the school year.

¹ Page, S. (2020, May 27). *Back to school? 1 in 5 teachers are unlikely to return to reopened classrooms this fall, poll says*. Retrieved from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/education/2020/05/26/coronavirus-schools-teachers-poll-ipsos-parents-fall-online/5254729002/>

Kurtz, H. Y. & Bushwaller, K. (2020, June 3.). *Most Educators Want Schools to Stay Closed to Slow Spread of COVID-19*. Retrieved from <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2020/06/03/most-educators-want-schools-to-stay-closed.html>

Lowe, Br.. (2020, May 11). *New Poll: Two-Thirds of Parents Support Keeping Schools Closed 'Until They Are Certain There Is No Health Risk'*. Retrieved from <https://www.the74million.org/new-poll-two-thirds-of-parents-support-keeping-schools-closed-until-they-are-certain-there-is-no-health-risk>

Amount of Asynchronous/Synchronous Instruction

- Agreement between parents and teacher reports that the amount of synchronous instruction was insufficient for students to learn effectively reflects two potential avenues for improvement. One pathway would be improvements in the amount of virtual instruction and the other pathway could be a return to in-school instruction.
- Parents and teachers differed more on their perspectives of asynchronous instruction, with teachers indicating the amount was sufficient while parents relatively evenly split between those who perceived the amount as not enough and those who considered it an appropriate amount. This may reflect difficulties families experienced ensuring students continued to learn new material or in occupying their children during quarantine.
- Families of students receiving Special Education services reported even higher levels of insufficient synchronous instruction than families of students not receiving these services. This difference coupled with results above that families of students receiving special education services also split in their preferences for virtual versus in-school instruction indicate a need for FCPS to consider improvements over what was provided during the COVID-19 school closure, whether instruction is delivered virtually or in-school.
- Other subgroup differences were small to moderate for both synchronous and asynchronous instruction, indicating general agreement with the overall trends among family and staff subgroups on the amount of synchronous and asynchronous instruction.

Access to Technology

- Majorities of families and staff reported access to both a device and the internet.
- Family Survey data disaggregated for subgroups indicates that FCPS has done a good job of ensuring that students have access to technology and that there are not largescale inequities among those who responded to the survey. However, given that the survey was administered online, the 1 percent of families who reported students without routine access to a device is likely lower than the actual figure for FCPS as a whole, since families where the student did not have access are also likely to be families that did not complete the online survey. It is important that until such time as all students have FCPS-provided devices that school-based staff continue to monitor who may need an FCPS-provided device.
- The lower percentages of instructional assistants who reported using an FCPS-provided device indicates that FCPS will need to consider expanding device access to this group if they continue to be heavily involved in virtual learning.
- FCPS should continue to monitor student and staff access, especially if changes are made to the amount of synchronous and asynchronous instruction in the future as this may place greater demand on shared computers within families.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
What is the purpose of the Return to School surveys?	1
Survey Design, Dissemination, and Respondent Demographics	1
Family Survey	1
Staff Surveys.....	3
Survey Results	3
Return to School Scenarios	4
Conclusions	5
Overall Family and Staff Responses to Return to School Scenarios.....	5
Family Responses to Return to School Scenarios, Disaggregated	10
Staff Responses to Return to School Scenarios, Disaggregated	23
Amount of Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction.....	30
Conclusions	30
Overall Parent/Caregiver and Teacher Perspectives on Instruction	31
Parent / Caregiver Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction, Disaggregated ...	32
Teacher Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction, Disaggregated	36
Access to Technology	38
Conclusions	38
Overall Student and Staff Access to Technology	39
Student Access to Technology, Disaggregated.....	40
Staff Access to Technology, Disaggregated.....	45

List of Tables

Table 1: Family Survey Completion Compared to FCPS Membership	2
Table 2: Family-Reported Subgroup Membership Compared to FCPS Membership	2
Table 3: Staff Survey Response Rates, Overall and by Position Type	3
Table 4: Family Level of Comfort with Return to School Scenarios	6
Table 5: Family's Top Considerations Associated with Comfort Level for Scenarios 1 and 2.....	7
Table 6: Family Importance and Likelihood of Use of Scenario 3, Online Learning by Choice	8
Table 7: Family's Top Considerations Associated with Scenario 3.....	8
Table 8: Staff Level of Comfort with Return to School Scenarios	9
Table 9: Staff's Top Considerations Associated with Comfort Level for Reopening Scenarios.....	9
Table 10: Family Scenario 1 by Race/Ethnicity	10
Table 11: Family Scenario 1 by Student Service	11
Table 12: Family Scenario 1 by Region	11
Table 13: Family Scenario 1 by School Level	12
Table 14: Family Scenario 1 by Elementary Grade Level	12
Table 15: Family Scenario 2a by Race/Ethnicity	13
Table 16: Family Scenario 2a by Student Service	13
Table 17: Family Scenario 2a by Region	14
Table 18: Family Scenario 2a by School Level	14
Table 19: Family Scenario 2a by Elementary Grade Level	15
Table 20: Family Scenario 2b by Race/Ethnicity	15
Table 21: Family Scenario 2b by Student Service	16
Table 22: Family Scenario 2b by Region	16
Table 23: Family Scenario 2b by School Level	17
Table 24: Family Scenario 2b by Elementary Grade Level	17
Table 25: Family Importance and Likelihood of Use of Scenario 3 by Race/Ethnicity	18
Table 26: Family Importance and Likelihood of Use of Scenario 3 by Student Service	19
Table 27: Family Importance and Likelihood of Use of Scenario 3 by Region	20
Table 28: Family Importance and Likelihood of Use of Scenario 3 by School Level	21
Table 29: Family Importance and Likelihood of Use of Scenario 3 by Elementary Grade Level	22
Table 30: Staff Level of Comfort with General Return by Position Type	23
Table 31: Staff Level of Comfort with General Return by Region	24
Table 32: Staff Level of Comfort with General Return by School Level of Principal	24
Table 33: Staff Level of Comfort with General Return by School Level of Teacher	25
Table 34: Staff Level of Comfort with General Return by Elementary Teacher Grade Level	25
Table 35: Staff Level of Comfort with General Return by Student Service	26
Table 36: Staff Level of Comfort with General Return for Select Positions	26
Table 37: Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2 by Position Type	27

Table 38: Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2 by Region	27
Table 39: Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2 by School Level of Principal	28
Table 40: Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2 by School Level of Teacher	28
Table 41: Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2 by Elementary Teacher Grade Level	29
Table 42: Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2 by Student Service	29
Table 43: Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2 for Select Positions	30
Table 44: Overall Parent and Staff Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction	31
Table 45: Parent Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction by Race/Ethnicity	32
Table 46: Parent Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction by Student Service	33
Table 47: Parent Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction by Region	34
Table 48: Parent Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction by School Level	34
Table 49: Parent Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction by ES Grade Level	35
Table 50: Teacher Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction by School Level	36
Table 51: Teacher Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction by ES Grade Level	37
Table 52: Teacher Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction by Student Service	37
Table 53: Overall Student and Staff Access to Technology	39
Table 54: Family-Reported Student Access to Technology by Race/Ethnicity	40
Table 55: Family-Reported Student Access to Technology by Student Service	41
Table 56: Family-Reported Student Access to Technology by Region	42
Table 57: Family-Reported Student Access to Technology by School Level	43
Table 58: Family-Reported Student Access to Technology by Elementary Grade Level	44
Table 59: Staff Access to Technology Disaggregated by Position Type	45
Table 60: Other School-Based Instructional Staff Access to Technology by Position Level	46
Table 61: Teacher Access to Technology by School Level	47
Table 62: Elementary Teacher Access to Technology by Elementary Grade Level	48
Table 63: Teacher Access to Technology by Student Service	49

Introduction

What is the purpose of the Return to School surveys?

In June 2020, the Governor and the Virginia Department of Education issued guidance regarding the reopening of schools for SY 2020-21 in light of the COVID-19 Pandemic. In response, FCPS developed potential options for reopening that aligned to the Governor's guidance. The Return to School surveys gathered information about family and staff preferences for returning to school options and about distance learning to gain a better understanding of strengths and challenges, and to make improvements for next school year. Findings will be used to inform decisions regarding the reopening of schools.

Survey Design, Dissemination, and Respondent Demographics

Family Survey

The Return to School Family Survey was designed by FCPS' Office of Research and Strategic Improvement (ORSI) in collaboration with the Reopening of Schools Task Force headed by Superintendent Brabrand and Deputy Superintendent Ivey. The Family Survey was designed to collect information on parent and caregivers return to school preferences and distance learning experiences for a specific child since families might well have very different preferences and experiences with different children. Thus, families with multiple students attending FCPS were encouraged to complete the survey multiple times, once for each child. Prior to dissemination, surveys were shared with community and staff groups for feedback to ensure readability and inclusion of the most critical concerns.

The online family survey was disseminated by FCPS' Office of Communications and Community Relations (OCCR) through multiple means, including individual communications sent to all FCPS parents and caregivers through the eNotify system. The survey and associated communication materials were shared in either English or the family's preferred correspondence language from among eight predominant languages in FCPS. The dissemination method for this survey intentionally cast as broad a net as possible to encourage all FCPS families, including those who are less often heard from on surveys, to respond to the survey. In addition to the individual eNotify messages, notifications about the survey were distributed through a message from the Superintendent (also posted on FCPS' Facebook and Twitter pages), a dedicated webpage on FCPS' website, messages in FCPS' Familygram, distribution of flyers announcing the survey at FCPS food distribution sites and bus stops, and sharing of electronic flyers and posters with the community. Consequently, the exact number of "invitations" to the family survey is unknown and response rates cannot be calculated.

The Family Survey received 124,271 responses. Table 1 indicates the breakdown of the family survey responses by the requested correspondence language documented in the FCPS student information system in comparison to FCPS membership. All eight non-English languages received responses. While parents request information be provided to them by FCPS in their chosen English or no-English language, historically parents have responded to surveys in a different language, typically English. For example, as seen in Table 1, those responding in English and Korean (86.2 percent and 1.5 percent, respectively) represent a larger share of the survey responses than in FCPS membership (79.0 percent and 0.8 percent, respectively). Those responding in Spanish represent a smaller share of the survey responses (10.0 percent) than in FCPS membership (17.0 percent). Table 2 shows the breakdown of subgroup membership for students reported on in family surveys in relation to FCPS membership. Subgroup membership was based on parent and caregivers responses to questions on the survey. Even with outreach encouraging hard to reach families to participate in the survey, Table 2 shows some subgroups remained underrepresented in the survey respondents when compared to FCPS membership as a whole. Specifically, survey responses about Black and Hispanic students were underrepresented in survey

responses than in FCPS membership. Additionally, English learners and Economically Disadvantaged students were underrepresented in the survey responses than in FCPS membership.

Table 1:
Family Survey Completion Overall and by Correspondence Language
Compared to FCPS Membership
(Percentages and Counts)

Correspondence Language	Survey Respondents	FCPS Membership Extract
All Languages	124,271	189,968
English	86.2% (n=107,123)	79.0% (n=151,690)
Amharic	0.3% (n=379)	0.0% (n=0)
Arabic	0.5% (n=617)	0.8% (n=1416)
Chinese	0.6% (n=748)	0.4% (n=682)
Farsi	0.1% (n=167)	0.1% (n=275)
Korean	1.5% (n=1926)	0.8% (n=1547)
Spanish	10.0% (n=12439)	17.0% (n=32371)
Urdu	0.1% (n=164)	0.3% (n=480)
Vietnamese	0.6% (n=708)	0.8% (n=1507)

Table 2:
Family-Reported Subgroup Membership of Student
Compared to FCPS Membership²
(Percentages and Counts)

Family-Reported Subgroup	Survey Respondents	FCPS Membership
Asian	18.3% (22,752)	19.5% (36,983)
Black	6.6% (n=8,232)	9.8% (n=18,647)
Hispanic	16.0% (n=19,830)	26.8% (n=50,904)
White	41.6% (n=51,755)	37.8% (n=71,841)
Students with Disabilities	16.3% (n=15,214)	15.4% (n=29,153)
English Learners	8.5% (n=7,987)	19.5% (n=36,980)
Economically Disadvantaged	11.3% (n=12,837)	30.0% (n=56,904)
Advanced Academic Program	24.5% (n=22,852)	27.6% (n=52,387)
Elementary	58.0% (n=66,887)	52.7% (n=99,992)
Middle	14.9% (n=17,199)	15.9% (n=30,119)
High	26.7% (n=30,808)	31.5% (n=59,744)

² FCPS membership counts for English Learners include ELP levels 1 to 5 and 9; counts for Advanced Academic Program include levels 1 to 4.

Staff Surveys

The Return to School Staff Surveys were also designed by FCPS' Office of Research and Strategic Improvement (ORSI) in collaboration with the Reopening of Schools Task Force members. ORSI drafted two staff surveys with overlapping language, wherever possible. One survey targeted instructional staff who had engaged in distance learning with students during the COVID-19 closure of schools and the second targeted all other FCPS staff. The two surveys were shared with Task Force members for feedback to ensure readability and inclusion of the most critical concerns.

Both staff surveys were disseminated by FCPS' Office of Research and Strategic Improvement (ORSI) via email to individual staff members using functionality available in SurveyMonkey. The distribution list was created by ORSI based on employee records provided by the Department of Human Resources (HR).

The response rate for the staff survey was 66 percent, which reflects 18,398 staff of the 28,003 who were sent a survey invitation. Table 3 shows the breakdown of position types within FCPS (number of invitations delivered) and of survey completers, as well as the response rate overall and within position type. Principals had the highest response rate (80 percent), followed by teachers (75 percent). School-based support staff had the lowest response rate (40 percent). The other two position types (other school-based instructional staff, central-based staff) had response rates similar to the overall response rate of 66 percent (68 and 66 percent, respectively).

Table 3:
Staff Survey Response Rates, Overall and by Position Type

Instrument	Number of Invitations Delivered	Number of Surveys Completed	Response Rate
Staff Survey	28,003	18,398	66%
Teachers	14486	10,845	75%
Principals	202	162	80%
Other School-based Instructional Staff ³	3764	2,561	68%
School-based Support Staff ⁴	5605	2,234	40%
Central-based Staff	3946	2,596	66%

Survey Results

This report represents the most pertinent subset of questions on these surveys for return to school decision-making. Specifically, the results reported on here cover the survey questions that asked about the return to school scenarios, amount of synchronous and asynchronous instruction, and access to technology. The analysis of the questions not contained in this report will be presented in future ORSI study reports on FCPS' approach to Distance Learning.

Each of the three results sections (Return to School Scenarios, Amount of Synchronous and Asynchronous Learning, Access to Technology) begins with conclusions that can be drawn from the survey results, then proceeds to share subsections that cover overall results, disaggregated results from the family survey, and disaggregated results from the parent survey. Each result subsection begins with a summary of findings before presenting tabled data.

³ Includes positions such as SBTS, instructional coaches, librarians, instructional assistants, and other administrators.

⁴ Includes positions such as food service, custodial, transportation, public health, safety and security, administrative support, and instructional assistants.

Return to School Scenarios

The following potential reopening scenarios were presented to families on their Return to School survey:

Scenario 1: Virtual Start	Scenario 2: Reopening with Health and Social Distancing	
	2a: Students in School Building <u>1 to 2</u> Days a Week	2b: Students in School Building <u>2 to 3</u> Days a Week
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No students allowed in school buildings All instruction delivered virtually through enhanced distanced learning Students given more digital access and digital curriculum resources Some home services may be provided to a few students with very special needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately <u>25</u> percent of students allowed in school building at one time Many students would be in the school building <u>1</u> day a week Some students with a high need for face-to-face instruction, such as students with disabilities, English-learner students, students in Kindergarten to Grade 2, would be in the school building <u>2</u> days a week. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately <u>50</u> percent of students allowed in school building at one time Many students would be in the school building <u>2</u> days a week Some students with a high need for face-to-face instruction, such as students with disabilities, English-learner students, students in Kindergarten to Grade 2, would be in the school building <u>3</u> days a week.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May involve new bell schedules In-school instruction would be supplemented for most students with enhanced distance learning, including expanded digital access and curriculum resources New health and safety protocols in classrooms and non-academic setting that meet health department and Governor's recommendations would be required. For example, students and teachers might be required to wear Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), such as masks, while in school buildings or during bus rides. FCPS would follow new rules for cleaning of school buildings. 	

Additionally, a third scenario on the Family Survey, labelled "Online Learning by Choice" reflected the option for parents to opt their children into virtual learning within any scenario that had students returning to school buildings. The description given parents for this scenario indicated:

- Could occur as part of any approach that returns students to school buildings
- Virtual delivery of instruction (e.g., FCPS Online Campus, Virtual Virginia, etc.) for students whose parents opt them out of in-school instruction

The staff survey asked generally about returning to school/work and specifically about reopening under Scenario 2 (reopening schools with health and social distancing), which was described to staff as:

- 25 to 50 percent of students might be allowed in school buildings each day with students attending one to three days a week for face-to-face classroom instruction.
- Health and social distancing protocols would be in place under this scenario.

Conclusions

- Of the return to schools scenarios proposed, there was no one scenario that stood out as a favored approach on either family or staff responses.
- For all scenarios, both families and staff responses indicated a relatively even split between feeling comfortable and uncomfortable with each scenario. In particular, the Family Survey showed a relatively even split, garnering 40 to 51 percent of comfortable and uncomfortable responses. Staff responses to scenarios demonstrated slightly more discomfort.
- A majority (60 percent) of parents indicated they were unlikely to opt into virtual learning if in-school instruction resumed. However, a large proportion (40 percent) also indicated they were likely to opt into virtual learning for their child.
- These findings are similar or at times more positive to available information about parent and teacher perspectives across the United States about returning to in-school instruction.⁵
- Any re-opening scenario that attends to only one type of start, either virtual or in school (even with social distancing), is likely to meet resistance from a substantial segment of the FCPS community.
- Subgroup disaggregations of data indicated consistency of family and staff responses across most groups on each scenario. Subgroup differences categorized as large in magnitude included families of White students showing greater willingness to return to in-school instruction than families of students from other racial/ethnic subgroups and families of English learner or economically disadvantaged students showing greater likelihood to opt into virtual instruction than families of English proficient or economically advantaged students.
- The interest of families of economically disadvantaged students to opt them into virtual learning indicates current meal delivery might need to continue to ensure these students receive adequate food and nutrition during the school year.

Overall Family and Staff Responses to Return to School Scenarios

Summary of Findings

- Overall, in examining all Family Survey data, approximately 45 to 50 percent are comfortable with a return to school and uncomfortable with a virtual start.
- Family respondents indicated being most comfortable with Scenario 2B (scenario where approximately 50 percent of students are in school buildings 2 to 3 days a week). This is the only scenario where a majority of families (51 percent) indicated they were comfortable or highly comfortable.
- The main factors that families reporting comfort with Scenario 2B considered were the quality of instruction the child would receive, child's social needs, child's physical health and safety, need to get back to normal life, and child's mental health needs. In contrast, those who reported discomfort with Scenario 2B highlighted their

⁵ Page, S. (2020, May 27). *Back to school? 1 in 5 teachers are unlikely to return to reopened classrooms this fall, poll says*. Retrieved from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/education/2020/05/26/coronavirus-schools-teachers-poll-ipsos-parents-fall-online/5254729002/>

Kurtz, H. Y. & Bushwaller, K. (2020, June 3.). *Most Educators Want Schools to Stay Closed to Slow Spread of COVID-19*. Retrieved from <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2020/06/03/most-educators-want-schools-to-stay-closed.html>

Lowe, Br.. (2020, May 11). *New Poll: Two-Thirds of Parents Support Keeping Schools Closed 'Until They Are Certain There Is No Health Risk'*. Retrieved from <https://www.the74million.org/new-poll-two-thirds-of-parents-support-keeping-schools-closed-until-they-are-certain-there-is-no-health-risk>

consideration of the child's and the family's physical health and safety, quality of instruction the child would receive, child's social needs, and child's mental health needs.

- A large majority (88 percent) of families indicated that it was important for FCPS to offer the opportunity to opt a child out of in-school instruction, with 43 percent of family respondents indicating they were likely or highly likely to use that option for their child.
- The main considerations families indicating they were likely or highly likely to opt their child out of in-school instruction were the child's and the family's physical health and safety, quality of instruction the child would receive, child's social needs, and child's mental health needs. Thus, the same considerations that parents who were uncomfortable with Scenario 2B highlighted were the considerations for those wanting to opt-out.
- In contrast to family responses, staff reported discomfort with the general return to work scenario and an even split between comfort and discomfort with the return with Scenarios 2A or 2B in place, though none reached a majority.
- The same five considerations rose to the top for both scenarios among teachers who were uncomfortable, namely personal health and safety, family's health and safety, student needs, childcare needs, and quality of work I can complete at school/worksites.
- Staff who reported being uncomfortable with a general return to schools and worksites echoed similar considerations to families. Student needs replaced childcare needs and quantity of work at home replaced quality of work the school / worksite in the top five. Among staff who reported being comfortable with the Scenario 2A or 2B concerns, they highlighted student needs, personal health and safety, family's health and safety, need to get back to normal life, and quality of work I can complete at school/worksites were top considerations.

Family Responses to Scenarios

Table 4:
Family Level of Comfort with Return to School Scenarios
(Percentages and Counts)

	Scenario 1: Virtual Start (n= 103,969)	Scenario 2: Reopening with Health and Social Distancing	
		25% of Students in School Building 1-2 days per week (n= 99,952)	50% of Students in School Building 2-3 days per week (n= 96,280)
Highly Comfortable	19% 19,690	10% 10,037	15% 14,339
Comfortable	25% 25,975	36% 35,570	36% 34,569
Uncomfortable	22% 22,916	26% 26,153	22% 21,612
Highly Uncomfortable	23% 24,301	19% 18,615	18% 17,669
Not sure how I feel	11% 11,087	10% 9,577	8% 8,091

Table 5:
Family's Top Considerations Associated with Comfort Level for Scenarios 1 and 2
(Percentage and Count within Respondents Reporting Similar Comfort Level)

	Scenario 1: Virtual Start (n=92,882)	Scenario 2: Reopening with Health and Social Distancing	
		25% of Students in School Building 1-2 days per week (n=94,633)	50% of Students in School Building 2-3 days per week (n=91,182)
Among Families Rating this Scenario as Comfortable or Highly Comfortable	Child's physical health and safety (61%, n=27,870) Family's physical health and safety (43%, n=19,679) Quality of instruction my child would receive (34%, n=15,378) Child's social needs (21%, n=9,557) Child's mental health needs (17%, n=7,716)	Quality of instruction my child would receive (54.6%, n=24,893) Child's social needs (49.2%, n=22,421) Child's physical health and safety (39.2%, n=17,882) Need to get back to normal life (24.6%, n=11,201) Child's mental health needs (22.0%, n=10,029)	Quality of instruction my child would receive (62.5%, n=30,548) Child's social needs (51.7%, n=25,308) Child's physical health and safety (29.7%, n=14,530) Need to get back to normal life (27.5%, n=13,427) Child's mental health needs (23.7%, n=11,575)
Among Families Rating this Scenario as Uncomfortable or Highly Uncomfortable	Quality of instruction my child would receive (63.7%, n=30,060) Child's social needs (45.2%, n=21,321) Need to get back to normal life (26.5%, n=12,509) Child's mental health needs (23.9%, n=11,307) Child's physical health and safety (21.5%, n=10,162)	Quality of instruction my child would receive (46.8%, n=20,958) Child's physical health and safety (41.8%, n=18,731) Family's physical health and safety (30.5%, n=13,661) Child's social needs (27.5%, n=12,296) Need to get back to normal life (20.2%, n=9,022)	Child's physical health and safety (59.0%, n=23,193) Family's physical health and safety (45.3%, n=17,800) Quality of instruction my child would receive (32.0%, n=12,584) Child's social needs (17.1%, n=6,700) Child's mental health needs (15.3%, n=6,021)

Table 6:
Family Perception of Importance and Likelihood of Use of
Return to School Scenario 3, Online Learning by Choice (Percentages and Counts)

Scenario 3 Importance (n= 94,191)		Scenario 3 Likelihood of Use (n= 94,034)	
Very important	46% 43,513	Highly Likely	18% 16,873
Important	42% 39,431	Likely	25% 23,464
Unimportant	9% 8,138	Unlikely	32% 29,691
Very Unimportant	3% 3,109	Highly Unlikely	26% 24,006

Table 7:
Family's Top Considerations Associated with Likelihood of Use for Scenario 3
(Percentage and Count within Respondents Reporting Similar Likelihood Level)

	Optional Approach Scenario 3: Online Learning by Choice (n=94,034)
Among Families Rating this Scenario as Likely or Highly Likely to Use	Child's physical health and safety (73.5%, n=29,645) Family's physical health and safety (53.1%, n=21,423) Quality of instruction my child would receive (23.4%, n=9,425) Child's mental health needs (13.9%, n=5,594) Child's social needs (10.8%, n=4,373)
Among Families Rating this Scenario as Unlikely or Highly Unlikely to Use	Quality of instruction my child would receive (63.9%, n=34,324) Child's social needs (47.1%, n=25,291) Need to get back to normal life (26.0%, n=13,936) Child's mental health needs (22.3%, n=11,992) Parents' work responsibilities (18.3%, n=9,808)

Staff Responses to Scenarios

Table 8:
Staff Level of Comfort with Return to School Scenarios (Percentages and Counts)

	General Return to School / Worksite (n=18,062)	Return to School / Worksite with Social Distancing and 25-50% of Students in School Building (n=18,005)
Highly Comfortable	10% 1,780	11% 1,901
Comfortable	26% 4,718	32% 5,744
Uncomfortable	28% 5,089	26% 4,707
Highly Uncomfortable	21% 3,764	17% 3,131
Not sure how I feel	15% 2,710	14% 2,522

Table 9:
**Staff's Top Considerations Associated with Comfort Level for Reopening Scenarios
(Percentage and Count within Respondents Reporting Similar Comfort Level)**

	General Return to School / Worksite (n=18,061)	Return to School / Worksite with Social Distancing and 25-50% of Students in School Building (n=18,006)
Among Staff Rating this Scenario as Comfortable or Highly Comfortable	Student needs (62%, n=4,020) Need to get back to normal life (46%, n=2,986) Quality of work I can complete at school/worksite (40%, n=2,597) Personal health and safety (34%, n=2,177) Family's health and safety (31%, n=2,029)	Student needs (66%, n=5,004) Quality of work I can complete at school/worksite (35%, n=2,699) Personal health and safety (41%, n=3,165) Need to get back to normal life (35%, n=2,673) Family's health and safety (34%, n=2,617)
Among Staff Rating this Scenario as Uncomfortable or Highly Uncomfortable	Personal health and safety (83%, n=7,312) Family's health and safety (79%, n=6,957) Student needs (27%, n=2,363) Childcare needs (18%, n=1,563) Quality of work I can complete at school/worksite (12%, n=1,001)	Personal health and safety (75%, n=5,875) Family's health and safety (69%, n=5,428) Student needs (34%, n=2,671) Quality of work I can complete at school/worksite (15%, n=1,186) Childcare needs (17%, n=1,350)

Family Responses to Return to School Scenarios, Disaggregated

Summary of Findings

- When scenario data from the Family Survey were disaggregated, similar patterns were observed to the overall data. However, there were some differences between family groups.
- A smaller percentage of families of White students reported being likely to opt into virtual learning in Scenario 3 than families of other students, which reflected a difference categorized as large in magnitude (*ES* range from .55 to .69).
- Families of ESOL students and economically disadvantaged students reported higher likelihood that they would want to opt into virtual learning in Scenario 3 compared to families of students not receiving these services, which reflected a difference categorized as large in magnitude (*ES* range from .55 to .59)
- Families of Asian students reported more comfort with Scenario 1 and less comfort with Scenario 2b than families of other students, which reflected a difference categorized as small in magnitude (*ES* range from .24 to .26).

Family Scenario 1: Virtual Start

Table 10:
Family Scenario 1 by Race/Ethnicity (Percentages and Counts)

	Asian Students (n=20,632)	Black Students (n=7,439)	Hispanic Students (n=16,794)	White Students (n=48,557)
Highly Comfortable	23% 4,780	21% 1,569	18% 3,022	17% 8,307
Comfortable	29% 6,014	27% 2,013	25% 4,242	23% 11,075
Uncomfortable	21% 4,311	22% 1,655	20% 3,406	23% 11,345
Highly Uncomfortable	16% 3,337	17% 1,231	20% 3,358	29% 13,878
Not sure how I feel	11% 2,190	13% 971	16% 2,766	8% 3,952

There is a moderate effect (*ES*=.26) between families of Asian students and White students.

Table 11:
Family Scenario 1 by Student Service (Percentages and Counts)

	Special Education Services (n= 14,374)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Services (n=7,156)	Students Receiving Free or Reduced Meals (n=10,471)	Advanced Academic Program (AAP) Services (n= 22,124)
Highly Comfortable	19% 2,751	18% 1,292	15% 1,575	21% 4,626
Comfortable	23% 3,362	27% 1,902	26% 2,710	26% 5,775
Uncomfortable	22% 3,197	21% 1,519	20% 2,130	22% 4,869
Highly Uncomfortable	26% 3,531	18% 1,276	18% 1,850	23% 5,052
Not sure how I feel	11% 1,533	16% 1,167	21% 2,206	8% 1,802

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 12:
Family Scenario 1 by Region (Percentages and Counts)

	Region 1 (n=23,586)	Region 2 (n=19,850)	Region 3 (n=16,385)	Region 4 (n=23,425)	Region 5 (n=19,635)
Highly Comfortable	19% 4,462	18% 3,608	19% 3,043	19% 4,449	20% 3,918
Comfortable	24% 5,687	26% 5,162	25% 4,093	24% 5,694	26% 5,111
Uncomfortable	22% 5,184	22% 4,346	22% 3,602	22% 5,224	22% 4,360
Highly Uncomfortable	25% 6,006	22% 4,345	22% 3,562	25% 5,845	22% 4,270
Not sure how I feel	10% 2,247	12% 2,389	13% 2,085	9% 2,213	10% 1,976

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 13:
Family Scenario 1 by School Level (Percentages and Counts)

	Elementary Students (n=60,571)	Middle School Students (n=15,472)	High School Students (n=26,386)
Highly Comfortable	19% 11,196	19% 3,002	20% 5,210
Comfortable	25% 14,972	26% 3,950	25% 6,710
Uncomfortable	22% 13,284	23% 3,520	22% 5,824
Highly Uncomfortable	24% 14,245	23% 3,511	23% 6,140
Not sure how I feel	11% 6,874	10% 1,489	9% 2,502

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 14:
Family Scenario 1 by Elementary Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

	Pre-Kindergarten Students⁶ (n= 2,061)	Primary Students (Kindergarten to Grade 2) (n= 26,631)	Upper Elementary Students (Grades 3 to 6) (n= 31,657)
Highly Comfortable	17% 356	18% 4,713	19% 6,093
Comfortable	19% 391	24% 6,396	26% 8,132
Uncomfortable	19% 398	22% 5,931	22% 6,903
Highly Uncomfortable	31% 649	24% 6,420	23% 7,126
Not sure how I feel	13% 267	12% 3,171	11% 3,403

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

⁶ This group includes surveys completed by the families of current FCPS pre-kindergarten students and families of rising kindergarten students not currently served by an FCPS pre-kindergarten program.

Family Scenario 2a: 25% of Students in Buildings 1-2x/per week

Table 15:
Family Scenario 2a by Race/Ethnicity (Percentages and Counts)

	Asian Students (n=19,707)	Black Students (n=7,079)	Hispanic Students (n=15,821)	White Students (n=47,202)
Highly Comfortable	9% 1,784	10% 694	11% 1,703	10% 4,917
Comfortable	37% 7,212	37% 2,612	34% 5,327	36% 16,864
Uncomfortable	27% 5,334	24% 1,703	25% 3,869	27% 12,653
Highly Uncomfortable	18% 3,471	16% 1,159	18% 2,774	20% 9,234
Not sure how I feel	10% 1,906	13% 911	14% 2,148	8% 3,534

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 16:
Family Scenario 2a by Student Service (Percentages and Counts)

	Special Education Services (n= 14,356)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Services (n=7,133)	Students Receiving Free or Reduced Meals (n=9,736)	Advanced Academic Program (AAP) Services (n= 22,119)
Highly Comfortable	11% 1,527	11% 760	10% 1,002	10% 2,119
Comfortable	36% 5,150	34% 2,419	33% 3,171	37% 8,066
Uncomfortable	26% 3,664	24% 1,739	23% 2,245	28% 6,113
Highly Uncomfortable	18% 2,610	17% 1,241	17% 1,620	19% 4,168
Not sure how I feel	10% 1,405	14% 974	17% 1,698	7% 1,653

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 17:
Family Scenario 2a by Region (Percentages and Counts)

	Region 1 (n=22,786)	Region 2 (n=18,994)	Region 3 (n=15,702)	Region 4 (n=22,639)	Region 5 (n=18,826)
Highly Comfortable	10% 2,369	10% 1,917	10% 1,577	10% 2,217	10% 1,822
Comfortable	35% 8,010	36% 6,890	36% 5,586	35% 7,958	36% 6,833
Uncomfortable	26% 6,009	25% 4,766	25% 3,944	27% 6,173	27% 5,035
Highly Uncomfortable	20% 4,471	18% 3,448	18% 2,827	19% 4,219	18% 3,440
Not sure how I feel	8% 1,927	10% 1,973	11% 1,768	9% 2,072	9% 1,696

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 18:
Family Scenario 2a by School Level (Percentages and Counts)

	Elementary Students (n= 58,114)	Middle School Students (n= 14,918)	High School Students (n= 25,479)
Highly Comfortable	9% 5,226	10% 1,555	12% 3,069
Comfortable	34% 19,929	37% 5,576	38% 9,612
Uncomfortable	27% 15,741	25% 3,800	25% 6,283
Highly Uncomfortable	19% 11,243	18% 2,671	17% 4,411
Not sure how I feel	10% 5,975	9% 1,316	8% 2,104

There is a small effect ($ES=.12$) between families of elementary students and high school students.

Table 19:
Family Scenario 2a by Elementary Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

	Pre-Kindergarten Students (n=1,963)	Primary Students (Kindergarten to Grade 2) (n=25,549)	Upper Elementary Students (Grades 3 to 6) (n=30,392)
Highly Comfortable	9% 181	9% 2,274	9% 2,743
Comfortable	31% 617	34% 8,725	35% 10,531
Uncomfortable	26% 519	27% 6,890	27% 8,285
Highly Uncomfortable	22% 429	19% 4,929	19% 5,843
Not sure how I feel	11% 217	11% 2,731	10% 2,990

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Family Scenario 2b: 50% of Students in Buildings 2-3x/week

Table 20:
Family Scenario 2b by Race/Ethnicity (Percentages and Counts)

	Asian Students (n=18,830)	Black Students (n=6,718)	Hispanic Students (n=14,725)	White Students (n=46,191)
Highly Comfortable	12% 2,197	13% 854	14% 2,040	17% 7,923
Comfortable	32% 6,041	35% 2,346	34% 4,949	38% 17,747
Uncomfortable	25% 4,729	23% 1,516	22% 3,270	21% 9,904
Highly Uncomfortable	23% 4,297	19% 1,304	19% 2,750	16% 7,433
Not sure how I feel	8% 1,566	10% 698	12% 1,716	7% 3,184

There is a small effect ($ES=.24$) between families of Asian students and White students.

Table 21:
Family Scenario 2b by Student Service (Percentages and Counts)

	Special Education Services (n=14,305)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Services (n= 7,043)	Students Receiving Free or Reduced Meals (n=8,804)	Advanced Academic Program (AAP) Services (n= 22,074)
Highly Comfortable	15% 2,167	13% 908	12% 1,052	15% 3,312
Comfortable	37% 5,225	32% 2,278	33% 2,917	36% 8,011
Uncomfortable	22% 3,160	24% 1,658	22% 1,937	23% 5,028
Highly Uncomfortable	18% 2,523	19% 1,331	18% 1,569	19% 4,172
Not sure how I feel	9% 1,230	12% 868	15% 1,329	7% 1,551

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 22:
Family Scenario 2b by Region (Percentages and Counts)

	Region 1 (n=22,056)	Region 2 (n=18,170)	Region 3 (n=15,031)	Region 4 (n=21,973)	Region 5 (n=18,136)
Highly Comfortable	16% 3,570	15% 2,640	14% 2,145	15% 3,275	14% 2,562
Comfortable	36% 7,934	36% 6,544	36% 5,361	36% 7,967	36% 6,490
Uncomfortable	22% 4,913	22% 3,979	22% 3,309	23% 5,061	23% 4,155
Highly Uncomfortable	18% 4,005	19% 3,364	18% 2,771	18% 3,890	19% 3,443
Not sure how I feel	7% 1,634	9% 1,643	10% 1,445	8% 1,780	8% 1,486

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 23:
Family Scenario 2b by School Level (Percentages and Counts)

	Elementary Students (n= 55,945)	Middle School Students (n= 14,351)	High School Students (n= 24,653)
Highly Comfortable	14% 7,673	16% 2,228	17% 4,221
Comfortable	35% 19,604	37% 5,315	37% 9,213
Uncomfortable	23% 12,986	22% 3,143	21% 5,201
Highly Uncomfortable	19% 10,639	18% 2,585	17% 4,183
Not sure how I feel	9% 5,043	8% 1,080	7% 1,835

There is a small effect ($ES=.12$) between families of elementary students and high school students.

Table 24:
Family Scenario 2b by Elementary Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

	Pre-Kindergarten Students (n=1,868)	Primary Students (Kindergarten to Grade 2) (n=24,581)	Upper Elementary Students (Grades 3 to 6) (n=29,303)
Highly Comfortable	14% 266	14% 3,367	14% 4,020
Comfortable	33% 614	34% 8,474	36% 10,451
Uncomfortable	23% 422	23% 5,763	23% 6,765
Highly Uncomfortable	20% 382	19% 4,700	19% 5,516
Not sure how I feel	10% 184	9% 2,277	9% 2,551

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Family Scenario 3: Online Learning by Choice

Table 25:
Family Perception of Importance and Likelihood of
Use of Scenario 3 by Race/Ethnicity (Percentages and Counts)

Level of Importance to Offer Option				
	Asian Students (n=18,271)	Black Students (n=6,519)	Hispanic Students (n=14,249)	White Students (n=45,559)
Very important	46% 8,394	52% 3,393	50% 7,106	44% 20,142
Important	42% 7,685	37% 2,405	39% 5,627	43% 19,788
Unimportant	9% 1,677	8% 531	7% 1,040	9% 4,060
Very Unimportant	3% 515	3% 190	3% 476	3% 1,569
Likelihood of Use of Option				
	Asian Students (n=18,253)	Black Students (n=6,520)	Hispanic Students (n=14,241)	White Students (n=45,457)
Highly Likely	27% 4,983	26% 1,685	23% 3,334	11% 5,190
Likely	36% 6,544	33% 2,173	32% 4,600	17% 7,929
Unlikely	25% 4,520	28% 1,803	26% 3,658	36% 16,515
Highly Unlikely	12% 2,206	13% 859	19% 2,649	35% 15,823

There are large effects ($ES=.55-.69$) between families of White students and other families.
There is a small effect ($ES=.14$) between families of Black and Hispanic students.

Table 26:
Family Perception of Importance and Likelihood of
Use of Scenario 3 by Student Service (Percentages and Counts)

Level of Importance to Offer Option				
	Special Education Services (n=14,331)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Services (n= 7,091)	Students Receiving Free or Reduced Meals (n=8,349)	Advanced Academic Program (AAP) Services (n= 22,078)
Very important	49% 6,996	47% 3,350	48% 4,025	47% 10,423
Important	40% 5,786	42% 2,966	40% 3,370	41% 9,046
Unimportant	8% 1,108	8% 578	8% 647	9% 1,910
Very Unimportant	3% 441	3% 197	4% 307	3% 699
Likelihood of Use of Option				
	Special Education Services (n=14,301)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Services (n= 7,089)	Students Receiving Free or Reduced Meals (n=8,368)	Advanced Academic Program (AAP) Services (n= 22,031)
Highly Likely	18% 2,590	28% 1,956	26% 2,217	18% 3,969
Likely	25% 3,552	40% 2,846	42% 3,516	23% 5,153
Unlikely	31% 4,441	20% 1,452	19% 1,618	33% 7,227
Highly Unlikely	26% 3,718	12% 835	12% 1,017	26% 5,682

There are large effects ($ES=.56-.59$) between families of students receiving ESOL services or free or reduced meals and those not receiving these services.

Table 27:
Family Perception of Importance and Likelihood of
Use of Scenario 3 by Region (Percentages and Counts)

Level of Importance to Offer Option					
	Region 1 (n=21,609)	Region 2 (n=17,684)	Region 3 (n=14,679)	Region 4 (n=21,593)	Region 5 (n=17,752)
Very important	46% 9,844	46% 8,079	48% 7,075	46% 9,874	46% 8,192
Important	42% 9,032	43% 7,518	40% 5,939	42% 9,173	42% 7,451
Unimportant	9% 1,969	8% 1,497	8% 1,216	9% 1,837	9% 1,549
Very Unimportant	4% 764	3% 590	3% 449	3% 709	3% 560
Likelihood of Use of Option					
	Region 1 (n=21,571)	Region 2 (n=17,646)	Region 3 (n=14,645)	Region 4 (n=21,552)	Region 5 (n=17,744)
Highly Likely	16% 3,541	19% 3,369	20% 2,930	16% 3,440	19% 3,398
Likely	22% 4,787	27% 4,828	27% 3,965	23% 4,991	26% 4,675
Unlikely	32% 7,005	31% 5,429	31% 4,528	32% 6,998	31% 5,479
Highly Unlikely	29% 6,238	23% 4,020	22% 3,222	28% 6,123	24% 4,192

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 28:
Family Perception of Importance and Likelihood of
Use of Scenario 3 by School Level (Percentages and Counts)

Level of Importance to Offer Option			
	Elementary Students (n=54,693)	Middle School Students (n=14,045)	High School Students (n=24,171)
Very important	47% 25,951	46% 6,443	43% 10,473
Important	41% 22,596	41% 5,817	44% 10,549
Unimportant	8% 4,455	9% 1,304	9% 2,267
Very Unimportant	3% 1,691	3% 481	4% 882
Likelihood of Use of Option			
	Elementary Students (n=54,592)	Middle School Students (n=14,024)	High School Students (n=24,134)
Highly Likely	18% 10,098	18% 2,529	16% 3,968
Likely	25% 13,867	26% 3,583	24% 5,702
Unlikely	31% 17,022	31% 4,402	33% 7,904
Highly Unlikely	25% 13,605	25% 3,510	27% 6,560

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 29:
Family Perception of Importance and Likelihood of Use of Scenario 3
by Elementary Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

Level of Importance to Offer Option			
	Pre-Kindergarten Students (n=1,822)	Primary Students (Kindergarten to Grade 2) (n=23,985)	Upper Elementary Students (Grades 3 to 6) (n=28,694)
Very important	51% 933	48% 11,446	47% 13,477
Important	38% 685	41% 9,928	42% 11,912
Unimportant	7% 128	8% 1,900	8% 2,407
Very Unimportant	4% 76	3% 711	3% 898
Likelihood of Use of Option			
	Pre-Kindergarten Students (n= 1,821)	Primary Students (Kindergarten to Grade 2) (n=23,939)	Upper Elementary Students (Grades 3 to 6) (n=28,640)
Highly Likely	18% 328	18% 4,328	19% 5,397
Likely	26% 468	25% 6,062	25% 7,273
Unlikely	27% 493	31% 7,424	32% 9,070
Highly Unlikely	29% 532	26% 6,125	24% 6,900

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Staff Responses to Return to School Scenarios, Disaggregated

Summary of Findings

- When the data on scenarios were disaggregated, similar patterns were observed to the overall data. However, there are some differences between staff groups.
- For most comparisons, staff reported discomfort with the general return to work scenario and an even split between comfort and discomfort with the return with Scenarios 2A or 2B in place, though none reached a majority.
- School-based support staff reported higher percentages of comfort than other position groups, which reflected differences categorized as small to moderate in magnitude (ES range from .20 to .42).
- Bus drivers reported higher percentages of comfort than other school support staff, differences categorized as moderate in magnitude (ES range from .40 to .41).
- Principals' level of comfort differed by school level, with high school principals reporting higher comfort than other principals, which reflected differences categorized as small to moderate in magnitude (ES range from .24 to .49 on the general return scenario and from .24 to .30 on the Scenario 2 return). Middle school principals also reported greater comfort on a general return than elementary principals, which reflected a difference categorized as small in magnitude ($ES=.24$).
- ESOL teachers reported less comfort with the general return scenario than non-ESOL teachers, while AAP teachers reported more comfort with Scenario 2 than non-AAP teachers, both of which were categorized as small differences ($ES=.28$ and $ES=.24$, respectively).

Staff General Return to School/Worksite Scenario

Table 30:
Staff Level of Comfort with General Return by Position Type (Percentages and Counts)

	Teachers (n=10,618)	Principals (n=162)	Other School- Based Instructional Staff (n=2,478)	School-Based Support Staff (n=2,228)	Central Office Staff (n=2,576)
Highly Comfortable	10% 1,057	14% 23	9% 234	13% 295	7% 171
Comfortable	25% 2,652	34% 55	26% 642	33% 737	25% 632
Uncomfortable	28% 2,945	23% 37	28% 706	25% 559	33% 842
Highly Uncomfortable	22% 2,364	20% 33	19% 472	14% 309	23% 586
Not sure how I feel	15% 1,600	9% 14	17% 424	15% 328	13% 344

There is a moderate effect ($ES=.37$) between school-based support staff and other positions.

Table 31:
Staff Level of Comfort with General Return by Region (Percentages and Counts)

	Region 1 (n=2,905)	Region 2 (n=3,300)	Region 3 (n=3,003)	Region 4 (n=2,675)	Region 5 (n=2,600)
Highly Comfortable	10% 298	10% 318	9% 263	11% 283	11% 285
Comfortable	26% 760	25% 823	26% 789	26% 688	27% 708
Uncomfortable	28% 822	28% 916	28% 830	28% 759	26% 677
Highly Uncomfortable	20% 587	22% 728	22% 675	19% 509	20% 529
Not sure how I feel	15% 438	16% 515	15% 446	16% 436	15% 401

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 32:
**Staff Level of Comfort with General Return
by School Level of Principal (Percentages and Counts)**

	Elementary School Principals (n=109)	Middle School Principals (n=16)	High School Principals (n=27)
Highly Comfortable	12% 13	19% 3	26% 7
Comfortable	31% 34	38% 6	41% 11
Uncomfortable	22% 24	19% 3	15% 4
Highly Uncomfortable	25% 27	19% 3	11% 3
Not sure how I feel	10% 11	6% 1	7% 2

There is a small effect ($ES=.24$) between middle school principals and other principals.

There is a moderate effect ($ES=.49$) between elementary principals and high school principals.

Table 33:
Staff Level of Comfort with General Return
by School Level of Teacher (Percentages and Counts)

	Elementary School Teachers (n=5,828)	Middle School Teachers (n=1,567)	High School Teachers (n=3,016)
Highly Comfortable	9% 503	10% 161	12% 375
Comfortable	26% 1,490	23% 366	25% 761
Uncomfortable	28% 1,623	30% 463	26% 797
Highly Uncomfortable	22% 1,296	22% 344	22% 665
Not sure how I feel	16% 916	15% 233	14% 418

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 34:
Staff Level of Comfort with General Return
by Elementary Teacher Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

	Pre-Kindergarten (n=474)	Primary (Kindergarten to Grade 2) (n=2,123)	Upper Elementary (Grades 3 to 6) (n=2,448)
Highly Comfortable	8% 39	9% 198	9% 227
Comfortable	24% 114	28% 587	27% 656
Uncomfortable	29% 137	27% 417	27% 668
Highly Uncomfortable	23% 108	20% 417	21% 508
Not sure how I feel	16% 76	16% 341	16% 389

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 35:
Staff Level of Comfort with General Return
by Student Service (Percentages and Counts)

	Special Education Teachers (n=1,916)	ESOL Teachers (n=557)	AAP Teachers (n=320)
Highly Comfortable	8% 158	5% 30	7% 21
Comfortable	25% 472	19% 108	23% 72
Uncomfortable	29% 447	30% 165	33% 104
Highly Uncomfortable	23% 447	30% 166	26% 84
Not sure how I feel	15% 286	16% 88	12% 39

There is a small effect ($ES=.28$) between ESOL teachers and non-ESOL teachers.

Table 36:
Staff Level of Comfort with General Return
for Select Positions (Percentages and Counts)

	Instructional Assistants (n=1,692)	Bus Drivers (n=642)
Highly Comfortable	10% 172	18% 115
Comfortable	27% 450	37% 239
Uncomfortable	27% 458	22% 139
Highly Uncomfortable	17% 296	12% 77
Not sure how I feel	19% 316	11% 72

There is a moderate effect ($ES=.41$) between bus drivers and other support staff.

Staff Return to School/Worksite Scenario 2: 25 to 50 Percent of Students Return to School

Table 37:
Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2 by Position Type (Percentages and Counts)

	Teachers (n=10,622)	Principals (n=162)	Other School- Based Instructional Staff (n=2,482)	School-Based Support Staff (n=2,222)	Central Office Staff (n=2,517)
Highly Comfortable	11% 1,164	12% 20	10% 237	13% 281	8% 199
Comfortable	30% 3,231	23% 37	33% 825	39% 872	31% 779
Uncomfortable	26% 2,804	28% 46	26% 641	23% 515	28% 701
Highly Uncomfortable	19% 2,025	27% 43	16% 393	12% 258	16% 412
Not sure how I feel	13% 1,398	10% 16	16% 386	13% 296	17% 426

There is a moderate effect ($ES=.42$) between principals and school-based support staff.

There is a small effect ($ES=.24$) between principals and other school-based instructional staff, between school-based support and teachers, and between central office staff and school-based support.

Table 38:
Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2 by Region (Percentages and Counts)

	Region 1 (n=2,909)	Region 2 (n=3,297)	Region 3 (n=3,008)	Region 4 (n=2,671)	Region 5 (n=2,601)
Highly Comfortable	11% 321	10% 342	10% 294	11% 300	11% 290
Comfortable	31% 913	31% 1,036	31% 940	33% 877	31% 814
Uncomfortable	27% 777	27% 879	26% 780	27% 712	25% 641
Highly Uncomfortable	18% 518	19% 612	19% 562	17% 442	18% 471
Not sure how I feel	13% 380	13% 428	14% 432	13% 340	15% 385

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 39:
Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2
by School Level of Principal (Percentages and Counts)

	Elementary School Principals (n=109)	Middle School Principals (n=16)	High School Principals (n=27)
Highly Comfortable	11% 12	13% 2	22% 6
Comfortable	23% 25	25% 4	22% 6
Uncomfortable	28% 31	38% 6	19% 5
Highly Uncomfortable	29% 32	19% 3	22% 6
Not sure how I feel	8% 9	6% 1	15% 4

There is a moderate effect ($ES=.30$) between elementary and high school principals.
There is a small effect ($ES=.24$) between middle and high school principals.

Table 40:
Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2
by School Level of Teacher (Percentages and Counts)

	Elementary School Teachers (n=5,833)	Middle School Teachers (n=1,565)	High School Teachers (n=3,017)
Highly Comfortable	10% 556	11% 176	14% 411
Comfortable	31% 1,795	30% 465	30% 915
Uncomfortable	27% 1,553	27% 306	26% 779
Highly Uncomfortable	19% 1,118	20% 306	18% 555
Not sure how I feel	14% 811	13% 198	12% 357

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 41:
Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2
by Elementary Teacher Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

	Pre-Kindergarten (n=245)	Primary (Kindergarten to Grade 2) (n=1586)	Upper Elementary (Grades 3 to 6) (n=2247)
Highly Comfortable	12% 30	11% 175	9% 202
Comfortable	29% 71	32% 501	32% 714
Uncomfortable	26% 63	25% 402	27% 421
Highly Uncomfortable	21% 52	19% 298	19% 421
Not sure how I feel	12% 29	13% 210	14% 304

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 42:
Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2
by Student Service (Percentages and Counts)

	Special Education Teachers (n=1,916)	ESOL Teachers (n=557)	AAP Teachers (n=320)
Highly Comfortable	9% 173	8% 45	6% 20
Comfortable	31% 586	27% 149	26% 84
Uncomfortable	28% 530	28% 130	30% 97
Highly Uncomfortable	19% 361	23% 130	23% 74
Not sure how I feel	14% 266	14% 75	14% 45

There is a small effect ($ES=.24$) between AAP teachers and non-AAP teachers.

**Table 43:
Staff Level of Comfort with Scenario 2
for Select Positions (Percentages and Counts)**

	Instructional Assistants (n=1,696)	Bus Drivers (n=640)
Highly Comfortable	10% 176	17% 110
Comfortable	36% 618	43% 278
Uncomfortable	23% 395	19% 124
Highly Uncomfortable	14% 229	9% 57
Not sure how I feel	16% 278	11% 71

There is a moderate effect ($ES=.40$) between bus drivers and other support staff.

Amount of Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction

Families and teachers were asked to report on the adequacy of the amount of synchronous and asynchronous instruction provided during the COVID-19 school closure.

Conclusions

- Agreement between parents and teachers that the amount of synchronous instruction was insufficient for students to learn effectively reflects two potential avenues for improvement. One pathway would be improvements in the amount of virtual instruction and the other pathway could be a return to in-school instruction.
- Parents and teachers differed more on their perspectives of asynchronous instruction, with teachers indicating the amount was sufficient while parents relatively evenly split between those who perceived the amount as not enough and those who considered it an appropriate amount. This may reflect difficulties families experienced ensuring students continued to learn new material or in occupying their children during quarantine.
- Families of students receiving Special Education services reported even higher levels of insufficient synchronous instruction than families of students not receiving these services. This difference coupled with results above that families of students receiving special education services also split in their preferences for virtual versus in-school instruction indicate a need for FCPS to consider improvements over what was provided during the COVID-19 school closure, whether instruction is delivered virtually or in-school.
- Other subgroup differences were small to moderate for both synchronous and asynchronous instruction, indicating general agreement with the overall trends among family and staff subgroups on the amount of synchronous and asynchronous instruction.

Overall Parent/Caregiver and Teacher Perspectives on Instruction

Summary of Findings

- Majorities of both parents (69 percent) and teachers (53 percent) responded that the amount of synchronous instruction provided to students during the COVID-19 closing was not enough to help students learn effectively.
- There was less agreement between parents and teachers about the amount of asynchronous instruction that students received during the COVID-19 closing. A majority of teachers (66 percent) responded that the amount was appropriate. Parents, however, reported more mixed views with 44 percent responding that asynchronous opportunities were not enough for students to learn effectively and 41 percent reporting that asynchronous opportunities were the appropriate amount.

Table 44:
Overall Parent / Cargiver and Staff Perspectives on Amount of Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction (Percentages and Counts)

Synchronous		
	Parents / Caregivers (n= 96,253)	Teachers (n=11,127)
Not Enough	69% 66,085	53% 5,863
Appropriate Amount	30% 29,189	43% 4,791
Too Much	1% 979	4% 473
Asynchronous		
	Parents / Caregivers (n= 96,239)	Teachers (n=11,137)
Not Enough	44% 42,482	23% 2,584
Appropriate Amount	41% 39,255	66% 7,319
Too Much	15% 14,502	11% 1,234

Parent / Caregiver Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction, Disaggregated

Summary of Findings

- When the family data on synchronous and asynchronous instruction were disaggregated, similar patterns were observed to the overall data. However, there were some differences that were small to large in magnitude between groups.
- Families of students receiving Special Education services reported that there was not enough synchronous instruction more often than families who did not receive these services, which was categorized as difference of large magnitude ($ES=.65$).
- Families of students receiving ESOL services were less likely to report not enough synchronous instruction than families of students not receiving these services, which was categorized as moderate difference ($ES=.39$).
- A greater percentage of families of White students reported not enough synchronous instruction than families of other students, which were categorized as small to moderate differences (ES ranges from .21 to .39).
- When looking at the data by elementary grade level, a smaller percentage of families of pre-K students reported not enough synchronous instruction, categorized as a small difference from the other grade level groups ($ES=.13$).

Table 45:
Parent / Caregiver Perspectives on Amount of
Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity
(Percentages and Counts)

Synchronous				
	Asian Students (n=18,731)	Black Students (n=6,638)	Hispanic Students (n=15,148)	White Students (n=45,876)
Not enough	65% 12,207	56% 3,735	56% 8,544	75% 34,605
Appropriate Amount	34% 6,385	43% 2,835	43% 6,448	23% 10,765
Too Much	1% 139	1% 68	1% 156	1% 506
Asynchronous				
	Asian Students (n=18,731)	Black Students (n=6,640)	Hispanic Students (n=15,173)	White Students (n=45,839)
Not enough	44% 8,288	34% 2,279	38% 5,840	48% 21,819
Appropriate Amount	44% 8,178	52% 3,434	49% 7,456	36% 16,304
Too Much	12% 2,265	14% 927	12% 1,877	17% 7,716

For synchronous instruction, there are small to moderate effects ($ES=.21-.39$) between families of White students and other families. For asynchronous instruction, There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 46:
Parent / Caregiver Perspectives on Amount of
Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction Disaggregated by Student Service
(Percentages and Counts)

Synchronous				
	Special Education (n=15,017)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (n=7,895)	Free or Reduced Meals (n=9,201)	Advanced Academic Program (n=22,763)
Not enough	66% 9,978	51% 4,029	49% 4,494	71% 16,121
Appropriate Amount	32% 4,809	47% 3,746	50% 4,574	28% 6,446
Too Much	2% 230	2% 120	1% 133	1% 196
Asynchronous				
	Special Education (n=15,025)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (n=7,885)	Free or Reduced Meals (n=9,200)	Advanced Academic Program (n=22,761)
Not enough	42% 6,253	38% 2,988	37% 3,448	44% 10,036
Appropriate Amount	41% 6,094	53% 4,186	53% 4,920	41% 9,357
Too Much	18% 2,678	9% 711	9% 832	15% 3,368

For synchronous instruction, there is a moderate effect ($ES=.40$) between ESOL and non-ESOL families and a large effect ($ES=.65$) between special education and non-special education families.

For asynchronous instruction, there is a large effect ($ES=.63$) between special education and non-special education families.

Table 47:
Parent / Caregiver Perspectives on Amount of
Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction Disaggregated by Region
(Percentages and Counts)

Synchronous					
	Region 1 (n= 22,021)	Region 2 (n= 18,256)	Region 3 (n= 15,047)	Region 4 (n= 21,993)	Region 5 (n= 18,107)
Not enough	73% 16,091	65% 11,875	64% 9,604	71% 15,603	69% 12,431
Appropriate Amount	26% 5,713	34% 6,171	35% 5,280	28% 6,181	30% 5,514
Too Much	1% 217	1% 210	1% 163	1% 209	1% 162
Asynchronous					
	Region 1 (n=22,001)	Region 2 (n=18,234)	Region 3 (n=15,054)	Region 4 (n=21,981)	Region 5 (n=18,132)
Not enough	47% 10,327	41% 7,461	42% 6,251	46% 10,139	44% 7,952
Appropriate Amount	37% 8,134	44% 8,033	45% 6,741	39% 8,547	41% 7,408
Too Much	16% 3,540	15% 2,740	14% 2,062	15% 3,295	15% 2,772

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 48:
Parent / Caregiver Perspectives on Amount of
Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction Disaggregated by School Level
(Percentages and Counts)

Synchronous			
	Elementary School (n=54,742)	Middle School (n=14,367)	High School (n=25,875)
Not enough	69% 37,916	69% 9,944	67% 17,450
Appropriate Amount	30% 16,172	30% 4,339	32% 8,205
Too Much	1% 654	1% 84	1% 220
Asynchronous			
	Elementary School (n=54,759)	Middle School (n=14,358)	High School (n=25,845)
Not enough	44% 23,805	44% 6,282	46% 11,848
Appropriate Amount	41% 22,617	40% 5,778	40% 10,297
Too Much	15% 8,337	16% 2,298	14% 3,700

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 49:
Parent / Caregiver Perspectives on Amount of
Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction Disaggregated by
Elementary Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

Synchronous			
	Pre-Kindergarten (n=1,537)	Kindergarten to Grade 2 (n=23,964)	Grades 3 to 6 (n=29,043)
Not enough	63% 975	69% 16,595	70% 20,231
Appropriate Amount	36% 546	29% 7,015	29% 8,532
Too Much	1% 16	1% 354	1% 280
Asynchronous			
	Pre-Kindergarten (n=1,538)	Kindergarten to Grade 2 (n=23,965)	Grades 3 to 6 (n= 29,055)
Not enough	47% 717	43% 10,406	43% 12,600
Appropriate Amount	45% 687	41% 9,891	41% 11,949
Too Much	9% 134	15% 3,668	16% 4,506

There is a small effect ($ES=.13-.14$) for pre-kindergarten families and other elementary families.

Teacher Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction, Disaggregated

Summary of Findings

- When teacher responses about synchronous and asynchronous instruction were disaggregated, similar patterns were observed to the overall data. The largest percentages of teachers responded that the amount of synchronous instruction provided to students during the COVID-19 closing was not enough to help students learn effectively. A majority of teachers responded that the amount of asynchronous instruction was appropriate. There were some differences between staff groups.
- Elementary teachers of pre-kindergarten to Grade 2 students were more likely to indicate that the amount of synchronous instruction was appropriate than elementary teachers of students in Grades 3 to 6, which were categorized as small to moderate differences (*ES* range from .22 to .38).
- A smaller percentage of elementary teachers reported that synchronous instruction was not enough compared to their middle and high school counterparts, differences categorized as small in magnitude (*ES* range from .23 to .26).

Table 50:
Teacher Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction Disaggregated by
School Level
(Percentages and Counts)

Synchronous			
	Elementary School (n=5,243)	Middle School (n=1,368)	High School (n=2,728)
Not enough	50% 2,606	59% 807	60% 1,625
Appropriate Amount	45% 2,361	38% 522	36% 989
Too Much	5% 276	3% 39	4% 114
Asynchronous			
	Elementary School (n=5,287)	Middle School (n=1,428)	High School (n=2,730)
Not enough	21% 1,085	20% 284	30% 815
Appropriate Amount	67% 3,546	66% 946	62% 1,689
Too Much	12% 656	14% 198	8% 226

There is a small effect (*ES*=.20) between elementary and middle school staff for synchronous instruction. There is a small effect (*ES*=.20-.26) between elementary teachers and both middle and high teachers for asynchronous instruction.

Table 51:
Teacher Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction Disaggregated by
Elementary Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

Synchronous			
	Pre-Kindergarten (n=199)	Kindergarten to Grade 2 (n=1,508)	Grades 3 to 6 (n=2,141)
Not enough	35% 69	41% 620	52% 1,108
Appropriate Amount	59% 117	52% 777	44% 949
Too Much	7% 13	7% 111	4% 84
Asynchronous			
	Pre-Kindergarten (n=211)	Kindergarten to Grade 2 (n=1,479)	Grades 3 to 6 (n=2,108)
Not enough	18% 39	19% 279	21% 440
Appropriate Amount	70% 147	70% 1,035	67% 1,403
Too Much	12% 25	11% 165	13% 265

There are small to moderate effects ($ES=.23-.38$) between pre-kindergarten teachers and other elementary teachers for synchronous instruction. There are no meaningful differences for asynchronous instruction.

Table 52:
Teacher Perspectives on Synchronous and Asynchronous Instruction Disaggregated by
Student Service (Percentages and Counts)

Synchronous			
	Special Education (n=1738)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (n=535)	Advanced Academic Program (n=300)
Not enough	55% 964	59% 315	49% 148
Appropriate Amount	41% 712	38% 207	47% 142
Too Much	4% 62	2% 13	3% 10
Asynchronous			
	Special Education (n=1693)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (n=507)	Advanced Academic Program (n=295)
Not enough	25% 420	24% 124	16% 46
Appropriate Amount	62% 1,045	62% 312	71% 209
Too Much	13% 2228	14% 71	14% 40

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Access to Technology

Families and staff were asked two questions about access to technology. One question targeted availability of a laptop, computer, or other device. A second question targeted access to the internet.

Conclusions

- Majorities of families and staff reported access to both a device and the internet.
- Family Survey data disaggregated for subgroups indicates that FCPS has done a good job of ensuring that students have access to technology and that there are not largescale inequities among those who responded to the survey. However, given that the survey was administered online, the 1 percent of families who reported students without routine access to a device is likely lower than the actual figure for FCPS as a whole, since families where the student did not have access are also likely to be families that did not complete the online survey. It is important that until such time as all students have FCPS-provided devices that school-based staff continue to monitor who may need an FCPS-provided device.
- The lower percentages of instructional assistants who reported using an FCPS-provided device indicates that FCPS will need to consider expanding device access to this group if they continue to be heavily involved in virtual learning.
- FCPS should continue to monitor student and staff access, especially if changes are made to the amount of synchronous and asynchronous instruction in the future as this may place greater demand on shared computers within families.

Overall Student and Staff Access to Technology

Summary of Findings

- For computer or device availability, the majority of families (70 percent) indicated students used a family-provided device. In contrast, a majority of staff (84 percent) reported using FCPS-provided computers or devices.
- Almost all families (98 percent) and staff (97 percent) reported using their own internet access for distance learning and teleworking.
- Approximately 1 percent of families reported the student did not have routine availability of a computer/device or routine access to the internet.

Table 53:
Overall Student and Staff Access to Technology (Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device		
	Family Reporting on Student (n= 96,584)	Staff Reporting on Staff (n=16,302)
Family-provided	70% 67,171	13% 2,111
FCPS-provided	28% 26,944	84% 13,741
Did not have routine availability	1% 984	<1% 63
Other	2% 1,485	2% 387
Internet		
	Family Reporting on Student (n= 96,592)	Staff Reporting on Staff (n=16,308)
Family-provided	98% 94,330	97% 15,738
FCPS-provided	1% 1,099	2% 406
Did not have routine access	1% 656	<1% 47
Other	1% 507	1% 117

Student Access to Technology, Disaggregated

Summary of Findings

- When Family Survey data on technology were disaggregated, similar patterns were observed to the overall data for most subgroups.
- The one exception was with families of pre-kindergarten students, who were less likely to report access to devices ($ES=.39-.53$, categorized as a moderate to large difference) and internet ($ES=.25-.37$, categorized as a small to moderate difference). Respondents at the pre-kindergarten level include families with pre-kindergarten students enrolled in FCPS, as well as those who were not but planned to enroll their child for the upcoming school year.

Table 54:
Family-Reported Student Access to Technology Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity
(Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device				
	Asian Students (n=18,713)	Black Students (n=6,637)	Hispanic Students (n=15,233)	White Students (n=46,071)
Family-provided	75% 13,967	60% 3,974	55% 8,340	73% 33,803
FCPS-provided	24% 4,483	37% 2,486	40% 6,029	25% 11,373
Did not have routine availability	1% 103	1% 82	3% 387	1% 307
Other	1% 160	1% 95	3% 477	1% 588
Internet				
	Asian Students (n=18,727)	Black Students (n=6,636)	Hispanic Students (n=15,203)	White Students (n=46,102)
Family-provided	98% 18,442	97% 6,418	94% 14,224	99% 45,552
FCPS-provided	1% 167	2% 124	3% 502	<1% 209
Did not have routine access	<1% 55	1% 63	2% 307	<1% 158
Other	<1% 63	<1% 31	1% 170	<1% 183

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 55:
Family-Reported Student Access to Technology Disaggregated by Student Service
(Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device				
	Special Education (n=15,073)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (n= 7,885)	Free or Reduced Meals (n=9,224)	Advanced Academic Program (n= 22,731)
Family-provided	65% 9,744	58% 4,579	43% 3,933	79% 18,025
FCPS-provided	32% 4,775	37% 2,912	49% 4,563	20% 4,440
Did not have routine availability	1% 219	2% 172	4% 355	<1% 80
Other	2% 335	3% 222	4% 373	1% 186
Internet				
	Special Education (n=15,074)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (n= 7,880)	Free or Reduced Meals (n=9,198)	Advanced Academic Program (n= 22,746)
Family-provided	97% 14,561	93% 7,320	89% 8,205	99% 22,477
FCPS-provided	2% 252	5% 363	6% 548	1% 153
Did not have routine access	1% 142	1% 112	3% 283	<1% 47
Other	1% 119	1% 85	2% 162	<1% 69

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 56:
Family-Reported Student Access to Technology Disaggregated by Region
(Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device					
	Region 1 (n=22,081)	Region 2 (n=18,300)	Region 3 (n=15,090)	Region 4 (n=22,087)	Region 5 (n= 18,166)
Family-provided	73% 16,165	69% 12,699	68% 10,302	74% 16,250	62% 11,285
FCPS-provided	25% 5,470	27% 4,960	29% 4,302	24% 5,401	36% 6,505
Did not have routine availability	1% 171	2% 285	1% 179	1% 164	1% 143
Other	1% 275	2% 356	2% 307	1% 272	1% 233
Internet					
	Region 1 (n=22,098)	Region 2 (n=18,290)	Region 3 (n=15,100)	Region 4 (n=22,077)	Region 5 (n= 18,164)
Family-provided	98% 21,708	96% 17,632	97% 14,650	99% 21,754	98% 17,819
FCPS-provided	1% 190	2% 319	1% 226	1% 141	1% 179
Did not have routine access	<1% 93	1% 218	1% 127	<1% 102	<1% 86
Other	<1% 107	1% 121	1% 97	<1% 80	<1% 80

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

**Table 57:
Family-Reported Student Access to Technology Disaggregated by School Level
(Percentages and Counts)**

Computer or Device			
	Elementary School (n=54,948)	Middle School (n=14,368)	High School (n=25,963)
Family-provided	84% 45,889	78% 11,169	36% 9,352
FCPS-provided	13% 7,133	21% 3,025	63% 16,349
Did not have routine availability	1% 822	<1% 66	<1% 41
Other	2% 1,104	1% 108	1% 221
Internet			
	Elementary School (n=54,972)	Middle School (n=14,362)	High School (n=25,952)
Family-provided	97% 53,584	98% 14,111	98% 25,447
FCPS-provided	1% 517	1% 158	1% 371
Did not have routine access	1% 501	<1% 53	<1% 62
Other	1% 370	<1% 40	<1% 72

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 58:
Family-Reported Student Access to Technology Disaggregated by
Elementary Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device			
	Pre-Kindergarten (n=1,680)	Kindergarten to Grade 2 (n=24,049)	Grades 3 to 6 (n=29,018)
Family-provided	74% 1,248	89% 21,369	80% 23,134
FCPS-provided	3% 50	7% 1,606	19% 5,429
Did not have routine availability	11% 181	2% 480	1% 152
Other	12% 201	2% 594	1% 303
Internet			
	Pre-Kindergarten (n= 1,679)	Kindergarten to Grade 2 (n= 24,066)	Grades 3 to 6 (n= 29,024)
Family-provided	88% 1,482	97% 23,391	98% 28,518
FCPS-provided	1% 14	1% 204	1% 294
Did not have routine access	6% 94	1% 306	<1% 98
Other	5% 89	1% 165	<1% 114

There are moderate to large effects ($ES=.39-.53$) between pre-kindergarten families and other elementary families for technology devices. There are small to moderate effects ($ES=.25-.37$) between pre-kindergarten families and other elementary families for internet access.

Staff Access to Technology, Disaggregated

Summary of Findings

- When the staff data on technology access were disaggregated, overall patterns were maintained for most staff groups.
- Instructional assistants reported a lower percentage of availability of an FCPS-provided device (50 percent) than other instructional staff.
- Small differences (*ES* ranging from .23 to .29 for devices, and .21 for internet) were also found for school-based support staff in comparison to other position types.

Table 59:
Staff Access to Technology Disaggregated by Position Type (Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device					
	Teachers (n=10,218)	Principals (n=162)	Other School- Based Instructional Staff (n=2,234)	School-Based Support Staff (n=1,461)	Central-Office Staff (n=2,227)
Family-provided	6% 603	0% 0	32% 724	36% 527	12% 257
FCPS-provided	92% 9,366	99% 160	65% 1,452	58% 852	86% 1,911
Did not have routine availability	<1% 7	0% 0	1% 15	2% 29	1% 12
Other	2% 242	1% 2	2% 43	4% 53	2% 47
Internet					
	Teachers (n=10,220)	Principals (n=162)	Other School- Based Instructional Staff (n=2,232)	School-Based Support Staff (n=1,466)	Central-Office Staff (n=2,228)
Family-provided	98% 9,987	99% 161	96% 2,133	92% 1,342	95% 2,115
FCPS-provided	2% 159	1% 1	3% 73	6% 87	4% 86
Did not have routine access	<1% 10	0% 0	1% 14	1% 16	0% 7
Other	1% 64	0% 0	1% 12	1% 21	1% 20

There are small effects (*ES*=.23-.29) between school-based support staff and teachers and principals for technology devices.

There is a small effect (*ES*=.21) between school-based support staff and principals for internet access.

Table 60:
Other School-Based Instructional Staff Access to Technology
Disaggregated by Position Level
(Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device			
	Instructional Assistants (n=1,498)	Non-Principal Administrators (n=278)	Other Instructional Staff (n=458)
Family-provided	47% 699	1% 4	5% 11
FCPS-provided	50% 753	98% 273	93% 426
Did not have routine availability	1% 15	0% 0	0% 0
Other	2% 31	<1% 1	2% 11
Internet			
	Instructional Assistants (n=1,495)	Non-Principal Administrators (n=278)	Other Instructional Staff (n=459)
Family-provided	94% 1,408	98% 272	99% 453
FCPS-provided	4% 65	1% 4	1% 4
Did not have routine access	1% 13	0% 1	0% 0
Other	1% 9	<1% 1	<1% 2

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 61:
Teacher Access to Technology Disaggregated by School Level
(Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device			
	Elementary School (n=7,948)	Middle School (n=1,891)	High School (n=3,654)
Family-provided	14% 1,101	8% 142	9% 314
FCPS-provided	84% 6,649	90% 1,696	88% 3,228
Did not have routine availability	<1% 19	<1% 6	<1% 15
Other	2% 179	3% 47	3% 96
Internet			
	Elementary School (n=7,946)	Middle School (n=1,892)	High School (n=3,660)
Family-provided	97% 7,727	97% 1,826	96% 3,524
FCPS-provided	2% 159	3% 48	3% 91
Did not have routine access	<1% 17	<1% 6	<1% 12
Other	1% 43	1% 12	1% 33

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 62:
Elementary Teacher Access to Technology Disaggregated by
Elementary Grade Level (Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device			
	Pre-Kindergarten (n=448)	Kindergarten to Grade 2 (n=2,018)	Grades 3 to 6 (n=2,360)
Family-provided	28% 124	16% 312	8% 195
FCPS-provided	66% 296	82% 1,659	89% 2,109
Did not have routine availability	1% 6	<1% 3	<1% 2
Other	5% 22	2% 44	2% 54
Internet			
	Pre-Kindergarten (n=448)	Kindergarten to Grade 2 (n=2,016)	Grades 3 to 6 (n=2,359)
Family-provided	96% 430	98% 1,974	98% 2,318
FCPS-provided	2% 10	1% 26	1% 27
Did not have routine access	1% 6	<1% 1	<1% 2
Other	<1% 2	1% 15	1% 12

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.

Table 63:
Teacher Access to Technology Disaggregated by
Student Service (Percentages and Counts)

Computer or Device			
	Special Education (n=1956)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (n=553)	Advanced Academic Program (n=313)
Family-provided	4% 68	5% 27	4% 13
FCPS-provided	94% 1,841	94% 518	93% 290
Did not have routine availability	<1% 3	0% 0	0% 0
Other	2% 44	1% 8	3% 10
Internet			
	Special Education (n=1955)	English for Speakers of Other Languages (n=551)	Advanced Academic Program (n=312)
Family-provided	97% 1,889	98% 538	99% 308
FCPS-provided	2% 47	2% 11	<1% 1
Did not have routine access	<1% 3	0% 0	0% 0
Other	1% 16	<1% 2	1% 3

There are no meaningful differences between groups, as reflected by effect sizes.