

Truxton Academy Charter School

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 16, 2021

By Sara Petit-McClure

6337 Academy Street, Truxton, NY 13158

607-842-6252

Sara Petit-McClure, Head of School and Jennifer Hull, Student Achievement Coordinator, prepared this 2020-21 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position	
	Office (e.g. chair, treasurer, secretary)	committees (e.g. finance, executive)
Stuart Young	President	Executive, Personnel, Finance
Krysta Austen	Vice President	Executive, Personnel, Nutrition
Korinne L'Hommedieu	Treasurer	Executive, Finance Co-chair
Dave Amberg	Board Member	Fundraising Chair, Re-opening
Cindy Denkenberger	Board Member	Personnel Chair, Curriculum Chair, Nomination Chair
Sarah Stevens	Board Member/Parent Representative	Marketing
Dr.Beth Klein	Board Member	Curriculum
Tom Brown	Finance Committee Co-Chair	Finance Co-Chair, Facilities, Nutrition, Transportation
Patty Dawson	Recording Secretary	Executive, Marketing Chair, Facilities, Nomination

Sara Petit-McClure has served as the Head of School since 2019.

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Truxton Academy Charter School opened in the Fall of 2019 with grades K-2 and added 3rd grade in the 2020-2021 school year. Truxton Academy Charter School has a curriculum focused on Project-Based Learning and includes Spanish as a second language starting in kindergarten. Our mission also includes a focus on agriculture, which is a growing part of the curriculum.

The student body consisted of approximately 95% white students, 3.5% Hispanic students, and 1.5% multiracial students. This is consistent with the local area’s racial make-up. Approximately 5 percent of our student body is identified as students with disabilities, and 2 percent is identified in the category of English language learners. Thirty-five percent of the school population is identified as economically disadvantaged.

For the 2020-2021 school year, we offered hybrid instruction. We began the year with some students learning in-person 4 days a week with one remote day and some learning remotely full time. Between 25 and 30 percent of the students were fully remote in the beginning of the year. By November, only about 12 percent of the students were learning completely remotely. Throughout the year, we had periods where various classes and twice the whole school ended up having to learn and teach through remote methods. In April, we went to 5 days per week for in-person instruction and still offered a fully remote option to the families that requested it (approximately 12% of the student population).

During this challenging school year, we held All-School Meetings virtually on Wednesdays to connect the whole school community. We partnered with Peaceful Schools to assist teachers in planning for a strong classroom community and implementing trauma-informed practices. We received training on mindfulness practices in the classroom and some teachers implemented mindfulness practices into their daily routine.

ENROLLMENT SUMMARY

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year														
School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2016-17														
2017-18														
2018-19														
2019-20	22	8	13											43
2020-21	19	16	8	13										56

GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will be proficient readers and writers of the English language.

BACKGROUND

We use the Lucy Calkins Readers' and Writers' Workshop curriculum for our English Language Arts curriculum. The Readers' and Writers' workshop model is designed to provide a simple and predictable environment for students to work in so that teachers can do the complex work of observing students' progress and teaching into their needs. Students develop independent work habits and take ownership of their learning, while teachers take the time necessary to differentiate instruction and meet students where they are to help them achieve their learning goals. The Calkins' Workshop curriculum lends itself to support Project Based Learning by providing the framework for high quality instruction, while allowing for the flexibility of topic and materials to support ongoing project learning.

Most of our ELA instruction was provided in-person during the 2020-2021 school year. Some ELA instruction was provided remotely during September to April on Wednesdays, when we used the hybrid model of in person 4 days, 1 day remote learning. Teachers provided ongoing project assignments during this period of at-home learning. For our entirely remote learners, ELA instruction was provided in multiple modalities. Some teachers taught both on-line and in-person students simultaneously, with the at-home students participating via smartboard for whole group instruction or laptop for small group work. Some teachers set aside one-on-one or small group time to provide ELA instruction to remote learners individually and outside of in-person class time. Some teachers used a mixture of these modalities. The structure of the modalities chosen were based on individual student needs. In general, 2nd and 3rd grade remote learning students had more instructional content delivered synchronously with in-person learners than the Kindergarten and 1st grade students did. All remote learners were given one-on-one and/or small group instruction in addition to time with their in-person learning peers.

METHOD

During 2020-21, the school(s) primarily used the following exam to assess student growth and achievement in ELA: **NWEA MAP**

We used multiple methods for assessment during the 2020-2021 school year. School wide, we utilized NWEA MAP to measure student achievement and growth in ELA. Students took the MAP in the Fall, Winter, and Spring at all grade levels. Teachers also used writing rubrics to provide on-going formative assessment as well as the Fountas and Pinnell leveled reading assessments, along with alternate assessments from Fountas and Pinnell to measure phonics, sight word, and sound and letter recognition knowledge. Fountas and Pinnell reading assessments were also completed in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

As seen in the tables below, end of the year NWEA MAP data indicated significant growth. 3rd grade students exceeded the school’s median growth percentile target of 50, with a median growth percentile of 69. Low initial achievers also exceeded the school’s median growth percentile target of 55 with a median growth percentile of 84. Special education students also exceeded the school’s median growth percentile target of 69 with a median growth percentile of 99. One target that we did not meet was for 75% of at least second year students to score at or above RIT proficiency for the grade level. Of our 8 returning students, only 37.5% met the RIT proficiency goal.

Measure	Subgroup	Target	Tested	Results	Met?
Measure 1: Each year, the school's median growth percentile of all 3 rd through 8 th grade students will be greater than 50. Student growth is the difference between the beginning of year score and the end of year score.	All students	50	13	69	Yes
Measure 2: Each year, the school's median growth percentile of all 3 rd through 8 th gradestudents whose achievement did not meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent in the fall will meet or exceed 55 in the spring administration.	Low initial achievers	55	4	84	Yes
Measure 3: Each year, the median growth percentile of 3 rd through 8 th grade students with disabilities at the school will be equal to or greater than the median growth of 3 rd through 8 th grade general education students at the school.	Students with disabilities	69	3	99	Yes

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Measure 4: Each year, 75% of 3 rd through 8 th grade students enrolled in at least their second year at the school will meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent according to the most recent linking study comparing NWEA Growth to New York State standards.	2+ students	75%	8	37.5%	No
---	-------------	-----	---	-------	----

End of Year Performance on 2020-21 NWEA MAP ELA Assessment

By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	57%	14	37.5%	8
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All	57%	14	37.5 %	8

End of Year Growth on 2020-21 NWEA MAP ELA Assessment

By All Students

Grades	Median Growth Percentile	Number Tested
3	69	13
4	N/A	N/A
5	N/A	N/A
6	N/A	N/A
7	N/A	N/A
8	N/A	N/A
All	69	13

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

This was our first year implementing the NWEA MAP assessment. We had some students take the assessment at home and others at school. Given that this provides a potential for parents to coach their children through the test, when given at home, the students were simultaneously on a zoom call with a teacher or teaching assistant to ensure test security, but at times due to poor internet connection in our rural area, some students had to have their cameras turned off and just be able to unmute and ask questions if necessary. In 3rd grade, the end of the year assessment was only taken by one student at home and he showed mastery of most concepts through other means as well so we are not concerned about his data being skewed.

Additional Measures

In addition to the MAP assessments administered to students K-3, teachers performed running records and/or other letter and word recognition tests for all students K-3 using the Fountas and Pinnell leveled reading assessments, sight word, and phonics assessments.

Fountas and Pinnell is a leveled reading system with Levels A-Z. Levels A-D represent the expected growth in Kindergarten, while Level Z represents the expected reading level for seventh and eighth grade with various incremental growth amounts expected in the grades in between.

Method:

Students in grades K-3 were evaluated in reading at the beginning of the school year, mid-year and at the end of the school year. Teachers performed assessments for students in their own class, with some assistance from the Special Education Teacher and Head of School.

Results and Evaluation:

2020-2021 EOY Running Record Levels					
Grade	Below	On	Above	Expected Growth	Average Growth
K	15	3	3	4 levels	2 levels
1st	15	0	0	6 levels	4 levels
2nd	2	2	6	3 levels	4 levels
3rd	4	1	9	3 levels	4 levels

Results of the Fountas and Pinnell reading tests in 3rd grade showed that 71% of 3rd grade students are reading at or above grade level. Additionally, 100% of 3rd grade students met or exceeded the expected growth of at least 3 levels, with the average growth being 4 levels.

For 2nd grade, 80% of students are reading at or above grade level. In 2nd grade, 90% of students met or exceeded the expected growth of at least 3 levels, with the average growth being 4 levels.

Reading tests showed that all students in 1st grade are reading below grade level. The expected level growth in 1st grade is 6 levels, while the average growth for our 1st graders was 4 levels. All of these students started the year reading below grade level. These are students who missed much instruction in their kindergarten year and will continue to catch up as they move to 2nd grade next year.

In Kindergarten, 29% of students are reading at or above grade level. The expected level growth in Kindergarten is 4 levels, while average growth for our Kindergarten was 2 levels.

SUMMARY OF THE ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

We are well on our way to achieving our goal of having students who are proficient readers and writers of the English language based on the 3rd grade data. Our younger students in grades K-1 started school in the midst of a global pandemic resulting in an apparent disruption in their achievement of the baseline skills they need to achieve in reading and writing. While these students will need particular care and focus as we plan and instruct them over the next school year, our knowledge of the skill gaps from the NWEA MAP assessment, the Fountas and Pinnell running

records, and other supplementary assessments will help us to help these students catch up and have them on track for success by 3rd grade.

ACTION PLAN

We will continue to use NWEA MAP and Fountas and Pinnell reading assessments to measure and track student progress and achievement in the 2021-2022 school year. Additionally, we will more intentionally use writing assessments as a part of the Lucy Calkins Writers' Workshop to track student writing progress and achievement throughout the 2021-2022 school year.

Over the course of the last two school years, teachers have noticed a need for more training in the Readers' and Writers' Workshop model in general and in using the Calkins curriculum specifically. Prior to the beginning of the school year, we have instructional and administrative staff members digging deeper into the Calkins curriculum in preparation to act as coaches in assisting teachers in making the best use possible of the curriculum for ELA instruction. We also have a team of Professional Development trainers in using the Readers' Workshop providing additional training to our staff prior to the start of school and are making time for staff to dig deeper into the curriculum. Some of our K-2 teachers engaged in phonics training over this summer and last through Neuhaus (Reading Readiness and Scientific Spelling) to strengthen their capacity as teachers of the foundational literacy skills. The intention of all of this professional development is to further improve our reading and writing instruction and positively impact student achievement. One of our teachers at this level also took a training in guided reading to be better able to target students at different reading levels in the classroom and help them all make greater gains. This teacher plans to share this learning with others on her K-2 team.

GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

All students will demonstrate competency in their understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

BACKGROUND

For mathematics instruction, we use the Investigations 3 mathematics curriculum to guide our planning and practice. Investigations 3 is aligned with New York State Standards for mathematics and incorporates the use of manipulatives, math games and investigations to deeply explore mathematical concepts. The design of the curriculum includes access to both print and digital resources, allowing teachers and students to engage in activities and instruction without access to technology, digitally, or a combination of both modes of instruction. Important aspects of Investigations 3 include explicit and careful attention to the Standards for Mathematical Practice, embedded differentiation support, extensive assessment, regular review and practice, and built-in professional development.

A majority of our students received in person instruction this school year, with some disruptions that resulted in temporary remote instruction due to COVID exposures. Classroom teachers used a combination of digital resources, hard copy resources, and manipulatives to provide instruction and practice in mathematics to continually meet the needs of students, whether providing instruction online or in person. Some of our teachers took advantage of the built-in professional development and digital resources to further engage students both online and in-person. Teachers took the opportunity that COVID disruptions provided to further their knowledge of online resources and teaching practices.

METHOD

During the 2020-2021 school year, we used multiple assessment methods to measure student growth and achievement in mathematics. We instituted the use of NWEA MAP assessments in the fall, winter and spring to monitor student growth over the school year.

In addition to MAP assessments, teachers continued to use assessments from the Investigations 3 mathematics curriculum, including an end of year test for grades 1-3. We also used student observation, checklists included with the Investigations 3 curriculum, performance in projects, and teacher-created assessments to monitor growth throughout the school year.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

At the end of the year, students demonstrated competency in their understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving to varying degrees. The MAP results indicated that our 3rd grade students surpassed the school's median growth percentile goal of 50 by 20 points, with a median growth percentile of 70. Also, our initial low achievers excelled in their mathematical growth with a median growth percentile of 70. Students with disabilities did not meet their targeted median growth of 73 and were very close to achieving that target with a median growth percentile of 70.

Looking at the percentage of students in at least their second year at the school, 50% met or exceeded the RIT score proficiency. The target is 75% so we did not meet this goal. Looking closer at the data, only 8 3rd grade students were in their second year at the school. Of these 8 students, 6 were among our initial low achievers and 2 were students with disabilities. Given this frame of reference, the growth of these students was significant. During the school year, the percent of students who met or exceeded RIT score proficiency increased from 25% in the Fall to 50% in the Spring.

2020-21 NWEA MAP Mathematics Assessment End of Year Results

Measure	Subgroup	Target	Tested	Results	Met?
Measure 1: Each year, the school's median growth percentile of all 3 rd through 8 th grade students will be greater than 50. Student growth is the difference between the beginning of year score and the end of year score.	All students	50	13	70	Yes
Measure 2: Each year, the school's median growth percentile of all 3 rd through 8 th grade students whose achievement did not meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent in the fall will meet or exceed 55 in the spring administration.	Low initial achievers	55	7	70	Yes
Measure 3: Each year, the median growth percentile of 3 rd through 8 th grade students with disabilities at the school will be equal to or greater than the median growth of 3 rd through 8 th grade general education students at the school.	Students with disabilities	73	3	70	No
Measure 4: Each year, 75% of 3 rd through 8 th grade students enrolled in at least their second year at the school will meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent according to the most recent linking study comparing NWEA Growth to New York State standards.	2+ students	75%	8	50%	No

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

End of Year Performance on 2020-21 NWEA MAP Math Assessment By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	64%	14	50%	8
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All	78.5%	14	62.5%	8

End of Year Growth on 2020-21 NWEA MAP Mathematics Assessment

By All Students

Grades	Median Growth Percentile	Number Tested
3	70%	13
4	N/A	N/A
5	N/A	N/A

6	N/A	N/A
7	N/A	N/A
8	N/A	N/A
All	70%	13

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

This was our first year implementing the NWEA MAP assessment. We had some students take the assessment at home and others at school. Given that this provides a potential for parents to coach their children through the test, when given at home, the students were simultaneously on a zoom call with a teacher or teaching assistant to ensure test security, but at times due to poor internet connection in our rural area, some students had to have their cameras turned off and just be able to unmute and ask questions if necessary. In 3rd grade, the end of the year assessment was only taken by one student at home and he showed mastery of most concepts through other means as well so we are not concerned about his data being impacted by the potential of parent support.

Additional Measures

The Investigations 3 end of the year math assessments were administered to students in grades 1-3. These assessments are aligned to the NYS Next Generation Mathematics Standards for P-12. In Kindergarten, a number sense assessment was given three times throughout the year.

Method:

Students were given the Investigation end of year assessment in either an on-line or paper copy format. Grades 1 and 2 took them in paper format and grade 3 took them on the computer. Afterwards, the data was analyzed by category and for each student, it was determined where they fell in each category based on the results of the assessment.

Results and Evaluation:

First Grade- Total Tested= 16			
Concepts	Area of Need	Progressing	Mastered
Number order	0	6	10
Addition and subtraction	2	8	6
Geometry	1	3	12
Data and graphing	0	9	7
Measurement	0	5	11
Time	0	10	6
Word problems	5	8	3
Scored 70% or higher- 9 students (56%)			

Second Grade- Total Tested= 10			
Concepts	Area of Need	Progressing	Mastered
Operations (+, -, and x)	0	3	7
Place Value	1	1	8
Geometry and Fractions	1	5	4
Data and graphing	0	4	6
Measurement and Money	2	6	2
Word problems	0	1	9
Scored 70% or higher- 9 students (90%)			

Third Grade- Total Tested= 12			
Concepts	Area of Need	Progressing	Mastered
Multiplication and Division	0	3	9
Equations and Comparing Numbers	0	4	8
Fractions	2	3	7
Data and graphing	3	3	6
Measurement	5	4	3
Word problems	0	6	6
Scored 70% or higher- 8 students (67%)			

At the end of the year Investigations 3 Assessment, 14 third graders, 10 second graders, and 16 first graders were evaluated. On the third grade assessment, 10 students, or 71%, scored above 70%. On the second grade assessment, 9 second graders, or 90%, scored above 70%. On the first grade assessment, 9 students, or 56%, scored above 70%.

Of the 40 students in grades 1-3 that were evaluated by the Investigations 3 end of year assessment, 26, or 65%, scored above 70%.

SUMMARY OF THE ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Overall, we are well on our way to meet our elementary mathematics goal. While there were some disruptions to learning due to COVID closures at the end of the 2019-2020 school year and temporary remote learning times during the 2020-2021 school year that may account for falling behind in some of our targets for the end of this school year, students have demonstrated significant achievement in mathematics. We anticipate that this trend will continue into the 2021-2022 school year.

ACTION PLAN

We will continue to employ NWEA MAP assessments and Investigations 3 curriculum based assessments to maintain consistency in data collection for the 2021-2022 school year.

Additional measures will be put in place to improve academic performance in mathematics for the 2021-2022 school year. Based on evaluation of our multiple assessment results, we noticed that students need a deeper understanding of how numbers work, especially within the context of problem solving. Our teaching staff will receive training in Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI), with ongoing support to help them implement this teaching tool within their mathematics planning and instruction. CGI helps teachers understand children’s intuitive mathematical thinking and use that knowledge to help students deepen their mathematical understanding.

GOAL 3: SCIENCE

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

All students will demonstrate competency in using technology and applying scientific concepts, reasoning, and principles.

BACKGROUND

Our science curriculum incorporated both the FOSS science investigation kit and teacher created investigations to involve science learning in Project Based Learning and other interdisciplinary projects. During the fall and spring, teachers designed much of their science instruction to take place outside. A majority of our students attended school in-person and science lessons were modified to accommodate students attending remotely.

METHOD

There were no formal school wide or nationally normed science assessments administered this year.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

See above.

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

Student science learning was assessed by teachers in the classroom and related to learning in other academic areas including ELA and mathematics.

SUMMARY OF THE ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCIENCE GOAL

All students will demonstrate competency in applying technology and scientific inquiry to develop a deeper understanding of scientific concepts, scientific reasoning and applying scientific principles to real world situations. While teachers use the FOSS curriculum and other teaching resources to instill a sense of scientific exploration with our students, we did not use a method to adequately measure our progress in this goal during the 2020-2021 school year.

ACTION PLAN

Our plan at the end of the 2019-2020 school year was to collaboratively create and implement rubrics to assess science for our school. The requirements of adapting to COVID put a pause on this goal, but it will be revisited in the upcoming school years. We've added descriptive learning goals for science to the 3rd and 4th grade report cards for the upcoming 2021-2022 school year. We plan to use the Fossmap assessments related to the unit of study for 3rd and 4th grade for the 2021-2022 school year.

GOAL 4: ESSA

Due to COVID-19 and the subsequent changes to the state’s testing, accountability, and federal reporting requirements, the 2020-21 school accountability statuses are the same as those assigned for the 2019-20 school year. The 2019-20 accountability statuses were based on 2018-19 exam results. Assigned accountability designations and further context can be found [here](#).

Goal 7: Absolute Measure

Under the state’s ESSA accountability system, the school is in good standing: the state has not identified the school for comprehensive or targeted improvement.

METHOD

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own performance levels or criteria of success for meeting the ESSA accountability requirements. Each year, the state issues School Report Cards that indicate a school’s status under the state accountability system.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Truxton Academy opened in the fall of 2019. The ESSA Accountability Status for the 2019-2020 school year is based on test results from the 2018-2019 school year. Truxton Academy was not open. The first year that Truxton Academy participated in state testing was the 2020-2021 school year; a year where COVID altered the state testing protocols and as of this date, no data has been released.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Truxton Academy does not yet have state testing data to be able to to be assigned an ESSA status.

Accountability Status by Year

Year	Status
2018-19	N/A
2019-20	N/A
2020-21	Not yet released as of the date of this report

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

The following section contains a Parent Satisfaction

Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year two-thirds of parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school’s program based on a parent satisfaction survey.

Method

In addition to various surveys throughout the year to gauge the effectiveness of our hybrid model of learning, at the end of the year, we sent home a digital parent survey to get feedback on the year. This survey asked about learning modality in addition to the experience of students with regards to academic and social emotional progress from the parent perspective. This is designed to help us meet student needs and inform our growth, planning, and professional development.

This survey used statements and a five point scale to show agreement or disagreement. The survey was submitted anonymously, but we did ask for grade level and teacher’s name so we can look for trend within certain classes as well as on the whole school level if needed.

Results

The parent responses showed, not only high satisfaction rates overall, but an increase in satisfaction across the board from previous year’s ratings. We also had a higher participation rate this year with 55% return rate rather than a 27% return rate like last year. Parents felt that academic growth, instructional staff knowledge of their individual child, and instructional staff’s ability to engage their child in learning were relatively high. Satisfaction with Social emotional support and school communication, while still over 80% were lower than the other areas.

2020-2021 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
26	47	55%

2020-2021 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied or above
Student Engagement	92%
Academic Growth	92%
Social Emotional Support	81%
Encouraging individuality and curiosity	92%
School Communication	88%

Evaluation

The overall growth and parent satisfaction is a testament to the hard work our whole staff did this year to really meet students' needs during the very challenging times of quarantines, multiple modality teaching, and following COVID guidelines in the school building. The results are evidence that while we will continue to improve our practice as we grow, parents feel that we are helping their students grow as students and as whole people. While we improved in all areas, including the return rate of the survey, we still did not meet the return rate of $\frac{2}{3}$ of our families returning and completing the survey. Next year, we will send the survey out earlier in the hopes of being able to send out more reminders. Additionally, we will attempt to send paper copies as well as the electronic one to families who need a different version.