

EDEP Registration Survey Results Summary

Participation

There were 583 responses for the EDEP registration survey, conducted March 26 – April 7, and there were responses from all 15 elementary schools in the division (see **Table 1** for complete participation counts). Both current EDEP participants (53.3%) and non-EDEP participants (46.1%) submitted responses. The responses to this survey are considered to be “households” or “families” rather than individual responses.

When asked, respondents were interested in having their child participate in EDEP (85.6% to 13.6%), and that interest spread across both current participants and non-EDEP participants. **Table 2** shows the unmet need by school. Unmet need is the number of participants not participating in EDEP, but wanting to. There is unmet need at all elementary schools, with larger populations of unmet need at larger schools. The need to expand EDEP was the most prevalent comment for the survey.

Positives and Negatives

Of the 583 responses, 436 (74.8%) included a comment about either the current registration system, an idea for how to change/improve the registration system, or both. Seventy-six responses (13%) were positive about the current registration system of first come, first served. Most commonly, they noted that the online registration portal was easy to use, fair, and worked for them.

Of the 583 responses, 233 responses (40%) had a negative review of the current registration system. The negative reviews were sorted into three challenge categories:

- Timing of registration;
- Use of the online portal; and
- Reminders/notifications about registration.

Timing was the largest issue with the current registration model: 198 responses indicated either that the time of day (noon), day of the week (a weekday), or how quickly the available spots filled as the primary concern related to timing. Respondents referenced the challenge for many families to be available and at a computer when registration opened. Several respondents mentioned taking time off work or rearranging their work schedule so they could be available for registration. Most of the responses in this category also mentioned completing the process quickly and on time only to find out their child had been waitlisted.

Another challenge noted was the online portal. Fourteen responses indicated that they had trouble with the online portal not functioning correctly or not having a fast enough internet connection to successfully complete the registration process in time to secure a spot.

The final category was notifications. Twenty-one respondents want more notifications and reminders, including information for families who move after the registration deadline has passed.

Recommendations

There were 25 responses (4% of total responses) with comments about alternative registration processes. The most common (20 responses) was a lottery system where registration was held open for a set period of time, and at the end of the registration window, students would be selected for the slots randomly. Respondents noted this addressed many of the challenges of the current system, specifically timing for parents who are not available during the current registration window.

Another recommendation (5 responses) was to change how seats are allotted. This proposal could use either the first come, first serve or lottery approach for selection. The change would be to align the number of seats available in each grade at each school with the number of applicants, as much as possible, rather than determining the number of seats prior to the registration process. Respondents commented this may reduce the number of families who end up with split enrollment and reduce the unmet need at some schools.

An additional 155 responses included recommendations that were related to the prioritization of registrants, rather than the process of registration. The ideas for prioritization are: (listed in order from most to least comments)

- Currently enrolled students are allowed to enroll early (73);
- Families be enrolled all together, not by student (46);
- Prioritizing need-based enrollment so families who are least able to provide alternatives are more likely to get a spot (14);
- County employees are allowed to enroll early (14); and
- Prioritizing full-time enrollment over part-time enrollment to maximize seats (8).

Sample comments from each method of prioritization are included in **Table 3**.

Table 1: Participation by School

	Frequency	Percent
Agnor-Hurt	24	4.1
Baker-Butler	65	11.1
Broadus Wood	23	3.9
Brownsville	108	18.5
Cale	79	13.6
Crozet	43	7.4
Greer	20	3.4
Hollymead	46	7.9
Meriwether Lewis	45	7.7
Murray Elementary	30	5.1
Red Hill	9	1.5
Scottsville	10	1.7
Stone-Robinson	35	6.0
Stony Point	11	1.9
Woodbrook	35	6.0
Total	583	100.0

Table 2: Unmet Need by School (“Yes” indicates respondents who do not have a spot, but would like one)

		Frequency	Percent
Agnor-Hurt	No	6	50.0
	Yes	6	50.0
	Total	12	100.0
Baker-Butler	No	7	21.2
	Yes	26	78.8
	Total	33	100.0
Broadus Wood	No	1	7.7
	Yes	12	92.3
	Total	13	100.0
Brownsville	No	8	14.5
	Yes	47	85.5
	Total	55	100.0
Cale	No	4	14.3
	Yes	24	85.7
	Total	28	100.0
Crozet	No	5	27.8
	Yes	13	72.2
	Total	18	100.0
Greer	No	1	6.7
	Yes	14	93.3
	Total	15	100.0
Hollymead	No	6	35.3
	Yes	11	64.7
	Total	17	100.0
Meriwether Lewis	No	4	21.1
	Yes	15	78.9
	Total	19	100.0
Murray Elementary	No	4	33.3
	Yes	8	66.7
	Total	12	100.0
Red Hill	No	3	60.0
	Yes	2	40.0
	Total	5	100.0
Scottsville	No	1	50.0
	Yes	1	50.0
	Total	2	100.0
Stone-Robinson	No	5	33.3
	Yes	10	66.7
	Total	15	100.0

		Frequency	Percent
Stony Point	No	2	40.0
	Yes	3	60.0
	Total	5	100.0
Woodbrook	No	8	40.0
	Yes	12	60.0
	Total	20	100.0

Table 3: Comments Related to Prioritization of Registrants

Current participants enroll early	<p>“Children already in the program should get the opportunity to register first”</p> <p>“... it would seem that prior year participants could have an early renewal option for the following year”</p> <p>“... it would be nice if currently enrolled EDEP students in good standing were given the opportunity to re-enroll”</p> <p>“If your child was enrolled in the current year, he/she should get priority enrollment for the upcoming year in order to support continuity and stability of care.”</p>
Whole family enrolled together	<p>“I managed to get one kid in and not the other which was really difficult. That is my only complaint is siblings should be automatically registered simultaneously”</p> <p>“... having an option for families registering 1 or more children should be guaranteed a slot for all children within the family. It doesn't help families if only one child gets in but another doesn't.”</p> <p>“Register families together, 1 entry per family. If my family name is drawn, all of my children should be able to get in. Once grades are filling, give preference to families who only need spaces in open grades.”</p>
Need-based enrollment	<p>“I'd rather see the ACPS move to a need-based model where students who are free/reduced lunch have priority over those who are not. To be clear, I would *not* benefit from such a model, but I would rather see the EDEP spots go to those in need first”</p> <p>“Use a needs based application process. As in financial needs. 2 working parents or 1? Adding this will help families who need it first. This isn't me and as a result our chances will be [diminished] but I still think it's right.”</p> <p>“I hope those with economic need are considered on a priority basis (or spots are held for people who have high need but couldn't register right away because they were working, unaware of the registration time, etc.)”</p>

County employees enroll early

“Could ACPS teachers get first priority in signing up so we as teachers can fulfill our after school responsibilities and attend professional development.”

“I think teachers and building staff should get first choice in registration. We work in the building and if we need childcare it only makes sense to have your child in the building in EDEP.”

[The current registration process] “disadvantages employees of ACPS and many of them are teachers who are teaching at the time the registration opens.”

Full-time participants over part-time

“Slots were given first come first served to families who only registered for part time and did not need the service, using it as back up to sitters or for the convenience of the parents when they needed a day. Priority should be given to families requiring full time aftercare and walk in slots should be allocated per school and provided on as needed basis for anything less than full time.”

“I think full time students should have priority over part time students.”

“Full Time Monday-Friday students should have prioritization before part-time students.”