

Commission To Study School Funding

Public Engagement Workgroup

Document date: 8/3/2020

For meeting on 8/3/2020

Preliminary Analysis of the School and District Employee Survey – Question 11

Question 11 is the first of the open-ended questions in the School and District Employee Survey. This document presents some preliminary analyses based on detailed qualitative coding of all responses from the 1,768 respondents.

Question 11 as it appeared in the School and District Employee Survey:

“From your perspective what are the most important factors in providing an adequate education to students across the state of NH?”

You can think about factors as what students have access to in their educational experiences at school, and what influences those experiences (curriculum, class size, technology, teacher qualifications or salary, teacher professional development, transportation, maintenance and facilities, special education etc.) AND the outcomes of a student’s education such as how college or career ready students are when they graduate.”

Note: Of the 1,768 total survey respondents 1,393 respondents answered Question 11.

Overall Code Counts Across All Respondents

Note: In the full report, a codebook describing each code will be provided.

All Codes Ranked by Number of Respondents Mentioning Each Code		
Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents Mentioning Each Code
1	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	714
2	Class size	569
3	Technology	513
4	Sufficient financial resources	459
5	Curriculum	452
6	Teacher & staff salaries	423
7	Equity (no socioeconomic disparities)	298
8	Special education	262
9	Student performance (outcomes)	257
10	Buildings & Facilities	225
11	College & Career Readiness	180
12	Behavioral & Mental Health Supports	168
13	Materials & Supplies	166
14	Community Engagement & Communication	124
15	Reliance on Property Taxes	121

Commission To Study School Funding

Public Engagement Workgroup

Document date: 8/3/2020

For meeting on 8/3/2020

16	State-Level Support and Resources	113
17	Leadership	86
18	Transportation	69
19	Challenges in small towns, rural communities	27
20/21	Charter Schools	26
20/21	Early Childhood Education	26
22	"All examples listed"	25
23	School duration	9

Community Type

Community types: Rural, Suburban, Urban, A mix of community types

Top 10 Codes Mentioned by Respondents from Districts that Serve Rural Communities		
Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents
1	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	335
2	Class size	241
3	Sufficient financial resources	230
4	Teacher & staff salaries	213
5	Curriculum	210
6	Technology	202
7	Equity	151
8	Student performance (outcomes)	125
9	Special education	104
10	Buildings & facilities	103

Top 10 Codes Mentioned by Respondents from Districts that Serve Suburban Communities		
Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents
1	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	144
2	Class size	129
3	Technology	118
4	Curriculum	89
5	Teacher & staff salaries	86
6	Sufficient financial resources	81
7	Special education	58
8	Equity	52
9	Facilities	49
10	Student performance (outcomes)	44

Commission To Study School Funding

Public Engagement Workgroup

Document date: 8/3/2020

For meeting on 8/3/2020

Top 10 Codes Mentioned by Respondents from Districts that Serve Urban Communities		
Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents
1	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	75
2	Technology	71
3	Class size	64
4	Sufficient financial resources	45
5	Curriculum	41
6	Teacher & staff salaries	36
7	Equity	29
8	Performance	28
9	Special education	28
10	Materials & Supplies	26

Top 10 Codes Mentioned by Respondents from Districts that Serve a Mix of Community Types		
Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents
1	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	160
2	Class size	135
3	Technology	122
4	Curriculum	112
5	Sufficient financial resources	103
6	Teacher & staff salaries	88
7	Special education	72
8	Equity	65
9	Student Performance	59
10	College/career readiness	56

Community by Equalized Property Valuation Per Pupil (EVPP)

(Based on the district where the respondent works)

Description of how School Districts were Classified based on EVPP	
Classification of School District	Equalized Property Valuation Per Pupil
High	\$1.2 million+
Medium	\$800k – \$1.2 million
Low	<\$800K
Charter Schools	EVPP not available

Commission To Study School Funding**Public Engagement Workgroup**

Document date: 8/3/2020

For meeting on 8/3/2020

Other Districts	Other districts for which EVPP is not available (includes Prospect Mountain JMA and Pinkerton Academy)
-----------------	---

Top 10 Codes Mentioned by Respondents from Districts with High EVPP

Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents
1	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	128
2	Curriculum	86
3	Class size	84
4	Technology	77
5	Sufficient financial resources	74
6	Teacher & staff salaries	67
7	Equity	53
8	Special education	46
9	Student Performance	41
10	Buildings & Facilities	37

*Note: Out of the 1,393 respondents of Question 11, 319 respondents work in districts classified as having a “high” equalized property valuation per pupil.

Top 10 Codes Mentioned by Respondents from Districts with Medium EVPP

Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents
1	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	369
2	Class size	330
3	Technology	272
4	Sufficient financial resources	232
5	Curriculum	215
6	Teacher & staff salaries	206
7/8	Equity	144
7/8	Special education	144
9	Student Performance	136
10	Buildings & Facilities	104

*Note: Out of the 1,393 respondents of Question 11, 880 respondents work in districts classified as having a “medium” equalized property valuation per pupil.

Commission To Study School Funding**Public Engagement Workgroup**

Document date: 8/3/2020

For meeting on 8/3/2020

Top 10 Codes Mentioned by Respondents from Districts with Low EVPP		
Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents
1	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	180
2	Technology	136
3	Class size	132
4	Sufficient financial resources	126
5	Curriculum	124
6	Teacher & staff salaries	120
7	Equity	82
8	Buildings & facilities	67
9	Student Performance	64
10	Special education	62

*Note: Out of the 1,393 respondents of Question 11, 465 respondents work in districts classified as having a “low” equalized property valuation per pupil.

Top 10 Codes Mentioned by Respondents from Charter Schools (no EVPP)		
Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents
1	Teacher & staff salaries	12
2/3/4	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	11
2/3/4	Technology	11
2/3/4	Curriculum	11
5/6/7	Class size	8
5/6/7	Charter Schools	8
5/6/7	Sufficient financial resources	8
8	Buildings & Facilities	7
9/10/11/12	College & Career Readiness	3
9/10/11/12	Equity	3
9/10/11/12	Special education	3
9/10/11/12	Student Performance (Outcomes)	3

*Note: Out of the 1,393 respondents of Question 11, 27 respondents work for “Charter Schools”, for which equalized property valuations per pupil could not be assigned.

Commission To Study School Funding

Public Engagement Workgroup

Document date: 8/3/2020

For meeting on 8/3/2020

Top 10 Codes Mentioned by Respondents from Other Districts (no EVPP)*		
Ranking	Code (Topic)	Number of Respondents
1	Sufficient financial resources	2
2	Buildings & Facilities	1
2	College/career readiness	1
2	Curriculum	1
2	Equity	1
2	Student Performance	1
2	Teacher & staff salaries	1
2	Teacher & staff quality (& quantity)	1
2	Technology	1
2	Transportation	1

*“Other districts” includes two districts for which EVPP is not available: Prospect Mountain JMA and Pinkerton Academy.

**Note: Out of the 1,393 respondents of Question 11, 5 respondents work for “Other Districts”, for which equalized property valuations per pupil could not be assigned.

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES