



New Jersey School Boards Association

413 West State Street • Trenton, NJ 08618 • Telephone: 609.695.7600 • Toll-Free: 888.88NJSBA • Fax: 609.695.0413

APPENDIX B

Accountability Regulations 2016:

Results of a Survey of Local School Officials
Conducted by the
NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey's Accountability Regulations

May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....B-3

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.....B-4

RESULTS AND ANALYSISB-5

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-3 Administration and Board Member Accountability.....B-5

Q4: CHIEF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR SALARY CAP B-5

Q. 5: ADMINISTRATOR CONTRACT REVIEW B-6

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-5 Effective and Efficient Expenditures of Funds.....B-7

Q6: PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS..... B-7

Q7: LEGAL SERVICES..... B-8

Q8: MEALS AND REFRESHMENTS B-9

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-6 Conditions for Receipt of State Aid.....B-10

Q9: NEPOTISM B-10

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-7 School District Travel Policies and ProceduresB-11

Q10: TRAVEL/TRAINING REIMBURSEMENT B-11

Q11: PRE-APPROVAL..... B-12

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-8 Annual Budget Development and Submission.....B-13

Q12: ADMINISTRATIVE SPENDING GROWTH LIMIT B-13

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-15 State Aid Calculation and Aid Adjustment for Charter SchoolsB-14

Q13: PAYMENTS TO CHARTER SCHOOLS B-14

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-17 Tuition Public SchoolsB-15

Q14: PUBLIC SCHOOL TUITION B-15

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-18 Tuition for Private Schools for Students with Disabilities.....B-16

Q15: PRIVATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS B-16

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS (charts).....B-17

INTRODUCTION

On March 17, 2016, the NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations distributed a survey to the state’s school district superintendents, business administrators and board of education presidents. Responses were gathered until April 8, 2016. The school officials were queried about a dozen of the most prominent regulations, and asked if they found each regulation to be “beneficial,” “somewhat beneficial,” “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental,” or if the regulations had “no impact” on the district. Respondents were also permitted to answer “don’t know.” In addition, school officials were afforded the opportunity to comment on each regulation.

Two hundred twenty-three school districts—39.1 percent of the state’s operating districts—are represented in the responses.

In general, respondents found the regulations addressed in the survey to be more detrimental than beneficial. One regulation, addressing access to the board attorney, was found to be beneficial by the majority of the respondents.

Key findings include the following:

- The Chief School Administrator (CSA) salary cap elicited the strongest reaction, and was deemed to have a negative impact by the greatest percentage of respondents overall. This regulation prompted 133 comments, the most of any provision.
- More than half of the respondents considered the regulation governing “effective and efficient expenditure of funds” by restricting district expenditure on meals and refreshments for staff to be “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.” Less than a quarter of respondents found it to be of benefit. Respondents provided 89 comments on this provision.
- The restriction on who within the district may contact the board attorney was the only provision one considered primarily beneficial. Just over half of the respondents found it to be “beneficial” or “somewhat beneficial.” Fifty-two comments were submitted by respondents.
- The 2.5 percent administrative spending growth limit prompted the second-strongest reaction, with more than two-thirds of respondents stating that this provision has been “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental” to the school district. School officials provided 100 comments on this regulation.

The total number of comments may provide one measure of the level of school officials’ frustration with, and sensitivity to, the regulations. In all, 816 comments were submitted by superintendents, business administrators and board presidents.

APPENDIX B: Survey Results

NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

(includes responses to Survey Questions 1, 2 and 3)

Responses were collected between March 17 and April 8, 2016. A total of 274 responses were received, representing 223 individual school districts. The total number of districts represented in the survey is 39.1 percent of the state’s operating school districts.

- School business administrators constituted the largest share of survey participants, totaling 111 and making up 40.5 percent of respondents.
- Superintendents were the next-largest group, with 95 responses, or 34.7 percent of the total.
- Board presidents submitted 68 responses, making up 24.8 percent of the total.
- All 21 counties are represented in the survey.

For purposes of analysis, responding districts were divided into the following geographic groupings:

- NORTH: Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Morris, Passaic, Sussex, Warren
- CENTRAL: Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth, Ocean, Somerset, Union
- SOUTH: Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Cumberland, Gloucester, Salem

Responses by Region		
	Frequency	Percent
Northern New Jersey	107	39.1%
Central New Jersey	85	31.1%
Southern New Jersey	80	29.1%
No Indication	2	0.7%
Total	274	100.0%

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-3 – ADMINISTRATION AND BOARD MEMBER ACCOUNTABILITY

Q4: Chief School Administrator Salary Cap

Establishes maximum salaries based on district enrollment, with stipends allowed for a shared superintendent position and overseeing a district with a high school. This provision also allows bonuses for achievement merit goals.

ANALYSIS: This query prompted the strongest reaction in the survey, with the vast majority of respondents— 68.6 percent—finding the salary cap “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.”

CSA Salary Cap		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental/Somewhat Detrimental	188	68.6%
No Impact	39	14.2%
Beneficial/Somewhat Beneficial	29	10.6%
Don't Know	18	6.6%
Total	274	100.0%

There was some variation among responses by the three groups of school officials: 85.2 percent of superintendents and 65.7 percent of business administrators indicated that the CSA salary cap has been “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental” to their districts, while 50 percent of board presidents expressed that sentiment.

A minority viewed the cap positively, with 26.5 percent of board presidents deeming it “beneficial” or “somewhat beneficial.” However, only 9.1 percent of business administrators and a mere 1.1 percent of superintendents rated it as such.

There were significant regional differences, with 75.7 percent of northern New Jersey respondents and 80 percent of central New Jersey respondents designating the cap as “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.” However, less than a majority of southern New Jersey school officials (48.8 percent) gave the CSA cap a rating of “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.”

COMMENTS:

I am currently a shared superintendent between two small districts. Two small neighboring districts informally approached me about being the shared superintendent for all four districts. While I could have handled the added responsibilities and brought a high level of experience to the districts, it was not something I would do for the small \$10,000 per district extra pay available. The stipend would not have begun to be commensurate with the additional workload.

– Superintendent

In a small district like ours, having a hard call on the administrative costs/salary cap has been a help. We have an easier time finding candidates when there is a set limit to how much they can be paid. It levels the playing field.

– Board President

We are unable to attract superintendents with experience. In some cases, we cannot attract other administrators because their salary is high and not capped in the current district.

– Business Administrator

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
 NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-3 – ADMINISTRATION AND BOARD MEMBER ACCOUNTABILITY

Q5: Administrator Contract Review

Requires Executive County Superintendents to review contracts for superintendents, assistant superintendents and school business administrators. The review includes all emoluments, including contributions to health benefits costs, sick and vacation leave, and other benefits.

ANALYSIS: Most respondents indicated that the administrator contact review was “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental” (35.8%) or that the provision had “no impact” (36.9%). Superintendents were more likely to view the regulation negatively, with 40.1 percent responding that it has been detrimental or somewhat detrimental.

Administrator Contract Review		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental/Somewhat Detrimental	98	35.8%
No Impact	101	36.9%
Beneficial/Somewhat Beneficial	59	21.5%
Don't Know	16	5.8%
Total	274	100.0%

COMMENTS:

The review of contracts seems to vary between counties, and what’s good in our county is not good in another county.

– Business Administrator

Boards of Education should retain the authority to approve contracts as long as they are in compliance with current regulations and law.

– Superintendent

Local rule should determine how we spend our money.

– Board President

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
 NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-5 – EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS

Q6: Professional Services Contracts

Governs public relations activities and professional services contracts, including requests for proposals, and sets maximum dollar amounts.

ANALYSIS: The largest groups of respondents (40.1%) found this provision to have “no impact” on the district. Other respondents were equally divided as to whether the regulation has been “beneficial” or “somewhat beneficial” (26.3%), while 25.9 percent said it was “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.”

Professional Service Contracts		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental or Somewhat Detrimental	71	25.9%
No Impact	110	40.1%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	72	26.3%
Don't Know	21	7.7%
Totals	274	100.0%

Board presidents were most likely to have a positive view of this provision, with 42.7 percent stating it was “beneficial” or “somewhat beneficial.” Only 21 percent of superintendents and 20.7 percent of business administrators saw any benefit to the requirement.

COMMENTS:

We are a very financially responsible district. From my experience, compliance has not affected us a great deal.

– Board President

Again, another oversight measure that takes local control from the board.

– Superintendent

One more distraction from education. Public relations IS a component of local government. Communication is necessary for input and relating messages. We know from teaching that multiple forms of communication are necessary for learners and it is not different for adults.

– Business Administrator

APPENDIX B: Survey Results

NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-5 – EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS

Q7: Legal Services

Limits who on the school board and in school administration may seek legal advice from the board attorney, and under what circumstances. Establishes procedures to be followed prior to contacting the board attorney and requires maintenance of a log to track contact with legal counsel.

ANALYSIS: Just over half of the total respondents (50.4%) found this regulation to be “beneficial” or “somewhat beneficial” in their districts. The second-largest group of respondents, 35.4 percent, indicated that it has had “no impact.” Only 8.8 percent of total respondents said it has been “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.”

Legal Services		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental or Somewhat Detrimental	24	8.8%
No Impact	97	35.4%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	138	50.4%
Don't Know	15	5.4%
Totals	274	100.0%

Board presidents were most likely to respond positively to this provision, with 63.2 percent deeming it “beneficial” or “somewhat beneficial.”

COMMENTS:

We had procedures in place prior to the law. This is good though, as some BOE members might take it upon him/herself to go to the attorney without approval.”

– Board President

The authors of this fail to realize how much work there is to be done already. As a BA, I check that bill on a monthly basis and ask questions about anything that looks out of whack, why keep a logbook?

– Business Administrator

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-5 – EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS

Q8: Meals and Refreshments

Restricts school district expenditures for certain activities, such as meals and refreshments for employees at back-to-school luncheons and similar events.

ANALYSIS: More than half of respondents found this regulation to be “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.” Respondents cited a negative impact on staff morale and communication. Superintendents expressed the strongest opposition, with 69.4 percent identifying the provision as “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.” Among board presidents and school business administrators, 47.1 percent and 43.2 percent, respectively, viewed the provision negatively.

Meals and Refreshments		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental/Somewhat Detrimental	146	53.3%
No Impact	53	19.3%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	60	21.9%
Don't Know	15	5.5%
Totals	274	100.0%

COMMENTS:

“There is no good reason why modest refreshments should not be able to be provided at all meetings. Why should administrative time be spent looking for donors? Why must districts appear inhospitable?”

– Board President

“The amount of \$ spent on these items had virtually no budgetary impact. However, the fact that they cannot be done is disgraceful and is permitted in all other businesses – private and public.”

– Board President

“As superintendent, I currently take money out of my own pocket in order to provide staff with a ‘Back to School’ luncheon. Total elimination of these activities has a detrimental effect on culture building, morale, and makes the schedule of professional development days challenging.”

– Superintendent

“Upsets certain employees though it does save the district (very limited) funding.”

– Business Administrator

“This should be a local decision. Some light refreshments are a simple morale booster. Currently, administrators bear these expenses personally to boost morale or just because it is the appropriate thing to do.”

– Business Administrator

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
 NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-6 – CONDITIONS FOR RECEIPT OF STATE AID

Q9: Nepotism

Requires school boards to adopt policies addressing employment of a “relative” and an “immediate family member” and sets limits on board member participation in hiring and negotiation. The regulation’s definitions of “relative” and “immediate family member” differ from those in the New Jersey School Ethics Act.

ANALYSIS: The largest group of respondents, 44.9 percent, found this regulation has been “beneficial” or “somewhat beneficial.” Over one-fifth (21.8%) stated that it had “no impact.” Less than 20 percent found it to be “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.”

Nepotism		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental or Somewhat Detrimental	52	19.0%
No Impact	87	21.8%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	123	44.9%
Don't Know	12	4.3%
Totals	274	100.0%

Board presidents responded most negatively to this provision, with 35.3 percent reporting that it has been “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental” to the district. Only 13.7 percent of superintendents and 13.5 percent of business administrators responded in the same way.

A total of 57 comments were received.

COMMENTS:

This is the BIGGEST problem in the regulations, along with how the nepotism cases are construed. A statutory fix may be required. Right now our BA and our CSA are both ‘conflicted out’ from participating in negotiations. There is no one at the table from administration who has an understanding of the operational ramifications of any decision. There is no way a superintendent or BA is going to be influenced because his or her spouse may be a union member in some other district. This one is my top priority.”

– Board President

You may lose a good candidate on occasion, but generally the Board member should have better sense to begin with; some things just look bad.

– Superintendent

Great provision. I’m grateful for the thinking used to implement this. This provision allowed us to focus on students instead of political pressure. Thank you.

– Business Administrator

APPENDIX B: Survey Results

NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-7 – SCHOOL DISTRICT TRAVEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Q10: Travel/Training Reimbursement

Governs board member travel and professional development, including a 50-mile-from-conference-site limit for reimbursement of overnight travel expenses.

ANALYSIS: Respondents were almost evenly split on this question. Some 36.5 percent found this Regulation had no impact. Another 32.8 percent said it has been “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental,” while 26.6 viewed it positively. There was no meaningful difference among responses to this question, either by respondents’ job titles, or geographic region.

Travel/Training Reimbursement		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental or Somewhat Detrimental	93	32.8%
No Impact	100	36.5%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	73	26.6%
Don't Know	11	4.1%
Totals	274	100.0%

COMMENTS:

“If travel and other related fees for training were not reimbursed, I would not be able to go as I am a single Mom with limited income. I am sure this does not only apply to me.”

– Board President

“Although this has had limited impact on our Board I can see that it may pose concerns for others.”

– Superintendent

“It is impractical for a person to drive 50 miles home and then 50 miles back several times during a 3-day workshop. The cost and value of a person’s time obviously was not considered when this regulation was enacted.”

– Business Administrator

APPENDIX B: Survey Results

NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-7 – SCHOOL DISTRICT TRAVEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Q11: Pre-Approval

Requires pre-event approval for board member to attend conferences, training events and programs. This process differs from that for employees, who may have an annual pre-set, per-person dollar amount to cover travel for training and professional development.

ANALYSIS: Almost half of respondents said this provision had “no impact.” The remaining responses were split between 27.4 percent that found it to be “beneficial” or “somewhat beneficial” and 19 percent who viewed the regulation negatively.

Responses among the three sets of officials—board presidents, superintendents and business administrators—reflected the overall distribution.

Pre-Approval for Board Member Training/Travel		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental or Somewhat Detrimental	52	19.0%
No Impact	134	48.9%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	75	27.4%
Don't Know	13	4.7%
Totals	274	100.0%

COMMENTS:

“Board members who volunteer their time have been denied the ability to participate in a class because they weren’t able to get pre-event approval.”

– Board President

“Extra paperwork. It’s never been a problem in district. Again, a broad stroke to address a problem in a few places.”

– Superintendent

APPENDIX B: Survey Results

NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey's Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-8 – ANNUAL BUDGET DEVELOPMENT AND SUBMISSION

Q12: Administrative Spending Growth Limit

Implements statute that sets a permissible range, limited to 2.5 %, for the cumulative annual growth in spending for administrative line items. Included in the administrative spending growth limit are administrators' salaries; principals and assistant principals' salaries; professional services such as attorney and auditor; communications/telephone costs; in-house training and meeting supplies; cost of secretaries and clerks.

ANALYSIS: This provision provided a strongly negative reaction among respondents. Overall, 66.8 percent of respondents said the regulation has been “detrimental” or somewhat “detrimental.” Only 12 percent reacted positively to the regulation, while 15 percent said that it has had no impact.

Administrators were most critical of this provision, with 80 percent of superintendents and 72 percent of business administrators identifying it as “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.” Only 39.7 percent of board presidents gave it such ratings. This regulation prompted 100 comments from respondents.

Administrative Spending Growth Limit		
	Frequency	Percent
Detrimental or Somewhat Detrimental	183	66.8%
No Impact	41	15.0%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	33	12.0%
Don't Know	17	6.2%
Totals	274	100.0%

COMMENTS:

“Irrelevant because the ‘admin costs’ include copiers, school main office secretaries, legal fees, auditor etc. It is literally a useless definition and therefore invalid measure of expenses. Finally it’s made worse and more ridiculous when enrollment slowly declines, and your per-pupil costs go up. This is basic math, and yet no one seems to understand that you cannot fire a principal if you lose 25 kids.”

– Business Administrator

“A cap within a cap limits any flexibility. This must go.”

– Superintendent

“Boards have to balance the costs of operating districts with the communities’ ability to pay. Setting limits typically encourages districts to ‘get to the cap’ instead of zero base budgeting their needs. This results in steady increases, which may or may not be tied to inflation. Alternatively, it prevents consideration for expanding capacity needed to ensure adequate supervision and evaluation.”

– Board President

“This hurts a small district tremendously. We can try to stay within the limit, but it doesn’t really happen.”

– Business Administrator

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
 NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-15 – STATE AID CALCULATION AND AID ADJUSTMENT FOR CHARTER SCHOOLS

Q13: Payments to Charter Schools

Addresses the method of calculating payments to charter schools by taking an enrollment count once a year and making an adjustment at the end of the year.

ANALYSIS: The largest group of respondents, 45.3 percent, said this regulation has “no impact,” a result that might be influenced by the fact that the majority of the state’s school districts do not have charter schools operating within their boundaries. Thirty-one percent deemed it to be “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.” Only 5.1 percent gave it positive reviews. A large proportion of school district officials (18.6%) responded “don’t know.”

The question generated 54 comments.

Payment to Charter Schools		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental or Somewhat Detrimental	85	31.0%
No Impact	124	45.3%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	14	5.1%
Don't Know	51	18.6%
Totals	274	100.0%

COMMENTS:

“Would like a complete overhaul of how Charter Schools are funded.”

– Board President

“I am not against charter schools, but I believe the state should be funding them, not the local school districts.”

– Business Administrator

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
 NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-17 – TUITION PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Q14: Public School Tuition

Prescribes method to determine tuition rates for regular public schools; for a new school district; for county vocational/technical schools; and for county special services schools.

ANALYSIS: More than half of respondents (51.8%) said the provisions regulation has had “no impact” on their districts. Another 12.4 percent responded “don’t know.” Just over 16 percent of respondents said the regulation has been detrimental or somewhat detrimental, and 19.7 percent said it has been beneficial or somewhat beneficial.

Tuition Public Schools		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental or Somewhat Detrimental	44	16.1%
No Impact	142	51.8%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	54	19.7%
Don't Know	34	12.4%
Totals	274	100.0%

COMMENTS:

“Costs are too high; their superintendents are not salary capped.”

– Superintendent

“Payments to the vocational/technical school in this county have basically crippled this district’s ability to function.”

– Business Administrator

“For county special services school districts – why do we have to pay an out-of-county fee if our county does not offer the program that the student needs? We are all part of the State of NJ – shouldn’t we all help each other out?”

– Business Administrator

“Academics should be taught in the high school and trades taught in the vocational/technical school. There is no reason why academics (math, language arts, etc.) need to be taught at both.”

– Board President

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
 NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

N.J.A.C. 6A:23A-18 – TUITION FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Q15: Tuition for Private Special Education Schools

Determines tuition payments by public school districts to private schools for students with disabilities.

ANALYSIS: The largest proportion of respondents (38%) said the regulation has been “detrimental” or “somewhat detrimental.” Over one-quarter gave the provision positive reviews, while 19.7 percent said it had “no impact” and 15.3 percent responded “don’t know.”

Results were similar when viewed by respondents’ position or region.

Tuition Private Special Education Schools		
	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Detrimental or Somewhat Detrimental	104	38.0%
No Impact	54	19.7%
Beneficial or Somewhat Beneficial	74	27.0%
Don't Know	42	15.3%
Totals	274	100.0%

COMMENTS:

“Cost of special education is going to drive school districts bankrupt – formula and/or method should be standard.”

– Board President

“Again, the costs are still so high that our district is dying a slow death. We are being bombarded with special needs students with no way to pay for their care. Our district will likely collapse in the next 5 years because of special education costs.”

– Board President

“It is in this area, where public monies must be spent on private vendors, where there needs to be regulations. However, those regulations must be placed on private institutions, as the costs are becoming prohibitive.”

– Superintendent

“Private schools should be held to the same “cap” as public schools!”

– Business Administrator

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey's Accountability Regulations

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Q4 CSA SALARY CAP	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	14	20.6	56	58.9	44	39.6
Somewhat Detrimental	20	29.4	25	26.3	29	26.1
No Impact	12	17.6	10	10.5	17	15.3
Somewhat Beneficial	11	16.2	1	1.1	7	6.3
Beneficial	7	10.3	0	0.0	3	2.8
Don't Know / Missing	4	5.9	3	3.2	11	9.9
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

Q4 CSA SALARY CAP	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	50	46.7	42	49.4	22	27.5
Somewhat Detrimental	31	29.0	26	30.6	17	21.3
No Impact	9	8.4	6	7.1	23	28.7
Somewhat Beneficial	9	8.4	6	7.1	4	5.0
Beneficial	1	0.9	3	3.4	6	7.5
Don't Know / Missing	7	6.6	2	2.4	8	10.0
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

Q5 ADMINISTRATOR CONTRACT REVIEW	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	1	1.5	22	23.2	22	19.8
Somewhat Detrimental	13	19.1	17	17.9	23	20.7
No Impact	25	36.7	35	36.8	41	36.9
Somewhat Beneficial	13	19.1	12	12.6	8	7.3
Beneficial	15	22.1	5	5.3	6	5.4
Don't Know / Missing	1	1.5	4	4.2	11	9.9
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0		100.0

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

Q5 ADMINISTRATOR CONTRACT REVIEW	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
	Detrimental	14	13.1	16	18.8	15
Somewhat Detrimental	20	18.7	16	18.8	17	21.3
No Impact	38	35.5	35	41.1	28	35.0
Somewhat Beneficial	14	13.1	10	11.8	9	11.3
Beneficial	11	10.3	6	7.1	8	10.0
Don't Know / Missing	10	9.3	2	2.4	3	3.7
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

Q6 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	3	4.4	10	10.5	6	5.5
Somewhat Detrimental	9	13.2	21	22.2	22	19.8
No Impact	21	30.9	38	40.0	51	45.9
Somewhat Beneficial	17	25.1	14	14.7	19	17.1
Beneficial	12	17.6	6	6.3	4	3.6
Don't Know / Missing	6	8.8	6	6.3	9	8.1
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

Q6 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	8	7.5	5	5.9	6	7.5
Somewhat Detrimental	16	15.0	23	27.1	13	16.2
No Impact	45	42.1	32	37.5	33	41.2
Somewhat Beneficial	21	19.6	14	16.5	15	18.8
Beneficial	7	6.5	5	5.9	9	11.3
Don't Know / Missing	10	9.3	6	7.1	4	5.0
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey's Accountability Regulations

Q7 LEGAL SERVICES	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	1	1.5	5	5.3	8	7.2
Somewhat Detrimental	2	2.9	4	4.2	4	3.6
No Impact	19	27.9	36	37.9	42	37.8
Somewhat Beneficial	19	27.9	20	21.1	29	26.1
Beneficial	24	35.3	28	29.5	18	16.2
Don't Know / Missing	3	4.4	2	2.1	10	9.0
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

Q7 LEGAL SERVICES	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	3	2.8	4	4.7	7	8.8
Somewhat Detrimental	3	2.8	7	8.3	0	0
No Impact	39	36.4	29	34.1	28	35.0
Somewhat Beneficial	26	24.3	24	28.2	18	22.5
Beneficial	28	26.2	20	23.5	22	27.5
Don't Know / Missing	8	7.5	1	1.2	5	6.2
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

Q8 MEALS / REFRESHMENTS	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	10	14.7	31	32.6	13	11.7
Somewhat Detrimental	22	32.4	35	36.8	35	31.6
No Impact	15	22.1	19	20.0	19	17.1
Somewhat Beneficial	8	11.7	4	4.2	21	18.9
Beneficial	8	11.7	5	5.3	14	12.6
Don't Know / Missing	5	7.4	1	1.1	9	8.1
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey's Accountability Regulations

Q8 MEALS / REFRESHMENTS	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	18	16.8	19	22.4	17	21.2
Somewhat Detrimental	38	35.6	29	34.1	25	31.2
No Impact	22	20.6	12	14.1	18	22.5
Somewhat Beneficial	12	11.2	12	14.1	9	11.3
Beneficial	7	6.5	12	14.1	8	10.0
Don't Know / Missing	10	9.3	1	1.2	3	3.8
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

Q9 NEPOTISM	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	8	11.8	3	3.2	8	7.2
Somewhat Detrimental	16	23.5	10	10.5	7	6.3
No Impact	15	22.1	35	36.8	37	33.4
Somewhat Beneficial	12	17.6	19	20.0	21	18.9
Beneficial	15	22.1	28	29.5	28	25.2
Don't Know / Missing	2	2.9	0	0.0	10	9.0
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

Q9 NEPOTISM	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	6	5.6	8	9.4	5	6.2
Somewhat Detrimental	9	8.4	8	9.4	15	18.8
No Impact	34	31.8	29	34.1	24	30.0
Somewhat Beneficial	23	21.5	18	21.2	11	13.7
Beneficial	25	23.4	21	24.7	24	30.0
Don't Know / Missing	10	9.3	1	1.2	1	1.3
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey's Accountability Regulations

Q10 TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	8	11.8	16	16.8	15	13.5
Somewhat Detrimental	10	14.7	22	23.2	19	17.1
No Impact	22	32.4	41	43.1	37	33.3
Somewhat Beneficial	11	16.2	11	11.6	12	10.8
Beneficial	15	22.1	5	5.3	19	17.1
Don't Know / Missing	2	2.9	0	0.0	9	8.2
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

Q10 TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	8	7.5	13	15.3	18	22.4
Somewhat Detrimental	21	19.6	19	22.4	11	13.8
No Impact	42	39.3	28	32.9	28	35.0
Somewhat Beneficial	10	9.3	13	15.3	11	13.8
Beneficial	17	15.9	12	14.1	10	12.5
Don't Know / Missing	9	8.4	0	0.0	2	2.5
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

Q11 PRE-APPROVAL	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	3	4.4	8	8.4	6	5.4
Somewhat Detrimental	8	11.8	9	9.5	18	16.3
No Impact	30	44.1	54	56.8	50	45.0
Somewhat Beneficial	8	11.8	15	15.8	11	9.9
Beneficial	17	25.0	8	8.4	16	14.4
Don't Know / Missing	2	2.9	1	1.1	10	9.0
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

APPENDIX B: Survey Results

NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey’s Accountability Regulations

Q11 PRE-APPROVAL	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	4	3.7	8	9.4	5	6.3
Somewhat Detrimental	13	12.1	15	17.6	7	8.8
No Impact	52	48.6	35	41.2	47	58.8
Somewhat Beneficial	12	11.2	13	15.3	8	10.0
Beneficial	18	16.8	12	14.1	10	12.5
Don't Know / Missing	8	7.5	2	2.4	3	3.8
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

Q12 ADMIN. SPENDING GROWTH LIMIT	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	7	10.3	43	45.3	51	45.9
Somewhat Detrimental	20	29.4	33	34.7	29	26.1
No Impact	13	19.1	14	14.7	14	12.6
Somewhat Beneficial	13	19.1	4	4.2	5	4.5
Beneficial	10	14.7	1	1.1	0	0.0
Don't Know / Missing	5	7.4	0	0.0	12	10.9
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

Q12 ADMIN. SPENDING GROWTH LIMIT	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	37	34.6	33	38.8	30	37.5
Somewhat Detrimental	33	30.8	24	28.2	25	31.3
No Impact	14	13.1	15	17.6	11	13.7
Somewhat Beneficial	8	7.5	10	11.8	4	5.0
Beneficial	2	1.9	1	1.2	8	10.0
Don't Know / Missing	13	12.1	2	2.4	2	2.5
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

APPENDIX B: Survey Results

NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey's Accountability Regulations

Q13 PAYMENTS TO CHARTER SCHOOLS	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	13	19.1	22	23.2	17	15.3
Somewhat Detrimental	10	14.7	10	10.5	13	11.7
No Impact	22	32.4	45	47.3	57	51.4
Somewhat Beneficial	2	2.9	2	2.1	4	3.6
Beneficial	5	7.4	1	1.1	0	0.0
Don't Know / Missing	16	23.5	15	15.8	20	18.0
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

Q13 PAYMENTS TO CHARTER SCHOOLS	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	16	15.0	21	24.8	15	18.8
Somewhat Detrimental	17	15.9	11	12.9	3	3.8
No Impact	46	43.0	37	43.5	41	51.1
Somewhat Beneficial	3	2.8	4	4.7	1	1.3
Beneficial	1	0.9	1	1.2	4	5.0
Don't Know / Missing	24	22.4	11	12.9	16	20.0
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

Q14 PUBLIC SCHOOL TUITION	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	7	10.3	5	5.3	8	7.2
Somewhat Detrimental	9	13.2	9	9.5	6	5.4
No Impact	21	30.9	52	54.7	69	62.2
Somewhat Beneficial	14	20.6	12	12.6	13	11.7
Beneficial	8	11.8	6	6.3	1	0.9
Don't Know / Missing	9	13.2	11	11.6	14	12.6
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	80	100.0

APPENDIX B: Survey Results
NJSBA Task Force on New Jersey's Accountability Regulations

Q14 PUBLIC SCHOOL TUITION	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	7	6.5	5	5.9	8	10.0
Somewhat Detrimental	9	8.4	8	9.4	6	7.5
No Impact	52	48.6	48	56.5	41	51.3
Somewhat Beneficial	16	15.0	13	15.3	10	12.5
Beneficial	5	4.7	4	4.7	6	7.5
Don't Know / Missing	18	16.8	7	8.2	9	11.2
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0

Q15 PRIVATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS	Board Presidents		Superintendents		Business Administrators	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	14	20.6	30	31.6	31	27.9
Somewhat Detrimental	9	13.2	14	14.7	6	5.4
No Impact	12	17.7	15	15.8	27	24.4
Somewhat Beneficial	13	19.1	19	20.0	22	19.8
Beneficial	9	13.2	6	6.3	5	4.5
Don't Know / Missing	11	16.2	11	11.6	20	18.0
Totals	68	100.0	95	100.0	111	100.0

Q15 PRIVATE SPECIAL EDUCATION SCHOOLS	North		Central		South	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Detrimental	31	29.0	22	25.9	21	26.3
Somewhat Detrimental	14	13.1	9	10.5	6	7.5
No Impact	13	12.1	19	22.4	22	27.5
Somewhat Beneficial	19	17.8	19	22.4	15	18.7
Beneficial	9	8.4	6	7.1	5	6.3
Don't Know / Missing	21	19.6	10	11.7	11	13.7
Totals	107	100.0	85	100.0	80	100.0