

NYUSteinhardt

Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development

Metropolitan Center for Urban Education



RUTGERS
UNIVERSITY

Newark Schools Research Collaborative

RESIDENT PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION IN NEWARK: A COMMUNITY SURVEY

Dr. Alan Sadovnik
Dr. Edward Fergus
Dr. Jeffrey Backstrand
Elizabeth Rivera
Mellie Torres
Angela Garretson
Anne Beitlers

A REPORT COMMISSIONED AND FUNDED BY PENewark (PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION IN NEWARK)



Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	9
Research Methods	12
Section 1: Demographics and Survey Sample Representation	199
Section 2: Perceptions of Education in Newark.....	277
Section 3: Perceptions of Traditional Public Schools.....	31
Section 4: Perceptions about Charter Schools.....	50
Section 5: Reforming Schools in Newark.....	63
Conclusion.....	68
Appendices	70

Executive Summary

Over the last six months, Newark has been at the center of debates about urban educational reform in New Jersey and nationally. Since 1995, New Jersey's education authorities have operated the Newark school district, the state's largest. The district was taken over because of poor student achievement and fiscal and operational problems. Sixteen years later, the Newark school district is still under state control.

In September 2010, Mark Zuckerberg made a historic \$100 million gift to Newark for educational improvement. Mayor Cory Booker undertook to raise matching funds. Shortly thereafter, two non-profit organizations were established to receive and disburse those funds: Startup Education for the original Zuckerberg gift and Foundation for Newark's Future for the matching funds.

In October 2010, Mayor Booker created the Partnership for Education in Newark (PENewark) to implement a large-scale community engagement project focused on the community's perceptions and beliefs about the state of public education in the city. The project includes the community's views on how to improve public education.

PENewark developed its strategy for community engagement through a series of meetings with community stakeholders including the Mayor and Shavar Jeffries, former chair of the Newark Public Schools Advisory Board. Local research universities known to be independent and non-partisan also assisted.

The strategy involved a four-step process. The first step consisted of a short-form survey (short survey) designed by PENewark, which was to be distributed to every household in Newark, mainly through door-to-door canvassing. The second step consisted of forty community forums sponsored by PENewark and organized around various important educational issues on which community residents were asked to weigh in. In December 2010, the Metropolitan Center for Urban Education at New York University (Metro Center) and the Newark Schools Research Collaborative (NSRC) at Rutgers University- Newark signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PENewark to conduct the third and fourth steps of the strategy. The third step consisted of a longer-form survey (long survey) developed and distributed by Metro Center and NSRC. Finally, Metro Center and NSRC were commissioned to compile and evaluate the results of this multi-step community engagement process and issue a report for public dissemination.

This report summarizes the perceptions and beliefs of Newark residents—and recommends that they become one part of the complex data that will inform the direction of educational reform in the city. As the state, city, and a new NPS superintendent move forward with educational reform plans, we believe the results reported here suggest that state and city political leaders provide the type of leadership resulting in more consensus and less conflict. Despite the differences among stakeholders, our report demonstrates that they all, at the end of the day, want the same thing—to provide an excellent education for all the children of Newark.

Project Overview

This Metro Center and NSRC research project is an important collaborative effort of two university-based research organizations. It includes four interrelated parts:

- A short survey designed and collected by PENewark
- Community forums, which were conducted, audio-taped, and transcribed by PENewark;
- A long survey designed, collected, and analyzed by Metro Center and NSRC; and
- Compilation and evaluation of the results of this multi-step community engagement process, as well as issuing this report for public dissemination.

For the purpose of our research and this report, “public education” refers to district public schools operated under the auspices of NPS and public charter schools. Since 1995, NPS and its schools have been under state department of education operation. Under state law, charter schools, although public, operate independently of NPS, in effect, as independent districts unto themselves.

This research summarizes data on the perceptions and beliefs of Newark residents with respect to the following five points:

- Perceptions of Traditional Public Schools and Public Charter Schools
- Perceptions of Problems in Traditional Public Schools and Public Charter Schools
- Perceptions of Strategies for Improving Traditional Public Schools and Public Charter Schools
- Perceptions of Current School Reform Efforts
- Perceptions of Ways to Involve Parents and the Community in the Public Education Process

Our report is based on a mixed-methods design, which includes quantitative analysis of the short and long survey data and qualitative analysis of the community forum transcripts. Metro Center/NSRC analyzed the data from the three parts of the research:

- The short survey with 23,058 responses designed and collected by PENewark. This report analyzes 16,920 surveys from those who could clearly be identified as residents;
- The 25 transcripts from community forums organized, designed, and taped by PENewark;
- The 1,043 long survey responses designed and collected by Metro Center/NSRC. This report analyzes 669 surveys from those who could clearly be identified as residents.

There are a number of methodological limitations applicable to each of the data sources, both with regard to the quality of the instruments and the representativeness of the data collected. These are discussed in detail in the report. We employed a number of methodological techniques to address these limitations to produce a report that provides valuable insights into resident perceptions of public education in Newark.

Demographics and Survey Sample Representation

The short and long surveys were opportunistic samples of the Newark population. As such, the results of these surveys imperfectly reflected the overall population. In addition, both surveys had a significant proportion of respondents who were non-residents, or for whom we could not determine their residency status. The analyses show Newark respondents were disproportionately Black, young, female, and from the North Ward. Residents of the East and West Wards were under-represented. The analyses show non-resident respondents were one-third of all long-survey respondents. As a group, they were better educated, reported higher incomes, and were less likely to be unemployed than residents.

The long survey shows a large proportion of respondents have little direct knowledge of the Newark public schools. Over one-third of resident respondents had not attended a Newark high school and half had no child or other family member who was currently attending a Newark school. Only a quarter of resident respondents have a child or other family member who is attending a public charter school. The analyses demonstrate non-residents have even less direct knowledge of Newark schools. Only 1 in 5 non-residents had attended a Newark high school or had a child or other family member enrolled in a Newark school.

In summary, the long and short surveys imperfectly reflect the population of Newark. Therefore, inferences about Newark public opinion concerning the Newark schools must be viewed with caution. Additionally, a large proportion of respondents in the survey samples have little direct knowledge about the Newark schools. Therefore, many of the opinions expressed in the surveys likely reflect general impressions of the Newark schools and not actual experience. Given the current attention to educational reform in Newark, the perceptions and beliefs reported here may have been significantly affected by media coverage as well as community and Advisory Board meetings.

Perceptions of Education in Newark

Overall, Newark residents perceive differences in the distribution of quality schools and education by wards and race/ethnicity. The North and East Wards are consistently viewed as having the highest quality education; meanwhile, the South and Central Wards are more frequently identified as having low-performing schools. Additionally, White, Portuguese, and Asian/Indian students are viewed as receiving the highest quality education, while Black, Latino, and Special Education students perceived as receiving the lowest quality education. These responses provide answers as to whether respondents perceive a quality difference across wards. In the next two sections, we provide answers specific to perceptions of quality education by traditional public schools and charter schools.

Perceptions of Traditional Public Schools

Overall, forum participants identified specific areas in traditional public schools that are of concern but also provided ideas for improving the schools. The areas of concern include the lack of parent involvement and the need to help parents know how to get involved in education, the need for better use of resources and more equitable allocation of resources and programs across the wards, the need for more qualified teachers and training of current teachers, the need for more caring and differentiated attention to the needs of Newark students, and finally the need for evaluation of current programs. Across the short and long survey and forums, it is apparent Newark residents are concerned about the quality of public schools. More specifically, residents are concerned about student outcomes (e.g., graduation and dropout rates), the violence surrounding them, the quality of teachers available to students, the degree of parental involvement, and other issues.

Perceptions of Charter Schools

Overall, only about 25% of Newark residents perceive the quality of charter schools to be fair or poor and between 35-48% say that charter schools have some moderate or major problems. These results must be tempered by the fact that 65% of these residents stated that they knew little or nothing about charter schools, compared to 35% reporting they knew little or nothing about traditional public schools. Additionally, residents considered parents as having some influence on charter schools; however, at least a third of the residents did not know whether parents had an influence. Finally, in the forums residents mostly discussed charter schools with regard to what they can do differently from public schools, such as, selectivity in admissions and requiring more from teachers and parents. However, residents also raised concerns regarding these activities of charter schools. Most importantly, participants noted what they perceived as unfair advantages enjoyed by charter schools, which result in some of them having higher student achievement. These advantages include charter schools' requirement for parental involvement and their ability to push low performing and/or students with behavioral problems out and back into the district schools. Once back, the district schools rather than the charter schools are accountable for their achievement.

Perceptions of Reforming Schools in Newark

Overall, residents are supportive of various reforms across all schools and wards. More specifically, residents are interested in increasing the number of effective after-school and arts programs, as well as curriculum and instruction. Additionally, residents are supportive of reforms such as: replacing principals, giving principals more control, and replacing teachers. Simultaneously, residents are interested in specific learning outcomes, such as teaching students to think and ask questions, teaching life and social skills, preparing all children to go to college, and providing more discipline and order. And finally, residents perceive the next Superintendent as someone who should be an academic leader, knowledgeable of Newark education, and able to work well with parents and community.

In sum, our research suggests the need for more extensive research on community perceptions and beliefs, with a particular emphasis on residents with children in Newark schools. This research might include the types of surveys conducted biannually by the Consortium on Chicago School Research of

teachers, administrators, and students in the Chicago Public Schools and an additional survey of parents. Such surveys will provide comprehensive and longitudinal data on stakeholder perceptions of public education in Newark.

Taken as a whole, our findings indicate that, although there is a great deal of agreement that public education in Newark needs significant improvement, it is less clear that there is consensus about how to improve it. Given these results and the ongoing contentiousness surrounding educational reform in Newark, we believe it is incumbent on all policymakers and stakeholders, including the Governor, Acting Commissioner of Education, Mayor, Advisory Board, new state superintendent, community leaders, parents, teachers, administrators and students, to work to reduce the conflicts and heated rhetoric and to seek more civil discourse on educational reforms. In that process, community input needs to be considered carefully and combined with best practices research to form the basis for meaningful educational policies in Newark. We hope that this report will make a positive contribution, although for reasons we have explained throughout it should be considered merely a starting point for meaningful community engagement and participation.

Introduction

Over the last six months, Newark has been at the center of debates about urban educational reform in New Jersey and nationally. Since 1995, New Jersey's education authorities have operated the Newark school district, the state's largest. The district was taken over because of poor student achievement and fiscal and operational problems. Sixteen years later, the Newark school district is still under state control.

A number of related events have put Newark at the center of current issues over school governance, charter schools, co-location of charter and district schools, public vouchers for students in failing schools, and teacher accountability issues related to tenure and seniority. Governor Christie announced on August 31, 2010 that he was not renewing the contract of Newark state school superintendent Clifford Janey—who had completed two years at the helm—and that a search for a new leader would commence shortly.

In September 2010, Mark Zuckerberg made a historic \$100 million gift to Newark for educational improvement. Mayor Cory Booker undertook to raise matching funds. Shortly thereafter, two non-profit organizations were established to receive and disburse those funds: Startup Education for the original Zuckerberg gift and Foundation for Newark's Future for the matching funds.

In October 2010, Mayor Booker created the Partnership for Education in Newark (PENewark) to implement a large-scale community engagement project focused on the community's perceptions and beliefs about the state of public education in the city. The project includes the community's views on how to improve public education.

PENewark developed its strategy for community engagement through a series of meetings with community stakeholders including the Mayor and Shavar Jeffries, former chair of the Newark Public Schools Advisory Board. Local research universities known to be independent and non-partisan also assisted.

The strategy involved a four-step process. The first step consisted of a short-form survey (short survey) designed by PENewark, which was to be distributed to every household in Newark, mainly through door-to-door canvassing. The second step consisted of forty community forums sponsored by PENewark and organized around various important educational issues on which community residents were asked to weigh in. In December 2010, the Metropolitan Center for Urban Education at New York University (Metro Center) and the Newark Schools Research Collaborative (NSRC) at Rutgers University- Newark signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PENewark to conduct the third and fourth steps of the strategy. The third step consisted of a longer-form survey (long survey) developed and distributed by Metro Center and NSRC. Finally, Metro Center and NSRC were commissioned to compile and evaluate the results of this multi-step community engagement process and issue a report for public dissemination.

Although the Mayor indicated that community involvement would be a key component of an educational reform plan, an outside diagnostic team, Global Education Advisors (GEA), co-founded and initially directed by Chris Cerf prior to his appointment by Governor Christie as the acting state commissioner of education, was commissioned to analyze the state of the Newark Public Schools (NPS) and to make recommendations for a city-wide plan in February 2011, months before the Metro Center/NSRC report was to be issued. In late February, a Star Ledger columnist was able to obtain the GEA team's draft report and, among other things, it called for the closing of numerous failing or under-enrolled NPS schools and replacing them with charter schools and new district schools administered by outside operators, some of which would be co-located with existing district schools.

Some community leaders and groups, especially the Coalition for Effective Newark Public Schools in Newark, were troubled by what they considered a lack of transparency. They argued that the Mayor was in fact running the schools through the acting commissioner and that the community engagement process did not adequately represent actual community input. The acting commissioner responded by indicating that the report was only a draft and that an overall plan would consider community input. At the same time, a search for a new superintendent proceeded, with disagreement as to the degree of community involvement and input.

Following the release of GEA's recommendations, a number of community and NPS Advisory Board meetings occurred, with each involving significant conflicts among stakeholders about the direction that educational reform should take. Much of the conflict centered on disagreements about the role of charter schools, school closings, and co-location of new and existing schools in this process. In April 2011, the Newark Advisory Board voted against the opening of the proposed new schools but the NJDOE overruled its advisory vote and proceeded with plans to open the schools.

During this process, PENewark took an advocacy role in the debates supporting expanded options for Newark parents through school choice. Although we believe PENewark has the right to play such an advocacy role, we would have preferred that it defer any advocacy until this report about community perceptions was issued. In our view, it is imperative that Metro Center, NSRC and their respective universities remain independent and non-partisan in conducting this research and writing this report. At no time were we influenced by the Governor, Mayor, PENewark, the Acting Commissioner, the Newark Advisory Board, the Coalition for Effective Newark Public Schools, or the myriad other community groups and stakeholders. We conducted the research according to recognized and accepted social science methodology, as independent research centers at two of the region's leading research universities.

On May 4, 2011, Governor Christie appointed Cami Anderson, a senior New York City school superintendent, as the new state superintendent of the Newark Public Schools (NPS) and stated that he would not return local control to the local school board until there was "success and excellence" (http://www.nj.com/news/index.ssf/2011/05/newark_schools_to_remain_in_st.html).

We issue our report within this political climate, however. Although we do not take a position on the disagreements discussed above, we believe that the educational reform process in Newark should take

into account the perceptions and beliefs of its residents. Community participation should be viewed as an essential component of the development of an overall strategic plan, along with other key components including a best practices research-based analysis of urban educational reforms nationally and in Newark, and a comprehensive analysis of the current state of public education in Newark.

This report summarizes the first of these components—the perceptions and beliefs of Newark residents—and recommends that they become one part of the complex data that will inform the direction of educational reform in the city. As the state, city, and a new NPS superintendent move forward with educational reform plans, we believe the results reported here suggest that state and city political leaders provide the type of leadership resulting in more consensus and less conflict. Despite the differences among stakeholders, our report demonstrates that they all, at the end of the day, want the same thing—to provide an excellent education for all the children of Newark.

Project Overview

This Metro Center and NSRC research project is an important collaborative effort of two university-based research organizations.

It includes four interrelated parts:

- A short survey designed and collected by PENewark (See Appendix A)
- Community forums, which were conducted, audio-taped, and transcribed by PENewark (Appendix B);
- A long survey designed, collected, and analyzed by Metro Center and NSRC (See Appendix C);and
- Compilation and evaluation of the results of this multi-step community engagement process, as well as issuing a report for public dissemination.

Prior to this report there was little qualitative and quantitative evidence of residents’ perceptions regarding public education in Newark. That led PENewark to launch a community engagement process and to commission Metro Center and NSRC to conduct a research-based study both to evaluate PENewark’s short survey and community forums and to triangulate those outreach efforts with a long-form survey developed and implemented by Metro Center and NSRC. The focus of the long survey was to collect relatively detailed information about the perceptions of public education among Newark residents.

For the purpose of our research and this report, “public education” refers to district public schools operated under the auspices of NPS and public charter schools. Since 1995, NPS and its schools have been under state department of education operation. Under state law, charter schools, although public, operate independently of NPS, in effect, as independent districts unto themselves.

Our report is based on a mixed-methods design, which includes quantitative analysis of the short

and long survey data and qualitative analysis of the community forum transcripts. The goal of the research was to provide the Mayor, the school district, and community members and leaders with an independent analysis of PENewark's community engagement process..

With this goal in mind, the researchers determined that the study's methods would: 1) analyze collected data and gather additional data; 2) the gather information about residents' knowledge of existing school reform issues or concerns in the community; and 3) produce an independent and non-partisan report.

This research summarizes data on the perceptions and beliefs of Newark residents with respect to the following five points:

- Perceptions of Traditional Public Schools and Public Charter Schools
- Perceptions of Problems in Traditional Public Schools and Public Charter Schools
- Perceptions of Strategies for Improving Traditional Public Schools and Public Charter Schools
- Perceptions of Current School Reform Efforts
- Perceptions of Ways to Involve Parents and the Community in the Public Education Process

Research Methods

This section reports on the methods employed by both PENewark and Metro Center /NSRC in the data collection and analysis. Metro Center and NSRC did not collect the short survey and community forum data, as it was done by PENewark, and cannot report on all of the specifics of their methodology and data collection processes. We provide more detail on the collection of the long survey as we collected these data ourselves. In the next section, we address limitations with all three sources of data.

The short survey and community forums gathered feedback in the field regarding residents' perceptions and beliefs about public education. The long survey was administered online and in person. It provided a more in-depth portrait of residents' perceptions and beliefs about a substantial number of issues relating to the five points outlined above through more in-depth and straightforward questions than the short survey.

PENewark created and administered the first two steps of data collection. The data were gathered from October 2010 to January 2011. Through a door-to-door canvassing program, PENewark

representatives spoke to approximately 63,000 individuals in Newark. 23,058 short surveys were collected; this represented approximately a 36% response rate, or about 8% of the total 277,140 Newark population. Additionally, PENewark sponsored 40 community forums.

We analyzed 16,920 surveys (by those whom we were able to determine were from residents),¹ which represents approximately 6% of the Newark population. We also analyzed transcripts of 25 community forums. We omitted 15 from our analysis because they included individuals under the age of 18. This would have violated NYU and Rutgers Institutional Review Board (IRB) procedures since pre-approvals were neither sought nor obtained for under-age individuals.

The third step used the long survey developed by Metro Center and NSRC in January 2011 and distributed by us in February 2011. This step gathered 1043 surveys and analyzed 669 submitted by those who were residents.² The long survey questions provided Newark residents an opportunity to give more specific responses than the short survey, documenting the demographics of neighborhoods where respondents lived (by matching their ward to 2010 Census data).

Stakeholders from community-based-organizations (CBOs) and public traditional or public charter schools, teacher and administrator unions, as well as parent advocacy groups and community canvassers, distributed the surveys. The survey was translated into Portuguese, Spanish, and French in order to ensure that all Newark residents were able to respond to the long survey. We made extensive efforts to reach out to a representative cross-section of CBOs in order to prevent sampling bias. In our analysis, we determined that there was no overrepresentation of any of the CBOs.

Short Survey: & Community Forums

PENewark spearheaded what it viewed as a robust four-month community engagement campaign. PENewark believed that a strong community engagement campaign was necessary in order to maximize the number of Newark residents who would participate in the short survey and community forums. As part of this effort, it engaged 130 community partners (all of whom formally agreed to be partners) (See Appendix D) and leveraged media sources to introduce PENewark to the community using a variety of methods, including a PENewark website, radio and newspapers, posters, billboards, and social media (e.g., Twitter and Facebook). PENewark initiated

¹ Although the survey was designed for Newark residents only, 6,138 respondents were not coded by PENewark by ward of residence, which made it impossible to determine if they were truly residents. PENewark's database contained addresses for all respondents; however, our IRB approvals did not permit us to see these addresses as they had the potential of identifying respondents. We asked PENewark to go back into its database and link each respondent's address to a ward, however, they did not have the capacity to do this. Therefore, we had to eliminate these cases.

² Since long surveys were completed both on-line and in-person, we had no way of ascertaining whether or not the on-line respondents were residents. Therefore, we had questions about whether respondents were residents, non-residents who worked in Newark, or non-residents. We analyzed only the 669 surveys from Newark residents.

partner meetings with local school district leaders, community activists, and organizations associated with public education in Newark.

Both traditional public and charter school leaders were approached to participate in the community engagement effort. PENewark obtained their opinions and perceptions of the process and identified stakeholders to reach residents throughout the city. In selecting partners, PENewark took several steps. First, PENewark created a list of stakeholders and would eventually secure 130 partners that signed the PENewark MOU. Second, within the city, PENewark selected partners to host forums on a series of specific issues (see Appendix B) and to distribute the short survey. Third, within each city ward, PENewark canvassed residential and non-residential areas door-to-door.

PENewark's community partners hosted 40 community forums in a variety of settings. Each of the forums covered a specific topic and/or was organized for a number of stakeholders. For PENewark, these forums were a means of giving Newark residents an opportunity to voice their opinions and a location to distribute the short surveys. We analyzed 1,282 pages of transcripts from these forums; tapes of which were provided by PENewark. PENewark held facilitator trainings and each community forum followed a similar format. The facilitator presented the topic and then broke the participants into smaller groups using a series of open-ended questions about the topic under discussion. These facilitators guided the discussion around key questions and helped to keep participants on point.

Door-to-Door Canvassing

PENewark undertook a canvassing program of Newark residents to distribute the short survey throughout the city. The canvassing program was conducted between October 2010 and January 2011. On average, the short survey took approximately five minutes to complete, although in some instances, it took up to 10 minutes. The survey included some screening questions which attempted to exclude non-residents from the survey.

Canvassing occurred across Newark. PENewark selected each area to ensure that the respondents were from all five Newark wards - South, Central, East, West and North. In addition to canvassing survey respondents, PENewark also distributed the short surveys at its issue-based forums in partnership with local organizations for city residents and public education stakeholders in Newark.

The door-to-door canvassing was conducted weekdays and weekends throughout the mornings and evenings. The short survey consisted of five closed-ended questions seeking residents' opinions on parental involvement in the schools, and family and community influence on education, as well as their knowledge of how the schools in Newark are performing in general and in their immediate neighborhood, and where they get their information on education in Newark. There also was one open-ended question about their perception of the greatest challenge facing schools in their community. Due to the wide-range of responses, the answers to the open-ended question were not

coded and analyzed in this report.

Long Survey

The long survey was designed to measure respondents' perceptions and beliefs about public education in Newark in significantly more detail than the short survey. Experts in survey design at Metro Center, NSRC, and the Rutgers-Newark School of Public Affairs and Administration designed the survey. It was pilot tested in early January 2011 for several factors, including length, wording, and respondent understanding of the questions. Respondents to the pilot included PENewark staff and volunteers and a random sample of Newark residents from both universities. The pilot provided the range of completion times to determine if items would need to be deleted.

The Metro Center/NSRC team, which met on a weekly basis throughout the project, made final revisions to the long survey based on this feedback and determined that the 20-page survey would take at least 20-30 minutes to complete.

Members of the Coalition for Effective Newark Public Schools were critical of the survey, sending a series of emails to this effect. Their criticisms of the initial draft included its length, inclusion of demographic questions, and that it did not include charter schools. We attempted to meet with the Coalition representatives, but they did not respond to our invitations. We did, however, revise the survey by adding sections on charter schools which paralleled the questions on the district schools.

An outside company, used on a regular basis by Metro Center translated the final version into Spanish, Portuguese and French.

The Sample

NSRC developed a list of organizations associated with public schools in Newark, along with the names, emails, and telephone numbers of persons associated with them from several sources. Using the PENewark community partner list and groups with whom we are aware of in Newark, we worked with the following community organizations to collect the long surveys: Big Brothers Big Sisters, The Gem Project, Inc, Communities in Schools of New Jersey, Newark Innovation Academy, Just One Neighborhood Program, North Star Academy, Senior Citizen Education Coalition, Education Pioneers, Citizen Schools, the Newark Museum, B.R.I.C.K, The Budgetnista, Christ Church Newark, Lotus Yoga in Action, All Stars project of New Jersey, Essex County College - College YES, Newark Charter School Fund, Teach for America, Democrats for Education Reform, North Star Academy, Saving Ourselves (SOS), Future Potential (FP) Youth Outcry Foundation, NJ LEEP, Newark Arts Council, Newark Now, and Darshell Quality Music, Inc, which all worked on the short survey and volunteered to continue to participate in the long survey.

NSRC supplemented this list with community-based organizations (CBOs) and contacts from various university-based partnerships and throughout the city to ensure heterogeneity and a wide

range of survey respondents.

We asked these CBOs to recommend other organizations in order to contribute a "snowball" component to the sample. Additionally, we requested that several key community members provide their personal contact lists and make additions and recommendations to our list.

Finally, the community members worked with Metro Center and NSRC to distribute the survey to Newark residents at CBO sites throughout the city. In some cases, canvassers administered surveys in doctors' offices, post offices, libraries, and local businesses.

Given the time limitations to complete the study, we could not develop a random sample. Our approach utilized a method to capture as many residents as possible in as representative a manner as possible. The Metro Center/NSRC data collection framework relied on six data sources. The following is a description of these sources and the types of information that they provide.

- **Surveys from Community Based Organizations**

We collected surveys through CBOs, including CBOs partnered with PENewark and others that were not involved in the PENewark process. We included organizations from all five wards, with different missions and views of public education in the city, in order to ensure a diverse and representative sample. Organizations were responsible for email blasting the survey link to their contact lists and/or distributing hard copies to their constituents, either at their site or through forums and meetings.

- **Canvassers' Surveys**

Canvasser/street teams of 10 people went into target areas in the Newark community to collect surveys from Newark residents and/or workers. Canvassers visited all five wards and canvassed CBOs and places where people were already sitting down and waiting (e.g., hospital waiting rooms, public libraries, Dunkin Donuts, and Family Success Centers). Canvassing took place over a one-month period.

- **Online/Paper Surveys**

We posted surveys on the RU-NSRC and the NYU Metro Center websites and sent an email to the list of organizations. Community partners of PENewark distributed email blasts and forwarded the survey link. Paper surveys were distributed to organizations that requested them. We sought to obtain a 20-30% return from each organization. The online and written surveys were coded in order to track how many surveys were completed through each organization. We disaggregated the responses in order to analyze the views of the constituents of each organization and to ensure their

affiliations did not create sampling bias.

- **College Surveys**

EOF offices were targeted at NJIT, Rutgers-Newark, UMDNJ, and Essex County Community College, where many students who are residents of Newark attended public school in the city attend. We targeted other Newark residents who are students at these institutions and asked them to participate in the survey. We provided college students with paper versions of the survey and the online version of the website. Tables were set up at each college when appropriate and permitted.

- **Teacher Union and Administrator Union Surveys**

Teachers and administrators in NPS and Newark charter schools were asked to complete surveys. We reached out to them through their union presidents.

Data Analysis

Metro Center/NSRC analyzed the data from the three parts of the research:

- The short survey with 23,058 responses designed and collected by PENewark. As stated above, this report analyzes 16,920 resident surveys;
- The 25 transcripts from community forums organized, designed, and taped by PENewark;
- The 1043 long survey responses designed and collected by Metro Center/NSRC. As stated above, this report analyzes 669 resident surveys.

Frequencies of all questions on the short and long surveys for residents and non-residents (including missing items) are contained in Appendix E – short survey, Appendix F – long survey, and Appendix G – comparison of short and long surveys of similar questions. Using standard statistical techniques, the report provides analyses based on all three data sources. It presents separate analyses of the short and long surveys using descriptive statistics. It provides a thematic analysis of the community forums, using standard qualitative techniques for the coding and analysis of transcript data. Finally, in order to ensure the triangulation of these data, we compare the findings from all three parts of the data collection in order to determine if there were significant differences among them.

Limitations

There are a number of methodological limitations applicable to each of the data sources, both with regard to the quality of the instruments and the representativeness of the data collected. The main limitations of the short survey designed by PENewark included its limited number of questions and its failure to

incorporate a number of important demographic questions. In addition, the inclusion of pledges on the reverse side of the survey, which asked respondents to sign a pledge to improve and transform public education in Newark, may have negatively skewed the responses if it was read prior to filling out the survey.

The main limitation of the community forums concerned their organization by different community partners, which tended to attract residents and community groups who had definitive and often conflicting positions. Despite this non-representative sample, the forums provided an important mechanism for gauging the various perspectives in the community. In addition, many of the questions in the interview protocol designed by PENewark were too leading and negative and had the potential of skewing responses in an overly negative manner.

As noted in Table 1.2, the long survey representation is closer to the Census. The main limitation of the long survey resulted from the lack of a random sample, due to the tight time constraints of the project and the use of PENewark community partners to distribute some of the surveys. Although not representative in all respects, it proved to be sufficient given the statistical tests discussed here. Our analysis controls, to the extent possible, for these over- and under-representations. In order to accomplish this, we conducted a number of bivariate and multivariate statistical tests, including weighting each group. Our analyses did not reveal significant differences among the different groups of respondents and/or the community based organization through which they were collected. Based on these tests, we are confident that our non-random sample did not skew the results or adversely affect the overall findings. Given the fact that this is a report for the general public, we have omitted these statistical calculations, but they will be available as a Technical Appendix.

Despite the methodological limitations of the data collected by PENewark, the short survey and community forums provided important opportunities for community engagement, as evidenced by the over 23,000 short-form surveys collected and the significant number of participants in the forums. In addition, as the next section indicates, the more representative sample of long surveys compared to the short surveys allows for the triangulation of the three data sources in order to provide a more valid and reliable analysis of resident perceptions and beliefs.

Section 1: Demographics and Survey Sample Representation

This section reports on both residents and non-residents. Based on this analysis, we decided to limit the remainder of the report to residents only, both because we are primarily concerned with the perceptions and beliefs of residents and because the significant differences between residents and non-residents would have skewed the results.

Newark Residents and Non-Resident Workers

For both the short and long surveys, non-Newark residents answered the questionnaire. **Table 1.1** shows one-third (32.4%) of respondents on the long survey were non-residents. For the short form, we rely on the coding completed by PENewark (prior to sending us the data file) as our indicator of residency. Using this criterion, three-quarters (74.2%) of short form respondents were Newark residents. In the following analyses, we compare the long and short form respondents with the U.S. Census data. For these comparisons, the long and short survey data are restricted to “residents.”

Table 1.1.: Residence and Employment in Newark – Long Survey

	N	%
I live and work in Newark	315	34.4
I live in Newark and do not work in Newark	305	33.3
I do not live in Newark and work in Newark	236	25.7
I do not live and Newark and do not work in Newark	61	6.7
TOTAL	917	100.0
Missing	126	---

Comparison of Survey Samples with Census Data

This section describes the short and long survey samples and how these compare with Census data for the City of Newark. Because the short and long surveys were opportunistic samples, they will imperfectly represent the Newark population. These comparisons provide insight into the extent to which the survey respondents vary from the Newark population. **Table 1.2** shows the proportion of the short and long surveys from each of Newark’s five wards. For comparative purposes, the table shows the population of Newark as enumerated in the 2010 Census. The North Ward was over-represented for both the long and short surveys, while the East and West Wards were under-represented as compared to the Census. **Table 1.3** shows the ethnic/racial status of respondents on the short and long surveys; the table also provides comparable data from the 2010 Census. Race/ethnicity was obtained differently in the short and long surveys. In the long survey, the race/ethnicity was obtained by providing choices similar to those that the Census provides. However, the short survey’s race/ethnicity question was open-ended. Therefore, respondents to the short form were able to self-identify into choices that were not provided by the long

survey. The responses had to be recoded into the Black, Hispanic, White, Asian, and Other categories. This comparison shows Black residents of Newark were substantially over-represented in the short survey: their numbers were 52% higher than would be expected if the sample were representative. Black residents were also over-represented in the long survey, although to a lesser extent. Hispanic residents were under-represented by 38% on the short form, and by 28% on the long form. Whites were under-represented by 68% on the short survey, and by 31% on the long survey.

Table 1.2.: The Short and Long Surveys and Population of Newark by Ward

<i>Ward</i>	2010 Census		Short Survey		Long Survey	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
North	56,014	20.3	5,875	34.7	172	26.2
Central	54,439	19.7	3,401	20.1	154	23.5
West	51,396	18.6	2,209	13.1	100	15.2
South	55,155	20.0	3,789	22.4	132	20.1
East	60,136	21.8	1,646	9.7	98	14.9
TOTAL	277,140	100.0	16,920	100.0	656	100.0

Table 1.3.: The Short and Long Surveys and the Population of Newark by Ethnicity

<i>Ethnicity/Race</i>	2010 Census		Short Survey		Long Survey	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Black	101,093	49.0	10,026	74.4	343	62.7
Hispanic	67,338	32.6	2,726	20.2	128	23.4
White	27,290	13.0	566	4.2	49	9.0
Asian	3,600	0.2	54	0.4	5	0.9
Other	3,711	0.2	108	0.8	22	4.0
TOTAL	206,253	100.0	13,480	100.0	547	100.0
Missing			3,440	---	109	---

Table 1.4.: The Short and Long Surveys and the Population of Newark by Age

Age	2009 ACS	Short Survey		Long Survey	
	%	N	%	N	%
18-24	15.9	2,809	24.8	213	38.1
25-44	42.9	5,457	48.2	226	40.4
45-64	29.8	2,577	22.8	94	16.8
65+	11.4	466	4.1	26	4.6
TOTAL	100.0	11,309	100.0	559	100.0
Missing		5,611	---	97	---

Table 1.4 shows the age distribution of individuals who completed the short and long surveys; these results are compared to the 2009 American Community Survey (ACS) because the 2010 Census data is not available. This comparison shows young adults aged 18-24 years were much more likely to have completed either survey. In particular, the long survey was very skewed toward young adults, who were almost 2.4 times more likely to have taken the long survey than would have occurred if the sample was representative. Young adults were also over-represented in the short survey, but the extent of this was far less than occurred with the long survey (56% more likely). The adults aged 25-44 generally reflected the Newark population. As might be expected, the elderly were under-represented on both the short and long surveys (by 63% and 60%, respectively). The over-representation of young adults is due in part to a relatively large number of college students who completed the long survey (see below).

Table 1.5 shows the distribution of gender in the 2010 census and on the long survey (gender data were not collected in the short survey). Women were over-represented in the long survey by 19%.

Table 1.5.: The Short and Long Surveys and the Population of Newark by Gender

Age	2010 Census	Long Survey	
	%	N	%
Female	49.0	322	58.2
Male	51.0	231	42.8
Missing	---	553	100.0
TOTAL	100.0	103	---

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the Long Survey

This section describes the demographic characteristics of the long survey respondents (the short survey did not collect demographic information from its respondents, other than street addresses, which we could not use to discern ward of residence). **Table 1.6** shows a large difference in the educational attainment of the Newark residents as compared to non-residents. Non-residents were more highly educated than Newark residents: a third of non-residents had a graduate degree as compared to 6.9% of Newark residents. Only 11.1% of Newark residents reported having less than a high school degree, which is a lower proportion than would be expected based on the American Community Survey.

Table 1.6.: Educational Attainment of Newark Residents vs. Non-Residents

	Residents		Non-Residents	
	N	%	N	%
Elementary School	10	1.9	2	1.0
Some High School	48	9.2	8	3.8
High School Degree	173	33.1	31	14.8
Some College	98	18.7	25	11.9
Associate’s Degree	70	13.4	22	10.5
Bachelor’s Degree	72	13.8	48	22.9
Some Graduate Education	16	3.1	3	1.4
Master’s Degree	25	4.8	62	29.5
Ph.D/JD/DDS etc.	11	2.1	9	4.3
TOTAL	523	100.0	210	100.0
Missing	133	---	177	---

Table 1.7 shows the employment status of Newark residents and non-residents. Nearly a third of Newark residents reported being unemployed vs. 15.2% of non-residents. Just 34.6% of Newark residents reported being fully employed, while 57.6% of non-residents had full-time employment.

Table 1.7.: Employment Status of Newark Residents vs. Non-Residents

	Residents		Non-Residents	
	N	%	N	%
Full-time employed	175	34.6	121	57.6
Part-time employed	111	22.0	35	16.7
Self-employed	24	4.8	17	8.1
Housewife/husband	12	2.4	0	0.0
Unemployed	148	29.3	32	15.2
Retired	35	6.9	5	2.4
TOTAL	505	100.0	210	100.0
Missing	151	---	177	---

Table 1.8 shows the reported income of the long-survey respondents. As would be expected, most of the Newark respondents (59.7%) were very low income, and another 26% had incomes in the \$25,000 to \$50,000 range. Non-residents generally reported higher incomes. A number of the respondents (17.9% of long-survey respondents) were college students at Newark institutions of higher learning. **Table 1.9** shows the numbers and percentages by Newark residency. The largest proportion of students attended Essex Community College with a smaller proportion attending Rutgers-Newark.

Table 1.8.: Income of Newark Residents vs. Non-Residents

	Residents		Non-Residents	
	N	%	N	%
\$0-\$25,000	280	59.7	70	34.8
\$25,001-\$50,000	122	26.0	35	17.4
\$50,001-\$75,000	34	7.2	21	25.4
\$75,001-\$100,000	21	4.5	26	12.9
\$100,000 or more	12	1.8	19	2.8
TOTAL	469	100.0	201	100.0
Missing	187	---	186	---

Table 1.9.: Newark College Students: Residents vs. Non-Residents

	Residents		Non-Residents	
	N	%	N	%
Rutgers	35	22.0	13	27.1
NJIT	2	1.3	1	2.1
UMDNJ	2	1.3	1	2.1
Essex Community College	98	61.6	29	60.4
Berkeley	11	6.9	2	4.2
Seton Hall Law School	1	0.6	0	0.0
Other	10	6.3	2	4.2
TOTAL	159	100.0	48	100.0
Missing/Non-applicable	497	---	339	---

Experience with the Newark Schools

This section describes prior respondent attendance at a Newark high school and current enrollment in Newark schools by a child or family member. **Table 1.10** shows past respondent attendance at a Newark public high school. Most residents (60.8%) had attended a Newark high school. However, the majority of non-residents had not attended a Newark public high school. **Table 1.11** shows the numbers who graduated from a Newark high school: just over half of Newark residents had graduated from a Newark public high school.

Table 1.12 shows the proportion of residents and non-residents who reported a child or other family member who is attending a Newark school. Half of Newark residents reported a child or other family member who was enrolled in a Newark school. In contrast, only 21.7% of non-residents have a child or family member who attends a Newark school. Most of these family members were enrolled in the traditional Newark public schools, while a quarter of residents reported a family member who was in a public charter school and 15.1% had a child or family member in a private school.

Table 1.10.: Attendance at a Newark High School: Residents vs. Non-Residents

	Residents		Non-Residents	
	N	%	N	%
No	193	36.7	169	77.5
Public high school	320	60.8	47*	21.6
Charter high school	7	1.3	0	0.0
Catholic high school	6	1.1	2*	0.9
TOTAL	526	100.0	218	100.0
Missing	130	---	169	---

Table 1.11.: Graduated from a Newark High School: Residents vs. Non-Residents

	Residents		Non-Residents	
	N	%	N	%
No	218	41.8	167	75.9
Public high school	293	56.1	49*	22.3
Charter high school	6	1.2	0	0.0
Catholic high school	5	1.0	4*	1.8
TOTAL	522	100.0	220	100.0
Missing	134	---	167	---

*Response error

Table 1.12.: Child or Other Family Member Who Attends a Newark School: Residents vs. Non-Residents

		Residents		Non-Residents	
		N	%	N	%
Child or other family member attends a Newark school	Any school	258	50.3	45	21.7
	Traditional public school	207	43.7	31	15.9
	Charter school	105	24.5	15	7.9
	Private school	63	15.1	8	4.2

Summary: Demographics and Survey Sample Representation

The short and long surveys were opportunistic samples of the Newark population. As such, the results of these surveys imperfectly reflected the overall population. In addition, both surveys had a significant proportion of respondents who were non-residents, or for whom we could not determine their residency status. The analyses show Newark respondents were disproportionately Black, young, female, and from the North Ward. Residents of the East and West Wards were under-represented. The analyses show non-resident respondents were one-third of all long-survey respondents. As a group, they were better educated, reported higher incomes, and were less likely to be unemployed than residents.

The long survey shows a large proportion of respondents have little direct knowledge of the Newark public schools. Over one-third of resident respondents had not attended a Newark high school and half had no child or other family member who was currently attending a Newark school. Only a quarter of resident respondents have a child or other family member who is attending a public charter school. The analyses demonstrate non-residents have even less direct knowledge of Newark schools. Only 1 in 5 non-residents had attended a Newark high school or had a child or other family member enrolled in a Newark school.

In summary, the long and short surveys imperfectly reflect the population of Newark. Therefore, inferences about Newark public opinion concerning the Newark schools must be viewed with caution.

Additionally, a large proportion of respondents in the survey samples have little direct knowledge about the Newark schools. Therefore, many of the opinions expressed in the surveys likely reflect general impressions of the Newark schools and not actual experience. Given the current attention to educational reform in Newark, the perceptions and beliefs reported here may have been significantly affected by media coverage as well as community and Advisory Board meetings.

Section 2: Perceptions of Education in Newark

This section of the report provides an overview of responses to questions specific to the quality of education existing in Newark schools. More specifically, we focus on questions regarding perceptions of whether there are differences in quality of schools among wards. We examine this because in the testing of the long survey, we became aware that residents may perceive differences in educational quality among these wards.

Short Survey Responses

As reported in the methods section, 16,920 Newark residents participated in the short survey. One of the questions answered by everyone regarded their perceived knowledge of how well schools were performing in their neighborhoods. Tables 2.1 and 2.2 provide the percentage of responses by ward and race/ethnicity. Of the short survey respondents, as shown in Table 2.1, 52% said they knew how well schools in their neighborhoods were performing. There were minor differences in opinions between the wards. The West Ward was the only ward below the average for all respondents and respondents there were least sure they knew how well schools in their neighborhoods were performing – with only 50% of the respondents indicating that they did. Conversely, the East Ward had the highest percentage of respondents (57%) say they knew how well schools in their neighborhoods were performing. When examining by race/ethnicity in Table 2.2, there also were minor differences in how well respondents believed they knew schools in their neighborhoods were performing. Of the racial categories, 55% of White respondents agreed that they knew how well schools in their neighborhood were performing, in contrast to 48% of respondents from Other Races/Ethnicity (not White, Hispanic, or Black).

Table 2.1: Percentage of Responses to Question, by ward (N=15,885) Ward

I know how well schools in my neighborhood are performing							
	Ward						
	Not Identified	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
% Agree	50%	52%	57%	53%	53%	50%	53%

Table 2.2: Percentage of Responses to Question by Race (Newark residents, N=15,885)

I know how well schools in my neighborhood are performing						
	Race					
	Not Identified	Black	Hispanic	Other	White	Total
% Agree	52%	48%	52%	47%	53%	50%

Long Survey Responses

The analyses of the long survey involve a disaggregation of residents by wards (N=669) as well as the entire pool of respondents (N=1043). The questions on the long survey focus on residents' perceptions of whether there is equity in the distribution of quality schools across the wards. **Table 2.3** provides

responses to the question: “How much do you Agree or Disagree with the following statements regarding the quality of education in Newark public schools.” Over 70% of residents, as made apparent by the table, agree with two statements on the quality of education in Newark: quality of traditional public schools differs by neighborhoods and schools with the greatest need should get more money and resources. Among Central, South, and West Ward residents, less than 50% agreed with the statement “teachers should be paid more to work in low-performing schools.” Slightly more than 50% of East and North Ward residents (50.6% and 54.9%, respectively) agree with the statement on teachers getting paid more to work in low-performing schools.

Table 2.3: Percentage of Residents in Agreement with Statements

	% Agree or Strongly Agree with Statements					
	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
The quality of the traditional public schools is different in different neighborhoods in Newark.	91.4	87.0	93.4	87.6	92.9	91.4
In order to make public education in Newark better, schools with the greatest need should get more money and resources.	80.7	77.5	79.7	84.5	74.2	79.6
Teachers should be paid more to work in low-performing schools.	50.0	44.1	40.4	46.5	47.7	45.5

Two questions in the long survey focus on the perception of where high- and low-performing schools are located. **Table 2.4** provides responses to the question: “Which ward of Newark do you think has the most higher-performing traditional public schools?” Within each ward, there was a consensus in identifying North and East Ward as containing the most high-performing schools. .

Table 2.4: Percentage of Respondents’ Perceptions of the Most High-Performing Schools by Ward

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Central Ward	21.7	14.2	15.1	10.2	25.0	17.0
East Ward	22.7	55.7	25.7	19.6	27.3	28.3
North Ward	31.6	28.5	46.9	40.1	23.8	35.8
South Ward	13.8	0	7.5	21.4	4.7	10.3
West Ward	9.9	1.4	4.5	8.4	19.0	8.5

When asked about the location of the lowest-performing schools, different wards were identified. Table 2.5 provides responses to the question: “Which ward of Newark do you think has the most lower-performing traditional public schools?” Within each of the wards, South, Central, and West were identified by a significant proportion of the respondents.

Table 2.5: Percentage of Respondents' Perceptions of the Most Low-Performing Schools by Wards

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Central Ward	31.9	13.0	16.3	20.7	22.6	20.9
East Ward	18.5	11.5	4.9	14.1	14.2	12.1
North Ward	9.2	17.3	26.2	8.4	8.3	14.9
South Ward	26.8	34.7	39.0	41.5	23.8	34.0
West Ward	13.4	23.1	13.4	15.0	30.9	18.1

We also asked questions about whether there were perceived differences in the quality of education by the racial/ethnic groups, in order to further understand the differences in quality by wards.

Table 2.6 provides responses to the question: “In Newark, which three groups of students receives the HIGHEST quality education?” Newark residents within each ward perceive the following three groups as receiving the highest quality education: Portuguese, White, and Asian/Indian students.

Table 2.6: Percent of Responses to Three Groups of Students Receiving the Highest Quality Education

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Latino students	16.9	29.6	28.5	29.6	23.0	25.3
Portuguese students	32.5	49.0	28.5	37.9	35.0	35.4
Brazilian students	15.6	27.7	13.4	15.15	12.0	16.2
White students	47.4	55.1	65.7	62.9	57.0	57.9
African American students	13.0	13.3	25.6	15.2	25.0	18.6
Afro-Caribbean students (Haitian, Jamaican, Trinidadian)	8.4	11.2	8.7	6.1	11.0	8.8
African students	10.4	10.2	13.4	9.8	22.0	12.8
American Indian students	9.1	10.2	7.0	9.1	8.0	8.5
Asian/Indian students	23.4	28.6	32.6	37.1	31.0	30.5
English as a Second Language students	7.1	5.1	12.2	6.8	10.0	8.5
Special education students	9.1	3.1	9.9	4.6	6.0	7.0

When asked about the groups of students receiving the lowest quality education, respondents identified different groups. **Table 2.7** provides responses to the question: “In Newark, which three groups of students receives the LOWEST quality education?” Across the wards, Latino, African American, and Special Education students were most frequently identified as receiving the lowest quality education.

Table 2.7: Percent of Responses to Three Groups of Students Receiving the Lowest Quality Education

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Latino students	31.2	39.8	51.7	39.4	33.0	39.8
Portuguese students	5.2	10.2	11.0	6.8	9.0	8.4
Brazilian students	8.4	15.3	7.6	6.1	11.0	9.2
White students	0.0	10.2	5.2	5.3	5.0	4.7
African American students	48.7	55.1	49.4	65.9	67.0	56.1
Afro-Caribbean students (Haitian, Jamaican, Trinidadian)	27.3	22.4	19.8	27.3	25.0	24.2
African students	22.1	18.4	22.1	26.5	19.0	22.0
American Indian students	2.6	8.2	8.7	3.8	10.0	6.4
Asian/Indian students	2.6	5.1	4.6	2.3	4.0	3.7
English as a Second Language students	11.7	34.7	30.8	25.0	27.0	25.2
Special education students	33.1	46.9	39.0	29.6	42.0	37.4

Overall, Newark residents perceive differences in the distribution of quality schools and education by wards and race/ethnicity. The North and East Wards are consistently viewed as having the highest quality education; meanwhile, the South and Central Wards are more frequently identified as having low-performing schools. Additionally, White, Portuguese, and Asian/Indian students are viewed as receiving the highest quality education, while Black, Latino, and Special Education students perceived as receiving the lowest quality education. These responses provide answers as to whether respondents perceive a quality difference across wards. In the next two sections, we provide answers specific to perceptions of quality education by traditional public schools and charter schools.

Section 3: Perceptions of Traditional Public Schools

This section of the report provides an overview of responses to questions addressing perceptions of local traditional public schools.

Short Survey Responses

As reported in the methods section, 16,920 of Newark residents completed the short survey. One survey question asked the respondents if “local schools encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas on what it takes to improve public education.” **Tables 3.1** and **3.2** show the responses to this question by ward and race/ethnicity. Overall, 64% of the Newark residents stated that “local public schools” encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas to improve public education either a “great deal” or a “good amount.” The North Ward had a lower percentage (58%) of its respondents who felt this way, while the West Ward had a higher percentage (70%). The other wards were within a few percentage - points of the overall findings for all of Newark. There were no major differences when looking at the responses by race/ethnicity (see **Table 3.2**).

Tables 3.3 and **3.4** provide responses to the question: “how much influence do parents, caregivers, and community members have over public education?” Of Newark residents who responded to the short survey, 57% said that parents, caregivers, and community members have a “good amount” or a “great deal” of influence over public education. The North (52%) and West Wards (61%) had a lower percentage of respondents who felt this way. There are no major differences by race/ethnic group of the respondents for this question (see **Table 3.4**).

Table 3.1: “Local Public Schools Encourage Parents to Participate and Contribute Ideas on What It Takes to Improve Public Education,” by Ward (Newark Residents)

	Ward										Total	
	Central		East		North		South		West			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at All	258	8.0	160	10.0	326	7.0	285	8.1	129	6.1	1,158	7.6
Very Little	786	24.2	417	26.2	1,648	35.3	885	25.1	507	24.0	4,243	28.0
Good Amount	1,020	31.4	588	36.9	1,474	31.6	1,121	31.7	673	31.9	4,876	32.2
Great Deal	1,180	36.4	428	26.9	1,219	26.1	1,241	35.1	802	38.0	4,870	32.2
Total	3,244	100.0	1,593	100.0	4,667	100.0	3,532	100.0	2,111	100.0	15,147	100.0

Table 3.2: “Local Public Schools Encourage Parents to Participate and Contribute Ideas on What It Takes to Improve Public Education” by Ethnicity (Newark Residents)

	Black		Hispanic		White		Asian		Other		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at All	569	6.4	242	9.4	52	9.8	2	3.9	7	7.4	872	7.2
Very Little	2,373	26.6	717	28.0	158	29.9	23	44.2	25	26.3	3,296	27.1
Good Amount	2,767	31.0	927	36.2	167	31.6	13	25.0	32	33.7	3,906	32.2
Great Deal	3,204	36.0	676	26.4	151	28.6	14	26.9	31	32.6	4,076	33.6
Total	8,913	100.0	2,562	100.0	528	100.0	52	100.0	95	100.0	12,150	100.0

Table 3.3: “How Much Influence do Parents, Caregivers, and Community Members have over Public Education?” (Newark Residents)

	Central		East		North		South		West		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at All	244	7.6	139	8.8	268	5.6	224	6.3	121	5.7	996	6.5
Very Little	1,048	32.4	542	34.4	2,025	42.5	1,304	36.8	705	33.4	5,624	37.0
Good Amount	1,124	34.8	522	33.1	1,486	31.2	1,121	31.7	718	34.0	4,971	32.7
Great Deal	815	25.2	373	23.7	983	20.6	890	25.1	567	26.9	3,628	23.8
Total	3,231	100.0	1,576	100.0	4,762	100.0	3,539	100.0	2,111	100.0	15,219	100.0

Table 3.4: “How Much Influence do Parents, Caregivers, and Community Members have over Public Education?” (Newark Residents)

	Black		Hispanic		White		Asian		Other		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Not at All	514	5.7	210	8.2	47	8.8	5	9.8	2	2.1	778	6.4
Very Little	3,297	36.7	940	36.9	190	35.6	11	21.6	37	39.0	4,475	36.7
Good Amount	2,946	32.8	839	33.0	170	31.9	23	45.1	32	33.7	4,010	32.8
Great Deal	2,226	24.8	557	21.9	126	23.6	12	23.5	24	25.3	2,945	24.1
Total	8,983	100.0	2,546	100.0	533	100.0	51	100.0	95	100.0	12,208	100.0

Long Survey Responses: Perceptions about Traditional Public Schools

Newark respondents to the long survey appeared to believe that they have a fair amount of knowledge about traditional public schools. **Table 3.5** provides responses to the question: “How much do you know about the traditional public schools in Newark?” Over half of the respondents from each ward identified themselves as knowledgeable about traditional public schools in Newark.

Table 3.5: Percentage of Newark Residents with Knowledge about the Traditional Public Schools in Newark

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Nothing at all	8.1	13.5	7.1	8.6	3.2	8.0
A little	27.7	22.9	33.3	23.4	21.0	21.0
Some	37.2	37.5	35.1	37.5	41.0	41.0
A lot	27.0	26.0	24.4	30.5	34.7	34.7
Total Count	148	96	168	128	95	635

Newark respondents were asked to assess the traditional public schools in Newark. **Table 3.6** provides responses to the question: “Based on what you know, how would you describe the quality of traditional public schools in Newark?” The overwhelming majority of residents (over 80%), regardless of ward, perceived the traditional public schools as being of “poor” or “fair” quality.

Table 3.6: Percentage of Perceived Quality of Traditional Public Schools (Newark Residents)

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Poor	44.9	39.8	48.0	49.2	54.6	47.3
Fair	38.1	31.2	33.3	36.7	36.1	35.2
Good	7.5	17.2	9.4	9.4	4.1	9.3
Excellent	0.7	2.2	2.9	0.0	2.1	1.6
Don't Know	8.8	9.7	6.4	4.7	3.1	6.6
Total Count	147	93	171	128	97	636

The short and long surveys contained similar questions that addressed perceptions about the quality of schooling in Newark. **Table 3.7** shows self-assessed knowledge about their neighborhood schools (the short survey) and of “traditional public schools in Newark” (the long survey). Half of the short-survey respondents felt that they had a good understanding of how their neighborhood schools were performing. In the long survey, almost a third of respondents felt they knew “a lot” about the Newark schools.

Table 3.7: Questions about Respondent Knowledge of Local Schools (Short and Long Surveys) (Newark Residents)

Short Survey			Long Survey		
“I know how well schools in my neighborhood are performing”			“How much do you know about the traditional public schools in Newark?”		
	N	%		N	%
Agree	8,375	52.7	A lot	178	28.0
Disagree	7,510	47.3	Some	237	37.3
TOTAL	15,885	100.0	A little	169	26.6
Missing	1035	---	Nothing at all	51	8.0
			TOTAL	635	100.0
			Missing/Don’t know	21	---

Table 3.8 shows the respondent’s assessment of the performance of their neighborhood school (short survey) and “traditional public schools in Newark” (long survey). In both surveys, very few respondents rated school performance as excellent or outstanding. Almost half of respondents of the long survey rated the Newark Public Schools as “poor.” When it came to their neighborhood school, respondents on the short survey were half as likely to rate it as “not doing well.” compared to long survey respondents to rate it as “not doing well” (23.8% short survey respondents said that neighborhood schools were not performing well). This is consistent with Gallup poll data; that indicates that respondents rate their own schools as higher than the school system. The differences in responses to these two questions suggest that residents may feel better about their neighborhood schools than they do about the Newark schools in general.

Table 3.8: Questions on Local School Performance/Quality (Newark Residents)

Short Survey			Long Survey		
“How well do you think the schools are performing in your neighborhood?”			“How would you describe the quality of traditional public schools in Newark?”		
	N	%		N	%
Outstanding	847	6.2	Excellent	10	1.6
Very well	1,999	14.5	Good	59	9.3
Well	3,022	21.9	Fair	224	35.2
Somewhat well	4,635	33.6	Poor	301	47.3
Not doing well	3,280	23.8	TOTAL	636	100.0
TOTAL	13,783	100.0	Missing/don’t know	62	---
Missing/Don’t know	3137	---			

The long survey asked questions about respondents’ perceptions of specific educational components as having moderate to major problems. **Table 3.9** provides responses to the question: “Please indicate whether you consider each a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for traditional public schools in Newark.” The overwhelming majority of residents perceived everything about the traditional public schools as a moderate-to-major problem. Over 90% of residents perceived these as issues: violence and student safety around schools, parental involvement, dropout rates, high school graduation rates, students who graduate without needed skills, and number of NPS students going to college.

Table 3.9: Perceived Problems of the Newark Public Schools, by Ward

	% Viewing as moderate or major problem					
	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Violence & student safety around schools	95.1	98.6	92.6	89.4	94.2	93.5
Availability of resources	90.3	80.0	82.7	84.1	87.2	85.1
Quality of school buildings	83.6	80.3	79.6	80.7	84.1	81.6
Amount of funding for schools	84.7	81.3	84.2	89.9	86.9	85.6
Class size	88.1	83.3	77.0	81.7	79.0	81.7
Parental involvement	91.3	90.5	82.3	90.3	93.9	88.9
Treatment of parents by schools	78.4	66.1	65.4	75.0	81.0	73.0
Quality of administrators	76.1	69.8	78.5	75.0	75.6	75.6
Experience of teachers	72.7	59.0	66.9	73.1	69.1	69.0
Teacher expectations for students	80.2	74.2	76.1	76.0	85.4	78.3
Quality of teachers	75.9	72.6	70.8	81.7	76.5	75.4
Quality of curriculum and classroom lessons	80.4	71.4	77.8	75.7	83.5	78.1
Quality of ESL instruction	76.6	73.8	76.2	73.3	78.3	75.7
Quality of special education services	79.3	80.0	79.0	75.0	81.8	78.9
Quality of services for immigrant students	83.7	73.7	74.1	76.2	80.0	88.5
Dropout rates	91.8	90.5	89.7	93.2	91.6	91.3
High school graduation rate	90.5	93.8	88.3	89.7	90.4	90.6
Students who graduate without needed skills	94.6	90.8	87.0	91.3	93.9	91.3
Number of NPS students going to college	92.8	90.6	84.8	85.0	91.4	88.5
Removal of ineffective teachers	84.6	78.3	68.4	75.5	85.0	77.4
Student enrollment policies	68.6	69.6	69.1	70.7	71.2	69.8

Admissions process	75.2	58.6	74.6	73.7	68.4	71.4
Removal or transfer of low-performing students	79.2	69.0	70.7	79.8	76.4	75.3
Removal or transfer of students with behavior problems	85.4	84.7	78.8	84.0	85.9	83.4
Loss or transfer of high-performing students	79.6	74.6	77.4	80.2	80.0	78.6

Another area of quality education in the long survey is residents’ perceptions of whether specific school activities with parents should occur more or less frequently. As identified in the above table, over 90% of residents consider parental involvement a quality of education issue. **Table 3.10** and **3.11** provide responses to the question: “How often do you think the following activities should occur at traditional public schools in Newark?” Among the various items, the largest percentage of residents (over 40%) indicates a preference to receive materials and information from teachers to assist their children with schoolwork on a weekly basis or more. Over 40% of residents also generally indicate that parent teacher conferences and other special events should take place multiple times through a month.

Table 3.10: “How Often Do You Think the Following Activities Should Occur at Traditional Public Schools in Newark?” (Newark Residents)

	% Once or more a week					
	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Parent-teacher conferences	17.3	20.5	20.1	20.9	9.8	19.5
Special events (e.g., science fairs, student plays)	11.0	14.3	6.2	11.5	5.0	10.1
Parents providing support in classrooms	22.2	19.0	21.7	27.9	19.0	23.9
Parents involved in issues about how to run the school	23.2	13.9	17.7	21.9	7.4	19.2
Parents involved in decisions about school budgets and how school money should be spent	18.8	13.0	15.1	17.9	13.8	17.5
Parents should receive materials and information from teachers that will help them assist their children with schoolwork at home	49.2	43.6	39.9	44.7	45.0	47.9

Table 3.11: “How Often Do You Think the Following Activities Should Occur at Traditional Public Schools in Newark?” (Newark Residents)

	% Once or twice a month					
	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Parent-teacher conferences	48.8	52.6	48.3	51.3	51.2	53.7
Special events (e.g., science fairs, student plays)	40.2	41.6	54.8	42.5	36.3	47.4
Parents providing support in classrooms	34.1	41.8	42.0	33.3	46.5	41.0
Parents involved in issues about how to run the school	34.4	35.4	39.5	36.8	32.1	39.1
Parents involved in decisions about school budgets and how school money should be spent	26.6	36.4	32.2	33.0	31.3	34.3
Parents should receive materials and information from teachers that will help them assist their children with schoolwork at home	24.2	33.3	35.8	33.3	32.5	34.3

Overall, Newark residents perceive the quality of traditional public schools as poor or fair quality. More specifically, they identify educational issues relating to parental involvement, graduation and dropout rates, and other issues as major problems. Additionally, although the short survey responses indicate that a small majority of residents that parents, caregivers, and community members have a good to great deal of influence on public education, nonetheless, on the long survey, residents indicated that they would like greater parental involvement in the schools. (These differences may not be significant because the questions ask different things).

Community Forums: Perceptions about Public Schools in Newark

The PENewark community forums were convened at sites across Newark,. Each forum was organized around a specific topic; these sessions elicited numerous comments that reflect a range of perspectives and opinion. Our analysis of the transcripts from these forums identified several common themes, most of which focused on the traditional public schools. The most prominent of these concerned the distribution and use of resources and programs, inadequate parental involvement, and the need for more qualified educators more caring school staff.

Theme 1: Resources / Programs

The most commonly expressed theme was the need for additional resources and programs. Many individuals stressed the need for additional outreach programs. Among these were after-school programs to provide structure for those students who would otherwise return to an empty home. Participants also stressed a need for social service outreach programs for Newark families struggling with issues such as drug abuse, poverty, or a lack of parenting skills.

Participants at several forums called for enrichment programs, including art and music programs, to meet the needs of the whole child and to teach discipline and dedication. Some residents identified a need for science programs, such as robotics programs, as well as programs that expose Newark students to life outside of their city (via college campus tours and nature field trips, etc.).

Forum participants often voiced concerns about the adequacy of Newark school resources and perceived inequities in their allocation. Participants raised concerns about the condition of school buildings with complaints about poor heating, rodents, lack of toilet paper, and old paint. Some expressed frustration about a lack of technology in many schools, which they believe negatively affects teachers' abilities to provide a twenty-first century curriculum. Lastly, many participants cited problems related to overcrowding in schools and poor student-to-teacher ratios.

Below are several representative comments related to programs and resources, organized by the title of the forum:

Public Education and Money – A

“When you step into this building, there are hazards in this building. That correlates with the quality of education that people go to --. That’s the heating system right here. Take a look at it. Do you want your child sitting over there?”

-“I just want to follow what he said about quality. What big issue also is whether or not the schools have lead paint in them? This is one of my staff issues, that’s a huge issue. And people tell us a common thing.”

Public Education and Money – A

“Actually it was two years ago, there was a reading program that would address the reading proficiencies of our kids in high school and it was the Read 180 program. And there was a great deal of money that was spent into the computers and software and staff. Then we had the extreme budget cuts and the program was completely sacked.”

Arts, Culture, and Academic Achievement – B

“The problem with implementation once a barrier is we don't have art classrooms in the majority of our schools. We don't have computer rooms. We don't have libraries. So you can't even implement a whole-hearted, well rounded curriculum in Newark public schools because at Dayton Street they may have an art room but they don't have a computer room. And then at Ridge Street they don't have a library and you have an art teacher carrying art supplies in a book bag and there's no music classes or there's no this.”

Arts, Culture, and Academic Achievement – C

“It is pervasive. You have haves and have nots. You have administrators that understand the value therefore they put the programs in or they do what they need to do to ensure that their kids gain access to those programs because they understand the benefit. You have other administrators that

don't understand it, don't value it, and therefore don't front it, don't support it, and don't put the teachers in place.”

Arts, Culture, and Academic Achievement – A

“Went to one school, there was no toilet paper in the bathroom. There were rats. At [school], the rats had names. Seriously.”

Models that Work - A

“One is, what's known generally in literature, professional development schools, urban teacher residency models where teachers are learning how to become teachers alongside model teachers, model classroom teachers, so you're increasing the numbers of adults in the classroom with a group of students.”

Models that Work – C

“Uh, and they're after-school programs. Uh, they have uh, like dress for success programs. Um, mentorship, uh, social services that the family also need that helps that child see in home someone being successful whether it be going and getting a GED, job readiness training, stuff like that.”

Special Needs Education – A

“Counseling and therapy in-home and in-home for a family group therapy and individual therapy in the house, in the home.”

Special Needs Education – A

“Well music art programs, I think that—we talk about behavioral problems. Give a kid an instrument and you might eliminate a lot of those behavioral problems. He's practicing twice a week, three times a week; an hour sitting on a piano. It's discipline, it's a certain discipline when you play that instrument. It's a certain discipline when you're drawing and you're painting.”

A Question of Accountability - A

When we were talking about accountability and holding the parents accountable, I was thinking in terms of like parenting skills classes because a lot of parents need -- to be --. And you were talking about resources.”

Community Forum on Education - D

“Actually, from having children in Newark school systems, I've witnessed how a lot of the classrooms are overcrowded, and unfortunately the teacher has to do more disciplining than teaching.”

Community Forum on Education - A

“If a child doesn't have parents who are involved in their school life, there needs to be some type of after-school support where they have some type of capability to talk to a mentor.”

Community Forum on Education - C

“There are some schools that are well-stocked with smart boards and yet other schools that don't even have toilet paper.”

Community Forum on Education - B

“She went to Montclair College, and she got a little feel on how college life on campus, and she, uh, attended Essex County College for a while so she got a feel of that.”

Theme 2: Parent Involvement

The next most common theme discussed in all the forums involved parent involvement in schools and education. Consistent with the data in the long survey, participants voiced a great deal of concern over lack of parent participation. Many forum participants felt parents should be held accountable for being involved in their child's school. Given the fact that the short survey indicated that the schools encourage parent and community involvement, this suggests that residents believe that parents need to take advantage of the opportunities available to become more involved in the schools. There was also discussion about the school's responsibility in getting parents involved, especially when parents feel disconnected or even unwelcome by schools.

Part of the conversation about getting parents involved included finding ways parents could help in the schools. There were suggestions to include parents in the classroom or even before or after school so that school grounds are safer, especially in neighborhoods where safety is an issue.

Finally, several of the forums included discussions about educating parents. Participants stressed education that involved teaching parents how to read to their children, how to ask them about their schoolwork, and how to help them with homework. Participants voiced concerns, especially with regard to immigrant parents, about their ability to access the school system. Therefore, participants recommended that parents be given this information, as well as general knowledge about how schools work. This would require schools to be open to parent participation and, in general, to be welcoming to parents. Participants also discussed the number of very young parents in Newark who may need social services intervention to teach them the importance of being involved in their children's education and to help them understand the importance of education.

Below are a number of representative comments from different forums related to the role of parents, organized by the title of the forum:

Public Education and Money - B

“More weekend - - with the parents, for the parents to attend. Because right now 6:00 or 7:00 o'clock at night, like - - most of our parents are getting home from work. But if you had, I think, something on a Saturday, every other Saturday, and make sure that you have bilingual interpreters.”

Community, Families, and Schools – E1

“We have a dedicated parent coordinator whose job at the school is to outreach to parents and organize you know workshops and - - . I mean all of their supposedly, you know every day, it’s a huge parent program at all these schools. If you have someone dedicated.”

Community, Families, and Schools – B

“...had a Spaghetti Night to incorporate families getting together, eating together and the whole sitting at the table.”

Community, Families, and Schools – A

“Volunteers. For example, right now we need safety. So when children are being dismissed there can be volunteers and they can stand at the doors——“

Models that Work – C

“The educational literacy of parents and knowing what classes do my children need to take? What skills do my children need to know? Um, and without parents being informed about you know, those certain important programs are available to child if my child is learning disabled or has a problem. A lot of times parents don't know that so, and so they go, the problems go unsolved. So, uh, in teaching parents essentially, I think it helps the school teach the student.”

Models that Work – B

“Their parents don't value education. They don't tell their kids listen, you have to get this education to get that job, to be the teacher, to be the farmer, to be, you're not going to make it. We have to start making again a program that has the parents involved it.”

Models that Work – B

“Barriers from parent-teacher communication. They need to stay in constant contact, be it by letter or by phone, because when they give the letter to the child, it never reaches them. Sometimes it gets lost, sometimes it gets misplaced, sometimes they throw it away. So there has to be a more forceful way for the teacher and parent to stay connected. If they aren't connected then there's a big problem. The teachers think the parents don't care or the parents think the teachers don't care and there's no understanding.”

Special Needs Education – A

“They come from countries where it’s not customary for the parents to talk about their educational needs as far as their children. They just go with the flow because they don’t have that [crosstalk] tailored thing. But we don’t just educate our kids we have to be also tools to inform our parents because we provide a service that affects our communities and our futures.”

Social Services in Education – B

“Parents volunteer. A lot of parents volunteer but they put them in kindergarten, first, or second. They should be also putting parents, as a volunteer, in upper levels to help the teachers control a

room. That it would be better with two adults instead of just one which is actually teaching and can be concentrating.”

A Question of Accountability – A

“They can also implement making the parents be held accountable. Because if you don't follow our rules, we're paying for your child's lunch, we're paying for your child's breakfast, we're paying for, you know, all the basic things that you really don't need to get an education, we're doing our part you do your part.”

A Question of Accountability - D

“Social service money, if your kids don't go to school, you don't get your food stamps, you know, [Crosstalk.] They used to do that in the '70s. Your social service resource would, directly impacted by what you did at home.”

Community Forum on Education – B

“In Newark it's an us versus them. Us meaning the system versus the parents. Try if you're a parent sometimes the most difficult thing to do is to have a good working relationship. That needs to be – there needs to be an open door policy. The parents need to be more welcome and the school need to be more accommodating of parents.”

Theme 3: Qualified Educators

The third most common theme throughout the forums was the need for qualified educators. These conversations focused on the need for experienced teachers who have taught for several years, as well as a concern about teacher retention. Participants felt these teachers had a better grasp on classroom management and curriculum development. However, even though participants expressed the need for experienced teachers, they acknowledged that years of experience do not necessarily make a teacher qualified and, if teachers are ineffective, they should be removed.

Participants proposed that teachers need to have a strong grasp of curriculum development. Teachers need to know how to customize a curriculum to students' needs and differentiate curriculum when necessary. Participants noted that qualified educators will also have high expectations of their students. Additionally, if teachers are qualified, the district and administration should trust teachers to make these decisions as opposed to forcing them to teach a scripted curriculum that may not always be in the best interest of students. Another suggestion involved teachers mentoring each other by, for example, matching experienced and highly qualified teachers with less experienced teachers. Schools should also provide professional development.

Below are a number of representative comments from different forums related to the theme of qualified educators, organized by the title of the forum:

Public Education and Money – A

“I think in Newark also we have to focus on teacher retention and they, as you mentioned, salaries [coughing] of—but then when you look at all the extraneous reasons why teachers to leave, okay?”

Arts, Culture, and Academic Achievement – A

“I’m like this when it comes to my teachers and they’ll tell you, I don’t care what happens in their classroom as long as I can monitor and know that you’re doing the right thing. If it doesn’t go with the book but it’s something that the kids need to know that you need to teach because books don’t teach kids, teachers do.”

Communities, Families, and Schools – D

“I think they need to get more, to focus on something I think can happen if teachers who educate in the city of Newark to live in the city of Newark.”

Models that Work - A

“Some people are just blindly without—it’s a very rogue level of knowledge that they have, it’s a very basic knowledge. They’re not students of their craft. I’m talking about teachers now. It’s important for them to constantly be learning and reading and seeking information when they’re confronted with students in their classes, present situations that may not have all the answers for or they’ve exhausted their strategy.”

Models that Work – C

“Schools leaders in the building need to remove the most ineffective teachers.”

“I think the model that I found to be really successful is one that really directly engages um, character through model focusing on instructional leadership where that teacher gets a lesson planner view, observation, meeting time every week with a mentor teacher who has the ability to show their expertise and development individually and personally.”

Educator’s Speak – D

“So, we need to teach out of the box while following the guidelines in the rules, but teach outside the box. Teach to the student.”

Educator’s Speak – B

“I think it’s a part of teacher’s staff development, the experienced teachers should be mentoring the new teachers.”

Educator’s Speak – B

“I was following the curriculum exactly the way they spelled it out for me and I was their robot. I did exactly what they told me to do. It wasn’t until I had extensive training under a master teacher right in the district, like you said they exist. That she taught me how to extend past the

curriculum, how to take the approaches and what the curriculum asked for and come up with my own ideas because I am my own person. There is no one size fits all approach. I think our district tends to think there is because they come in with their clipboards and they have their checklist or whatever they're gonna look for, they spend about five or ten minutes and they get a snapshot."

Educator's Speak – A

"Assuming that we have effective teachers in front of our students then we should assume that they know what's best for kids and give them the freedom to adjust the curriculum, their approach to teaching so that it meets their kids where they are."

Educator's Speak – A

"I think one of the things that will support that would professional learning community that are run by teachers and not by administrators."

Teacher and Administrator Effectiveness - B

"Just knowing your subject matter is primary. But I've seen teachers--one thing that goes hand in hand with that is classroom management skills."

Theme 4: Caring and Committed Teachers

Another common theme of the forums was the need for caring and committed teachers and administrators who know and understand their students. Participants suggested that teachers should understand their students culturally and be culturally sensitive, as well as get to know the students' unique personalities and understand how to motivate and support them. They should also know how to differentiate curriculum for individual students.

Participants stated that teachers need to care for the students. Teachers show this caring by being dedicated and going the extra mile with phone calls and more availability, helping students before or after school, and communicating progress. They also show caring through compassion and empathy with students and trying to understand their lives outside the classroom.

Below are a number of representative comments from different forums related to the need for caring and committed teachers, organized by the title of the forum:.

Arts, Culture, and Academic Achievement – A

"As with poetry. Like even, I always have my kids write a poem about themselves or whatever they feel like writing and the teacher learns so many things about the students from that student reading that poem. Like one of the students always criticizing other classmen, she has eight brothers and sisters. She's taking care of a baby and the teacher didn't know it so they had a conversation later on. But if it wasn't for that poem that she wrote and read in class, she would not have known where her situation was at."

Models that Work – B

“Um, they're with him, they just the small portions where he has the attention that he needs. So he sits there and the teacher works with him. She gets it done, she knows how to get it done when he shuts down. So she learns to work around that. She knows how to deal with it and she's gotten him to learn so much that he's been learning to spell big words on his own. So the resource program is the best thing.”

Educator's Speak – A

“I would say love them. If you love the students you can do all of those things that you just talked about and get them the education that they need. You'll provide the resources, you'll find a way to get the programs, you'll find a way to get the parent involvement, you'll get your own special development and make yourself the best possible resource for those children that are important.”

Educator's Speak – C

“But a dedicated teacher will say, gladly I'll take that class to the next level. And what it does is there's no adjustment time for the teacher. There's no adjustment time for the children. The teacher knows those kids so well. Moves them right into second grade from first and that momentum keeps going. You know, you take real ownership.”

Educator's Speak – D

“And that's that teacher that takes that extra moment, even at nine o'clock at night, to make sure she calls that parent.”

Educator's Speak – B

“I was thinking whoever's standing in front of our young people in the city of Newark has got to have some level of cultural competency.”

Educator's Speak – B

“We talked about the home, we talked about the interpersonal relationship, whether or not they think or were a good student in the morning, etcetera. We shared that information. But what was more important all of our students knew that we shared that information about all of the ninth graders.”

Teacher and Administrator Effectiveness – B

“I don't have a particular person in mind, but when I think about an effective administrator, I think of someone who is transformational, who is a visionary, someone who will stand against the grain to do what is right for the students and won't be a puppet to bureaucracy. I think about someone who is congruent, someone who is transparent, someone who really loves children, someone who is confident and effective like the gentleman you said in pedagogy and able to build a collective efficacy within their school. And someone who is focused on enhancing student achievement, not

just for standardized tests, but really creating a climate that is conducive to teaching the whole child, psychologically, academically, emotionally, socially.”

Teacher and Administrator Effectiveness – B

“So I think compassion is brought to the thing, because it must be built inside and then brought outside through the -- . So compassion. She has an inexhaustible amount of understanding.”

Teacher and Administrator Effectiveness – A

“An effective teacher to me is passionate, they know they're learners, they observe them, they know where they are to differentiate the instruction, they build on what they know, and what they don't know they're -- and find a way to get to that child.”

Teacher and Administrator Effectiveness – B

“But teachers should have empathy, and they should be culturally competent.”

Community Forum on Education – D

“A more caring attitude and non-judgmental attitude, you know, because a lot of the kids are going through things that we as adults don't really understand. We need to be more caring to their needs and their necessities. That's where with the times that have changed.”

Community Forum on Education – A

“It comes—the compassion ratio at least helps you to funnel some extra time, extra attention to that child to differentiate in such a way that that child maybe can overcome whatever that problem is.”

Theme 5: Evaluation / Accountability

The last common theme discussed across the focus group forums was the need for evaluation and accountability. Many participants discussed the need for teacher evaluation. They felt this evaluation would determine whether teachers were qualified, but also would help teachers improve practice. There were suggestions for rubrics, if they aren't already being used, such as the Charlotte Danielson rubric, which breaks teaching down into several components. Evaluation was also suggested as a way to determine what should be taught.

Several participants also discussed the need for program evaluation, because there are several outside programs contracted to work in Newark schools and their effectiveness is not evaluated. Additionally, some participants felt there should be some sort of evaluation conducted to determine what services are needed within the district. Lastly, some expressed a desire for an evaluation of policies and procedures in the district.

Below are a number of representative comments from different forums related to the need for evaluation and accountability, organized by the title of the forum:

Models that Work – C

“So I think that analytics to not only looking at but to derive instruction about what exactly needs to be taught and how it's taught.”

Models that Work – C

“Because you're just going to see, you know, principal person to person– teacher once a year. You're not going to be able to assess that teacher sufficiently to really understand what their strengths and weaknesses are. So I think it's ongoing hit that gather data that build an evaluation system that really says here's what you need.”

Educator's Speak – B

“It is important that we get an objective evaluation because that tells us where our performance needs to improve, where it needs to stay the same, and it also give us the opportunity to cultivate relationships with those individuals and those organizations because inevitably we're going to need their support as we try to implement new programs [crosstalk] across the board.”

Social Services in Education – A

“I think also there needs to be more accountability fiscally. I worked for a non-profit very briefly that specializes in providing housing and supportive services for [off mic] complete scam. And that goes on all the time. So those monies that are being used for that could be diverted to actually do some real good.”

Social Services in Education – B

“[Name] says one way would be to develop process that, I guess, would have benchmarks and things like to objectively evaluate the process of the delivery of services for different needs throughout the city.”

A Question of Accountability – A

“Newark public schools as a whole have these policies and procedures. We need to implement them. We need to see what's working and we don't know because we don't do it. We don't -- them out. We talk about them and we discuss them but we don't really, really hold anybody accountable to making sure that they're implemented.”

Overall, forum participants identified specific areas in traditional public schools that are of concern but also provided ideas for improving the schools. The areas of concern include the lack of parent involvement and the need to help parents know how to get involved in education, the need for better use of resources and more equitable allocation of resources and programs across the wards, the need for more qualified teachers and training of current teachers, the need for more caring and differentiated attention to the needs of Newark students, and finally the need for evaluation of current programs.

Across the short and long survey and forums, it is apparent Newark residents are concerned about the quality of public schools. More specifically, residents are concerned about student outcomes (e.g.,

graduation and dropout rates), the violence surrounding them, the quality of teachers available to students, the degree of parental involvement, and other issues.

Section 4: Perceptions about Charter Schools

Long Survey Responses: Perceptions about Charter Schools

In the long survey we included the same questions about charter schools as we did for public schools in order to understand whether there are differences in how they are perceived. We begin by first examining what Newark residents know about the public charter schools. **Table 4.1** provides the percentage of Newark residents with knowledge about the public charter schools. Within each ward, less than 50% of respondents had some or a lot of knowledge regarding public charter schools.

Table 4.1: Percentage of Newark Residents with Knowledge about the Public Charter Schools in Newark

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Nothing at all	33.5	35.2	41.9	33.9	26.1	34.9
A little	35.1	29.6	29.7	27.3	32.6	30.9
Some	21.6	21.6	18.1	28.1	28.3	23.1
A lot	9.7	13.6	10.3	10.7	13.0	11.2
Total Count	134	88	155	121	92	590

In **Table 4.2** we provide percentage of perceived quality of public charter schools. Within the wards, 30-40% of respondents rate the quality of the charter schools as good or excellent. Also important to note is at least a quarter of respondents did not know about the quality of charter school.

Table 4.2: Percentage of perceived quality of Public Charter Schools in Newark (Newark Residents))

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Poor	7.4	5.8	2.0	6.5	7.8	5.6
Fair	20.0	21.8	19.5	13.7	22.2	19.2
Good	31.1	18.4	28.6	30.7	36.7	29.3
Excellent	12.6	13.8	11.0	16.9	8.9	12.7
Don't Know	28.9	40.2	39.0	32.3	24.4	33.2
Total Count	135	87	154	124	90	590

Aside from examining respondents' perception of quality, we also identify where residents receive information about charter schools, given that charter schools are not located in all neighborhoods or wards. **Table 4.3** provides total responses to the question: "Where do you learn about public charter schools issues?" Respondents across all wards consistently identified three specific sources of information about public charter schools: 1) family and friends, 2) community organizations, and 3) educators.

Table 4.3: Count of Responses to the Top Sources for Information About Public Charter Schools

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Television	19.5	27.6	26.2	20.4	18.0	22.4
Magazines and Newspapers	15.6	20.4	23.3	17.4	28.0	20.6
Radio	7.8	10.2	8.7	6.1	13.0	8.8
Community Organizations	24.0	18.4	21.5	25.0	35.0	24.4
Internet	20.1	17.4	20.4	21.2	24.0	20.6
Elected Officials	12.3	12.2	8.7	10.6	17.0	11.7
Educators	25.3	22.4	19.8	23.5	34.0	24.4
Family and Friends	43.5	41.8	41.3	49.2	50.0	44.8

Newark residents were somewhat divided across wards on whether charter schools greatly encouraged parents to participate. **Table 4.4** provides the percentage of Newark residents' answers to the question: "How much do public charter schools in Newark encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas?" Less than half consider "some or a lot" of effort..

Table 4.4: Percentage of Effort Charter Schools Make to Encourage Parents to Participate by Ward (Newark Residents)

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Not at all	2.4	8.0	10.2	9.3	7.7	7.6
A little	24.4	14.0	26.5	5.3	23.1	19.5
Some	26.8	26.0	32.6	32.0	23.1	28.6
A lot	46.3	52.0	30.6	53.3	46.2	44.3
Total	82	50	98	75	65	370

Additionally, when residents were asked about whether they perceived parents in charter schools to have influence, they also differed. **Table 4.5** provides the percentage of Newark residents' answers to the question: "How much influence do parents, caregivers, and community members have over education in Newark's public charter schools?" A significant portion within each ward consider parents as having an influence on charter schools, but also more than a third didn't know.

Table 4.5: Percentage of Influence Parents Have on Charter Schools

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
None	7.1	6.0	9.8	5.4	6.4	7.2
A little	28.6	16.0	29.4	18.9	17.7	23.2
Some	33.3	44.0	28.3	32.4	37.1	34.0
A lot	31.0	34.0	32.6	43.2	38.7	35.6
Total	84	50	92	74	62	362

Similar to the traditional public schools, when asked about specific educational components a significant portion of residents perceived moderate to major problems in charter schools. Table 4.4 provides responses to the question: “Please indicate whether you consider each a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for charter schools in Newark.” Unlike perceptions of traditional public schools, slightly less than 50% of residents did not perceive these issues as moderate or major problems, except for quality of administrators and admissions process.

Table 4.6. Perceptions of Problems in Charter Schools by Ward

	% Viewing as moderate or major problem					
	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Violence & student safety around schools	48.8	43.9	44.6	39.4	38.3	43.5
Availability of resources	45.7	51.2	36.9	35.7	37.7	40.6
Quality of school buildings	48.7	48.7	35.8	38.0	41.9	42.0
Amount of funding for schools	48.2	47.7	44.4	37.1	53.2	45.9
Class size	46.7	42.5	37.3	35.7	32.8	39.0
Parental involvement	40.2	41.9	33.8	27.4	45.2	37.1
Treatment of parents by schools	39.0	35.0	28.2	35.2	36.1	34.6
Quality of administrators	52.6	42.1	38.0	34.3	31.0	39.9
Experience of teachers	41.6	43.6	35.9	28.8	35.0	36.4
Teacher expectations for students	36.4	40.0	33.8	32.9	31.0	34.5
Quality of teachers	47.4	40.0	35.0	30.3	30.5	36.8
Quality of curriculum and classroom lessons	44.9	45.0	32.5	30.6	30.5	36.2
Quality of ESL instruction	53.1	44.7	47.8	37.1	35.3	44.0
Quality of special education services	44.4	41.5	35.5	39.1	29.1	48.4
Quality of services for immigrant students	46.6	43.2	47.7	38.6	40.8	43.6
Dropout rates	46.6	51.2	37.5	40.3	35.1	41.7
High school graduation rate	45.2	42.1	36.1	34.7	32.7	38.1
Students who graduate without needed skills	45.3	46.5	43.1	43.3	35.7	42.8
Number of NPS students going to college	42.2	36.6	35.1	37.5	32.1	36.9
Removal of ineffective teachers	44.4	41.5	35.5	39.1	29.1	37.8
Student enrollment policies	49.3	47.6	38.2	35.7	35.6	41.0
Admissions process	59.5	50.0	44.7	42.4	42.4	48.1
Removal or transfer of low-performing students	48.6	53.8	45.8	33.8	31.0	42.0
Removal or transfer of students with behavior problems	47.9	43.6	43.5	32.4	35.1	40.5
Loss or transfer of high-performing students	37.5	38.5	36.2	31.8	27.3	34.2

Community Forums: Perceptions About Newark Charter Schools

The community forums varied in topic and location, however, across several there were conversations regarding charter schools. In those forums, specific themes surrounding charter schools were apparent: some residents identified charter schools as being selective in their admissions process; charter schools are perceived as being able to make requirements of parents unlike public schools; charter schools are able to be more flexible including allowing teachers to participate in planning; and charter schools are perceived as taking funds from the school district.

Theme 1: Charter Schools Can Be Selective

The most common discussion around charter schools in the community forums had to do with the perception that charter schools have the ability to be selective in their admissions and retention policies. Some of these discussions focused on the involvement of parents in the process. Participants shared that charter schools often have parents sign contracts for participation and, if they don't honor the contract, their children can be asked to leave the school. Many participants pointed out that this is something district schools are not allowed to do.

Additionally, some participants felt that charter schools paint a picture of exclusivity, though they are open to all. They indicated that some parents consider sending their children to charter schools as they perceive them to be more elite or effective than the district schools. These participants also felt this is damaging to the morale of the district.

Last, participants discussed charter schools' ability to return students to the district. If students are not performing, perhaps because they have special needs the charter schools cannot meet, participants believe charter schools can send students back to district schools. Or, if students aren't behaving, the charter schools can ask students to leave. Participants stated that district schools have a responsibility to all students and cannot either exclude or transfer students.

Below are representative comments on the theme of selectivity, organized by the specific forums:

Public Education and Money – A

Participant 23: "I'd say I'm impressed with some of the high performing charter schools in the city like the ones that come to mind are Northstar, TEAM, and Robert Treat Academy, in terms of the scores that the students are posted and their preparedness for the upper grades, for the high schools that they go to or the colleges that they go to."

Participant 23: "The scores that are posted [background noise] the graduation rates, the attendance grades at each of those three schools and [crosstalk]."

Participant 21: "They also have what they call a -- at Northstar."

Participant 24: "A couple things. Well two -- first of all it really isn't about programs it's about people, okay? It's not about programs, it's not about initiatives. But one, I guess, as [coughing]

that because you know the people is a program called CFI and it's a children's literacy initiative and it's an amazing program that we actually—is being -- been in Newark public schools for awhile. The teachers do our model teachers -- program. Their students specifically outperform other students of [background noise] teachers and that program is being expanded through a grant that's going on. Another one is project -- that's another kind of program. But, again, it's really not about programs. It's about people [background noise] CFI works so well because you're—they get coached and the teachers get a coach to show them the most effective and best practices. So you can concentrate on people. You're not investing money in programs. When you only invest money in programs and you only invest money in initiatives it's short term. It's not long term. In terms of the charter schools the reason, one of the reasons they can do what they do and the performance that they can get is because they can do things that traditional public schools cannot and that is they make parents sign contracts [interruption].”

Participant 25: “That's not true.”

Participant 24: “Many of them do. When -- teach students don't do what they need to do they're allowed to disenroll those students.”

Participant 25: “That's not true.”

Participant 24: “That is true. It is true. I had [crosstalk]”

Participant 26: “That should be taken very cautiously, number one. The next look at the -- in terms of their discrepancy between what the charter schools allowed to do as far as the parents concerned that [background noise] and I say that because my son is at Northstar Academy. Having said that though there is a sense of enhanced performance when you're independent and Northstar and all the charter schools are [background noise] independents. They can enhance, increase big expanse of shortages and that's the fundamental reason why -- every system must be conclusive of success. Then I submit to you that sometimes in terms of [background noise] and other urban -- does not give us the ability to just sort of be—to step up the game so to speak.”

Arts, Culture, and Academic Achievement – D

“The paradigm shift is all schools, all people, must be treated with respect and equal. As soon as you say there's a magnet school, as soon as you say there's a charter school, as soon as you say there's a—there's nothing wrong with saying we're a performing arts school. There's nothing wrong with saying we are a history school. Those are skills that if your child is inclined to do those things, we're uplifting those skills, and there's nothing wrong with that. But when you set aside oh, my kid goes to a charter school, or my kid goes to a magnet school, you're showing exclusivity, and that means if you don't go there, you're not as good as me, and that gets shown out on the playground. That gets shown on the streets. That gets shown in the way we teach our children. I know one of the first educational lessons that I learned as an educator, one of the—it was the old story about there was a new teacher coming in, and the principal said we're going to

switch this school around completely, and you're not going to know whether you get an advanced class or if you get the "dummies" of the school. You're not going to know. So everybody was on a level playing field. Well, the teacher that supposedly had the dummies was convinced that they were going to get the best kids. Well, by not knowing, the kids that were the lowest, supposedly, reached up to the highest kids, and the kids that were supposed to be the highest went down. That's a proven—anybody who takes the educator psychology classes, that's one of the first lessons that you learn. So I think we need a paradigm shift to not see in the rearview mirror, and to stop saying let's create special schools. There's nothing wrong with saying an arts school as the kids get older, as the kids get in high school going onto college. But from K up through that point of when they can divide up and go to their special skills, every school must have the same thing. Every child must have the same education."

Community, Families, and Schools – C

"The big - - is like this lady was talking about the charge - - . This is supposed to be for every child, every school, and if you start to a charter school does this, a magnet school does this, it's not for every kid and so therefore we are relating - - not positive because that is a have and a have not. And that's your model for failure and success. If you want to - - really do something it has to be complete - - ship that this is for every child, every family, every school possible."

Models that Work – A

Participant 1: "I think – is very important, however, when you look at the different age categories in education that's always a completely different spin on it. You're talking about higher level education at the university level, you're talking here about public schools and this was brought up in the last meeting, the last -- , when you make statements like that, you are pinning private schools, charter schools against public schools. You're making their parents and teachers and students, above all the students, when you're thinking like that, the first thing that goes through a child's mind is, "I'm not good enough. I'm not into the charter school, so I'm not good enough." We have to be very careful when we formulate something new, it is for the public school, it is for the good of all, and to raise the level of everyone."

Participant 7: "Right and the way that you do that is we need to -- expectations. I am the product of public education. I am the product of public education that adequately prepared me before I went forward into private institution. But when I say by fixing excellence, anyone can fix excellence. You can go into any -- and you can say, you will become the trailblazers for excellence and you will do a disservice if we told our students in public education, you can't be that -- of greatness."

Educators Speak - C

Participant 8: "The parents have to buy in. I walked into a charter school the other day. In 37 years I never saw anything like it. North Star. I have never seen children, and I beg each one of

you to go to North Star Elementary, in my whole life. In any reading I've ever done, nothing. Those children and parents, it's a commitment that's made. And of course, it's not a North Public, so if those children are not going to adhere to the commitment, they're gone and they're back in the public school system. So, you need to really, I mean, if we really want this to work, let's look at some of the things that work. The wheel has been invented. So, you need to see that."

F: "All right. Okay."

Participant 36: "I think that goes back, I hate to say this, to a barrier."

Participant 37: "I was going to say the same thing."

Participant 36: "If we are pinning a charter school and saying, you're going to go back to a public school. I'm sorry. We're dead meat."

Special Needs Education – B

Participant 3: "What happens with the charter schools and the so-called parochial schools? [background noise] but they're magnets. Yeah right. The magnets also. To explain what a magnet school is, the students have to take a test to get in. So the high functioning kids get in and they do fine. [crosstalk] Right but what I found very oppressive for me. The magnet schools take the money. Now the district schools take the money. Once this child becomes a behavior issue they wait until after they know they can keep that tuition for the year and the student is returned to the district. It has happened to me a million times. I got my [background noise] student back. My thing is we have to keep them. So if you take them - - or charter or whatever school, magnet schools that's your child. They should not be allowed to move [crosstalk] child that's your baby."

Teacher and Administrator Effectiveness – B

Participant 1: "I think it's important to note that there's a big difference between what charter schools and what traditional public schools can do in terms of mandating parent involvement. In a charter school, they have the ability to have parents sign contracts. And so they can be selective about the students that they have, because if a parent doesn't want to sign the contract, they're not allowed then to attend that charter school in some cases, if that's the rule of the charter school. Traditional public schools don't have that ability to do that. And so there is no way to force parent involvement through that. In fact, it would be a violation of both state and federal law in order to enforce that. So you're talking about a massive, a change--I'm not saying you can't pass it--but of massive proportion in order to do that. And I think what we also need to point out is that we know exactly what it takes to transform schools. There's no mystery to it. There's been massive studies. One of the best known people in terms of data, actual data, of what really changes student achievement is Robert Marzano [phonetic], and he's put out many, many books that actually track specifically with tons of data, what specifically impacts the most in like 59 different areas of both teachers and principals."

A Question of Accountability – A

Participant 37: “Are the charter schools just taking our kids and relocating them in the same system, and then if they don't get in they're -- by a lottery so they got to wait and wait and wait, so then, if you watch *Waiting for Superman*, one lady says the difference between my child being able to go to a charter school or the public school is life and death so I have to wait on the lottery system. How about we just not reinvent the wheel and we——“

Participant 1: “So what are we——“

Participant 37: “—fix what's wrong.”

A Question of Accountability – A

Participant 37: “—if those kids aren't there, if those kids aren't there, there are charter schools that have kicked out kids by November. We know that for a fact. There are charter schools in Newark that if the kid isn't making muster by November, they have said thank you, you can go back to Avon Avenue.”

A Question of Accountability – D

Participant 16: “In front of the kids. And I think with that being said, you know, they're just out of resources. Charter schools have the ability to bench children to do certain things, to create consequences for their behavior, where the Newark public school system is not set up for that. And they discourage that. In the Newark public schools we have a no suspension rule.”

Community Forum on Education – A

Participant 1: “From my child going here to the charter school, we have to—like we do the Saturday classes, or we—it's always like once a month it's something for the parents. But if you don't show up, you have to make it up. But a lot of people already have the concept, being that their child is here, that you have to do it. But public school is like a whole different attitude. It's like I have to do—like you have to teach my child. My child has to report.”

Participant 4: “Well, that's the point. That's the bigger, to me, point, which is, is public education a right? Is it a privilege? It's a mandate, but——“

Participant 2: “It's definitely not a privilege.”

Participant 4: “It's not a privilege?”

Participant 2: “No.”

R: “What were you going to add before?”

Participant 3: “What I was going to say is that there’s simply no way that you can ensure that every parent is going to be involved. I went to college in Newark, and I’ve met students who made it through college simply on their own accord. Their parents could not, would not have been involved in any way, shape, or form because of their social economy situation, and because of personal issues. You have some students whose parents are drug addicts. When you deal in a school system that—you can have students that want to learn, but their parents are not present whatsoever. The state or the municipality has to be able to step up. Also, I think what needs to be done is that somehow the state or the municipality has to make up for that. They have to be able to teach the child to a certain point where you may not need parental involvement. Sometimes you may have to have it, but sometimes you will not. You simply won’t get it.”

Community Forum on Education - B

Participant 34. : “Okay. I want to sort of explain something about discipline in my school. In a charter school or in a magnet school, if you don’t perform the way they want you to, they can kick you out. Then the child is moved to what’s called a comprehensive school which is like Weequahic or Central School. We are - I am not - a kid could be jumping up and down on top of desks, rolling on the floor - - but just acting wild. I am not allowed to send that child out of the room unless he is physically hurting someone. So the - there is no - I can’t control the behavior. I need to get better at that but it’s not only me, it’s the same for all teachers regardless of the experience. I mean some are better than others. I can’t say there’s nobody that can’t do it, but we at the comprehensive school, need a better discipline system.”

Theme 2: Charter Schools Have More Flexibility

Another common conversation about charter schools involved the perception that charter schools have more flexibility than district schools. Participants believed that they have more flexibility to structure their schools, especially when it comes to allowing for teachers to have a voice in the planning; they have more flexibility to include outside programs within the school walls and within school programming;, and they also have more flexibility in teacher hiring and expectations of teachers. Participants indicated they believe that most charter school teachers are less experienced and can be paid more and they can ask, and even require, teachers to work longer hours than district teachers.

Below are representative comments on the theme of flexibility, organized by the specific forums:

Public Education and Money – A

“Having said that though there is a sense of enhanced performance when you’re independent and Northstar and all the charter schools are [background noise] independents. They can enhance, increase big expanse of shortages and that’s the fundamental reason why -- every system must be conclusive of success. Then I submit to you that sometimes in terms of [background noise] and other urban -- does not give us the ability to just sort of be—to step up the game so to speak.”

Arts, Culture, and Academic Achievement – D

“So back to my point. Yeah, that would be great if we could collectively—all of the things that contribute to our students’ failure, address every last thing. That’s ideal. I know that there are some charter schools that are able to do things like that; you know, have the programs and the clinics and everything on one site. That’s probably less likely in a big district like ours. But for our children who are in those kinds of predicaments, we still have to teach them.”

Models that Work – B

“Sure. Uh, so one of the most powerful ones is danger and mistrust. It's happened to many, some of the most high performing charter schools here and that's a, here's a distance where there's a highly organized calendar throughout the year with benchmarks that are administered and then there's systems in place for teachers' voices to be included in the planning and the action plan that may be put in place to truly differentiate instruction. So all this time we focus our conversations about teachers leaning on the high stakes test and they asked what that means. That's really not what matters when it comes to kids learning and the high performing schools here in the city have systems, have data driven systems that empower teachers to be more successful with their students. Um, and there's a lot of support around the systems, their whole school and school culture is built around supporting those systems. And um, from experience in having worked on both sides of the charter, successful and unsuccessful, when the teachers experience success, um, that's the case. And that's why I'm also very optimistic and highly reputable.”

Models that Work – B

Participant 7: “I think that um, it'd be too like, the key to a successful model is empowerment. Um, I've had a privilege to see um, experience different things that I attended public school in Newark and starting until I attended high school and then um, I had an opportunity to teach for America to work with um, -- who teach in charter schools here in Newark and in Philadelphia and the common thread is that teachers and students were empowered. And what I mean by that is that they didn't have so much dictated from the top in terms of how they're to spend their time. How are they to structure their day or their lesson. I think about my own experience and when I went to school in Newark and in Orange um, my teachers weren't told, okay you've got to teach this page in this book. You have to do this. But it was more about, I'm going to prepare you for the world. Okay. And so I'm going to speak, I'm planning backwards from where I want you to be when you're a successful adult and that's where I'm at right now. And guess that's a philosophy by which I approach my classroom and a that's philosophy that um, we're taking here at Brick. Teachers should be involved in that plan and I'm not badgering the instruction in terms of a buzzword. If we're going to really affect our students we're going to look at this data and we're going to ask questions. I can't just put something into Excel and say we have data. We're going to talk about okay, so, tomorrow I'm going to plan for next week's lesson and I'm going to ask you think of questions that are a part of these skills. I'm going to make these action items a part of

these skills. I'm going to use this model first to target these skills. I'm going push these students more and I think we need to move toward somewhere where teachers are empowered, students are empowered, not only are they learning but students know how to think what excellence is, how does this empower, and how does this instructor conduct him or herself just by their environment. We have to deal with better.”

Social Services in Education – A

Participant 10: “As far as my vision for the school if there’s a school that doesn’t [background noise] shut out parents. For example, we [background noise] agencies or schools that we focus on social transformation and moral transformation I -- we only hold these kids for eight hours, for two hours a day. Their parents are their first primary education. So why are we setting the parents. So my vision would be that the schools would provide services for the parents. Like everyone’s been saying let’s educate the parents. In my former life I was a teacher. I would invite the parents after school, “This is what I’m teaching your kids. Please go home and reinforce this.” We have to have that commercial engagement now and I know for North charter school what we’re doing is we’re engaging parents for all charter schools. What I would like to see for not only charter schools but for public schools let’s start engaging these parents, educating parents beyond the academics, beyond just how to be parents but for the whole student so they holistically can uplift our students.”

A Question of Accountability – B

Participant 18: “Right -- it's not so much -- charter school or a school is a traditional public school -- it's the systems that are put in place in order to in the end effect -- and so one of the reasons why charter schools that they're not traditional -- they're not traditional and do some of the things that public schools can no longer do is because public schools have been challenged in court so many times so some of the things that public schools used to be able--used to do, they are now by law no longer allowed to do. So as a parent--“

Community Forum on Education - B

Participant 49: “I think another barrier literally the length of the school day. Um, I think that some of the successful programs that say like a charter school is able to replicate, um, they can do so because they have an extended day and they have an extended school year. So their amount of time that they have with students is - - magnitude larger than the number of - - allowed within a district setting, so I think a barrier could be that the day is too short and the school year is too short in the district.”

Public Education and Money – A

“[background noise] and I wanted to point out about the budget. One of the students [background noise] 20% less [background noise] with any budget for any institution a large part of that is about

which just the nature of any business for that matter and so you were talking about the longevity of many of our teachers being here for many years so the salaries are up higher. Typically if you do any study of charter schools they tend to have much younger staff and as a result the salaries are going to be significantly lower, that portion of their budget. And so we talked about that, that's one of the reasons that their budget may be 20% less. Because if any budget about anywhere 50% in salary."

Theme 3: Charter Schools Take Money from the District

The last discussion on charter schools focuses on the distribution of money. This was not a prevailing conversation but a number of participants in one forum talked about charter schools taking money from district schools.

Below are representative comments on this theme, organized by the specific forums:

A Question of Accountability – A

Participant 50: "-- parents start pulling the kids out of public schools, Newark Public Schools, and put them in charter schools and let their child -- go to public schools and what the kids are not getting, we come out and protest and said we need that child to have, downtown will supply it, but we stay behind. We need to get out there and get behind that person because we need this. Where is the funding at. Newark -- got 100 million dollars, that should be in the school come 1st of September so we need to get out there and -- community—"

A Question of Accountability – A

Participant 52: "Exactly. We're building more prisons not more schools. We're building, we're pumping \$3,000,000 into every new charter school instead of taking that \$3,000,000 for every charter school, to improve our education system and keep the structure together. Let's be real about what we're looking at here. I'm not knocking charter schools but I'm saying what's real. If we didn't invest 3 billion dollars—3 million dollars every time a new charter school pops up, maybe we could take those schools and take that money and reinvest it into our schools and reaffirm the structure. We're not doing that. We're just saying hey, we're going to take Week Way and throw it outside with the garbage and put a different Week Way there and call it Week Way charter revival or something, I don't know."

Theme 4: The Need for Accurate Data on Charter Schools

Several respondents in two forums talked about the need for information on what is happening in charter schools that is based on accurate data. Below are representative comments on this theme, organized by the specific forums.

Public Education and Money – A

Participant 60: “I’m [background noise] based on opinions that are going to big on, not people’s opinions that think charter schools are better [background noise] not the actual data and there are, as Mr. [Name] said, there are good ones, there are bad ones in both [background noise] it’s just, again, there are concessions that we are to regret, concessions made be accurate, they may not be accurate but I want the—whatever happens based on the actual data.”

Models that Work – C

Participant 4: “Right. Not just a district wide it's like, some student might benefit more in the public school than the charter school. Some students might benefit more in the charter school. I'm saying you have to look at all possibilities and all opportunities for that student based on data and based on everyone analyzing that student and saying this student is going to go here by the time they're here. It should also be another education program would fit that student better.”

Models that Work – C

Participant 3: “Um, I think specifically about the sort of charter versus public point is that is well taken. Um, I was thinking about this as a barrier earlier. I think sort of the conflict that exists in sort of the charter versus the district model is a lot of misinformation that exists on both sides. And I think that's a real barrier to thinking about how you would look at each side to look for best practices. Misinformation about charter schools and misinformation about the district.”

Overall, only about 25% of Newark residents perceive the quality of charter schools to be fair or poor and between 35-48% say that charter schools have some moderate or major problems. These results must be tempered by the fact that 65% of these residents stated that they knew little or nothing about charter schools, compared to 35% reporting they knew little or nothing about traditional public schools. We deal at more length with the differing perceptions of traditional public schools and charter schools in the conclusion. Additionally, residents considered parents as having some influence on charter schools; however, at least a third of the residents did not know whether parents had an influence. Finally, in the forums residents mostly discussed charter schools with regard to what they can do differently from public schools, such as, selectivity in admissions and requiring more from teachers and parents. However, residents also raised concerns regarding these activities of charter schools. Most importantly, participants noted what they perceived as unfair advantages enjoyed by charter schools, which result in some of them having higher student achievement. These advantages include charter schools’ requirement for parental involvement and their ability to push low performing and/or students with behavioral problems out and back into the district schools. Once back, the district schools rather than the charter schools are accountable for their achievement.

Section 5: Reforming Schools in Newark

Aside from gaining an understanding of how residents perceive the quality of schools, both traditional public and charter, we also sought to understand the types of reform residents would like to see in schools. The long survey included various questions about reform: turnaround models, programs to improve or expand learning experiences desired for children, the qualities necessary for the next superintendent, etc. **Table 5.1** provides total responses to the question: “If you could improve three things about the traditional public and public charter schools in Newark, which of the following three programs would you choose?” The top three programs that residents recommend for improvement are: 1) after-school programs, 2) arts program, and 3) curriculum and instruction.

Table 5.1: Responses to Three Programs to Improve Traditional Public and Public Charter Schools (% Selected)

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Quality After-School	48.0	39.8	43.6	43.2	48.0	44.7
Access to Pre-School	16.2	16.3	16.3	13.6	16.0	15.7
Arts Programs	27.9	32.6	44.8	47.7	28.0	37.0
Athletic Programs	22.1	22.4	31.4	25.8	15.0	24.2
Health and Social Services	26.0	26.5	22.7	22.7	19.0	23.5
Effective Curriculum and Instruction	41.6	46.9	43.6	46.2	58.0	46.3
Support for Teacher	26.0	21.4	29.6	28.8	32.0	27.7
Support for Principals	11.7	7.1	12.2	6.1	13.0	10.2
Teacher Pay	14.3	9.2	19.2	22.7	9.0	15.7

Table 5.2 provides the percentage of agreement on the question: “To improve traditional public schools in Newark, the school district should....” Across the wards there appears to be consistency about which strategies should be used to improve public schools. The majority (above 50%) of respondents identified “increasing length of school day,” “replace half of teachers”, “giving principals more control” and “replace principals.” The latter two reform strategies had two-thirds to three-fourths of residents agreeing with the strategy, indicating that residents believe that school leadership is among the most important factors for improving schools.

With respect to the issue of opening more charter schools, and closing failing district schools and replacing them with charter schools, 63.3% of all respondents support the former, but they are almost equally split on the latter (50.3% in favor).

Table 5.2: Percentage of Agreement on Items to Improve Traditional Public Schools

	% Agree or strongly agree with strategy					
	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Increase the length of the school day.	63.0	51.3	51.9	56.7	71.2	58.2
Increase the length of the school year.	60.0	50.7	52.3	57.3	62.5	56.4
Close schools with low achievement.	41.6	30.7	45.7	55.0	39.7	43.5
Replace principals of low performing schools.	77.7	68.5	75.4	77.7	68.5	74.3
Replace half of the teachers at low performing schools.	64.9	59.7	67.7	66.7	59.2	64.4
Give good teachers additional pay.	70.3	56.9	73.4	71.0	69.9	69.2
Give principals more control of their schools.	86.6	72.2	80.3	85.6	85.1	82.4
Open more public charter schools.	62.5	58.0	69.4	62.2	60.6	63.3
Close traditional public schools with low achievement and replace them with public charter schools.	47.8	51.4	52.3	54.3	45.3	50.3

The same question was asked regarding charter schools and the more prevalent responses were slightly different. **Table 5.3** provides responses to question: “If my child or children in my family were attending a low-performing public charter school(s), I would support the district” When asked about the measures that they would support in the district’s efforts to address low-performing public charter schools, the highest percentage of respondents (over 40%) agreed with the following strategies: 1) replacing principals and teachers and 2) providing principals with more control of their schools. However, among the South and West Ward residents, more than 60% agreed with such strategies. Once again, residents indicate that they view school leadership as central to school improvement.

Table 5.3: Percentage of Agreement on Items to Improve Charter Schools

	% Agree or strongly agree with strategy					
	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Increase the length of the school day.	52.8	47.3	57.9	50.6	64.1	54.8
Increase the length of the school year.	52.2	41.1	47.2	51.3	56.2	49.8
Close schools with low achievement.	56.2	48.2	55.8	61.6	40.6	53.4

Replace principals of low performing schools.	78.3	61.4	69.3	75.7	64.5	70.6
Replace half of the teachers at low performing schools.	65.1	57.4	68.0	68.4	64.4	65.3
Give good teachers additional pay.	64.0	54.6	68.0	63.5	69.5	64.4
Give principals more control of their schools.	77.5	66.0	75.8	71.8	80.0	74.7
Open more public charter schools.	54.1	53.8	65.3	63.2	59.3	59.7
Close traditional public schools with low achievement and replace them with public charter schools.	59.0	50.0	56.4	54.7	53.2	55.2

Aside from reforming the organization of schools, residents were also asked about the types of learning outcomes schools should improve upon and attain. **Table 5.4** provides the percentage of agreement to the question: “To improve public education in Newark, schools should.” In nearly every item and across all the wards, over 70% of residents agree with the improvement strategies. However, for one strategy “decreasing testing,” there was not an overwhelming majority of respondents testing in agreement.

Table 5.4: Percentage of Agreement on Items to Improve Schools

	% Agree or strongly agree with strategy					
	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Teach students to think, ask questions, and to make decisions.	97.5	97.5	95.0	97.1	98.8	97.0
Teach life and social skills that extend outside of the classroom.	97.5	95.0	91.4	96.3	98.8	95.4
Focus on academic subjects and skills.	97.5	95.0	93.6	90.7	97.6	94.7
Provide safe and orderly schools.	96.6	97.5	94.2	95.4	100.0	96.4
Welcome parents who ask questions about their children’s education.	93.2	95.0	96.4	98.1	98.8	96.2
Decrease testing.	57.4	46.0	58.8	62.3	60.8	57.6
Conduct home-visits to share important information with parents.	84.5	66.7	85.3	82.9	84.0	81.7
Increase supports that help students be successful in school.	94.1	93.7	96.3	93.5	97.6	95.0
Provide school facilities that have science labs and technology.	94.9	92.4	91.4	92.6	97.6	93.5
Focus on meeting state and district test goals.	79.5	85.7	82.4	80.2	86.2	82.4
Give teachers training that meet their individual needs.	94.1	90.9	91.9	95.3	100.0	94.2
Prepare all children to go to college.	91.4	92.3	91.2	93.5	90.0	91.7
Prepare children to go to work and	95.8	97.4	96.3	94.3	97.5	96.1

to college after high school.						
Provide more discipline and order.	94.0	94.9	96.3	91.4	98.7	94.9
Provide more arts (e.g., music, drama, writing, etc.)	97.4	96.0	93.4	93.3	95.1	95.0

As stated in the introduction, issues of educational quality have taken center stage across the country as well as in Newark. We sought, therefore, to understand how residents perceive specific educational reform efforts. **Table 5.5** provides responses to the question: “How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement.” This section asks questions about educational issues that people in Newark often disagree about. The top three educational issues upon which over half of respondents across each ward agreed included: return control of Newark Public Schools to the city, allow control of the district by an elected school board, and require the Superintendent to hold an appropriate school administrator license from NJ or elsewhere. With respect to the return of local control, resident responses directly disagree with Governor Christie’s statement on May 4th that “he will absolutely not support returning Newark’s schools to local control by its school board or mayor”

(http://www.nj.com/news/index.ssf/2011/05/gov_christie_appoints_ex-nyc_s.html)

With respect to the issue of publicly funded vouchers or scholarships for private schools (“Children in traditional Newark public schools or public charter schools with consistently low test scores should be able to get public funds to attend private or religious schools”), 60.6% of all residents who answered the question either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. However, given the large number of non-responses to the question, these findings may be significantly skewed, especially since the data for all the respondents, including non-residents, indicate a significantly lower percentage in favor (46%, which is more consistent with other national, state, and local surveys). Given the continuing debates about the scholarship bill currently under consideration in the state legislature, these data at the very least suggest that Newark residents view it as an option for consideration.

Table 5.5. Percentage of Agreement on Reform Options

	% Agree or strongly agree with strategy					
	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
The state of NJ should give back control of the Newark Public Schools to Newark.	87.4	82.6	79.6	88.3	82.4	84.1
Newark Public Schools should be run by an elected school board.	81.6	79.4	79.0	83.7	82.2	81.1
Newark Public Schools should be run by a school board appointed by the Mayor.	39.0	47.7	57.1	40.4	33.8	44.4
Newark Public Schools should be run by the Mayor without a school board.	31.6	32.8	45.7	24.2	27.7	33.3
Children in traditional Newark public schools or public charter	62.8	50.0	69.0	63.3	50.7	60.6

schools with consistently low test scores should be able to get public funds to attend private or religious schools.						
License as a school administrator in New Jersey or another state in order to be Superintendent.	83.5	78.7	81.3	77.1	76.4	79.8

Another area of conversation in Newark is the selection and qualification of the next Superintendent. **Table 5.6** provides total responses to the question “Which three qualities are most important for the next Superintendent of the Newark Public Schools to have.” Respondents across all wards consistently identified three specific qualities as most important to the next Superintendent: works well with parents and community; strong academic leader; and knowledge of education in Newark.

Table 5.6: Percentages of Three Most Important Qualities for Next Superintendent

	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
Clear vision.	26.6	27.6	29.1	22.7	22.0	25.9
Works well with parents and community.	27.9	41.8	41.9	42.4	36.0	37.8
Effective manager.	24.7	24.5	25.0	22.0	23.0	23.9
Strong academic leader.	33.8	39.8	45.4	45.4	48.0	42.2
Visits schools regularly.	24.7	27.6	29.6	25.0	22.0	26.1
Understanding of different groups and cultures.	19.5	25.5	26.2	23.5	23.0	23.5
Knowledge of education.	22.1	18.4	30.2	31.8	21.0	25.5
Knowledge of education in Newark.	35.1	29.6	35.5	46.2	41.0	37.5
Knowledge of non-education related issues in Newark.	12.3	10.2	12.8	10.6	11.0	11.6

Overall, residents are supportive of various reforms across all schools and wards. More specifically, residents are interested in increasing the number of effective after-school and arts programs, as well as curriculum and instruction. Additionally, residents are supportive of reforms such as: replacing principals, giving principals more control, and replacing teachers. Simultaneously, residents are interested in specific learning outcomes, such as teaching students to think and ask questions, teaching life and social skills, preparing all children to go to college, and providing more discipline and order. And finally, residents perceive the next Superintendent as someone who should be an academic leader, knowledgeable of Newark education, and able to work well with parents and community.

Conclusion

Overall, the community survey and forum data illuminate several salient themes regarding community perceptions of the quality of public education in Newark. First, **the community's perspective on education in Newark is expansive but at times limited**. In other words, Newark community members have opinions on numerous aspects of the educational process; there were very few items in which residents did not have an opinion. For example, community members maintained definitive and negative opinions about traditional public schools; however one area where residents were less clear was with respect to charter schools, where slightly less than half of residents had clear opinions, while another third of residents did not have an opinion or did not know enough about the issue.

Another salient theme is the thoughtfulness of the comments made at the community forums. **The inclusion of the community forum data provided greater understanding of the long-survey data**. For example, the long survey identified some areas that are often documented as areas of disagreement about charter schools; the community forums highlighted a number of these areas of concern specifically: admissions and selectivity, requiring more from parents, and reduction of funds from public schools. The community forums demonstrated the complexity behind the residents' concerns regarding the reform of public education in Newark.

A consistent finding from all three data sources is the level of **agreement among residents that there is a problem in public education**, particularly in traditional public schools. The problems identified include the distribution of resources and quality programs; the availability of quality teachers and leaders and caring school environments; and violence in the schools. Residents also had clear opinions about many of the types of reforms they would like to see in their schools. In some cases, however there was disagreement. For example, a majority of residents supported an increase in the number of charter schools; however, residents were equally divided about closing district public schools and replacing them with charter schools.

Additionally, residents expressed a desire for improving programming such as arts and after-school programs, along with effective and quality curriculum. Another area in which residents demonstrated agreement was in the top three qualities for their next superintendent, which included: works well with parents and community, academic leader, and is knowledgeable about education in Newark. Thus, residents' opinions on reforms are relatively uniform regarding the areas in which they would like to see reform, as well as the strategies by which they would like to see such reforms occur. For example, on almost all questions about how to improve schools in Newark, between 81 and 97% of residents agreed or strongly agreed with each of the specific strategies. The question where there was the least agreement was with respect to closing traditional public schools and replacing them with public charter schools, where residents were equally divided this strategy.

In sum, the responses residents provided in this community feedback process demonstrate there is concern about the quality of education in Newark public schools. Additionally, there is a desire for educational reform, specifically in the areas of effective teachers and leaders, quality curriculum,

attention to the social needs of the Newark community, and leadership that interacts with the community and understands the educational needs of Newark.

The areas that have attracted considerable attention in the recent debates in Newark are school closings, and charter schools. Newark residents are split on the issue of school closings and a majority support more charter schools. This may be viewed by policymakers as supporting the reform policies currently being implemented in Newark or supported by the Governor and Mayor. However, given the limitations of the data outlined above, we are extremely cautious about using these data by themselves to support any particular reform. These data also indicate that, while most residents believe there are significant educational problems in Newark, there is not uniform agreement as to their solutions. For example, while a significant majority of residents agree about general strategies for improving schools, there was more variation for questions specific to either public charter or traditional public schools.

Our research suggests the need for more extensive research on community perceptions and beliefs, with a particular emphasis on residents with children in Newark schools. This research might include the types of surveys conducted biannually by the Consortium on Chicago School Research of teachers, administrators, and students in the Chicago Public Schools and an additional survey of parents. Such surveys will provide comprehensive and longitudinal data on stakeholder perceptions of public education in Newark.

Taken as a whole, our findings indicate that, although there is a great deal of agreement that public education in Newark needs significant improvement, it is less clear that there is consensus about how to improve it. Given these results and the ongoing contentiousness surrounding educational reform in Newark, we believe it is incumbent on all policymakers and stakeholders, including the Governor, Acting Commissioner of Education, Mayor, Advisory Board, new state superintendent, community leaders, parents, teachers, administrators and students, to work to reduce the conflicts and heated rhetoric and to seek more civil discourse on educational reforms. In that process, community input needs to be considered carefully and combined with best practices research to form the basis for meaningful educational policies in Newark. We hope that this report will make a positive contribution, although for reasons we have explained throughout it should be considered merely a starting point for meaningful community engagement and participation.

Appendices

Appendix A & C are attached as PDF files.

Appendix B

List of Community Forums

2010 – 2011

PENewark		Lead: Eddie Fergus			
Date Rec'd	Item Title	Transcriber	Completed	Warehoused	# of Pages
11/9	Community Forum - Youth speak -A	KW	1/22	2/1	26
11/9	Community Forum - Youth speak -B	KW	1/24	2/1	25
11/13	Community Forum - A	KW	1/21	2/1	40
11/13	Community Forum - B	DW	1/20	2/1	34
11/13	Community Forum - C	SM	1/23	2/1	35
11/13	Community Forum - D	SM	1/24	2/1	37
11/18	CF Questions of Accountability	SM	1/25	2/1	37
11/18	CF Questions of Accountability - B	TM	1/18	2/1	25
11/18	CF Questions of Accountability - C	LW	1/24	2/1	21
11/18	CF Questions of Accountability Forum A	LW	1/24	2/1	25
11/18	CF Questions of Accountability - D	CM	1/19	2/1	28
11/18	CF Newark Pride Alliance	TM	1/24	2/1	6
11/22	CF South Region Parents Council - A	TM	1/24	2/1	3
11/22	CF South Region Parents Council - B	TM	1/25	2/1	3
11/22	CF South Region Parents Council - C	TM	1/25	2/1	2
11/22	CF South Region Parents Council - D	TM	1/25	2/1	2
11/22	CF South Region Parents Council - E	TM	1/25	2/1	2
11/22	CF South Region Parents Council - F	TM	1/25	2/1	2
11/22	CF South Region Parents Council - G	TM	1/25	2/1	2
11/22	CF South Region Parents Council - H	TM	1/25	2/1	2
11/23	CF Social Services in Education - A	RK	1/19	2/1	24
11/23	CF Social Services in Education - B	RK	1/20	2/1	21
11/27	CF Teacher & Administrator Effectiveness - A	MS	1/26	2/1	28
11/27	CF Teacher & Administrator Effectiveness - B	MS	1/26	2/1	27
12/7	CF Special Needs Education - A	RK	1/21	2/1	36
12/7	CF Special Needs Education - B	RK	1/24	2/1	31
12/9	CF Educators Speak - A	RK	1/25	2/1	17

12/9	CF Educators Speak - B	RK	1/25	2/1	28
12/9	CF Educators Speak - C	CJ	1/23	2/1	43
12/9	CF Educators Speak - D	RK	1/25	2/1	38
12/14	CF Models that work in Public Edu - A	LW	1/19	2/1	21
12/14	CF Models that work in Public Edu - B	LZ	1/19	2/1	33
12/14	CF Models that work in Public Edu - C	LZ	1/19	2/1	27
12/14	CF Models that work in Public Edu - D	LZ	1/19	2/1	6
12/15	Mini Forum - NJCRI Project WOW	KW	1/24	2/1	33
	MF Center for Collaborative Change - B	KW	1/24	2/1	2
	MF Off. of Visual and Performing Arts - A	KW	1/24	2/1	1
12/15	CF Center for Collaborative Change - A	TM	1/25	2/1	2
12/16	Office of Visual and Performing Arts - B	KW	1/24	2/1	1
12/16	MF Office of Visual & Performing Arts - C	KW	1/24	2/1	1
12/16	MF Office of Visual & Performing Arts - D	KW	1/24	2/1	1
12/16	MF Cry Out Ink - A	KW	1/24	2/1	5
12/16	MF Cry Out Ink - B	KW	1/24	2/1	6
12/16	MF Cry Out Ink - C	KW	1/24	2/1	2
12/16	MR Cry Out Ink - D	KW	1/24	2/1	3
12/17	MF Newark Charter School fund - A	KW	1/24	2/1	1
12/17	MF Newark Charter School fund - B	KW	1/24	2/1	1
12/18	MF GEM Project - Year	KW	1/24	2/1	20
12/18	CF Public Education and Money - A	RK	1/25	2/1	44
12/18	CF Public Education and Money - B	KB	1/22	2/1	44
12/20	MF Tegnane Jeffries Home	KW	1/24	2/1	36
12/20	CF Arts Culture - A	LZ	1/19	2/1	21
12/20	Community Forum Arts Culture - B	LZ	1/19	2/1	32
12/20	CF Arts , Culture & Academic Achievement C	MW	1/25	2/1	36
12/20	CF Arts , Culture & Academic Achievement D	KW	1/19	2/1	28
12/21	CF Families and Schools B	KB	1/20	2/1	38
12/21	CF Families and Schools B	KB	1/20	2/1	28
12/21	CF Families and Schools C	KB	1/20	2/1	28
12/21	CF Families and Schools D	KB	1/20	2/1	28
12/21	CF Families and Schools E1	KB	1/20	2/1	9
12/21	CF Families and Schools E2	KB	1/20	2/1	7
12/22	MF African Roots & Education	KW	1/24	2/1	20
28-	CF Aids Resource Foundation	TH	1/21	2/1	27

Dec					
	Unidentified	TH	1/24	2/1	40
					1282

Appendix E

Short -Form Survey Results

	Not at All	Very Little	Good Amount	Great Deal
Local public schools encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas on what it takes to improve public education	7.18%	28.12%	32.31%	32.40%
How much influence do parents, caregivers, and community members have over public education?	6.25%	36.69%	32.79%	24.28%

Local public schools encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas on what it takes to improve public education, by Race				
	Not at All	Very Little	Good Amount	Great Deal
Not Specified	8.89%	31.50%	32.04%	27.57%
Asian	6.82%	31.82%	30.68%	30.68%
Black	6.07%	26.43%	31.25%	36.24%
Hispanic	8.62%	28.87%	36.20%	26.31%
Other	6.19%	32.47%	34.54%	26.80%
White	8.61%	29.97%	33.53%	27.89%
Total	7.18%	28.12%	32.31%	32.40%

Local public schools encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas on what it takes to improve public education, by Ward				
	Not at All	Very Little	Good Amount	Great Deal
Not Specified	5.97%	28.38%	32.60%	33.04%
Central	7.95%	24.23%	31.44%	36.37%
East	10.04%	26.18%	36.91%	26.87%
North	6.99%	35.31%	31.58%	26.12%
South	8.07%	25.06%	31.74%	35.14%
West	6.11%	24.02%	31.88%	37.99%
Total	7.18%	28.12%	32.31%	32.40%

How much influence do parents, caregivers, and community members have over public education, by Race				
	Not at All	Very Little	Good Amount	Great Deal
Not Specified	7.00%	38.48%	31.51%	23.01%
Asian	12.50%	18.18%	38.64%	30.68%
Black	5.48%	36.09%	33.03%	25.41%
Hispanic	7.81%	36.71%	33.51%	21.97%
Other	4.12%	39.18%	35.57%	21.13%
White	7.21%	36.91%	32.06%	23.82%
Total	6.25%	36.69%	32.79%	24.28%

How much influence do parents, caregivers, and community members have over public education, by Ward				
	Not at All	Very Little	Good Amount	Great Deal
Not Specified	5.48%	36.00%	33.11%	25.42%

Central	7.55%	32.44%	34.79%	25.22%
East	8.82%	34.39%	33.12%	23.67%
North	5.63%	42.52%	31.21%	20.64%
South	6.33%	36.85%	31.68%	25.15%
West	5.73%	33.40%	34.01%	26.86%
Total	6.25%	36.69%	32.79%	24.28%

	Agree	Disagree
I know how well schools in their neighborhoods are performing	51.94%	48.06%

I know how well schools in their neighborhoods are performing, by Race		
	Disagree	Agree
Not Specified	44.25%	55.75%
Asian	51.14%	48.86%
Black	49.75%	50.25%
Hispanic	47.34%	52.66%
Other	52.74%	47.26%
White	44.70%	55.30%
Total	48.06%	51.94%

I know how well schools in their neighborhoods are performing, by Ward		
	Disagree	Agree
Not Specified	50.18%	49.82%
Central	47.76%	52.24%
East	43.38%	56.62%
North	47.14%	52.86%
South	47.07%	52.93%
West	50.19%	49.81%
Total	48.06%	51.94%

	Not Doing Well	Somewhat Well	Well	Very Well	Outstanding
How well do you think the schools are performing in your neighborhood?	24.18%	33.77%	22.08%	14.02%	5.94%

How well do you think the schools are performing in your neighborhood, by Race					
	Not Doing Well	Somewhat Well	Well	Very Well	Outstanding
Not Specified	24.58%	32.44%	22.14%	14.89%	5.95%
Asian	28.75%	33.75%	17.50%	13.75%	6.25%
Black	24.83%	35.28%	21.03%	13.02%	5.85%
Hispanic	21.41%	30.70%	25.41%	16.45%	6.04%
Other	27.49%	33.33%	25.15%	7.60%	6.43%
White	21.94%	30.65%	24.12%	16.25%	7.04%
Total	24.18%	33.77%	22.08%	14.02%	5.94%

How well do you think the schools are performing in your neighborhood, by Ward
--

	Not Doing Well	Somewhat Well	Well	Very Well	Outstanding
Not Specified	25.16%	34.13%	22.47%	12.81%	5.43%
Central	24.43%	33.09%	20.81%	14.26%	7.42%
East	20.39%	28.45%	24.25%	19.41%	7.50%
North	22.78%	35.87%	22.19%	14.32%	4.84%
South	27.37%	33.69%	21.05%	12.61%	5.28%
West	21.76%	33.25%	22.78%	14.76%	7.46%
Total	24.18%	33.77%	22.08%	14.02%	5.94%

Source of Information	
TV	46.13%
Printed Newspapers	17.13%
Radio	11.37%
Community Organizations	21.07%
Internet	26.91%
Elected Officials	5.84%
Family and Friends	37.24%
Other	5.39%

Source of Information, by Ward							
	Not Specified	Central	East	North	South	West	Total
TV	47.63%	44.85%	43.86%	45.31%	47.39%	45.67%	46.13%
Printed Newspapers	20.32%	15.47%	13.14%	13.86%	19.57%	18.32%	17.13%
Radio	12.62%	13.44%	7.48%	8.64%	12.67%	12.65%	11.37%
Community Organizations	25.69%	20.94%	15.27%	16.83%	20.63%	24.81%	21.07%
Internet	32.72%	23.53%	26.58%	25.62%	22.22%	27.80%	26.91%
Elected Officials	6.91%	6.35%	3.22%	4.59%	6.35%	6.44%	5.84%
Family and Friends	40.10%	37.15%	42.40%	34.61%	33.99%	38.23%	37.24%
Other	6.73%	7.03%	3.83%	4.01%	5.21%	4.26%	5.39%

Source of Information, by Race							
	Not Specified	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Other	White	Total
TV	45.99%	32.26%	46.46%	45.74%	42.38%	45.76%	46.13%
Printed Newspapers	17.55%	21.51%	17.96%	11.71%	23.81%	22.67%	17.13%
Radio	10.66%	9.68%	12.30%	8.49%	17.14%	11.82%	11.37%
Community Organizations	20.80%	22.58%	22.79%	15.18%	27.62%	17.52%	21.07%
Internet	25.90%	27.96%	25.98%	30.16%	35.71%	32.96%	26.91%
Elected Officials	6.05%	5.38%	6.06%	3.93%	11.90%	7.65%	5.84%
Family and Friends	37.22%	37.63%	35.99%	42.27%	37.62%	36.02%	37.24%
Other	5.48%	7.53%	5.28%	5.47%	6.19%	5.70%	5.39%

Appendix F

Long -Form Survey Results

Table 6.1: Percentage of Respondent Age

Age	Percent	Count
Over 18	92.91%	969
Not over 18	0.96%	10
Missing	6.14%	64
TOTAL	100.00%	1043

Table 6.2: Percentage of Respondents Living and/or Working in Newark

Living and Working	Percent	Count
I live in Newark and work in Newark	30.20%	315
I live in Newark and do not work in Newark	29.24%	305
I do not live in Newark and work in Newark	22.63%	236
I do not live in Newark and do not work in Newark	5.85%	61
Missing	12.08%	126
TOTAL	100.00%	1043

Table 6.3: Percentage of Respondents Living in Newark, by Ward

Living	Percent	Count
Central Ward	14.77%	154
East Ward	9.40%	98
North Ward	16.49%	172
South Ward	12.66%	132
West Ward	9.59%	100
Not Applicable	1.25%	13
Missing	35.86%	374
TOTAL	100.00%	1043

Table 6.4: Percentage of Respondents Working in Newark, by Ward

Working	Percent	Count
Central Ward	22.15%	231
East Ward	5.66%	59
North Ward	8.82%	92
South Ward	7.29%	76
West Ward	6.33%	66
Not Applicable	8.82%	92
Missing	40.94%	427
TOTAL	100.00%	1043

Table 6.5: Percentage of Respondents Know about Traditional Public Schools

How much do you know about the TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS in Newark?		
Nothing at all	7.57%	79
A little	21.09%	220
Some	31.54%	329
A lot	26.17%	273
Missing	13.61%	142
TOTAL	100.00%	1043

Table 6.6: Percentage of Respondents' Description of the Quality of Traditional Public Schools

Based on what you know, how would you describe the quality of traditional public schools in Newark?		
Poor	43.14%	450
Fair	28.19%	294
Good	7.00%	73
Excellent	1.15%	12
Don't Know	0.48%	5
Missing	20.04%	209
TOTAL	100%	1043

Table 6.7: Percentage of Respondents’ Perception of Problems in Traditional Public Schools

Please indicate whether you consider each a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for traditional public schools in Newark.												
	Missing		Not a problem		Minor problem		Moderate problem		Major problem		Don’t know enough about issue	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Violence and student safety in and around schools	25.22%	263	1.15%	12	2.88%	30	13.90%	145	54.94%	573	1.92%	20
Availability of resources (e.g., textbooks, computers, etc.)	25.98%	271	2.68%	28	7.57%	79	20.33%	212	38.06%	397	5.37%	56
Quality of school buildings	26.08%	272	3.16%	33	8.53%	89	22.15%	231	35.57%	371	4.51%	47
Amount of funding for schools	26.27%	274	6.14%	64	6.42%	67	14.96%	156	41.04%	428	5.18%	54
Parent involvement	26.46%	276	2.40%	25	4.70%	49	15.53%	162	46.79%	488	4.12%	43
Treatment of parents and students by schools	26.37%	275	4.99%	52	11.98%	125	20.90%	218	27.80%	290	7.96%	83
Quality of school administrators (e.g., principals)	26.37%	275	4.12%	43	10.93%	114	20.61%	215	30.49%	318	7.48%	78
Experience of teachers	26.94%	281	6.04%	63	14.67%	153	22.72%	237	22.91%	239	6.71%	70
Quality of teachers	26.94%	281	4.70%	49	10.35%	108	21.09%	220	31.74%	331	5.18%	54
Quality of curriculum and classroom lessons	27.61%	288	3.55%	37	9.20%	96	19.18%	200	34.23%	357	6.23%	65
Quality of instruction for students who speak English as a Second Language.	27.23%	284	4.12%	43	9.01%	94	16.87%	176	26.27%	274	16.49%	172

Quality of Classroom Instruction	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	
Quality of special education services	27.23%	284	3.74%	39	7.29%	76	15.34%	160	32.50%	339	13.90%	145
Removal of ineffective teachers	26.65%	278	4.31%	45	7.96%	83	14.96%	156	38.16%	398	7.96%	83
Teacher expectations for students	27.52%	287	4.99%	52	8.15%	85	18.02%	188	35.67%	372	5.66%	59
Student Enrollment Policies	28.28%	295	5.66%	59	11.51%	120	14.57%	152	23.59%	246	16.40%	171
Admissions process (e.g., testing admissions, lottery system)	28.09%	293	6.62%	69	11.03%	115	14.00%	146	24.93%	260	15.34%	160
Removal or transfer of low-performing students	28.09%	293	5.27%	55	8.82%	92	14.48%	151	28.95%	302	14.38%	150
Loss or transfer of high-performing students	28.86%	301	4.89%	51	7.48%	78	14.77%	154	30.87%	322	13.14%	137
Removal or transfer of students with behavior problems	28.86%	301	3.84%	40	5.37%	56	14.19%	148	35.28%	368	12.46%	130
Dropout rates	28.19%	294	1.73%	18	2.78%	29	7.38%	77	54.36%	567	5.56%	58
High school graduation rate	27.71%	289	1.73%	18	3.36%	35	8.34%	87	53.88%	562	4.99%	52
Number of Newark students who graduate from high school without the skills needed for entry-level jobs	27.71%	289	1.63%	17	2.97%	31	9.20%	96	53.40%	557	5.08%	53
Class size	29.34%	306	4.41%	46	8.34%	87	14.77%	154	36.15%	377	7.00%	73
Number of Newark students going to college after high	27.90%	291	2.11%	22	3.93%	41	10.83%	113	50.34%	525	4.89%	51

school												
Quality of services for immigrant students	27.52%	287	3.55%	37	7.48%	78	14.38%	150	25.98%	271	21.09%	220

Table 6.8: Percentage of Respondents' Perception of Schools Encouraging Parents to Participate

How much do traditional public schools in Newark encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas?		
	Percent	Count
Not at all	9.68%	101
A little	25.89%	270
Some	21.09%	220
A lot	9.88%	103
Don't know	10.07%	105
Missing	23.39%	244
TOTAL	100.00%	1043

Table 6.9: Percentage of Respondents' Perception of Parents Influence on Public Schools

How much influence do parents, caregivers, and community members have over education in Newark's traditional public schools?		
	Percent	Count
Not at all	11.31%	118
A little	30.39%	317
Some	17.55%	183
A lot	10.07%	105
Don't know	7.57%	79
Missing	23.11%	241
TOTAL	100.00%	1043

Table 6.10: Percentage of Respondents' Perceptions of Public School Quality

How much do you Agree or Disagree with the following statement? Only check one box for each statement listed below.												
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Don't Know Enough About Issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
The quality of the traditional public schools is different in different neighborhoods in Newark.	29.82%	311	31.93%	333	4.31%	45	2.01%	21	7.86%	82	24.07%	251
In order to make public education in Newark better, schools with the greatest need should get more money and resources.	23.30%	243	30.01%	313	12.66%	132	4.41%	46	4.99%	52	24.64%	257
Teachers should be paid more to work in low-performing schools.	14.00%	146	24.93%	260	21.96%	229	7.86%	82	6.04%	63	25.22%	263

Table 6.11: Percentage of Respondents' Perceptions of Ward with Most Low-Performing Schools

Which ward of Newark do you think has the most lower-performing traditional public schools?	Percent	Count
Central Ward	13.33%	139
East Ward	6.62%	69
North Ward	9.11%	95
South Ward	23.87%	249
West Ward	12.56%	131
Missing	34.52%	360
Total	100.00%	1043

Table 6.12: Percentage of Respondents' Perceptions of Groups Receiving Highest Quality Education in Newark

In your view, how many of the students in each of these groups in Newark receive a high quality education?												
	None		Only a few		Some		Most		Don't know enough about the issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Latino students	2.78%	29	17.83%	186	30.58%	319	7.67%	80	17.55%	183	23.59%	246
Portuguese students	2.68%	28	12.56%	131	24.45%	255	16.78%	175	20.04%	209	23.49%	245
Brazilian students	3.36%	35	14.09%	147	24.64%	257	12.37%	129	21.76%	227	23.78%	248
White students	3.36%	35	7.57%	79	15.34%	160	32.79%	342	18.02%	188	22.91%	239
African American students	4.99%	52	25.79%	269	23.30%	243	5.85%	61	15.34%	160	24.74%	258
African students	4.22%	44	19.65%	205	25.02%	261	8.44%	88	18.60%	194	24.07%	251
Afro-Caribbean students (e.g., Haitian, Jamaican, Trinidadian)	4.31%	45	21.38%	223	23.97%	250	6.33%	66	19.27%	201	24.74%	258
American Indian students	4.22%	44	13.81%	144	19.65%	205	9.68%	101	28.57%	298	24.07%	251

Asian/Indian students	4.03%	42	10.74%	112	17.16%	179	18.98%	198	24.35%	254	24.74%	258
Other	0.00%		0.10%	1	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		99.90%	1042
English as a Second Language students	4.60%	48	22.63%	236	20.42%	213	6.90%	72	21.38%	223	24.07%	251
Special education students	7.67%	80	25.31%	264	16.78%	175	4.79%	50	20.90%	218	24.54%	256

Table 6.12: Percentages of Respondents' Perceptions of Three Groups Receiving Highest Quality Education in Newark

In Newark, which three groups of students receives the HIGHEST quality education? Only check boxes for 3 groups of students		
	Percent	Count
Latino students	21.67%	226
Portuguese students	32.21%	336
Brazilian students	15.24%	159
White students	50.14%	523
African American students	15.44%	161
Afro-Caribbean students (e.g., Haitian, Jamaican, Trinidadian)	6.90%	72
African students	10.83%	113
American Indian students	7.67%	80
Asian/Indian students	25.98%	271
Other	0.00%	0
English as a Second Language students	6.23%	65
Special education students	6.04%	63

Table 6.13: Percentages of Respondents' Perceptions of Three Groups Receiving Lowest Quality Education in Newark

In Newark, which three groups of students receives the LOWEST quality education? Only check boxes for 3 groups of students		
	Percent	Count
Latino students	32.50%	339
Portuguese students	6.04%	63
Brazilian students	6.81%	71

White students	3.64%	38
African American students	50.43%	526
Afro-Caribbean students (Haitian, Jamaican, Trinidadian)	22.15%	231
African students	18.98%	198
American Indian students	5.08%	53
Asian/Indian students	2.59%	27
Other students	0.00%	0
English as a Second Language students	22.72%	237
Special education students	33.94%	354

Table 6.14: Percentages of Respondents’ Knowledge about Charter Schools

How much do you know about the public charter schools in Newark?		
	Percent	Count
Nothing at all	25.31%	264
A little	23.20%	242
Some	18.60%	194
A lot	12.56%	131
Missing	20.33%	212

Table 6.15: Percentages of Respondents’ Description of Charter Schools’ Quality

Based on what you know, how would you describe the quality of public charter schools in Newark?		
	Percent	Count
Excellent	9.78%	102
Good	25.31%	264

Fair	15.82%	165
Poor	3.84%	40
Don't Know	24.83%	259
Missing	20.42%	213

Table 6.16: Percentages of Respondents' Sources of Information regarding Charter Schools

Where do you learn about public charter schools issues? (check all that apply)		
	Percent	Count
Television	20.52%	214
Magazines and Newspapers	22.15%	231
Radio	7.96%	83
Community Organizations	23.97%	250
Internet	21.19%	221
Elected Officials	13.23%	138
Educators	26.85%	280
Family and Friends	39.02%	407

Table 6.17: Percentages of Respondents’ Perceptions of Problems in Charter Schools

Please indicate whether you consider each a major problem, moderate problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for public charter schools in Newark. Only check one box for each problem listed below.												
	Not a Problem		Minor Problem		Moderate Problem		Major Problem		Don’t Know Enough about Issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Violence and student safety in and around schools	11.41%	119	16.78%	175	9.01%	94	9.88%	103	4.99%	52	47.94%	500
Availability of resources (e.g., textbooks, computers, etc.)	13.14%	137	15.05%	157	11.41%	119	7.29%	76	4.51%	47	48.61%	507
Quality of school buildings	11.51%	120	14.57%	152	11.89%	124	8.25%	86	5.27%	55	48.51%	506
Amount of funding for schools	12.66%	132	12.46%	130	12.18%	127	9.68%	101	4.51%	47	48.51%	506
Parent involvement	16.59%	173	14.29%	149	7.86%	82	8.63%	90	4.22%	44	48.42%	505
Treatment of parents and students by schools	18.60%	194	13.61%	142	7.29%	76	6.23%	65	5.18%	54	49.09%	512
Quality of school administrators (e.g., principals)	17.26%	180	11.98%	125	9.40%	98	6.33%	66	6.14%	64	48.90%	510
Experience of teachers	15.63%	163	13.42%	140	9.20%	96	6.90%	72	6.14%	64	48.71%	508
Quality of teachers	16.87%	176	12.56%	131	8.82%	92	6.33%	66	6.23%	65	49.19%	513

Quality of curriculum and classroom lessons	17.93%	187	12.66%	132	8.25%	86	6.62%	69	6.52%	68	48.03%	501
Quality of instruction for students who speak English as a Second Language	10.74%	112	10.26%	107	7.09%	74	9.40%	98	14.29%	149	48.23%	503
Quality of instruction	0.00%		0.00%		0.10%	1	0.00%		0.00%		99.90%	1042
Quality of special education services	10.74%	112	9.49%	99	9.30%	97	10.07%	105	12.18%	127	48.23%	503
Removal of ineffective teachers	17.16%	179	10.55%	110	7.38%	77	6.52%	68	10.16%	106	48.23%	503
Teacher expectations for students	19.85%	207	10.93%	114	7.96%	83	6.14%	64	6.33%	66	48.80%	509
Student enrollment policies	15.05%	157	10.45%	109	8.63%	90	9.01%	94	8.34%	87	48.51%	506
Admissions process (e.g., testing admissions, lottery system)	13.04%	136	10.74%	112	9.68%	101	10.64%	111	7.09%	74	48.80%	509
Removal or transfer of low-performing students	13.90%	145	10.07%	105	8.82%	92	8.63%	90	9.97%	104	48.61%	507
Loss or transfer of high-performing students	17.93%	187	10.83%	113	5.85%	61	6.52%	68	10.35%	108	48.51%	506
Removal or transfer of students with behavior	13.52%	141	11.03%	115	7.00%	73	9.68%	101	10.07%	105	48.71%	508

problems												
Dropout rates	14.67%	153	11.70%	122	6.23%	65	9.78%	102	8.92%	93	48.71%	508
High school graduation rate	17.26%	180	11.03%	115	5.47%	57	9.30%	97	8.34%	87	48.61%	507
Number of Newark students graduating from high school without the skills for entry-level jobs	14.29%	149	12.18%	127	6.23%	65	10.16%	106	8.34%	87	48.80%	509
Class size	16.49%	172	12.27%	128	8.05%	84	7.19%	75	6.62%	69	49.38%	515
Number of Newark students going to college after high school	15.63%	163	12.66%	132	5.85%	61	8.82%	92	8.72%	91	48.32%	504
Quality of services for immigrant students	10.64%	111	8.72%	91	7.29%	76	8.25%	86	16.40%	171	48.71%	508

Table 6.18: Percentages of Respondents’ Perceptions of Charter Schools Encouraging Parent Participation

How much do public charter schools in Newark encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas?		
	Percent	Count
Not at all	3.36%	35
A little	9.68%	101
Some	17.93%	187
A lot	17.74%	185
Don’t know	0.10%	1
Missing	51.20%	534

Table 6.19: Percentage of Respondents’ Perceptions of Parents’ Influence on Charter Schools

How much influence do parents, caregivers, and community members have over education in Newark’s public charter schools?		
	Percent	Count
None	3.26%	34
A little	8.25%	86
Some	15.05%	157
A lot	23.97%	250
Don’t know	0.10%	1
Missing	49.38%	515

Table 6.20: Percentage of Respondents’ Knowledge about School Improvement Models

How much have you heard about the school improvement models that are being used to make the lowest performing traditional public schools in Newark better?		
	Percent	Count
Nothing at all	16.59%	173

A little	17.16%	179
Some	17.93%	187
A lot	10.45%	109
Don't know	0.00%	0
Missing	37.87%	395

6.21: Percentage of Respondents' Perception of School Improvement Ideas for Public Schools

To improve traditional public schools in Newark, the school district should...										
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Increase the length of the school day.	18.31%	191	22.05%	230	18.31%	191	8.92%	93	32.41%	338
Increase the length of the school year.	16.11%	168	22.63%	236	19.46%	203	8.72%	91	33.08%	345
Close schools with low achievement.	11.98%	125	16.78%	175	25.41%	265	10.93%	114	34.90%	364
Replace principals of low performing schools.	21.48%	224	27.90%	291	12.56%	131	3.74%	39	34.32%	358
Replace half of the teachers at low performing schools.	16.59%	173	23.30%	243	18.98%	198	5.27%	55	35.86%	374
Give good teachers additional pay.	16.78%	175	28.48%	297	13.81%	144	5.08%	53	35.86%	374
Give principals more control of their schools.	21.19%	221	32.31%	337	8.82%	92	2.49%	26	35.19%	367
Open more public charter schools.	15.34%	160	22.53%	235	14.96%	156	9.40%	98	37.78%	394
Close traditional public schools with low achievement and replace them with public charter schools.	12.18%	127	19.08%	199	16.68%	174	14.48%	151	37.58%	392

6.22: Percentage of Respondents' Perception of Improvements for Public Schools

If my child or children in my family were attending a low-performing TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOL(s) I would support the district...										
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Increasing the length of the school day at their school(s).	16.78%	175	16.78%	175	13.61%	142	5.47%	57	47.33%	494
Increasing the length of the school year at their school(s).	14.67%	153	17.26%	180	14.29%	149	6.14%	64	47.61%	497
Closing their school(s).	8.53%	89	12.37%	129	22.53%	235	7.77%	81	48.76%	509
Replacing the principal(s) at their school(s).	15.63%	163	21.96%	229	10.16%	106	3.26%	34	48.96%	511
Replacing half of the teachers at their school(s).	13.52%	141	19.37%	202	14.19%	148	3.36%	35	49.53%	517
Giving good teachers additional pay at their school(s).	14.57%	152	21.00%	219	11.60%	121	3.74%	39	49.05%	512
Giving principals more control of their school(s).	16.87%	176	22.44%	234	9.11%	95	1.92%	20	49.63%	518
Opening more public charter schools.	12.85%	134	17.35%	181	12.46%	130	6.71%	70	50.59%	528

Closing their school(s) and replacing them with them with public charter school(s).	11.12%	116	13.33%	139	15.15%	158	8.72%	91	51.64%	539
---	--------	-----	--------	-----	--------	-----	-------	----	--------	-----

Table 6.23: Percentages of Respondents' Perception of Improvements for Charter Schools

To improve public charter schools in Newark, the school district should...												
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Don't Know Enough About Issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Increase the length of the school day.	11.70%	122	16.20%	169	17.93%	187	6.04%	63	18.70%	195	29.43%	307
Increase the length of the school year.	11.03%	115	15.53%	162	19.37%	202	6.14%	64	18.70%	195	29.24%	305
Close schools with low achievement.	11.03%	115	17.64%	184	18.31%	191	4.03%	42	19.18%	200	29.82%	311
Replace principals of low-performing schools.	13.61%	142	22.91%	239	10.83%	113	2.68%	28	19.65%	205	30.30%	316
Replace half of the teachers at low-performing schools.	10.74%	112	20.23%	211	15.15%	158	3.07%	32	20.52%	214	30.30%	316
Give good teachers additional pay.	12.85%	134	20.04%	209	12.66%	132	3.84%	40	20.04%	209	30.58%	319
Give principals more control of their schools.	16.11%	168	21.48%	224	9.88%	103	2.30%	24	20.42%	213	29.82%	311
Open more public charter schools.	11.41%	119	16.87%	176	12.66%	132	7.29%	76	21.67%	226	30.11%	314

Close public charter schools with low achievement and replace them with new public schools	10.07%	105	15.82%	165	15.92%	166	6.14%	64	21.67%	226	30.39%	317
--	--------	-----	--------	-----	--------	-----	-------	----	--------	-----	--------	-----

6.24: Percentage of Respondents' Perceptions of Improving Charter Schools

If my child or children in my family were attending a low-performing PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL(s), I would support the district...												
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Don't Know Enough About Issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Increasing the length of the school day at their school(s).	13.42%	140	11.98%	125	13.42%	140	5.18%	54	14.77%	154	41.23%	430
Increasing the length of the school year at their school(s).	11.70%	122	12.56%	131	14.29%	149	4.99%	52	14.67%	153	41.80%	436
Closing their school(s).	9.68%	101	12.37%	129	17.07%	178	4.22%	44	14.96%	156	41.71%	435
Replacing the principal(s) at their school(s).	13.23%	138	17.35%	181	9.68%	101	2.21%	23	15.63%	163	41.90%	437
Replacing half of the teachers at their school(s).	11.70%	122	16.40%	171	11.70%	122	2.78%	29	15.92%	166	41.51%	433

Giving good teachers additional pay at their school(s).	12.66%	132	16.11%	168	10.26%	107	3.93%	41	0.00%	0	57.05%	595
Giving principals more control of their school(s).	15.15%	158	17.55%	183	8.15%	85	1.92%	20	15.82%	165	41.42%	432
Opening more public charter schools.	9.20%	96	14.67%	153	12.37%	129	5.56%	58	16.59%	173	41.61%	434
Closing their school(s) and replacing them with them with another public school(s).	8.34%	87	13.81%	144	13.81%	144	4.89%	51	17.16%	179	41.99%	438

Table 6.25: Percentage of Respondents' Perceptions of Improvements for Newark Schools

To improve public education in Newark, schools should.....												
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Don't Know Enough About Issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Teach students to think, ask questions, and to make decisions.	50.62%	528	16.59%	173	1.34%	14	0.67%	7	4.12%	43	26.65%	278
Teach life and social skills that extend outside of the	47.75%	498	18.79%	196	2.01%	21	1.05%	11	3.74%	39	26.65%	278

classroom.												
Focus on academic subjects and skills.	44.97%	469	21.00%	219	3.07%	32	0.58%	6	3.84%	40	26.56%	277
Provide safe and orderly schools.	48.90%	510	18.41%	192	1.34%	14	0.86%	9	3.64%	38	26.85%	280
Welcome parents who ask questions about their children's education.	48.51%	506	18.12%	189	2.01%	21	0.77%	8	3.84%	40	26.75%	279
Decrease testing.	19.75%	206	19.75%	206	19.85%	207	8.63%	90	5.08%	53	26.94%	281
Conduct home-visits to share important information with parents.	30.30%	316	24.64%	257	10.64%	111	2.11%	22	5.27%	55	27.04%	282
Increase supports that help students be successful in school.	47.27%	493	18.79%	196	2.49%	26	0.77%	8	4.03%	42	26.65%	278
Provide school facilities that have science labs and technology.	46.02%	480	19.46%	203	3.07%	32	1.05%	11	3.84%	40	26.56%	277
Focus on meeting state and district test goals.	30.97%	323	23.59%	246	11.22%	117	2.49%	26	4.70%	49	27.04%	282

Give teachers training that meet their individual needs.	43.72%	456	20.13%	210	3.26%	34	0.77%	8	4.31%	45	27.80%	290
Prepare all children to go to college.	43.72%	456	18.22%	190	5.56%	58	1.05%	11	4.12%	43	27.33%	285
Prepare children to go to work and to college after high school.	44.77%	467	20.81%	217	2.21%	23	0.77%	8	4.03%	42	27.42%	286
Provide more discipline and order.	44.49%	464	20.04%	209	2.59%	27	0.77%	8	4.79%	50	27.33%	285
Provide more arts (e.g., music, drama, writing, etc.)	44.30%	462	20.52%	214	2.30%	24	0.96%	10	4.41%	46	27.52%	287

Table 6.26: Percentages of Respondents’ Perceptions of Improvements for Schools

To improve public education in the school my child or children in my family attend, I would support their school(s)...												
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Don't Know Enough About Issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Teaching students to think, ask questions, and to make decisions.	32.12%	335	11.98%	125	0.77%	8	0.48%	5	3.45%	36	51.20%	534
Including help with life and social skills that extend outside of the classroom.	30.01%	313	14.00%	146	0.77%	8	0.58%	6	3.36%	35	51.29%	535
Focusing on academic subjects and skills.	28.38%	296	14.09%	147	2.01%	21	0.19%	2	3.55%	37	51.77%	540
Providing safe and orderly schools.	30.78%	321	12.37%	129	1.25%	13	0.96%	10	3.36%	35	51.29%	535
Welcoming parents who ask questions about their children’s education.	30.78%	321	12.18%	127	1.25%	13	0.58%	6	3.74%	39	51.49%	537
Decreasing testing.	14.29%	149	13.14%	137	11.89%	124	4.99%	52	3.74%	39	51.97%	542
Conducting home-visits to share important information with parents.	21.67%	226	14.96%	156	5.94%	62	1.73%	18	3.74%	39	51.97%	542

Increasing supports that help students be successful in school.	29.15%	304	12.37%	129	2.30%	24	0.77%	8	3.64%	38	51.77%	540
Providing school facilities that have science labs and technology.	28.76%	300	12.94%	135	1.92%	20	1.34%	14	3.36%	35	51.68%	539
Focusing on meeting state and district test goals.	20.81%	217	16.59%	173	5.66%	59	1.34%	14	3.93%	41	51.68%	539
Giving teachers training that meet their individual needs.	27.80%	290	14.19%	148	1.44%	15	1.15%	12	3.74%	39	51.68%	539
Preparing all children to go to college.	29.05%	303	11.60%	121	2.59%	27	1.05%	11	3.84%	40	51.87%	541
Preparing children to go to work and to college after high school.	30.01%	313	11.89%	124	1.34%	14	0.96%	10	3.64%	38	52.16%	544
Providing more discipline and order.	28.48%	297	12.85%	134	1.92%	20	1.25%	13	3.74%	39	51.77%	540
Provide more arts (e.g., music, drama, writing, etc.)	28.00%	292	13.71%	143	0.86%	9	1.15%	12	3.64%	38	52.64%	549

Table 6.27: Percentages of Respondents' Perceptions of Three Things to Improve in Newark Schools

If you could improve three things about the traditional public and public charter schools in Newark, which of the following three programs would you choose? ONLY CHOOSE 3				
	Selected		Not Selected	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Quality After-School	37.87%	395	62.13%	648
Access to Pre-School	14.29%	149	85.71%	894
Arts Programs	30.68%	320	69.32%	723
Athletic Programs	18.31%	191	81.69%	852
Health and Social Services	20.81%	217	79.19%	826
Effective Curriculum and Instruction	42.09%	439	57.91%	604
Support for Teacher	25.41%	265	74.59%	778
Support for Principals	9.01%	94	90.99%	949
Teacher Pay	12.56%	131	87.44%	912

Table 6.28: Percentages of Respondents’ Perceptions of Occurrences for Specific Activities

How often do you think the following activities should occur at traditional public schools in Newark? Only check one box for each activity listed below.														
	Once or More a Week		Once or Twice a Month		A Few Times a Year		Once a Year		Never		Don’t Know Enough About Issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
Parent-teacher conferences	10.93%	114	35.57%	371	19.56%	204	1.63%	17	0.29%	3	5.27%	55	26.75%	279
Special events (e.g., science fairs, student plays)	5.85%	61	30.68%	320	27.04%	282	3.36%	35	0.19%	2	5.18%	54	27.71%	289
Parents providing support in classrooms	16.01%	167	26.94%	281	17.55%	183	4.70%	49	1.73%	18	5.08%	53	28.00%	292
Parents involved in issues about how to run the school	11.79%	123	25.41%	265	20.23%	211	7.38%	77	1.73%	18	5.94%	62	27.52%	287
Parents involved in decisions about school budgets and how school money should be spent	10.07%	105	21.00%	219	21.57%	225	8.53%	89	4.41%	46	6.52%	68	27.90%	291
Parents should receive materials and information	33.17%	346	23.39%	244	8.72%	91	1.63%	17	0.38%	4	5.56%	58	27.13%	283

from teachers that will help them assist their children with schoolwork at home														
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 6.29: Percentages of Respondents' Perceptions of Parent Involvement

Parents and community members should be involved in decisions about...												
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Don't Know Enough About Issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
School improvements.	42.47%	443	25.79%	269	2.30%	24	0.29%	3	3.07%	32	26.08%	271
School closings or openings.	32.50%	339	25.22%	263	10.16%	106	1.53%	16	3.93%	41	26.65%	274
The selection of the school superintendent.	35.47%	370	26.75%	279	5.75%	60	1.34%	14	3.84%	40	26.85%	272

Table 6.30: Percentages of Respondents' Perceptions of Improvement in Schools

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements:												
	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Don't Know Enough About Issue		Missing	
	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count
The state of NJ should give back control of the Newark public schools to Newark	24.64%	257	23.20%	242	7.86%	82	2.59%	27	14.38%	150	27.33%	285
Newark public schools should be run by an elected school board	20.33%	212	25.02%	261	9.68%	101	2.88%	30	14.19%	148	27.90%	291
Newark public schools should be run by a school board appointed by the Mayor	8.25%	86	17.07%	178	20.52%	214	11.12%	116	15.15%	158	27.90%	291
Newark public schools should be run by the Mayor without a school board	7.96%	83	10.45%	109	22.15%	231	16.87%	176	14.48%	151	28.09%	293
The teachers unions should be collaborative partners in school reform efforts in Newark	0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	

Children in traditional Newark public schools or public charter schools with consistently low test scores should be able to get public funds to attend private or religious schools	14.57%	152	18.70%	195	14.09%	147	9.30%	97	15.05%	157	28.28%	295
License as a school administrator in New Jersey or another state in order to be superintendent	18.50%	193	21.09%	220	8.25%	86	3.93%	41	19.75%	206	28.48%	297

Table 6.31: Percentages of Respondents' Perceptions of Qualities for Next Superintendent

Which three qualities are most important for the next superintendent of the Newark Public Schools to have? CHECK ONLY THREE		
	Percent	count
Clear vision	23.20%	242
Works well with parents and community	31.83%	332
Effective manager	23.30%	243
Strong academic leader	37.39%	390
Visits schools regularly	21.00%	219
Understanding of different groups and cultures	19.37%	202
Knowledge of education	21.67%	226
Knowledge of education in Newark	30.39%	317
Knowledge of non-education related issues in Newark	9.78%	102

Table 6.32: Percentage of Respondent Age

What is your age?	Percent	Count
18-24	26.56%	277
25-44	30.87%	322
45-64	13.04%	136
65 and older	3.26%	34

Missing	26.27%	274
---------	--------	-----

Table 6.33: Percentage of Respondent Gender

Gender	Percent	Count
Male	43.62%	455
Female	29.34%	306
Missing	27.04%	282

Table 6.34: Percentage of Respondent Race/Ethnicity

What Race/Ethnicity do you identify yourself?	Percent	Count
Latino (e.g., Puerto Rican, Dominican, Mexican)	13.33%	139
Portuguese	1.73%	18
Brazilian	0.48%	5
White	8.92%	93
African American	37.97%	396
African	2.49%	26
Afro Caribbean (for example, Haitian, Jamaican)	3.16%	33
Asian (for example, Chinese, Laotian, Japanese, Vietnamese)	0.86%	9
American Indian	0.67%	7
Missing	30.39%	317

Table 6.35: Percentage of Respondent Employment Status

What is your employment status?	Percent	Count
Full time employed	28.38%	296
Part time employed	14.00%	146
Self-employed	3.93%	41
Housewife/husband	1.15%	12
Unemployed	17.26%	180
Retired	3.84%	40
Missing	31.45%	328

Table 6.36: Percentage of Respondent Income Level

What is your income level?	Percent	Count
\$0 - \$25,000		
\$25,001 - \$50,000		
\$50,001 - \$75,000		
\$75,001 - \$100,000		
\$100,000 or more	2.97%	31
Missing	97.03%	1012

Table 6.37: Percentage of Respondents' Highest Level of Education

What is your highest level of education?	Percent	Count
Elementary school	1.25%	13
High school	24.74%	258
College (two- or four-year degree)	0.00%	
Graduate school	0.00%	

Missing	74.02%	772
---------	--------	-----

Table 6.38: Percentage of Respondents' Degree Level

What is your degree level?	Percent	Count
High school diploma	29.91%	312
Associate's degree	8.82%	92
Bachelor's degree	12.46%	130
Master's degree	8.34%	87
PhD, MMD, DDS, JD, or other graduate level degree	1.92%	20
None	7.09%	74
Missing	31.45%	328

Table 6.39: Percentage of Respondents' Employment Status with Newark Public Schools

Are you a Newark Public Schools Employee?	Percent	Count
Yes	5.66%	59
No	67.40%	703
Missing	26.94%	281

Table 6.40: Percentage of Respondents' Position in Newark Public Schools

Please identify your position in the district.	Percent	Count
Teacher	2.40%	25
Principal	0.29%	3
Administrator	0.96%	10

Parent Liaison	0.00%	
Other (please specify)	5.85%	61
Missing	90.51%	944

Table 6.41: Percentage of Respondents' Employment Status with Charter School

Are you employed by a charter school in Newark?	Percent	Count
Yes	4.60%	48
No	68.17%	711
Missing	27.23%	284

Table 6.42: Percentage of Respondents' Position with Charter School

Please identify your position in the charter school.	Percent	Count
Teacher	2.68%	28
Principal	0.19%	2
Administrator	0.86%	9
Parent Liaison	0.10%	1
Missing	96.16%	1003

Table 6.43: Percentage of Respondents' Attending Newark Colleges

Are you a college student in Newark?	Percent	Count
Yes	17.93%	187
No	17.93%	506
Missing	48.51%	350

Table 6.44: Percentage of Respondents' Attendance at Newark Colleges

What college do you attend in Newark?	Percent	Count
Rutgers	4.60%	48
NJIT	0.29%	3
UMDNJ	0.29%	3
Essex	12.18%	127
Berkeley	1.25%	13
Seton Hall Law School	0.10%	1
Missing	81.30%	848

Table 6.45: Percentage of Respondents' Having Children in Newark Schools

Do you have children or other family members who attend a Newark school?	Percent	Count
Yes	29.05%	303
No	39.98%	417
Missing	30.97%	323

Table 6.46: Percentage of Respondents' Attending Newark High School

Did you attend a high school in Newark?	Percent	Count
No	34.71%	362
Yes, public high school	35.19%	367
Yes, charter high school	0.67%	7
Yes, Catholic high	0.77%	8

school		
Missing	28.67%	299

Table 6.47: Percentage of Respondents' Graduation from Newark Schools

Did you graduate from a high school in Newark?	Percent	Count
No	36.91%	385
Yes, public high school	32.79%	342
Yes, charter high school	0.58%	6
Yes, Catholic high school	0.86%	9
Missing	28.86%	301

Table 6.48: Percentage of Respondents' Completing Survey Online or Paper

Please select whether you filled out the survey online or on paper.		
Online	51.10%	533
Paper	16.01%	167
Missing	32.89%	343

Appendix G

Comparable Short and Long Survey Items

The short-survey questionnaire was comprised of six questions. For four of these, the long survey contained questions that paralleled the content of these questions. However, the precise wording and the “response set” (e.g., “strongly agree,” “agree,” etc.) varied among short and long survey questions. Variation in the question phrasing and response sets can have an important influence in how people answer a question. Therefore, the comparisons in this section’s tables should be viewed as roughly (but not exactly) comparable.

Table 7.1 shows the responses to questions asking the respondent to rate the extent of the school’s encouragement of parental participation in public education. As noted above, the two questions were phrased differently and had differing “response sets” (e.g., “A real deal,” etc.). Therefore, these results are only roughly comparable. The two surveys show that the majority of respondents felt the “local public schools” (“public schools in Newark”) encouraged parental participation in contributing ideas concerning education. Only a small proportion of respondents felt the schools were uninterested in parental input.

Table 7.1: Questions on Public Schools Encouraging Parental Participation

Short Survey			Long Survey		
“Local public schools encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas on what it takes to improve public education”			“How much do traditional public schools in Newark encourage parents to participate and contribute ideas?”		
	N	%		N	%
Great deal	5648	31.8	A lot	103	14.8
Good amount	5666	31.9	Some	222	31.8
Very little	5140	28.9	A little	272	39.0
Not at all	1326	7.5	Not at all	101	14.5
TOTAL	17780	100.0	TOTAL	698	100.0
Missing	1381	---	Missing/Don’t know	345	---

Table 7.2 shows questions that asked respondents to assess parental/community influence over the local schools. The results show that the majority of respondents felt parents, caregivers, and the community possessed some influence over public education. Only a small proportion of respondents felt that they had no influence over public education.

Table 7.2: Questions on Parental Influence Over Public Education

Short Survey			Long Survey		
“How much influence do parents, caregivers, and community members have over public education?”			“How much influence do parents, caregivers, and community members have over education in Newark’s traditional public schools?”		
	N	%		N	%
Great deal	24.0	4242	A lot	106	14.6

Good amount	32.3	5761	Some	183	25.2
Very little	37.5	6682	A little	319	43.9
Not at all	6.4	1145	None	1183	16.2
TOTAL	17830	100.0	TOTAL	726	100.00
Missing	1331	---	Missing/Don't know	317	---

Table 7.3 shows self-assessment of the respondent's knowledge about their neighborhood schools (the short survey) and "traditional public schools in Newark" (the long survey).

Half of the short survey respondents felt that they had a good understanding of how their neighborhood schools were performing. In the long survey, almost a third of respondents felt they knew "a lot" about the Newark schools.

Table 7.3: Questions about Knowledge About Local Schools

Short Survey			Long Survey		
"I know how well schools in my neighborhood are performing"			"How much do you know about the traditional public schools in Newark?"		
	N	%		N	%
Agree	9418	51.4	A lot	273	30.2
Disagree	8908	48.6	Some	332	36.7
TOTAL	18326	100.0	A little	220	24.3
Missing	835	---	Nothing at all	79	8.7
			TOTAL	904	100.0
			Missing/Don't know	139	---

Table 7.4 shows the respondent's assessment of the performance of their neighborhood school (short survey) and "traditional public schools in Newark" (long survey). In both surveys, very few respondents rated school performance as excellent or outstanding. More than half of respondents of the long survey rated the Newark public schools as "poor." When it came to their neighborhood school, respondents on the short survey were half as likely to rate it as "not doing well." The differences in responses to these two questions suggest that respondents may feel better about their neighborhood schools than they do about the Newark schools in general.

Table 7.4: Questions on Local School Performance/Quality

Short Survey			Long Survey		
"How well do you think the schools are performing in your neighborhood?"			"How would you describe the quality of traditional public schools in Newark?"		
	N	%		N	%
Outstanding	857	5.3	Excellent	11	1.3
Very well	2135	13.1	Good	70	8.4
Well	3576	22.0	Fair	298	35.7
Somewhat well	5577	34.2	Poor	455	54.6
Not doing well	4148	25.5	TOTAL	834	100.0
TOTAL	16293	100.0	Missing/Don't know	209	---

Missing/Don't know	2868	---	
--------------------	------	-----	--