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Introduction

Due to the nature of this engagement, it was important to analyze general functions performed across divisions and personnel levels throughout DOE. In order to solicit such information from across the organization we developed and distributed a Job Activity Questionnaire (JAQ). The JAQ was aimed at the following:

- Solicit information related to the scope of the engagement.
- Provide all DOE employees an opportunity to provide confidential feedback as part of the review.
- Get an understanding of oversight activities taking place throughout DOE.
- Help understand communication lines/practices, training protocol, technology assessment, performance management and other practices across the organization.

JAQ questions were developed by KPMG based on the engagement scope, then reviewed and approved by DOE on 05/27/2007. The JAQ was distributed via e-mail on 06/04/2007 and closed on 06/12/2007. The total population for analysis purposes was 931, 610 responded, a 44% response rate. It should be noted that 88% of employees are union employees but only 69% of JAQ respondents were union employees.

Key sections of the JAQ included:

1. **Responsibilities**: Purpose was to obtain detailed information about responsibilities and management practices and procedures. Questions included:
   - Describe your current job title/function?
   - Indicate the percentage of your activity of responsibilities?

2. **Organization**: Purpose was to help identify supervisory, reporting roles and existence of adequate job descriptions. Questions included:
   - How many people do you supervise?
   - Are there adequate position descriptions and are they used and updated?

3. **Communication**: Purpose was to identify lines of communication, effectiveness, and policies and procedures. Questions included:
   - Are lines of communication for your functional area well defined?
   - Are DOE’s goals, policies and directives effectively communicated to you?
4. **Performance Management**: Purpose was to identify current performance employee measurements in place, adequacy, and suggestions for improvement. Questions included:
   - Are adequate measures used to assess your performance and/or the performance of your staff?
   - Are performance evaluations regularly performed?
   - Is feedback communicated to you pertaining to your evaluations?

5. **Training**: Purpose was to identify current training provided, assessable, required and what training would be beneficial to DOE employees. Questions included:
   - Is training provided related to your roles and responsibilities?
   - How often is training provided?
   - Is the training provided beneficial?

6. **Staffing**: Purpose was to identify current staffing levels and needs of DOE. Questions include:
   - Does DOE have adequate staffing to manage the workload of your functional work area?
   - Are staffing priorities, assignments, and levels consistent with workloads?
   - Is there duplication of effort within your office/functional area?

7. **Technology**: Purpose was to identify current technology resources and support available to DOE staff. Questions include:
   - Are you able to get accurate and timely reports to support your work, either internally or externally as applicable?
   - Are technical issues resolved in a timely manner?
   - Is technical support available to your functional work area?

8. **QSAC**: Purpose was to obtain detailed information about QSAC. Questions included:
   - Are you familiar with the QSAC process?
   - Has QSAC training been provided?
   - Is QSAC, or the District monitoring practice, part of your daily core job functions?

9. **District Responsibilities**: Purpose was to identify DOE roles and responsibilities with the Districts. Questions included:
   - As part of your job responsibilities, do you provide direct service to the Districts?
   - What is your level of involvement in service to Districts?
   - Do you believe the service you provide is valued by the Districts?
**Respondent Profile**

As surveys were received, the information was consolidated for the analytical process. Information is provided on a summary basis and is not intended to be a complete record. The following tables illustrate a summary of DOE participation and survey response results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Surveys Started by DOE Employees</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Surveys Never Opened by DOE Employees</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>931</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Surveys Completed by DOE Employees</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Surveys Opened but Not Completed by DOE Employees</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>610</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOE Employees</th>
<th>Total Number of Completed Surveys</th>
<th>Percentage Completed by Group</th>
<th>Average # Years working @ DOE</th>
<th>Collective Bargaining Employee</th>
<th>Non-Collective Bargaining Employee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division Heads</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Support</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>427</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Results

The JAQ results were segregated into seven distinct groups based on respondent level or title and by Collective or Non-Collective Bargaining designation. The purpose of segregating employees into these groups was to analyze survey results both as a whole for DOE, and more specifically by employee level or type.

The first category of respondents were divided by level. The levels used for the survey were:

• **DOE**: consists of all DOE employees.

• **Department/Division Head**: consists of Assistant Commissioners, Directors, and County Superintendents.

• **Manager/Supervisor**: consists of Managers, Coordinators, Supervisors, and Business Administrators.

• **Staff**: consists of DOE non-managerial and non-support staff.

• **Clerical Support**: consists of Secretarial and Administrative Support Staff.

The second category of respondents were divided by union status. This was done to separate and identify specific responses by Collective and Non-Collective Bargaining status. The levels used for the survey were:

• **Collective Bargaining Employee**: consists of Union employees.

• **Non-Collective Bargaining Employee**: consists of Non-Union employees.
### Job Activity Questionnaire Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Function</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Responsibilities         | • Of the total survey results, half of surveys completed were from DOE Staff, one-quarter were from DOE Managers, and the remainder consisted of Clerical Support and Division Heads. DOE respondents consisted of 69% Collective Bargaining employees and 31% Non-Collective Bargaining employees.  
• DOE employees responded they spend 49% of their time performing primary job functions, 49% of their time performing administrative tasks and 11% of their time on training. |
| Organization             | • Of the approximate two-thirds of DOE employees who responded that position descriptions are adequate and updated, 85% were Non-Collective Bargaining employees and 76% were Collective Bargaining employees. |
| Communication            | • 78% of DOE employees feel lines of communication within their functional work area are well defined and responsibilities and authority are clear and appropriate; 61% indicated DOE goals, policies and directives are effectively communicated.  
• While 65% of DOE employees indicated policies and procedures for their job are current and accurately reflect the work they perform, only 58% feel there are formal policies in place to guide key operational functions and relationships between organizational units and outside agencies. |
| Performance Management   | • Where 70% of DOE employees indicated there are adequate measures to assess performance and/or performance of staff, only 50% off Division Heads indicated this to be the case. 63% of Division Heads also indicated that feedback is communicated pertaining to their evaluations, which is lower than the 83% average for all DOE employees. |
| Training                 | • Approximately 75% of Clerical Support indicated that they are provided training for their roles and responsibilities. The majority (79%) of DOE employees also indicated that training is provided as necessary and 53% responded that additional training would be beneficial.  
• Approximately 33% of Division Heads, Managers, and Staff responded there is not enough training provided. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Function</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td>• The majority of Division Heads feel that DOE does not have adequate staffing to manage the workload of their functional work area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DOE employees indicated that their skill set adequately prepares them for the tasks they are assigned and maintain certain skills within their functional area is not a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two-thirds of DOE employees responded that staffing priorities, assignments, and levels are not consistent with workloads and 55% responded that staffing priorities and assignments are not in line to meet goals and management objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where 57% of DOE employees indicated there is adequate staffing to manage the workload of their functional work area, 25% responded that management and supervisory staffing levels are not adequate to provide proper oversight and a reasonable span of monitoring. Over half of Division Heads feel that management and supervisory staffing levels are not adequate to provide proper oversight and a reasonable span of monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td>• The majority of DOE responses indicated that technical support is available for their functional work area and technical issues are resolved in a timely manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two-thirds of DOE responses indicted they are able to get accurate and timely reports to support their work, either internally or externally. Division head responses were higher than the 67% average whereas Managers, Staff, and Clerical Support responses were lower than the average.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QSAC</strong></td>
<td>• Where 52% of DOE employees responded they are familiar with the QSAC process, 54% responded they should know about QSAC for their functional work area. Division Heads responded at an 88% response rate for being familiar and knowing about QSAC for their functional work area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Of the 17% of responses that indicated QSAC training was provided, 85% responded that the training was beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td>• DOE respondents indicated that their level of involvement with the Districts range from medium to high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 69% of DOE employees responded they provide direct services to Districts as part of their job duties. Division Heads, Managers, and Staff all indicated they provide a large percentage of direct services to Districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Responsibilities

The objective of the responsibilities section of the survey was to gather information about the types of activities and responsibilities carried out by different levels and types of employees.

Summary of Results

The majority of DOE employee survey responses were received from managers and staff, of which the majority consisted of Collective Bargaining employees. Of the total responses, DOE employees indicated they spend approximately half of their time working on core job functions. Key survey results were:

- DOE employees responded they spend 49% of their time performing core job functions, 25% performing administrative tasks and 11% training. Collective Bargaining and Non-Collective Bargaining employees responded they spend similar time participating in, or conducting, training.

Of the total survey results, half were from DOE staff and one-quarter were from DOE managers. DOE respondents consisted of 69% of Collective Bargaining employees and 31% of Non-Collective Bargaining employees.
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**Question:** Which title closely relates to your current job title/function?

- Staff, 56%
- Managers, 26%
- Division Heads, 6%
- Support Staff, 12%

**Note:** The Staff category includes the Staff, Employee and Other categories of respondents listed on the JAQ.

**Question:** Are you a collective bargaining employee or a non-collective bargaining employee?

- Collective Bargaining, 69%
- Non-Collective Bargaining, 31%
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**Question:** What percentage of time is spent on the following activities?

![Pie chart showing percentage distribution of time spent on different activities]

- **Supervising:** 15%
- **Core Job Function:** 49%
- **Admin:** 25%
- **Training:** 11%

By level:

- **Core Job Function**: Division Heads - 54%, Management - 51%, Staff - 64%, Clerical Support - 80%
- **Supervising**: Division Heads - 23%, Management - 14%, Staff - 13%, Clerical Support - 0%
- **Training**: Division Heads - 28%, Management - 8%, Staff - 12%, Clerical Support - 3%
- **Admin Work**: Division Heads - 21%, Management - 10%, Staff - 17%, Clerical Support - 12%

**Note:** This bar graph and the bar graphs on subsequent pages may not sum to 100% due to individual respondents not answering specific questions.
2. Organization

The objective of the organization section of the survey was to obtain detailed information regarding the reporting structure and position descriptions, especially in light of the recent DOE reorganization. More specifically, the number of staff that are supervised (also known as “Span of Control”) and the number of people staff report to.

Summary of Results

67% of DOE employees feel there are up-to-date and accurate position descriptions to define duties, roles and responsibilities. Also, approximately two-thirds of DOE employees indicated that they have no supervisory responsibilities. Key results from the survey were:

- 54% of division heads indicate they supervise 1-5 people, and 67% indicated they directly report to a single individual.
- 46% of managers indicate they supervise 1-5 people, and 69% indicated they directly report to a single individual.
- 75% of division heads and 68% of managers feel the position descriptions are adequate and up-to-date.
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**Question:** How many people do you supervise?

- None: 61%
- 1-5: 23%
- 6-10: 7%
- 11+: 9%

*By level*

- Division Heads: 54%
  - None: 21%
  - 1-5: 25%
  - 6-10: 0%
  - 11+: 0%
- Management: 46%
  - None: 15%
  - 1-5: 18%
  - 6-10: 21%
  - 11+: 2%
- Staff: 83%
  - None: 14%
  - 1-5: 2%
  - 6-10: 0%
  - 11+: 0%
- Clerical Support: 83%
  - None: 17%
  - 1-5: 2%
  - 6-10: 0%
  - 11+: 0%
- Collective Bargaining: 72%
  - None: 3%
  - 1-5: 23%
  - 6-10: 2%
  - 11+: 16%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: 36%
  - None: 23%
  - 1-5: 16%
  - 6-10: 25%
  - 11+: 0%
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**Question:** To how many people do you directly report?

![Pie chart showing distribution of direct reports]

- **None:** 10%
- **1:** 65%
- **2:** 15%
- **3 or More:** 10%

By level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Heads</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Clerical Support</th>
<th>Collective Bargaining</th>
<th>Non-Collective Bargaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: Are there adequate position descriptions and are they used and updates?

Yes: 65%
No: 35%

By level:
- Division Heads: 75% Yes, 25% No
- Management: 68% Yes, 32% No
- Staff: 63% Yes, 37% No
- Clerical Support: 66% Yes, 34% No
- Collective Bargaining: 63% Yes, 37% No
- Non-Collective Bargaining: 71% Yes, 29% No
3. Communication

The objective of the communication section of the survey was to obtain detailed information regarding communication within DOE from both a vertical (top-down) and horizontal (across) perspective; e.g., defined lines of communication, delivery of communication, frequency, awareness and adequacy.

Summary of Results

Overall, DOE employees indicated that the lines of communication within their functional work area are well defined and responsibilities of authority are clear and appropriate; however, lines of communication between or across functions work areas leaves room for improvement. Key survey results were:

- While 78% of DOE employees feel lines of communication within their functional work area are well defined and responsibilities and authority are clear and appropriate, only 61% indicated DOE goals, policies and directives are effectively communicated.
- While 58% of the division heads indicated the policies and procedures for your job up-to-date and accurately reflect the work performed, and 54% of division heads indicated there are formal policies in place to guide key operational functions and relationships between organizational units and outside agencies.
- While 65% of DOE employees indicated policies and procedures for their job are current and accurately reflect the work they perform, only 58% feel there are formal policies in place to guide key operational functions and relationships between organizational units and outside agencies.
- Only 54% of management and 59% of staff thought DOE’s goals, policies and directives were effectively communicated to them.
- 75% of division heads, 72% of staff, and 74% of Collective Bargaining employees feel formal policies and procedures exist that are used in accomplishing their job; which are all below the DOE average of 76%.
**Question:** Are the lines of communication for your functional work area well defined?

- **Yes:** 78%
- **No:** 22%

By level:

- **Division Heads:**
  - Yes: 82%
  - No: 18%

- **Management:**
  - Yes: 74%
  - No: 26%

- **Staff:**
  - Yes: 83%
  - No: 17%

- **Clerical Support:**
  - Yes: 76%
  - No: 24%

- **Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes: 85%
  - No: 15%
**Question:** Are your responsibilities and authority clear and appropriate?

- **Yes:** 78%
- **No:** 22%

By level:

- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 92%
  - No: 8%
- **Management**
  - Yes: 75%
  - No: 25%
- **Staff**
  - Yes: 76%
  - No: 25%
- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 87%
  - No: 13%
- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 77%
  - No: 23%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 80%
  - No: 21%
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**Question:** Are the DOE’s goals, policies and directives effectively communicated to you?

- **Yes:** 61%
- **No:** 39%

**By level**

- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 75%
  - No: 25%
- **Management**
  - Yes: 54%
  - No: 46%
- **Staff**
  - Yes: 59%
  - No: 41%
- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 76%
  - No: 24%
- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 60%
  - No: 40%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 63%
  - No: 37%
**Question:** Are there formal (i.e. documented) policies/procedures that you use in accomplishing your job?

![Pie chart showing 76% Yes, 24% No]

By level:
- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 75%
  - No: 25%
- **Management**
  - Yes: 81%
  - No: 19%
- **Staff**
  - Yes: 72%
  - No: 28%
- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 81%
  - No: 19%
- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 74%
  - No: 26%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 80%
  - No: 20%
**Question:** Are the policies and procedures for your job up-to-date and accurately reflect the work performed?

![Pie chart showing the results of the question.](chart)

- **Yes:** 65%
- **No:** 35%

### By level

- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 58%
  - No: 42%
- **Management**
  - Yes: 73%
  - No: 28%
- **Staff**
  - Yes: 61%
  - No: 39%
- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 68%
  - No: 32%
- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 63%
  - No: 37%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 70%
  - No: 30%
**Question:** Are there formal policies in place to guide key operational functions and relationships between organizational units and outside agencies?
4. Performance Management

The objective of the performance management section of the survey was to access current performance measurements, goals, and the personnel evaluation system in place at DOE and more specifically, whether or not goals are communicated and if feedback for performance is provided on a regular basis.

Summary of Results

Overall, DOE employees indicated performance evaluations are regularly performed and feedback is communicated relating to the performance evaluations. Also, the majority of DOE employees indicated that goals and expectations are communicated and there are adequate measures used to assess performance. Key survey results were:

- Where 70% of DOE employees indicated there are adequate measures to assess performance and/or performance of staff, only 50% of division heads indicated this to be the case. Only 63% of division heads also indicated that feedback is communicated pertaining to performance evaluations, which is lower than the 83% average.
- 77% of clerical support indicated goals and expectations are communicated to them, which is below the average of 80%.
- 64% of Non-Collective Bargaining employees report that there are adequate measures used to assess performance and/or the performance of their staff which is below the overall average of 70%.
**Question:** Are adequate measures used to assess your performance and/or the performance of your staff?

![Pie chart showing the percentage of responses to the question. The chart shows that 70% of respondents answered 'Yes' and 30% answered 'No'.](chart.png)

By level:
- **Division Heads:** 50% Yes, 50% No
- **Management:** 65% Yes, 35% No
- **Staff:** 74% Yes, 26% No
- **Clerical Support:** 72% Yes, 28% No
- **Collective Bargaining:** 73% Yes, 27% No
- **Non-Collective Bargaining:** 64% Yes, 36% No
**Question:** Are goals/expectations communicated to you?

- **Yes:** 80%
- **No:** 20%

**By level:**
- **Division Heads:** 83% Yes, 17% No
- **Management:** 81% Yes, 19% No
- **Staff:** 80% Yes, 20% No
- **Clerical Support:** 77% Yes, 23% No
- **Collective Bargaining:** 80% Yes, 20% No
- **Non-Collective Bargaining:** 81% Yes, 19% No
Question: Are performance evaluations regularly performed?

By level

- Division Heads: 75% Yes, 25% No
- Management: 82% Yes, 18% No
- Staff: 88% Yes, 12% No
- Clerical Support: 76% Yes, 25% No
- Collective Bargaining: 87% Yes, 13% No
- Non-Collective Bargaining: 78% Yes, 22% No
**Question:** Is feedback communicated to you pertaining to your evaluations?

![Pie chart showing 83% Yes, 17% No feedback](chart.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division Heads</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Support</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Training

The objective of the training section of the survey was to assess the adequacy of training activities at DOE. More specifically, the types, frequency, and effectiveness of training accessible to DOE employees.

Summary of Results

Overall, DOE employees indicated they receive training in a variety of areas as needed.

- 62% of DOE employees indicated that they are provided training for their roles and responsibilities. 58% also indicated that training is provided as necessary, and 70% responded that additional training would be beneficial.
- 33% of division heads, managers, and staff responded that there is not enough training provided.
- Of the 30% of DOE employees who responded they receive cross-training from other functional areas, 92% responded that the cross-training was beneficial.
- 57% of management and 53% of staff thought training programs were adequate, relevant, and properly promoted by top management.
Question: Is training provided related to your roles and responsibilities?

- Yes: 62%
- No: 28%
- N/A: 10%

By level:

- Division Heads: Yes 63%, No 8%, N/A 29%
- Management: Yes 61%, No 34%, N/A 6%
- Staff: Yes 58%, No 33%, N/A 9%
- Clerical Support: Yes 76%, No 9%, N/A 15%
- Collective Bargaining: Yes 60%, No 8%, N/A 32%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 62%, No 9%, N/A 29%
**Question:** What kind of training is provided?

- **Computer:** 22%
- **Professional Development:** 24%
- **Required (i.e. sexual harassment, ethics, etc):** 31%
- **Other:** 23%

By level:

- **Division Heads:**
  - Computer: 29%
  - Professional Development: 25%
  - Required: 18%
  - Other: 8%

- **Management:**
  - Computer: 18%
  - Professional Development: 15%
  - Required: 14%
  - Other: 10%

- **Staff:**
  - Computer: 23%
  - Professional Development: 18%
  - Required: 18%
  - Other: 10%

- **Clerical Support:**
  - Computer: 15%
  - Professional Development: 15%
  - Required: 18%
  - Other: 8%

- **Collective Bargaining:**
  - Computer: 15%
  - Professional Development: 12%
  - Required: 9%
  - Other: 13%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining:**
  - Computer: 8%
  - Professional Development: 14%
  - Required: 18%
  - Other: 22%
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Question: How often is training provided?

- As Necessary: 58%
- Not Enough: 28%
- Too Frequently: 2%
- N/A: 12%

By level:
- Division Heads: Not Enough 33%, As Necessary 58%, Too Much 0%
- Management: Not Enough 28%, As Necessary 63%, Too Much 0%
- Staff: Not Enough 32%, As Necessary 51%, Too Much 4%
- Clerical Support: Not Enough 4%, As Necessary 79%, Too Much 0%
- Collective Bargaining: Not Enough 29%, As Necessary 57%, Too Much 0%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Not Enough 26%, As Necessary 61%, Too Much 0%
**Question:** How is training administered?

- **N/A:** 15%
- **Internal:** 35%
- **External:** 8%
- **Combination:** 42%

By level:

- **Division Heads:**
  - Internal: 33%
  - External: 17%
  - Combination: 32%
  - NA: 8%

- **Management:**
  - Internal: 47%
  - External: 13%
  - Combination: 32%
  - NA: 8%

- **Staff:**
  - Internal: 44%
  - External: 16%
  - Combination: 32%
  - NA: 4%

- **Clerical Support:**
  - Internal: 59%
  - External: 26%
  - Combination: 11%
  - NA: 4%

- **Collective Bargaining:**
  - Internal: 36%
  - External: 8%
  - Combination: 15%
  - NA: 8%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining:**
  - Internal: 34%
  - External: 8%
  - Combination: 14%
  - NA: 8%
**Question:** Is the training provided beneficial?

- Yes: 70%
- No: 9%
- N/A: 21%

By level:
- Division Heads: Yes 63%, No 17%, N/A 21%
- Management: Yes 71%, No 16%, N/A 14%
- Staff: Yes 68%, No 12%, N/A 20%
- Clerical Support: Yes 81%, No 8%, N/A 11%
- Collective Bargaining: Yes 70%, No 13%, N/A 17%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 71%, No 12%, N/A 17%
Question: Would additional training be beneficial?

Yes: 64%
No: 36%

By level:
- Division Heads: Yes 54%, No 46%
- Management: Yes 70%, No 30%
- Staff: Yes 65%, No 35%
- Clerical Support: Yes 53%, No 47%
- Collective Bargaining: Yes 63%, No 36%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 65%, No 35%
Question: Are the training programs adequate, relevant and properly promoted by top management?

By level:

- Division Heads: Yes 63%, No 38%
- Management: Yes 57%, No 43%
- Staff: Yes 53%, No 47%
- Clerical Support: Yes 74%, No 26%
- Collective Bargaining: Yes 55%, No 45%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 61%, No 39%
**Question:** Are you provided cross-training by other functional areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By level**

- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 33%
  - N/A: 17%

- **Management**
  - Yes: 51%
  - No: 35%
  - N/A: 15%

- **Staff**
  - Yes: 49%
  - No: 27%
  - N/A: 23%

- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 43%
  - No: 32%
  - N/A: 28%

- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 51%
  - No: 21%
  - N/A: 41%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 35%
  - No: 24%
Question: If yes, is it beneficial?

Yes 92%
No 8%

By level

Division Heads
- Yes 42%
- No 8%
- N/A 0%
- Management
- Yes 30%
- No 0%
- N/A 5%
- Staff
- Yes 26%
- No 1%
- N/A 0%
- Clerical Support
- Yes 25%
- No 0%
- N/A 0%
- Collective Bargaining
- Yes 26%
- No 2%
- N/A 0%
- Non-Collective Bargaining
- Yes 31%
- No 4%
- N/A 0%
6. Staffing
The objective of the staffing section of the survey was to identify the current staffing environment at DOE. More specifically, staffing levels, staffing priorities, workload assignments, and staffing skill sets.

Summary of Results
• 83% of division heads feel that DOE does not have adequate staffing to manage the workload of their functional work area.
• Two-thirds of DOE employees responded that staffing priorities, assignments, and levels are not consistent with workloads; 55% responded that staffing priorities and assignments do not meet goals and management objectives.
• 62% of DOE management and 59% of DOE staff feel they do not have adequate resources, i.e. clerical support, technology, etc. to effectively perform their jobs.
• A small percentage of DOE employees indicated there is a duplication of effort within their functional area; 68% of clerical support indicated that a duplication of tasks exist.
• Approximately half of DOE employees feel their current workload is about right and half feel their workload is too much.
**Question**: Does DOE have adequate staffing to manage the workload of your functional work area? 

By level:

- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 83%
  - No: 17%

- **Management**
  - Yes: 67%
  - No: 33%

- **Staff**
  - Yes: 77%
  - No: 22%

- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 59%
  - No: 41%

- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 71%
  - No: 29%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 77%
  - No: 23%
**Question:** Are management and supervisory staffing levels adequate to provide proper oversight and a reasonable span-of-monitoring, e.g. the number of people you oversee?

![Pie chart showing responses to the question](chart)

- **Yes:** 51%
- **No:** 25%
- **N/A:** 24%

By level:

- **Division Heads:** 46% Yes, 29% No, 6% N/A
- **Management:** 44% Yes, 23% No, 0% N/A
- **Staff:** 45% Yes, 32% No, 15% N/A
- **Clerical Support:** 48% Yes, 23% No, 14% N/A
- **Collective Bargaining:** 55% Yes, 29% No, 31% N/A
- **Non-Collective Bargaining:** 55% Yes, 29% No, 31% N/A
**Question:** Do the current staffing levels in your functional area reflect recent changes in workload levels, program responsibilities and technology (automation, equipment, etc.) if applicable?
**Question:** Are staffing priorities, assignments, and levels consistent with workloads?

![Pie chart showing the results](chart.png)

- **Yes:** 31%
- **No:** 63%
- **N/A:** 6%

**By level**

- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 58%
  - No: 42%
  - N/A: 0%

- **Management**
  - Yes: 62%
  - No: 36%
  - N/A: 3%

- **Staff**
  - Yes: 67%
  - No: 25%
  - N/A: 8%

- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 45%
  - No: 42%
  - N/A: 9%

- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 62%
  - No: 31%
  - N/A: 7%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 64%
  - No: 31%
  - N/A: 5%
Question: Are staffing priorities and assignments appropriate for meeting goals and management objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division Heads</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Clerical Support</th>
<th>Collective Bargaining</th>
<th>Non-Collective Bargaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes 58%</td>
<td>Yes 54%</td>
<td>Yes 59%</td>
<td>Yes 47%</td>
<td>Yes 52%</td>
<td>Yes 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 42%</td>
<td>No 42%</td>
<td>No 30%</td>
<td>No 36%</td>
<td>No 36%</td>
<td>No 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A 0%</td>
<td>N/A 4%</td>
<td>N/A 11%</td>
<td>N/A 13%</td>
<td>N/A 11%</td>
<td>N/A 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: Is there duplication of effort within your office/functional area?

![Pie chart showing the results of the question.]

- Yes: 16%
- No: 84%

By level:

- Division Heads: 100%
- Management: 88%
- Staff: 83%
- Clerical Support: 68%
- Collective Bargaining: 83%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: 84%
**Question:** Do you feel you have adequate resources (support staff, technology, etc.) to effectively perform your job?

![Pie chart showing the percentage of respondents who feel they have adequate resources.](image)

- **Yes:** 42%
- **No:** 58%

**By level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division Heads</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Support</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question:** How would you describe your workload?

- **Too Much:** 46%
- **About Right:** 52%
- **Not Enough:** 2%

**By level:**
- **Division Heads:**
  - Too much: 42%
  - About Right: 54%
  - Not enough: 4%
- **Management:**
  - Too much: 44%
  - About Right: 55%
  - Not enough: 1%
- **Staff:**
  - Too much: 44%
  - About Right: 51%
  - Not enough: 3%
- **Clerical Support:**
  - Too much: 68%
  - About Right: 3%
  - Not enough: 2%
- **Collective Bargaining:**
  - Too much: 42%
  - About Right: 54%
  - Not enough: 3%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining:**
  - Too much: 44%
  - About Right: 54%
  - Not enough: 1%
Question: Does your skill set adequately prepare you for the tasks you are assigned?

Yes: 96%
No: 4%

By level:
- Division Heads: 100%
- Management: 95%
- Staff: 95%
- Clerical Support: 89%
- Collective Bargaining: 93%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: 98%
**Question:** Is it hard to maintain certain skill sets within your functional work area?

- **Yes:** 22%
- **No:** 78%

By level:
- **Division Heads:**
  - Yes: 75%
  - No: 25%
- **Management:**
  - Yes: 76%
  - No: 24%
- **Staff:**
  - Yes: 77%
  - No: 22%
- **Clerical Support:**
  - Yes: 13%
  - No: 87%
- **Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes: 77%
  - No: 23%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes: 79%
  - No: 21%
7. Technology

The objective of the technology section of the survey was to provide information about technology resources available at DOE. More specifically, the adequacy, reliability, and availability of current technology and levels of technical support.

Summary of Results

Overall, the majority of DOE employees responded that current computer resources are adequate to perform necessary tasks and job functions and receive necessary reports in a timely manner. Key survey results were:

- 79% of DOE respondents indicated that technical support is available for their functional work area and technical issues are resolved in a timely manner.
- 67% of DOE respondents indicated they are able to get accurate and timely reports to support their work, either internally or externally. 87% of division heads indicated they are able to get accurate and timely reports to support their work whereas only 62% of managers, 53% of staff, 59% of clerical support responses indicated they are able to get accurate and timely reports to support their work.
- DOE respondents indicated that existing computer resources are user-friendly (87%), integrated (72%), adequate (69%), relevant (89%), reliable (72%), and modern (67%).
- 67% of DOE employees believe tasks they currently perform manually could not be automated.
**Question:** Are the existing computer resources available to you user friendly?

- Yes: 87%
- No: 13%

By level:
- Division Heads: 100% Yes, 0% No
- Management: 86% Yes, 14% No
- Staff: 84% Yes, 15% No
- Clerical Support: 89% Yes, 8% No
- Collective Bargaining: 85% Yes, 13% No
- Non-Collective Bargaining: 87% Yes, 12% No
Question: Are the existing computer resources available to you integrated?

No 28%
Yes 72%

By level

Division Heads: Yes 83%, No 17%
Management: Yes 73%, No 27%
Staff: Yes 68%, No 31%
Clerical Support: Yes 79%, No 15%
Collective Bargaining: Yes 69%, No 29%
Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 77%, No 23%
**Question:** Are the existing computer resources available to you adequate?

![Pie chart and bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who believe the existing computer resources are adequate.](chart.png)
Question: Are the existing computer resources available to you relevant?

Yes 89%
No 11%

By level

- Division Heads: Yes 96%, No 4%
- Management: Yes 91%, No 9%
- Staff: Yes 86%, No 13%
- Clerical Support: Yes 85%, No 11%
- Collective Bargaining: Yes 86%, No 12%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 89%, No 10%
Question: Are the existing computer resources available to you reliable?

- Yes: 72%
- No: 28%

By level:

- Division Heads:
  - Yes: 67%
  - No: 33%
- Management:
  - Yes: 73%
  - No: 28%
- Staff:
  - Yes: 68%
  - No: 31%
- Clerical Support:
  - Yes: 89%
  - No: 8%
- Collective Bargaining:
  - Yes: 73%
  - No: 25%
- Non-Collective Bargaining:
  - Yes: 68%
  - No: 31%
Question: Are the existing computer resources available to you modern?

Yes: 67%
No: 33%

By level:
- Division Heads: Yes 63%, No 38%
- Management: Yes 67%, No 33%
- Staff: Yes 64%, No 34%
- Clerical Support: Yes 74%, No 21%
- Collective Bargaining: Yes 67%, No 31%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 64%, No 36%
**Question:** Are you able to get accurate and timely reports to support your work, either internally or externally as applicable?

- **Yes:** 67%
- **No:** 33%

By level:
- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 83%
  - No: 17%
  - N/A: 0%
- **Management**
  - Yes: 62%
  - No: 27%
  - N/A: 11%
- **Staff**
  - Yes: 53%
  - No: 30%
  - N/A: 15%
- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 59%
  - No: 8%
  - N/A: 0%
- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 55%
  - No: 27%
  - N/A: 17%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 65%
  - No: 24%
  - N/A: 11%
Job Activity Questionnaire Results

**Question:** Is technical support available to your functional work area?

**Yes** 89%

- **No** 8%
- **N/A** 3%

By level:

- **Division Heads:**
  - Yes 96%
  - No 4%
  - N/A 0%

- **Management:**
  - Yes 89%
  - No 8%
  - N/A 3%

- **Staff:**
  - Yes 86%
  - No 3%
  - N/A 10%

- **Clerical Support:**
  - Yes 86%
  - No 3%
  - N/A 0%

- **Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes 93%
  - No 0%
  - N/A 0%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes 88%
  - No 3%
  - N/A 8%

- **By level:**
  - Division Heads: Yes 96%, No 4%, N/A 0%
  - Management: Yes 89%, No 8%, N/A 3%
  - Staff: Yes 86%, No 3%, N/A 10%
  - Clerical Support: Yes 93%, No 0%, N/A 0%
  - Collective Bargaining: Yes 88%, No 3%, N/A 8%
  - Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 89%, No 2%, N/A 8%
**Question:** Are technical issues resolved in a timely manner?

- Yes: 79%
- No: 17%
- N/A: 4%
**Question:** Are there tasks that you currently perform manually that could be automated?

![Pie chart showing Yes and No responses]

- Yes: 33%
- No: 67%

**By level:**

- Division Heads: Yes 67%, No 33%
- Management: Yes 62%, No 39%
- Staff: Yes 67%, No 31%
- Clerical Support: Yes 68%, No 23%
- Collective Bargaining: Yes 65%, No 33%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 69%, No 30%
**Question:** Are there any tasks for which you are responsible that you would consider unnecessary?

- **Yes:** 27%
- **No:** 63%
- **N/A:** 10%

By level:

- **Division Heads:**
  - Yes: 83%
  - No: 17%
  - N/A: 0%

- **Management:**
  - Yes: 64%
  - No: 28%
  - N/A: 8%

- **Staff:**
  - Yes: 59%
  - No: 30%
  - N/A: 10%

- **Clerical Support:**
  - Yes: 60%
  - No: 13%
  - N/A: 19%

- **Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes: 58%
  - No: 29%
  - N/A: 11%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes: 71%
  - No: 21%
  - N/A: 8%
**Question:** Do you believe the constituent community you serve is satisfied with the services you provide?

- **Yes:** 83%
- **No:** 12%
- **N/A:** 5%
8. QSAC

The objective of the QSAC section of the survey was to obtain detailed information about QSAC. More specifically, DOE employee familiarity, trainings, communication and understanding of the process.

Summary of Results

Overall, approximately half of DOE employees are familiar with the QSAC process with approximately one-third indicating QSAC legislation was communicated to them. Key survey results were:

• Where 52% of DOE employees responded they are familiar with the QSAC process, 54% responded they should know about QSAC for their functional work area. 88% of division heads indicated they were familiar with QSAC and should know about QSAC because of their functional work area.

• Of the 17% of respondents that indicated QSAC training was provided, 85% responded the training was beneficial.

• Although 54% of respondents indicated they should know about QSAC for their functional work area, only 26% indicated QSAC was part of their daily core job functions.

• Approximately one-third of DOE responded that QSAC legislation was communicated or provided to them and one-quarter responded that the changes between the old monitoring system and QSAC has also been communicated.

• Approximately 16% of DOE employees responded that QSAC had been appropriately communicated externally to Districts, school boards, etc., and 23% thought it was not appropriately communicated. This was contrasted by 33% of division heads who thought it was communicated appropriately and the 46% who thought it was not appropriately communicated.
Question: Are you familiar with the QSAC process?

N/A 8%
Yes 52%
No 40%

By level:
- Division Heads: 88% Yes, 8% No, 0% N/A
- Management: 60% Yes, 31% No, 9% N/A
- Staff: 49% Yes, 42% No, 7% N/A
- Clerical Support: 55% Yes, 17% No, 13% N/A
- Collective Bargaining: 44% Yes, 44% No, 9% N/A
- Non-Collective Bargaining: 64% Yes, 27% No, 8% N/A
Question: For your functional work area and responsibilities, should you know about QSAC?

Yes: 54%
No: 22%
N/A: 24%

By level:
- Division Heads: Yes 88%, No 0%, N/A 8%
- Management: Yes 58%, No 22%, N/A 20%
- Staff: Yes 54%, No 25%, N/A 19%
- Clerical Support: Yes 34%, No 30%, N/A 21%
- Collective Bargaining: Yes 49%, No 21%, N/A 26%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 61%, No 21%, N/A 17%
**Question:** Has training been provided pertaining to QSAC?

- **No:** 64%
- **Yes:** 17%
- **N/A:** 19%
Job Activity Questionnaire Results

**Question:** If yes, was the training beneficial?

- **Yes:** 85%
- **No:** 15%

By level:
- **Division Heads:** 58%
- **Management:** 16%
- **Staff:** 12%
- **Clerical Support:** 2%
- **Collective Bargaining:** 9%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining:** 26%
**Question:** Is QSAC, or other District monitoring practice a part of your daily core job functions?

![Pie chart showing the results of the question]

- **Yes:** 26%
- **No:** 63%
- **N/A:** 11%

**By level:**

- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 67%
  - No: 25%
  - N/A: 4%

- **Management**
  - Yes: 66%
  - No: 27%
  - N/A: 7%

- **Staff**
  - Yes: 61%
  - No: 25%
  - N/A: 11%

- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 70%
  - No: 11%
  - N/A: 2%

- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 64%
  - No: 20%
  - N/A: 12%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 55%
  - No: 36%
  - N/A: 7%
**Question:** Has the QSAC legislation or administrative code been communicated or provided to you?

- **Yes:** 36%
- **No:** 46%
- **N/A:** 18%

By level:
- **Division Heads:** Yes 83%, No 4%, N/A 8%
- **Management:** Yes 43%, No 13%, N/A 4%
- **Staff:** Yes 48%, No 31%, N/A 18%
- **Clerical Support:** Yes 40%, No 15%, N/A 30%
- **Collective Bargaining:** Yes 48%, No 28%, N/A 21%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining:** Yes 52%, No 35%, N/A 11%
**Question:** Has QSAC been appropriately communicated externally to Districts, school boards, etc.?

- **Yes:** 16%
- **No:** 23%
- **N/A:** 61%

**By level:**

- **Division Heads**
  - Yes: 33%
  - No: 46%
  - N/A: 17%

- **Management**
  - Yes: 21%
  - No: 24%
  - N/A: 55%

- **Staff**
  - Yes: 11%
  - No: 22%
  - N/A: 55%

- **Clerical Support**
  - Yes: 11%
  - No: 9%
  - N/A: 64%

- **Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 13%
  - No: 19%
  - N/A: 64%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining**
  - Yes: 28%
  - No: 21%
  - N/A: 49%
**Question:** Have the changes between the old monitoring process and QSAC been communicated to you?

![Pie chart showing distribution of responses]

- **N/A:** 29%
- **Yes:** 25%
- **No:** 46%

**By level**

- **Division Heads:**
  - Yes: 71%
  - N/A: 8%
- **Management:**
  - Yes: 50%
  - N/A: 22%
- **Staff:**
  - Yes: 48%
  - N/A: 20%
- **Clerical Support:**
  - Yes: 36%
  - N/A: 9%
- **Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes: 49%
  - N/A: 18%
- **Non-Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes: 37%
  - N/A: 36%
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**Question:** Do you have a general understanding of the District Performance Review Process (DPR)?

- **Yes:** 36%
- **No:** 43%
- **N/A:** 21%

The pie chart shows the distribution of responses, with the majority (43%) indicating that they do not have a general understanding of the DPR. The least percentage (21%) is for the answer 'N/A'.
9. District Responsibilities

The objective of the District Responsibilities section of the survey was to identify DOE’s responsibilities to the Districts. More specifically, level of involvement, services provided and value.

Summary of Results

Overall, DOE personnel feel they provide a high level of direct services to Districts as part of their job responsibilities. DOE employees believe these services are valued. Key survey results were:

- About two-thirds of DOE employees indicated their level of involvement with the Districts range from medium (24%) to high (43%). Division heads indicated the highest level of involvement with Districts.

- 69% of DOE employees responded they provide direct services to Districts as part of their job duties. 83% of division heads, 73% of managers, and 69% of staff all indicated they provide direct services to Districts.

- 6% of DOE employees indicated they provide budget reviews and 7% indicated they provide data collection services to the Districts; and 37% of the respondents indicated they provide technical assistance to the Districts.

- 82% of DOE employees believe the services they provide are valued by the Districts. 57% of the clerical support thought their services were valued by the Districts.
**Question:** As a part of your job responsibilities, do you provide a direct service to District’s?

- **Yes:** 69%
- **No:** 23%
- **N/A:** 8%

Breakdown by level:

- **Division Heads:**
  - Yes: 83%
  - No: 13%
  - N/A: 0%

- **Management:**
  - Yes: 73%
  - No: 21%
  - N/A: 6%

- **Staff:**
  - Yes: 69%
  - No: 20%
  - N/A: 8%

- **Clerical Support:**
  - Yes: 38%
  - No: 34%
  - N/A: 13%

- **Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes: 63%
  - No: 23%
  - N/A: 10%

- **Non-Collective Bargaining:**
  - Yes: 77%
  - No: 18%
  - N/A: 3%
Question: What type of service do you provide to the District's?

By level:

- Division Heads
  - Data Collection: 13%
  - Trainings: 3%
  - Other: 3%
- Management
  - Data Collection: 7%
  - Trainings: 4%
  - Other: 4%
- Staff
  - Data Collection: 5%
  - Trainings: 2%
  - Other: 9%
- Clerical Support
  - Data Collection: 4%
  - Trainings: 3%
  - Other: 6%
- Collective Bargaining
  - Data Collection: 4%
  - Trainings: 1%
  - Other: 9%
- Non-Collective Bargaining
  - Data Collection: 7%
  - Trainings: 9%
  - Other: 6%
Question: What is your level of involvement in service to the District’s?

- **High**: 43%
- **Medium**: 24%
- **Low**: 21%
- **N/A**: 12%
Question: Do you believe the service you provide is valued by the Districts?

Yes: 82%
N/A: 15%
No: 3%

By level:

- Division Heads: Yes 83%, No 4%, N/A 8%
- Management: Yes 86%, No 2%, N/A 12%
- Staff: Yes 81%, No 3%, N/A 14%
- Clerical Support: Yes 57%, No 4%, N/A 26%
- Collective Bargaining: Yes 77%, No 2%, N/A 17%
- Non-Collective Bargaining: Yes 84%, No 3%, N/A 11%
Appendix C: District Survey Results
Introduction

The District Survey was provided to all local school Districts in New Jersey. At the request of DOE, the survey was sent to 21 County Offices for distribution to the Districts for completion. The intended audience for the District Survey included District Superintendents, Chief School Administrators, Assistant Superintendents, or a like designee. The questions in the survey solicited information related to the oversight and management activities of DOE, and was approved by the Commissioner.

The District Survey questions was delivered on 06/05/2007 and closed on 06/15/2007. 45.4% of Districts completed the survey. The following topics were covered:

This survey documents the opinions of District personnel with regards to this summary of items:

1. **Communication**: Purpose was to identify lines of communication, effectiveness and formal policies and procedures. Questions included:
   - Are the lines of communication between DOE and the Districts well defined?
   - How does your District receive information from DOE?

2. **Staffing Levels**: Purpose was to identify current staffing levels and adequacy to support QSAC and CORE. Questions included:
   - Do you feel DOE has adequate staffing for District oversight?
   - In which program or functional are do you feel more staff is required?

3. **District Oversight**: Purpose was to identify adequacy of District oversight provided by DOE. Questions included:
   - Does DOE provide adequate services to Districts with special needs, such as Abbott Districts?
   - Is DOE responsive to your needs?

4. **QSAC**: Purpose was to identify adequacy of support, training and oversight specific to QSAC by DOE. Questions included:
   - Are you familiar with the QSAC?
   - How did you find out about the elements of QSAC?
5. **District Preparation**: Purpose was to identify if Districts are adequately prepared by DOE for QSAC and CORE. Questions included:

- Has your District identified an owner for the QSAC process that will complete or manage the completion of the DPR?
- What preparation do you feel would be useful to ready your District for a QSAC review?

6. **County Office Support**: Purpose was to identify the adequacy, frequency and types of support provided to County Offices by DOE. Questions included:

- What preparation from the County Office do you feel would be useful to ready your District for a QSAC review?
- Based on your past experience with the level of support you have received from your County Office, do you feel that they are prepared to assist you in general monitoring requirements and/or the new QSAC requirements?

7. **CORE Impact**: Purpose was to identify the impact on Counties and Districts from CORE and DOE roles and responsibility. Questions included:

- How did you find out about the contents of CORE?
- How will CORE affect your District?

8. **DOE Support**: Purpose was to identify additional support or service Counties or Districts require from DOE to be effective and efficient. Questions include:

- Based on the level of support you have received in the past from DOE regarding the rollout of new initiatives, laws, rules, etc.; do you feel that DOE is prepared to assist you with CORE requirements?
- Do you feel you have adequate information on CORE or do you feel that additional information would be useful?
- If additional information would be useful, what form should it take?
District Survey Results

**Respondent Profile**

As surveys were received, the information was consolidated for analysis. Information provided is on a summary basis and is not intended to be a complete record. The following tables illustrate a summary of DOE participation and survey response results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Surveys Started by County or District Staff</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>389</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Surveys Not Opened by County or District Staff</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>612</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Surveys Completed by County or District Staff</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Surveys Opened but Not Completed by County or District Staff</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Percentage of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Completed Surveys</th>
<th>Total Number of Completed Surveys</th>
<th>Percentage Completed by Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts in Need</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Districts</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                            | 278                              | 100%                          |
## District Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Function</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Communication**    | • 71% of survey results indicated the lines of communication with DOE are well defined, 64% of Abbott Districts responded there are well defined lines of communication.  
• A majority of respondents indicated lines of communication were well defined (71%) and they are aware of data, documents, reports, etc. they need to provide to DOE (95%). However, only approximately half (56%) of the respondents indicated that DOE goals, polices and directives are effectively communicated. |
| **Staffing Levels**   | • Districts indicated that the program or functional areas that appear to require additional DOE staff are:  
• District contacts at the County level  
• Certification of teacher candidates  
• No Child Left Behind (NCLB)  
• Special Education  
• General issues and curriculum  
• Accounting and budgeting personnel |
| **District Oversight**| • 63% of the Districts responded that overall DOE is responsive to their needs; 93% feel that the County Offices are responsive to their needs.  
• Of the results, Districts in Need of Improvement indicated that the County Offices are 100% responsive to their needs, while DOE is 48% responsive to their needs.  
• Level II Districts indicated DOE is responsive approximately one-third of the time; they responded that the Counties are responsive 73% of the time. |
| **QSAC**              | • While over 90% of the Districts indicated they were aware of QSAC and that each public school District was required to conduct a DPR every three (3) years; 28% indicated they found out through DOE communication and 11% indicated they found out through DOE training.  
• Of the survey respondents currently under QSAC evaluation, 15% fall into the following Districts: Level II, State Operated, Districts in Need of Improvement or Bacon Districts. |
### District Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Function</th>
<th>Summary Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Preparedness</td>
<td>- 42% of the Districts responded that they do not have adequate information on QSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 43% of Districts that indicated based on past experiences that DOE is not prepared to assist them with new QSAC requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Office Support</td>
<td>- Districts indicated that the following tools or resources from the County Office would help prepare them for a QSAC review:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Training by the County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Onsite technical assistance from the County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Written Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Online tools and templates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- While a majority of Districts feel the County Offices are prepared to assist in general monitoring requirements of QSAC, respondents that feel the County Offices are most likely not prepared due to staffing shortages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE Oversight</td>
<td>- 77% of Districts indicated they were familiar with CORE legislation; only 50% of Abbott Districts indicated they were familiar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Of the majority of Districts familiar with CORE, only 15% indicated that they were informed of CORE by DOE communication; 53% indicated they were informed through advocacy or professional organization training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE Support</td>
<td>- 84% of the Districts indicated that additional information on CORE would be useful, predominately in the form of training by the County Offices, written documentation and online tools and templates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Communication

The objective of the communication section of the survey was to obtain detailed information regarding District communication with DOE and County Offices, more specifically: defined lines of communication, delivery of communication, frequency, awareness and adequacy.

Summary of Results

Overall, Districts indicated that the lines of communication with DOE are well defined. Districts also indicated that they are aware of data, documents, reports they are required to submit to DOE, when they are due for submission and who to contact within DOE for assistance regarding various topics. Key survey results were:

- A majority of respondents indicated lines of communication are well defined (71%), and they are aware of data, documents, and reports they need to provide to DOE (95%). However, only approximately half (56%) of the respondents indicated that DOE goals, policies and directives are effectively communicated.
- The majority of respondents indicate that information from DOE is received during monthly meetings, the County Office or e-mail.
- Of the regular communication with DOE, reporting requirements and budget information are the main topics of discussion.
**Question:** Are the lines of communication between DOE and the Districts well defined? Do you know who to call for assistance regarding varying topics such as programming, budget, administrative hearings, reporting requirements, policy, monitoring etc.?

![Pie chart showing 71% Yes and 29% No responses.]

**Note:** This bar graph and the bar graphs on subsequent pages may not sum to 100% due to individual respondents not answering specific questions.
**Question:** How does your District receive information from DOE?

Note: As respondents were able to select all methods of communication that apply, results indicate that Monthly Meetings, County Office, and e-mail are the most frequent paths of receiving information from DOE.

### District Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Abbott</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Districts in Need of Improvement</th>
<th>General Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Meetings</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Office</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Calls</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**District Survey Results**

*Question:* If you have regular communication with DOE employees, what topics are covered?

![Bar chart showing topic coverage](chart.png)

Note: As respondents were able to select all methods that apply, results indicate that Reporting Requirements and Budget are the topics most regularly covered in communicating with DOE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abbott</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Districts in Need of Improvement</th>
<th>General Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: Are you aware of the data, documents, reports, etc. you need to provide to the DOE and when they are due?

- Yes: 95%
- No: 5%

Bar charts showing:
- General Districts: 95% Yes, 5% No
- Level II: 100% Yes, 0% No
- Districts in Need of Improvement: 100% Yes, 0% No
- Abbott: 100% Yes, 0% No
**Question:** Are DOE’s goals, policies and directives effectively communicated?

- **Yes:** 56%
- **No:** 44%

---

- **General Districts:**
  - Yes: 56%
  - No: 44%

- **Level II:**
  - Yes: 64%
  - No: 36%

- **Districts in Need of Improvement:**
  - Yes: 64%
  - No: 36%

- **Abbott:**
  - Yes: 57%
  - No: 43%
2. Staffing Levels

The objective of the staffing level section of the survey was to obtain detailed information regarding the adequacy of staff for the purpose District oversight, areas additional staff may be required and areas where there may be overstaffing.

Summary of Results

Approximately one-third (36%) of the Districts feel that DOE is not adequately staffed to provide effective District oversight. Key survey results were:

• Districts indicated that the program or functional areas that require additional staff are:
  • District contacts at the County level
  • Certification of teacher candidates
  • No Child Left Behind (NCLB)
  • Special Education
  • General issues and curriculum
  • Accounting and budgeting personnel
• In general, Districts do not believe that any program or functional areas are overstaffed.
**Question:** Do you feel the DOE has adequate staffing for District oversight?

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses to the question.](chart)

- **Yes:** 36%
- **No:** 64%

Below are the survey results for different levels and districts:

- **General Districts:**
  - Yes: 36%
  - No: 64%

- **Level II:**
  - Yes: 16%
  - No: 84%

- **Districts in Need of Improvement:**
  - Yes: 46%
  - No: 54%

- **Abbott:**
  - Yes: 36%
  - No: 64%
**Question:** In which program or functional areas do you feel more staff is required?

- **IT Programming:** 3%
- **District Contacts at County Level:** 22%
- **Certification of Teacher Candidates:** 24%
- **NCLB:** 14%
- **Special Education:** 16%
- **General Issues and Curriculum:** 14%
- **Accounting/Budget/Personnel:** 8%

**Note:** As respondents were able to select all methods that apply, results indicate Certification of Teacher Candidates and District Contacts at the County Level are areas that require additional staff.
3. District Oversight

The objective of this section of the survey was to obtain information about general District oversight by DOE and the Counties. More specifically, categorizing special needs to Districts, the responsiveness of DOE and the Counties to the Districts, and the existence or adequacy of services received.

Summary of Results

Of the responses received, only a small percentage (18%) fell into the special need categories of Abbott, Level II, or Districts in Need of Improvement (see page 236 for the breakdown of respondents by category). Of the special need Districts that responded, approximately half believe that DOE provides their Districts with adequate services, while a majority (74%) of the non-special needs Districts respondents indicated that DOE provides adequate services to their Districts. Key survey results were:

- 63% of the Districts responded that DOE is responsive to their needs and 93% feel that the County Offices are responsive to their needs.
- Of the results, Districts in Need of Improvement indicated that the County Offices are 100% responsive to their needs while DOE is 48% responsive to their needs.
- Level II Districts indicated DOE is responsive approximately one-third of the time; they responded that the Counties are responsive 73% of the time.
- 50% of Abbott Districts and 48% of Districts in Need of Improvement indicated that DOE provides adequate services to their Districts, which is below the overall average of 51%.
- Districts indicated that the most beneficial assistance from DOE or the County Offices included the following:
  - Funding or grant assistance
  - Legislation, mandate, regulation content or implementation
  - Data collection or technical assistance
**Question:** Does your District fall into any of the following special categories?

- Districts in Need: 9%
- Level II: 4%
- Abbott: 5%
- Nonspecial Needs: 82%
**Question:** Does DOE provide adequate services to Districts with special needs, such as Abbott Districts?

- **Yes:** 51%
- **No:** 49%

### Level II Districts in Need Abbott

- **Yes:** 52%
- **No:** 48%

- **Yes:** 50%
- **No:** 50%
**Question:** If you are not included in any of the special District categories, do you feel adequate services are provided to your District?

- **Yes:** 74%
- **No:** 26%
**Question:** Is DOE responsive to your needs?

- Yes: 63%
- No: 37%

**General Districts**
- Yes: 66%
- No: 34%

**Level II**
- Yes: 64%
- No: 36%

**Districts in Need of Improvement**
- Yes: 48%
- No: 52%

**Abbott**
- Yes: 64%
- No: 36%
**Question**: Is the County Office responsive to your needs?

- **Yes**: 93%
- **No**: 7%

### District Survey Results

- General Districts: Yes 95%, No 5%
- Level II: Yes 73%, No 27%
- Districts in Need of Improvement: Yes 100%
- Abbott: Yes 71%, No 29%
**Question:** Do you receive the services you need from DOE (including County Offices)?

- **Yes:** 83%
- **No:** 17%

**General Districts**
- Yes: 86%
- No: 14%

**Level II**
- Yes: 64%
- No: 36%

**Districts in Need of Improvement**
- Yes: 68%
- No: 32%

**Abbott**
- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%
**Question:** If you do not receive the services you need, in what areas would assistance be useful?

![Bar chart showing percentage of responses by District type.](image)

**Note:** As respondents were able to select all methods that apply, results indicate that Funding or Grant Assistance and Legislation are the areas assistance would be useful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of responses by District type that indicated additional assistance would be useful.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abbott</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Assistance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding or Grant Assistance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training – Technical</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training – Professional Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. QSAC

The objective of the QSAC section of the survey was to obtain information about duties related to QSAC. More specifically, familiarity, awareness, source of knowledge, preparation and support for Districts pertaining to the QSAC review.

Summary of Results

Overall, Districts throughout New Jersey indicated that they are familiar with QSAC while a small percentage are participating in the initial pilot phase. Key survey results were:

- 90% of the Districts indicated they were aware of QSAC and that each public school District was required to conduct a DPR every three (3) years; 28% indicated they found out through DOE communication and 11% indicated they found out through DOE training.
- Of the survey respondents currently under QSAC evaluation, 15% fall into the following Districts: Level II, State Operated, Districts in Need of Improvement or Bacon Districts.
- Approximately half (53%) of responses indicate that DOE and/or the County Offices have not adequately prepared the Districts in advance for the start of their QSAC review. The majority of Districts indicated that written documentation, online tools and onsite technical assistance from the County Offices would better enable them to complete the QSAC review.
**Question:** Are you familiar with the New Jersey Quality Single Accountability Continuum (QSAC)?

- **Yes:** 91%  
- **No:** 9%

**District Survey Results**

- **General Districts:**
  - Yes: 90%
  - No: 10%

- **Level II:**
  - Yes: 91%
  - No: 9%

- **Districts in Need of Improvement:**
  - Yes: 92%
  - No: 8%

- **Abbott:**
  - Yes: 86%
  - No: 14%
Question: Are you aware that each public school District in the state must conduct a District Performance Review every three years which consists of a self-assessment tool developed by the DOE that measures the District's compliance with pre-determined quality performance indicators?
**District Survey Results**

**Question:** How did you find out about the particulars of QSAC?

![Bar Chart]

- **DOE Communication:** 28%
- **DOE Training:** 11%
- **Advocacy/Professional Communication:** 17%
- **Advocacy/Professional Training:** 10%
- **News:** 7%
- **Other:** 26%

### Percentage of responses by District type that indicated method of finding out about QSAC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abbott</th>
<th>Districts in Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>General Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOE Communication</strong></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOE Training</strong></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy/Professional Communication</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy/Professional Training</strong></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>News</strong></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question:** If you are currently under evaluation by QSAC, please identify the category that best represents your District.

- **General Districts:** 85%
- **Level II:** 4%
- **State Operated:** 1%
- **District in Need:** 7%
- **Bacon:** 3%
**Question:** Do you feel that the DOE and/or the County Office adequately prepared your District in advance of the start of your QSAC review?

**Pie Chart:**
- Yes: 53%
- No: 47%

**Bar Chart:**
- **General Districts:**
  - Yes: 70%
  - No: 17%
  - No Answer: 13%
- **Level II:**
  - Yes: 64%
  - No: 18%
  - No Answer: 18%
- **Districts in Need of Improvement:**
  - Yes: 60%
  - No: 12%
  - No Answer: 28%
- **Abbott:**
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 28%
  - No Answer: 21%
**Question:** Are you receiving adequate support from the DOE regarding your QSAC review or needs?

- **Yes:** 56%
- **No:** 44%

---

**General Districts**
- **Yes:** 71%
- **No:** 12%
- **No Answer:** 17%

**Level II**
- **Yes:** 64%
- **No:** 18%
- **No Answer:** 20%

**Districts in Need of Improvement**
- **Yes:** 60%
- **No:** 20%
- **No Answer:** 21%

**Abbott**
- **Yes:** 71%
- **No:** 29%
- **No Answer:** 50%
**District Survey Results**

**Question:** What support has been provided?

- Workshops: 44%
- Round-Table Meeting: 14%
- Informal County Support: 28%
- State Contacts & Memos/E-Mails: 14%

Note: As respondents were able to select all methods that apply, results indicate that, or assistance that was provided, Workshops and Informal County Support was the most prevalent.
**Question**: What additional support would you like your County Office or DOE to provide in order to better enable you to complete your QSAC review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Support</th>
<th>Abbott Districts (%)</th>
<th>Districts in Need of Improvement (%)</th>
<th>Level II (%)</th>
<th>General Districts (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Documentation</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Tools</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Technical Assistance from DOE</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Technical Assistance from County Office</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As respondents were able to select all methods that apply, results indicate that Written Documentation, Online Tools and Templates, and Onsite Technical assistance from County Offices would better enable Districts to complete their QSAC review.
Question: Were you a pilot site for the District Performance Review?

- Yes: 4%
- No: 96%

**Graph:**

- **General Districts:**
  - Yes: 85%
  - No: 12%
  - No Answer: 3%

- **Level II:**
  - Yes: 82%
  - No: 18%
  - No Answer: 0%

- **Districts in Need of Improvement:**
  - Yes: 80%
  - No: 16%
  - No Answer: 4%

- **Abbott:**
  - Yes: 50%
  - No: 21%
  - No Answer: 29%
5. District Preparedness

The objective of the District preparedness section of the survey was to obtain information about the current state of Districts preparedness to conduct a QSAC evaluation. More specifically, establishment of ownership of the DPR, and tools or resources required to adequately prepare for the QSAC evaluation.

Summary of Results

Overall, a majority of the Districts feel that they do not have adequate information on QSAC and feel that based on past experiences that DOE is not prepared to assist with new QSAC requirements. Key survey results were:

- Overall, 53% of the Districts have identified owners for the completion of the DPR primarily because they have no need to identify such a resource at this time.
- Districts indicated that written documentation, training by the County Offices, and online tools would be useful tools to assist in preparing for their QSAC review.
- 42% of the Districts responded that they do not have adequate information on QSAC.
- 43% of Districts indicated based on past experiences that DOE is not prepared to assist them with new QSAC requirements.
Question: Has your District identified an owner for the QSAC process that will complete or manage the completion of the DPR?

Yes: 53%
No: 47%

District Survey Results

General Districts
- Yes: 50%
- No: 38%
- No Answer: 12%

Level II
- Yes: 55%
- No: 27%
- No Answer: 18%

Districts in Need of Improvement
- Yes: 56%
- No: 28%
- No Answer: 16%

Abbott
- Yes: 57%
- No: 14%
- No Answer: 29%
District Survey Results

**Question:** If not, why not?

- Lack of Resources: 3%
- Lack of Applicable Schools: 4%
- No Current Need to Identify: 77%
- Other: 16%
## District Survey Results

**Question:** What preparation do you feel would be useful to ready your District for a QSAC review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Type</th>
<th>Abbott</th>
<th>Districts in Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>General Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training by DOE</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training by County Office</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Documentation</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Tools</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Technical Assistance from DOE</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Technical Assistance from County Office</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As respondents were able to select all methods that apply, results indicate that Written Documentation, Training by the County Offices, and Online Tools and Templates would be most useful in preparing Districts for a QSAC review.
**Question:** Do you feel you have adequate information on QSAC?

- Yes: 42%
- No: 58%

General Districts:
- Yes: 37%
- No: 12%
- No Answer: 51%

Level II:
- Yes: 36%
- No: 18%
- No Answer: 46%

Districts in Need of Improvement:
- Yes: 40%
- No: 16%
- No Answer: 44%

Abbott:
- Yes: 36%
- No: 36%
- No Answer: 27%
District Survey Results

**Question:** If not, or if additional information would be useful, what form should it take?

- **Trainings:** 75%
- **E-Mail:** 15%
- **Newsletters:** 2%
- **Other:** 8%

**Yes** 64% 80% 73% 71%
**No** 26% 20% 27% 29%
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**Question:** Based on your past experience with the level of support you have received from the DOE, do you feel that DOE is prepared to assist you with the new QSAC requirements?

Yes: 43%
No: 57%

- **37%** General Districts
- **51%** Level II
- **48%** Districts in Need of Improvement
- **43%** Abbott

- **12%** No
- **18%** No Answer
District Survey Results

6. County Office Support
The objective of the County Office support section of the survey was to obtain information about support and technical assistance provided to Districts by the County Offices. More specifically, the County Offices ability to prepare Districts for QSAC review and services required for implementation.

Summary of Results
Districts indicated that they feel that, based on past experiences, the County Offices are prepared to assist in the general monitoring requirements of QSAC. Key results from the survey were:

- Districts indicated that the following tools or resources from the County Office would help prepare them for a QSAC review:
  - Training by the County
  - Written Documentation
  - Online tools and templates
  - Onsite technical assistance from the County

- While a majority of Districts feel the County Offices are prepared to assist in general monitoring requirements of QSAC, respondents feel the County Offices are not prepared due to staffing shortages.

- Districts indicated the following other services and/or support for DOE or County Offices to assist in the implementation of QSAC:
  - Training by the County Office
  - Written Documentation
  - Training by DOE
  - Online tools and templates
  - Regular communication
Study Findings

**Question:** What preparation from the County Office do you feel would be useful to ready your District for a QSAC review?

![Bar chart showing percentages of responses]

Legend of the chart:
- **Training by County:** 87%
- **Written Documentation:** 80%
- **Online Tools:** 68%
- **Onsite Tech Assistance from County:** 51%
- **Other:** 6%

**Note:** As respondents were able to select all methods that apply, results indicate that Training by the County Offices, Written Documentation, and Online Tools and Templates would be the most useful tools from the County Offices to assist in preparing for a QSAC review.
**Question:** Based on your past experience with the level of support you have received from your County Office, do you feel that they are prepared to assist you with general monitoring requirements and/or the new QSAC requirements?

Yes 78%

No 22%

General Districts

- Yes: 64%
- No: 26%

Level II

- Yes: 80%
- No: 20%

Districts in Need of Improvement

- Yes: 73%
- No: 27%

Abbott

- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%
District Survey Results

**Question:** If no, why not?

Note: As respondents were able to select multiple responses that apply, results indicate that Staffing Shortages are the most common response for County Offices not being prepared to assist with general monitoring requirements or new requirements of QSAC.
**Question:** What other services and/or support from either the DOE or County Offices will assist you with the implementation of QSAC guidelines?

Note: As respondents were able to select all methods that apply, results indicate that Training by the County Offices, Written Documentation, Online Tools and Templates, and Regular Communication would assist in the implementation of QSAC guidelines.
District Survey Results

7. CORE Oversight
The objective of the CORE oversight section of the survey was to obtain information regarding Districts awareness of CORE. More specifically, familiarity, changes and the potential affect on Districts.

Summary of Results
Overall, Districts indicated that they are familiar with CORE legislation and the changes to the Office of County Superintendent of Schools included within CORE, including the expanded duties of the position. Key results from the survey were

- 77% of Districts indicated they were familiar with CORE legislation; only 50% of Abbott Districts indicated they were familiar.
- Of the majority of Districts that are familiar with CORE, only 15% indicated that they were familiar due to DOE communication; 53% indicated they are familiar through advocacy or professional organization training.
- Districts indicated that CORE would affect them primarily through budget and purchasing changes.
**Question:** Are you familiar with CORE legislation (Clearing hurdles to shared services; Overriding waste in schools; Reining in pension abuses; and, Empowering citizens) which was enacted in spring 2007?
Question: How did you find out about the contents of CORE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Abbott</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>Districts in Need of Improvement</th>
<th>General Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOE Communication</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy or Professional Organization</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Training</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District Survey Results

**Question:** How will CORE affect your District?

Note: As respondents were able to select all methods of communication that apply, results indicate that Budget Changes, Purchasing Changes, and Consolidation of Shared Services would be the biggest impact of CORE.
**Question:** How will CORE affect your District? (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of responses by District type indicating affect of CORE to their Districts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Access to Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of Shared Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Consolidation of District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Elimination of District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of Special Ed Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question:** Are you aware of the changes to the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools included within CORE, including the expanded duties of the position?

![Pie chart showing 68% yes and 32% no.]

- **General Districts:** Yes 74%, No 26%
- **Level II:** Yes 80%, No 20%
- **Districts in Need of Improvement:** Yes 80%, No 20%
- **Abbott:** Yes 50%, No 50%
8. DOE Support

The objective of the DOE support section of the survey was to obtain information regarding support and technical assistance provided by DOE to the Districts related to CORE. More specifically, types and adequacy of support provided by DOE.

Summary of Results

Overall, the majority of Districts feel that additional information on CORE would be useful and that DOE is not prepared to assist with new CORE requirements. Key results from the survey were:

- 84% of the Districts indicated that additional information on CORE would be useful, predominately in the form of training by the County Offices, written documentation and online tools and templates.
District Survey Results

**Question:** Do you feel you have adequate information on CORE or do you feel that additional information would be useful?

- **Adequate Info:** 16%
- **Require Additional Info:** 84%

---

Graph showing survey results:

- **General Districts:**
  - Yes: 60%
  - No: 13%
  - No Answer: 27%

- **Level II:**
  - Yes: 73%
  - No: 9%
  - No Answer: 14%

- **Districts in Need of Improvement:**
  - Yes: 72%
  - No: 8%
  - No Answer: 20%

- **Abbott:**
  - Yes: 43%
  - No: 7%
  - No Answer: 50%
District Survey Results

**Question:** If additional information would be useful, what form should it take?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Additional Information</th>
<th>Abbott</th>
<th>Districts in Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Level II</th>
<th>General Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training by DOE</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training by County Offices</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Documentation</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Tools and Templates</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Technical Assistance from DOE</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Technical Assistance from County Office</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As respondents were able to select all methods of that apply, results indicate that Training by the County Offices, Written Documentation, and Online tools and Templates would be most useful when receiving additional information.
**Question:** Based on the level of support you have received in the past from the DOE regarding the rollout of new initiatives, laws, rules, etc.; do you feel that DOE is prepared to assist you with CORE requirements?

![District Survey Results Diagram](image_url)

- **Yes:** 34%
- **No:** 66%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Districts</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts in Need of Improvement</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Benchmarking Results
Benchmarking Introduction

In order to help develop recommendations to the findings identified in this report, and compare DOE against peers, we conducted a benchmarking analysis of four state Departments of Education. The benchmarking analysis focused on reviewing alternative service delivery methods that may help enable DOE to improve the effectiveness of its District oversight responsibilities. States were selected in concert with DOE, and DOE provided a primary contact for each state. Structured interviews were then conducted, with planned agendas approved by DOE, and further research was conducted on each state’s website. The following state Departments of Education participated in this survey:

- Arkansas Department of Education (AKDOE)
  Dr. Ken James, Commissioner of Education
  www.Arkansased.org

- Kentucky Department of Education (KYDOE)
  Gene Wilhoit, formerly the Commissioner of Education
  http://www.kde.state.ky.us/KDE/

- Massachusetts Department of Education (MADOE)
  Jeff Nellhaus, Deputy Commissioner
  http://www.doe.mass.edu

- North Carolina State Board of Education (NCDOE)
  June Atkinson, Superintendent
  http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/

In addition to gathering information on each state, the State of New Jersey DOE was benchmarked against the four states and summarized in the tables in this section for comparative purposes.

The following pages provide overall analysis based on the results of the benchmarking effort. The analysis focuses on primary findings, other common themes, or other questions where the representative’s response was pertinent to the report. Benchmarking results are provided in a comparative, summary format for each state included in the benchmarking effort.
Benchmarking Results –
Key Themes

**Key Themes**

Based on the benchmarking analysis the following five key themes and practices were identified:

**Agency Head**

In all four states interviewed, the Commissioner or the Superintendent is the agency head and the State Board of Education is a partner in setting policy for DOE. In Arkansas, the State Board of Education cannot overturn a decision of the AKDOE. In Massachusetts, Kentucky, and North Carolina the State Board of Education has the final authority to establish policy. These policies can only be overturned by the respective State Legislatures. However, in the four states interviewed, the State Board of Education’s oversight does not extend to operational issues. In New Jersey, the State Board of Education can overturn adjudicative decisions.

**Districts Receiving Additional Resources**

North Carolina and Arkansas both have Districts or schools that require additional resources or funding because of a court decree. North Carolina has high schools that receive additional resources as a result of a lawsuit similar to the Abbott decision; however, the North Carolina State Supreme Court ruled that inequitable access to financial resources was not the main issue for underperforming schools. Instead of providing additional funding to the high schools, the NCDOE created the Basic Education Program which outlined access to education requirements. The 35 lowest performing high schools then received additional assistance from “Turn Around Teams” in order to help them meet the basic requirements.

In Arkansas, there are Districts that are divided into groups that receive additional resources, similar to the Abbott Districts. Unlike New Jersey, specific personnel were only assigned to these Districts temporarily. There are not permanent staffing positions dedicated to these efforts, with the exception of staff people assigned to equity and adequacy issues surrounding the case. The State of Arkansas infused additional resources statewide and the lawsuit was resolved after ten years. As a result of the court decree more funding goes into at-risk populations and enhanced educational funding.

**Compensation**

North Carolina and Massachusetts commented on the challenges they face with their salary structures, and expressed concern over the level of compensation that Districts are able to offer. They are unable to match or exceed District salaries in order to attract key personnel. Arkansas currently has a competitive salary structure in place. The Commissioner of Education asked for flexibility from the State Legislature for staffing because they were losing staff to the District positions. As a result, AKDOE is able to have a pool positions they can hire from at competitive wages. In Kentucky, management salaries are set based on the top three salaries of similar positions in the Districts in order to effectively recruit personnel. In New Jersey, 88% of DOE employees are unionized, where compensation scales are pre-determined based on a CBA. High-level union employees may receive higher compensation than DOE management, and Districts have the ability to pay more than DOE.
Benchmarking Results – Key Themes

Key Themes (continued)

Union Employees
Arkansas and North Carolina do not have unionized employees. In those two states, agency management heads have more flexibility in hiring, evaluating performance, establishing salary structures, and changing job descriptions to fit agency needs. New Jersey has a union which includes the majority of DOE employees. The CBA establishes salary structures, compensation performance evaluations, and grievance procedures.

Employee Performance Evaluation
All four states interviewed allow their employees to have some level of input in setting their own performance goals and objectives.

North Carolina has the employee set their individual performance standards against the goals of the DOE. Each division creates a Leadership Management Plan based on the goals of the department and each employee within each division creates their own performance plan. Each supervisor evaluates the employee’s performance evaluation and decides if it is in accordance with the overall Leadership and Management Plan and the DOE’s goals.

North Carolina uses a client satisfaction survey, which is sent to all information technology clients. The results of the satisfaction survey are then tied back in to the employee’s performance evaluation. They plan to incorporate a client satisfaction survey into other areas of their department.

Training
All four states interviewed offer a series of internal training programs either from their respective State Personnel Departments or within DOEs. All differ from the New Jersey DOE in the travel approval process. The four benchmarked states have final approval for reimbursements for out-of-state travel and training costs as long as they work within the confines of their travel budgets.
Summary Tables
The following tables present the benchmarking results in a comparative, summary format for each state included in, and responsive to the benchmarking effort. For benchmarking source documentation refer to page 311 of this section.

Table 1: State Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>Kentucky</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Expenditure Per Student (2003/2004)*</td>
<td>$6,895</td>
<td>$6,888</td>
<td>$10,986</td>
<td>$6,732</td>
<td>$13,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Districts</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts Designated as Requiring Additional Resources</td>
<td>Yes, Lakeview Districts</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, 35 low performing high schools</td>
<td>Yes, 31 Abbott Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>2,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>463,922</td>
<td>664,606</td>
<td>968,661</td>
<td>1,369,493</td>
<td>1,387,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch (%)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Number of DOE Staff</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Number of Institutional Staff (School for the Deaf and/or School for the Blind)**</td>
<td>272 (not in DOE budget)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>40 (in DOE budget)</td>
<td>Approximately 200 (not included in DOE budget)</td>
<td>259 (in DOE budget)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: [http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/profile.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/profile.asp). This data is from 2003/2004 which this is the most recent information available online from this organization. For additional benchmarking sources refer to page 311.

**Note: The number of staff in this row were separated and are excluded, from the row above entitled Approximate Number of DOE staff.
Table 2: Summary of Primary Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>Kentucky</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a strategic plan or goals?</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes, based on the long-term goals of all schools and that all students reach proficiency by 2014.</td>
<td>A high level framework for leadership in action, which includes a statement of principals.</td>
<td>Yes, current DOE goals were developed through a collaborative effort between the State Board of Education and the DOE.</td>
<td>Yes, developed by the State Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is the agency head?</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointed by/elected?</td>
<td>Appointed by Governor</td>
<td>Appointed by State Board of Education</td>
<td>Appointed by State Board of Education</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>Appointed by Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What authority does the State Board of Education have to influence the policy and administration of the DOE?</td>
<td>The State Board of Education cannot overturn a decision made by the DOE. The decisions are made jointly. The Board has a significant responsibility with consolidation efforts and legislative matters.</td>
<td>The Commissioner reports to the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education has the authority to overrule DOE policy related decisions, if the decision was presented before the State Board of Education. As mandated by Kentucky law, the Kentucky Board of Education develops and adopts the regulations that govern Kentucky’s 176 public school districts and the actions of the Kentucky Department of Education. Department officials follow board guidelines.</td>
<td>The DOE prepares and presents agendas to the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education approves policies and makes the final decision. The State Board is responsible for basic policy such as academic standards.</td>
<td>The State Board of Education has the final decision. Legislation may overrule the State Board of Education. The Board sets state policy as it relates to public education (preK-12) for accountability, licensing, and approving statewide curriculum. They approve any reorganizations of the DOE and the hiring of upper level management.</td>
<td>The State Board of Education can overturn DOE decisions and has influence over policy and administrative decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Summary of Primary Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>Kentucky</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your current</td>
<td>The DOE monitors the Districts from a distance. If issues require</td>
<td>Districts are overseen and supervised by the DOE.</td>
<td>DOE and an independent entity, Educational Quality Assurance (EQA), are</td>
<td>Very structured statewide school system. The Districts report to DOE on policy</td>
<td>County Offices evaluate and monitor local Districts annually. Also, Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure to support</td>
<td>additional assistance, then the DOE will take the necessary steps up and</td>
<td></td>
<td>responsible for District quality reviews.</td>
<td>only.</td>
<td>are locally controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District oversight?</td>
<td>including District takeover.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you working on</td>
<td>Yes, Arkansas has gone from 310 to 245 Districts since 2004. The</td>
<td>Yes, Kentucky began working on them several years ago, but it is no</td>
<td>No real efforts to consolidate; unsure of the financial incentives that</td>
<td>Annually, a bill is introduced that attempts to cut the amount of Districts</td>
<td>Yes, as part of the CORE law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District consolidation</td>
<td>consolidation efforts are based on Act 60, the consolidation law.</td>
<td>longer a priority. Districts are consolidating naturally where</td>
<td>fewer Districts may bring.</td>
<td>from 115 to 100; however, the bill has never passed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts?</td>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a County</td>
<td>No. The DOE has 16 educational service cooperatives that operate as</td>
<td>No. The DOE has Regional Support Centers that provide technical</td>
<td>No, there are no intermediary offices. Regional offices were disbanded about</td>
<td>No regional offices or technical assistance centers. Districts can form</td>
<td>Yes, County Offices are the conduit to the Districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Regional structure</td>
<td>intermediary agencies.</td>
<td>assistance to Districts.</td>
<td>15 years ago.</td>
<td>Regional Agencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that provides District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oversight?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any specific</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No, but they have a tiered system of support for Districts that begins</td>
<td>Educational reform act of 1993 provided improvements in funding,</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes, QSAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State laws that mandate</td>
<td></td>
<td>with a District self-evaluation.</td>
<td>accountability for student learning, and standards for both students and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the oversight or self-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>personnel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluations of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 4: Summary of Secondary Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOE Staff Unionized?</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>Kentucky</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOE Staff Unionized?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is your performance management system designed?</td>
<td>Employee creates their own standards for the job and receive annual reviews.</td>
<td>Employees self evaluate, formative through the year and summative at year-end.</td>
<td>Employees set own benchmarks. Employees are evaluated at the interim and annually.</td>
<td>Each employee creates their own performance plan and are rated annually.</td>
<td>Employees are evaluated at the interim and annually. Forms, included in the CBA, are used: PES for union employees; PAR for non-union management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is compensation tied to merit?</td>
<td>Merit increases by rating: * Exceeds: 4%  * Above Avg:2%  * Satisfactory:0.5%</td>
<td>Yes, for the union employees. Management raises are tied to evaluations, but have to stay within parameters set by the legislature.</td>
<td>Management evaluations determine 2-5% increases in pay every year.</td>
<td>The General Assembly does not fund pay increases based on performance reviews.</td>
<td>Not for unionized employees. Management may receive a 0-6% increase based on PAR ratings over the next two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have your compensation scales been adjusted recently?</td>
<td>Recently adjusted upward to compensate employees at the same level as Districts.</td>
<td>Management salaries are set based on the top three salaries of similar positions in the Districts. This helps the DOE effectively recruit from the Districts.</td>
<td>No. There is flexibility regarding salaries, but the policies are under the State Personnel Department guidelines.</td>
<td>The compensation scale is set by the General Assembly. The current salary schedules are not competitive within the various positions in the DOE.</td>
<td>There was a recent update to management level compensation scales but it may not be continued past 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmarking Results – Arkansas

The following pages provide a narrative summary of the information provided by each state.

Summary of Responses

The following information was provided about the Arkansas Department of Education (AKDOE), by Dr. Ken James, Commissioner of Education.

- **Description of District oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**
  - Act 35 is the educational reform act.
  - Act 1467 is the Omnibus Act that outlines the responsibilities for AKDOE’s oversight of Districts.
  - Monitoring teams are in place to check the current standards. They monitor in terms of adherence to state standards which may result in a citation or probation. If a District does not meet standards then a District may be put on probation.
  - The accountability requirements of NCLB mandate that states establish steadily increasing targets for student achievement and that schools progress toward meeting the long-term goal of proficiency in reading and math for all students by 2013-14. Those schools that do not meet state targets for two consecutive years are identified as “schools in need of improvement.” 35 Districts are in years 3, 4, or 5 of school improvement.
  - Three (3) Districts with two (2) superintendents were taken over and now report directly to the Commissioner of Education.
  - Teams are responsible for oversight and compliance. The Learning Service Division is responsible for oversight. They have a checklist of standards and focus on certain Districts that may need additional assistance.

- **Functions of the Department of Education:**
  - Technical assistance is provided through America’s Choice for the 35 Districts in years 3, 4, and 5 of school improvement. It is a not-for-profit organization that has been working for AKDOE for the last year and is paid by federal and state funds.
  - Currently management and supervisory levels are not understaffed. Arkansas has non-union employees and is able to keep appropriate staffing levels. However, AKDOE may be understaffed in the future and may need more technical assistance personnel due to the NCLB Act.
Benchmarking Results – Arkansas

- **Strategic Planning and Goals:**
  - No information was provided for this area.

- **Structure to Support District Oversight:**
  - AKDOE monitors the Districts from a distance. If there are issues that need additional assistance, the AKDOE will take any necessary steps.
  - A District can be taken over with approval from the Governor’s Office and the Legislature.
  - AKDOE does not have County Offices. It has educational service cooperatives that operate as intermediary agencies. There are 16 cooperatives throughout the State. They were created by legislation. The AKDOE gives them some funding but they have no direct control over them.
  - Consolidation of Districts was driven by the Governor in 2004. Since that time, Arkansas went from 310 to 245 Districts. The consolidation efforts are based on Act 60, which maps out the consolidation process. For example, if a District falls below 350 students for 2 years in a row, the District is consolidated.

- **Governance**
  - The Superintendent is a non-voting member of the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education consists of 9 people appointed by the Governor. The current Superintendent is the agency head, appointed by the Governor, and has a good working relationship with the State Board of Education.
  - The State Board of Education cannot overturn a decision that the AKDOE made. The decisions are made jointly, so the AKDOE is aware of the decisions.
  - The State Board of Education has a significant responsibility with consolidation efforts and legislation. All applications for charters go to the State Board of Education.
  - There are no laws that are similar to QSAC or CORE. The Districts have to collect data in advance of monitoring teams arriving, but there is no official self-assessment for the Districts. Monitoring teams are in place to check the current standards, and if a District does not meet the standards than a District may be put on probation.
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- **Performance Management**
  - There are no unionized employees AKDOE.
  - The job descriptions are aligned with the Performance Evaluation system.
  - District Superintendents assess field staff who apply for positions with AKDOE.
  - AKDOE has trouble filling two positions – IT Programmers and Facility Site Supervisors.
  - Employees create their own standards for the job, which result in measurable goals for the employee’s performance. New employees have a 6-month probationary evaluation. After one year, they have a regular evaluation.
  - Compensation is tied to performance evaluation ratings: Exceeds receive a 4% increase, Above Average receives a 2% increase, and Satisfactory receives a 0.5% increase in compensation. The percentages are set by the State Office of Personnel Management.
  - A competitive salary structure is in place. The Commissioner asked for flexibility in staffing; therefore, AKDOE is able to have a pool of positions to hire from at competitive wages.
  - The compensation scale grid was reevaluated for AKDOE, because employees were moving to Districts for higher pay.

- **Professional Development**
  - The following professional development avenues are available for AKDOE employees:
    - Internal conferences for administrative staff.
    - In-service trainings for sexual harassment, communication skills, and other general topics.
    - State Office of Personnel Management trainings.
  - The travel budget for AKDOE includes funds for conferences, and travel is allowed with approval from immediate supervisors and/or others with AKDOE.
Summary of Responses
The following information was provided about the Kentucky Department of Education (KYDOE), by Gene Wilhoit, the former Commissioner of Education. Mr. Wilhoit was solicited as the former head of KYDOE and is currently the Executive Director of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO).

• **Description of District oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**
  • Districts are supervised and overseen by KYDOE. KYDOE is responsible for oversight activities.
  • KYDOE has the power to takeover a District and remove superintendents and school board members.
  • KYDOE provides technical assistance to Districts using a tiered system. If the District is functioning well there is nothing beyond general assistance. However, if the District is trending down or has no growth:
    • Tier 1: An internal review is conducted. KYDOE does not intervene, but monitors the District.
    • Tier 2: A team of auditors visits the District and sets a course for improvement.
    • Tier 3: The District participates in a program to move support teams into schools.
    • Tier 4: Highly Skilled Professional educators go into the District for 3-4 years and act as internal change agents.
    • Tier 5: KYDOE take over the District.

• **Functions of the Department of Education:**
  • Administering the statewide assessment and accountability system.
  • Providing technical assistance to schools and Districts in the areas of financial management and curriculum.
  • Providing support and information to the Kentucky State Board of Education as it promulgates state education regulations.
  • Overseeing the state’s education technology system.
  • Monitoring school and District compliance with state and federal laws.
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- **Strategic Planning and Goals:**
  - In 2001, the Kentucky State Board of Education adopted a strategic plan based on the long-term goals of all schools and with the goal of all students reaching proficiency by 2014. A study was conducted in 2005 to evaluate the KYDOE’s progress in achieving its strategic objectives.

- **Structure to Support District Oversight:**
  - Kentucky does not have an intermediary agency between the KYDOE and the Districts. Regional support centers are used for technical assistance to Districts, but those offices have no jurisdiction over Districts.
  - Consolidation efforts: 56 Districts that are not associated with a County are being merged into the County Districts, but this process is slow.

- **Governance:**
  
  **Legislation**
  - Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 (KERA, House Bill 940). The passing of this law resulted in sweeping changes to the Kentucky Public Education School Systems:
    - Creation of the Commonwealth School Improvement Fund (CSIF) to assist local schools in pursuing new and innovative strategies to meet the educational needs of the school’s students and raise the school’s performance level.
    - Require each District and public school to produce and distribute District report cards.
  - As mandated by Kentucky law, the Kentucky State Board of Education develops and adopts the regulations that govern Districts and the actions of KYDOE. KYDOE officials follow State Board of Education guidelines.
  - The Superintendent generally is responsible for developing proposed drafts of new policies. State law requires the Superintendent to prepare, under State Board’s of Education direction, all rules, regulations, bylaws, and statements of policy for approval and adoption by the State Board of Education.
Governance Structure

- The Commissioner is the agency head and not the State Board of Education. A Kentucky law exists that prevents a board from being in charge of an agency.
- KYDOE is an agency of the State Education Cabinet. KYDOE is led by an appointed Commissioner of Education, who answers to the 11-member Kentucky Board of Education.
- The Kentucky State Board of Education appoints the Commissioner. The Commissioner reports to the Kentucky State Board of Education and sets the agenda. The Commissioner also makes recommendations to the Kentucky State Board of Education.
- The Kentucky State Board of Education also serves as the Board for the Kentucky School for the Blind and Kentucky School for the Deaf, and KYDOE staff serve as resources for those schools.
- The Office of Legal and Legislative Services (“Office”) provides KYDOE staff and the Kentucky State Board of Education with legal counsel and advice on matters pertaining to education-related state and federal laws and regulations. The Office’s Chief Counsel also serves as a hearing officer for the Kentucky State Board of Education.

Performance Management:

Staffing

- KYDOE has the ability to reduce civil service employee staffing levels as long as seniority is honored.
  - Commissioner appointments are not union and KYDOE can hire contractors for specific tasks and policy development.
  - Career employees are represented by a union in KYDOE.

Performance Evaluation Process

- Formative through the year and then summative at the end of the year.
- Includes a self-evaluation, reflection period, and then documentation.
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Compensation Increases

• For union employees, compensation is tied to merit.
• For management, raises are tied to evaluations, but the increases have to stay within parameters set by the legislature.
  • Management salaries are set based on the top three salaries of similar positions in the Districts.

Professional Development:

• KYDOE, Educational Professional Standards Board and other organizations involved in e-Learning offer online professional development courses.
  • The e-Learning For Educators is a multi-state collaboration between eight state education agencies and associated public broadcast stations and is funded by a federal grant.
• Students and teachers use the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS) to improve their proficiency levels.
  • Schools who receive awards through CATS receive money from the state to use for schools expenses.
  • Schools who fail to receive awards are subject to a Scholastic Audit.
• KYDOE provides a number of internal programs; some employees receive reimbursement for college level classes.
• KYDOE has authority to allow employees to travel out-of-state as long as it is within the travel budget.
Summary of Responses
The following information was provided about the Massachusetts Department of Education (MADOE), by Jeff Nielhaus, Deputy Commissioner.

• **Description of District oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**
  
  **District Oversight**
  
  • The Educational Quality Assurance (EQA) is responsible for District quality reviews. The reviews are government established and are a funded entity independent of the MADOE. Each entity has their own Board and Executive Director.
  
  • The Educational Management Accountability Council (EMCA) oversees the EQA.
  
  • Additional oversight for Districts or Schools under corrective action is in place.
  
  • Some Districts have been identified as “under-performing.” They have received supplementary support.

  **Technical Assistance**
  
  • Technical assistance is provided by outside partners including America’s Choice (assists 1 of the 3 under-reporting Districts) and Educational Development Corporation (EDC).
  
  • Technical assistance regarding implementation and interpretation is obtainable on a continuous basis in regulated program areas.
  
  • Educational Quality Assurance (EQA) is responsible for administering certain waivers, approvals, and special notices that are required by the State Board of Education.

  **Staffing Levels**
  
  • Management and supervisory staffing levels are adequate to provide proper oversight and a reasonable span-of-control without a reduction in current service levels and efficiencies.
• **Functions of the Department of Education:**
  • Provide qualified educators for every public school and classroom.
  • Establish high proficiency standards for all students in core subjects.
  • Provide adequate resources and support services; utilized by schools, Districts, and communities.
  • Provide valid, reliable assessment and accountability systems for students, educators, schools, and Districts.
  • Provide timely, useful information to stakeholders.
  • Ensure efficient agency management.
  • Perform oversight regarding Special Education Appeals even though they are handled through an outside agency.

• **Strategic Planning and Goals:**
  • There is a current strategic plan that includes Departmental goals.
  • The strategic plan is a high level framework for leadership in action and includes action principals, which are statements describing what MADOE believes and levers, which are tools the MADOE can use to drive improvement.

• **Structure to Support District Oversight:**
  • There are no intermediary offices. Regional offices were disbanded 15 years ago.
  • New regional entities are being considered as Regional Support Centers for technical assistance and will not have direct oversight of the Districts.
  • There have been past attempts to consolidate the number of Districts but none have been successful. No efforts to consolidate are in place.
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Governance:

Legislation

- The educational reform act of 1993 provided improvements in funding, accountability for student learning, and standards for both students and personnel in their respective Districts.
- The “foundation budget,” a portion of the educational reform act of 1993, was established to create a foundation level for each District to benchmark its spending. The goal is to improve progressively from the initial “foundation budget” each year.
- The “foundation budget” is the school funding formula, which is set by law and is refined over time.
- The “foundation budget” establishes a minimum spending and tax rate. The Districts raise a certain amount of money towards the “foundation budget.” Ultimately, if funding is below the original “foundation budget,” then the State pays the difference.

Governance Structure

- Policies and standards are set by the State Board of Education. A regulation gets final approval from the State Board of Education.
  - The State Board of Education is responsible for basic policy such as academic standards.
- MADOE staff may write regulations, but they require approval by the State Board of Education.
- MADOE prepares and presents agendas to the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education approves items as seen fit.
- The Commissioner is appointed by the State Board of Education. The Governor appoints the State Board of Education.
**Performance Management:**

*Staffing*
- Management positions are non-union and non-management, professional staff positions are unionized.
- MADOE can reduce union staff if forced to by budget constraints.
- Management can reduce staff, as long as the reductions are within union guidelines and regulations.
- There are no political hires; however, the Governor may refer people for an interview that he or she feels are qualified for a certain position.

*Performance Evaluation Process*
- There are adequate position descriptions.
- An on-line system is used to generate performance reviews for the management level. Management evaluations determine 2-5% increases in pay every year. A finite amount of money is divided into raises.
- There are two reviews a year for union staff. Unionized employees use a paper system.
- Employees set benchmarks for themselves, which are reviewed by their supervisor.

*Compensation Increases*
- Salaries are not competitive within the various positions in MADOE.

**Professional Development:**
- Training courses are offered surrounding technology, hiring and interviewing, and other general workplace issues.
- Staff are able to attend conferences.
- Training programs are adequate, relevant, and properly promoted by top management.
- Currently, there is no policy that deters out-of-state travel for conferences.
- There are opportunities for advancement and more responsibility.
- There is no issue with the union level compensation scales and management compensation scales. The maximum salary for a union employee is around $75,000. The maximum salary for a non-union management employee exceeds this amount.
Summary of Responses

The following information was provided about North Carolina Department of Education (NCDOE), by June Atkinson, Superintendent.

• **Description of District oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**
  • A statewide uniform budgeting system is in place and NCDOE staff utilize it to monitor budgets and expenditures.
  • Districts report student data through the North Carolina Window of Information on Student Education (NCWISE), an electronic student accounting system.
  • Each office is responsible for its own data; however, the Division of Agency Operations (DAO) is responsible for integrating all systems and data. They are also responsible for oversight of the business systems.
  • The DAO is also responsible for the purchase of school buses and a transportation system to study the efficiency of budgets (by legislation).
  • Teams provide technical assistance to the local education agencies.
  • Master teachers provide assistance to struggling schools.
  • Management and supervisory staffing levels are adequate to provide proper oversight and a reasonable span-of-control without a reduction in current service levels and efficiencies. However, staffing levels may be a problem in the future due to requirements under NCLB for additional services without additional funding for staff.

• **Functions of the Department of Education:**
  • Monitor District budgets to ensure each District is spending money efficiently.
  • Participate in court hearings for rule promulgation.
  • Work collaboratively with the State’s Information Technology (IT) department.
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• **Strategic Planning and Goals:**
  
  • Currently, a strategic plan is in place.
  
  • NCDOE goals were developed through a collaborative effort between the State Board of Education and the NCDOE. The goals were updated a third time a year and a half ago.
  
  • In addition to a guiding mission, there are 5 major goals:
    
    • North Carolina public schools will produce globally competitive students.
    
    • North Carolina public schools will be led by 21st Century professionals.
    
    • North Carolina public school students will be healthy and responsible.
    
    • Leadership will guide innovation in North Carolina public schools.
    
    • North Carolina public schools will be governed and supported by 21st Century systems.
  
  • Each school is required to complete a school improvement plan that is aligned with current NCDOE goals.

• **Structure to Support District Oversight:**
  
  • Each of the 115 Districts has its own Board of Education and superintendent; however, the Districts report to the NCDOE on policy.
  
  • Each division is responsible for overseeing and monitoring its respective offices.
  
  • There is no layer of management between Districts and NCDOE. There are no regional offices or technical assistance centers, however, Districts can pool together to form a Regional Agency.
  
  • Annually, a bill is introduced that attempts to cut the amount of Districts from 115 to 100, however the bill has never passed. The purpose of the bill is to incorporate the 15 City systems into the existing 100 County systems.
  
  • Each District Office is responsible for its own data but the DAO is responsible for integrating all systems and each District’s data.
• **Governance:**
  
  • NCDOE personnel and the State Board of Education work collaboratively with the Governor’s Office. The Superintendent is a non-voting member of the Board of Education. The State Board of Education has an eight year staggered term.
  
  • The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction is responsible for implementing State Board of Education policies and procedures regarding the school system. The elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction is in charge of this department.
  
  • The State Board of Education sets state policy as it relates to public education (pre K-12) for accountability, licensing, and approving statewide curriculum.
  
  • The process for promulgating rules is to present them to the State Board of Education and NCDOE implements the changes.
  
  • NCDOE staff writes all regulations.
  
  • The Commissioner of the NCDOE is independent of the State Board of Education and is an elected official.
  
  • There are no laws similar to QSAC/CORE; however, there is a case similar to the Abbott Districts. The Leandrow court order requires the 35 lowest performing high schools to receive additional assistance from highly skilled teams.
  
  • If a school is required to provide a school improvement plan, the plan must adhere to the goals of the NCDOE.
  
  • NCDOE sends in technical assistance teams to low performing schools.
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- **Performance Management**
  - Adequate position descriptions exist and they are used and updated on an "as needed" basis.
  - Research is conducted upfront to ensure skill sets match the job positions offered.
  - Statisticians, curriculum, and instruction staff are the most difficult to recruit.
  - There are no civil service employees.
  - The performance evaluation format consists of each division creating a Leadership Management Plan based on the goals of NCDOE. Employees create their own performance plan and their supervisor evaluates the plan to determine if it is in accordance with the overall Leadership Management Plan.
  - Performance evaluations are conducted twice a year. A checklist is prepared, which includes a review of areas needing improvement.
  - There is not a competitive salary structure. The compensation scale is set by the General Assembly.

- **Professional Development**
  - The State Personnel Division provides general training.
  - Ongoing professional development opportunities geared towards technology are available.
  - Work performance plans must identify staff needs.
  - Flexibility exists within NCDOE’s budget for training and travel must be approved by the Associate Superintendent.
  - Staff are limited to 10 days per year for out-of-state training. NCDOE approves reimbursements for out-of-state travel and training costs.
  - There is opportunity for advancement within NCDOE.
Benchmarking Sources

Information for the benchmarking analysis was obtained from a variety of sources in addition to structured interviews with the heads of each organization, such sources are as follows:

**New Jersey**
- http://www.state.nj.us/education/
- Various interviews with New Jersey DOE management and staff

**North Carolina**
- Interview with June Atkinson, Superintendent

**Massachusetts**
- http://www.doe.mass.edu
- Interview with Jeff Nielhaus, Massachusetts Deputy Commissioner

**Kentucky**
- www.kde.state.ky.us
- Interview with Gene Wilhoit, former Commissioner

**Arkansas**
- www.arkansased.org
- http://normessasweb.uark.edu/src1/State3.php
- Interview with Dr. Ken James, Commissioner

**Other**