



Performance Based Funding in New Jersey: Leveraging Education Spending to Close Stark Achievement Gaps

Doug Mesecar and Don Soifer

April 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

New Jersey has among the highest levels of elementary and secondary education spending in the nation, accounting for at least 6.3 percent of the state's GDP. But the impact of this investment is questionable, according to many prominent indicators.

Overall, more than half of New Jersey students are considered unprepared for success in college and the workforce based on benchmarks associated with the National Assessment of Educational Progress. In comparing all statewide trends with trends in major urban areas, disconcerting inequities emerge with on-time high school graduation rates in the most challenged school districts being dramatically lower.

The Garden State's present school accountability system identifies Priority schools as the state's bottom 5 percent in terms of student achievement, while Focus schools have notably wide achievement gaps. Collectively, these struggling schools serve more than 170,000 students. New Jersey must address the issues at these schools.

This paper examines systems of Performance Based Funding underway in other states, and includes specific recommendations for how such a model could be employed in New Jersey.

This approach represents a powerful way to address New Jersey's uneven performance, and create a different, more incentivized funding regime: fund performance in terms of absolute achievement and growth instead of seat time.

Details follow.



INTRODUCTION

An improving economy is showing promise for America and for New Jersey, but new thinking about how to improve education – a vital engine for any economy – is sorely needed as policymakers continue the ongoing effort to improve achievement for ALL students.

Most education reform is focused on the usual issues of staffing, choices, governance, or the accountability of schools and districts. Debates over education funding usually revolve around less vs. more for competing priorities, which is especially true in New Jersey, a state with among the highest education spending levels in the country and with almost four decades of court involvement in school funding. Rarely does the focus capture a more comprehensive and deeper view of improving our schools: aligning incentives around funding and outcomes. The New Jersey state legislature, which spends more money on education than any other government function,¹ always relies on increasing funds in the hopes that somehow this will lead to different outcomes.

For more than three decades, New Jersey's education funding has been largely shaped by a series of judicial rulings from the 1985 *Abbott v. Burke* ruling. Under court dictated spending mandates related to the *Abbott* and *Abbott*-related decisions, the percent of state funding going to the so-called *Abbott* districts is between 60 and 70 percent.² What is clear is that this money, driven by judicial fiat ignoring the lack of success in these districts, sets up a perverse incentive structure that doubles down on the notion that government education funding should be solely compensatory instead of largely incentivizing.

Today, U.S. taxpayers spend at least 5.4 percent of the nation's GDP funding elementary and secondary education.³ In the Garden State, it is over 6.3 percent of the state's GDP.⁴ The nation's education system, and more pointedly, New Jersey's, is not sustainable at its present level of productivity relative to expenditures. Legislators of all stripes need to start making policy differently in order to achieve better outcomes. For example, instead of just funding the status quo, lawmakers should reward schools for both achievement AND improvement to promote classroom innovation, productive competition, and close persistent and egregiously large achievement gaps.

PERFORMANCE BASED FUNDING

The current practice of funding schools based almost exclusively on attendance is one that has outlived its usefulness. Its intrinsic flaws misalign incentives, reward sub-par performance, and diminish the imperative for significant and sustained educational outcomes. The value of opportunities provided to students must necessarily consider equity of student outcomes – not just tax dollars allocated to education systems. School funding should be based upon academic growth – not just whether a student sits at a desk or maintains the status quo.

A better model that circumvents entrenched arguments and which is gaining momentum around the country is Performance Based Funding (PBF). This simple concept seeks to better align funding for schools with important student outcomes to incent ongoing, improved performance of schools individually and systemically. Implementing PBF provides an opportunity to make strategic investments in schools at the state level by a straightforward focusing of school funding on desired results.

Performance Based Funding models are being implemented in some higher education settings and in vocational education, but so far there have only been a few experiments in K-12 schools. At the state level, there have been efforts by various governors and states to implement PBF for all public schools. Arizona began a statewide Performance Based Funding program in 2013, called "Student Success Funding," which it expanded in 2014. Governor Jan Brewer said it well in her 2013 State of the State address: "And that brings us to school funding. Whatever your point of view, we should all agree that it's time we start funding the academic results we want to see."

Likewise, Michigan has been implementing a limited Performance Based Funding model since 2012. Pennsylvania took a slightly different approach, providing funding flexibility in exchange for performance based outcomes. In addition, Florida, Wisconsin, and Oregon have all recently been exploring PBF. In each case, the amounts of funding are modest, but the potential impact promises to be significant over time. As Oregon state representative Betty Komp expressed in reference to then-Gov. John Kitzhaber's budget plan, which includes elements of performance based funding, "I think the governor's approach here is very wise. He's looking at finding efficiencies in our system. Yet, we'll be doing it in a way that uses those dollars better and makes sure they get into the classroom."⁵

This new concept in school funding is not an all-or-nothing proposition; in Arizona and Michigan, Performance Based Funding is applied to new funding over and above existing dollars schools are already receiving, or applied to what schools already received. While these experiments are too new to make a statement about outcomes yet, they are worthy endeavors because they are additive. PBF is an incentive structure in addition to basic school and district funding.

WHY PBF FOR NEW JERSEY? SOME SPENDING FACTS

Why does New Jersey need Performance Based Funding? For all of the taxpayer money New Jersey spends on education, it is not efficiently spent and what it does buy in terms of specific academic outcomes is uneven and highly tenuous for student populations that have been underserved.

When looking at achievement across different economic, racial and achievement groups, New Jersey has some of the largest achievement gaps in the country, despite overall high aggregate achievement when averaging all student scores. In other words, the high achievement in New Jersey is not equally distributed and is despite the performance of poor and minority students. New Jersey needs to do more to ensure a child's race or zip code is not the best predictor of academic achievement. And, for those students who are not behind academically, the rigor of the education they receive can be questionable.

New Jersey has some of the largest achievement gaps in the country.

The Taxpayers' Guide to Education Spending 2015, published annually by the New Jersey Department of Education showed average per-pupil spending at \$19,211 for the 2013-14 school year, an increase of less than 2 percent over 2012-13.⁶ Spending varied widely across school districts. Among districts serving students in grades K-12, Asbury Park and Keansburg schools ranked near the top, at \$33,109 and \$30,290, respectively, and Elmwood Park and Toms River Regional schools each spending just above \$15,000, all on a per-student basis.⁷

Based on federal Census data, New Jersey schools spent an average of \$17,250 to educate each student during the 2013-14 school year, ranking it in the top three states in the country. That compares to the national average of approximately \$11,000 per student. The state's total education spending last year was \$26.6 billion, ranking it the 5th highest nationally. This spending comes from various sources: 5 percent from the federal government, approximately 38 percent from the state, and 57 percent from local sources. Such a large share of locally-generated school funding places New Jersey behind only Connecticut as the nation's highest.⁸

Although New Jersey cut per pupil spending between 2010 and 2011, it remained among the highest education spenders. New Jersey made up for its unprecedented downturn in education spending the following year, when per pupil spending rose 8.1 percent, among the most of any state.⁹

A state-funded model for Performance Based Funding faces some limitations in New Jersey, where the state provides a smaller-than-average share of total school funding and faces the continued constraints of the court decreed Abbott funding scheme.

Relying on local leadership to institute Performance Based Funding models locally is particularly problematic because of various decision-maker dynamics and institutional pressures of local school board budgets. One state-level policy option would be a plan that leverages new state funding to match locally-derived PBF models. The 20 school districts that hold annual voter referendums to approve school budgets, which are often more immune to internal pressures between school leaders and other stakeholders, could be more likely to take advantage of such an incentive program.

HIGH SPENDING ≠ EQUITABLE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Despite these impressive spending statistics, there are significant achievement gaps in New Jersey which have persisted for some time. Black, Latino and low-income students trail behind their white and more affluent peers in both reading and math proficiency levels.

The most recent data available from the 2013 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) shows that New Jersey’s achievement gaps continue to fester. In fourth-grade math, the percentage of black students scoring proficient or above is 37 percentage points behind their white peers. Latino students trail 31 percentage points behind their white peers. And on the eighth-grade reading assessment, black students are 30 percentage points behind their white peers. Low-income students are 34 percentage points behind their non-low-income peers.¹⁰

New Jersey spends well above the national average per student.

These inequities emerge in other metrics. New Jersey’s overall high school graduation rates are relatively strong, with 86 percent of students graduating on time, but there are large gaps. While 93 percent of white students graduated on time in New Jersey, only 75 percent of black students, 77 percent of Latino students and 75 percent of economically disadvantaged students graduated on time. Similarly, when looking at state trends in comparison to some specific urban areas in New Jersey, disconcerting inequities emerge with on-time high school graduation rates in the most challenged school districts being dramatically lower. In Asbury Park, Trenton and Camden, fewer than 50 percent of students graduated on time in 2012. In Jersey City, Paterson and Newark, fewer than 70 percent of students made it to graduation in four years.¹¹

ARE NEW JERSEY GRADUATES READY FOR COLLEGE AND CAREER?

Addressing these long-standing and glaring gaps would be reason enough to re-examine how New Jersey could better leverage its nation-leading spending. However, there is more to the story. Not only are New Jersey schools failing to educate wide swaths of low-income students, students of color and students in urban districts, it is generally failing to set the bar high enough to ensure that all students are college- and career-ready. New Jersey can’t be complacent toward inequities in student opportunity.

Overall, more than half of New Jersey students are considered unprepared for success in college and the workforce based on NAEP benchmarks. On the 12th-grade NAEP, only 38 percent of New Jersey’s students were considered college- and career-ready. Further, this pattern holds true on the SAT; in 2012 only 43 percent of New Jersey students met the appropriate target for college readiness.¹²

SCHOOL RANKINGS

Further evidence of the state's uneven academic performance lies with the rankings of the schools under New Jersey's present school accountability system as defined by its federally-approved No Child Left Behind (NCLB) waiver scheme. The number of schools the New Jersey Department of Education has flagged for dramatic improvement is large. For the 2013-14 school year, there were 249 Priority and Focus schools statewide and a nearly identical number for the 2014-15 school year. Priority schools are defined as the state's bottom 5 percent in terms of student achievement, while Focus schools have notably wide achievement gaps. Collectively, these struggling schools serve more than 170,000 students. New Jersey must address the issues at these schools. A powerful way to do so is to create a different, more incentivized funding regime: fund performance in terms of absolute achievement and growth instead of seat time.

But what about schools performing at the high end of achievement? Under the state's NCLB waiver, it also recognizes schools with high performance or high growth, which are called Reward schools. The most recent published list of Reward schools listed 57 schools, approximately 1/5 the number of Priority and Focus schools. The number of Reward schools is half of the previous year's 112 schools, largely due to the fact that schools are now required to meet specific achievement targets. While the focus on specific, measurable outcomes is the right decision, the shrinking number of Reward schools is also evidence that New Jersey needs to improve its approach to drive higher achievement among all schools and students and thereby increase the number of Reward schools.

Just nine schools were highlighted as "high growth" for reaching the progress targets, with the remaining 48 on the list as "high performing" based on overall achievement. Not surprisingly, the vast majority of the highest performers were either in higher-income communities or magnet schools that select their students through an application process.¹³

Beyond pride of place, Reward schools don't earn much of a reward, although those receiving federal Title I funds can potentially receive financial rewards under the state's system. In fact, last year 23 schools received reward payments based on the size of the school. The awards ranged from several thousand dollars to almost a hundred thousand. Nineteen schools were rewarded for high performance, while only four were rewarded for high progress. This is a significant step toward incentivizing performance, but these 23 Reward schools are the grand total of schools receiving awards since 2011. While New Jersey should be acknowledged for following through on rewarding schools achieving success, it is clear that far too few schools are considered for performance rewards, and are being rewarded too infrequently with too little funding. Systemic change requires more of New Jersey policy makers.

In fourth-grade math, the percentage of black students scoring proficient or above is 37 percentage points below white students. Latino students trail white students by 31 percentage points.

A PBF FRAMEWORK FOR NEW JERSEY

How can New Jersey address its achievement gaps, improve college and career readiness, decrease the number of Priority and Focus schools AND increase the number of Reward schools? The state's current school accountability system, as defined by its approved waiver plan from NCLB's outdated accountability regime, provides a useful context for considering Performance Based Funding. As described above, New Jersey has established a three-tier ranking structure for its schools. The criteria for underperforming schools (Priority and Focus) are not relevant to identifying schools to reward based on success. A list of identified schools can be found in the appendix to this report.

A Performance Based Funding framework should start with New Jersey's Reward schools.¹⁴ A Reward school is one with outstanding student achievement OR growth over the preceding three years. Specifically, the types of Reward schools are:

- **High Performing:** schools that are the top-performing in the state, in terms of school-wide proficiency, subgroup proficiency, and graduation rates.
- **High Progress:** schools that have high levels of student growth, measured using their median Student Growth Percentiles over time.

School achievement measurement considers the performance of every tested student. Based on this assessment data, the New Jersey Department of Education computes each school's math and language arts proficiency rate and then generates an average by weighting each subject's proficiency rate by the number of valid scores. The same method is used to compute an overall proficiency rate for all subgroups in a school. New Jersey also uses its four-year cohort-adjusted graduation rate for high schools.

New Jersey recognizes schools that have achieved high levels of student performance — both in the aggregate and in each eligible student subgroup — over a three year period. The state ranks each school's individual subgroup proficiencies against those of other schools in the state. Schools in which: 1) each eligible subgroup ranks in the top 10 percent of that subgroup's performance across the state; 2) the overall proficiency rate is greater than 90 percent, or at the high school level, 95 percent; and 3) the overall graduation rate (where applicable) is greater than 90 percent, are classified as Reward schools with High Performance.

Importantly, New Jersey currently recognizes schools that have grown the achievement of individual students over time. The Student Growth Percentile system developed and implemented over the past five years measures the amount every student has learned from one year to the next (as demonstrated on state tests), compared with students who scored similarly the previous year across the state.

Specifically, schools with a median Student Growth Percentile of 65 or higher, based on the three years of assessment data, are classified as Reward schools with High Progress. For high schools, the state determines high growth based on school-wide proficiency changes over time. Median growth scores, whether for schools or subgroups of student populations within schools, must meet a minimum population size to qualify.¹⁵

REWARDS FOR REWARD SCHOOLS

The New Jersey Department of Education implements several rewards and recognitions for its High Performing and High Progress Reward schools. The decision on how to use any monetary rewards a school receives from the state is made by the district and school based on feedback from stakeholders, including teachers and district leaders.

To acknowledge New Jersey's Reward schools, the Department of Education uses Title I, Part A funds that may be available for reallocation such as excess carryover funds up to a maximum of \$1 million.

Title I Reward schools that are designated as High Performing or High Progress will receive a monetary reward of up to \$100,000 each, based on school enrollment size and poverty factors. The recognized schools that receive a monetary reward for sustained achievement must: 1) have a poverty rate of at least 35 percent over the three-year period; 2) have received a Title I allocation and operate a Title I program; 3) meet the criteria of a Reward School; and 4) enroll students without a selective admissions process.¹⁶

As a starting point for a New Jersey Performance Based Funding Plan, New Jersey's present school accountability system as defined by its federal No Child Left Behind Act waiver approach includes some features of a quality Performance Based Funding framework, including:

School performance should be evaluated equally on both student growth and achievement.

- **Evaluation of achievement or growth.** Reward schools are identified on the basis of achievement or growth. This is critical in ensuring that recognition or performance awards don't only go to those who are already ahead in terms of achievement. Equity dictates a focus on growth toward an objective goal to ensure those who start further behind and are making great progress are identified and rewarded;
- **Graduation rates.** Reward schools are also evaluated on this important outcome measure. While success on assessments is important, if such achievement comes without a diploma, it isn't worth much to the most important stakeholder — the student;
- **Inclusion.** All schools in New Jersey are eligible to be Reward schools and the process to identify such schools is fair to those schools starting further behind;
- **Structured as part of a larger system.** Reward schools are part of the state's overall accountability superstructure and are identified as a regular course of action. This is important in systemizing and norming the notion that performance is recognized and rewarded; and
- **Tangible funding that is in addition to the base or foundational amount needed by schools and districts to operate.** New Jersey has provided funds that supplement the funding schools and districts would otherwise receive and thus provide stimulation in addition to stability.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN EFFECTIVE NEW JERSEY PBF FRAMEWORK

While all of the attributes listed above form a valuable starting point for the state in creating a successful Performance Based Funding framework, there are additional factors the state should consider in designing a system that is truly scalable and effective:¹⁷

- **Reward schools should be evaluated equally on both achievement AND growth instead of looking at each component of achievement separately.** Growth without achievement against objective standards of performance is directionally promising, but not completely successful. Likewise, high achievement without growth rewards established success without demanding more and is also not the full embodiment of quality continuous improvement. New Jersey should consider rewarding schools for both dimensions of achievement;
- **A filter should be applied that looks at student performance on academic achievement and other success outcomes over a two or three year period.** This approach, while cutting down on the number of data points to view success, reduces the tendency to look at "snapshot" performance, which says as much about a student's background as it does about the contribution of a district's or school's performance. Viewing performance over a multi-year prism provides more information about the quality of the teachers, administration and instructional program;
- **Evaluate schools on both the four year adjusted cohort graduation rate, as well as a five year graduation rate.** Since 2012, New Jersey has measured the five-year graduation rates for graduation cohorts, in addition to four-year rates. The

data show that the five-year rate is about two points higher, in aggregate, than the four-year rate and generally appropriately captures students who are taking longer to graduate for specific reasons. It can provide a more comprehensive picture of district or school success over time than the four-year rate does for the purposes of Performance Based Funding;

- **Allow ALL schools to earn awards.** Currently, New Jersey’s approach only provides additional, Performance Based Funding to Title I schools. Some racial minority, special-needs or economically disadvantaged student populations often face disproportionately steep educational struggles in suburban school districts. Performance Based Funding can help all schools achieve and is not just the domain of schools with students facing greater socioeconomic challenges. This dovetails and reinforces the point above about rewarding absolute achievement and growth in achievement;
- **Make the Performance Based Funding meaningful.** New Jersey provides awards that are highly variable depending on the size of the school. This approach, while logical, diminishes the impact of the additional funding and should be reconsidered. The size of the awards should be significant enough to leverage change, but not so large as to warp that leverage. Schools only receiving several thousands of dollars are probably not being given sufficient incentive to continuously move the academic needle. For example, given school funding levels, it would not be extreme to contemplate rewards of \$100,000 for successful schools that have 400-600 students, with multiples of this base amount for schools with larger populations;
- **Funding should be integrated into the core funding regime in the state.** New Jersey’s performance awards for Reward schools are designed as a supplement to core school funding from the state. It should be an integrated and regular part of the state funding. While education funding is subject to appropriations, Performance Based Funding should be part of the fabric of funding, not an add-on that may be only sporadically available. Such variability in the availability of funds will significantly diminish the effectiveness of the incentive; and
- **Performance should be measured across additional factors beyond multi-year average proficiency rates for math and language arts.** Other performance frameworks include leading indicators and gateway measures. For example, New Jersey should consider:
 - for elementary schools, a gateway measure of performance in 3rd grade reading; if 3rd grade reading is not mastered, achievement will be substantially impacted.
 - for middle schools, a gateway measure of performance in 8th grade math; if 8th grade math is not mastered, the ability to take higher level math and attain college and career readiness will be dramatically lessened.
 - for high schools, a gateway measure of performance on college entrance exams like the ACT or SAT.
 - for all schools, a leading indicator of performance could include attendance, attrition and/or discipline; obviously, if students are not attending school or are constantly in disciplinary action, achievement becomes secondary, at best.¹⁸

As a comparison point, it is also helpful to review the principles of Performance Based Funding in New Jersey’s current NCLB waiver scheme in comparison to the more developed models in Arizona and Michigan. Below is a chart comparing New Jersey’s present system to Arizona and Michigan, using principles identified by the authors.

PBF SUCCESS PRINCIPLES		NJ	AZ	MI
	Measures objective outcomes	•	•	•
	Includes absolute achievement AND achievement growth		•	•
	Includes leading indicators AND gateway measures			
	Includes outcome measures like graduation rate, attendance, etc.	•		
	Transparency and understandability of PBF framework		•	
	Funding is integrated AND supplemental		•	•
	Funding is predictable, stable and auditable		•	•
	Assessment of, and funding availability for all schools		•	•
	Independent assessment of framework and awards		•	

CONCLUSION

The problem of misaligned incentives is a well-researched topic in numerous fields. But it has not been a topic of deep research and reflection in education, where the misalignment between funding and performance is at best a drag on the system and student performance, and at worst a fundamental flaw that ensures our schools will never improve sufficiently for New Jersey to live up to its founding ideals of equality and opportunity.

Performance Based Funding is a first step in breaking the current funding structure that delivers dollars to all schools regardless of performance.

Allocating dollars based on educational results is gaining traction because of its potential to drive student performance higher in a scalable way that has system-level implications. Rewarding schools for both achievement and improvement (i.e., longitudinal growth) can promote innovation and achievement. In addition, Performance Based Funding is a model that integrates easily with competency based learning approaches.

New Jersey has a solid foundation upon which to build a very effective Performance Based Funding system. The Reward schools included in New Jersey’s NCLB waiver are the foundation to which additional, objective measures can be added. Further, New Jersey should be commended for starting to put funding behind the Reward schools, but has room to improve the amount, distribution and stability of the funding. By including all schools in a Performance Based Funding framework, New Jersey can better leverage its nation-leading spending to close achievement gaps and better prepare ALL of New Jersey’s students for future success as citizens, and in college or career. Finally, a more defined approach to Performance Based Funding can also begin to lay the groundwork for a different approach to school funding in New Jersey, one structured to drive improvement rather than simply to support existing institutions.

Performance Based Funding is a policy innovation that is deserving of more attention and analysis, and which can provide a new approach to improving academic outcomes outside the traditional reform approaches, while addressing systemic inefficiency. New Jersey should step up and embrace this new, strategic direction in funding schools and pursuing educational excellence and equality.

APPENDIX A

New Jersey Department of Education Final list of Priority and Focus Schools Published March 11, 2015

DISTRICT NAME	SCHOOL NAME	GRAD SPAN	DISTRICT NAME	SCHOOL NAME	GRAD SPAN
Asbury Park City	Asbury Park High	09 - 12	Camden City	Whittier	PK - 08
Asbury Park City	Asbury Park Middle	06 - 08	Camden City	Wilson	PK - 08
Atlantic City	Atlantic City High	09 - 12	Camden City	Woodrow Wilson High	09 - 12
Atlantic City	Dr M L King Jr Sch Comp	PK - 08	Camden City	Yorkship	PK - 08
Atlantic City	Sovereign Ave School	KG - 08	City Of Orange Twp	Orange High	09 - 13
Atlantic City	Texas Avenue	KG - 08	City Of Orange Twp	Orange Prep Academy	08 - 09
Belleville Town	Belleville Middle	06 - 08	City Of Orange Twp	Rosa Parks Elem School	PK - 07
Beverly City	Beverly School	PK - 08	Cliffside Park Boro	Number 6	KG - 08
Bridgeton City	Bridgeton High	09 - 12	Clifton City	Christopher Columbus Mid	06 - 08
Bridgeton City	Broad Street Elem Sch	KG - 08	Clifton City	Number 12	KG - 05
Bridgeton City	Cherry Street	KG - 08	Deerfield Twp	Deerfield	PK - 08
Bridgeton City	Indian Ave	KG - 08	East Brunswick Twp	Churchill Jr	08 - 09
Camden City	Bonsall	PK - 08	East Brunswick Twp	Hammarskjold Middle	06 - 07
Camden City	Camden High	09 - 12	East Orange	Cicely Tyson Com Ms/Hs	06 - 12
Camden City	Catto Community School	PK - 08	East Orange	East Orange Campus Hs	09 - 12
Camden City	Coopers Poynt	PK - 08	East Orange	John L. Costley Middle	06 - 08
Camden City	Cramer	PK - 06	East Orange	Patrick F. Healy Middle	06 - 08
Camden City	Davis Elem	PK - 08	East Windsor	Ethel Mcknight	KG - 05
Camden City	Dudley Elem School	PK - 08	Regional		
Camden City	East Camden Middle	06 - 08	East Windsor	Walter C Black	KG - 05
Camden City	Forest Hill	KG - 08	Regional		
Camden City	Hatch Middle	01 - 08	Edison Twp	John Adams Middle	06 - 08
Camden City	Mcgraw	PK - 05	Egg Harbor Twp	Egg Harbor Twp H S	09 - 12
Camden City	Morgan Village Middle	06 - 12	Egg Harbor Twp	Fernwood Middle Sch	06 - 08
Camden City	Pyne Poynt Family School	07 - 08	Elizabeth City	Adm. W. F. Halsey Ldrshp	09 - 12
Camden City	R C Molina Elem School	PK - 07	Elizabeth City	John E. Dwyer Tech Acad	09 - 12
Camden City	Riletta Cream Elem School	PK - 08	Elizabeth City	No 1 G Washington	PK - 08
Camden City	Sumner	PK - 08	Elizabeth City	No 14 A Lincoln	KG - 08
Camden City	U S Wiggins	PK - 08	Elizabeth City	No 28 Duarte-Marti	PK - 08
Camden City	Veterans Memorial Middle	PK - 08	Elizabeth City	T. Jefferson Arts Acad	09 - 12
			Elizabeth City	T.A. Edison Career/Tech	09 - 12

DISTRICT NAME	SCHOOL NAME	GRAD SPAN
Elmwood Park	Elmwood Park Middle Sch	06 - 08
Englewood City	Dwight Morrow High	09 - 12
Essex Co Voc-Tech	Essex Cty Voc-West Caldw	09 - 12
Fairfield Twp	Fairfield Township School	PK - 08
Franklin Twp	Franklin Middle School	07 - 08
Franklin Twp	Sampson G. Smith School	05 - 06
Freedom Academy Cs	Freedom Academy Cs	06 - 08
Freehold Boro	Intermediate	06 - 08
Galloway Twp	Smithville Elem School	KG - 06
Glassboro	Glassboro Intermediate	07 - 08
Guttenberg Town	Anna L Klein	PK - 08
Hackensack City	Hackensack High	09 - 12
Highland Park Boro	Highland Park Middle Sch	06 - 08
Hillsdale Boro	George G White	05 - 08
Hillside Twp	Hillside High	09 - 12
Hoboken City	Thomas G Connors	PK - 06
Howell Twp	Howell Twp Memorial Ms	06 - 08
Irvington Township	Irvington High School	09 - 12
Irvington Township	Union Ave	06 - 08
Irvington Township	University Middle School	06 - 08
Jersey City	Alexander D Sullivan 30	PK - 05
Jersey City	Center For The Arts	PK - 08
Jersey City	Ezra L Nolan 40	06 - 08
Jersey City	Franklin L Williams Ms#7	06 - 08
Jersey City	Henry Snyder	09 - 12
Jersey City	James F Murray 38	PK - 08
Jersey City	James J Ferris	09 - 12
Jersey City	Jotham W Wakeman 6	PK - 05
Jersey City	Julia A. Barnes #12	PK - 08
Jersey City	Liberty High School	09 - 12
Jersey City	Lincoln	09 - 12
Jersey City	Number 23	PK - 08
Jersey City	Number 24	KG - 08
Jersey City	Number 4 Middle Sch	06 - 08

DISTRICT NAME	SCHOOL NAME	GRAD SPAN
Jersey City	Whitney M Young	PK - 08
Jersey City	William L Dickinson	09 - 12
Keansburg Boro	Joseph R. Bolger Mid Sch	05 - 08
Kingsway Regional	Kingsway Reg Middle	07 - 08
Lakewood Twp	Clifton Ave Grade Sch	01 - 05
Lakewood Twp	Ella G Clarke Elem School	01 - 05
Lakewood Twp	Lakewood High	09 - 12
Lakewood Twp	Lakewood Middle	06 - 08
Leonia Boro	Leonia Middle	06 - 08
Manalapan- Englishtown Reg	Pine Brook	06 - 06
Metuchen Boro	Edgar	05 - 08
Middlesex Co Vocational	Mdsx Co Voc Piscataway	09 - AE
Millville City	Bacon Elem	KG - 05
Millville City	Holly Heights	KG - 05
Millville City	Lakeside Middle School	06 - 08
Millville City	R D Wood	KG - 05
Millville City	Silver Run School	KG - 05
Montclair Town	Charles H Bullock Sch	KG - 05
Montclair Town	Glenfield Middle	06 - 08
Morris School District	Normandy Park School	KG - 05
Morris School District	Sussex Avenue	03 - 05
New Brunswick City	A Chester Redshaw	KG - 05
New Brunswick City	Livingston	KG - 05
New Brunswick City	Lord Stirling	PK - 05
New Brunswick City	Mckinley Comm	PK - 08
New Brunswick City	New Brunswick High	PK - 12
New Brunswick City	New Brunswick Middle	06 - 08
New Brunswick City	Roosevelt Elem	PK - 05
New Milford Boro	David E. Owens M.S.	06 - 08
Newark City	Avon Ave	KG - 08
Newark City	Barringer	09 - 13
Newark City	Belmont Runyon	PK - 08
Newark City	Camden St	PK - 08

DISTRICT NAME	SCHOOL NAME	GRAD SPAN
Newark City	Central	09 - 13
Newark City	Chancellor Ave	KG - 08
Newark City	Dayton Elementary at Peshine Avenue	PK - 08
Newark City	Dr E Alma Flagg	KG - 08
Newark City	Dr William H Horton	KG - 08
Newark City	East Side	09 - 13
Newark City	Elliott St	PK - 04
Newark City	Fast Track Success Academy	07 - 12
Newark City	George Washington Carver	KG - 08
Newark City	Hawkins St	PK - 08
Newark City	Hawthorne Ave	KG - 08
Newark City	Ivy Hill	PK - 08
Newark City	Louise A. Spencer	KG - 09
Newark City	Malcolm X Shabazz High	09 - 13
Newark City	Mckinley	PK - 08
Newark City	Miller St	PK - 08
Newark City	Mt Vernon	PK - 08
Newark City	Newark Innovation Academy	09 - 12
Newark City	Newark Vocational H S	09 - 12
Newark City	Quitman Community School	PK - 08
Newark City	Rafael Hernandez School	PK - 08
Newark City	South Seventeenth St	KG - 08
Newark City	Sussex Ave	PK - 08
Newark City	Thirteenth Ave	PK - 08
North Brunswick Twp	John Adams	PK - 05
North Brunswick Twp	Linwood Middle	06 - 08
Old Bridge Twp	Jonas Salk Middle	06 - 08
Paramus Boro	East Brook Middle	05 - 08
Passaic City	Etta Gero No 9	04 - 06
Passaic City	Number 1 Thomas Jefferson	PK - 06
Passaic City	Number 11 Cruise Memorial	01 - 06
Passaic City	Number 3 Mario J Drago	PK - 06
Passaic City	Number 4 Lincoln	07 - 08
Passaic City	Number 5	03 - 05

DISTRICT NAME	SCHOOL NAME	GRAD SPAN
Passaic City	Number 6 Martin L King	PK - 06
Passaic City	Passaic High	09 - 12
Passaic Co	Manchester Reg H	09 - 12
Manchester Reg		
Paterson City	Academy High Sch	09 - 12
Paterson City	High School Of Government And Public Administration	09 - 12
Paterson City	High School Of Hospitality Tourism And Culinary Arts	09 - 12
Paterson City	High School Of Information Technology	09 - 12
Paterson City	Martin Luther King	KG - 08
Paterson City	Napier School Of Tech	01 - 08
Paterson City	New Roberto Clemente	06 - 08
Paterson City	Number 10	PK - 08
Paterson City	Number 11	04 - 08
Paterson City	Number 12	01 - 08
Paterson City	Number 13	PK - 08
Paterson City	Number 15	PK - 05
Paterson City	Number 18	PK - 08
Paterson City	Number 2	KG - 08
Paterson City	Number 20	KG - 08
Paterson City	Number 21	PK - 08
Paterson City	Number 24	PK - 08
Paterson City	Number 25	KG - 08
Paterson City	Number 26	KG - 08
Paterson City	Number 28	PK - 04
Paterson City	Number 3	KG - 08
Paterson City	Number 5	KG - 06
Paterson City	Number 6, Acad Perf Arts	PK - 08
Paterson City	Number 8	KG - 08
Paterson City	YES Academy	09 - 12
Paul Robeson	Paul Robeson Humanities	04 - 08
Paul Robeson	Humanities	
Paulsboro Boro	Paulsboro High	09 - 12
Penns Grv- Carney's Pt Reg	Penns Grove High	09 - 12

DISTRICT NAME	SCHOOL NAME	GRAD SPAN	DISTRICT NAME	SCHOOL NAME	GRAD SPAN
Perth Amboy City	Mc Ginnis Middle School	05 - 08	Trenton City	Franklin	KG - 05
Perth Amboy City	Samuel E Shull Middle	05 - 08	Trenton City	Grace A Dunn Middle Sch	06 - 08
Phillipsburg Town	Phillipsburg Middle	06 - 08	Trenton City	Grant	KG - 05
Plainfield City	Boaacd	09 - 12	Trenton City	Gregory	KG - 05
Plainfield City	Charles H. Stillman	KG - 05	Trenton City	Hedgepeth-Williams Sch	KG - 05
Plainfield City	Hubbard	06 - 08	Trenton City	Jefferson	KG - 05
Plainfield City	Jefferson	KG - 05	Trenton City	Joyce Kilmer	06 - 08
Plainfield City	Maxson	06 - 08	Trenton City	Luis Munoz-Rivera MS	06 - 08
Plainfield City	Plainfield High	09 - 12	Trenton City	Monument	KG - 05
Pleasantville City	Pleasantville H S	09 - 12	Trenton City	Mott	KG - 05
Pleasantville City	Pleasantville Middle Sch	06 - 08	Trenton City	P.J. Hill	KG - 05
Red Bank Boro	Red Bank Middle	04 - 08	Trenton City	Robbins	KG - 04
Rochelle Park Twp	Midland No 1	PK - 08	Trenton City	Robeson	KG - 05
Rockaway Boro	Thomas Jefferson Middle	04 - 08	Trenton City	Trenton Central High	09 - 12
Roselle Boro	Abraham Clark High	09 - 12	Trenton City	Trenton Central High West	09 - 12
Roselle Boro	Leonard V. Moore	05 - 06	Trenton City	Washington	KG - 04
Saddle Brook Twp	Saddle Brook Mid/High Sch	07 - 12	Upper Deerfield Twp	Woodruff School	06 - 08
Salem City	Salem High	09 - 12	Vineland City	Landis Middle School	06 - 08
Salem City	Salem Middle	03 - 08	Washington Twp	Bunker Hill Middle Sch	06 - 08
South Brunswick Twp	Constable	PK - 05	Washington Twp	Chestnut Ridge Middle	06 - 08
South Brunswick Twp	Crossroads North	06 - 08	West New York Town	Memorial High	09 - 12
South Brunswick Twp	Crossroads South	06 - 08	West New York Town	West New York Ms	07 - 08
South Orange- Maplewood	Clinton	PK - 05	West Orange Town	Edison Middle	06 - 06
South Orange- Maplewood	Maplewood Middle	06 - 08	Westfield Town	Thomas Edison Inter.	06 - 08
South Orange- Maplewood	South Orange Middle	06 - 08	Wildwood City	Glenwood Ave Elementary	PK - 05
South River Boro	South River Elem Sch	PK - 05	Wildwood City	Wildwood Middle School	06 - 08
Trenton City	Columbus	KG - 05	Willingboro Twp	Willingboro High	09 - 13
Trenton City	Daylight/Twilight H S	09 - AE	Winslow Twp	Winslow Twp Middle School	07 - 08
			Woodstown- Pilesgrove Reg	Woodstown Middle School	06 - 08

Source: <http://www.state.nj.us/education/reform/PFRschools/>

ENDNOTES

- 1 National Association of State Budget Officers, *State Expenditure Report: Examining Fiscal 2011-2013 State Spending*, <http://www.nasbo.org/sites/default/files/State%20Expenditure%20Report.pdf> (2013).
- 2 Bill Wichert, "Chris Christie claims 31 former Abbott districts receive 70 percent of the state aid," PolitiFact New Jersey, <http://www.politifact.com/new-jersey/statements/2011/dec/01/chris-christie/Chris-Christie-claims-31-former-Abbott-districts-r/> (Dec. 1, 2011).
- 3 The World Bank, *Public spending on education, total (% of GDP)*, <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.XPD.TOTL.GD.ZS> (accessed 2015).
- 4 US Government Spending, *State Education Spending Rank*, http://www.usgovernmentsspending.com/compare_state_spending_2015b20an (accessed 2015).
- 5 Kimberly Melton, "Gov. John Kitzhaber plans a powerful Oregon education board, connecting school funding to performance," *The Oregonian* http://www.oregonlive.com/politics/index.ssf/2011/02/gov_john_kitzhaber_plans_to_cr.html (Feb. 11, 2011).
- 6 John Mooney, "Under the Magnifying Glass: What NJ Spends on its Public School Students," NJ Spotlight, April 2, 2015.
- 7 New Jersey Department of Education, *Taxpayers' Guide to Education Spending, 2015*, <http://www.state.nj.us/education/guide/2015/ind.shtml#vital>
- 8 JERSEYCAN, *New Jersey Schools: A Framework for Excellence 2014*, <http://www.jerseycan.org/research/new-jersey-schools-framework-excellence> (2014); New America Foundation, *Federal Education Budget Project: New Jersey*, <http://febp.newamerica.net/k12/NJ> (accessed 2015); U.S. Census Bureau, *Public Education Finances: 2012*, <http://www2.census.gov/govs/school/12f33pub.pdf> (May, 2014).
- 9 Thomas C. Frolich, "States spending the most on education," *USA Today*, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2014/06/07/states-spending-education/10083569/> (June 7, 2014).
- 10 State of New Jersey Department of Education, *Education Funding Report*, <http://www.state.nj.us/education/stateaid/1213/report.pdf> (February 23, 2012); National Center for Education Statistics, NAEP Data Explorer, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/dataset.aspx> (accessed 2015).
- 11 State of New Jersey Department of Education, *New Jersey High School Graduation Rate Increases to 86% in 2011-12 School Year, While Turnaround Schools Make Significant Gains Across the State*, <http://www.state.nj.us/education/news/2012/1205grad.htm> (Dec. 5, 2012); State of New Jersey Department of Education, *2012 Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates*, <http://www.state.nj.us/education/data/grate/2012/> (accessed 2015).
- 12 National Assessment of Educational Progress, *Grade 12 Reading and Mathematics 2009 National and Pilot State Results*, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2009/2011455.pdf> (Nov. 2010); College Board, *The SAT Report on College & Career Readiness: 2012*, <http://media.collegeboard.com/homeOrg/content/pdf/sat-report-college-career-readiness-2012.pdf> (2012).
- 13 John Mooney, "Department of Education Posts List of Nearly 60 Reward Schools," NJ Spotlight, <http://www.njspotlight.com/stories/13/03/11/departement-of-education-posts-list-of-nearly-60-reward-schools/> (Mar. 11, 2013).

- 14 State of New Jersey Department of Education, *Definitions of Priority, Focus, and Reward Schools*, <http://www.state.nj.us/education/reform/PFRschools/TechnicalGuidance.pdf> (accessed 2015).
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 State of New Jersey Department of Education, *ESEA Waiver Request from New Jersey*, <http://www.state.nj.us/education/grants/nclb/waiver/waiverapp.pdf> (Jan. 25, 2012).
- 17 Doug Mesecar and Don Soifer, *Applying Performance-Based Funding To Public Education*, Lexington Institute, <http://lexingtoninstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Performanced-BasedFunding.pdf> (July 2013).
- 18 District of Columbia Public Charter School Board, *Performance Management Framework: Guidelines and Technical Guide*, http://pcsb-pmf.wikispaces.com/file/view/2010-2011%20PMF%20Guidelines%2011_1_11.pdf/270302742/2010-2011%20PMF%20Guidelines%2011_1_11.pdf (Nov. 2011).

