

Beyond Bricks and Mortar

Strategic Investment in School Facilities Through a Financial and Social Equity Lens

Examining Financial Capacity, Infrastructure Investment, and Educational Equity

Adina Williams

Executive Doctorate in Business Administration (EDBA)

Fox School of Business, Temple University

Research Project III

Mentor: Dr. TL Hill

Spring 2026

Abstract

Public school facilities represent a critical yet persistently undervalued dimension of educational quality and equity. While prior research has established that the physical environment influences student achievement and teacher outcomes, less attention has been given to the financial mechanisms that produce disparities in facility conditions. This study advances the argument that district-level financial capacity functions as a foundational driver of infrastructure quality and, by extension, educational outcomes.

Grounded in Strategic Facilities Management and Environmental Psychology, this research proposes a pathway-based conceptual model linking financial capacity and strategic financial management to facility conditions, and facility conditions to educational outcomes. Using publicly available secondary data, the study applies a comparative case-study design across selected New Jersey public school districts representing urban, suburban, and affluent contexts.

Using publicly available data from the New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE), the Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA) database, and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the study finds that urban, high-need districts such as Newark, Camden, and Paterson consistently exhibit lower bond ratings, lower per-pupil maintenance investment, older facilities, and graduation rates 20–35 percentage points below affluent districts such as Princeton, Ridgewood, and West Windsor–Plainsboro. Importantly, variation among mid-wealth suburban districts indicates that strategic financial management moderates the relationship between funding and infrastructure quality. These results support the argument that school facilities serve as the physical manifestation of financial decision-making and reinforce the need to treat infrastructure investment as a strategic and equity-relevant policy domain. The study

provides a foundation for subsequent statewide quantitative analysis and contributes to a more integrated understanding of how financial systems shape educational environments.

Introduction

Background and Motivation

The condition of public-school facilities remains one of the most visible and inequitable dimensions of the American education system. Across the United States, school infrastructure is aging rapidly, with many buildings exceeding fifty years in age and requiring substantial capital investment to remain functional and safe. Deferred maintenance backlogs continue to grow as school districts face increasing pressure to allocate limited financial resources across competing priorities, including instructional programs, staffing, and operational costs (Filardo, 2016).

School facilities are not neutral environments. Rather, they play a significant role in shaping the experiences of students and educators. Factors such as indoor air quality, lighting, acoustics, thermal comfort, and spatial design directly influence student concentration, teacher effectiveness, and overall school climate (Earthman, 2002; Schneider, 2002). Poor facility conditions can lead to increased absenteeism, reduced instructional time, and lower teacher retention, while well-maintained and modernized facilities support engagement, safety, and organizational stability.

Despite widespread recognition of the importance of facilities, significant disparities persist across school districts. These disparities often reflect broader inequalities in funding structures, governance capacity, and access to capital. In states such as New Jersey, where local property taxes play a central role in school funding, districts vary widely in their ability to generate revenue and finance capital projects. As a result, students within the same state may experience dramatically different physical learning environments.

Research Problem and Gap

While existing research has established that school facilities influence educational outcomes, there is a critical gap in understanding the financial mechanisms that drive disparities in facility quality. Much of the literature focuses on the effects of facilities without fully examining the upstream factors that determine infrastructure investment.

This study addresses that gap by advancing a central argument:

District-level financial capacity is a primary structural driver of school facility conditions, and through those conditions, influences educational outcomes.

Furthermore, this research argues that school facilities are not merely operational assets, but rather:

The physical manifestation of financial decision-making and systemic inequality.

Districts with stronger financial capacity, characterized by higher property tax bases, stronger credit ratings, and lower borrowing costs are better positioned to invest in infrastructure through long-range planning and preventive maintenance. In contrast, districts with constrained financial capacity often rely on reactive maintenance and deferred investment, leading to deteriorating infrastructure over time.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this Research Project III is to develop a comprehensive research paper that demonstrates the relationship between financial capacity, strategic financial management, facility conditions, and educational outcomes. Building on prior research proposals, this study integrates theory, empirical observation, and comparative analysis to establish a foundation for dissertation research.

Specifically, the study aims to:

1. Examine how financial capacity varies across school districts
2. Identify patterns linking financial capacity to facility conditions
3. Analyze how strategic financial management influences infrastructure outcomes
4. Explore the relationship between facility conditions and educational performance
5. Provide a framework for future quantitative analysis

Significance of the Study

This study contributes to both theory and practice by reframing school facilities investment as a strategic and equity-relevant financial decision domain. Rather than treating facilities as a cost center, this research positions infrastructure as a critical lever influencing organizational performance and educational outcomes.

From a theoretical perspective, the study integrates concepts from Strategic Facilities Management and Environmental Psychology to develop a multidisciplinary framework. From a practical perspective, it provides insights for policymakers, school administrators, and financial leaders seeking to improve infrastructure investment decisions.

Literature Review

Overview

The literature on school facilities spans multiple disciplines, including education, finance, public policy, and environmental psychology. This review synthesizes key findings across four domains: facility quality and educational outcomes, deferred maintenance and financial implications, equity in school funding, and financing mechanisms.

Facility Quality and Educational Outcomes

A substantial body of research demonstrates that school facilities influence student learning and teacher effectiveness. Earthman (2002) found that facility conditions are significantly associated with student achievement, particularly in relation to environmental factors such as temperature, lighting, and air quality. Schneider (2002) further emphasized that school buildings function as “silent teachers,” shaping behavior, motivation, and engagement.

Barrett et al. (2015) expanded on this work by identifying specific environmental design factors that contribute to student learning progress. Their findings suggest that classroom design, lighting, and spatial organization can account for meaningful variation in academic performance. In addition to student outcomes, facility quality also affects teacher retention and job satisfaction. Buckley et al. (2005) found that teachers working in better-maintained schools were more likely to remain in their positions, reducing turnover and supporting instructional continuity.

Environmental Psychology

Environmental Psychology provides a theoretical framework for understanding how physical environments influence human behavior and performance. Evans (2006) demonstrated that

environmental stressors including noise, overcrowding, and poor air quality negatively impact cognitive functioning and emotional regulation in children. Within the school facilities context, each of these stressors is directly shaped by the age, maintenance condition, and design quality of the physical plant, making them central to this study's framework.

Noise in School Environments

The noise experienced by students and teachers in school settings is not a single phenomenon but a composite of several distinct source types, each with different relationships to facility quality and condition. Shield and Dockrell (2003) identified two primary categories: external environmental noise including traffic, aircraft, and urban ambient sound penetrating the building envelope and internal noise generated within the school itself, including HVAC mechanical systems, neighbor classrooms, corridors, and cafeteria spaces. Their review found that both categories have significant and measurable negative effects on children's academic performance, including reduced reading comprehension, impaired memory recall, and diminished motivation.

External noise intrusion is directly mediated by building envelope quality specifically window glazing, wall insulation, and structural integrity all of which deteriorate with age and deferred maintenance. Urban districts such as Newark, Camden, and Paterson, where schools are situated in densely populated environments with high traffic and industrial noise exposure, face compounded disadvantage: older buildings with degraded envelopes offer less acoustic protection precisely in contexts where external noise levels are highest.

HVAC and mechanical noise represents a particularly important internal noise source in the context of this study. Aging heating and cooling systems common in districts with lower maintenance investment ratios generate persistent background noise that directly degrades

classroom acoustic quality. Poor acoustic conditions impair speech intelligibility, which is foundational to learning, especially for younger students and English language learners. Maxwell and Evans (2000) demonstrated that chronic exposure to elevated noise levels is significantly associated with impaired speech perception and pre-reading skills in young children, with effects that are language-specific rather than generalized attentional deficits. This finding is particularly salient for high-need urban districts, which tend to serve higher proportions of English language learners who are disproportionately harmed by degraded speech intelligibility conditions.

Reverberation and poor room acoustics arising from hard surfaces, open floor plans, and the absence of sound-absorbing materials represent a third noise-related dimension shaped by facility design and renovation status. Classrooms in older buildings, which were often designed before contemporary acoustic standards were established, tend to have higher reverberation times that amplify ambient sound and reduce the signal-to-noise ratio of teacher speech. Taken together, these noise dimensions establish a direct pathway from facility condition to learning quality that is grounded in the physical characteristics of the building stock examined in this study.

In school settings, these environmental factors translate into measurable effects on student engagement and teacher effectiveness. Well-designed, well-maintained environments promote comfort, reduce physiological stress, and enhance productivity, while poorly maintained environments create compounding barriers to learning barriers that fall disproportionately on students in lower-capacity districts whose facilities are least equipped to mitigate them.

Deferred Maintenance and Financial Implications

Deferred maintenance represents a significant challenge in public education. While postponing maintenance may provide short-term budget relief, it often results in higher long-term costs due to accelerated deterioration and emergency repairs (Filardo, 2016).

Kats (2006) found that investment in energy-efficient and modernized school facilities can generate long-term cost savings, demonstrating that infrastructure investment can support both financial sustainability and educational outcomes.

Equity in School Funding

School funding systems based on local property taxes create structural inequities in financial capacity. Wealthier districts benefit from stronger tax bases and greater ability to fund capital projects, while lower-wealth districts face constraints that limit investment (Baker & Bernstein, 2012).

These disparities directly impact facility quality, reinforcing broader inequalities in educational opportunity.

Financing Mechanisms

School infrastructure is financed through a range of mechanisms that vary considerably in accessibility, cost, and equity implications. Understanding this landscape is essential for interpreting the disparities observed across the districts in this study. The primary and alternative mechanisms relevant to New Jersey public schools are examined below.

Municipal Bonds

Municipal bonds remain the dominant mechanism for school capital financing in New Jersey and nationally. Districts issue general obligation bonds repaid through local property tax revenues, with borrowing costs directly tied to bond ratings assigned by agencies such as S&P Global and Moody's. Districts with stronger credit profiles access capital at lower interest rates, enabling greater and more sustained infrastructure investment. As demonstrated in this study's comparative data, the bond rating gap between urban high-need districts (BBB+ to A-) and affluent suburban districts (AA to Aaa) translates into structurally different capacities to finance facilities over time (EMMA, 2024). This credit-to-capital dynamic is a central mechanism through which financial inequality is physically embedded in school infrastructure.

New Jersey Schools Development Authority (SDA)

A distinctive and critically important mechanism in the New Jersey context is the Schools Development Authority (SDA), established under the New Jersey Educational Facilities Construction and Financing Act of 2000 following the *Abbott v. Burke* Supreme Court ruling. The court held that aging and inadequate facilities in high-poverty districts prevented students from receiving the constitutionally required "thorough and efficient" education (NJSDA, 2024). The SDA is mandated to fund 100 percent of eligible construction and renovation costs in the 31 designated SDA districts which include Newark, Camden, Paterson, and Trenton, four of the districts analyzed in this study. Non-SDA districts receive grants covering a minimum of 40 percent of eligible project costs (NJSDA, 2024).

Despite this legal mandate, SDA funding has been chronically insufficient. Between 2008 and 2021, the state made no major capital infusions to the SDA. Governor Murphy's administration

authorized nearly \$2 billion across the 2022 and 2023 budget cycles, yielding 19 new construction projects and hundreds of repair projects (Chalkbeat, 2023). Nevertheless, a 2023 special master’s report submitted to the New Jersey Supreme Court found that the state lacks a long-term funding mechanism for SDA obligations, relying instead on annual “pay-as-you-go” appropriations that are vulnerable to budget cycles (New Jersey Monitor, 2023). This structural gap helps explain why even SDA-eligible urban districts in this study continue to exhibit significantly older infrastructure despite the existence of a statutory financing mechanism designed to address precisely that disparity.

Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Funding

The federal ESSER program, authorized in three tranches under the CARES Act (2020), CRRSA Act (2020), and American Rescue Plan (2021), provided approximately \$189.5 billion nationally to help schools safely reopen and recover from the COVID-19 pandemic (U.S. Department of Education, 2021). Funds were distributed through the Title I formula, directing proportionally more resources to high-poverty districts. Approximately 20 percent of ESSER expenditures nationally were directed toward physical health and infrastructure improvements, including HVAC upgrades, ventilation systems, and facility repairs (GAO, 2024). A 2024 survey by AASA found that 65 percent of district leaders identified renovating school facilities among their top five uses of American Rescue Plan funds (K-12 Dive, 2024).

Although all three ESSER tranches have now expired with the final obligation deadline of September 30, 2024, and liquidation deadline of January 28, 2025, the program represented a significant but one-time source of capital improvement funding for high-need districts (CBPP, 2024). Its expiration has created a funding cliff that disproportionately affects lower-capacity districts that relied on ESSER to address deferred maintenance backlogs they could not

otherwise finance. The legacy of ESSER for school facilities reinforces a core finding of this study: temporary, categorical federal funding however impactful cannot substitute for the sustained, strategically managed infrastructure investment that district financial capacity enables over time.

Green Bonds and Sustainability Financing

Green bonds represent an emerging financing mechanism that allows school districts to issue municipal bonds specifically designated for environmentally sustainable capital projects, including energy-efficient HVAC systems, solar installations, LED lighting, and building envelope improvements. By labeling bonds as “green” in alignment with frameworks such as the International Capital Market Association (ICMA) Sustainability Bond Guidelines, districts can attract impact-oriented investors and, in some cases, access slightly more favorable borrowing terms. The San Diego Unified School District’s issuance of a \$320 million sustainable bond under voter-approved Measure U provides a well-documented example of this mechanism applied at scale in a district with a significant proportion of economically disadvantaged students (ImpactAlpha, 2023).

Green bond financing is particularly relevant to this study because it connects infrastructure investment to the operational cost savings documented by Kats (2006), who found that modernized, energy-efficient school facilities generate long-term cost benefits that can partially offset borrowing costs. However, the accessibility of green bonds remains stratified. Districts with stronger credit ratings and dedicated financial management capacity are better positioned to structure, market, and sustain green bond programs, while constrained urban districts face barriers including higher transaction costs, weaker investor demand at their credit tier, and limited internal staff capacity to manage complex issuance processes (Climate and Community

Institute, 2023). This dynamic suggests that green bonds, while promising, may reinforce existing financing inequities unless paired with direct state or federal subsidy mechanisms.

Lease-Purchase Agreements

Lease-purchase agreements offer an alternative capital financing path for districts that lack the voter approval required for general obligation bond referenda or that need to move quickly on smaller-scale projects. Under a lease-purchase structure, a district enters into a financing agreement with a lender or public facility corporation, acquiring the use of a facility or equipment while making scheduled lease payments that effectively amortize the purchase price over time. Title typically transfers to the district at the end of the term. Unlike voter-approved bonds, lease-purchase agreements are generally authorized by school board action alone, making them more accessible for districts facing political or timing constraints on bond referenda (U.S. Department of Energy, 2016).

While lease-purchase agreements provide a useful financing tool for targeted renovations, equipment upgrades, and energy efficiency improvements, they carry important limitations relevant to the research context. Because payments are typically drawn from operating or maintenance budgets rather than dedicated capital reserves, they can reduce the maintenance expenditure ratios that this study uses as a proxy for strategic financial management. Moreover, like green bonds, the terms available to districts under lease-purchase arrangements correlate with creditworthiness higher-rated districts access lower implied interest rates, while financially constrained urban districts may face less favorable terms or more limited lender interest. This reinforces the study's broader argument that financial capacity shapes infrastructure outcomes not only through bond market access but across the full spectrum of available financing mechanisms.

Social Impact Bonds and Public-Private Partnerships

Alternative financing mechanisms, including social impact bonds and public-private partnerships, offer potential solutions but remain limited in application in the school facilities context (Clifford & Jung, 2016; Broccardo et al., 2020). Social impact bonds tie investor returns to measurable educational or social outcomes, introducing performance accountability into capital financing. While theoretically well-aligned with the equity goals of school infrastructure investment, they have yet to achieve significant scale in U.S. school facilities finance. Public-private partnerships can enable districts to leverage private capital and expertise for construction and facility management but require strong contractual governance capacity that may be beyond the reach of under-resourced districts again highlighting the role of financial and management capacity as a prerequisite for accessing more sophisticated financing tools.

Table 1

Financing Mechanisms for School Infrastructure: Accessibility, Equity, and Status

Mechanism	Description	Accessibility	Equity Implications	Current Status (NJ)
Municipal Bonds	General obligation bonds repaid through property tax revenue; primary school capital financing mechanism	Tied to bond rating; higher-rated districts borrow at lower cost	Stratified by creditworthiness; widens capacity gap between wealthy and poor districts	Active; dominant mechanism statewide
NJ Schools Development Authority (SDA)	State-funded construction and renovation for 31 high-poverty SDA districts; mandated by Abbott v. Burke (2000)	Available only to designated SDA districts; non-SDA districts receive 40% grants	Designed to address equity gaps; chronically underfunded relative to mandate	Active; ~\$2B authorized 2022–2023; no long-term funding plan (NJ Monitor, 2023)
ESSER (Federal COVID Relief)	Three federal tranches (CARES, CRRSA, ARP) totaling \$189.5B nationally for pandemic recovery including facility upgrades	Distributed via Title I formula; proportionally more to high-poverty districts	One-time windfall; high-need districts used funds for deferred maintenance they could not otherwise afford	Expired; final obligation deadline Sept. 30, 2024
Green Bonds	Municipal bonds designated for environmentally sustainable capital projects (HVAC,	Requires strong credit rating, investor demand, and internal	Accessible primarily to higher-rated districts; may reinforce inequities without subsidy pairing	Emerging; limited NJ adoption; San Diego USD \$320M example

Mechanism	Description	Accessibility	Equity Implications	Current Status (NJ)
	solar, LED, building envelope)	issuance capacity		(ImpactAlpha, 2023)
Lease-Purchase Agreements	Board-approved financing for facilities/equipment with title transfer at term end; no voter referendum required	More accessible than bond referenda; terms still favor higher-rated districts	Draws from operating/maintenance budgets, potentially reducing maintenance ratios used as SFM proxy	Active; used for targeted renovations and equipment upgrades statewide
Social Impact Bonds / P3s	Performance-linked financing (SIBs) or private capital/expertise partnerships (P3s) for construction and management	Requires strong governance capacity and outcome measurement infrastructure	May be inaccessible to under-resourced districts lacking contractual governance capacity	Limited; no significant scale in U.S. school facilities to date

Conceptual Framework

Theoretical Integration

This study integrates two complementary theoretical perspectives: Strategic Facilities Management (SFM) and Environmental Psychology, to explain how financial decisions translate into educational outcomes through infrastructure conditions.

Strategic Facilities Management (Lavy & Shohet, 2009) conceptualizes facilities as strategic assets that require proactive planning, lifecycle management, and continuous investment. Within this framework, infrastructure quality is not an incidental outcome but the result of deliberate financial and operational decision-making. Preventive maintenance, long-range capital planning, and resource allocation strategies are central to sustaining facility performance over time.

Environmental Psychology (Evans, 2006) provides the behavioral and cognitive lens through which facility conditions affect human outcomes. This perspective emphasizes that physical environments influence stress levels, cognitive performance, engagement, and overall well-being. In educational settings, these effects translate into measurable differences in student achievement, attendance, and teacher retention.

By integrating these frameworks, this study establishes a financial-to-environmental pathway, in which financial capacity and strategic decision-making shape infrastructure conditions, which in turn influence educational outcomes.

Conceptual Model

This research advances a pathway-based model that positions financial capacity as the foundational driver of infrastructure quality:

Figure 1

Conceptual Pathway Model Linking Financial Capacity, Facility Conditions, and Educational Outcomes

Financial Capacity → Strategic Financial Management → Facility Conditions → Educational Outcomes

Each component of the model represents a distinct but interconnected construct:

- Financial Capacity refers to a district's ability to generate revenue and access capital at favorable terms. This includes tax base strength, bond ratings, and borrowing costs.
- Strategic Financial Management reflects how districts allocate resources, particularly in relation to preventive maintenance, capital planning, and long-term infrastructure investment.
- Facility Conditions represent the physical state of school infrastructure, including building age, modernization, and maintenance status.
- Educational Outcomes include indicators such as graduation rates, attendance, academic performance, and teacher retention.

Core Argument

The central argument of this study is that:

Financial capacity is not merely a contextual factor but a primary structural determinant of facility conditions, and through those conditions, influences educational outcomes.

Importantly, the model also recognizes that strategic financial management moderates this relationship. While wealthier districts generally have greater capacity, the effectiveness of infrastructure investment depends on how resources are allocated and sustained over time.

Propositional Logic

Although this study is exploratory and does not formally test hypotheses, it is guided by the following propositions:

- **Proposition 1:** Districts with higher financial capacity will demonstrate stronger facility conditions.
- **Proposition 2:** Districts with higher levels of maintenance investment will exhibit newer and better-maintained facilities.
- **Proposition 3:** Strategic financial management will moderate the relationship between financial capacity and facility conditions.
- **Proposition 4:** Stronger facility conditions will be associated with improved educational outcomes.

These propositions provide a structured framework for interpreting the comparative case findings.

Research Questions

To operationalize the conceptual model, this study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: How do selected school districts vary in financial capacity, strategic financial management practices, facility conditions, and educational outcomes?

RQ2: What patterns suggest a relationship between financial capacity (e.g., bond ratings, revenue strength) and facility quality?

RQ3: How does strategic financial management, particularly maintenance investment, influence facility conditions across districts?

RQ4: What patterns suggest a relationship between facility conditions and educational outcomes?

RQ5: Which measures and indicators are most appropriate for scaling this research into a statewide quantitative study?

Methodology

Research Design

This study employs a comparative case-study design using publicly available secondary data.

The case-study approach is appropriate for examining complex, context-dependent relationships where multiple variables interact within real-world settings.

Rather than seeking causal inference, the study emphasizes:

- Pattern identification
- Cross-case comparison
- Theory development

This design aligns with the objectives of Research Project III, which emphasize applied research competency and the development of a dissertation foundation .

Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis is the school district. Each district is evaluated based on financial, operational, and outcome indicators.

Case Selection Strategy

A purposive sample of 10 New Jersey school districts was selected to capture variation across three categories:

- **Urban / High-Need Districts**

Newark, Paterson, Camden, Trenton

- **Suburban / Mid-Wealth Districts**

Scotch Plains–Fanwood, Montclair, Woodbridge

- **Affluent / High-Capacity Districts**

Princeton, Ridgewood, West Windsor–Plainsboro

This selection enables meaningful comparison across:

- Financial capacity levels
- Infrastructure conditions
- Outcome performance

Data Sources

The study relies on publicly available secondary data, including:

- New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE) Reports
(graduation rates, attendance, performance metrics)

- Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports (CAFRs)
(expenditures, maintenance spending, debt service)
- EMMA (Electronic Municipal Market Access)
(bond ratings, financing data)
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)
(enrollment and demographic data)
- U.S. Census / American Community Survey (ACS)
(local economic indicators)

Variable Operationalization

To ensure methodological rigor, each construct in the conceptual model is operationalized using measurable indicators:

Financial Capacity

- Bond ratings (AAA, AA, A, BBB)
- Tax revenue per pupil (proxy)
- Debt service burden (where available)

Strategic Financial Management

- Maintenance expenditure ratio (% of total budget)
- Evidence of long-range planning (qualitative indicators)

Facility Conditions

- Average facility age
- Deferred maintenance indicators (proxy)
- Modernization status (where available)

Educational Outcomes

- Graduation rates
- Attendance rates
- Academic proficiency (where available)
- Teacher retention proxies

Table 2

Conceptual Model Constructs and Operationalization

Construct	Definition	Indicators	Data Source(s)
Financial Capacity	District ability to generate revenue and access capital at favorable terms	Bond rating (S&P/Moody's); tax revenue per pupil; debt service burden	EMMA; NJDOE TGES; CAFRs
Strategic Financial Management	How districts allocate resources toward preventive maintenance, capital planning, and long-term infrastructure investment	Maintenance expenditure ratio (% of total budget); evidence of long-range capital planning	NJDOE TGES; CAFRs; district budget documents
Facility Conditions	Physical state of school infrastructure including age, modernization, and maintenance status	Average facility age (years); deferred maintenance indicators; modernization status	NJSDA facility assessments; district reports
Educational Outcomes	Student and organizational performance indicators influenced by the school environment	Four-year graduation rate; attendance rate; academic proficiency (where available); teacher retention proxies	NJDOE School Performance Reports; NCES CCD

Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected using a structured extraction template to ensure consistency across districts. Financial and operational data were normalized using per-pupil measures where appropriate to allow comparability.

To enhance validity:

- Data were cross-referenced across multiple sources
- Multi-year averages (2018–2023) were used to reduce volatility
- Missing data were documented and handled transparently

Maintenance expenditure ratios were directly reported through NJDOE Taxpayers' Guide to Education Spending datasets and cross-referenced with district CAFRs where available.

Addressing Data Uncertainty

A deliberate limitation of this study is that several key variables most notably facility age and maintenance expenditure ratios are approximations derived from publicly available administrative records rather than directly verified district-level measurements. Facility age estimates draw on NJSDA facility assessment records and district reports, which vary in specificity and reporting frequency across districts. Maintenance expenditure ratios are calculated from NJDOE Taxpayers' Guide budget categories, which aggregate maintenance-related line items differently across districts depending on local accounting practices. These measurement constraints are inherent to secondary data research at this scale and do not undermine the study's analytical conclusions for the following reasons.

First, the study's findings are directional and comparative rather than point-estimate dependent. The core argument does not require precise measurement of, for example, whether Newark's average facility age is exactly 58 or 63 years, it requires only that Newark's facilities are demonstrably and substantially older than Princeton's, a pattern confirmed consistently across all available data sources. The magnitude of the observed differences between district tiers (30–40 year gaps in facility age, maintenance ratios differing by a factor of two, graduation rate gaps of 30–35 percentage points) substantially exceeds any plausible margin of measurement error, making the directional conclusions robust to data imprecision.

Second, multi-source triangulation was applied to all key variables. Bond ratings were verified against EMMA transaction records and district press releases. Graduation rates were drawn directly from NJDOE School Performance Reports, which are audited state-level data. Revenue per pupil figures derive from NCES federal datasets that standardize reporting definitions across districts. Where estimates from different sources diverged, the more conservative figure was used. Third, multi-year averages spanning 2019–2023 were employed to reduce the influence of single-year anomalies, including pandemic-year disruptions that affected both facility investment and outcome metrics in 2020–2022. Together, these procedures provide reasonable assurance that the patterns observed are reflective of genuine structural differences across district tiers rather than artifacts of measurement inconsistency.

Analytical Strategy

The analysis follows a four-step process:

1. Within-Case Analysis

Each district is profiled based on financial capacity, management practices, facility conditions, and outcomes.

2. Descriptive Comparison

Key indicators are compared across districts using tables and summary statistics.

3. Cross-Case Synthesis

Patterns are identified across cases to evaluate alignment with the conceptual model.

4. Theoretical Interpretation

Findings are interpreted in relation to the proposed financial-to-facility-to-outcome pathway.

Methodological Justification

This methodology demonstrates competency across key DBA learning goals by:

- Applying theory to real-world contexts
- Developing a structured conceptual model
- Utilizing appropriate research design for applied questions
- Demonstrating data collection and analytical rigor
- Generating findings with both academic and practical relevance

Limitations of Methodology

While appropriate for exploratory research, this design has limitations:

- Small sample size limits generalizability
- Secondary data may lack consistency across districts

- No causal inference can be established

These limitations are addressed through careful interpretation and serve as the basis for future quantitative analysis.

Results

Overview of Findings

The comparative case analysis reveals consistent and meaningful patterns across districts that align with the proposed conceptual framework. Variation in financial capacity, strategic financial management, facility conditions, and educational outcomes is not random, but instead reflects underlying structural differences in funding access and resource allocation practices.

Across all cases, districts with stronger financial capacity and higher levels of maintenance investment demonstrate more favorable facility conditions and stronger outcome indicators. Conversely, districts with constrained financial capacity exhibit older infrastructure, lower maintenance investment, and weaker outcome performance.

Descriptive Cross-District Comparison

Table 3 presents a comparative overview of key indicators across selected districts, drawn from publicly available NJDOE, NCES, and EMMA data for the period 2019–2023.

Table 3

Comparative Overview of Financial, Facility, and Outcome Indicators Across Selected New Jersey School Districts (2019–2023)

District	Facility Age (Years)	Maintenance Ratio (%)	Bond Rating	Revenue per Pupil (\$)	Graduation Rate (%)
Newark	55–65	3.1	A- (S&P, 2024)	32,859	86
Paterson	50–60	2.8	BBB+ (S&P)	19,500	81
Camden	60–70	2.4	BBB+ (city)	55,976	65
Trenton	50–60	3.0	A	19,278	62
Scotch Plains–Fanwood	32	5.1	AA	22,137	95
Montclair	42	4.6	AA-	24,200	93
Woodbridge	44	3.8	A+	18,531	91
Princeton	29	5.8	Aa2/AA (Moody's/S&P)	21,153	99
Ridgewood	36	5.4	AA+	22,040	96
West Windsor–Plainsboro	31	5.2	AA	21,073	97

Key Observations

1. Financial Capacity and Facility Age

Districts with stronger bond ratings (AA to Aa2) consistently exhibit newer facilities (29–36 years average age), while districts with lower ratings (BBB+ to A-) show significantly older infrastructure (50–70 years). Newark’s recent bond rating upgrade from BBB+ to A- (S&P, 2024) reflects improved fiscal discipline (Newark Board of Education, 2024) but has not yet translated into substantially newer infrastructure consistent with the long lead times required for capital investment. This suggests that access to affordable capital plays a critical role in infrastructure renewal.

2. Maintenance Investment as a Strategic Lever

Maintenance ratios above approximately 5% are consistently associated with lower facility age, while ratios below 3.5% correspond with older infrastructure. This indicates that maintenance investment functions as a leading indicator of facility condition.

3. Outcome Alignment

Based on 2022–2023 NJDOE data, districts with newer facilities and higher maintenance investment demonstrate graduation rates of 91–99% (e.g., Woodbridge 91%, Scotch Plains–Fanwood 95%, Princeton 99%), while urban, high-need districts with older infrastructure show rates of 62–86% (e.g., Trenton 62%, Camden 65%, Paterson 81%, Newark 86%). While not causal, this alignment is consistent with the proposed relationship between facility conditions, organizational stability, and educational outcomes. The state’s overall four-year graduation rate was 91.3% in 2023, the highest since the current methodology was implemented underscoring that gaps in high-need districts persist even as statewide averages improve (NJDOE, 2024).

Cross-Case Analysis

Urban Districts (High-Need, Constrained Capacity)

Urban districts such as Newark, Camden, and Paterson exhibit a consistent pattern of:

- Lower bond ratings
- Lower maintenance investment
- Older facilities
- Lower graduation rates

These findings suggest that financial constraints limit both capital investment and the ability to sustain infrastructure, resulting in compounding deterioration over time.

Suburban Districts (Moderate Capacity, Strategic Variation)

Suburban districts present a more nuanced picture. While not as financially strong as affluent districts, they demonstrate:

- Moderate to strong bond ratings
- Higher maintenance investment than urban districts
- Improved facility conditions
- Strong educational outcomes

This variation highlights a critical insight:

Strategic financial management can partially offset differences in financial capacity.

Affluent Districts (High Capacity, Proactive Investment)

Affluent districts such as Princeton and Ridgewood demonstrate:

- Strong bond ratings (AA–AAA)
- High maintenance investment
- Newer infrastructure
- Strong outcome indicators

These districts illustrate how financial capacity combined with strategic investment produces consistently strong infrastructure outcomes.

Key Findings

1. Financial capacity is strongly associated with facility condition
Districts with stronger funding access consistently maintain newer infrastructure.
2. Maintenance investment is a critical strategic variable
Higher maintenance ratios correlate with improved facility conditions.
3. Strategy moderates wealth effects
Some mid-wealth districts outperform expectations through disciplined investment.
4. Facility conditions align with educational outcomes
Infrastructure quality appears linked to performance indicators.

Table 4**Cross-Case Pattern Summary: Alignment with Conceptual Model Propositions**

District Tier	Bond Rating Range	Maintenance Ratio (%)	Avg. Facility Age (Yrs.)	Revenue/Pupil (\$)	Grad. Rate (%)	Proposition Alignment
Urban / High-Need (Newark, Paterson, Camden, Trenton)	BBB+ to A-	2.4–3.1	50–70	19,278–55,976	62–86	Supports P1, P2, P4; confirms structural constraint thesis
Suburban / Mid-Wealth (Scotch Plains–Fanwood, Montclair, Woodbridge)	A+ to AA-	3.8–5.1	32–44	18,531–24,200	91–95	Supports P3; strategic management moderates capacity differences
Affluent / High-Capacity (Princeton, Ridgewood, West Windsor–Plainsboro)	AA to Aa2	5.2–5.8	29–36	21,073–22,040	96–99	Supports P1, P2, P4; high capacity + high strategy = best outcomes

Note. P1–P4 refer to the four propositions of the conceptual model. Revenue per pupil for Camden reflects total spending per pupil inclusive of out-of-district program costs. Data sourced from NJDOE (2024), NCES (2024), and EMMA (2024).

Discussion

Full Argument

This study provides strong descriptive evidence supporting the argument that:

Financial capacity functions as a foundational driver of school facility conditions, and through those conditions, influences educational outcomes.

The findings demonstrate that disparities in school infrastructure are not incidental but are structurally linked to differences in funding access and financial decision-making.

Financial Capacity as Structural Driver

Districts with stronger financial capacity benefit from:

- Lower borrowing costs
- Greater access to capital
- Increased flexibility in resource allocation

These advantages enable proactive investment, long-range planning, and sustained infrastructure quality. In contrast, districts with constrained financial capacity face structural limitations that result in deferred maintenance and aging facilities.

Strategic Financial Management as a Moderator

Importantly, financial capacity alone does not determine outcomes. The findings reveal that:

Strategic financial management plays a critical mediating role.

Districts that prioritize maintenance and long-term planning are better able to sustain infrastructure, even with moderate resources. This reinforces the distinction between:

- Capacity - what districts can afford
- Strategy - how districts allocate resources

Facilities as an Equity Mechanism

The results highlight that school facilities function as a visible and material expression of systemic inequality. Students in lower-capacity districts are more likely to experience:

- Older buildings
- Poor environmental conditions
- Disruptions to learning

These conditions reinforce disparities in educational opportunity, extending beyond instructional resources.

Theoretical Implications

This study contributes to theory by integrating:

- Strategic Facilities Management (financial and operational lens)
- Environmental Psychology (behavioral and outcome lens)

into a unified framework that explains how financial systems shape educational environments.

Contributions

Contribution to Theory

- Establishes a **financial-to-facility-to-outcome pathway**
- Differentiates between capacity and strategy
- Positions infrastructure as a central variable in educational research

Contribution to Practice

- Provides actionable insight for:
 - School business administrators
 - Policymakers
 - Facilities managers
- Emphasizes:
 - Preventive maintenance
 - Strategic budgeting
 - Long-term planning

Contribution to Future Research

This study lays the groundwork for:

- Statewide quantitative analysis
- Regression modeling of relationships
- Policy evaluation of funding systems

Limitations

- Small sample size
- Reliance on secondary data
- Lack of causal inference

These limitations highlight the need for expanded quantitative research. The most significant limitation of this study is its purposive sample of ten districts, which, while theoretically representative of the three wealth tiers examined, is insufficient to support statistical generalization across New Jersey's approximately 556 public school districts. Future research will address this through a stratified random sample of approximately 278 districts representing approximately 50 percent of the state's K–12 operating districts, stratified by District Factor Group to ensure proportional representation across the full socioeconomic spectrum. This expansion would provide sufficient statistical power for regression modeling of the relationships proposed in the conceptual framework.

Conclusion

This Research Project III demonstrates that school facilities are not merely operational assets, but strategic determinants of educational quality and equity. Through a comparative analysis of New Jersey school districts, the study establishes consistent relationships between financial capacity, infrastructure investment, facility conditions, and educational outcomes.

The findings suggest that disparities in school facilities are structurally linked to funding systems and financial decision-making processes. Districts with stronger financial capacity and strategic investment practices are more likely to sustain high-quality infrastructure and achieve stronger outcomes.

By reframing facilities as the physical manifestation of financial systems, this study advances a more integrated understanding of how funding, strategy, and infrastructure interact to shape educational environments. This perspective positions infrastructure investment as a central component of both financial management and educational equity.

Data Sources

Data reported in Table 3 were compiled from multiple publicly available sources to ensure reliability and cross-district comparability. Bond ratings reflect S&P Global and Moody's ratings as reported via the Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA) database ([msrb.org](https://www.msrb.org)) and district press releases (2019–2024). Revenue per pupil and maintenance expenditure ratios are derived from New Jersey Department of Education Taxpayers' Guide to Education Spending (NJDOE, 2022–2024) and Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports (CAFRs) where available. Facility age estimates are based on district facility assessments and reports filed with the New Jersey Schools Development Authority (NJSDA). Graduation rates reflect four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates as reported in the NJDOE School Performance Reports (2022–2023 cohort). Where multi-year averages were used, data were drawn from the 2019–2023 period to reduce pandemic-year volatility. Note that Camden City's per-pupil expenditure is notably elevated relative to other urban districts due to state-administered special services funding structures and the full inclusion of out-of-district program costs; this figure reflects total spending per pupil as reported by NCES.

References

- Baker, D. P., & Bernstein, H. (2012). The impact of school buildings on student health and performance: A call for research. McGraw-Hill Research Foundation.
- Barrett, P., Zhang, Y., Davies, F., & Barrett, L. (2015). Clever classrooms: Summary report of the HEAD Project. University of Salford.
- Broccardo, E., Mazzuca, M., & Frigotto, M. L. (2020). Social impact bonds: State of the art and future directions. *The British Accounting Review*, 52(5), 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2020.100888>
- Buckley, J., Schneider, M., & Shang, Y. (2005). Fix it and they might stay: School facility quality and teacher retention in Washington, D.C. *Teachers College Record*, 107(5), 1107–1123.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2005.00506.x>
- Carè, R., Trotta, A., & Carè, M. (2020). Social impact investing for sustainable education: Financing tools and hybrid models. *Sustainability*, 12(3), 1–20.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su12031177>
- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (2024, February 28). Expiration of federal K–12 emergency funds could pose challenges for states. <https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/expiration-of-federal-k-12-emergency-funds-could-pose-challenges-for>
- Chalkbeat Newark. (2023, October 20). Newark says it needs \$2B to fix its schools. Who will fund it? <https://www.chalkbeat.org/newark/2023/10/20/23924349/newark-nj-school-development-authority-construction-funding-building-repairs-2-billion/>
- Clifford, J., & Jung, T. (2016). Social impact bonds: Exploring and understanding an emerging phenomenon. *Public Management Review*, 18(8), 1234–1256.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2015.1113728>
- Climate and Community Institute. (2023). Healthy school finance: Rethinking debt in the movement for green public education facilities.
<https://climateandcommunity.org/research/healthy-school-finance/>
- Disley, E., Giacomantonio, C., Kruithof, K., & Sim, M. (2011). Payment by results in the criminal justice system: Lessons from the literature. RAND Europe.
- Earthman, G. I. (2002). School facility conditions and student academic achievement. UCLA Institute for Democracy, Education, and Access.
- Evans, G. W. (2006). Child development and the physical environment. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57(1), 423–451. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190057>
- Filardo, M. (2016). State of our schools: America’s K–12 facilities 2016. 21st Century School Fund.

- Kats, G. (2006). Greening America's schools: Costs and benefits. Capital E.
- Lavy, S., & Shohet, I. M. (2009). Integrated maintenance management of hospital buildings. *Construction Management and Economics*, 27(3), 197–208.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01446190902748788>
- Maxwell, L. E., & Evans, G. W. (2000). The effects of noise on pre-school children's pre-reading skills. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 20(1), 91–97.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jevp.1999.0144>
- Newark Board of Education. (2024, December). Newark Public Schools' bond rating goes up.
<https://www.nps.k12.nj.us/press-releases/newark-public-schools-bond-rating-goes-up/>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2024). 2023–2024 New Jersey School Performance Reports. <https://www.nj.gov/education/spr/>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2024). 2024 Taxpayers' Guide to Education Spending.
<https://www.nj.gov/education/guide/>
- New Jersey Department of Education. (2024). Adjusted cohort graduation rates, cohort 2023.
<https://www.nj.gov/education/schoolperformance/grad/>
- New Jersey Monitor. (2023, April 1). Report dings N.J. for no long-range plan on funding repairs at low-income schools. <https://newjerseymonitor.com/2023/04/01/report-dings-n-j-for-no-long-range-plan-on-funding-repairs-at-low-income-schools/>
- New Jersey Schools Development Authority. (2024). What we do: School construction program.
<https://www.njsda.gov/About/WhatWeDo>
- Schneider, M. (2002). Do school facilities affect academic outcomes? National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2021). Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund. <https://www.ed.gov/grants-and-programs/formula-grants/response-formula-grants/covid-19-emergency-relief-grants/elementary-and-secondary-school-emergency-relief-fund>
- U.S. Department of Energy. (2016). Financing energy upgrades for K–12 school districts. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.
<https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2016/03/f30/financing-energy-upgrades-guide.pdf>
- U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2024, September 23). K–12 education: School districts reported spending initial COVID relief funds on meeting students' needs and continuing school operations (GAO-24-106913). <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-24-106913>

U.S. Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board. (2024). Electronic Municipal Market Access (EMMA). <https://emma.msrb.org>