In total, 2,137 respondents took the online survey that APS created to allow for community input for Phase 2 of Blueprint APS. The chart above illustrates the demographic breakdown of those respondents, according to their relationship with APS related to their role in the community. Because respondents could, potentially, fill multiple roles for this item, they were allowed to select multiple options.

In the chart to the left, those same slices now only contain responses that selected only one option. In addition, the chart to the left provides the number of respondents who selected multiple options.

About one-third of respondents chose either “APS employee” or “Child goes to an APS school” as their single option, or they chose multiple roles within the community.

For those who chose multiple roles within the community, their responses are illustrated in the chart to the right. Within the multiple response group, we see a greater variety of community roles.
Respondent Demographics

Child goes to an APS school, 1013, 41%
Child graduated from an APS school, 105, 4%
APS employee, 842, 34%
Community citizen, 309, 12%
Other, 50, 2%
Works in community, 135, 5%
APS student, 52, 2%

Respondents were able to select multiple options for an item that asked:
What is your relationship to APS?

- The above chart illustrates all responses, it is inclusive of multiple responses
- The next sheet disaggregates the multiple responses

Whereas the charts on the previous page were disaggregated to show multiple selections (and thus, the numbers add to the actual number of responses for this item), the data in this chart represent all responses. In other words, if a respondent selected “APS employee” and “Child goes to an APS school”, they are represented in the total and percentages of both of those slices.

The majority of respondents selected “Child goes to an APS school” (41%) and/or “APS employee” (34%).
These charts also serve to help describe the respondents.

For respondents who had a child in APS schools, they were asked to indicate which school their child attends. The schools were collapsed into a Quadrant category, and the majority of responses were from the Northeast Quadrant (37%). In the same manner, the majority of responses were from parents of children in High Schools (27%).

All forms of communication were effective in educating the community about Blueprint APS and the survey, but the majority of respondents (63%) indicated that email was the form of communication that they gained knowledge about it.

The survey was offered online in 11 languages. Notably all language options were utilized, and some of the respondents (by means of an open-ended response at the end of the survey) even thanked APS for offering their language as an option!
The survey allowed participants to both (1) rank the scenarios after they had a chance to read about each one and (2) rate the scenarios following a description of each one. This chart illustrates the top-ranked scenario by means of the percentage of respondents who ranked each of the scenarios as their top choice.

The top two scenarios were A and B. Further consideration of these two scenarios suggests that there is less variation in Scenario B, suggesting that it is viewed more positively across the community than Scenario A.

In other words, although Scenario A had roughly the same overall percent of responses as a first choice, compared to Scenario B, respondents who took the survey in a language other than English or Spanish did not rate it as favorably as any of the other Scenarios. Rather, they rated Scenarios B and E fairly equivalently. It should also be noted that the Spanish-speaking community overwhelmingly chose Scenario A as their top choice.
In the survey, respondents were shown a brief description of the Scenario (and provided a link to read more in-depth about it), and then were asked to (1) rate the scenario on a 6-point scale from:
1 = “Strongly Oppose”
2 = “Oppose”
3 = “Somewhat Oppose”
4 = “Somewhat Favor”
5 = “Favor”
6 = “Strongly Favor”, as well as (2) rate key components of the scenario on the same scale.

This chart shows data from respondents’ overall ratings of the Scenarios. These reinforce the rankings that are shown on the previous page. Namely, Scenario B is viewed most positively across all groups. Again, respondents who completed the survey in a language other than English or Spanish rated Scenario A the lowest. However, they had similar ratings across all other Scenarios.

Interestingly, Spanish-speaking respondents did not rate Scenario A as positively as
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might be expected, taking their high rankings of the Scenario into account. Rather, they rated Scenario E the highest—similar to respondents who completed the survey in a language other than English or Spanish.
This page goes further into the ratings. Namely, the key components that were mentioned on the previous page. These key components were aligned with the Blueprint APS literature—Educational Programming, Choice Philosophy, and School Size & Configuration.

As a whole, the Educational Programming aspect seemed to be the most salient component across nearly all of the Scenarios.

For Scenario B (the highest rated and ranked Scenario), Educational Programming stood out as being both the highest rated component for the Scenario, as well as having the highest rating across all components/scenarios.

Again, the scale was:
1 = “Strongly Oppose”
2 = “Oppose”
3 = “Somewhat Oppose”
4 = “Somewhat Favor”
5 = “Favor”
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6 = “Strongly Favor”,

The final sheet of the survey asked respondents to rate if other aspects were important to them (as "Not Important", "Neutral", or "Important").

It should be noted that all items were rated, overall, on the important-side of the scale, but there were some items that stood out from the rest.

**Taking all respondents into consideration, the most important aspects to them when considering the scenarios are listed as the top three in the box above (and their rankings are provided to the right). These items and rankings corresponded to English-speaking respondents.**

**Spanish-speaking respondents also rated these as their most important aspects, but they had one additional item that was also rated high (the fourth in the list). Their rankings for the items are provided in the bracket labeled “Spanish”.**

The remaining respondents who spoke one of the other nine languages also had these items in their top five important aspects, but there was only one item that stood out among the others. It is provided at the bottom of the list above.
Again, all items were rated, overall, on the important-side of the scale (as “Not Important”, “Neutral”, or “Important”), but it is also worth mentioning what items were rated the lowest.

For all respondents (English respondents also corresponded to this as well), the lowest-rated items are listed as the first four in the box above. Note that the rankings also start at “1”. As opposed to the previous page, the 1 here indicates that it is the least-favorable item in the list.

For Spanish-speaking respondents, all items were generally rated higher, but there was one that had a slightly lower overall rating. This was the fourth lowest rated item for all respondents, and it is the fourth item on the list above.

A similar pattern was seen for respondents who speak a language other than English or Spanish. That is, all items were generally high. The one item that was lower than the others is the fifth, lone item that did not correspond to the English or Spanish-speaking respondents. It is at the bottom of the list.