In the following report, Hanover Research analyzes the central office structures of school districts across the country in order to compare organization, positions, and services. An introduction to current literature regarding central office organization is provided, followed by profiles of selected districts’ central office organizational structures.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND KEY FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

As our partner prepares for increasing student enrollment numbers across the coming years, district administrators are proactively anticipating the need to assess and restructure the current configuration of the central office. The district has requested the assistance of Hanover Research in examining the structures, positions, and services provided by other districts that can inform decision making processes in the coming years.

This report includes a benchmarking analysis of central office structures at school districts slightly larger than our partner in an attempt to help the district evaluate the most common designs and services. The report is structured as follows:

- **Section I: Central Office Organization** describes the current scholarly perspectives on central office organization, including literature that discusses the best methods of ensuring student success through central office involvement.

- **Section II: Profiles of Central Office Structures** profiles five school districts with student enrollments within our partner’s anticipated range of growth. The demographic characteristics of each district are described, followed by an analysis of each district’s organizational structure. While some organizational charts are included in an Appendix, others are too large but are referenced throughout the report.

KEY FINDINGS

- Current research indicates that central offices are most effective when they function as support mechanisms for individual schools instead of management apparatuses that closely govern school operations. Defining a clear district mission that focuses on effectively providing resources to its schools is an important first step toward producing positive outcomes.

- Job titles and hierarchical arrangements are less important to school district efficacy than job descriptions and the cultivation of an office-wide mindset that emphasizes the importance of supporting teaching and learning. Increasing interaction between central office staff and individual schools, providing school principals with sufficient discretion to manage their staffs, and incorporating all central office departments in curriculum discussions have been linked to improved school outcomes.

- Size is the most significant determinant of district central office structure. School districts with more students tend to have larger, more complex central office structures. Smaller districts are more likely to have fewer departments, and campus principals are more likely to report directly to the district superintendent.
• The curriculum management operations of a district are either grade-level based or subject-area based. The three smaller, out-of-state districts examined in this report follow a grade-level based system that allocates curriculum staff to work with specific age groups such as elementary, middle, or high school. The larger districts do not use elementary/secondary distinctions, but rather employ curriculum staff that focus on a specific subject area such as math, science, or language arts for all grades throughout the district.

• Student services – non-academic services dedicated to ensuring student physical and emotional well-being – do not occupy the same department across all districts. Student services most commonly fall within districts’ curriculum and instruction departments, although they may be classified in operations departments, as is the case at Lexington School District One.

• Keller ISD utilizes the most complex organizational structure of the districts considered in this report. Its Leadership department, led by the Assistant Superintendent of Administrative services, contains many of the district’s non-academic leadership positions that are commonly distributed among operations and curriculum and instruction departments at other districts.

• Mansfield ISD is the only district to employ multiple central office administrators whose primary responsibilities are to oversee campus principals. The district’s three Area Superintendents are each assigned 13 to 15 school principals to manage.

• In all districts where English Language Learner and English as a Second Language programs are identified, those programs can be found within the districts’ curriculum and instruction departments. In the examined districts, ESL and ELL directors generally report directly to the assistant superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction.
SECTION I: CENTRAL OFFICE ORGANIZATION

In this first section of the report, Hanover briefly reviews scholarly literature related to best practices in central office organization and administration. Much of the existing literature on central office organization focuses on the reformation of central offices in urban districts rather than the expansion of central offices in quickly-growing districts; however, there are some central office restructuring studies that provide useful insight into best practices for central offices of all sizes, regardless of location. This section then provides a brief review of the scholarship concerning central office organization as an introduction to the profiles in Section II.

EFFECTIVE CENTRAL OFFICE ORGANIZATION

In order to determine the most effective way to structure a school district’s central office, it is important to define the purpose and goals of the district as a whole. According to a presentation by the Annenberg Institute for school reform, the purpose of a school district is six-fold, revolving around issues of equity and cooperation. The Institute states that districts function primarily to:

- Ensure that good schools exist for all children;
- Make sure that all students learn what they need to fulfill individual, family, and community aspirations, spur economic growth, and advance democracy;
- Allocate public funds and other resources equitably;
- Protect children and communities against “bad” schools;
- Ensure a “common” education if not a common school; and
- Ensure that some schools at least work together to support a Pre-K-16 educational pathway.1

In addition to this core purpose of school districts, the presentation goes on to argue that effective districts have three concrete responsibilities. The report asserts that effective districts must:

- Provide schools, students, and teachers, with needed supports and timely interventions;
- Ensure that schools have the power and the resources to make good decisions; and
- Make decisions and hold people throughout the system accountable by using indicators of school and district performance and practices.2

---

2 Ibid. pp.24-26
These suggestions lead into the discussion of the importance of school district central offices in supporting school and student success. One 2010 study from the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy (CTP) at the University of Washington asserts that:

Districts generally do not see district-wide improvements in teaching in learning without substantial engagement by their central offices in helping all schools build their capacity for improvement. **Central offices and the people who work in them are not simply part of the background noise in school improvement.** Rather, school district central office administrators exercise essential leadership, in partnership with school leaders, to build capacity throughout public educational systems for teaching and learning improvements.

Multiple recent studies, such as a 2010 report from the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), conclude that the in order to fulfill this active, positive role in school improvement, the key function of district central offices should be to provide schools with resources to make good decisions rather than closely managing schools and their principals. This idea is echoed by comments made by current U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan while he was serving as the CEO of Chicago Public Schools. Duncan explained that “the job of the central office is to support the schools, not manage them.”

Some studies, including the previously referenced 2010 CTP publication, claim that in order to be successful in this supportive approach to central office operations, districts must shift the focus of the central office toward teaching and learning in every facet of the organization. The CTP study argues in favor of developing a central office that “focuses centrally and meaningfully on teaching and learning improvement.” Similarly, the 2010 SREB report funded by the Wallace Foundation concludes that “the key organizational action districts can take to support school improvement is to define the mission of the central office as supporting principals to create the educational conditions that promote the climate, organization, instruction and practices that lead to students’ success.”

Aside from establishing a clear district mission based on creating a learning-focused environment that provides ample support to schools and their principals, districts can also design the structural organization of their central office to facilitate effective leadership. Organizational improvement, however, is not limited to the arrangement of the district’s organizational chart; according to the SREB report, “**job titles, hierarchy, and district**

---


organization” are less important to the effectiveness of central offices in providing support to schools than “changing the mindsets and job descriptions of central-office staff to focus more on curriculum, instruction, and school support.”

To this end, the report cites survey responses indicating that in the most effective central offices, staff spend significant amounts of time within the districts’ schools, human resources staff give principals sufficient discretion in hiring their own staff, and assistant superintendents in charge of business departments are engaged in curriculum and instruction discussions. The study does describe some areas where central office structure can play a role in improving school success, operating under the caveat that “how central office staff members organize their time and work to support principals’ work is more important than how the district is organized.” Some structural adjustments mentioned in the report include:

- Elimination of an assistant superintendent of athletics position in favor of a curriculum and instruction support position
- Creation of a specific division dedicated entirely to student support services for challenged students
- Elevation of the lead professional development position from coordinator to director or a cabinet-level position. Keller ISD, profiled in Section II, utilizes such a system with its Director of Organizational Improvement position.
- Pairing staff with different areas of experience together to ensure the needs of all schools are being met. The example discussed in the study involves pairing a superintendent with primarily elementary school experience with an assistant superintendent more experienced in high school operations.
- Maintaining a relatively small central office. According to one school board chair interviewed for the study, “keeping the central office small encouraged staff members to work more closely with principals and teachers, since there were not enough central-office staff members to complete tasks and achieve goals alone.”

The profiles in the following section of this report will focus on the ways in which a specific set of school districts approaches central office organization.

---

7 Ibid., pp. 18-24.
SECTION II: PROFILES OF CENTRAL OFFICE STRUCTURES

This section provides profiles of the central office structures of five districts, assembled from information provided in phone interviews and collected from district websites and organizational charts. Some districts of interest did not make organizational structure information available and could not be reached for comment; districts that did not provide sufficient organizational information are not profiled in this report.

METHODOLOGY AND PEER SELECTION

In order to ensure that the information contained in this report is relevant to our partner, we have limited our analysis to a group of peer school districts. Two primary tools provided by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) were used to streamline the process of identifying peer districts. The NCES’ public school district search option allows for the examination of a large number of districts that share common characteristics such as location and student enrollment numbers. The other search tool used is the Public School District Finance Peer Search, which automatically identifies peer districts throughout the country based on “district type, locale, total enrollment, student/teacher ratio, and the percentage of children in poverty.” The public school district search is especially useful for identifying school districts in Texas that may have similarities not considered by the finance peer search, while the finance peer search is especially effective at identifying peer districts in other regions of the country. Figure 2.1 on the following page provides the list of districts that were considered for the final report.

When narrowing down the list of potential peers to the set of districts profiled in this report, we considered three specific characteristics:

- **District Size**: School districts with less than 15,000 students or more than 38,000 students were not considered for this report.
- **Locale**: The NCES classifies districts according to their locale and level of urbanization. For this report, we focused on districts in “rural fringe” areas just outside urban areas and small to midsize cities and suburbs. Districts located in major urban cities or rural areas distant from urban centers were not included.
- **Student Demographics**: This includes the percentage of student that are eligible to receive free or reduced price lunch, minority composition, and the percentage of students who are English Language Learners (ELL).

---

Figure 2.1: Peer Districts Considered in this Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL DISTRICT</th>
<th>ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FREE/REDUCED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PRICE LUNCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGLISH LANGUAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEARNERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisco ISD (TX)</td>
<td>37,279</td>
<td>$7,999</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller ISD (TX)</td>
<td>32,746</td>
<td>$7,122</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield ISD (TX)</td>
<td>32,251</td>
<td>$7,029</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton ISD (TX)</td>
<td>23,994</td>
<td>$9,112</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia County Schools (GA)</td>
<td>23,722</td>
<td>$8,414</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington School District 01 (SC)</td>
<td>22,694</td>
<td>$9,240</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goose Creek CISD (TX)</td>
<td>21,283</td>
<td>$8,817</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catawba County Schools (NC)</td>
<td>17,370</td>
<td>$7,920</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Enrollment and demographic statistics are from 2010-2011; financial statistics are from 2008-2009
Source: Federal Education Budget Project11

Each profile in this section provides a brief description of the district, as well as its central office structure. Job titles and their corresponding positions within the district hierarchy were collected from phone interviews with district representatives and district organizational charts (included in the appendix of this report).

When analyzing the profiles below, it is important to recognize that there is not a standard model that is used by all districts when creating their organizational charts. Each district’s organizational chart varies both in arrangement and depth. All organizational lists are not comprehensive. Some districts do not include clerical staff positions, and others do not list any positions beneath the director level. In other cases, a district may provide a position title but fail to acknowledge how many staff members hold that position. Because three of the districts profiled do not provide information below the Director level, it is difficult to make conclusions about staffing trends in very specific areas such as English as a Second Language (ESL) or drug and alcohol prevention. In addition, it is not always possible to determine if a position listed on the district organizational chart is located in the district’s central office or in one of the district’s schools. Therefore, a comparison of districts based purely on staff numbers is insufficient.

DEFINING CENTRAL OFFICE STRUCTURES

In order to compare districts effectively, it is important to provide an overview of the typical way in which most school district central offices are structured. The position titles and structures utilized by school districts vary depending on a number of factors, but there are some general consistencies among district central office arrangements. Notably, most districts utilize a similar taxonomy for signifying the level of responsibility given to a position. The district’s chief executive officer is always the Superintendent, who is overseen by the district’s school board.

Reporting directly to the Superintendent are department heads, generally holding the title of Assistant Superintendent but on occasion holding Chief Officer titles. Beneath the Assistant Superintendents are group directors. Many districts choose not to include positions below director on their organization charts. The positions that generally report to directors are coordinators and specialists. This shared taxonomy is useful for comparing the relative responsibility of different positions. Larger districts tend to have more directors in a diverse array of subject areas, while smaller districts may have fewer directors and instead leave responsibilities for a wide spectrum of tasks in the hands of coordinators.

Despite the variation in central office structures, most districts loosely follow a basic framework composed of a few key departments. Every district has departments dedicated to Curriculum and Instruction, Finance, and Human Resources, and most districts also have distinct Operations, Technology, and Communications departments. In some districts, major groups will be combined into a single, larger department; for instance, at Lexington School District One in South Carolina, technology functions are classified within the district Operations department.¹²

Figure 2.2 on the following page lists the most common department types, as well as the responsibilities that are typically managed by each department. The list is not comprehensive and no examined district uses the exact structure indicated in the figure. However, the figure does provide a standard to which different districts can be compared. Districts said to follow typical structures are those that adhere most closely to the arrangement in Figure 2.2, while complex structures may include additional departments or distribute similar responsibilities among different departments. Following this figure, we provide the profiles of examined districts.

¹² Lexington School District One Organizational Chart. See Appendix.
Figure 2.2: Typical Departments and Associated Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction/Academics</td>
<td>Curriculum management, guidance counseling, assessment and accountability, special education, student services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Accounting, accounts payable, grants, payroll, purchasing, risk management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Employee benefits, personnel services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Facilities, food services, maintenance, nutrition, transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Information technology, network management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Public relations, media communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Keller Independent School District (TX)**

According to the most recent NCES data, Keller Independent School District (KISD) serves 32,746 students on the north side of Fort Worth and its surrounding area. Almost 19 percent of its students qualify for free or reduced price lunch, and 4.8 percent of students are classified as English Language Learners (ELL). According to 2009 financial data, KISD has a per pupil expenditure of $7,122.13

**Organizational Structure**

Of the districts profiled in this report, KISD provides the most detailed and comprehensive organizational chart that includes all of the district’s departments, administrators, and clerical staff. This level of detail, along with KISD’s high enrollment, contributes to KISD’s high number of reported central office staff positions. Further, KISD is also the only district that designates whether its central office positions are part-time or full-time.

The KISD central office is divided into seven major “functions:” Finance, Learning, Workforce, Leadership, Business, Technology, and Media Services. KISD is the only district to divide its academic operations into separate Leadership and Learning departments. The leaders of each department report directly to the district superintendent. The district lists 141 total central office staff members, with the Learning department occupying more staff members.

---

members than any other department. Figure 2.3 on the following page lists the different KISD departments and their primary responsibilities.\textsuperscript{14}

**The Learning department is the most expansive department within the KISD structure.** It is led by the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction and oversees academic, assessment and accountability, and student services responsibilities. The academic section of this branch is arranged around six subject-specific learning coordinators that each manage the curriculum for their academic area at all grade levels. Special education services, led by the Director of Special Education and supported by four coordinators and seven additional staff members, form a substantial part of the KISD Learning function. KISD, unique among districts examined in this report, includes a specialized braillist position within its Special Education group.

A six-person assessment and accountability group manages the district’s data analysis efforts, as well as its mandatory data submissions to the Texas Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS).\textsuperscript{15} Satisfying its responsibility to provide for the emotional well-being of students, KISD includes many student services within the Learning department under the supervision of the Director of General Education Support, including academic and career counseling, drug and alcohol prevention, and at-risk elementary student services. KISD employs a director that reports directly to the Assistant Superintendent with the specific task of overseeing district language acquisition needs. She is supported by a translator, an ESL facilitator, and an additional support staff member.\textsuperscript{16} A number of other ancillary academic positions exist within the Learning function, including the Director of Organizational Improvement, who oversees many of the district’s professional development initiatives.\textsuperscript{17}

KISD’s other departments also possess unique characteristics. **Its Leadership function is the only one of its kind in the districts examined in this report.** KISD employs an Assistant Superintendent of Administrative Services to oversee the district’s campus principals, as well as its Leadership, Fine Arts, Athletics, Safety and Security, and Health Services Directors. In other districts, these positions are generally included within a larger Curriculum and Instruction department.

KISD’s central office structure divides financial and business responsibilities into two separate departments: the Financial department manages accounting, payroll, and purchasing, while the Business department oversees many operations functions such as maintenance, transportation, and nutrition services.

\textsuperscript{15} “PEIMS Data Standards.” Texas Education Agency. http://www.tea.state.tx.us/peims/
The Media Services and Workforce functions at KISD fulfill typical communications and human resources (HR) responsibilities. The Media Services department supports four employees reporting to the Director of Communications who contribute to the district’s media and web communications efforts. The Workforce department, overseen by the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources and managed by the Directors of Employee Benefits and Human Resources, handles the district’s personnel responsibilities.

KISD hosts the largest Technology department of the districts included in this report, employing 29 analysts, engineers, and specialists that report to the district’s Chief Technology Officer. The supervisory roles within the Technology department include Innovation Architect, Application Automation Architect, Delivery Leader, and Field Services Technical Manager.18

Figure 2.3 below summarizes the main responsibilities and functions of these seven departments. As the KISD organizational chart is contained in a nine page document, it is not included in the Appendix of this report and should be reference from the footnotes in this section.

**Figure 2.3: Keller ISD Departments and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Accountability</td>
<td>Field Services Technicians</td>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Technology Engineers</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Improvement</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Security</td>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td><strong>Media Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance</strong></td>
<td>Media Productions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td>Web Communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce</strong></td>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Keller ISD

---

MANSFIELD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (TX)

Mansfield Independent School District (MISD) is another large district in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. It is similar in size and per pupil expenditure to Keller ISD, serving 32,251 students with a per pupil expenditure of $7,029. However, MISD has a much higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students, with 37 percent of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. Just over 9 percent of students are classified as ELL.¹⁹

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

MISD, similar in size to Keller ISD, also utilizes a seven-department central office configuration, though it differs in a few notable ways from KISD. Most significantly, MISD utilizes three Area Superintendent positions within the Division of Curriculum/Instruction that are each assigned to oversee a set of school principals. Rather than requiring one Assistant Superintendent to oversee all of the school principals, this system allows the workload to be distributed among multiple administrators who are then able to dedicate more time toward becoming familiar with individual campuses and communities. MISD also employs more Assistant and Associate Superintendents than KISD, although both districts have the same number of department heads. The result is that some department heads at MISD have to directly oversee fewer total employees because administrative duties are delegated to additional Assistant Superintendents.²⁰

MISD’s seven departments are: Curriculum and Instruction, Human Resources, Budget and Finance Development, Facilities, Media and Communication Development, Technology Development, and School Safety. MISD is the only examined district to dedicate an entire department to school safety.

The Curriculum and Instruction department, which is led by the Associate Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Accountability, houses the district’s leadership, student services, accountability, and curriculum groups, as well as some of the district’s operations such as health services and transportation. In other districts, it is more common to see operations responsibilities within a Business or Finance department; however, the Curriculum and Instruction division is managed by five Assistant, Associate, and Area Superintendents that report directly to the department head. Thus, the Curriculum and Instruction department can be more easily divided into three subgroups overseen by third-tier superintendents. An Associate Superintendent oversees the district’s operations, extracurricular, student services, and accountability activities; an Assistant Superintendent manages the subject-area specific curriculum coordinators; and the campus principals are overseen by one of three Area Superintendents.²¹

²¹ Ibid.
The HR and Finance groups, both led by Associate Superintendents, handle the standard responsibilities that are attributed to those departments in other districts. The HR department also manages MISD’s guidance counselors and title programs. The Facilities department at MISD is responsible for the operations tasks not governed by the Curriculum and Instruction department, which include maintenance, custodial, and nutrition services.

Based on the reported staff numbers, MISD has the largest Communications department of the districts studied. The Media and Communications department has individual positions dedicated to web services, multimedia activities, sales and marketing, district events, and public relations. The Technology and Information Services Assistant Superintendent leads a department that handles fairly typical IT responsibilities, but MISD’s PEIMS data reporting responsibilities lie within the Technology department, as well.

Finally, MISD designates an entire department dedicated to school safety. The department is completely composed of police or school resource officers, led by a Police Chief and Assistant Chief. Figure 2.4 lists MISD’s different departments and their responsibilities. Similar to KISD, Mansfield ISD’s organizational chart is too large to be contained in the Appendix of this report, and should be referenced from the footnotes in this section.

Figure 2.4: Mansfield ISD Departments and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum and Instruction</th>
<th>Budget and Finance</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Title Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Accountability</td>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media and Communication</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officers</td>
<td>Media Productions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales and Marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Event Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mansfield ISD

22 Ibid.
COLUMBIA COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT (GA)

Columbia County School District (CCS) serves 23,722 students in the vicinity of Augusta, Georgia, according to 2011 NCES data. CCS’s per pupil expenditure is about $8,414 per student annually. Just over 32 percent of its students qualify for free or reduced price lunch, and at 1.2 percent, the district’s ELL percentage is the lowest of any district considered in this report.23

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

As one of the smaller districts considered in this report, CCS has a more centralized structure and fewer Assistant Superintendents. According to the district’s organizational chart, there are a total of 101 staff in the central office. The Finance Controller and Deputy Superintendent are the only positions that report directly to the district Superintendent; the Deputy Superintendent is the primary manager for the district’s department heads. The district is divided into three major departments led by Assistant Superintendents, including Student Learning, Student Support, and Special Services. There are also smaller divisions for Human Resources, Technology, and Public Relations. The Student Support division handles the district’s operations responsibilities, including public safety. The Student Services department includes health services, psychological services, and social work, as well as the district’s special services operations. In many other districts, student services are categorized under Curriculum and Instruction, but CCS chooses to assign student and special services to the same department head.24

The district’s Student Learning department utilizes a different approach to curriculum management than the other districts considered in this report. Whereas other districts employ a subject area based structure, CCS uses a grade level based curriculum structure. There are three academic directors that are each assigned to oversee elementary, middle, or high school curricula. In addition, one director oversees the district’s Career and Technical education and another strictly handles Title I schools. All campus principals do not report to a specific department head, but rather each Assistant Superintendent is assigned a given set of principals to manage based on grade level. One Assistant Superintendent oversees only elementary principals, another oversees primarily middle school principals and some elementary principals, and another manages only high school principals. Each Assistant Superintendent also oversees one principal who is new to the district.

Figure 2.5 on the following page provides a brief overview of the district’s departments and corresponding responsibilities.25

---

LEXINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT ONE (SC)

The most recent NCES data indicate that Lexington School District One serves 22,694 students near Columbia, South Carolina. At $9,240, Lexington’s per pupil expenditure is the highest of districts included in this report. Nearly 36 percent of students qualify for free or reduced price lunch, and 3.8 percent of its students are English Language Learners.26

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Lexington follows a five-department central office structure, composed of the following branches: Academics, Communications, Finance, Human Resources, and Operations. Rather than utilizing Assistant Superintendent titles, Lexington assigns chief department officers to lead its different sections. In general, the Lexington School District One central office structure is straightforward and matches many of the most common position arrangements found in other districts.

Like Columbia County Schools, Lexington’s curriculum management operates on a grade level based structure rather than a subject area based one. Academic directors are assigned to elementary schools, though the district does not indicate that there is an academic officer in charge of high school curriculum. In addition to curriculum services, the areas of assessment and accountability, guidance counseling, and special services are contained within Lexington’s academic branch. School principals, who are often managed by directors within the Curriculum and Instruction departments at other districts, report directly to the Superintendent at Lexington.27

The Communications department is led by the Chief Communications Officer, supported by only one Communications Director. The Finance department, led by the Chief Finance Officer, manages typical financial responsibilities; however, unique to Lexington, food service and nutrition are included within the Finance department. The Human Resources department governs the district’s personnel and employee quality activities, and the Operations department oversees building maintenance and transportation. In addition to these common operations responsibilities, though, the Operations department also

---


manages information technology and student services. Figure 2.6 below demonstrates the functions of Lexington’s central office departments.28

### Figure 2.6: Lexington School District One Departments and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Curriculum</td>
<td>- Public Relations</td>
<td>- Fiscal Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Innovation</td>
<td>- Information Technology</td>
<td>- Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessment and Accountability</td>
<td>- Building Maintenance and Facilities</td>
<td>- Food Service and Nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Guidance</td>
<td>- Student Services</td>
<td>- Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Instructional Technology</td>
<td>- Transportation</td>
<td>- Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Special Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Employee Quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lexington School District One

**CATAWBA COUNTY SCHOOLS (NC)**

According to the NCES, Catawba County Schools serves 17,370 students in a region located about 40 miles northwest of Charlotte, North Carolina. The most recent NCES data show that the district spent $7,920 per pupil in 2009. Catawba County has a higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students than any other districts profiled in this report, with 47 percent of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch. Approximately 8 percent of the district’s students are English Language Learners.29

**ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

Catawba County Schools utilizes the simplest and most predictable central office structure of the districts contained in this report. Responsibilities are divided among five departments: Human Resources, Curriculum, Operations, Finance, and Technology. Each department is led by an Assistant Superintendent or Chief Officer. The Human Resources department strictly handles personnel services, while the Finance department does not contain any services that are more commonly associated with other departments such as Operations. The Technology department handles information technology, instructional technology, and communications responsibilities. The Operations department manages purchasing, transportation, child nutrition, and facilities.30

---

28 Ibid.
Like the other non-Texas districts in this report, Catawba County’s Curriculum department is based on a grade level centered approach. The district divides curriculum responsibilities between an Elementary and a Secondary Education director. Federal Programs and Testing and Accountability Directors report to the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum, as do the directors of many alternative education services. These alternative services include career-technical education, exceptional children (special education), ESL, and early childhood education programs.

Similar to Lexington School District One, the school principals report directly to the Superintendent. Catawba County’s central office departments are shown in Figure 2.7 below.

**Figure 2.7: Catawba County Schools Departments and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Programs</td>
<td>New Teacher Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing and Accountability</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career-Technical Education</td>
<td>Purchasing</td>
<td>Media Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Student Information and Data Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td>Instructional Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Catawba County Schools

APPENDIX: DISTRICT ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS

As previously noted, the organizational charts for Keller ISD and Mansfield ISD were too large to be included in this Appendix. These charts should be referenced from the footnotes in the respective sections. The final three districts’ organizational charts are included below.
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