DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 470 966   EA 029 963

TITLE   Reduction in School District Administrative Overhead. Interim
                 Project Summary.
INSTITUTION   Florida State Senate, Tallahassee.
REPORT NO   No-98-57
PUB DATE   1998-10-00
NOTE   10p.; Produced by the Committee on Ways and Means.
AVAILABLE FROM   Committee on Ways and Means, Sub B, 404 South Monroe Street,
                 Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100. Tel: 850-487-5140. For full text:
                 http://www.leg.state.fl.us/ data/Publications/1998/Senate/
                 reports/interim_reports/pdf/98-57wmb.pdf.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE   EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Administrators; Cost Effectiveness; *Costs; *Databases;
                 Elementary Secondary Education; Government Publications
IDENTIFIERS   *Florida

ABSTRACT
                 This report examines school district staffing patterns in
Florida. School districts selected for this report were asked to identify
actual job duties for all staff who were assigned to an instructional job
title for the 1997-98 school year, were not assigned to a specific group of
students, or were assigned to the superintendent's office. Staffing data were
analyzed by school size (small, medium, and large) and by school type
(elementary, middle, and high). Findings show that data in the staff database
cannot currently be used for any evaluative purpose. It is recommended that:
(1) if staff data are ever to be used for any evaluative purpose, the
Department of Education should begin periodically to check and verify that
districts' job assignments are recorded in the state's staff database; (2)
the components of administration—school-site administrators, non-school-site
administrators, and administrators with an instructional responsibility—be
recognized; (3) that school staff be differentiated into instructional staff,
instructional support staff, and administrative staff with an instructional
responsibility; and (4) that the Department of Education provide information
about, and evaluate, the different staffing standards districts currently
use. (RT)

ED 470 966

Reduction in School District Administrative Overhead

The Florida Senate
Committee on Ways and Means

October 1998

EA0299963

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC

The Florida Senate

Interim Project Summary 98-57   *October 1998*

Committee on Ways and Means	Senator Donald C. Sullivan, Chairman

REDUCTION IN SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE OVERHEAD

SUMMARY

Schools districts employee a variety of administrative, instructional and support staff. The Legislature has encouraged districts to administrative cost and to redirect spending from administration to instruction. Two years ago the state budget included a provision that would have reduced a district's FEFP funding entitlement if it failed to reduce administrative costs to a specified level. Although that budget restriction was never implemented, legislative interest in emphasizing classroom instruction over administrative cost remains.

This report examines school district staffing patterns and goes beyond data found in the state's educational staff database. School districts selected for this report were asked to identify actual job duties for all staff who a) were assigned to an instructional job title for the 1997-98 year, b) were not assigned to a specific group of students, or 3) were assigned to the superintendent's office.

Based on the findings of this report, staff concluded that data in the staff database can not currently be used for any evaluative purpose. Although the proportion of school districts' staff who are administrative is relatively small, it is difficult to identify all staff who function in an administrative capacity because districts can easily assign an instructional job title to an employee who actually functions as an administrator. Some job title assignments are misleading or inaccurate; however, it appears to be more frequently the case that a trend toward greater specialization in the job duties of educational employees causes the distinction between administrative and instructional to become increasingly blurred. Especially for exceptional students, there is a significant number of educational specialists who serve as staff "extenders" of the school principal's role as instructional leader of the school. There is a continuum of job responsibilities between administrative and instructional, and it is currently difficult to define where one leaves off and the other begins. Staff, therefore, recommend that the state's staff database recognize a distinction between a) instructional employees who are assigned to a specific group of students, b) educational support staff (e.g., guidance counselors, librarians and others) who have direct instructional contact with students for the entire school day even though they are not assigned to a specific group of students, and c) administrators with an instructional responsibility (e.g., curriculum consultants) who have indirect contact with students or who work with a combination of students and teachers or other groups.

BACKGROUND

METHODOLOGY

During the 1997-98 school year, there were a total of 255,307 school district employees; 8,740 (3.4%) were administrative employees, 140,163 (54.9%) were instructional employees, and 106,404 (41.7%) were support staff employees. These school district employees were assigned to one of a total of 1,123 different job titles. This interim project report analyzes staffing patterns for two small (Glades and St. Johns), two medium (Collier and Escambia) and two large (Palm Beach and Pinellas) districts. These six districts employed a total of 42,139 people in 673 different job titles during the 1997-98 school year, approximately 17% of the state's total number of school district employees.

This report analyzes staffing data by school size (small, medium and large) and by school type (elementary, middle and high schools) This report also analyzes staffing patterns both for employees assigned to individual school sites (elementary, middle and high) and for employees assigned to the superintendent's office. However, not all school district employees are included in this analysis. Employees assigned to a school that exclusively

serves a special population, such as exceptional students or dropout prevention students, or programs operated pursuant to a contractual agreement with a third party, are not included in this report. The number of students served by such special school centers is relatively small, however. For purposes of this report, employees assigned to a vocational-technical center are included in data reported for high schools.

This report first addresses staff assignments as they are recorded in the staff database. Then, based on conversations with district human resource directors, the report addresses anomalies that affect those data for instructional staff only. Staff data were matched with student data to identify employees classified as instructional personnel who were not assigned directly to students. Excluding some groups of instructional employees (such as art, music and physical education teachers and guidance counselors and librarians who serve large numbers of students and who are not assigned directly to students in the statewide database), human resource directors in these six districts were asked to contact school principals to learn the exact jobuties for 1997-98 for all instructional employees not directly assigned to students

FINDINGS

Not surprisingly, data suggest an inverse relationship between district size the number of district administrators; smaller districts have proportionately greater numbers of administrators. Administrative employees are 5.3% of all school employees in the small districts included in this report; in the large districts included in this report, administrative employees are only 3.0% of all school employees. The larger proportion of administrators in smaller districts probably reflects diseconomies of scale. Regardless of district size, every district has a superintendent and every school has a principal. In small districts, these relatively fixed positions account for a greater proportion of total employees.

Data do not support the common sense notion that relatively larger numbers of administrators are associated with relatively smaller numbers of instructional staff. Smaller districts, which have the *highest* proportion of *administrative* staff (5.3%), also have the *highest* proportion of *instructional* staff (55.4%). Large districts, which have the *smallest* proportion of *administrative* staff (3.0%), also have the *smallest* proportion of *instructional* staff (52.3%).

Rather than a tradeoff between administrative and instructional staff, data suggest a tradeoff between administrative and support staff. Small districts have the *largest* proportion of *administrative* staff (5.3%) and the *smallest* proportion of *support* staff (39.3%). Large districts have the *smallest* proportion of *administrative* staff (3.0%) and the *largest* proportion of *support* staff (44.7%). The greatest number of support staff are teacher's aides, tutors, interpreters and other classroom support personnel.

Calculating the number of district employees per 1,000 students is another way to measure differences between districts with regard to numbers and types of employees. Using that measure, data again show that small districts have more administrative employees than do medium or large districts. In small districts there are 6.0 administrative employees for every 1,000 students, as compared with 4.0 administrative employees per 1,000 students in medium districts and 3.4 administrative employees per 1,000 students in large districts. Although small districts have proportionately more *administrative* employees than medium or large districts, they have proportionately the same number of *instructional* employees as medium districts, and they have **more instructional** employees than large districts; 62.7 instructional employees per 1,000 students in small districts, as compared with 62.4 per 1,000 students in medium districts and 59.2 in large districts. The reverse is true for support employees. Small districts have fewer support employees per 1,000 students (44.5) than either medium districts (51.2) or large districts (50.6).

ADMINISTRATIVE EMPLOYEES

For the six districts included in this report, 69.4% of all employees classified as administrative employees are assigned to individual school sites (i.e., elementary, middle or high schools), and the remaining 30.6% of all administrative employees are assigned to the superintendent's office. In small districts, school site administrators are 39.7% of all administrative employees; in medium districts, school site administrators are 58.0% of all administrative employees; and in large districts, school site administrators are 77.4% of all administrative employees (see Figure #3 below). Almost all school site administrators are principals, assistant principals, deans and registrars. These job titles account for 95.5% of all school site administrative employees.

For the districts included in this report, the weighted average number of *elementary* school site administrators per 1,000 students is 2.3; the range is from a low of 1.6 in Glades County to an adjusted high of 3.4 in St. Johns County. Virtually all elementary schools have one principal and, depending on the size of the school, one assistant principal. The average size of an elementary school ranges from a low of 567 students in Escambia County to a high of 854 students in Palm Beach County.

The weighted average number of school site administrators per 1,000 students for *middle* schools is 2.7. The range for middle schools is from a low of 2.2 school site administrators per 1,000 students in Escambia County to a high of 3.2 school site administrators per 1,000 students in Collier County. The actual number of administrators in Escambia County middle schools is, on the average, 1.8; and the average size of a middle school in Escambia County 841 students. Collier County middle schools have an average of 3.0 administrators and an average size of 944 students.

The average number of school site administrators per 1,000 students for *high* schools is 2.6. The range for high schools is from a low of 1.7 school site administrators per 1,000 students in Escambia County to a high of 3.2 school site administrators per 1,000 students in Pinellas County. The actual number of administrators in Escambia County high schools is, on the average, 3.8, and the average size of an Escambia County high school is 1,674 students; Pinellas County high schools have an average of 6.3 administrators and an average size of 1,903 students.

The difference between the total number of administrative employees for the six districts included in this report (1,314) and the total number of school site administrators in those districts (917) is 397, which is the residual category of "other" administrative employees. Most of these are employees whose principal responsibility is curriculum development (N = 174, which is 43.8% of the "other" administrative employees). The number of "other" administrators per 1,000 students ranges from a high of 11.2 in Glades County to a low of 0.5 in Palm Beach County. Glades' 11.2 administrators per 1,000 students, which appears to be a high number compared to other districts represented in this report, consists of a total of twelve (12) employees (one coordinator of instruction, one exceptional student coordinator, two Chapter 1 coordinators, five school

board members, one superintendent, one comptroller and one transportation director.)

Pinellas County's 1.2 "other" administrators per 1,000 students appears *not* be be a large number, yet it is more than twice as large as the number of "other" administrators per 1,000 students for Palm Beach County (0.5). Part of this difference reflects the fact that Pinellas County has 62 curriculum specialists as compared with Palm Beach which has only 27 curriculum specialists. Pinellas has a large number of subject area curriculum specialists (e.g., health, math, music, art, science); Palm Beach relies on a smaller number of assistant superintendents for instruction and administrators on special assignment. Another difference between Palm Beach and Pinellas can be found in the General Administration/District category. Palm Beach County has only three (3) employees in this category (one superintendent, one associate superintendent for administration and one coordinator for administration); Pinellas County has 13 employees (one superintendent, one deputy superintendent, four associate superintendents, one executive director for administration, four other directors of administration, one administration corrdinator and one administrator on special assignement). Similarly, Palm Beach has a single coordinator for planning, research and evaluation as compared with Pinellas, which has four administrators assigned to that function.

INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF

The distinction between administrative and instructional is increasingly blurred. Teachers assigned full-time to a classroom and to a distinct group of students are clearly regarded as instructional employees. An assistant principal is, likewise, clearly regarded as an administrative employee. As teachers grow more and more specialized in their responsibilities, it becomes increasingly difficult to know with certainty whether a teacher is serving primarily in an instructional capacity or in an administrative capacity. Is a teacher who works both with students and other teachers primarily an instructional employee? Should a teacher who coaches or consults with other teachers only, with only occasional contact with students, be considered an instructional or an administrative employee?

All classroom teachers are instructional employees, but not all instructional employees are classroom teachers. In Glades County, the smallest district

included in this report, almost nine out of every ten (87%) instructional employees are classroom teachers directly assigned to a group of students (e.g. self-contained fifth grade classroom teachers, middle school language arts teachers or high school science teachers). In the other five school districts included in this report, the number of instructional employees assigned to a classroom and to a specific group of students ranges from a low of 74.4% in Escambia County to a high of 77.6% in Palm Beach County. Expressed as the number of instructional employees per 1,000 students, the number of teachers directly assigned to students ranges from a low of 44.4 in Collier County to a high of 55.8 in Glades County.

A substantial proportion of instructional employees, ranging from a low of 11.6% of all instructional employees in Glades County to a high of 22.6% of all instructional employees in Escambia County, are teachers who, for a variety of reasons, are not linked directly to a specific group of students in the state's student data base.

The number of employees per 1,000 students for this group of instructional employees who were *not* directly assigned to students ranged from a low of 7.4 in Glades County to a high of 14.3 in Escambia County. In this category are art, music, and physical education teachers who serve a large number of students for a part of the school day and week. Similarly, guidance counselors, media specialists, psychologists and social workers are responsive to all students in the school and are not assigned a specific group of students for a specific part of the school day or week. In addition, there is a significant number of educational "specialists" who have direct contact with students but who are not assigned to a particular group of students. Reading resource teachers, for example, may work with small groups of students who are "pulled out" of their regular classroom for that purpose. Resource teachers for exceptional students and other itinerant teachers may move from room to room within a school or from school to school to work with different groups of teachers and students. "Inclusion" teachers work in the same room with another classroom teacher to provide a mainstream education for exceptional students. Behavior specialists and crisis intervention teachers likewise work as a team with regular classroom teachers. In the statewide student database, a particular student is assigned to only one teacher; if there is a second teacher in the room (e.g., team teaching, "inclusion"

for exceptional students, English for Speakers of Other Languages teachers, speech therapists or reading specialists), there would be no association between that teacher and any student in the state's database at the present time.

There is a third group of employees who are classified as instructional even though their contact with students is indirect. The analysis required for this report identified several ways to determine whether an instructional employee's contact with students is direct or indirect. First, records in the state's staff database were matched with records in the state's student database. If no students were assigned to an instructional employee, that employee was initially assumed to have indirect student contact. That assumption was confirmed or contradicted by subsequent conversations with district human resource directors. Second, the state's staff database includes a large number of job titles for instructional employees. Instructional job codes begin with 51001 (Teacher, Dropout Prevention, Elementary) and end with 73030 (Apprentice Trainer I). Direct student contact is most commonly found in job titles with codes greater than 50000 and less than 60000. Third, all instructional employees assigned to the superintendent's office were assumed to have indirect student contact. Conversations with district human resource directors were also used to confirm the accuracy of that assumption as well.

Relative to the total number of instructional employees, the proportion of instructional employees with indirect student contact is small. In the six districts included in this report, the proportion of instructional employees with indirect student contact ranges from a low of 1.4% in Glades County to a high of 4.3% in Collier County. The number of employees per 1,000 students for this group of instructional employees who were *indirectly* assigned to students ranged from a low of 1.8 in Pinellas County to a high of 2.6 in Collier County. Several circumstances are represented in this group of instructional employees.

- First, many teachers serve as "extenders" for the instructional responsibilities of school principals and assistant principals. Their work is principally with other teachers. For example, primary specialists and ESE coordinators are examples of instructional staff who work primarily with other teachers to promote staff development.

- Second, there are several job codes and titles for "Teachers on Special Assignment" who are not assigned to students and who work either with other teachers or in a capacity that is more administrative than instructional.

- Third, some instructional job code assignments obscure the clearly administrative nature of the employee's actual job responsibilities. For example, in Escambia County one kindergarten teacher and one fifth-grade teacher actually served as trainers for other teachers and were, therefore, not assigned to students. In St. Johns County, the job title "Student Services Worker" was used for instructional employees who actually served as deans. In Palm Beach County, four social studies teachers, two teachers assigned the job title "Senior High Classroom Teacher" and twenty-seven teachers assigned the job title "Teacher, Other Instruction" actually served as deans, assistant principals, and, in the case of one teacher, an athletic director. Collier County used the job titles "Teacher on Special Assignment, Basic Instruction" and "Teacher, Apprentice Trainer I" for instructional employees who actually served as deans.

The distinction between administrative functions and instructional functions is not always easy to recognize. An employee assigned to the job title "Coordinator, Instruction/Curriculum" (job code = 63008) is considered an administrative employee currently in the statewide staff database. An employee assigned to the job title "Specialist/Manager, Instruction/Curriculum" (job code = 63010) is considered an instructional employee. It is possible that the subtlety of that distinction is too fine to be useful. It may be more helpful to define total administrative staff as the sum of the following three groups of employees: (1) school site administrators, who are for the most part principals, assistant principals, deans and registrars; (2) other administrative staff, who are principally those administrative staff assigned to the superintendent's office, and (3) those instructional staff, both those assigned to individual schools and to the superintendent's office, who have indirect contact with students. Using this revised definition, the total number of administrative staff per 1,000 students in

the six districts included in this report ranges from a low of 4.9 in Palm Beach County to a high of 14.9 in Glades County. Ignoring Glades, which may be very untypical because of its very small size, the range would be from a low of 4.9 in Palm Beach County to a high of 7.8 in St. Johns County.

Interestingly, the data do not suggest wide variation among districts with regard to the number of employees who function primarily as administrators. With the exception of the smallest district, the variation in the number of administrative employees per 1,000 students is only from 4.9 to 7.8. As discussed earlier in this report with regard to unadjusted data, much more variation exists among districts in their relative emphasis on basic, at-risk, exceptional and vocational education instruction. Variation among districts is the least for basic instruction. The lowest number of basic instructional staff per 1,000 basic students (54.6) is found in Palm Beach County, and the highest number (61.6) is found in Glades County. Ignoring Glades County because of its very small size, the variation is from a low of 54.6 (Palm Beach County) to a high of 60.5 (Collier County). Glades County is able to emphasize basic instruction because they do not have a significant number of "other" basic instructional staff (i.e., art, music, physical education and computer teachers) and because their number of instructional staff for exceptional education per 1,000 exceptional students is also the lowest among the districts included in this report. Collier County's number of basic instructional staff per 1,000 basic students is high for three reasons. First, Collier has a significant number of ESOL teachers in its basic program who work alongside a basic education teacher in a classroom. Second, Collier has the lowest number of at-risk instructional staff per 1,000 at-risk students. And third, Collier has the lowest number of vocational instructional staff per 1,000 vocational students.

The variation among districts with regard to the number of at-risk instructional staff per 1,000 at-risk students is substantial. The adjusted instructional staff data show that Collier County has the lowest number of at-risk education instructional staff per 1,000 at-risk students (3.6) and St. Johns has the highest (198.5). Collier County operates its at-risk program for 2,794 full-time-equivalent students with eighteen (18) dropout prevention teachers. St. Johns County operates its At-Risk program for 212 full-time-equivalent students with a staff of twenty-four (24) dropout prevention teachers as well as Chapter I, in-

school suspension, and remedial/compensatory teachers.

Adjusted instructional staff data show that the variation among districts with regard to the number of exceptional education staff per 1,000 exceptional students ranges from a low of 31.0 in Glades County to a high of 64.8 in Palm Beach County. Glades relies on a staff of five (5) varying exceptionalities teachers for its 162 full-time equivalent exceptional students. Palm Beach County employed an exceptional education instructional staff of 1,625 for its 25,061 full-time equivalent exceptional students. In addition to its staff of 1,323 exceptional education classroom teachers (educable mentally handicapped – 45, trainable mentally handicapped – 27, deaf – 25, visually impaired – 10, emotionally handicapped – 119, specific learning disabled – 320, gifted – 213, hospital/homebound – 15, profoundly mentally handicapped – 10, severely emotionally disturbed – 27, varying exceptionalities – 243, physical therapist – 14, and speech and language pathologist – 209), Palm Beach has a substantial staff of resource teachers who work with both students and teachers, such as exceptional education coordinators, diagnosticians, inclusion teachers (exceptional teachers who work in the same room with a basic education teacher for mainstreamed students), staffing specialists, parent liaisons, crisis intervention teachers, behavior specialists, and subject area specialists for exceptional students (writing, math, science and music therapy). Adjusted instructional staff data show that Palm Beach is the only district included in this report that has more exceptional staff per 1,000 exceptional students than it does basic education staff per 1,000 basic students; 64.8 instructional staff for exceptional education as compared with 54.8 instructional staff for basic education.

Variation among districts with regard to the adjusted number of vocational education staff per 1,000 vocational students ranges from a low of 25.5 in Collier County to a high of 94.0 in Glades County. Glades County operates a vocational program with five (5) teachers for its 64 full time equivalent vocational students. Collier County operates its vocational program with a staff of seventy-three (73) for its 842 full time equivalent vocational students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation #1: If staff data are ever to be used for any evaluative purpose, the Department of Education should begin periodically to check and verify districts' job assignments as they are recorded in the state's staff database. Currently, a lack of consistency and uniformity in the application of coding prevents greater use of staff data. The Department should particularly work with districts to eliminate the practice of assigning misleading job codes, such as "Student Services Worker" for staff who are actually functioning as assistant principals.

Recommendation #2: Staff data presented in this report, both unadjusted and adjusted following discussions with school district human resource directors, suggest that school districts have a relatively stable proportion of their total staff devoted principally to administrative duties. It might be useful to recognize the following three components of administration:

- *school site administrators*, who are, for the most part, principals, assistant principals, deans and registrars;

- *non-school site administrators*, who are district administrators (superintendents, assistant and associate superintendents and board members); curriculum development and staff training specialists; and various fiscal, information, food, transportation, plant operation and maintenance, and other related business specialists assigned to the superintendent's office; and

- *administrators with an instructional responsibility*, who are those persons currently coded as instructional staff who have indirect contact with students, which would include both those staff assigned to individual school sites and those assigned to the superintendent's office .

Recommendation #3: Instructional and administrative roles are increasingly differentiated. Like their counterparts in other professions, educators are becoming increasingly specialized in their job responsibilities. Districts employ teachers who provide instruction just for reading or technology instruction or for English instruction for speakers of other languages. For exceptional students, some teachers specialize in diagnosis of conditions while other teachers move from room to room assisting

other teachers with "behavioral crisis intervention." There is a continuum from the traditional image of a teacher assigned to a particular room and a particular group of students to the traditional image of an administrator who is assigned to a office and has infrequent contact with students.

It is widely known and commonly accepted that the school principal acts both as an administrator and as the instructional leader of the school. The principal relies on a variety of other staff to serve as "extenders" both of the principal's administrative and instructional responsibilities. The vast gray area revealed by the data presented in this report is the question, "Where is the line that separates instructional from administrative?" A science teacher assigned to a specific group of science students would clearly be an instructional employee. If that teacher were itinerant, moving from room to room or from school to school to instruct special topics in science, the teacher would still clearly be instructional. Similarly, if that teacher pulls small groups of students from their regular classroom to conduct special science experiments, the teacher would still clearly be an instructional employee. However, if the teacher is itinerant and works as a consultant with other teachers, helping them to develop and refine curriculum, is the teacher still considered instructional? And if the teacher coordinates the district's science curriculum, and is assigned to the superintendent's office and infrequently spends instructional time with students, is the teacher still to be considered an instructional employee?

It is the conclusion of this report that the Department of Education should revise current definitions to differentiate between the following three groups:

• *instructional staff,* who are staff assigned to a distinct group of students in the state's staff and student databases. Included in this group are staff (such as art. music and physical education teachers) who spend their time during the school day in direct instructional contact with students and who are not currently assigned to students in the state's staff database. *It is recommended that only those staff who have are responsible for evaluating student performance and mastery of curriculum frameworks and for assigning grades for students should be included in this group.*

The Department should add a designation to the staff database that recognizes a dual teaching responsibility

for those teachers who are cooperating with other teachers in a team teaching situation or who are working as a second teacher in a classroom as "inclusion" teachers for exceptional students or who otherwise spend their day in direct instructional contact with a specific group of students. Similarly, there should be a designation for teachers who provide direct instruction for large groups, such as art, music, physical education and other teachers who work with a specific group of students for a part of the school day.

• *instructional support staff,* who are all persons currently classified as instructional staff

1) who are not assigned to a specific group of students, who do not directly evaluate student performance and who do not assign student grades but

2) who, nonetheless, work with small groups of different students or who are available to the entire student body, or who work with groups of students for short periods. *All persons included in this group would spend their entire school day in direct instructional contact with students only.* Guidance counselor, librarians, social workers, psychologists, behavior specialists and reading teachers would be examples of job titles included in this group.

• *administrative staff with an instructional responsibility,* who are all staff currently classified as administrative and instructional who have indirect instructional contact with students; i.e., *those who provide consultative services for other teachers, those who work both with other teachers and with students. or those who work with parents or other groups (e.g., parent liaisons).* It is important to concede that all adults in a school have an instructional responsibility for students. However. it is the conclusion of this report that teachers who work with a combination of other teachers and students as consultants or resource teachers should be considered an extension of the instructional arm of the principal's responsibility to be the instructional leader of the school.

S. 236.685, F.S., provides definitions for "Administrative personnel," Educational support personnel", "Instructional personnel", "Instructional

9

specialists", "Instructional support personnel", and "Managers" and requires school boards to classify all employees into one of the following categories: "Instructional personnel", "Instructional specialists", "Instructional support personnel", "Administrative personnel", "Managers" or "Educational support personnel". This statute should be amended to be consistent with any changes made to existing employee classifications pursuant to these recommendations.

Recommendation #4: Because the greatest number of staff currently classified as administrative are assigned to a school site as principals, assistant principals, deans and registrars, it might be helpful for the Department of Education to provide information about, and to evaluate, the different staffing standards districts currently use. For example, Escambia High School in Escambia County operates with two (2) assistant principals and a student body of approximately 2,100; in contrast, Glades Central High School in Palm Beach County operates with six (6) assistant principals and a student body of approximately 1,650. Does one of those schools have too many assistant principals or does one have too few? Does Escambia High School use other staff to supplement the work of their two assistant principals? Is Escambia High more efficient? These and other questions could be addressed if the Department of Education were to begin analyzing school district staffing data and to disseminate information about current practices.

COMMITTEE(S) INVOLVED IN REPORT *(Contact first committee for more information.)*
Committee on Ways and Means, Sub B, 404 South Monroe Street, Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100, (850) 487-5140 SunCom 277-5140
Committee on Education

MEMBER OVERSIGHT
Senators Kirkpatrick and Cowin

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:

Reduction in School District Administrative Overhead

Author(s):

Corporate Source:	Publication Date:
The Florida Senate	

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ ☐	Level 2A ↑ ☐	Level 2B ↑ ☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please	Signature: *Edward W. Woodruff*	Printed Name/Position/Title: Chief Fiscal Analyst
	Organization/Address: Appropriations Committee, Florida Senate, Tallahassee Fl 32399-1100 201 Capitol	Telephone: 850-487-5140	FAX:
		E-Mail Address:	Date: 10-15-02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:	ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management 1787 Agate Street 5207 University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403-5207 Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC