

Educational Governance  
in the United States:

A 2007 Report

**By Brian Melman**  
**Intern with the Vermont Department of Education**  
**July 2007**

# Table of Contents

<b>I. Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Interviews with State Officials .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Methodology .....	3
Summary of Findings .....	4
Redistricting Conclusions .....	5
Other Findings .....	7
Summary of Data .....	8
Local School Boards .....	8
Service Regions .....	8
Redistricting and Consolidation .....	9
<b>III. Data Analysis:</b>	
<b>How Vermont’s District Management Compares to Other States .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Overview .....	10
Re: Appendix A .....	10
Re: Appendix B .....	10
Re: Appendix C .....	11
Conclusions from the NCES Report Data and Appendices A, B, and C .....	11
<b>IV. Appendices: .....</b>	<b>13</b>
Appendix A - Average Number of Students per District .....	13
Appendix B – Number and Types of School Districts.....	14
Appendix C – Distribution of Students .....	16

## **I. Introduction**

This report is intended to provide an overview of the systems of education governance utilized by the 50 states. It also seeks to determine the various causes and variables that influence both the construction and management of these systems. Lastly, it is concerned with how these systems may be changing in the future in response to changing governance issues and needs.

The overarching intention of this report is to determine how Vermont's system of education governance is similar or different from other states, and how other states are responding to some of the controversial governance issues Vermont currently faces. This study was undertaken with the hope of shedding light on the merits and/or faults of Commissioner Cate's White Paper and his plan for changing the governance model of the education system in Vermont. It also sought to further inform the issues raised by attendees at 31 public meetings regarding any future governance changes.

For the purposes of completeness, a two-pronged approach has been used:

1) Discussions with education professionals. Phone interviews were attempted with representatives of each state's department of education. This approach was chosen for its ability to get "an inside look" at what is currently happening on issues of governance within each state. A special attempt was made to learn: a) the current system of governance at the local level; b) the frequency and various applications of service regions to improve administrative efficiency; and c) current thoughts, plans, and proposals related to school redistricting/consolidation. Any other unusual issues and recent histories were made a note of as well. The data, facts and opinions culled from these initial interviews were sometimes aided with additional information gleaned from each education department's Web site, follow-up interviews with more specialized personnel, and other relevant Web sites suggested by these officials.

2) A reporting and analysis of the most up-to-date educational data available on district management. These data were taken from the latest National Center for Educational Statistics report, released in June of 2007.

## **II. Interviews with State Education Officials**

### **A. Methodology**

For a period of six weeks, attempts were made to contact a knowledgeable representative from each state's education department. These attempts took the form of both e-mails and telephone calls to targeted personnel. Of 50 potential interviews, 46 were completed. Four states (Florida, Michigan, Hawaii, and North Dakota) did not respond to requests to participate in this study before the interview process concluded.

## **B. Summary of Findings**

What was immediately clear early in this process is that there is a great deal of diversity when it comes to matters of educational governance across the United States. The reasons for this are varied. In some cases, unique policies stem from unique situations. Most of these are related to size; for example extremely small or isolated areas. In some cases, the unique foundation of a state's educational policies are derived from what one official referred to as "historical precedent," or the practice of simply continuing to use a system because "that's the way it's always been." This explains, among other things, the surprisingly wide variance in terminology and procedure at the state level for relatively standard practices and positions.

However, in most instances, the bulk of education policies have been created or upheld simply due to the ardent desire of local communities to keep as many issues within their control as possible. This issue of "local control" was raised during nearly every interview, and more often than not was emphatically presented as the single major element requiring consideration in all education-based decision-making. In fact, most interviewees prefaced discussions by announcing that theirs was a decidedly "local control state," further clarifying that it was a vital matter of state culture and tradition to leave most education decisions to the districts themselves.

It is clear from these interviews that many communities, especially those that are smaller and more rural, take great pride in the individuality of their systems, despite and even sometimes in spite of the fact that the method of governance they choose may be less cost-effective and/or educationally sound than other alternatives. In these instances, methodology has become culture, and culture identity, making any significant system-wide changes difficult to raise, let alone implement. Attempts to even mildly alter the method of educational governance are rarely seen in the light of the terms presented. They are often perceived as attacks on ownership rights of local life and even the identity of the community itself.

There is no doubt that in most states, as with Vermont, the issue of "local control" is the most significant factor bearing consideration when any kind of educational initiative is discussed. Regardless of the changes being discussed, it is always bigger than the issue and impossible to ignore.

For many years the passion and persistence of these feelings has dissuaded most state education department officials from attempting to initiate changes in the local governance structures of their communities. At the same time, however, there currently exists a strong and rapidly growing belief within many state educational bodies that the sheer number of districts, especially the smallest ones, are proving to be a terrific hindrance to good fiscal, administrative, and even instructional policy. As school enrollments decline, the need for new technology increases, and the cost of supplies and especially personnel continues to climb, systems that are fiscally and administratively inefficient are becoming harder to ignore.

What has gotten special attention in this regard is the cost of service duplication. It is difficult in a time of fiscal crisis to justify paying full salaries to superintendents who supervise less than a few hundred students, instructors who teach sparsely filled classes, or special education staff who serve only a handful of students when another district or multiple districts are nearby and these services could be shared. More importantly, education officials see the prospect of consolidating these positions as an opportunity to channel saved funds into programs and personnel they currently cannot afford.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, there was a largely shared sentiment among officials that the smallest districts are not able to provide an educational environment strong enough to pass many of the new national requirements (like those required under the No Child Left Behind Act), and that the lack of continuity in quality and curriculum among small primary schools can have dire consequences once students move on to larger, shared secondary units. Simply stated, schools with less competitive classes and fewer resources are producing students that often cannot adequately compete at the next level. Consolidating small districts into unified school systems was regularly cited as the most logical answer to this problem.

In light of this growing sentiment, many states have recently taken the time to study and discuss potential redistricting options. In some cases these studies have been fairly in-depth and conclusive, and the results nearly always provide solid evidence that the reorganization of districts and consolidation of certain small schools would have a positive effect, especially in regards to fiscal matters. Despite these reports, however, and the clear desire of most education departments to reduce the number of districts within their state, only a few district reorganization projects are ongoing. Of those, most are aiming at or expecting to achieve only a minimal implementation. The reason for this, despite the complexity of the issue, is simple: the facts, even those related to cost-saving, often have little impact on the public's belief that the management of school districts should be a local affair.

### **C. Redistricting Conclusions**

This is an issue that has provoked an intense amount of feeling among residents in nearly every state where it has been raised. In most cases, the intensity of these feelings was due less to factors related to educational policy and theory, and far more to the more basic urge to not allow "outsiders" to infiltrate their community. There are numerous cases, where multiple factors have been presented that state a clear case for consolidation. These include: studies that report a potential for large cost-savings, studies that report a potential for increased infrastructure and services, financial incentives to consolidate, and even financial incentives to consider consolidation. Yet in most instances, not only do these reports not help sway the public, but actually seem to inflame its desire to keep things as they are.

Redistricting appears to be that special kind of issue where the most persuasive evidence in its favor usually only emboldens its detractors. The reason for this stems in large part

from the inherent difficulty any state office faces when trying to sway an emotional public with cold facts. However, in the case of redistricting, the public is being asked to compromise on not one, but two personal and potentially excitable issues - the power to govern their own affairs and the quality of education available to their children. Thus, when proposals powered primarily by cost-savings estimates are presented, their ability to impact public perception is often minimal. At the same time, these proposals can also trigger a more protective and forceful negation from those inherently distrustful of any governmental intrusion on the local level. In many instances, therefore, the more convincing the data supporting consolidation, the more determined the anti-consolidation response.

Even the briefest discussions with representatives at these departments revealed the overall state of confusion most states now feel on the issue. They are simply at a loss as to how to proceed when the one carrot that always works – cost-savings/lower taxes – does not prove effective. Even secondary carrots such as improved technology, increased services, and the assurance of a better overall educational experience for children similarly fall on deaf ears. What makes the issue most frustrating to education officials is that those small communities that are the least cost-efficient and would benefit the most from consolidation are nearly always its fiercest opponents.

One could divide the feelings of states on this issue into five groups: 1) Yes, we must have redistricting at all costs; 2) Yes, we must have redistricting. Let's convince the public how wonderful it could be; 3) Yes, we must have redistricting, but what should we do?; 4) Yes, we must have redistricting, but it will never happen here; and 5) No, everything is fine as it is.

Approximately half of all states would fall into categories 2 through 4. They are interested – in some cases intensely so – in the prospect of consolidating their districts for any number of the reasons listed above. Yet it appears most of those states are going to have little if any movement on the issue, perhaps for years. While discussions may be ongoing internally, there is often a fear or even a sense of resignation associated with bringing the issue to a public discussion. In states where the prospect has been made public, it often has only a single proponent actively supporting it. In some cases it may be the board of education, in others the governor or a particular legislator or group of legislators. In a few cases, there is a public interest group that is also bringing the discussion into the public consciousness. However, in each of these cases the single proponent standing alone is often drowned out by the expected public outcry, and the even more expected reaction of legislators whose typical instinct is to protect the expressed interests of their constituents. As a result of this, few potential bills are actually raised in legislatures, and those that are raised rarely make it to a vote. In some states, these legislative activities may go back as far as ten years.

What has become clear over the course of these interviews, if nothing else, is that a very aggressive attitude toward redistricting is necessary to give it any real chance of succeeding. This includes a combination of in-depth studies with conclusive results, financial incentives, and, most importantly, constant public and political activity on the

issue. Those states that do seem to be moving forward have had significant legislative activity, set up committees and Web sites, and made very clear public announcements that the issue will be pursued. They also, however, have shown a willingness to be flexible, allowing public discussion to affect the nature and content of any proposals. It appears that the concept of redistricting is one that requires some time for the public to grow accustomed to. However, when presented with some sense of inevitability, it appears there will eventually be some compromise.

#### **D. Other Findings**

While many states have encountered problems on the issue of redistricting, many (more than 75 percent of those interviewed) have managed to create a great deal of cost-saving and administrative efficiency through the use of service regions. Service regions provide a variety of different services, including purchasing (to create economies of scale), professional development, vocational training, technical training, curriculum advisement, pooling of resources (most notably specialists such as special educators), as well as many others. Some service regions serve only as advisory boards, set up primarily to help answer administrative and instructional questions, especially the smaller districts. Smaller districts benefit the most from service regions. By separating the administrative aspects of education from the instructional, service regions greatly relieve the burdens on school officials, many of whom have not been trained to handle such issues and are also understaffed.

Most service regions are designed to meet the needs of the districts they serve, and create programming and services accordingly. In many cases, service regions are not administered with any state control, although they often run with the help of state funds. In other cases, a more capitalistic approach is used – service regions charge fees for their services and competition is allowed. In some states, each district is a part of a service region, although the depth to which they take advantage of the services provided is often left up to the local boards. Where membership in service regions is voluntary, a majority of districts usually participate.

Other findings from interviews concluded:

- Most states have one superintendent for every school district. Any exceptions to this usually occurred only in the smallest or most isolated districts, especially those that had less than a few hundred students.
- School boards are nearly always elected locally. In the cases where a state has a combination of elected and appointed officials, the appointed officials were always in the minority.
- Most principals are chosen by superintendents. About half of the time their selections require approval from the school board, but are rarely if ever overturned.

**E. Summary of Data (for 46 of 50 states):**

**I. Local School Boards**

1. Is there a single superintendent for every district?	
A. Only one:	30
B. More than 95% of districts have their own superintendent:	11
C. More than 75% of districts have their own superintendent:	4
D. Less than 25% - 75% of districts have their own superintendent:	0
E. Less than 25% of districts have their own superintendent:	1
2. How are school boards selected?	
A. Elected locally:	39
B. Appointed:	0
C. Sometimes elected, sometimes appointed:	7
3. How are superintendents selected?	
A. Elected locally:	0
B. Appointed by school board:	42
C. Sometimes elected, sometimes appointed:	3
D. Hired by a supervisory union made up of school board members appointed by their respective boards:	1
4. How are principals selected?	
A. Hired by superintendent:	15
B. Hired by school board:	8
C. Selected by superintendent, but requires approval from board:	17
D. Sometimes school board, sometimes superintendent:	4
E. Collaborative process between superintendent and school board:	1
F. Decision-making council made up of parents, teachers, and principal:	1

**II. Service Regions**

5. Is there a service region of some kind? (This region may be run by the state, a cluster of districts, or an independent agency.)	
A. Yes:	35
B. No:	10
C. N/A:	1
6. If yes, about what percentage of districts use these service regions:	
A. 95%- 100%:	26
B. 50% - 94%:	6
C. Less than 50%:	2
D. N/A:	1

7. If yes, do these service regions sometimes help create economies of scale?:
- A. Yes: 20
  - B. No: 15

8. If yes, do these service regions sometimes provide administrative assistance or professional development?
- A. Yes: 31
  - B. No: 2
  - C. N/A: 2

9. If yes, do these service regions sometimes help provide special education services?
- A. Yes: 17
  - B. No: 17
  - C. N/A: 1

### III. Redistricting and Consolidation

10. Are any governance changes related to redistricting or consolidation taking place now, in the recent past, or potentially in the near future?
- A. Yes: 8
  - B. No: 38

*Note: "Yes" states include: Arizona, Arkansas, Maine, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, South Dakota, and Vermont.*

11. If yes:
- A. Changes have occurred within the last 2-10 years: 2
  - B. A change has occurred within the last year, or is happening now: 4
  - C. A change is slated to be proposed or voted on within the next two years: 2

*Note: States can be listed in multiple categories below where applicable.*

12. If no:
- A. But offer financial incentives to districts who choose to consolidate: 4
  - B. But offer financial incentives to districts willing to explore consolidation: 2
  - C. But redistricting possibilities are/have been recently researched: 5
  - D. But redistricting possibilities are being actively discussed: 16
  - E. But redistricting possibilities have been recently discussed in the legislature: 9
  - F. But offer administrative assistance to districts that consolidate on their own: 5
  - G. But there has been a recent trend toward consolidation: 8
  - H. And there has been a recent trend toward deconsolidation: 3

### **III. Data Analysis: How Vermont's District Management Compares to Other States**

#### **A. Overview**

In June of 2007, the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) released a report, "Numbers and Types of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies from the Common Core of Data: School Year 2005-06," that provides a detailed look at the composition of each state's educational system. The NCES is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States and other nations. It fulfills a congressional mandate to collect, collate, analyze, and report full and complete statistics on the condition of education in the United States.<sup>1</sup>

What the data provided tell us is that Vermont has a governance structure that, at least in regards to district management, runs in stark contrast to most other educational systems across the United States. The three appendices included at the end of this section were created using figures provided by the NCES report. Below is a brief analysis of the information contained in these tables.

#### **B. Re: Appendix A - Average Students per District**

Appendix A shows us that Vermont not only has the lowest student per district average in the United States, but that the large majority of other states do not have averages within a close range. In fact, only five other states have as few as three times as many students per district as Vermont. Moreover, Vermont's average of 312 students per district is less than 10 percent of the national average of 3,382. It is also less than 10 percent of the national median of 3,398. A closer look at the data does not reveal any bias for the states with similar student populations and district size.

#### **C. Re: Appendix B – Number and Types of School Districts**

Appendix B shows that Vermont has the lowest percentage of unified districts (PUD) in the country. Once again, their placement is not only the lowest but also well out of normal range for nearly all other states. Vermont's PUD of 11.6 percent is 63 percentage points below the national average of 74.8 percent. Perhaps even more telling is the fact that Vermont falls 83 percentage points below the nation's median of 94.5 percent. Only one state (Montana) places within even 24 percent of Vermont's PUD. Only seven other states have a PUD of less than 50 percent.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Note: The figures included in the appendices for school districts are for "regular" school districts only. The NCES classifies a regular school district as: "Public elementary and/or secondary school districts that provide instruction and other education services that do not focus primarily on special education or vocational education. Education service agencies are also excluded from this category."*

## **D. Re: Appendix C – Distribution of Students**

Appendix C shows that Vermont has, by a wide margin, the highest concentration of students attending small districts in the United States. 96.2 percent of Vermont's students attend districts that serve fewer than 2,999 students. This is 76.1 percentage points higher than the national average and 71.6 percentage points above the national median. No other state placed within 21 percentage points of Vermont.

When broken down further, the data are even more revealing. Only one other state (Montana) has a higher percentage of students in districts containing 1 to 99 students. No other state has a higher percentage of students in districts containing 100 to 299 students, 300 to 499 students, or 500 to 999 students. These were the four lowest categories compiled in the NCES report.

## **E. Conclusions from the NCES Report Data and Appendices A, B, and C**

Any way you analyze the data, it seems clear that Vermont is a state that is operating counter to most educational trends nationwide when it comes to district management. At a time when many states are trying to find ways to consolidate and increase the size of their districts, Vermont has posted the lowest numbers in all relevant categories. What makes these data particularly significant is that, while the issue of "local control" is at least as central to the culture of educational governance in most other states as it is in Vermont, each of the other 49 states has found a way to construct governance structures that produce considerably larger and more unified districts.

Another factor worth consideration is that there are no obvious reasons outside of personal preference why Vermont should stand so independently from the rest of the nation on these issues. If we break down the other states by any number of categories, including number of districts, student population, location, or geographical size, no patterns emerge that lump similar groups together. If anything, looking at those states most similar to Vermont in each of the three appendices is likely to produce a varied cross-section of random states.

If we look closer at Appendix A (Average Students Per District), it is particularly revealing that of those five states within three times of Vermont's student per district average, four of them have either recently passed or are actively pursuing redistricting initiatives at this time. Montana offers financial incentives to consolidate and as a result has reduced its number of districts by 150 (or 25 percent) over the last ten years. Nebraska's legislature passed a bill mandating consolidation into unified districts for its smallest schools two years ago, but the process was halted by public referendum. The issue now awaits resolution during its next legislative session, but it appears that at least some consolidation will occur. Maine passed a major redistricting bill in June of 2007 that requires all schools to consolidate into unified districts of no fewer than 2,500 students, with a few exceptions that allow no less than 1,200 students. And South Dakota passed a bill in March of 2007 that also mandated consolidation for its smallest districts.

(The only exception on this list, North Dakota, could not be reached in time for this report. Their recent activity on this issue remains unknown.)

There are two basic conclusions that one could draw from this: a) Since most of these states either already have or are in the process of increasing their average district size, when new data are again accumulated it appears Vermont will be even more isolated than before on this list; and b) Keeping the district average small is not a desired outcome for the rest of the country.

On this same note, a closer look at Appendices B (Number and Types of School Districts) and C (Distribution of Students), reveal similar trends and conclusions. The only state that places even close to Vermont on Appendix B (within 24 percentage points) is Montana, which as noted has been trying to increase its number of unified schools. The three closest states on Appendix C (Maine, South Dakota, and Montana) have likewise taken measures to group their students into larger districts. While South Dakota's consolidation is relatively small, both Montana and Maine will most likely soon be creating more space between Vermont and themselves on this list.

The fact that so few states post similar numbers to Vermont on these issues, and that of those that do, a high number of them are choosing to make changes to their governance system, seems a telling sign that other states consider conditions similar to those in Vermont as reasons to attempt change. The figures from the NCES report appear to back up this similar conclusion drawn from the interview portion of this report.

**APPENDIX A: AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER DISTRICT (School Year '05-'06)**

<b>State</b>	<b>Districts</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>Avg.</b>	<b>Rank</b>
<b>United States</b>	<b>14,199</b>	<b>48,013,931</b>	<b>3,382</b>	
<b>Vermont</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>94,160</b>	<b>312</b>	50
Montana	430	145,259	338	49
North Dakota	204	98,172	481	48
Nebraska	474	285,547	602	47
Maine	285	195,174	685	46
South Dakota	168	121,718	725	45
New Hampshire	179	205,636	1,149	44
Oklahoma	540	634,468	1,175	43
Iowa	365	483,482	1,325	42
Kansas	300	467,292	1,558	41
Missouri	524	915,870	1,748	40
Wyoming	48	86,155	1,795	39
Arkansas	253	472,609	1,868	38
Wisconsin	440	874,098	1,987	37
Idaho	122	261,907	2,147	36
New Jersey	615	1,380,119	2,244	35
Massachusetts	350	808,121	2,309	34
Minnesota	343	809,156	2,359	33
Illinois	875	2,097,924	2,398	32
Alaska	54	133,288	2,468	31
Oregon	200	535,176	2,676	30
Ohio	614	1,769,274	2,882	29
Michigan	552	1,635,076	2,962	28
Mississippi	152	493,952	3,250	27
Connecticut	166	549,616	3,311	26
Washington	296	1,031,668	3,485	25
Indiana	294	1,026,106	3,490	24
Pennsylvania	501	1,752,402	3,498	23
New Mexico	89	326,761	3,671	22
New York	730	2,790,140	3,822	21
Kentucky	176	679,621	3,861	20
Texas	1035	4,450,139	4,300	19
Arizona	218	943,841	4,330	18
Rhode Island	32	138,934	4,342	17
Colorado	179	779,219	4,353	16
Alabama	165	743,626	4,507	15
West Virginia	55	279,788	5,087	14
Delaware	19	114,371	6,020	13
California	987	6,240,080	6,322	12
Tennessee	136	953,796	7,013	11
South Carolina	85	699,027	8,224	10
Georgia	180	1,597,682	8,876	9
Virginia	134	1,201,142	8,964	8
Louisiana	68	648,313	9,534	7
North Carolina	115	1,388,216	12,071	6
Utah	40	496,507	12,413	5
Nevada	17	412,747	24,279	4
Maryland	24	860,021	35,834	3
Florida	67	2,663,973	39,761	2
Hawaii	1	182,818	182,818	1

Hoffman, L. (2007). "Numbers and Types of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies from the Common Core of Data: School Year 2005-06" (NCES 2007-353). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Statistics. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007353>

**APPENDIX B: Number and Types of School Districts (School Year '05-'06)**

State	Districts	PK, K, 1-6	PK, K, 1-9	7 to12	9 to12	Other	Unified Districts PK, K, 1-12	Percent of Unified Districts	Rank
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>14,199</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>2,281</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>10,622</b>	<b>74.8%</b>	
<b>Vermont</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	<b>50</b>
Montana	430	23	246	11	4	0	52	12.1%	49
New Jersey	615	64	221	0	1	0	223	36.3%	48
New Hampshire	179	35	55	0	15	0	65	36.3%	47
California	987	54	461	0	0	1	394	39.9%	46
Maine	285	17	86	43	35	0	114	40.0%	45
Illinois	875	1	384	0	0	0	389	44.5%	44
Arizona	218	0	101	5	3	0	98	45.0%	43
Massachusetts	350	51	15	3	0	0	176	50.3%	42
Nebraska	474	20	185	0	0	0	254	53.6%	41
Connecticut	166	15	22	0	0	0	121	72.9%	40
North Dakota	204	11	28	0	0	0	154	75.5%	39
Oklahoma	540	9	102	0	0	0	429	79.4%	38
Washington	296	13	35	0	0	1	248	83.8%	37
Wisconsin	440	3	55	1	98	2	369	83.9%	36
Delaware	19	0	0	0	0	2	16	84.2%	35
Missouri	524	0	75	0	0	0	449	85.7%	34
Rhode Island	32	2	2	0	0	0	28	87.5%	33
Tennessee	136	4	11	0	0	0	121	89.0%	32
Alabama	165	1	2	0	0	0	147	89.1%	31
Oregon	200	1	16	0	5	63	179	89.5%	30
Idaho	122	0	10	0	0	0	111	91.0%	29
New York	730	26	16	0	2	106	677	92.7%	28
Iowa	365	9	14	0	0	0	342	93.7%	27
Nevada	17	0	1	2	0	0	16	94.1%	26
Michigan	552	8	20	0	3	0	524	94.9%	25
Minnesota	343	6	5	0	0	0	328	95.6%	24
South Dakota	168	0	4	0	109	0	161	95.8%	23
Texas	1035	12	28	5	10	0	995	96.1%	22
Kentucky	176	0	5	0	0	0	171	97.2%	21
Mississippi	152	1	0	0	3	0	148	97.4%	20

Hoffman, L. (2007). "Numbers and Types of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2005-06"(NCES 2007-353). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Statistics.  
<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007353>

							Unified Districts	Percent of Unified Districts	
State	Districts	PK, K, 1-6	PK, K, 1-9	7 to12	9 to12	Other	PK, K, 1-12	Districts	Rank
<b>U.S.</b>	<b>14,199</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>2,281</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>10,622</b>	<b>74.8%</b>	
Alaska	54	0	0	0	1	0	53	98.1%	19
Georgia	180	0	3	0	0	0	177	98.3%	18
Indiana	294	0	1	0	0	2	291	99.0%	17
Pennsylvania	501	0	2	0	0	1	498	99.4%	16
Arkansas	253	0	0	0	0	1	252	99.6%	15
Kansas	300	0	1	0	0	2	299	99.7%	14
Ohio	614	0	0	0	0	0	612	99.7%	13
Colorado	179	0	0	1	1	2	179	100.0%	1
Florida	67	0	0	0	0	0	67	100.0%	1
Hawaii	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	100.0%	1
Louisiana	68	0	0	0	0	3	68	100.0%	1
Maryland	24	0	0	0	0	0	24	100.0%	1
New Mexico	89	0	0	0	0	0	89	100.0%	1
North Carolina	115	0	0	0	0	0	115	100.0%	1
South Carolina	85	0	0	0	0	0	85	100.0%	1
Utah	40	0	0	0	0	0	40	100.0%	1
Virginia	134	0	0	0	0	0	134	100.0%	1
West Virginia	55	0	0	1	12	0	55	100.0%	1
Wyoming	48	0	0	0	0	0	48	100.0%	1

Hoffman, L. (2007). "Numbers and Types of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2005-06"(NCES 2007-353). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Statistics.  
<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007353>

## APPENDIX C: Distribution of Students (School Year '05-'06)

State	Districts	Students	100,000 or more	10,000-99,000	5,000-9,999	3,000-4,999	1,000-2,999	500-999	300-499	100-299	1-99	2,999 or less	Rank
<b>United States</b>	<b>14,199</b>	<b>48,013,931</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>42.3%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>11.4%</b>	<b>14.7%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>20.1%</b>	
<b>Vermont</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>94,160</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>27.6%</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>17.9%</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>96.2%</b>	<b>50</b>
Maine	285	195,174	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	22.0%	49.2%	14.0%	4.8%	5.4%	1.0%	74.4%	49
South Dakota	168	121,718	0.0%	26.7%	0.0%	6.2%	27.0%	18.6%	8.4%	12.7%	0.5%	67.2%	48
Montana	430	145,259	0.0%	6.9%	8.9%	18.5%	20.3%	14.7%	10.7%	14.8%	5.3%	65.8%	47
New Hampshire	179	205,636	0.0%	14.8%	7.9%	20.8%	39.5%	9.3%	4.4%	2.4%	0.7%	56.3%	46
North Dakota	204	98,172	0.0%	22.0%	20.2%	3.3%	13.5%	10.7%	11.7%	16.1%	2.5%	54.5%	45
Iowa	365	483,482	0.0%	23.1%	9.5%	13.4%	27.6%	19.7%	5.1%	1.5%	0.2%	54.1%	44
Wyoming	48	86,155	0.0%	29.0%	8.7%	12.8%	33.5%	12.3%	2.5%	1.0%	0.2%	49.5%	43
Arkansas	253	472,609	0.0%	20.7%	13.8%	16.2%	31.4%	15.6%	2.4%	0.1%	0.0%	49.5%	42
Oklahoma	540	634,468	0.0%	33.8%	10.4%	7.7%	24.8%	10.7%	6.9%	5.3%	0.4%	48.1%	41
Nebraska	474	285,547	0.0%	35.1%	11.3%	12.1%	11.7%	11.8%	8.7%	7.9%	1.5%	41.6%	40
Wisconsin	440	874,098	0.0%	28.7%	13.5%	16.3%	27.0%	10.7%	2.8%	0.8%	0.1%	41.4%	39
Kansas	300	467,292	0.0%	35.4%	11.9%	12.0%	19.9%	11.9%	5.9%	3.0%	0.1%	40.8%	38
Ohio	614	1,769,274	0.0%	20.1%	21.7%	18.9%	34.2%	4.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	39.3%	37
Missouri	524	915,870	0.0%	35.3%	14.3%	14.8%	20.6%	9.1%	3.3%	2.5%	0.2%	35.7%	36
New Jersey	615	1,380,119	0.0%	21.2%	26.8%	18.1%	24.8%	6.3%	1.8%	1.0%	0.1%	34.0%	35
Illinois	875	2,097,924	20.1%	17.9%	15.0%	13.7%	22.8%	7.2%	2.1%	1.0%	0.1%	33.2%	34
Michigan	552	1,635,076	8.1%	21.9%	21.8%	16.8%	26.5%	3.7%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	31.3%	33
Minnesota	343	809,156	0.0%	36.2%	19.6%	13.0%	20.3%	7.6%	2.3%	0.8%	0.0%	31.0%	32
Mississippi	152	493,952	0.0%	20.2%	18.5%	30.4%	28.2%	2.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	31.0%	31
Indiana	294	1,026,106	0.0%	35.8%	20.1%	14.6%	26.2%	3.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	29.4%	30
Pennsylvania	501	1,752,402	10.5%	12.7%	23.9%	23.7%	26.6%	2.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	29.3%	29
Idaho	122	261,907	0.0%	39.3%	16.4%	15.2%	19.7%	4.9%	2.4%	2.0%	0.1%	29.1%	28
Kentucky	176	679,621	0.0%	36.3%	16.8%	20.1%	23.5%	2.7%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	26.8%	27
Connecticut	166	549,744	0.0%	21.5%	34.7%	18.9%	21.1%	2.4%	0.8%	0.5%	0.0%	24.8%	26
Massachusetts	350	808,121	0.0%	24.6%	23.9%	27.2%	21.2%	1.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.0%	24.3%	25
Alaska	54	133,288	0.0%	59.9%	11.2%	5.8%	13.1%	4.6%	3.0%	2.2%	0.2%	23.1%	24
New York	730	2,790,140	0.0%	46.3%	17.2%	14.0%	18.3%	3.1%	0.8%	0.2%	0.0%	22.4%	23
Oregon	200	535,176	0.0%	45.2%	20.8%	11.8%	15.2%	4.7%	0.9%	1.2%	0.2%	22.2%	22
Alabama	165	743,626	0.0%	41.1%	26.5%	15.2%	16.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.1%	21
Washington	296	1,031,668	0.0%	55.5%	19.2%	8.8%	11.7%	3.0%	0.7%	0.9%	0.2%	16.5%	20
Rhode Island	32	138,934	0.0%	34.6%	23.5%	26.0%	14.4%	0.9%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	15.9%	19
Texas	1,035	4,450,139	8.3%	57.9%	12.0%	7.1%	9.3%	3.5%	1.0%	0.8%	0.1%	14.7%	18
West Virginia	55	279,788	0.0%	36.7%	27.1%	22.0%	13.8%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.1%	17
New Mexico	89	326,761	0.0%	55.9%	18.0%	12.4%	8.3%	2.9%	1.3%	1.1%	0.1%	13.7%	16
Arizona	218	943,841	0.0%	64.4%	15.3%	6.8%	10.3%	1.6%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%	13.4%	15
Colorado	179	779,219	0.0%	75.0%	7.4%	5.0%	7.6%	2.4%	1.3%	1.1%	0.1%	12.5%	14
Tennessee	136	953,796	12.6%	45.7%	17.6%	14.5%	8.4%	1.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%	13

Hoffman, L. (2007). "Numbers and Types of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2005-06" (NCES 2007-353). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Statistics. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007353>

State	Districts	Students	100,000 or more	10,000-99,000	5,000-9,999	3,000-4,999	1,000-2,999	500-999	300-499	100-299	1-99	2,999 or less	Rank
<b>United States</b>	<b>14,199</b>	<b>48,013,931</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>42.3%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>11.4%</b>	<b>14.7%</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>20.1%</b>	
Virginia	134	1,210,142	13.6%	57.4%	12.0%	8.3%	8.0%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>8.8%</b>	12
Georgia	180	1,597,682	22.1%	48.1%	12.0%	9.5%	7.8%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>8.2%</b>	11
California	987	6,240,080	13.8%	57.5%	14.3%	6.4%	5.8%	1.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	<b>8.1%</b>	10
South Carolina	85	699,027	0.0%	62.1%	21.7%	9.2%	6.4%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>6.9%</b>	9
Delaware	19	114,371	0.0%	49.0%	24.6%	19.9%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>6.5%</b>	8
Louisiana	68	648,313	0.0%	65.9%	18.5%	9.2%	6.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>6.5%</b>	7
Utah	40	496,507	0.0%	85.4%	5.0%	5.4%	3.5%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	<b>4.2%</b>	6
North Carolina	115	1,388,216	17.6%	56.3%	15.8%	6.6%	3.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>3.7%</b>	5
Nevada	17	412,747	71.3%	15.6%	9.8%	2.0%	0.9%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	<b>1.4%</b>	4
Florida	67	2,663,973	53.2%	42.3%	2.6%	1.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.8%</b>	3
Maryland	24	860,021	44.2%	50.2%	3.5%	1.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.6%</b>	2
Hawaii	1	182,818	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.0%</b>	1

Hoffman, L. (2007). "Numbers and Types of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies From the Common Core of Data: School Year 2005-06" (NCES 2007-353). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C: National Center for Education Statistics. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2007353>