GARY B. MARLY

1992 REPORT ON SCHOOL FACILITIES

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
DIVISION OF RESOURCE PLANNING AND REPORTS
AUSTIN, TEXAS

MAY 1992
DRAFT

Project Staff

Joe Wisnoski
Director
Resource Planning and Reports

Debra S. Haas
Project Manager

Teresa Kay Tharp
Melinda Preston
Mary Alvarez
Mary Ann Sparkman
Richard Dirkes-Jacks

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Supreme Court's decision in Edgewood v. Kirby that the state must equalize funds for capital outlay and debt service has propelled the state into the realm of financing school facilities. The issue now before the legislature is how best to begin to address an activity that has traditionally been the responsibility of local school districts. Recently, school districts have spent approximately $1 billion per year to meet their debt service obligation. In addition to the monies being spent by school districts, there is an additional $1 billion in need to meet the costs of growth in the student population and aging of existing facilities. With state participation, at least a portion of these additional funds will come from the state, either through appropriation of tax receipts or increases in the state's debt obligation.

To date, the Legislature has directed the Agency to undertake a number of activities related to school facilities, including work with the School Facilities Advisory Committee, conducting an inventory of the state's public school facilities and educational technology, and the development of standards. During the past five years several study groups and committees have examined the state role in facilities finance and construction, and proposed a number of alternatives for providing funding for school facilities. These include per capita, guaranteed yield, per project and combination financing approaches, as well as options for complementary mechanisms for allocating funds.

These options vary widely on a number of policy issues including: the level of control over construction issues which are mandated by the state or left to the school district; the degree to which they can be made to meet court mandated equity requirements; the type of projects which can be addressed; and the impact of these options on the Texas Education Agency and the Legislature.

on-going needs for school facilities. The one-time needs include such things as replacement of some portable/temporary space and additional instructional space to meet overcrowding. The long-term, and perhaps more serious issues, include needs that result from aging facilities and need for additional instructional space to meet growth in the student population. These perennial issues are the sort which districts have long addressed on their own, and which represent a significant new financial commitment for the state.

Sources of revenue must also be examined for a direct state role in debt service and capital outlay, direct appropriations, the issuance of general obligation debt, and new uses of the Available School Fund, or revenue bond programs authorized by the Public School Facilities Funding Act. Whether existing funds are redirected towards school facilities, or new monies are sought, the Legislature is faced with a financial commitment to a share of capital outlay or existing debt service requirements worth more than $2 billion for the next biennium.

This document does not contain the definitive answer to any of the school facilities issues facing the Legislature. Such an answer likely does not exist. However, it should provide a useful basis for discussion of the costs associated with meeting the state's needs, the mechanisms for providing districts with the funding to meet those needs, and the probable consequences of alternatives.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The financing of school facilities has become an increasingly important issue in discussions related to the overall financing of public education in Texas. Several advisory committees and the state courts have examined the issue in recent years, and during its 71st session in 1989 the state legislature began to address the problems related to the financing of school facilities.

Contents of the Report

This report attempts to provide a overview of the major issues related to school facilities policy in Texas. Chapter 1 summarizes the legislative history of facilities policy and outlines the actions that have been taken by the Texas Education Agency to address facilities issues. Chapter 2 examines facilities policies and programs in a number of other states. Chapter 3 furnishes detailed information on the school facilities inventory, including a description of the data collection process, an analysis of state level data, and a discussion of the appropriate uses of that data. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 deal with the major finance policy issues facing the state. Chapter 4 focuses cost estimates, standards, and debt service projections from both the Agency and the State Bond Review Board. Chapter 5 outlines the state role in funding facilities, and Chapter 6 lays out options for funding.

Legislative Charges and Agency Actions

Although the issues of long-term financing for debt service and school construction remain unresolved, the legislature has begun to address issues related to school facilities. Early actions taken by the legislature and the State Board of Education have resulted in an inventory of school facilities and the establishment of rules related to an emergency grant program and to facilities standards.

Senate Bill 1019, passed during the 71st regular session, directed the State Board of Education to conduct an inventory of the state's public school facilities, develop standards for the construction of new facilities, and establish a facilities advisory committee to assist in the development of policy related to school facilities and debt service. Senate Bill 11, passed during the 72nd legislature, 6th Called Session, provided $5 million for the conduct of the inventory, and $50 million for an emergency grant program for school facilities.

With respect to the inventory, the law requires that "(a) The State Board of Education shall establish a statewide inventory of school facilities and shall update the inventory on a periodic basis" and that "(b) The inventory shall include information on the condition, use, type and replacement costs of public school facilities in this state." During the period from October 1990 through September 1991, the Texas Education Agency, through a series of contracts, conducted an inventory of all of the public school facilities in the state. The result of the inventory was the creation of a research data base containing information on the size, age and general condition of the state's physical plant for public education.

The law also required the State Board of Education to "establish standards for adequacy of public school facilities. The standards shall include requirements related to space, educational adequacy, and construction quality." The board is currently in the process of adopting standards which will be distributed to school districts over the summer of 1992, and which will take effect on September 1, 1992. To assist the agency and school districts in the process of implementing these standards, the agency has hired two architects to provide technical assistance in the development and administration of the standards.

The School Facilities Advisory Committee, created by the legislature and appointed by the State Board of Education has worked with agency staff for the past two and one-half years on the development of the inventory, standards, and financing options for facilities and debt service. The recommendations of the advisory committee are presented as a part of the discussion of finance options later in the report.

Financing Options

There are a variety of options for financing school facilities and debt service. Chapter 6 outlines both options for long-term financing programs, which include funding on a per capita basis, funding on a per project basis, and guaranteed yield funding, complimentary programs, such as grant and incentive programs will be addressed. In addition to the alternatives for distributing funds, this report also contains a discussion of potential funding sources for these new programs.

CHAPTER 2

FACILITIES PROGRAMS IN OTHER STATES

A review of other states shows that Texas is not alone in facing the issue of meeting district needs for assistance in planning and financing school construction. Every state holds some degree of control over the construction of facilities by virtue of various building codes. The range of state control, however, is from one extreme to the other. In Hawaii, for example, the state approves and totally finances public education facilities. In the past in Texas, however, state aid was unavailable and state education agency approval was not needed in order to build. No standards beyond basic fire and safety standards as contained in locally adopted building codes have been applied to school buildings by external authorities.

Many states have no mandated requirements, yet have recommended standards, provide guidelines for facilities' planning processes, and outline procedures for submitting district facility information to the state for review. Some states use this information in a variety of ways, occasionally as the benchmark by which state funding participation levels are measured. Capsule summaries follow for the states of California, Florida, Illinois, Kentucky, New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania and of their respective roles as state governments in providing assistance to local school district to assure public school facilities' adequacy and quality.

California

In an effort to allow school districts to design facilities consistent with their local educational philosophies and program needs, districts are not required to follow any statewide educational specification standards. However, state aid is tied to particular facilities planning practices and need factors. Hence, it behooves the districts to follow the guidelines provided by the state for developing educational specifications.

Over two hundred (200) individuals are employed by the state of California to administer facility planning, standards and project reviews, and facility funding. Over five million students are served in California's public school system.

California provides state aid for school facilities through State General Obligation Bonds which are voted on in statewide bond elections every two years. Approximately eighty (80) percent of capital expenditures for school facilities has come from the state over the past few years. Currently, a state general obligation bond is up for election for the amount of $1.9 billion. The state has identified statewide facilities needs of $6 billion. Allocation of state monies for school facilities is based on a complicated set of prioritized district needs, placing heavy emphasis on districts experiencing substantial enrollment growth and having multitrack year-round schools. Because of the restrictions on the use of local funds, the waiting period for a particular project desired by a district may be several years.

Florida

The state of Florida plays a significant role in school facilities' planning and financing. There is a pre-planning phase during which the state determines eligibility and need for school facilities. Eligibility is determined by the Office of Educational Facilities within the State Department of Educati[illegible] There are state requirements for mandated community involvement in this phase. Local districts are required to file with the state, for review and approval, written educational, auxiliary and ancillary facilities specifications based on program curriculum needs. The state provides guidance as to what should be included in educational specifications as well as occupant design criteria, and minimum square footage standards for various classroom uses.

For the school year 1991-92 the state of Florida spent over $657 million on school facilities and local districts spent an additional $822 million. Florida's current student enrollment totals 1,905,513. The two primary sources of state funding for school facility capital outlay are the Public Education Capital Outlay program and the Capital Outlay and Debt Service program, both of which derive income from dedicated state taxes. The first

program generates monies via a gross receipts tax on state utility companies. The later one raises monies through a tax on license plate revenue.

Florida employs a total of 99 state employees in the areas of school construction and facility financing. Included among these employees, besides architects and engineers, are curriculum experts who provide extensive review approval (or denial) of local districts' educational specifications.

Illinois

The state of Illinois has no educational specification standards or minimum square footage standards for classroom size. The state offers support by providing guidance to local districts in facility planning. State monies for school facilities are raised through state general obligation bond elections, but the state has provided no state aid to schools for facility needs since 1980. Total state enrollment is 2,100,000. A total of nine staff are employed by the state to provide support for school facilities.

Kentucky

Kentucky has recently passed a major education reform act. Their state education board is in the process of adopting educational specifications standards for the state. Each curriculum area within the state education agency will be responsible for review and approval of local district educational specifications related to that area's curriculum specialty. Like the other states described thus far, Kentucky is actively involved in providing guidance to local districts in the facility planning process.

In the aggregate, Kentucky's state aid pays for 50% of the state facility capital expenditures. Total state enrollment is 635,000 and has been relatively stable over the past few years. There are three sources of state funding for facilities. The Capital Outlay program allocates $100 per ADA statewide. This program generated $58 million for the 1990-92 biennium and can be used for new construction, maintenance and operations and to service facilities' debt.

For districts which levy a designated five cent tax per $100 assessed property value, two other sources of state revenue are available for school facilities. For the 1990-92 biennium, the Kentucky legislature allocated $13.5 million to the School Facilities' Construction Commission fund. These monies were used to secure $135 million in long term bonds to be used to meet school district needs for construction. These funds are allocated through a formula which compares district need and wealth to the state.

The Kentucky Facilities' Support program is an equalized source of funding to assist districts in meeting both new construction needs and debt service obligations. Districts are guaranteed $112 per ADA for school facilities under this program. If the mandated local five cent tax per $100 assessed property value does not generate the $112 per ADA revenue, then the state contributes the difference. Eight professional staff and three clerical staff provide support for both state school facilities planning and financing.

New York

New York requires local districts to submit educational specifications and a long-range facilities plan to the state. New York provides an outline of what local school districts should include in their educational specifications and long-range plan, but no specific educational specifications standards. There are however, state minimum square footage standards for various curriculum rooms.

State aid is provided for "approved" building expenses including both debt service and capital outlay. "Approved" projects are determined through a state facilities review process. New York then uses this information as the basis for making funding decisions. A percentage equalizing formula is utilized, using a combined wealth measure of property and taxable income. Total capital expenditures for the school year 1991-92 was $534,422,495. Sixty three percent of this total was from state aid.

New York's statewide total student enrollment for the school year 1990-1991 was 2,618,512, somewhat less than enrollment in Texas. Although an upward trend in enrollment is expected for New York, the rate of growth is much lower than that in Texas. A statewide enrollment projection for 1995-96 is close to

2.8 million. By comparison, Texas school districts are spending nearly $1 billion per year to house just under 3.4 million students. Currently, a total of eighteen state staff employees administer New York's facilities' standards and plan review programs.

North Carolina

The state of North Carolina requires that educational specifications for each school district be submitted to the state. This is part of the state's mandated facilities pre-planning process. The state provides guidance and assistance to local schools in the pre-planning process and in developing educational specifications, yet there are no state mandated minimum square footage standards or educational specifications standards beyond basic building code requirements. Five educational specialists, five engineers and three architects are employed by the state to provide state facility support to districts.

In the school year 1990-91 North Carolina had 1.2 million students enrolled. During that same year $450 million was spent statewide on capital outlay for school facilities. Approximately twenty eight (28) percent of those expenditures were funded through state aid. The state of North Carolina has basically three sources of revenue for capital outlay and for retiring bonds: A critical needs fund targeted to poor districts, a per ADA fund, and a sales tax fund which targets districts with prioritized needs. Information on state staffing to administer these funds is not available.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania has state minimum room size requirements and provides support for facility planning as well as guidelines for developing educational specifications. A staff of seven provides state facilities support to districts. Total statewide enrollment is 1,667,834. State funding comes from the state general fund. Thirty (30) percent of the total debt service payments ($534 million) of school districts is paid by the state. Funds are allocated to districts based on a project application and review process of facility need, which is determined by a district's enrollment projection and their current facilities' conditions. Once a district is deemed eligible for state monies, a complex formula determines a dollar amount based on the

project's total capacity and campus types. The lesser of the formula generated dollar amount or the actual project cost is used to set state aid for the project.

Texas

Texas has no program to provide direct or dedicated funds to districts for school facilities. Under the second tier of the Texas school finance system districts may use their debt service tax rate (as a part of the total tax rate) to generate state guaranteed yield funds. These funds may be used to finance construction or debt service, although it is not required that the funds be used in this manner. Most Texas school districts use debt to finance the cost of constructing new buildings. Chapter 4 of this report contains a discussion of school district debt in Texas.

The Legislature has appropriated $50 million in emergency facilities grant funds for the 1992-93 school year. These funds will be distributed to school districts by the Texas Education Agency through a formula which takes into account district wealth, historical tax effort, and historical and project growth rate. These funds will be allocated to approximately 125 districts, and may be used to meet a variety of facilities needs, including health and safety needs, and overcrowding.

State resources needed to support school districts' facility needs varies depending upon what state administered programs are in place. Until recently, Texas was among those states with no staff in the area of school facilities. These states provide no services to local school districts nor school facilities funding. Other states, like Florida, house a seasoned state bureau dedicated to providing facilities planning, financial, and technical support to local school districts.

In early 1992 the Texas Education Agency hired two architects to develop a facilities program. Like these other large states, Texas is experiencing significant enrollment growth. If the state of Texas is to take a more participatory role in guiding the planning of and providing funding for school facilities, additional professional staff will be a necessity.

CHAPTER 3

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
BUILDING AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT (BETA)

During the summer of 1990, the Texas Legislature passed Senate Bill 11 during the Sixth Called Session including a $5 million appropriation to the Texas Education Agency for the conduct of a comprehensive inventory of the state's public school facilities and educational technology. The massive undertaking, known as the Building and Educational Technology Assessment or BETA project involved teams of architectural and engineering professionals collecting space and condition information for all public school facilities in Texas.

The project began in October 1990, when 3DI, Inc. of Houston, was hired to develop the data collection methodology and manage the data collection. In December 1990, five regional data collection firms were hired, and the inventory process began in January 1991. The data collection effort represented an intense, schedule driven activity, with more than 100 individuals involved in the process. In an eight month period, from January to August, 1991, project staff inventoried over 6,000 school sites in an area covering over 200,000 square miles.

Information Collected

Data were gathered on over 29,000 buildings at 6,000 school sites. Detailed information was collected for all instructional facilities, and general information was obtained for all ancillary buildings. Information about instructional facilities included descriptive information about the site, architectural and mechanical/electrical/plumbing systems for each building, and detailed information for each room, including room use, area, and utility attributes such as electrical outlets, phone jacks, sinks, cable connections, gas jets and special ventilation. Data on educational technology were collected at the campus level.

Included in Appendix A are copies of the forms used for data collection during the inventory. A description of each form and its purpose is provided below.

Form A, the Site/Outdoor Area Profile was used to collect data about the physical location and attributes of the school campus and buildings. Information on the form indicates whether there are multiple campuses sharing a site, such as elementary and secondary schools at the same location, or a magnet school within a school. This form also collects campus address.

Forms B1 and B2, the Architectural/System Profile and Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing Systems Profiles were used to collect information about certain structural aspects of each building. Information provided on these forms included an indicator of portability (non-permanent construction) as well as handicapped access adequacy. In addition to these specific pieces of information, these forms were used to record subjective condition information about the foundation, exterior shell, roof, heating, cooling, lighting and plumbing systems of the building.

Form B3, Alternate Campuses at Buildings collected information related to the multiple campuses at a site information obtained on Form A. Using Form B3, individual buildings can be assigned to a single campus number if multiple campuses are sharing a location. If a district has only one site for grades kindergarten through 12, but the elementary, middle, and high schools each have a separate building, it will be reflected on this form.

Form C, the Indoor Instructional Space Profile, was used to collect information on individual rooms within a building. The vast majority of the data collected during the inventory process was recorded on C forms. General information on this form included the floor level (story), square footage, intended use, condition and age information about each room. Also included on this form were the additional built-in fixtures and equipment, including fixed student and teacher stations, drinking fountains, toilet fixtures, sinks, showers, exhaust fans, cable and phone jacks, gas jets and electrical outlets.

Form D, the Educational Technology Profile was used to record information at a campus level about the types of technology being used within the schools.

Information collected on this form was obtained primarily through the use of a fixed asset report provided by the districts to the data collection teams. The teams then verified this information as they conducted the inventory within each building. Data items included information about mainframe, mini, and personal computers, distance learning, satellite and cable television reception, as well as equipment such as modems, video equipment and other peripheral devices.

In addition to collecting detailed information on instructional facilities, data were also gathered about non-instructional buildings. *Form X - District Ancillary Buildings*, was used to record gross square footage, age and overall condition information about all non-instructional facilities within a school district. This form was used to obtain data on district administration buildings, maintenance facilities, athletic stadiums and similar facilities in which no instruction took place.

Uses of Data

The data collected through the BETA project provide, for the first time, information about the size, age, and condition of school facilities throughout the state. These data have already been used to create a picture of the general condition of the physical plant in Texas, and to provide baseline estimates for the cost of meeting a limited set of facilities needs. (These estimates are presented in Chapter 4 of this report.) With the development of standards for school facilities, the data can also be used to determine the degree to which current facilities are meeting modern requirements for instructional environments.

Although this vast data base can be analyzed and queried to provide a great deal of new information for educators and policy makers, there are some things it cannot do. The data that were collected represent an inventory, or count of the buildings and technology in place at the time of the collection. Although building systems were examined, and a condition code was assigned to each, there was not a detailed analysis of maintenance and repair projects identified. Therefore, while gross generalizations about the overall condition of buildings can be made, the inventory should not be used as the

sole assessment of condition or single determinant of need at the district or campus level.

For example, data collected for a building includes a condition rating for all classrooms. If one room in a building received a rating of poor, there are a number of possible reasons for that rating, including such things as water damage, peeling paint, missing windows or flooring, or other types of damage or decay. Nowhere on the form is the nature of the disrepair indicated, making it impossible to know what renovation or repair, or even replacement would be the correct approach. To attempt to use these data for anything other than a general analysis would be inappropriate and could be misleading. In order to make determinations about renovation and repair costs at a district or campus level, an assessment, rather than an inventory, would need to be conducted in each district.

As a part of their final report, 3D/I provided the agency with a cost estimate for doing a true assessment of all the state's school buildings, one in which all repairs and renovations would be identified and costed out. The report stated that based on an assessment that 3D/I performed for the District of Columbia public schools, "a linear comparison to perform a similar assessment for Texas schools would result in a projected cost of around $26 million."[1]

Summary of Facilities Information

An analysis of the inventory data indicates that while there is great diversity of circumstances and history behind the capital assets of public school districts, the vast majority of all buildings appear to be in good or fair condition.

The summary reports, which are attached to this document as Appendix B, contain six different examinations of the data. A detailed analysis of the data is presented below.

---

1. Final Report, Texas Education Agency BETA Project, 3DI,Inc., Houston, Texas, October 15, 1991, p. 3.

General Information

Reports A and B provide an overview of the types of facilities used by the Texas public schools. Data for 1,051 districts currently resides in the data base. Key facts about these districts are:

- 29,133 buildings
- 573,791 rooms
- Total square footage of 379,915,816
- 15,383,677 square feet, or 4.05% of the total is in portable buildings
- Median size of elementary school general classroom is 715 square feet
- Median size of middle school general classroom is 690 square feet
- Median size of high school general classroom is 690 square feet
- Average effective age appears to be slightly below 20 years

Report A indicates the total square footage, square footage per person, portable space, and effective age by intended room use. The percentage of classroom space in portable buildings is highest at the elementary level, which had been expected as a result of the growth in the early grades experienced in Texas in the 1980's. Use of portables for classroom space diminishes at higher grade levels. However, special education classrooms are more likely to be in portable buildings than general classrooms. Portables also are more concentrated in urban and suburban school districts, but show little relationship to school district property wealth. A rough estimate of the cost to replace all portable space with permanent construction is $750 million. As the early grade surge in growth begins to move into the upper grade levels, use of portables on those campuses may increase.

Room sizes and square footage allowances of classroom space per student in Texas conform very much to expectations, based on national standards. Report B provides median room sizes by intended use of the room, divided into four groups of school types.

The effective age of facilities is about 19 years for permanent space. This figure can be contrasted with the expected life of most permanent school construction of between 30 and 50 years. Suburban school districts and non-

metro fast growth districts show significantly lower effective ages than core urban neighbors.

Low wealth school districts have slightly higher effective ages than high wealth districts. These district also tend to have a percentage of space in portable buildings which is slightly higher than either the state average or districts with above average wealth.

Condition

More than 90% of all districts statewide received average ratings of fair or good for their rooms and building systems. In spite of the generally favorable ratings given to school buildings and building systems, the ratings have been a source of some controversy. There is an assumption that the rating information provides detail concerning the nature and extent of repairs or renovations which would be necessary to improve the condition of the building. This is not the case. The ratings contained in the inventory data are based on visual evaluations of structures and systems made as the professional teams visited each site. Because of the subjective nature of the condition ratings, some school districts have expressed a desire to change ratings as they exist in the database.

Room Condition

More than 96% of all rooms were rated by the professional teams as fair or good. There seems to be some slight correlation between district wealth and building condition. Low wealth districts have higher percentages of space in worse condition, although rarely a high percentage of total space. High wealth districts appear to have somewhat higher percentages of space rated as good. This the trend would support the belief that fiscal constraints of poor school districts have led to some maintenance problems.

The data indicate that buildings are generally well maintained in districts in all wealth groups, based on a rating of fair or good. In some cases, high ratings for room condition appear to be correlated to young buildings rather than any pattern of maintenance.

Geographically, the area of the state with the highest percentage of buildings with below average ratings is the lower Rio Grande valley. Across the state, 3.41% of space was rated below fair, compared to 7.26% in the Edinburg region and 5.02% in the Corpus Christi region. This may bear out anecdotal evidence that the extremely rapid growth in those regions has put pressure on the ability of districts to maintain facilities.

System Condition

In addition to evaluating space, the inventory teams provided condition information on mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems for each building. The inventory data reveal that:

- 92% of the heating systems were rated as fair or good
- 93% of the cooling systems were rated as fair or good
- 91% of the plumbing systems were rated as fair or good
- 94% of the lighting systems were rated as fair or good.

Mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems in the state's public schools appear to be in fair or good condition. Plumbing seems to be an area of greater concern for ongoing maintenance, although plumbing problems may be more readily apparent than in other building systems.

Buildings were more likely to have a system rated as poor than to have individual rooms rated in poor condition. Nearly 2% of all building systems received a poor rating. There do not appear to be any trends in the condition of building systems which are related to district wealth or geographic location. The most likely reasons for building systems to be in disrepair are the age of the building or lack of preventive maintenance.

Educational Technology

Senate Bill 650, 71st Legislature, Regular Session, directed the Texas Education Agency to collect information on educational technology as a part of the inventory effort. The technology data reveal the following:

- 252,002 computers
- 48% are Apple II microcomputers
- About 28% of the computers are MS-DOS microcomputers
- Apple II family computers are more prevalent at elementary campuses, whereas MS-DOS computers are more frequently found in middle and high schools
- 871 districts have student to computer ratio of 20:1 or better
- 87 districts have ratios of 5:1 or better
- 1,055 satellite and microwave dishes were counted
- 6,800 video cameras were found
- 32,558 instructional learning system workstations were in place at the time of the inventory

A ratio of about 13 computers per student is observed. The value of investment to date in microcomputer technology probably exceeds $200 million.

Report C indicates the distribution of microcomputers by district category. There appears to be no significant pattern of distribution related to property wealth, but it does appear that smaller school districts tend to have substantially lower ratios than larger districts. Because the inventory of technology did not attempt to distinguish instructional computers from those used to support the administrative services, these ratios may not actually reflect computing resources available to students.

Report D provides distributional data for various types of microcomputers. There do not appear to be any significantly different trends in acquisition by type of school district, wealth or geographic region. As one might expect, the major metropolitan regions have larger quantities of computers, but there is no significant pattern in student to computer ratios.

General Conclusions and Key Findings

Although it does not provide detailed information about renovation and repair needs at each campus, the inventory does confirm the suspicion that the investment which has been made by school districts in the physical plant and

technology is enormous and still growing. A rough estimate of the replacement cost for present day school facilities is approximately $20 billion.

Some of the key findings to date are:

- Buildings are older in poor districts
- Poor districts have proportionately more space in portable buildings
- Rapidly growing districts have proportionately more space in portable buildings
- Building M/E/P systems need significant attention, probably due to age and lack of preventive maintenance
- Almost half of the microcomputer technology in use dates to the late 1970's and early 1980's and will need replacement to run modern, sophisticated applications

These findings suggest that overall, buildings in poor districts are in worse condition than those in wealthy districts. In using this general information in discussions of need and financing options, the data tend to support funding programs, such as a guaranteed yield, which take into account the local ability to pay for both new construction and on-going maintenance.

CHAPTER 4

DETERMINING THE NEEDS

To determine appropriate solutions to facility and debt service needs, a clearer understanding of the state's present facilities situation must be achieved. The three fundamental areas of need in school districts are debt service, repair and renovation, and new construction. From data collected through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), the inventory of school facilities, and other sources, a picture of aggregate need begins to emerge. Because needs for space and funding are inextricably linked, this chapter first discusses current debt service issues, then turns to other factors affecting the determination of facilities need.

Debt Service

The population in Texas public schools has been increasing steadily for more than a decade, and only shows signs of accelerating its rate of growth. In response to the clear need to house students, school districts have consistently increased indebtedness, and debt service payments have risen as a result.

For the 1981-82 school year, total school district debt was approximately $4.7 billion. At the end of the decade, for the 1989-90 school year, total debt had risen to approximately $7.1 billion. During the past three years, school districts have been spending approximately one billion dollars annually to meet their debt service obligations, including principal and interest. For the 1991-92 school year, districts reported that they anticipated collected $982 million in debt service tax revenues. Debt service payments will exceed $1.1 billion, or seven (7) percent of all school district expenditures, excluding capital outlay.

The debt burden of school districts is serviced by taxes on property. The average tax effort needed to raise this year's debt service across the entire

statewide tax base would be between $0.16 and $0.17 per $100 of assessed valuation. Approximately 800 of the state's 1,051 districts have debt service payments. Among these districts, the average effective rate is $0.19, although more than 200 district report rates above $0.40.

School districts with high debt service per student generally have property high wealth or have experienced rapid growth. Since many poor districts are also fast-growing, the burden of debt service tends to fall heavily on property poor districts.

An analysis of agency data on district debt from the 1987-88 school year through the 1991-92 school year reveal that debt service per student has risen nearly thirty (30) percent in the past five years. The aggregate amount of debt service has increased from $878 million to $1.12 billion over five-year time period.

The average debt service among the bottom fifteen (15) percent of student by property wealth is about $200 per student in 1992. The average amount in the wealthiest fifteen (15) percent is about $450. While the average dollar amount of per student is lower in property poor school districts, the rate needed to service debt in the poorest districts averages nearly three times the rate of property wealthy districts. Districts representing the bottom fifteen (15) percent of students in terms of property wealth need an effective tax rate of nearly $0.33 for 1992 compared to only about $0.13 for the wealthiest fifteen (15) percent. Suburban and other fast growing districts also tend to have higher debt service costs than other types of districts.

Summary of State Bond Review Board Report[2]

The Texas Bond Review Board has also been examining the issue of school district borrowing needs and expectations. In January of 1991, the Board completed a statewide survey of Texas public school districts. Information was obtained about districts' borrowing and most pressing facility needs. A total of 725 school districts out of 1,052 districts responded to the survey.

2. Texas Public Schools Facility Needs and Borrowing Expectations, State Bond Review Board, Austin, Texas, March 1991.

Districts responding to the survey estimated the cost to alleviate their most pressing facility concerns to be $2.25 billion.

More than half of this estimated need, $1.3 billion, is driven by enrollment growth. Other factors impacting district facility needs include plant modernization, fire and life safety code compliance, and legislatively mandated maximum class size requirements for kindergarten to fourth grade. Some 27 percent of all school districts responding had no facility needs. These schools were small, wealthy and stable in comparison to state averages.

The report stated that thirty (30) percent of all school districts responding to the survey expect to issue bonds within the next three years. The 200 school districts that identified a dollar amount expect to borrow a total of $2.1 billion. The majority of schools with facility needs did not indicate that they expect to issue bonds. Instead, they plan to use existing reserves, build up a cash reserve to complete future projects, or they may simply not attempt to remedy their needs.

Poor school districts, defined by the Bond Review Board as those with wealth per ADA below $113,000, share some similarities with their more affluent counterparts. Both property wealthy and property poor districts reported a need for plant modernization and improvements to meet accreditation citations. Both wealthy and poor districts indicated that they place a higher priority on new construction projects than on debt service relief. For those districts with bond elections in 1990, 65% of the elections were successful. However, as tax rates increase, bond success rates decrease. For districts with tax rates over $1.00 only 50% of the elections were successful, and for those districts with rates in excess of $1.25, only 29% of elections were successful. Although tax effort did seem to have an effect on the success of a bond election, local property wealth did not. Elections were successful at approximately the same rate in both wealthy and poor districts with similar tax rates.

The poorest districts have borrowed less per student for facilities than wealthier school districts. The 300 poorest are carrying only 14 percent of all school debt even though they house 21 percent of all Texas public school

students. Paying off their facilities debt, however, requires a greater tax effort than for the richer districts. The poorest districts responding to the survey require an average tax levy of $.23 per $100 for debt service, 59 percent above the state average. The 252 wealthiest school districts responding to the survey are carrying a debt burden that is 9 percent above the state average on a per-student basis. But these school districts on average levy only a $.07 per $100 I & S tax, or 52 percent less than the state average, to pay off this debt.

Standards

The majority of states which provide funding for facilities to local school districts also require that districts meet some level of standards when constructing new buildings. As of September 1992, all Texas school districts must comply with facilities standards in order to use state or local funds for construction.

Senate Bill 351, passed during the 72nd Legislative Session requires that "all facilities constructed after September 1, 1992, must meet the standards in order to be financed with state or local tax funds." In response to this legislation, the State Board of Education is in the process of adopting rules on standards, and final adoption will take place in July, 1992. The rule defines the circumstances under which the standards apply, and specifies requirements for square footages in instructional areas, professional certification of design and construction, and recommendations for educational adequacy.

The implementation of standards, and the requirement that they be met in order to pay for new construction with either state or local monies will effect the way districts determine their needs, both for additional space and for construction funds.

Cost Estimates

Using information collected as a part of the school facilities inventory, it is possible to provide gross statewide estimates for the cost of meeting some major facility needs. The following estimates were generated using data from

the inventory. Due to the nature of the data, some of these costs may be overlapping, making it difficult to produce a single cost amount to meet facilities needs. A brief explanation of how each cost was generated is presented below, a more complete explanation is included in Appendix D.

TABLE 1

COST ESTIMATES TO MEET SPACE NEEDS

Activity	Estimated Cost
Replace space rated below fair	$895 million
Relieve classroom overcrowding	$126 million
Provide adequate science labs	$31 million
Provide sufficient gymnasium space	$988 million
Provide sufficient library space	$621 million
Replace excess portable space	$197 million

Explanation of Cost Calculations

Information from the inventory was used to estimate the amount of space that would be needed to meet a number of instructional facility needs. In most cases, cost estimates were based on $60 per square foot for construction, a cost level which would yield a standard of finish acceptable for an instructional facility. Renovation costs were estimated at a somewhat lower rate. The following descriptions represent the estimation method chosen by the agency for illustration and research purposes but should not be interpreted as an exacting method for estimating costs.

Space Rated Below Fair - Statewide, 14,920,426 square feet of space received a rating of below fair or poor when evaluated by the professional staff performing the inventory. Replacement was estimated to cost $60 per square foot.

Overcrowded Classrooms - Statewide, there is a need for 2.5 million additional square feet of space to relieve overcrowded classrooms. This estimate was developed at a campus level by dividing total classroom space by enrollment to determine a classroom utilization rate. Overcrowding was considered to occur

when the utilization rate indicated less than 36 square feet per student in the elementary grades and 28 square feet per student in the secondary grades. Replacement was estimated to cost $60 per square foot.

Inadequate Science Labs - There are 281 high schools across the state without rooms which were originally intended to be science labs. Assuming that each school requires at least one science lab, the number of schools without labs was multiplied by 1,440 square feet per lab. $60 per square foot was used to estimate the cost of constructing the labs. To calculate the number of science labs requiring improvements, a count was taken of the number of labs without either emergency showers, exhaust fans, sinks, or gas jets. Costs were calculated based on an estimate for adding the necessary equipment to the labs.

Inadequate Gymnasium Space - There are 694 campuses across the state without space designated as gymnasiums. There are an additional 3,139 campuses with insufficient gym space to meet their needs. The cost estimate was generated using a construction cost of $60 per square foot for both new construction and additions.

Insufficient Library Space - There are 482 campuses across the state without libraries. There are an additional 4,041 campuses with insufficient library space to meet their needs. Insufficient space was calculated by subtracting the amount of library space on a campus from the amount of library space recommended for a campus at that grade level. The cost estimate was generated using a construction cost of $60 per square foot for both new construction and additions.

Excess Portable Space - Across the state there are 997 campuses with more than 20 percent of their classroom space in portable buildings. To reduce the amount of portable space in these districts to no more than 20 percent would require the replacement of 3.3 million square feet at a cost of $60 per square foot. To eliminate all portable space would require the replacement of 15.3 million square feet at a cost of $922 million using a $60 per square foot cost.

Some facilities costs will continue to occur even after all improvements to instructional space have been made. These costs are a function of on-going events such as the aging of existing facilities and continued growth in the student population.

TABLE 2

ANNUAL COST ESTIMATES TO MEET SPACE NEEDS

Activity	Estimated Cost
Renovate aging space (annually)	$66 million
Needs for student growth (annually)	$300 million

Renovation Needs - During the 10 year period from 1980 through 1989 school districts renovated an average of 3.3 million square feet per year. Renovation cost estimates were made using a cost of $20 per square foot rather than $60 per square foot for new construction. Renovation was assumed to have taken place if the values for year renovated differed from that for year constructed. Renovation information was collected on a room by room basis, and the square footage used may represent a partial building.

Student Growth Needs - The student population is growing at a rate of approximately 50,000 per year. For each student in attendance, a facility needs to have approximately 100 square feet of instructional and non-instructional space. Since it is impossible to predict whether student growth will occur in areas where there is excess capacity, this estimate assumes that facilities will need to be constructed to accommodate all student growth. This will require 5,000,000 square feet of new space each year. A construction cost of $60 per square foot was used to calculate this estimate.

CHAPTER 5
PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS OF THE STATE ROLE IN FUNDING SCHOOL FACILITIES

In his 1987 opinion in the first trial hearing on the Edgewood v. Kirby case, Judge Harley Clark stated that the Texas system of school finance "is UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UNENFORCEABLE IN LAW because it fails to insure that each school district in this state has the same ability as every other district to obtain, by state legislative appropriation or by local taxation, or both, equal funds for educational expenditures, *including facilities*" (emphasis added).

Previous Attempts To Address The Facilities Issue

Since 1987, a number of legislative and advisory committees have examined the issues related to funding school facilities, and have made recommendations to that end. A summary of the recommendations of previous committees is presented below.

Recommendations of the 1987-1988 Accountable Costs Advisory Committee[3]

In November 1988, the State Board of Education released the report of the 1987-1988 Accountable Costs Study. As a part of that study, the advisory committee addressed issues related to school facilities, including the need for additional study. The committee recommended that a facilities advisory committee be appointed, and that a study, including an inventory of facilities be undertaken.

Specifically, the advisory committee made the following recommendations concerning the cost of school facilities:

---

3. 1987-1988 Accountable Costs Study From the State Board of Education, Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, November 1988, pp. 3-4.

1. Construction and Renovation of Facilities

Although accurate and complete data on the status and inventory of facilities are not available, the Committee estimates that the cost of facilities for public school districts for the next biennium may require an investment of approximately $760 million each year. This cost estimate includes construction to meet the demands of growing student populations, renovation of existing structures, and facilities required to meet the maximum class size standard of 22:1 in grades 3 and 4.

2. Inventory of School Facilities

It is the recommendation of the Committee to the State Board of Education that specific legislative authority be sought to inventory and evaluate all structures used for educational purposes. It is also recommended that an adequate legislative appropriation be sought to fund the development of an inventory database. Continuing appropriations will be necessary for the maintenance and update of the database.

3. State Role in Financing School Facilities

The role of the state in financing and constructing school facilities should be sufficient to help districts which do not have the resources to construct adequate school facilities while at the same time allowing all districts to maintain a significant degree of local control about what type of facilities to construct. As part of defining the role of the state, minimum standards should be established for facilities and an inventory of existing facilities should be undertaken. The state should establish guidelines for providing a debt service subsidy to the low wealth districts, using criteria such as wealth and tax effort, level of existing debt, quality of existing facilities, or some combination thereof.

4. Texas School Bond Guarantee Insurance Program

The legislature should authorize the Permanent School Fund to establish an independent insurance company with an investment of at least $100 million from the fund. This company would provide bond insurance to all districts in the state, guaranteeing a AAA rating for all bonds. Such

an investment would also serve to reduce any state funds required for interest subsidies under other recommendations.

Recommendations of the 1988 Select Committee On Education[4]

The Select Committee offered a number of recommendations for financing capital outlay and debt service. Like the Accountable Costs Committee, the Select Committee recommended that the state undertake a data collection process. The Select Committee broke their recommendations down into two groups. The first group provided "Guiding Principles" for addressing issues related to capital outlay and debt service. These principles included the implementation of fiscal controls to protect the integrity of state funds, should a program be put in place; limitations on the permissible uses of state funds for facilities; equalization of state funds for facilities; Texas Education Agency review of local need for the provision of state funds; and the recommendation that a facilities and debt service funding program be separate from the Foundation School Program funding mechanism.

As their "Guiding Principles" for capital outlay and debt service, the committee offered the following:

a. A comprehensive approach does not seem feasible at this time because current data concerning school facilities in Texas school districts do not provide sufficient information concerning the condition of individual buildings, the number of "unhoused" or "inadequately housed" school pupils, or the extent to which existing buildings are educationally obsolete.

b. When data are available concerning the condition of school facilities in local districts, consideration should be given to developing a state program through which fiscally equalized funds would be provided to assist in meeting current requirements for capital construction and debt service and future needs for school facilities.

---

4. The Final Report and Recommendations of the Select Committee on Education, Volume 1, Austin, Texas, December 1988, pp 142-147.

c. Whenever state funds are provided, fiscal controls should be installed to protect the integrity of the state funds for capital outlay and debt service and to prevent diversion of the funds for purposes other than capital outlay and debt services.

d. A state equalization funding program for capital facilities and equipment should include criteria and standards that limit the permissible uses of state funds to such areas as classrooms and related instructional items rather than permit the use of state funds for any local school district expenditures for school facilities and equipment.

e. To address the facility needs in low-wealth school districts, especially in those adversely affected by state mandates, any capital construction or debt service programs should be fiscally equalized with the result that no funds, or limited funds, would be provided to high-wealth districts irrespective of their level of debt or need for facilities.

f. In any program involving the use of state funds, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) should review local need for school facilities, local capacity to pay for facilities, school sites, architectural plans, and methods for financing school construction projects.

g. Any state program for capital outlay or debt service should be totally separate from the process used in determining and administering the calculation process used for the Foundation School Program.

The committee also made specific recommendations on capital outlay and debt service funding. These included:

a. The state should establish a State Capital Fund of $100 million to address emergency facility needs. Need should be determined on a variety of factors, including regional differences in construction costs, growth in student population, age and condition of existing facilities, unused bonding capacity, district fiscal capacity and the district's educational program.

b. The creation of a capital depreciation grant program which recognizes previous local efforts in meeting facilities needs. This equalized program, when administered in conjunction with the State Capital Fund would provide assistance to districts for both debt service relief and new construction.

In the discussion following these recommendations, the committee focuses on the need for an equalized system for financing facilities. The report advocates using "a district power equalized state aid for debt service under a highly equalized formula to provide maximum benefit to the poorest local school districts."[5] The district power equalized system that is described in the Select Committee report is essentially a guaranteed yield system of funding analogous to proposals which were made during the 71st and 72nd legislative sessions.

Recommendations of School Facilities Advisory Committee

Created by the Legislature, with the passage of Senate Bill 1019, and appointed by the State Board of Education in October, 1989, the fifteen members of the School Facilities Advisory Committee have built upon the work of previous advisory groups. The Committee has made recommendations to the State Board of Education concerning options for interim and long-term financing of school facilities, as well as assisted in the development of the requests for proposals for the facilities inventory and in the development of school facilities standards.

Specifically, the Committee recommended that a guaranteed yield system which uses the interest and sinking fund tax rate to recognize both new construction and previous debt be used to fund school facilities. The Committee also recommended that standards be applied only to new construction, and that the Texas Education Agency hire appropriate staff to assist in the implementation of these new programs.

---

5. Ibid, p. 145.

Below is a summary of the advisory committee recommendations which were sent to the State Board of Education in October, 1990.

1. Both an interim financing program (for the period prior to the completion of the inventory) and a long-term financing program should be developed.

2. Financing for both the interim and long-term programs should be through a modified guaranteed yield system, which recognizes the efforts of districts that constructed or purchased buildings from operating funds or fund balances.

3. Weighted ADA should be used in the calculation of facilities funding in order to be consistent with other funding formulas found in Senate Bill 1.

4. The committee recommends the following priorities for allocating limited state funds:

   a. Renovation or new construction projects for eligible instructional and support spaces.
   b. Portable buildings to meet emergency situations where permanent construction is inappropriate. Portable buildings must also meet state standards.
   c. Debt service on projects which are brought up to state standards, including any debt on a building prior to bringing it up to standard.
   d. Debt service on eligible projects built since 1984 which meet standards.

5. Standards for school facilities should be developed in the areas of size and space, safety, and educational appropriateness.

6. Standards should be mandatory for all instructional facilities in order to qualify for state funding.

7. Standards should be applied to existing facilities if districts wish to be eligible for financing for existing debt service. A program of grants should be established to bring existing facilities into compliance with standards.

8. An appropriate division within the Texas Education Agency should be responsible for monitoring districts and enforcing standards.

9. Additional agency staff should be hired to accommodate the workload that will be associated with increased state responsibilities for school facilities.

10. At the time that any building which was constructed with state funds is put into surplus or sold, the state should participate in the proceeds from the sale in the same proportion as it participated in construction costs.

11. Only those buildings constructed since 1984 and the passage of House Bill 72 will be eligible for funding for debt service relief.

12. Initial estimates place the annual cost of the long-term program at $350 million per year in state money. This represents a state share of 50% of costs for debt service and new construction, on average.

13. The interim and permanent debt service and capital outlay programs should be established as a part of the Foundation School Program, and any shortfall in appropriations should be subjected to the same treatment as other appropriation shortfalls in the Foundation School Program.

14. The committee recognizes that some school districts finance new facilities with fund balances rather than debt, and recommends further study of a mechanism for reimbursing these districts.

15. The committee recognizes that there needs to be a transition period as the state moves from funding the debt service tax rate as a part of the

overall guaranteed yield program to funding this tax rate separately. The committee recommends additional study in the area of transition mechanisms.

The advisory committee presented the State Board of Education with a report in which they provided detailed examples of their recommended funding mechanisms. A copy of the report is attached to this document as Appendix C. The committee has also discussed year-round schooling as an option for meeting short-term needs for additional space and recommended that the agency examine this issue further.

Common Themes

There are a number of issues and recommendations which are common to all of the committees which have examined this issue in the last several years. In each case, there is some discussion of an inventory, standards, funding options, and agency involvement.

Inventory

Both the Accountable Costs Advisory Committee (ACAC) and the Select Committee on Education (SCOE) recommended that the state obtain data on school facilities. Based on these recommendations, the Legislature provided funding for the inventory, and the School Facilities Advisory Committee (SFAC) worked with the agency to complete the project. Both the ACAC and the SFAC have recommended that the information be updated on a regular basis. All groups saw the inventory information as beneficial to the agency and to policy makers, but none provided specific recommendations as to how the data should be used.

Standards

Both the ACAC and the SFAC recommended that standards for school facilities be developed. The SFAC was heavily involved in the development of the standards, which are discussed in detail later in this report, and recommended that funding be linked to compliance with the standards. As with the inventory,

the Legislature has acted, and required that districts comply with standards beginning with the 1992-93 school year in order to use state or local funds for construction.

Funding

The ACAC worked to identify costs, and recommended that options for funding be studied more carefully. Both the SCOE and the SFAC have made a number of recommendations for financing options. Both committees recommended that both a short-term program, with a recommended appropriation of $100 million, be established while a long-term option was put into place. The Legislature did establish an emergency grant program along these lines, but set the funding at $50 million.

In addressing the issue of long-term financing, both the SCOE and SFAC have recommended an equalized program which enables districts to both meet their debt service obligations and needs for new construction. Both committees specifically recommended the use a of guaranteed yield approach for distributing these funds.

Texas Education Agency Involvement

All of the advisory committees addressed the issue of agency involvement. The SCOE and the SFAC state that the agency should be in a position to monitor and enforce standards. Additionally, the agency should be appropriately staffed to undertake the new obligations that will be associated with school facilities. In response to these recommendations, the agency has added two architects to the staff in the Division of State Funding and School Facilities.

CHAPTER 6

OPTIONS FOR FUNDING FACILITIES

All interested parties agree that the state must become involved in a significant manner in the long-term financing of capital outlay and construction funding for school facilities.

Critical choices must be made in establishing a state government role in what has previously been a local government function. Six issues or elements have been identified for the purposes of this report to characterize the role the state will play, and each of these six areas require definition to fully describe the state role.

The six elements identified for this analysis are:

- The level of state control and influence over school district decisions and activities
- The level of local flexibility within and beyond a state support system
- The level of equity or fiscal neutrality to be met by the entire system of support
- The types of activities (debt service, repair, renovation, new construction) to be supported
- The data required to make decisions at the state level
- The impact on the Texas Education Agency and other state entities including staffing and administrative requirements for the state authority

There are a variety of alternatives available to channel funding for school facilities from the state to districts. Three basic options for meeting long-term needs include (1) a per capita allotment, (2) a guaranteed yield program, or (3) project or need based funding. In addition to these long term

programs, complimentary programs can be used either to meet emergency needs, or to encourage new construction to improve school district efficiency.

As these basic options are examined in this chapter, the focus will be on how these options might address the needs which have been identified, and what consequences will likely result from a state program of support. Alternatives for the six elements characterizing the state's role under each option will be examined. A table which provides a summary of each financing option and its various attributes is provided at the end of this chapter.

Because school districts expend about $1 billion for debt each year along with $1 billion for capital outlay, the cost to the state of sharing responsibility for these costs could represent several hundred million dollars of expense. It is important to consider options for raising the necessary revenues for the state's participation.

Per Capita Funding

A per capita allotment would provide a fixed dollar amount of funding per pupil in weighted average daily attendance (WADA) to each school district. This is the funding mechanism which will be used to distribute the $50 million appropriated to the agency for the emergency facilities grants during the 1992-93 school year. Of the financing options to be presented here, this one offers the least amount of state control and is the least restrictive to school districts.

Under a per capita funding program, the state would establish a funding level, such as the $150 maximum per WADA used for the emergency grant program, and flow money to districts on the basis of the student population. Such a program has many attractive features, primarily due to the simplicity of administration. Very little data is needed to grant a continuing per capita sum of money, although the state can place restrictions on uses of the funds or eligibility for receipt which would complicate the grant process. Without the restrictions of eligibility criteria or limits on the use of grants, local control and flexibility are left virtually intact.

This option is the least equalizing of the three basic options presented. Under a pure per capita program, all districts are treated equally even though their needs and ability to meet those needs may differ greatly. There are methods through which this type of program could be modified to reflect differences in district needs, including requiring districts to demonstrate that, in fact, they have a debt service obligation or construction project in process, or by wealth testing district eligibility. More eligibility requirements place additional burdens on administration, increasing the likelihood that added staff would be needed.

Even with these types of modifications, a per capita program tends to favor large districts and put small districts at a disadvantage due to the small volume of cash provided. As an example, a district with 500 students would only receive $75,000 per year from a per capita allotment of $150 per student. This sum of money is sufficient to purchase less than two classrooms.

A per capita grant program is generally best suited to a system in which the funds have few restrictions other than reservation construction or debt service. There are few incentives inherent in a pure per capita grant program which would encourage fiscal restraint on the part of school districts with relatively few needs. An advantage to the state, however, is that cost can be more reliably identified and controlled.

Guaranteed Yield Funding

It has been the recommendation of the School Facilities Advisory Committee and a previous select committee that a guaranteed yield approach be applied to financing capital outlay and debt service in the Texas schools. Under a guaranteed yield system districts would be guaranteed a minimum rate of return for each penny of debt service tax rate per pupil. A guaranteed yield tier for facilities would function in the same manner as the current guaranteed yield system for operating funds.

While a guaranteed yield system leaves most of the control over how funds are spent with the local school district, this option provides the state with more control over the types of districts which receive funding than does a per

capita approach. A guaranteed yield approach enables the state to direct funds at those low wealth districts which traditionally have had difficulty in raising funds for capital outlay. Because of the implied debt burden to local taxpayers which generates guaranteed yield funding, there are some higher assurances that school administrations will be more restrained in the projects undertaken, but the state cost of the support program is to some extent controlled by local district actions.

Concern has been expressed that in spite of its name, a guaranteed yield is not a true guarantee for funding, making bond counsels somewhat hesitant to support this type of program. In its recommendations, the 1988 Select Committee on Education addressed the issue of maintaining the integrity of funds allocated for school facilities. This is done in a fairly straightforward manner by requiring districts to deposit funds generated through a guaranteed yield program to their interest and sinking fund, to be used only for the payment of debt service and the construction of new facilities.

Districts without an I&S tax rate will not be able to receive funding under this program. This program therefore is restricted to supporting only debt service needs.

There are attractive features about this financing option including the limited need for additional agency support, the high level of control which remains with the districts, and that a guaranteed yield system effectively lends itself to the criteria for equity established by the court.

Project Funding

A project funding approach is the most time consuming and administratively taxing of the options presented, and the one with the highest level of state control over state funds. This option would involve state review of each project, and funding would be provided for eligible portions of the construction. Under this option, funding could be based on pre-established standards for buildings or on state determined costs for various types of

construction. State cost could be tightly controlled in the project approval process.

This option certainly increases state control of the kinds and costs of facilities which are constructed in local school districts. While the state would have more complete knowledge of how dollars for facilities are being spent, the administrative costs to the state are high due to the project review process. Administrative costs to school districts and the time to complete a project could also be lengthened by the review process. Some loss of local control should be expected, and decreased local flexibility to meet unique needs or preferences may result.

It is also unclear whether a project or needs based approach, unless it were to be wealth tested in some way, would meet the court requirement for equity. Under a project approach, districts with pending new construction or renovation needs would stand to benefit the most, but districts with outstanding debt obligations would receive no relief. Project funding could be a vehicle for targeting state funds to meet specific state-wide objectives, such as reducing portable building use.

Complementary Programs

In addition to the long-term programs presented to meet on-going district needs for funding for capital outlay and debt service, there are additional programs which can be used to meet emergency needs for facilities, or to provide incentives to districts to increase efficiency.

$50 Million Emergency Facility Grant Program

The 72nd Texas Legislature established an emergency grant program directed at helping property poor school districts meet their needs for safe buildings and adequate instructional space. Under rules adopted by the State Board of Education, school districts which qualify will receive $150 per pupil in weighted average daily attendance during the 1992-93 school year to be used for facilities repair or construction. Funds are distributed based on a

formula which takes into account school district wealth, three year average tax effort, and growth in student population over a five year period.

Although the program is currently in place only for the 1992-93 school year, additional appropriations could extend the program, making it a supplementary allotment for districts with severe or emergency facility needs.

Incentive Programs for Increased Efficiency

Another option for programs which would be complementary to one of the long-term financing programs discussed above would be an incentive program for increased efficiency. Under such a program small school districts which elected to consolidate for the purpose of delivering services more efficiently could be provided with incentive funds to meet their needs for new construction.

The agency currently has an incentive program which provides districts with additional funds for up to ten years to districts which undergo consolidation. This program provides incentive aid payments to new districts with a minimum of 750 students in ADA. The amount of the aid is the difference between the new district's foundation aid and the sum of the foundation payments which would have been received had no consolidation occurred. A program for additional facilities funding could be established either as a part of the current program, or as a parallel program.

Combination Funding

Both the Select Committee on Education and the School Facilities Advisory Committee have recommended funding approaches that combine various aspects of the options presented above. The Select Committee proposed the use of both a capital depreciation grant for debt service along with an equalized funding program for new construction. Likewise, the School Facilities Advisory Committee has proposed both an interim, grant-based, financing program as well as a guaranteed yield program for meeting long-term needs.

None of the options presented above is intended to be mutually exclusive. By using two or more of these financing programs in combination, it would be possible to address a wide variety of needs at all levels of district wealth. Districts with emergency needs could obtain funding on an as needed basis through a grant program, while districts with long-term obligations for new construction and debt service would obtain funds through a facilities guaranteed yield as a part of the foundation program.

Sources of Revenue

State funding of grants to school districts for capital outlay and debt service will require substantial appropriations, probably increasing the overall appropriations for public education. As with any source of funds that is not the result of increased state revenues, additional funds directed towards school facilities must mean a decrease in funding for some other item.

Guaranteed Yield Under the Foundation School Program

Under the current Foundation School Program funding system, districts generate guaranteed yield funds from both the maintenance and operations (M&O) and the interest and sinking fund (I&S) tax rates. For the 1991-92 school year, districts could generate up to $21.50 in guaranteed yield funds for each penny of tax effort up to $0.45 above the required local fund assignment.

During the current year, districts generated $603 million in state guaranteed yield funds through the I&S tax rate. In general, most school districts appear to levy sufficient local taxes to meet I&S obligations rather leverage their local taxes through the existing guaranteed yield. Under current law, districts are not required to use state guaranteed yield funds generated by I&S taxes to finance debt service.

It is estimated that the state commitment to a facilities financing program would be between $300 and $500 million annually to meet current debt requirements through a separate debt service guaranteed yield. Were debt service to be placed in a separate facilities financing tier, the state cost of the current guaranteed yield would decrease by about $600 million. A

separated guaranteed yield system for debt service could be essentially revenue neutral to the state. Some sort of phase-in period would be necessary to allow districts time to compensate for the loss of these funds from maintenance expenditures. In addition to the lost operating funds, allowances would need to be made for district reductions in tax rates which would result from additional state aid for debt service.

Issuance Of State General Obligation Bonds

Another option for generating new funds for school facilities is the issuance of state general obligation bonds. Unlike the revenue bonds authorized under the Public School Facilities Funding Act (see below), general obligation bonds carry the full faith and credit of the state, and are the first item in line to be paid from state funds. Receipts from the issuance of debt could be used to support any of the options identified above.

While these bonds would provide the state with additional monies to provide to school districts, the state would be responsible for finding the funds to repay the principal and interest on the debt. These funds would come either from increases in state revenues or redistribution of funds away from existing uses. However, depending on the amount of bonded indebtedness incurred, and prevailing interest rates, the use of general obligation debt could be a more economically effective approach to providing funding for facilities.

Redirecting Other State Funds

The state currently provides approximately $6.5 billion in direct education related appropriations, not including the employer's share of teacher retirement. These funds come from general revenue tax sources, tax receipts of the Foundation School Fund, and the Available School Fund. To fund the state share of capital outlay or debt service, some current state appropriations could be redirected to meet the needs of a guaranteed yield or other grant system.

As an example, approximately $1 billion is provided annually to school districts through the Available School Fund (ASF). The ASF derives its income

from dividends on Permanent School Fund (PSF) investments and other revenues. Because the PSF is a long-term capital asset, it may be logical to use the proceeds from it as a means to secure additional long-term assets for public education. Currently the ASF funds are distributed on a per capita basis and may be used for any legal purpose. It is possible that the ASF could also be used to provide the state share of the cost of debt service and capital outlay, or as a revenue source to guarantee state bonds to provide facilities funding to districts.

Alternative uses for the ASF will not add to the total revenues available for appropriation. If the ASF supports a separated debt service guaranteed yield program, the impact to the overall state appropriation requirements could be minimal, assuming some reduction in the maintenance guaranteed yield costs. As a revenue source to back additional state debt to be channeled to capital outlay, alternative uses of current state appropriations may actually extend the financial support the state can provide to districts.

Use of the Public School Facilities Fund[1]

In 1989 the 71st Texas Legislature authorized the State Bond Review Board to sell up to $750 million in revenue bonds in order to provide low interest rate loans to school districts for the purpose of either refunding existing debt or constructing new facilities. To date, no bonds have been sold under the program, however discussions as to how these funds might be used to finance some or all of the state's share of a facilities program are underway. One option which is under consideration as a potential piece of legislation is the modification of the Public School Facilities Funding Act to allow the state to issue these bonds as general obligation bond to meet its share of a facilities funding program.

---

1. Public School Facilities Funding Act, Article 717t, Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes, 1992.

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS FOR FACILITIES FINANCING

POLICY OPTION	LEVEL OF STATE CONTROL	LEVEL OF LOCAL FLEXIBILITY/ CONTROL	LEVEL OF EQUITY	DEBT SERVICE OR NEW FACILITIES	DATA REQUIREMENTS	AGENCY CONSEQUENCES
Per Capita (WADA) This is the system used to distribute the $50 million emergency grants. This option would provide a fixed dollar amount per pupil in weighted average daily attendance to each district.	This option provides the lowest level of state control, unless separate specific restraints are built into the system. While being the least restrictive policy option presented, it is also the least discriminating. In a pure system, every district would receive funds regardless of need. This could result in funds being provided to districts that would not use them. To avoid potentially wasting funds in this way, it would be possible to establish wealth or need tests for such an allotment.	This option provides the greatest level of local flexibility or control. In a per capita system, districts are provided with a grant to meet their facilities needs as they see fit. State restrictions could be imposed to limit uses of funds. Districts will be required to comply with State Board of Education standards for new construction.	The level of equity in a pure per capita system is very low because this type of funding mechanism does not discriminate either on the basis of district need or ability to pay. Equity could be improved if the allotment were wealth tested.	Monies provided to districts under this option could be used either to meet existing debt service obligations or to provide financing for new construction.	This option would not require the collection of any new or additional data. Information on district populations and district wealth (should a wealth test be applied) are currently available at the agency.	This option would have very limited consequences for the agency. There would be no additional administrative or data collection requirements in order to provide funding to districts on a per capital basis.

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS FOR FACILITIES FINANCING

POLICY OPTION	LEVEL OF STATE CONTROL	LEVEL OF LOCAL FLEXIBILITY/ CONTROL	LEVEL OF EQUITY	DEBT SERVICE OR NEW FACILITIES	DATA REQUIREMENTS	AGENCY CONSEQUENCES
Guaranteed Yield This option would operate in the same manner as the current guaranteed yield system for operating funds to provide a guaranteed return for each penny of debt service tax rate per pupil for qualifying districts. This option has been proposed previously as a separate tier, but has not been passed.	This option provides some level of state control through the financing levels established. Under this option all districts below a specified level of wealth would receive a guaranteed return on a fixed level of interest and sinking fund (I&S) tax rate. The state would not control the types of projects for which funds are spent.	This option provides a significant level of local control for districts which qualify for funding. Districts which receive funding will be able to use the funds to meet their needs as they see fit. State restrictions could be imposed to limit the uses of funds. Districts will be required to comply with State Board of Education standards for new construction.	A guaranteed yield system of funding school facilities would meet the equity test laid out by the courts. Under such a system the amount of funding available for financing capital outlay and debt service is not a function of local district wealth.	Under this option the level of funding would be tied to the district's debt service tax rate, however, districts would be able to use funds to meet existing debt obligations or to finance new construction.	This option would not require the collection of any new or additional data. Information on district wealth and debt service tax rates are currently available to the agency.	This option would have very limited consequences for the agency. There would be no additional data collection requirements and few administrative changes necessary in order to provide funding to districts on a guaranteed yield basis.

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS FOR FACILITIES FINANCING

POLICY OPTION	LEVEL OF STATE CONTROL	LEVEL OF LOCAL FLEXIBILITY/ CONTROL	LEVEL OF EQUITY	DEBT SERVICE OR NEW FACILITIES	DATA REQUIREMENTS	AGENCY CONSEQUENCES
Per Project This option would involved state review of each project, and funding would be provided for some or all of the construction. Under this option funding could be based on pre-set standards for buildings or on state determined allowable costs.	This option provides the greatest level of state control. Under a per project funding option, districts would be required to submit project information and funding needs to the state for review prior to receiving any monies. Although this option provides significant state control, it does come with a high state cost. The up-front cost of this program includes both the provision of state funds, and the commitment of state resources for plan review (see Agency Consequences).	This option provides local districts with the least flexibility and control. Under this option districts would be required to seek prior approval for a project in order to receive state funding. In addition to limiting control, this option also requires the district to budget extra time for the review process.	A per project system could be made equitable provided that the percentage of state and local funds assigned to the project reflected local school district wealth. Another option for increasing equity would be to have the entire cost of the project funded by the state and make no allowanced for local funds or improvements.	This option provides funding only for new facilities. Under this option districts with completed construction projects and outstanding debt obligations would not be eligible for funds.	A per project funding option would require data in addition to the information currently available at the agency. Districts would be required to submit additional information as a part of the application process.	This option would impose significant new demands on agency resources. Currently there are two individuals in the Division of State Funding and School Facilities working on implementation of the facilities program. However, this is insufficient staff for review of project plans. In states with project review programs, staff size ranges from 10 to more than 70 persons working in this area.

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS FOR FACILITIES FINANCING

POLICY OPTION	LEVEL OF STATE CONTROL	LEVEL OF LOCAL FLEXIBILITY/ CONTROL	LEVEL OF EQUITY	DEBT SERVICE OR NEW FACILITIES	DATA REQUIREMENTS	AGENCY CONSEQUENCES
Complementary Programs						
$50 Million Emergency Grant During the 1992-93 school year, $50 million in emergency facilities funds will be distributed to school districts on the basis of local property wealth, tax effort and growth in student population. Grants will be in the amount of $150 per student in weighted average daily attendance.	The level of state control associated with this program is minimal. The funds are provided to the districts as a grant, and districts will determine what constitutes an emergency.	This program provides those districts receiving funds with significant flexibility. Although districts are encouraged to use the funds to meet health and safety needs first, funds may be used to address any kind of need for instructional space.	This program is equalized by wealth and tax effort. Under the formula used to allocate funds, 55% of the determination is based on district wealth and 30% of the determination is based on tax effort.	This option is directed at meeting needs for renovation or new construction, but may be used to address debt service needs.	This program did not present a need for any new or additional data.	As a result of this new program, the agency has developed rules for the distribution of funds, and has hired two architects to work in the Division of State Funding and School Facilities and administer the program.
Incentive Programs for Increased Efficiency This program would provide incentive funding for districts to consolidate and build new facilities in order to increase district efficiency.	The level of state control under this option would be relatively low. Once districts had made a decision to consolidated and build a new facility, funds would be awarded for district use.	The level of local control under this option would be relatively high. Districts would be free to make decisions about consolidation, and the only construction requirements would be those contained in the agency standards.	N/A	This option provides funding only for new construction or the renovation of facilities. Districts would not be able to use this option to meet outstanding debt obligations.	This option would require no new data to be collected by the agency.	This program would have limited consequences for the agency. There would be some additional administrative requirements associated with this program.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

Through the collection of school facilities data under the BETA project, the state has, for the first time, the ability to analyze issues related to school facilities. While these data provide a great deal of information about the general condition and level of need for facilities in the state, it is important to remember that it has limitations. If it is the desire of the legislature to have detailed data that will make it possible to calculate facilities costs at a district or campus level, a much more comprehensive assessment of school facilities will be required.

The conduct of an inventory was recommended by all of the previous groups which have examined the issues relating to funding school facilities. With that inventory we are better able to estimate the need for facilities funding. As they have addressed this issue, previous advisory groups to the state have recommended a guaranteed yield approach to facilities funding, with a funding tier separate from the two existing levels of the foundation program. This type of funding approach is outlined in this report and has been offered up to the legislature before. As with the previous occasions, and as with any plan to involve the state in facilities funding, additional revenue sources will be needed to provide funds to school districts.

In determining a state role in funding facilities, the legislature must simultaneously balance several interests. Local schools must be assured a means of providing appropriate housing for students. The state must be certain that its assistance will be used in a responsible manner. Unproductive bureaucracies and processes must be avoided. Costs must fit within revenues, and efficient utilization of resources must be encouraged. This report is an attempt to provide the legislative leadership with some assistance in achieving that balance as they begin to walk the facilities wire.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION FORMS

FORM A

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Site / Outdoor Area Profile

Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date:

Month Day Year

Contact:

Surveyor:

Reviewed By: _____ Date: _____

1. County – District Number	2. Campus Number	3. Action Code	4. Other Campuses Sharing this Site

5. District Name
6. Campus Name
7. Street Address
8. City
9. Zip Code

10. Total Acreage	11. Campus Layout	12. Water Source	13. Sewage Treatment

14. Site Drainage	15. Site Fencing	16. Campus Security

17. Access Between Buildings	18. % of Access that is Covered

19 Parking Lot Surface	20 Adequate Spaces	21 Lighted

22. Outdoor Area	23. Surface	24. Rating	25. Covered	26. Lighted	27. Seating Capacity	28. Rating

Form B1

Architectural/Structural System Profile

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date: Month ____ Day ____ Year ____

Contact: ____________________

Surveyor: ____________________

Reviewed By: ____________________ Date: __________

1. County – District Number ___ – ___

2. Campus Number ___

Campus Name (please print legibly) ____________________

3. Action Code	4. Building Description	5. Building Number	6. Relocatable	7. Stories	8. Structure	9. Rating	10. Foundation	11. Rating	12. Ext Finish	13. Rating	14. Window Oper	15. Window Type	16. Rating	17. Roof Design	18. Roof Material	19. Rating	20. Conveying Sys	21. Rating	22. Handicpd Acc

Form B2

M/E/P Systems Profile

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date: Month ____ Day ____ Year ____

Contact: ____________________

Surveyor: ____________________

Reviewed By: ____________________ Date: __________

1. County – District Number ___ – ___

2. Campus Number ___

Campus Name (please print legibly) ____________________

3. Action Code	Building Description (print legibly)	4. Building Number	5. Fuel Source	6. Heat Medium	7. Heat Distrib	8. Rating	9. Cooling Sys	10. Rating	11. Int Lighting	12. Rating	13. Emergency Lt	14. Intercom	15. Fire Alarm	16. Fire Protect	17. Plumbing Rate

Form B3

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Alternate Campuses at Buildings

Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date: Month ____ Day ____ Year ____

Contact: ______________________

Surveyor: ______________________

Reviewed By: ______________________ Date: __________

1. County – District Number	2. Campus Number	Campus Name (please print legibly)
___ – ___	___	______________________

3. Action Code	Building Description (print legibly)	4. Building Number	5. Other Campus Number	6. Other Campus Number	7. Other Campus Number	8. Other Campus Number	9. Other Campus Number

Form C

Indoor Instructional Space Profile

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date:

Month Day Year

Contact: _____

Surveyor: _____

Reviewed By: _____ Date: _____

1. County - District Number ___ - ___

2. Campus Number ___

Campus Name (please print legibly) _____

Building Name (s) _____

3. Action Code	4. Building Number	5. Room Number	6. Floor Level	7. Room Area (SF)	8. Intended Use	9. Floor Finish	10. Ceiling	11. Ceiling	12. Ceiling	13. Room Condition	14. Lighting Adeq	15. Student Station (fixed)	16. Teacher Sta	17. Drinking Fountain	18. Toilet Fixtures	19. Sinks	20. Showers	21. Exhaust Fans	22. Elect. Outlets (Duplex)	23. Cable Outlets	24. Phone Jacks	25. Gas Jets	26. Year Constructed	27. Year	Remodeled

Form D

Educational Technology Profile

(See other side)

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date

Month Day Year

Contact: _____

Surveyor: _____

Reviewed By: _____

1. County - District Number ☐☐☐ - ☐☐☐

2. Campus Number ☐☐☐

Campus Name _____

3. Action Code ☐

A. Do you have a central computing facility (mainframe)? _____ Yes/No

If Yes,

	4. Qty	5. Brand	6. Model
Mainframes (List)	☐☐		
	☐☐		
Minis/Super Minis (List)	☐☐		
	☐☐		

B. Do you have a dish receiver (distance learning)? _____ Yes/No Qty Fixed Qty Steerable

If yes, is it microwave? (ITFS) _____ Yes/No 7. ☐ 8. ☐

If not microwave, do you receive only? (TVRO) _____ Yes/No 9. ☐ 10. ☐

If not microwave, can you send and receive? (VSAT) _____ Yes/No 11. ☐ 12. ☐

If yes to VSAT, do you have student keypads? _____ Yes/No 13. Quantity ☐☐☐

C. 14. Do you receive commercial cable? (CATV) ☐ 0 - No 1 - Yes

D. Do you have electronic networking capabilities between:

Campuses / Buildings		Districts & Outside Sources	
15. Video	☐	17. Video	☐ 0 - No 1 - Yes
16. Data	☐	18. Data	☐ 0 - No 1 - Yes

E. Other Telecommunications Devices

19. Fax Machines ☐ 0 - No 1 - Yes

F. How many of each video device?

	Qty
20. Video Tape Recorders	☐☐☐
21. Video Cameras (hand held)	☐☐☐
22. Televisions - Non-projection	☐☐☐
23. Televisions - Projection	☐☐☐

G. How many of each peripheral are currently being used?

	Qty		Qty
24. Printers - Laser	☐☐☐	28. Bar Code Readers	☐☐☐
25. Printers - Other	☐☐☐	29. CD-ROM Players	☐☐☐
26. Plotters	☐☐☐	30. LCD Projectors	☐☐☐
27. Scanners	☐☐☐		

	Qty
31. Modems < 2400 baud	☐☐☐
32. Modems 2400 baud and >	☐☐☐
Laser/Videodisc Players with following capabilities:	Qty
33. Interfaced with Computers	☐☐☐
34. Not Interfaced with Computers	☐☐☐

H. How many microcomputers currently in use?

	Qty		Qty
35. Apple II Family	☐☐☐	38. OS2 Model 25	☐☐☐
36. Macintosh Family	☐☐☐	39. OS2 Model 30 & >	☐☐☐
37. MS DOS Family	☐☐☐	40. PC Jr.	☐☐☐

Others not included above:

	Qty
41. Pre-1985 Models	☐☐☐
42. 1985 Models and Later	☐☐☐

Form X

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

District Ancillary Buildings

Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date:

Month Day Year

Contact: _____

Surveyor: _____

Reviewed By: _____ Date: _____

1. County – District Number	2. Campus Number	3. Action Code
___ – ___	7 0 0	

4. Building Name
5. Street Address
6. City
7. Zip Code
8. Building Use
9. Gross Square Footage
10. Year Built/Renovated
11. Overall Condition
12. Building Number

4. Building Name
5. Street Address
6. City
7. Zip Code
8. Building Use
9. Gross Square Footage
10. Year Built/Renovated
11. Overall Condition
12. Building Number

4. Building Name
5. Street Address
6. City
7. Zip Code
8. Building Use
9. Gross Square Footage
10. Year Built/Renovated
11. Overall Condition
12. Building Number

RENOVATION OF AGING SPACE ON AN ANNUAL BASIS

ESTIMATED COST: ***$66 million (annually)***

ASSUMPTIONS:

During the 10 year period from 1980 through 1989 school districts renovated an average of 3.3 million square feet per year. Renovation cost estimates were made using a cost of $20 per square foot rather than $60 per square foot for new construction.

Renovation was assumed to have taken place if the values for year renovated differed from that for year constructed. Renovation information was collected on a room by room basis, and the square footage used may represent a partial building.

SPACE NEEDS FOR PROJECTED GROWTH ON AN ANNUAL BASIS

ESTIMATED COST: ***$300 million (annually)***

ASSUMPTIONS:

The student population is growing at a rate of approximately 50,000 per year. For each student in attendance, a facility needs to have approximately 100 square feet of instructional and non-instructional space.

Since it is impossible to predict whether student growth will occur in areas where there is excess capacity, this estimate assumes that facilities will need to be constructed to accommodate all student growth. This will require 5,000,000 square feet of new space each year.

A construction cost of $60 per square foot was used to calculate this estimate.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY REPORT ON SCHOOL FACILITIES INVENTORY DATA

NOVEMBER 1991

SCHOOL GROUP=ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

ROOM USE	TOTAL SQ. FEET PER PUPIL	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE	MEDIAN ROOM SIZE
CLASSROOM	41.24	72,461,897	8,592,152	11.86%	18	715
LANGUAGE LABORATORY	0.88	179,914	18,417	10.24%	18	261
COMPUTER LABORATORY	1.65	1,506,614	110,600	7.34%	17	690
SCIENCE LABORATORY	2.28	468,817	20,562	4.39%	19	817
SPECIAL ED.CLASSROOM	2.36	1,631,888	252,796	15.49%	17	601
WELDING SHOP	2.64	11,990	1,133	9.45%	16	740
WOOD SHOP	6.00	26,825	1,627	6.07%	26	1495
AUTOMOTIVE SHOP	3.91	19,524			19	1683
COSMETOLY LAB	1.91	2,204			20	586
HEALTH CARE LAB	0.42	2,388			11	84
DARK ROOM	0.42	2,160	720	33.33%	17	120
VIDEO STUDIO	1.03	14,047	600	4.27%	18	343
OTHER VOCATIONAL	3.88	61,184	4,011	6.56%	15	955
ART ROOM	1.66	750,239	35,998	4.80%	16	853
HOME ECONOMICS	2.71	88,916	1,539	1.73%	19	764
DRAFTING	1.50	3,822			23	548
R.O.T.C.	1.02	372			35	372
GREENHOUSE	1.28	5,537	25	0.45%	19	171
BAND/CHORAL ROOM	1.90	1,408,366	122,727	8.71%	16	829
PRACTICE ROOM	0.61	33,920	848	2.50%	18	64
GYMNASIUM	8.05	8,520,359	95,088	1.12%	16	3773
NATATORIUM	8.73	22,995			21	3169
LOCKER/DRESSING ROOM	2.16	846,588	2,051	0.24%	22	345
WEIGHT ROOM	2.25	19,619	623	3.18%	21	614
ATHLETIC THERAPY	0.82	11,718	2,909	24.83%	18	190
KITCHEN	2.54	4,185,899	37,521	0.90%	20	1200
CAFETERIA	5.76	3,145,691	57,920	1.84%	22	2556
CAFETORIUM	6.01	6,775,354	49,580	0.73%	20	3350
STORAGE	2.50	4,345,102	183,815	4.23%	19	70
WORK ROOMS	1.15	1,606,594	42,700	2.66%	18	210
LIBRARY	3.40	5,657,556	134,392	2.38%	19	1452
AUDITORIUM	5.25	1,201,670	5,098	0.42%	28	2665
STAGE	1.29	1,708,170	9,465	0.55%	22	648
TOILET ROOM	3.04	5,329,752	180,594	3.39%	18	70
HEALTH CLINIC	0.47	743,673	19,019	2.56%	20	213
COUNSELOR OFFICE	0.48	490,593	25,538	5.21%	17	180
ADMINSTRATIVE OFFICE	2.46	4,273,111	69,504	1.63%	19	234
LOUNGE	0.90	1,179,904	23,487	1.99%	21	310
MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	1.30	1,873,486	17,238	0.92%	16	94
CHILD/DAY CARE	3.06	35,246	3,470	9.85%	17	632
INDOOR CORRIDOR	12.44	21,033,608	164,389	0.78%	19	600
OUTDOOR CORRIDOR	0.07	31,185	2,618	8.40%	24	0
OTHER	3.17	641,199	28,222	3.15%	16	187
TOTAL		152,359,696	10,310,996			

SCHOOL GROUP=ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY

ROOM USE	TOTAL SQ. FEET PER PUPIL	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE	MEDIAN ROOM SIZE
CLASSROOM	51.01	3,004,465	174,579	5.81%	21	643
LANGUAGE LABORATORY	3.02	18,974	768	4.05%	27	611
COMPUTER LABORATORY	3.46	125,374	7,968	6.36%	21	630
SCIENCE LABORATORY	5.64	290,806	4,899	1.68%	22	816
SPECIAL ED.CLASSROOM	6.93	175,836	16,654	9.47%	23	603
WELDING SHOP	6.76	99,236	2,497	2.52%	20	2153
WOOD SHOP	5.75	120,277	4,781	3.97%	22	1395
AUTOMOTIVE SHOP	3.42	29,922			15	2009
COSMETOLY LAB	24.50	10,168			13	1174
HEALTH CARE LAB	5.40	605			12	605
DARK ROOM	0.31	4,930	137	2.78%	22	105
OTHER VOCATIONAL	9.31	238,451	1,390	0.55%	20	1520
ART ROOM	2.84	53,940	374	0.69%	26	740
HOME ECONOMICS	4.57	233,325	4,818	2.06%	25	734
DRAFTING	1.80	19,396			14	1365
R.O.T.C.	30.74	4,488			59	4488
GREENHOUSE	9.87	16,029	3,462	21.60%	16	920
AGRICULTRUAL	9.93	71,693	641	0.89%	26	1728
BAND/CHORAL ROOM	3.82	119,032	1,230	1.03%	21	1182
PRACTICE ROOM	0.66	11,667			15	60
GYMNASIUM	33.21	1,802,391			27	6235
NATATORIUM	11.70	28,505			17	3710
LOCKER/DRESSING ROOM	10.67	565,915	791	0.14%	26	469
WEIGHT ROOM	3.02	101,811	2,083	2.05%	24	709
ATHLETIC THERAPY	0.98	18,272			16	228
KITCHEN	4.54	248,067	3,761	1.52%	23	744
CAFETERIA	8.72	343,762	5,470	1.59%	25	1552
CAFETORIUM	12.18	198,175			22	2513
STORAGE	7.96	471,168	13,663	2.90%	22	85
WORK ROOMS	2.64	118,847	5,333	4.49%	20	169
LIBRARY	6.53	352,899	6,010	1.70%	24	969
AUDITORIUM	9.75	280,256	2,784	0.99%	32	2956
STAGE	3.17	154,716	522	0.34%	30	653
TOILET ROOM	5.91	350,043	8,318	2.38%	20	103
HEALTH CLINIC	1.04	43,041	2,584	6.00%	23	189
COUNSELOR OFFICE	1.13	40,130	1,028	2.56%	25	150
ADMINSTRATIVE OFFICE	9.09	536,474	16,067	2.99%	21	189
LOUNGE	1.89	75,770	880	1.16%	24	267
MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	2.52	112,209	151	0.13%	20	53
CHILD/DAY CARE	8.77	5,041			43	896
INDOOR CORRIDOR	26.33	1,551,183	6,795	0.44%	23	313

REPORT A
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ENTIRE STATE BY SCHOOL GROUPINGS

SCHOOL GROUP=SECONDARY SCHOOLS

ROOM USE	TOTAL SQ. FEET PER PUPIL	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE	MEDIAN ROOM SIZE
CAFETORIUM	7.43	1,212,725			15	4152
STORAGE	6.57	5,475,239	61,901	1.13%	18	110
WORK ROOMS	2.04	1,610,157	18,777	1.17%	17	180
LIBRARY	4.57	3,752,971	15,246	0.41%	17	2000
AUDITORIUM	6.34	3,989,108	7,621	0.19%	23	4719
STAGE	2.14	1,538,696	3,144	0.20%	22	1260
TOILET ROOM	3.60	3,006,267	17,549	0.58%	18	150
HEALTH CLINIC	0.37	265,142	2,789	1.05%	19	220
COUNSELOR OFFICE	0.81	605,996	6,597	1.09%	19	169
ADMINSTRATIVE OFFICE	5.63	4,687,407	30,232	0.64%	18	163
LOUNGE	1.02	728,047	4,459	0.61%	20	340
MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	2.46	1,966,678	5,151	0.26%	16	120
CHILD/DAY CARE	1.04	39,128	6,635	16.96%	17	633
INDOOR CORRIDOR	23.62	19,699,903	54,115	0.27%	19	616
OUTDOOR CORRIDOR	0.15	30,401	0		21	0
OTHER	2.13	1,082,044	22,014	2.03%	17	256
TOTAL		131,622,024	2,115,369			
		379,775,160	15,387,463			

N8R DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS					
6	OVER 50,000	58,169,920	3,941,873	6.78%	24
20	25,000 TO 49,999	71,312,231	3,139,640	4.40%	16
45	10,000 TO 24,999	74,973,556	2,877,871	3.84%	17
58	5,000 TO 9,999	40,209,263	1,437,212	3.57%	16
81	3,000 TO 4,999	37,769,034	1,156,893	3.06%	19
127	1,600 TO 2,999	33,814,184	1,238,533	3.66%	19
118	1,000 TO 1,599	21,314,291	678,773	3.18%	18
205	500 TO 999	23,237,586	553,512	2.38%	19
392	UNDER 500	19,227,819	370,460	1.93%	22
DISTRICT TYPE					
8	MAJOR URBAN	66,198,748	4,524,635	6.83%	23
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	102,759,722	3,941,229	3.84%	16
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	46,038,177	1,645,487	3.57%	18
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	31,758,046	995,196	3.13%	16
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	33,757,426	1,388,175	4.11%	20
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	8,258,338	318,656	3.86%	13
266	NON-METRO STABLE	60,632,306	1,997,423	3.29%	20
493	RURAL	30,625,121	583,966	1.91%	21
WEALTH (MEDIAN=$145,390)					
104	UNDER $76,634	34,518,815	1,987,754	5.76%	17
105	$76,634 TO $92,482	22,223,957	843,914	3.80%	19
105	$92,483 TO $108,328	30,451,694	1,217,565	4.00%	22
105	$108,329 TO $125,109	20,813,425	881,778	4.24%	20
104	$125,110 TO $145,389	49,472,559	1,780,825	3.60%	17
105	$145,390 TO $170,034	40,440,812	1,110,128	2.75%	16
105	$170,035 TO $204,844	50,691,434	1,820,297	3.59%	18
105	$204,845 TO $271,616	69,123,356	3,871,808	5.60%	20
105	$271,617 TO $436,122	46,897,673	1,700,307	3.63%	19
104	OVER $436,122	14,559,760	117,553	0.81%	19
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
WEALTH (ST AVG=$186,841)					
682	UNDER $186,841	221,999,152	8,721,436	3.93%	18
365	OVER $186,841	157,194,333	6,610,493	4.21%	20
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP					
24	UNDER $46,305	14,814,589	813,003	5.49%	17
54	$46,305 TO < $71,749	16,064,968	1,038,906	6.47%	17
74	$71,749 TO < $84,206	17,623,071	777,712	4.41%	19
132	$84,206 TO < $103,653	20,625,469	610,585	2.96%	19
23	$103,653 TO < $107,069	16,820,249	764,758	4.55%	25
94	$107,069 TO < $122,094	19,547,996	857,195	4.39%	20
57	$122,094 TO < $133,451	20,662,856	785,044	3.80%	18
44	$133,451 TO < $140,903	18,678,976	708,562	3.79%	18
41	$140,903 TO < $149,956	18,702,907	529,258	2.83%	16
59	$149,956 TO < $162,715	19,100,942	480,694	2.52%	16
32	$162,715 TO < $172,398	19,344,534	736,425	3.81%	15
39	$172,398 TO < $183,529	18,737,075	596,493	3.18%	17
45	$183,529 TO < $199,613	19,798,267	685,605	3.46%	22
42	$199,613 TO < $220,926	20,710,075	626,440	3.02%	15
39	$220,926 TO < $241,469	9,578,151	266,808	2.79%	18
1	$241,469 TO < $242,339	17,146,765	1,586,492	9.25%	29
27	$242,339 TO < $262,043	15,790,489	712,202	4.51%	18
39	$262,043 TO < $308,333	21,491,751	1,117,357	5.20%	17
21	$308,333 TO < $336,062	18,944,993	915,093	4.83%	20
160	$336,062 AND OVER	35,009,362	723,297	2.07%	18
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$1.0454)					
261	UNDER 0.9481	76,508,863	3,650,324	4.77%	21
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	99,442,386	4,275,175	4.30%	19
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	107,297,729	3,453,267	3.22%	18
262	1.1897 AND OVER	95,944,507	3,953,163	4.12%	17
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$0.8896)					
261	UNDER 0.7663	70,587,985	2,610,215	3.70%	17
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	109,026,148	4,660,789	4.27%	18
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	117,335,616	4,646,953	3.96%	20
262	OVER 1.0276	82,243,736	3,413,972	4.15%	20
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
SPT8 HIGHEST CATEGORY					
337	RESIDENTIAL	215,828,033	9,218,063	4.27%	17
309	LAND	21,617,166	632,449	2.93%	21
208	OIL AND GAS	32,105,799	571,625	1.78%	20
193	BUSINESS	109,642,487	4,909,792	4.48%	22
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
1,052	STATE TOTAL	380,027,884	15,394,767	4.05%	19

REPORT B
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE TOTAL AREA DATA

11:08 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	50,554,925	1,106,011	2.19%	22
282	5 TO UNDER 20	62,623,644	2,461,289	3.93%	18
118	20 TO UNDER 100	60,728,937	2,014,568	3.32%	17
97	100 AND OVER	205,285,979	9,750,061	4.75%	19
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	102,996,065	4,156,330	4.04%	21
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	163,242,230	7,503,414	4.60%	20
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	81,086,018	2,510,842	3.10%	16
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	25,855,601	951,102	3.68%	13
53	10% AND OVER	6,847,970	273,079	3.99%	15
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	141,163,027	5,364,731	3.80%	18
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	72,964,061	2,790,681	3.82%	17
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	72,115,907	2,811,718	3.90%	19
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	24,049,721	565,958	2.35%	16
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	62,450,438	3,543,640	5.67%	22
12	50% AND OVER	7,284,730	318,039	4.37%	23
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	51.852,245	1,264,141	2.44%	18
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	63,047,479	2,276,796	3.61%	16
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	60,584,099	1,934,364	3.19%	16
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	44,931,912	1,498,396	3.33%	21
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	89,921,313	4,839,258	5.38%	22
179	50% AND OVER	69,690,836	3,581,812	5.14%	19
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	9,873,702	311,690	3.16%	20
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	18,945,141	669,949	3.54%	16
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	50,288,878	1,411,465	2.81%	16
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	47,205,890	1,659,491	3.52%	17
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	88,247,430	2,699,598	3.06%	19
253	50% AND OVER	165,466,843	8,642,574	5.22%	20
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	79,995,994	3,032,533	3.79%	15
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	59,619,362	1,287,394	2.16%	17
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	77,358,687	2,555,442	3.30%	19
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	115,349,490	5,984,029	5.19%	21
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	41,224,605	2,188,001	5.31%	21
33	80% AND OVER	6,479,746	347,368	5.36%	19
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	54,314,034	2,201,150	4.05%	15
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	82,031,272	3,089,094	3.77%	17
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	165,156,139	7,389,609	4.47%	20
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	78,526,439	2,714,914	3.46%	21
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=$26,840)					
263	UNDER $24,038	22,132,360	697,863	3.15%	18
263	$24,038 TO UNDER $25,043	40,307,162	1,443,685	3.58%	18
264	$25,043 TO UNDER $26,251	87,351,246	3,279,705	3.75%	18
262	$26,251 AND OVER	230,237,116	9,973,514	4.33%	19
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	116,439,160	3,555,790	3.05%	17
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	68,152,010	2,118,996	3.11%	18
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	58,982,254	1,996,666	3.39%	19
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	33,285,883	1,449,161	4.35%	17
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	53,659,146	2,631,298	4.90%	19
59	50% AND OVER	49,509,431	3,642,856	7.36%	23
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	36,180,977	1,698,039	4.69%	19
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	74,715,395	2,650,552	3.55%	19
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	119,061,419	3,900,088	3.28%	18
263	33.4% AND OVER	150,070,093	7,146,088	4.76%	19
1,052	STATE TOTAL	380,027,884	15,394,767	4.05%	19

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL PUPILS ENROLLED	TOTAL COUNT OF COMPUTERS	PUPILS TO COMPUTER RATIO
	ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS			
6	OVER 50,000	588,698	33,407	17.62
20	25,000 TO 49,999	713,774	53,405	13.37
45	10,000 TO 24,999	727,371	52,429	13.87
58	5,000 TO 9,999	367,370	25,802	14.24
81	3,000 TO 4,999	316,776	24,079	13.16
127	1,600 TO 2,999	271,247	20,968	12.94
118	1,000 TO 1,599	149,921	13,512	11.10
205	500 TO 999	147,609	16,042	9.20
391	UNDER 500	95,425	12,467	7.65
	DISTRICT TYPE			
8	MAJOR URBAN	680,565	36,949	18.42
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	967,402	72,247	13.39
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	440,786	36,594	12.05
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	294,155	20,384	14.43
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	314,017	22,250	14.11
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	69,605	5,347	13.02
266	NON-METRO STABLE	446,325	37,867	11.79
492	RURAL	165,336	20,473	8.08
	WEALTH (MEDIAN=$145,390)			
104	UNDER $76,634	370,759	26,297	14.10
105	$76,634 TO $92,482	204,692	15,015	13.63
105	$92,483 TO $108,328	281,313	17,079	16.47
105	$108,329 TO $125,109	180,116	14,695	12.26
104	$125,110 TO $145,389	454,813	28,334	16.05
105	$145,390 TO $170,034	352,616	23,838	14.79
105	$170,035 TO $204,844	440,718	31,356	14.06
105	$204,845 TO $271,616	640,020	47,808	13.39
105	$271,617 TO $436,122	377,555	37,734	10.01
103	OVER $436,122	70,436	9,201	7.66
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
	WEALTH (ST AVG=$186,841)			
682	UNDER $186,841	2,061,107	140,605	14.66
364	OVER $186,841	1,311,931	110,752	11.85
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
	WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP			
24	UNDER $46,305	173,249	12,098	14.32
54	$46,305 TO < $71,749	167,352	11,816	14.16
74	$71,749 TO < $84,206	169,761	11,610	14.62
132	$84,206 TO < $103,653	168,127	13,635	12.33
23	$103,653 TO < $107,069	169,170	8,686	19.48
94	$107,069 TO < $122,094	168,968	13,626	12.40
57	$122,094 TO < $133,451	186,742	11,572	16.14
44	$133,451 TO < $140,903	168,725	10,725	15.73
41	$140,903 TO < $149,956	169,239	11,888	14.24
59	$149,956 TO < $162,715	167,215	10,594	15.78
32	$162,715 TO < $172,398	172,070	10,835	15.88
39	$172,398 TO < $183,529	172,338	12,812	13.45
45	$183,529 TO < $199,613	166,765	12,122	13.76
42	$199,613 TO < $220,926	168,490	12,607	13.36
39	$220,926 TO < $241,469	73,806	6,337	11.65
1	$241,469 TO < $242,339	194,208	10,235	18.97
27	$242,339 TO < $262,043	149,570	14,109	10.60
39	$262,043 TO < $308,333	176,770	15,536	11.38
21	$308,333 TO < $336,062	170,804	10,983	15.55
159	$336,062 AND OVER	219,759	29,531	7.44
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
	TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$1.0454)			
260	UNDER 0.9481	713,092	48,238	14.78
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	898,105	68,540	13.10
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	957,623	77,192	12.41
262	1.1897 AND OVER	804,218	57,387	14.01
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
	M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$0.8896)			
260	UNDER 0.7663	654,615	45,149	14.50
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	1,011,631	71,833	14.08
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	1,023,562	85,715	11.94
262	OVER 1.0276	683,230	48,660	14.04
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
	SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY			
337	RESIDENTIAL	2,036,272	148,464	13.72
309	LAND	144,456	15,565	9.28
207	OIL AND GAS	191,879	18,348	10.46
193	BUSINESS	1,000,431	68,988	14.50
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
1,051	STATE TOTAL	3,378,191	252,111	13.40

REPORT C
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE LISTING OF PUPIL TO COMPUTER RATIOS

12:10 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL PUPILS ENROLLED	TOTAL COUNT OF COMPUTERS	PUPILS TO COMPUTER RATIO
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)				
549	LESS THAN 5	303,736	32,801	9.26
282	5 TO UNDER 20	512,429	40,301	12.72
118	20 TO UNDER 100	558,398	37,908	14.73
97	100 AND OVER	1,998,475	140,347	14.24
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)				
434	DECLINING PUPILS	829,194	65,073	12.74
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	1,502,857	108,065	13.91
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	750,507	57,805	12.98
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	228,989	16,672	13.73
53	10% AND OVER	66,644	4,496	14.82
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)				
620	UNDER 5%	1,214,182	96,288	12.61
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	652,943	49,915	13.08
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	639,482	47,854	13.36
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	200,099	14,187	14.10
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	613,000	38,772	15.81
12	50% AND OVER	58,485	5,095	11.48
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)				
299	UNDER 5%	397,640	37,913	10.49
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	540,459	43,626	12.39
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	510,138	36,950	13.81
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	388,143	32,485	11.95
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	841,578	57,223	14.71
178	50% AND OVER	700,233	43,914	15.95
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)				
105	UNDER 5%	75,118	6,138	12.24
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	143,817	11,558	12.44
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	404,653	37,143	10.89
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	393,287	32,762	12.00
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	743,289	60,623	12.26
252	50% AND OVER	1,618,027	103,887	15.57
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)				
156	UNDER 20%	688,399	56,639	12.15
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	487,812	39,497	12.35
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	683,299	53,043	12.88
303	40% TO UNDER 60%	1,026,601	70,004	14.66
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	429,783	28,067	15.31
33	80% AND OVER	62,297	4,861	12.82
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)				
258	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	495,743	34,330	14.44
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	727,459	54,337	13.39
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	1,532,559	115,735	13.24
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	622,430	47,709	13.05
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=$26,840)				
263	UNDER $24,038	158,712	15,570	10.19
262	$24,038 TO UNDER $25,043	319,459	26,036	12.27
264	$25,043 TO UNDER $26,251	746,977	56,356	13.25
262	$26,251 AND OVER	2,153,043	154,149	13.97
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)				
599	UNDER 5%	903,525	79,428	11.38
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	561,536	47,899	11.72
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	530,576	40,666	13.05
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	309,655	20,515	15.09
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	527,308	32,498	16.23
59	50% AND OVER	545,591	31,105	17.54
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)				
262	UNDER 18.6%	316,520	24,561	12.89
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	663,328	47,978	13.83
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	1,045,217	76,865	13.60
263	33.4% AND OVER	1,353,126	102,707	13.17
1,051	STATE TOTAL	3,378,191	252,111	13.40

REPORT D
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE COUNT OF COMPUTERS BY BRAND

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	APPLE II MICRO COMPUTER	MACINTOSH MICRO COMPUTER	MS-DOS MICRO COMPUTER	OTHER MICRO COMPUTERS
	ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS				
6	OVER 50,000	15,857	1,421	5,987	10,142
20	25,000 TO 49,999	23,462	2,857	18,936	8,150
45	10,000 TO 24,999	25,086	2,870	14,789	9,684
58	5,000 TO 9,999	13,115	2,100	6,377	4,210
81	3,000 TO 4,999	12,423	1,413	6,003	4,240
127	1,600 TO 2,999	10,027	738	6,141	4,062
118	1,000 TO 1,599	6,802	705	3,699	2,306
205	500 TO 999	7,910	563	4,548	3,021
391	UNDER 500	5,670	405	3,633	2,759
	DISTRICT TYPE				
8	MAJOR URBAN	18,226	1,464	6,704	10,555
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	35,136	5,614	19,217	12,280
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	14,832	1,265	14,965	5,532
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	10,722	1,069	5,076	3,517
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	10,857	1,221	5,784	4,388
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	2,542	317	1,622	866
266	NON-METRO STABLE	18,635	1,530	10,556	7,146
492	RURAL	9,402	592	6,189	4,290
	WEALTH (MEDIAN=$145,390)				
104	UNDER $76,634	12,456	1,143	7,947	4,751
105	$76,634 TO $92,482	8,076	441	3,997	2,501
105	$92,483 TO $108,328	9,266	653	3,718	3,442
105	$108,329 TO $125,109	7,069	603	3,304	3,719
104	$125,110 TO $145,389	14,198	1,681	7,020	5,435
105	$145,390 TO $170,034	11,260	1,163	7,529	3,886
105	$170,035 TO $204,844	13,316	1,592	9,799	6,649
105	$204,845 TO $271,616	23,629	3,046	11,564	9,569
105	$271,617 TO $436,122	16,437	2,104	11,710	7,483
103	OVER $436,122	4,366	501	3,248	1,086
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
	WEALTH (ST AVG=$186,841)				
682	UNDER $186,841	70,188	6,908	37,255	26,254
364	OVER $186,841	49,885	6,019	32,581	22,267
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
	WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP				
24	UNDER $46,305	5,598	431	3,996	2,073
54	$46,305 TO < $71,749	5,748	645	3,138	2,285
74	$71,749 TO < $84,206	6,598	297	2,673	2,042
132	$84,206 TO < $103,653	6,741	624	4,035	2,235
23	$103,653 TO < $107,069	4,785	235	1,701	1,965
94	$107,069 TO < $122,094	6,429	514	3,124	3,559
57	$122,094 TO < $133,451	6,185	550	3,371	1,466
44	$133,451 TO < $140,903	5,198	718	2,576	2,233
[illegible]	$140,903 TO < $149,956	6,331	695	2,376	2,486
[illegible]	$149,956 TO < $162,715	4,517	375	3,559	2,143
[illegible]	$162,715 TO < $172,398	5,704	636	3,183	1,312
[illegible]	$172,398 TO < $183,529	5,979	1,106	3,455	2,272
45	$183,529 TO < $199,613	4,903	401	3,440	3,378
42	$199,613 TO < $220,926	4,198	305	5,865	2,239
39	$220,926 TO < $241,469	3,102	214	2,089	932
1	$241,469 TO < $242,339	6,440	750	1,516	1,529
27	$242,339 TO < $262,043	6,594	1,378	3,240	2,897
39	$262,043 TO < $308,333	7,447	890	3,017	4,182
21	$308,333 TO < $336,062	4,360	357	2,241	4,025
159	$336,062 AND OVER	13,216	1,806	11,241	3,268
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
	TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$1.0454)				
260	UNDER 0.9481	26,217	2,039	11,970	8,012
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	32,376	2,962	18,538	14,664
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	33,498	4,621	23,649	15,424
262	1.1897 AND OVER	27,982	3,305	15,679	10,421
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
	M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$0.8896)				
260	UNDER 0.7663	23,540	1,935	12,439	7,235
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	35,746	4,153	18,532	13,402
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	35,282	3,954	27,571	18,908
262	OVER 1.0276	25,505	2,885	11,294	8,976
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
	SPT8 HIGHEST CATEGORY				
337	RESIDENTIAL	69,877	8,532	42,568	27,487
309	LAND	7,321	626	4,415	3,203
207	OIL AND GAS	8,033	763	5,885	3,659
193	BUSINESS	34,842	3,006	16,968	14,172
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
1,051	STATE TOTAL	120,352	13,072	70,113	48,574

REPORT D
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE COUNT OF COMPUTERS BY BRAND

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	APPLE II MICRO COMPUTER	MACINTOSH MICRO COMPUTER	MS-DOS MICRO COMPUTER	OTHER MICRO COMPUTERS
	DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)				
549	LESS THAN 5	15,740	1,116	9,916	6,029
282	5 TO UNDER 20	19,358	1,597	10,658	8,688
118	20 TO UNDER 100	18,582	2,302	11,243	5,781
97	100 AND OVER	66,393	7,912	38,019	28,023
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
	PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)				
434	DECLINING PUPILS	31,276	2,035	17,245	14,517
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	53,844	5,312	27,270	21,639
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	25,059	4,363	19,644	8,739
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	8,086	998	4,853	2,735
53	10% AND OVER	2,087	364	1,101	944
	PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)				
620	UNDER 5%	44,943	4,924	30,952	15,469
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	23,657	2,820	14,252	9,186
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	22,404	2,615	12,127	10,708
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	8,891	618	2,331	2,347
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	17,854	2,018	8,966	9,934
12	50% AND OVER	2,603	77	1,485	930
	PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)				
299	UNDER 5%	16,557	1,518	13,039	6,799
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	22,802	3,946	10,202	6,676
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	18,421	1,862	10,808	5,859
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	13,373	1,010	9,304	8,798
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	26,875	2,901	14,960	12,487
178	50% AND OVER	22,324	1,835	11,800	7,955
	PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)				
105	UNDER 5%	3,268	434	1,514	922
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	5,458	793	2,967	2,348
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	16,037	2,231	13,580	5,295
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	15,888	2,206	8,555	6,113
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	28,286	2,873	17,602	11,862
252	50% AND OVER	51,415	4,535	25,895	22,042
	PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)				
156	UNDER 20%	24,960	4,858	19,166	7,655
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	20,202	1,682	9,427	8,186
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	25,286	2,169	15,431	10,157
303	40% TO UNDER 60%	33,702	3,030	17,548	15,724
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	13,652	1,176	7,308	5,931
33	80% AND OVER	2,550	157	1,233	921
	AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)				
258	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	16,707	1,813	10,567	5,243
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	28,080	2,945	13,163	10,149
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	54,698	6,385	33,058	21,684
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	20,957	1,929	13,325	11,498
	AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=$26,840)				
263	UNDER $24,038	7,680	827	4,048	3,015
262	$24,038 TO UNDER $25,043	13,096	1,263	6,240	5,437
264	$25,043 TO UNDER $26,251	28,028	2,952	15,752	9,624
262	$26,251 AND OVER	71,548	8,030	44,073	30,498
	PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)				
599	UNDER 5%	36,212	4,487	25,388	13,341
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	23,258	3,477	12,144	9,020
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	19,421	1,715	12,264	7,266
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	9,985	838	4,892	4,800
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	15,166	1,089	8,288	7,955
59	50% AND OVER	16,310	1,466	7,137	6,192
	% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)				
262	UNDER 18.6%	12,098	972	7,312	4,179
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	24,318	2,259	12,413	8,988
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	34,838	3,937	23,933	14,157
263	33.4% AND OVER	49,098	5,904	26,455	21,250
1,051	STATE TOTAL	120,352	13,072	70,113	48,574

REPORT E
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANLYZE OF BUILDING CONDITION AREA

11:42 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL AREA	% TOTAL AREA RATED POOR	% TOTAL AREA RATED BELOW AVG	% TOTAL AREA RATED FAIR	% TOTAL AREA RATED GOOD	AVG AGE OF PORTABLE AREA	AVG AGE OF ALL AREA
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS								
6	OVER 50,000	58,169,920	0.51	3.89	49.15	45.92	13	24
20	25,000 TO 49,999	71,312,231	0.12	0.59	22.57	76.50	13	16
45	10,000 TO 24,999	74,973,556	0.44	2.28	28.13	68.87	13	17
58	5,000 TO 9,999	40,209,263	0.32	3.42	35.27	60.85	11	16
81	3,000 TO 4,999	37,769,034	0.44	3.03	38.92	57.33	16	19
127	1,600 TO 2,999	33,814,184	0.73	4.79	38.70	55.60	15	19
118	1,000 TO 1,599	21,314,291	0.46	2.48	39.10	57.89	14	18
205	500 TO 999	23,237,586	0.74	4.39	38.15	56.57	11	19
392	UNDER 500	19,227,819	0.74	6.27	43.97	48.82	12	22
DISTRICT TYPE								
8	MAJOR URBAN	66,198,748	0.48	3.56	46.75	48.74	12	23
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	102,759,722	0.36	0.84	21.70	76.82	11	16
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	46,038,177	0.23	2.06	28.69	68.81	18	18
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	31,758,046	0.29	4.62	40.47	54.55	11	16
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	33,757,426	0.43	4.02	46.16	49.10	15	20
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	8,258,338	0.30	3.95	32.12	63.43	8	13
266	NON-METRO STABLE	60,632,306	0.67	3.81	38.71	56.68	16	20
493	RURAL	30,625,121	0.69	5.41	40.44	53.25	13	21
WEALTH (MEDIAN=$145,390)								
104	UNDER $76,634	34,518,815	0.41	5.43	42.40	51.61	13	17
105	$76,634 TO $92,482	22,223,957	0.49	4.35	32.69	62.30	14	19
105	$92,483 TO $108,328	30,451,694	0.69	4.09	37.51	57.64	15	22
104	$108,329 TO $125,109	20,813,425	0.46	4.67	39.04	55.33	13	20
105	$125,110 TO $145,389	49,472,559	0.58	2.36	37.68	58.91	14	17
105	$145,390 TO $170,034	40,440,812	0.36	1.99	29.16	68.44	15	16
105	$170,035 TO $204,844	50,691,434	0.50	2.03	26.74	70.66	12	18
105	$204,845 TO $271,616	69,123,356	0.24	3.13	34.23	61.88	12	20
105	$271,617 TO $436,122	46,897,673	0.52	1.86	42.34	55.11	14	19
104	OVER $436,122	14,559,760	0.15	1.25	28.99	69.24	10	19
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
WEALTH (ST AVG=$186,841)								
682	UNDER $186,841	221,999,152	0.49	3.31	34.35	61.63	14	18
365	OVER $186,841	157,194,333	0.37	2.50	36.21	60.59	13	20
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP								
24	UNDER $46,305	14,814,589	0.32	6.50	46.33	46.74	14	17
54	$46,305 TO < $71,749	16,064,968	0.36	4.86	41.54	53.06	12	17
74	$71,749 TO < $84,206	17,623,071	0.53	4.58	29.26	65.54	14	19
132	$84,206 TO < $103,653	20,625,469	0.80	4.66	40.68	53.67	12	19
23	$103,653 TO < $107,069	16,820,249	0.54	2.90	35.13	61.41	16	25
94	$107,069 TO < $122,094	19,547,996	0.31	3.60	36.73	58.82	13	20
57	$122,094 TO < $133,451	20,662,856	0.47	3.61	43.84	51.61	13	18
44	$133,451 TO < $140,903	18,678,976	1.04	3.28	33.81	61.32	18	18
41	$140,903 TO < $149,956	18,702,907	0.34	1.72	38.27	59.47	11	16
59	$149,956 TO < $162,715	19,100,942	0.39	1.73	23.57	74.25	19	16
32	$162,715 TO < $172,398	19,344,534	0.27	1.89	26.54	71.21	14	15
39	$172,398 TO < $183,529	18,737,075	0.44	1.28	19.11	79.11	9	17
45	$183,529 TO < $199,613	19,798,267	0.75	3.35	41.00	54.83	12	22
42	$199,613 TO < $220,926	20,710,075	0.28	1.32	20.22	78.10	16	15
39	$220,926 TO < $241,469	9,578,151	0.20	1.53	29.98	68.25	12	18
1	$241,469 TO < $242,339	17,146,765	0.32	9.16	60.73	28.05	14	29
27	$242,339 TO < $262,043	15,790,489	0.16	1.15	32.07	66.57	10	18
39	$262,043 TO < $308,333	21,491,751	0.18	1.27	20.12	78.25	10	17
21	$308,333 TO < $336,062	18,944,993	0.97	2.01	60.48	36.27	15	20
160	$336,062 AND OVER	35,009,362	0.19	1.35	30.91	67.35	13	18
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$1.0454)								
261	UNDER 0.9481	76,508,863	0.28	5.02	41.56	52.58	14	21
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	99,442,386	0.62	2.71	44.37	52.14	15	19
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	107,297,729	0.37	2.30	29.96	67.18	14	18
262	1.1897 AND OVER	95,944,507	0.46	2.37	26.18	70.79	11	17
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$0.8896)								
261	UNDER 0.7663	70,587,985	0.28	3.78	34.40	61.43	13	17
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	109,026,148	0.34	3.19	38.67	57.37	13	18
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	117,335,616	0.66	2.46	36.15	60.45	16	20
262	OVER 1.0276	82,243,736	0.40	2.73	29.59	67.16	12	20
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
SPT8 HIGHEST CATEGORY								
337	RESIDENTIAL	215,828,033	0.30	2.43	28.01	69.12	12	17
309	LAND	21,617,166	0.73	6.26	43.56	49.28	12	21
208	OIL AND GAS	32,105,799	0.56	3.21	34.08	61.93	13	20
193	BUSINESS	109,642,487	0.62	3.33	47.76	47.75	16	22
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
1,052	STATE TOTAL	386,027,884	0.44	2.97	35.10	61.23	13	19

REPORT E
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANLYZE OF BUILDING CONDITION AREA

11:42 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL AREA	% TOTAL AREA RATED POOR	% TOTAL AREA RATED BELOW AVG	% TOTAL AREA RATED FAIR	% TOTAL AREA RATED GOOD	AVG AGE OF PORTABLE AREA	AVG AGE OF ALL AREA
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)								
550	LESS THAN 5	50,554,925	0.61	4.22	39.01	55.98	15	22
282	5 TO UNDER 20	62,623,644	0.51	4.42	39.44	55.39	14	18
118	20 TO UNDER 100	60,728,937	0.49	3.54	34.45	61.33	12	17
97	100 AND OVER	205,285,979	0.36	2.06	33.05	64.22	13	19
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)								
435	DECLINING PUPILS	102,996,065	0.43	3.42	39.33	56.63	16	21
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	163,242,230	0.50	2.97	39.42	56.74	14	20
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	81,086,018	0.31	2.45	24.08	72.93	10	16
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	25,855,601	0.50	2.31	24.18	72.97	9	13
53	10% AND OVER	6,847,970	0.35	4.70	40.21	54.52	14	15
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)								
621	UNDER 5%	141,163,027	0.34	3.68	33.73	62.05	13	18
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	72,964,061	0.34	2.00	26.92	70.56	13	17
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	72,115,907	0.68	1.86	31.69	65.47	14	19
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	24,049,721	0.48	2.34	26.52	70.59	16	16
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	62,450,438	0.48	3.94	53.95	41.09	14	22
12	50% AND OVER	7,284,730	0.50	3.63	44.05	51.68	16	23
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)								
299	UNDER 5%	51,852,245	0.52	3.88	42.72	52.79	12	18
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	63,047,479	0.42	2.38	29.06	68.03	11	16
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	60,584,099	0.47	2.28	25.27	71.89	13	16
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	44,931,912	0.40	2.07	32.21	64.93	13	21
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	89,921,313	0.54	2.77	39.72	56.33	15	22
179	50% AND OVER	69,690,836	0.27	4.26	39.34	56.03	13	19
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)								
105	UNDER 5%	9,873,702	0.61	4.31	44.65	50.30	10	20
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	18,945,141	0.64	5.27	40.54	53.42	9	16
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	50,288,878	0.43	2.71	30.50	66.26	12	16
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	47,205,890	0.46	2.20	27.40	69.80	12	17
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	88,247,430	0.42	2.16	31.13	65.97	16	19
253	50% AND OVER	165,466,843	0.42	3.36	39.62	56.27	13	20
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)								
156	UNDER 20%	79,995,994	0.30	1.37	23.09	75.11	11	15
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	59,619,362	0.45	2.77	33.57	63.05	10	17
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	77,358,687	0.63	2.74	34.23	62.06	15	19
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	115,349,490	0.45	3.38	42.22	53.52	14	21
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	41,224,605	0.32	5.33	39.99	54.23	14	21
33	80% AND OVER	6,479,746	0.22	4.85	49.97	44.93	13	19
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)								
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	54,314,034	0.39	2.73	30.76	65.82	12	15
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	82,031,272	0.49	3.73	28.55	67.13	12	17
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	165,156,139	0.24	2.74	34.64	62.02	13	20
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	78,526,439	0.85	2.81	45.92	50.22	17	21
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=$26,840)								
263	UNDER $24,038	22,132,360	0.76	5.19	39.04	54.91	12	18
263	$24,038 TO UNDER $25,043	40,307,162	0.49	4.45	38.36	56.42	14	18
264	$25,043 TO UNDER $26,251	87,351,246	0.47	2.84	34.07	62.51	15	18
262	$26,251 AND OVER	230,237,116	0.39	2.55	34.54	62.19	13	19
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)								
600	UNDER 5%	116,439,160	0.51	2.93	30.57	65.85	12	17
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	68,152,010	0.43	2.56	27.91	68.88	16	18
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	58,982,254	0.51	1.54	32.55	64.97	15	19
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	33,285,883	0.19	1.13	29.55	69.01	10	17
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	53,659,146	0.45	2.18	42.97	54.31	12	19
59	50% AND OVER	49,509,431	0.37	7.42	53.91	37.64	14	23
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)								
263	UNDER 18.6%	36,180,977	0.64	5.36	40.23	53.67	13	19
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	74,715,395	0.30	3.52	31.12	64.80	14	19
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	119,961,419	0.56	2.30	28.10	68.76	14	18
263	33.4% AND OVER	150,070,093	0.37	2.65	41.41	55.30	13	19
1,052	STATE TOTAL	380,027,884	0.44	2.97	35.10	61.23	13	19

REPORT F
T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF HEP SYSPTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AVG	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS					
6	OVER 50,000	60	140	1,213	3,328
20	25,000 TO 49,999	46	192	1,466	2,799
45	10,000 TO 24,999	54	347	2,166	2,615
58	5,000 TO 9,999	78	167	1,132	1,262
81	3,000 TO 4,999	76	181	953	1,280
127	1,600 TO 2,999	67	219	1,032	1,338
118	1,000 TO 1,599	26	104	583	995
205	500 TO 999	20	136	738	1,243
392	UNDER 500	41	169	769	1,202
DISTRICT TYPE					
8	MAJOR URBAN	60	254	1,490	3,858
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	59	251	1,656	3,449
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	41	105	1,662	1,644
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	69	264	1,171	795
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	66	204	948	1,414
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	11	38	226	533
266	NON-METRO STABLE	117	306	1,785	2,543
493	RURAL	45	233	1,114	1,826
WEALTH (MEDIAN=$145,390)					
104	UNDER $76,634	51	229	2,106	1,761
105	$76,634 TO $92,482	24	193	699	1,212
105	$92,483 TO $108,328	45	88	740	1,846
105	$108,329 TO $125,109	33	122	492	1,301
104	$125,110 TO $145,389	120	287	1,126	1,908
105	$145,390 TO $170,034	41	142	865	1,335
105	$170,035 TO $204,844	32	165	1,155	1,531
105	$204,845 TO $271,616	90	236	1,465	3,285
105	$271,617 TO $436,122	30	155	1,194	1,366
104	OVER $436,122	2	38	186	462
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
WEALTH (ST AVG=$186,841)					
682	UNDER $186,841	322	1,124	6,417	10,210
365	OVER $186,841	146	531	3,611	5,797
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP					
24	UNDER $46,305	28	92	1,258	632
54	$46,305 TO < $71,749	19	118	732	871
74	$71,749 TO < $84,206	22	142	532	1,108
132	$84,206 TO < $103,653	18	135	722	984
23	$103,653 TO < $107,069	8	20	276	1,184
94	$107,069 TO < $122,094	50	99	393	1,272
57	$122,094 TO < $133,451	77	212	661	739
44	$133,451 TO < $140,903	34	76	427	777
41	$140,903 TO < $149,956	22	37	306	666
59	$149,956 TO < $162,715	18	60	371	681
32	$162,715 TO < $172,398	18	76	396	513
39	$172,398 TO < $183,529	8	42	306	754
45	$183,529 TO < $199,613	24	104	714	549
42	$199,613 TO < $220,926	14	33	359	515
39	$220,926 TO < $241,469	5	35	277	303
1	$241,469 TO < $242,339	35	94	236	1,359
27	$242,339 TO < $262,043	12	31	406	595
39	$262,043 TO < $308,333	29	84	435	977
21	$308,333 TO < $336,062	13	61	662	475
160	$336,062 AND OVER	14	104	559	1,053
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$1.0454)					
261	UNDER 0.9481	95	388	2,314	4,420
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	139	559	3,330	3,451
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	84	327	2,510	4,218
262	1.1897 AND OVER	150	381	1,874	3,918
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$0.8896)					
261	UNDER 0.7663	88	392	2,780	3,229
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	129	517	2,632	4,704
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	144	362	2,710	4,476
262	OVER 1.0276	107	384	1,906	3,598
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY					
337	RESIDENTIAL	189	925	5,771	8,688
309	LAND	49	160	835	1,444
208	OIL AND GAS	36	144	794	1,186
193	BUSINESS	194	426	2,628	4,689
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
1,052	STATE TOTAL	468	1,655	10,052	16,062

REPORT F
T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSPTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AVG	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	80	273	1,470	2,758
282	5 TO UNDER 20	85	405	1,896	2,677
118	20 TO UNDER 100	123	324	1,848	2,170
97	100 AND OVER	180	653	4,814	8,402
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	137	402	2,972	4,819
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	236	775	4,390	7,615
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	65	309	1,684	2,519
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	22	122	745	738
53	10% AND OVER	8	47	261	371
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	209	735	4,437	6,497
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	44	368	1,440	2,816
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	76	199	1,327	3,267
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	39	102	512	679
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	95	230	2,014	2,688
12	50% AND OVER	5	21	322	115
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	125	294	1,882	1,458
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	70	258	1,605	1,914
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	89	258	1,197	1,954
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	28	101	860	1,981
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	100	257	1,580	4,880
179	50% AND OVER	56	487	2,928	3,875
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	18	59	351	410
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	90	130	581	650
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	52	241	1,168	1,591
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	42	157	1,051	1,559
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	116	342	1,781	3,753
253	50% AND OVER	150	726	5,120	8,099
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	62	229	1,577	2,143
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	121	258	1,202	2,096
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	94	315	1,844	3,508
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	141	626	3,084	5,499
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	45	203	1,932	2,529
33	80% AND OVER	5	24	413	287
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	78	276	1,813	2,166
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	102	456	2,253	3,404
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	205	620	3,665	7,706
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	83	303	2,321	2,786
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=$26,840)					
263	UNDER $24,038	44	158	836	1,243
263	$24,038 TO UNDER $25,043	127	240	1,280	1,940
264	$25,043 TO UNDER $26,251	108	395	2,278	3,951
262	$26,251 AND OVER	189	862	5,658	8,928
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	174	543	2,700	4,177
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	84	251	1,321	2,451
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	77	201	1,170	2,865
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	41	99	805	1,424
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	26	295	1,783	2,124
59	50% AND OVER	66	266	2,273	3,021
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	58	175	1,825	1,866
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	79	338	1,752	3,975
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	125	440	2,244	4,658
263	33.4% AND OVER	206	702	4,231	5,563
1,052	STATE TOTAL	468	1,655	10,052	16,062

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSPTEMS

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AVG	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS					
6	OVER 50,000	79	169	1,262	3,098
20	25,000 TO 49,999	77	104	1,515	2,637
45	10,000 TO 24,999	40	381	2,168	2,491
58	5,000 TO 9,999	78	147	1,080	1,238
81	3,000 TO 4,999	49	154	961	1,169
127	1,600 TO 2,999	51	185	994	1,258
118	1,000 TO 1,599	22	76	554	915
205	500 TO 999	25	139	685	1,131
392	UNDER 500	38	144	730	1,040
DISTRICT TYPE					
8	MAJOR URBAN	80	200	1,610	3,627
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	112	244	1,636	3,359
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	14	117	1,614	1,501
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	56	263	1,136	738
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	58	166	984	1,276
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	5	31	225	509
266	NON-METRO STABLE	91	256	1,715	2,373
493	RURAL	43	222	1,029	1,594
WEALTH (MEDIAN=$145,390)					
104	UNDER $76,634	16	219	2,121	1,707
105	$76,634 TO $92,482	22	185	634	1,197
105	$92,483 TO $108,328	51	74	751	1,687
105	$108,329 TO $125,109	30	136	512	1,122
104	$125,110 TO $145,389	129	157	1,193	1,618
105	$145,390 TO $170,034	35	141	823	1,270
105	$170,035 TO $204,844	24	172	1,077	1,438
105	$204,845 TO $271,616	115	253	1,485	3,122
105	$271,617 TO $436,122	32	123	1,153	1,318
104	OVER $436,122	4	39	176	448
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
WEALTH (ST AVG=$186,841)					
682	UNDER $186,841	290	968	6,375	9,442
365	OVER $186,841	168	531	3,550	5,485
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP					
24	UNDER $46,305	4	98	1,281	637
54	$46,305 TO < $71,749	11	106	727	838
74	$71,749 TO < $84,206	19	143	502	1,053
132	$84,206 TO < $103,653	15	109	666	951
23	$103,653 TO < $107,069	13	21	313	1,071
94	$107,069 TO < $122,094	53	101	426	1,104
57	$122,094 TO < $133,451	96	103	738	522
44	$133,451 TO < $140,903	19	73	379	730
41	$140,903 TO < $149,956	21	28	312	624
59	$149,956 TO < $162,715	21	52	378	637
32	$162,715 TO < $172,398	14	87	353	493
39	$172.398 TO < $183,529	4	41	260	755
45	$183,529 TO < $199,613	17	109	695	472
42	$199,613 TO < $220,926	16	35	349	481
39	$220,926 TO < $241,469	8	25	271	275
1	$241,469 TO < $242,339	56	121	300	1,241
27	$242,339 TO < $262,043	13	30	486	595
39	$262,043 TO < $308,333	31	74	390	983
21	$308,333 TO < $336,062	12	47	624	492
160	$336,062 AND OVER	15	96	555	973
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$1.0454)					
261	UNDER 0.9481	93	388	2,363	4,133
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	119	470	3,396	3,237
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	108	322	2,304	3,842
262	1.1897 AND OVER	138	319	1,862	3,715
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$0.8896)					
261	UNDER 0.7663	39	362	2,747	3,111
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	148	485	2,662	4,425
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	170	345	2,686	4,034
262	OVER 1.0276	101	307	1,830	3,357
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY					
337	RESIDENTIAL	151	766	5,673	8,290
309	LAND	46	173	791	1,249
208	OIL AND GAS	20	140	738	1,098
193	BUSINESS	241	420	2,723	4,290
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
1,052	STATE TOTAL	459	1,499	9,949	14,977

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSPTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AVG	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	72	274	1,367	2,456
282	5 TO UNDER 20	72	319	1,857	2,493
118	20 TO UNDER 100	105	280	1,841	2,028
97	100 AND OVER	209	626	4,860	7,950
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	125	368	2,820	4,475
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	258	688	4,464	7,007
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	50	270	1,693	2,432
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	19	122	701	725
53	10% AND OVER	7	51	271	338
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	200	669	4,347	6,082
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	38	263	1,487	2,555
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	73	195	1,235	3,137
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	30	89	531	608
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	111	271	2,035	2,488
12	50% AND OVER	7	12	314	107
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	105	273	1,805	1,344
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	60	232	1,524	1,847
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	87	260	1,169	1,789
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	29	92	805	1,780
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	160	264	1,607	4,572
179	50% AND OVER	18	378	3,039	3,645
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	22	52	331	371
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	69	131	544	612
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	47	217	1,103	1,502
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	41	120	1,013	1,447
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	145	350	1,768	3,388
253	50% AND OVER	135	629	5,190	7,657
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	61	218	1,493	2,068
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	97	205	1,182	2,013
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	132	343	1,790	3,135
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	152	518	3,069	5,150
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	13	193	1,984	2,361
33	80% AND OVER	4	22	431	258
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	38	284	1,768	2,032
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	96	412	2,193	3,280
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	243	551	3,727	7,055
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	82	252	2,261	2,610
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=$26,840)					
263	UNDER $24,038	33	141	808	1,098
263	$24,038 TO UNDER $25,043	122	216	1,220	1,815
264	$25,043 TO UNDER $26,251	77	395	2,132	3,626
262	$26,251 AND OVER	227	747	5,789	8,438
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	153	508	2,520	3,873
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	68	239	1,251	2,196
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	119	180	1,195	2,679
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	44	93	748	1,417
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	14	205	1,806	2,037
59	50% AND OVER	61	274	2,429	2,775
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	20	167	1,775	1,730
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	70	349	1,781	3,642
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	164	361	2,124	4,273
263	33.4% AND OVER	205	622	4,269	5,332
1,052	STATE TOTAL	459	1,499	9,949	14,977

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AV	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
	ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS				
6	OVER 50,000	23	113	1,227	1,661
20	25,000 TO 49,999	31	51	1,122	1,604
45	10,000 TO 24,999	16	201	1,469	1,790
58	5,000 TO 9,999	60	247	887	878
81	3,000 TO 4,999	28	190	848	942
127	1,600 TO 2,999	106	211	885	1,041
118	1,000 TO 1,599	38	130	632	718
205	500 TO 999	21	166	704	1,104
392	UNDER 500	60	223	772	989
	DISTRICT TYPE				
8	MAJOR URBAN	30	143	1,547	1,828
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	38	112	1,082	2,194
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	21	98	1,099	1,147
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	44	206	957	555
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	62	223	867	1,055
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	17	31	188	408
266	NON-METRO STABLE	108	426	1,709	1,977
493	RURAL	63	293	1,097	1,563
	WEALTH (MEDIAN=$145,390)				
104	UNDER $76,634	48	307	1,514	1,061
105	$76,634 TO $92,482	39	160	673	725
105	$92,483 TO $108,328	44	134	1,004	1,099
105	$108,329 TO $125,109	35	130	541	998
104	$125,110 TO $145,389	48	198	1,037	1,246
105	$145,390 TO $170,034	63	93	813	915
105	$170,035 TO $204,844	21	121	797	1,186
105	$204,845 TO $271,616	54	182	957	2,029
105	$271,617 TO $436,122	30	172	995	1,001
104	OVER $436,122	1	35	189	422
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
	WEALTH (ST AVG=$186,841)				
682	UNDER $186,841	286	1,066	5,917	6,633
365	OVER $186,841	97	466	2,603	4,049
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
	WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP				
24	UNDER $46,305	15	143	892	401
54	$46,305 TO < $71,749	27	129	507	519
74	$71,749 TO < $84,206	31	139	502	567
132	$84,206 TO < $103,653	43	130	707	808
23	$103,653 TO < $107,069	13	56	538	560
94	$107,069 TO < $122,094	28	97	522	957
57	$122,094 TO < $133,451	33	145	572	605
44	$133,451 TO < $140,903	23	56	396	454
41	$140,903 TO < $149,956	13	46	265	422
59	$149,956 TO < $162,715	35	40	364	458
32	$162,715 TO < $172,398	16	42	362	333
39	$172,398 TO < $183,529	9	36	248	526
45	$183,529 TO < $199,613	2	75	438	461
42	$199,613 TO < $220,926	10	18	266	480
39	$220,926 TO < $241,469	7	69	184	255
1	$241,469 TO < $242,339	9	2	107	510
27	$242,339 TO < $262,043	30	27	247	491
39	$262,043 TO < $308,333	11	98	382	679
21	$308,333 TO < $336,062	19	80	558	381
160	$336,062 AND OVER	9	104	463	815
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
	TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$1.0454)				
261	UNDER 0.9481	75	312	1,692	2,497
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	76	425	2,915	2,553
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	114	338	1,950	3,077
262	1.1897 AND OVER	118	457	1,963	2,555
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
	M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$0.8896)				
261	UNDER 0.7663	95	356	2,165	2,059
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	88	273	2,043	3,045
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	123	389	2,254	3,354
262	OVER 1.0276	77	514	2,058	2,224
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
	SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY				
337	RESIDENTIAL	174	720	4,501	5,718
309	LAND	57	194	838	1,151
208	OIL AND GAS	47	246	676	979
193	BUSINESS	105	372	2,505	2,834
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
1,052	STATE TOTAL	383	1,532	8,546	10,727

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AV	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	74	390	1,446	2,318
282	5 TO UNDER 20	157	419	1,777	1,945
118	20 TO UNDER 100	73	325	1,382	1,656
97	100 AND OVER	79	398	3,915	4,763
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	137	512	2,971	3,051
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	170	643	3,658	5,149
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	39	239	1,172	1,751
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	19	103	511	542
53	10% AND OVER	18	35	234	234
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	179	904	3,583	4,561
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	50	186	1,308	1,979
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	93	154	1,576	2,152
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	27	104	484	474
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	30	164	1,332	1,468
12	50% AND OVER	4	20	263	93
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	104	355	1,681	1,132
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	37	179	1,053	1,337
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	72	190	951	1,497
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	35	103	591	1,490
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	70	155	1,478	3,192
179	50% AND OVER	65	550	2,792	2,079
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	12	69	309	373
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	48	190	522	472
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	44	148	884	1,288
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	79	139	835	1,038
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	83	290	1,485	2,893
253	50% AND OVER	117	696	4,511	4,663
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	37	221	965	1,449
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	93	199	1,088	1,743
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	66	250	1,500	2,712
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	143	471	2,874	3,266
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	41	343	1,815	1,332
33	80% AND OVER	3	48	312	225
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	101	222	1,514	1,480
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	67	383	1,742	2,207
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	122	566	2,990	4,948
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	93	361	2,300	2,092
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=$26,840)					
263	UNDER $24,038	67	183	824	952
263	$24,038 TO UNDER $25,043	114	251	1,243	1,484
264	$25,043 TO UNDER $26,251	94	458	1,957	2,624
262	$26,251 AND OVER	108	640	4,522	5,667
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	141	546	2,190	3,201
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	101	174	1,200	1,854
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	65	164	1,025	2,161
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	11	92	725	989
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	27	245	1,610	1,118
59	50% AND OVER	38	311	1,796	1,404
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	67	231	1,541	1,341
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	109	342	1,510	2,590
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	85	368	1,901	3,355
263	33.4% AND OVER	122	591	3,594	3,441
1,052	STATE TOTAL	383	1,532	8,546	10,727

REPORT F
T E X A S E D U C A T I O N A G E N C Y
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSPTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AV	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
	ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS				
6	OVER 50,000	157	309	1,403	3,009
20	25,000 TO 49,999	41	112	1,295	3,198
45	10,000 TO 24,999	28	170	1,508	3,611
58	5,000 TO 9,999	66	82	865	1,685
81	3,000 TD 4,999	17	67	856	1,591
127	1,600 TO 2,999	55	153	836	1,665
118	1,000 TO 1,599	20	64	500	1,163
205	500 TO 999	24	107	630	1,408
392	UNDER 500	21	102	670	1,435
	DISTRICT TYPE				
8	MAJOR URBAN	160	348	1,725	3,572
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	63	143	1,039	4,321
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	12	98	1,257	2,202
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	40	106	1,112	1,109
66	INDEPENDENT TOHN	51	69	863	1,690
61	NON-METRO FAST GROHING	5	16	162	642
266	NON-METRO STABLE	67	250	1,412	3,110
493	RURAL	31	136	993	2,119
	WEALTH (MEDIAN=$145,390)				
104	UNDER $76,634	49	220	1,824	2,205
105	$76,634 TO $92,482	18	66	662	1,429
105	$92,483 TO $108,328	54	59	853	1,824
104	$108,329 TO $125,109	19	58	379	1,515
105	$125,110 TO $145,389	58	169	1,213	2,049
105	$145,390 TO $170,034	29	68	659	1,673
105	$170,035 TO $204,844	37	86	812	2,031
105	$204,845 TO $271,616	151	361	963	3,768
105	$271,617 TO $436,122	13	71	1,065	1,631
104	OVER $436,122	1	8	123	572
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
	WEALTH (ST AVG=$186,841)				
682	UNDER $186,841	245	670	5,808	11,784
365	OVER $186,841	184	496	2,745	6,913
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
	WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP				
24	UNDER $46,305	10	110	1,213	775
54	$46,305 TO < $71,749	37	82	510	1,161
74	$71,749 TO < $84,206	16	59	513	1,252
132	$84,206 TO < $103,653	19	65	670	1,143
23	$103,653 TO < $107,069	39	25	404	1,066
94	$107,069 TO < $122,094	13	46	307	1,468
57	$122,094 TO < $133,451	16	90	780	824
44	$133,451 TO < $140,903	29	60	362	882
41	$140,903 TO < $149,956	20	39	288	701
59	$149,956 TO < $162,715	24	27	315	784
32	$162,715 TO < $172,398	15	37	255	717
39	$172,398 TO < $183,529	7	27	151	973
45	$183,529 TO < $199,613	19	56	571	775
42	$199,613 TO < $220,926	2	5	155	774
39	$220,926 TO < $241,469	15	21	131	472
1	$241,469 TO < $242,339	116	275	329	1,063
27	$242,339 TO < $262,043	12	30	243	815
39	$262,043 TO < $308,333	7	49	299	1,208
21	$308,333 TO < $336,062	6	28	678	511
160	$336,062 AND OVER	7	35	379	1,333
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
	TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$1.0454)				
261	UNDER 0.9481	192	483	2,110	4,607
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	107	267	3,043	4,257
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	55	202	1,765	5,269
262	1.1897 AND OVER	75	214	1,635	4,564
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
	M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=$0.8896)				
261	UNDER 0.7663	97	244	2,488	3,837
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	203	472	2,155	5,323
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	62	217	2,321	5,282
262	OVER 1.0276	67	233	1,589	4,255
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
	SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY				
337	RESIDENTIAL	160	449	4,568	10,788
309	LAND	19	104	770	1,645
208	OIL AND GAS	26	131	592	1,470
193	BUSINESS	224	482	2,623	4,794
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
1,052	STATE TOTAL	429	1,166	8,563	18,765

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSPTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AV	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	42	197	1,174	3,259
282	5 TO UNDER 20	88	247	1,719	3,095
118	20 TO UNDER 100	52	138	1,492	2,890
97	100 AND OVER	247	584	4,168	9,453
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	116	280	2,419	5,690
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	238	629	4,092	8.397
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	59	163	1,287	3,190
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	12	67	528	1,058
53	10% AND OVER	4	27	237	430
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	131	439	3,797	7,774
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	36	143	1,149	3,485
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	50	150	1,241	3,547
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	20	45	457	836
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	178	382	1,795	2,791
12	50% AND OVER	14	7	124	332
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	49	149	1,580	2,030
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	42	92	1,004	2,762
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	68	121	757	2,619
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	33	75	611	2,365
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	148	410	1,587	4,862
179	50% AND OVER	89	319	3,024	4,127
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	6	29	280	537
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	12	46	498	911
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	45	108	775	2,174
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	29	57	771	1,983
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	85	214	1,463	4,380
253	50% AND OVER	252	712	4,776	8,780
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	40	83	996	2,947
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	50	122	897	2,710
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	65	192	1,487	4,162
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	197	552	2,845	5,957
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	76	187	2,027	2,572
33	80% AND OVER	1	30	311	417
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	51	159	1,657	2,575
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	64	260	1,805	4,259
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	251	588	3,086	8,584
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	63	159	2,015	3,347
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=$26,840)					
263	UNDER $24,038	34	110	712	1,472
263	$24,038 TO UNDER $25,043	35	132	1,119	2,370
264	$25,043 TO UNDER $26,251	92	274	1,713	4,758
262	$26,251 AND OVER	268	650	5,019	10,165
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	87	241	2,032	5,336
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	50	139	939	3,038
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	52	125	940	3,351
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	29	77	593	1,748
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	64	121	1,623	2,488
59	50% AND OVER	147	463	2,436	2,804
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	30	136	1,733	2,157
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	106	216	1,347	4,612
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	83	282	1,769	5,486
263	33.4% AND OVER	210	532	3,714	6,510
1,052	STATE TOTAL	429	1,166	8,563	18,765

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE SCHOOL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FINANCING OPTIONS
FACILITIES FUNDING PROGRAM
A REPORT OF THE SCHOOL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Both an interim financing program (for the period prior to the completion of the inventory) and a long-term financing program should be developed.

2. Financing for both the interim and long-term programs should be through a modified guaranteed yield system, which recognizes the efforts of districts that constructed or purchased buildings from operating funds or fund balances.

3. Weighted ADA should be used in the calculation of facilities funding in order to be consistent with other funding formulas found in Senate Bill 1.

4. The committee recommends the following priorities for allocating limited state funds:

   a. Renovation or new construction projects for eligible instructional and support spaces.

   b. Portable buildings to meet emergency situations where permanent construction is inappropriate. Portable buildings must also meet state standards.

   c. Debt service on projects which are brought up to state standards, including any debt on a building prior to bringing it up to standard.

   d. Debt service on eligible projects built since 1984 which meet standards.

5. Standards for school facilities should be developed in the areas of size and space, safety, and educational appropriateness.

6. Standards should be mandatory for all instructional facilities in order to qualify for state funding.

7. Standards should be applied to existing facilities if districts wish to be eligible for financing for existing debt service. A program of grants should be established to bring existing facilities into compliance with standards.

8. An appropriate division within the Texas Education Agency should be responsible for monitoring districts and enforcing standards.

9. Additional agency staff should be hired to accommodate the workload that will be associated with increased state responsibilities for school facilities.

10. At the time that any building which was constructed with state funds is put into surplus or sold, the state should participate in the proceeds from the sale in the same proportion as it participated in construction costs.

11. Only those buildings constructed since 1984 and the passage of House Bill 72 will be eligible for funding for debt service relief.

12. Initial estimates place the annual cost of the long-term program at $350 million per year in state money. This represents a state share of 50% of costs for debt service and new construction, on average.

13. The interim and permanent debt service and capital outlay programs should be established as a part of the Foundation School Program, and any shortfall in appropriations should be subjected to the same treatment as other appropriation shortfalls in the Foundation School Program.

14. The committee recognizes that some school districts finance new facilities with fund balances rather than debt, and recommends further study of a mechanism for reimbursing these districts.

15. The committee recognizes that there needs to be a transition period as the state moves from funding the debt service tax rate as a part of the overall guaranteed yield program to funding this tax rate separately. The committee recommends additional study in the area of transition mechanisms.

FACILITIES REPORT

INTRODUCTION

At the first meeting of the School Facilities Advisory Committee, held on December 5, 1989, Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff presented the committee with a document entitled Policy Options for Financing School Facilities. This document outlined three overall approaches for financing facilities: a per capita approach, a guaranteed yield approach, and a needs based formula financing approach.

The committee has met eight times since December. At these meetings the members have discussed possible options for financing both debt service and capital outlay for school facilities. The committee recommends both an interim financing program, for the period prior to the collection of inventory data, and a long-term financing program which will use the information collected during the inventory as a basis for decision making. The committee recommends the use of a modified guaranteed yield system for financing school facilities for both the interim and long-term options. Both options recognize construction efforts made by districts through the use of debt and through the purchase of buildings out of operating funds or fund balances.

In determining the state and local shares under a guaranteed yield system, consideration should be given to local district wealth per pupil, as well as other factors. The committee recommends the use of weighted ADA in the calculation of facilities funding in order to be consistent with other funding formulas found in Senate Bill 1.

APPROACHES TO FINANCING SCHOOL FACILITIES

Initially, the committee was presented with three standard approaches to financing school facilities. These approaches followed three different general models and are presented below.

Per Capita Financing

Under a per capita financing system, funds would be provided to school districts on a per student basis, regardless of the condition of school facilities or any demonstration of district need for facilities funds. This type of financing system would simply take a total allotment for facilities and divide it among the districts based on their total number of students.

Guaranteed Yield Financing

Under a guaranteed yield system, districts would receive funds that could be used either to finance expenses for existing debt service, or to finance new construction. Unlike the per capita system, a district would only qualify for funding if it had an existing debt service tax rate or was about to engage in the construction of a new facility. Under this financing scheme, only those districts which had a demonstrated need for funds (in the form of an I&S tax rate) would be eligible for funding.

One drawback to this model of guaranteed yield is that it does not compensate districts which have taken on construction or the addition of new space without the use of debt.

Formula (Need-Based) Financing

A formula based financing scheme provides funding to districts on the basis of demonstrated need. In order to have an effective need-based funding scheme, the state will need to develop both standards for school facilities and a data base which can be used to evaluate district facilities prior to the distribution of funds. Under this sort of financing scheme, funding could be restricted to instructional space only, or be limited for non-instructional facilities.

COMMITTEE ACTION

At subsequent meetings, the members of the committee rejected the use of a per capita financing system on a number of grounds, including the argument that such a system does not discriminate between districts that need new facilities and those that do not, nor does it make allowances for variations in need or ability to pay for new construction or renovation of facilities. The two remaining approaches, the use of a guaranteed yield system, and a per project funding model, have remained topics of discussion and were presented to the committee at the May 1990 meeting.

On May 2, 1990, the committee was presented with a variety of options including guaranteed yield and per project approaches with both high and low levels of state involvement as well as a mixed approach with a moderate level of state involvement.

After considerable discussion, the committee adopted a modified guaranteed yield approach with a high level of state involvement in prioritizing projects and allocating funds. This approach also includes funding for construction financed with operating funds or fund balances. A detailed explanation of the committee's recommendations both for interim and long-term financing programs is provided in this document.

STANDARDS AND NEEDS CRITERIA

The long-term financing option presented here assumes the use of agency approved standards for school facilities. Charges to the committee include the development of standards for public school buildings. Committee discussion indicates that standards should be developed in the areas of size and space, safety, and educational appropriateness. For funding purposes, perhaps the most important among these are the size and safety standards. For the development of facilities that can be considered to be equitable, standards must be comparable across buildings in different kinds of districts.

As yet, standards have not been established. However, several recommendations have been made related to the development and application of standards. The committee has recommended that TEA establish an internal task force to examine programmatic issues related to facilities and that the work of this task force and the data collected in the inventory be used to develop state standards for educational appropriateness. In addition to the creation of facilities

standards, needs criteria and definitions for eligible costs must also be developed in order to evaluate district applications for funds and make decisions about priorities.

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

The committee has made clear its feelings that funding should be directed primarily at classroom space in the initial stages of any funding program, and that instructional space should receive preference over construction of auxiliary space or facilities to be used for extra- or co-curricular activities. As a longer term proposition, after direct instructional needs have been satisfied, and in the event that funds are available, a funding program could be constructed to reflect preferences by varying the level of state participation according to the type of facility to be constructed.

STATE INVOLVEMENT

The committee has agreed that the state must be highly involved in the decision making processes related to prioritization of projects and allocation of funds. The committee reached this recommendation based on recognition of the fact that there may be insufficient state funds available for projects in any given year, and the state is in the best position to compare all projects and place priorities on them.

The committee acknowledged that in order to make these decisions, a comprehensive data base will be necessary. It also recognized that such a data base may not be available for a period of one to two years while the inventory is underway. For the interim period, the committee suggested a financing system to deal primarily with existing debt service. The advantage of an interim system, as seen by the committee, is the ability to flow money to school districts prior to the development of an inventory. The committee does not feel that an effective and accurate inventory can be developed in an artificially short timeframe.

REVIEW CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

Districts should be required to submit information about each building in a proposed project to confirm compliance with state requirements and standards. The review process should provide a vehicle for prioritization of projects and determinations of the appropriate allocations to districts for each project.

Discussions with the School Facilities Planning Division in the state of California provide a basis for estimating the amount of staff and time that will be required to review applications for funding. California employs seven professional staff people to work with districts in developing and evaluating building plans. On average, projects take approximately two days to review, and the office reviews 400 - 500 projects per year. With roughly the same number of school districts in Texas, it is estimated that approximately 400 applications per year can be expected in the proposed facilities financing program. The committee also recommends additional agency staff in order to accommodate the workload that will be associated with increased state responsibilities for facilities.

FINANCING PROGRAMS

The following pages provide details concerning both an interim financing scheme and a proposal for the long-term financing of school facilities. They are intended to form the basis of a policy designed to address the requirements put forth by the legislature in Senate Bill 1019, 71st Regular Session.

Both the interim and long-term programs should operate on a modified guaranteed yield basis, providing funds to districts to offset the costs of existing debt service as well as to provide financing for new construction.

In the aggregate, interest on existing debt accounts for a much greater portion of overall spending than do payments on new debt, at least in the initial years of the program. A significant portion of the funding for a long-term financing plan will be directed at relieving debt burdens. However, for any given district, new debt may be the only debt. The interim financing program should recognize both existing debt and any newly acquired debt a district may have.

The committee has also agreed that at the time that any building which was constructed with state funds is put into surplus or sold, the state should participate in the proceeds from the sale in the same proportion as it participated in construction costs. Any funds returned to the state from the sale of buildings should revert back to the facilities program fund.

INTERIM FINANCING (TWO YEAR MAXIMUM TIMEFRAME)

In the interim period, which will occur prior to the completion of an inventory of school facilities and the availability of data about the conditions of existing buildings, the committee feels that there should be some form of financing for facilities in response to both the court decision in Edgewood v. Kirby and actions taken by the legislature. Because the only data available in this time period will concern existing debt service, only limited evaluation of new projects will be possible for this program.

The use of the guaranteed yield mechanism to distribute funds for debt service will recognize both district need, in the form of property value per student, and effort, in the form of the debt service tax rate, to provide an equitable distribution of funds to districts with existing debt service. Funding provided to districts during the interim period will result in a direct decrease in the debt burden of the district, thereby lowering the district's debt service tax rate. The committee also advocates the use of some funds to provide reimbursement to districts that purchased or constructed additional classroom space with operating funds.

The amount of funding that will be available for this program has yet to be determined. However, the figure of $100 million has been suggested by the Governor's Select Committee, the State Board of Education, and the School Facilities Advisory Committee as a potential target for the first year of a temporary program. The committee recommends that debt eligible for financing under this program must have been incurred since the passage of House Bill 72 in 1984.

This program is separate from, and in addition to the Public School Facilities Development Grants provided for in Senate Bill 1. No appropriation has been made for either the grant program or for the interim program proposed here.

LONG-TERM FINANCING

A long-term financing system for capital outlay (facilities and eligible equipment) and debt service, which evaluates projects and establishes priorities, necessitates an inventory. This financing program should address both existing district debt (since 1984) and new construction. The committee also recommends that construction financed out of tax-generated operating funds be eligible for reimbursement.

The committee recommends that only those projects undertaken since 1984 (and the passage of House Bill 72) be eligible for funding for debt service relief. The committee also recommends that projects eligible for funding under this program must have voter approval prior to the initiation of the application process. The committee recognizes that prior agency approval of a project may make it easier to pass a bond election to finance the project, however, there are lingering concerns about approving a project and committing funds to that project without voter approval.

Initial estimates indicate that the annual cost of the program will be approximately $350 million. This estimate is based on $1 billion in debt issued annually between 1984 and 1990 for a total of $6 billion. Debt service payments are estimated at $600 million per year for payment of interest and principal. If the state is to share in the costs of debt issued since 1984 at a rate of 50% statewide, the state cost for debt service will be approximately $300 million. Similarly, the cost of servicing $1 billion in new debt each year will be approximately $100 million, half of which will be cost to the state.

In 1985 and 1986 many districts refinanced their debt at lower rates of interest to lower their costs. Including all refinanced debt, outstanding debt (principal only) in 1989 was approximately $6.9 billion.

As debt incurred prior to 1990 is retired, the ratio of "old" debt to "new" debt will shift towards debt accrued since the start of the financing program, but if the amount of debt issued each year remains stable, the cost of the program should remain fairly constant as well.

LONG-TERM ALLOCATION PRIORITIES

The committee recommends that both debt service on existing buildings and funding for new construction should be eligible for allocations under the proposed school facilities funding program. The committee also recommends that in order to be eligible for funding, a proposed building must meet all state standards, and any existing building for which a debt service subsidy is sought must either meet standards at the time of application, or be brought up to standard in order to be eligible to participate in the state program.

FUNDING EXAMPLE

Hopeful ISD has had a small but steady building program for the past several years to meet the mandates of House Bill 72. Currently, Hopeful has $8.6 million in outstanding debt, with annual debt service payments of $831,372.

Hopeful ISD needs a new elementary school. After consulting with architects and engineers and developing plans for a new school, the assistant superintendent for business has presented the board with his estimate of the cost of the new building: $4 million.

Hopeful is a district with 2,200 students and a property value per student of $175,000. The total cost for the building, financed over 20 years at an annual interest rate of 7.5% is $8,097,054, making Hopeful's annual cost for the new building $404,853.

Hopeful ISD submits its building plan to the Texas Education Agency noting that the new facility is needed both to accommodate growth in its elementary population and the maximum class size requirement in grades kindergarten through 4.

Upon receipt of the Hopeful plan, TEA staff determine whether Hopeful's project is eligible for funding. Because Hopeful's wealth is below state average, and because the facility consists of classroom and other instructional space, staff determines this to be a fundable project.

For purposes of illustration, comparison levels of wealth and state share are included in the funding examples for each option.

WHAT HAPPENS TO HOPEFUL

Interim Program

Prior to the introduction of the interim facilities financing program, Hopeful needed a debt service tax rate of $0.2519 per $100 of assessed valuation in order to meet its obligations on $8.6 million in debt. Under a guaranteed yield program in which the guaranteed tax base is $400,000 per pupil, Hopeful will receive $467,647 in state aid, and can reduce its I&S tax rate to $0.0945 per $100 of assessed valuation . Even with a partial guarantee against a maximum tax rate of $0.04 per $100 of assessed valuation for state aid, Hopeful would receive $198,000 in state aid and could reduce its I&S tax rate to $0.1645 per $100 of assessed valuation.

Long-Term Program

After making the appropriate decisions at the district level, Hopeful submits its plan for the new elementary school to TEA. TEA staff make a determination that Hopeful is in compliance with all state required standards for a new elementary school and is therefore eligible for maximum state funding for this project.

The guaranteed yield tax rate required to raise the necessary revenue for this building is .0460 based on a guaranteed yield wealth level of $400,000 per pupil. At this tax rate, Hopeful can raise $177,123 annually. The annual

cost of the building is $227,730 more than Hopeful can raise against its own tax base, and this result is the state share. The state share amounts to $103.51 per pupil.

Without a state contribution, Hopeful would need a tax rate of $0.1052 per $100 of assessed valuation to raise enough revenue to meet the obligations of this new building.

APPENDIX D

FACILITIES COST ESTIMATES

REPLACE SPACE RATED BELOW FAIR

ESTIMATED COST: ***$895 million***

ASSUMPTIONS:

Statewide, 14,920,426 square feet of space received a rating of below fair or poor when evaluated by the professional staff performing the inventory. Space that was rated below average is defined as "moderately deteriorated, requiring partial replacement" and space that was rated poor is defined as "highly deteriorated, requiring total replacement". Because it is impossible to know the degree to which the space rated below average would require replacement, all space receiving this rating was included in the estimate. In some cases, problems might be alleviated through remodeling or additions, however in other cases replacement will be necessary.

Replacement was estimated to cost $60 per square foot. A $60 per square foot construction cost will allow a district to build a facility with an average quality of finish and will allow for reasonable site and design work. This estimate does not allow for the building to be equipped with special features or for extensive site work to take place. This estimate does not reflect variations in construction cost across the state.

PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE IN OVERCROWDED DISTRICTS

ESTIMATED COST: ***$126 million***

ASSUMPTIONS:

Statewide, there is a need for 2.5 million additional square feet of space to relieve overcrowded classrooms. This estimate was developed at a campus level by dividing total classroom space by enrollment to determine a classroom utilization rate. Overcrowding was considered to occur when the utilization rate indicated less than 36 square feet per student in the elementary grades and 28 square feet per student in the secondary grades.

To develop the square footage requirements, the number of overcrowded classrooms was multiplied by the recommended size of the room. The number of elementary classrooms was multiplied by 750 square feet per room. Recommended rooms sizes are 800 square feet per room for grades pre-kindergarten to 2, and 700 square feet for grades 3-6. For secondary schools, the number of classrooms was multiplied by 700 square feet.

Replacement was estimated to cost $60 per square foot.

ADD SCIENCE LABS TO HIGH SCHOOLS WITHOUT LABS OR BRING LABS UP TO A MINIMUM LEVEL

ESTIMATED COST: ***$31 million***

ASSUMPTIONS:

There are 281 high schools across the state without science labs. Assuming that each school requires at least one science lab, the number of schools without labs was multiplied by 1,440 square feet per lab. $60 per square foot was used to estimate the cost of constructing the labs.

To calculate the number of science labs requiring improvements, a count was taken of the number of labs without either emergency showers, exhaust fans, sinks, or gas jets. Costs were calculated based on an estimate for adding the necessary equipment to the labs as follows:

Add showers at $3,000 per room.
Add exhaust fans at $5,000 per room.
Add sinks at $750 per room.
Add gas jets at $1,500 per room.

There are some instance in which districts are successfully using a regular classroom as a science lab, through the use of self-contained Bunsen burners, as opposed to gas jets for example. Also, while all science labs should be equipped with a sink and exhaust fan, only a chemistry lab might require a safety shower or gas jets. Therefore, these estimates are approximate.

PROVIDE GYMNASIUMS TO SCHOOLS WITH INSUFFICIENT SPACE

ESTIMATED COST: ***$988 million***

ASSUMPTIONS:

There are 694 campuses across the state without gymnasiums. There are an additional 3,139 campuses with insufficient gym space to meet their needs. Insufficient space was calculated by subtracting the amount of gym space on a campus from the amount of gym space recommended for a campus at that grade level. For elementary campuses, 4,000 square feet is recommended. At the secondary level, 6,000 square feet is recommended for junior high and middle schools and 8,000 is recommended for high schools. To develop these estimates, 7,000 square feet was used as the recommended size for a secondary school gymnasium.

The total square footage necessary to provide adequate gym space in all schools which were lacking a gym or had insufficient gym space is 16 million square feet. This estimate, which provides for only one gym for each campus without one, is probably low, particularly for the secondary schools, which generally have both a girls and a boys facility.

The cost estimate was generated using a construction cost of $60 per square foot for both new construction and additions.

PROVIDE LIBRARIES TO SCHOOLS WITH INSUFFICIENT SPACE

ESTIMATED COST: ***$621 million***

ASSUMPTIONS:

There are 482 campuses across the state without libraries. There are an additional 4,041 campuses with insufficient library space to meet their needs. Insufficient space was calculated by subtracting the amount of library space on a campus from the amount of library space recommended for a campus at that grade level. For elementary campuses, 2000 square feet is recommended, and at the secondary level, 6,000 square feet is recommended.

The cost estimate was generated using a construction cost of $60 per square foot for both new construction and additions.

REPLACE EXCESS PORTABLE SPACE WITH PERMANENT SPACE

ESTIMATED COST: ***$197 million***

ASSUMPTIONS:

Across the state there are 997 campuses with more than 20 percent of their classroom space in portable buildings. To reduce the amount of portable space in these districts to no more than 20 percent would require the replacement of 3.3 million square feet at a cost of $60 per square foot.

To eliminate all portable space would require the replacement of 15.3 million square feet at a cost of $922 million using a $60 per square foot cost.