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The problem of this study was to determine the impact of the Regional Education Service Centers on the public school superintendency in Texas and the desired future development of the centers. The sources of data included a review of literature, a meeting with all Regional Education Service Center executive directors, discussions with selected superintendents of schools, and a review of Texas Education Agency records. The survey technique, using a jury-validated questionnaire, was also used to collect data on the impact of the Education Service Centers on the public school superintendent in a stratified, random sample of superintendents in Texas public schools.

The study was developed around ten questions concerning the Regional Education Service Centers and the impact of their operation on the public school superintendency. The items on the questionnaire were designed to elicit information in such a manner as to sequentially answer the questions for the study.

The introduction and the statement of the problem and purposes were presented in Chapter I, the review of
literature and supplemental data in Chapter II, the collection of data in Chapter III, the findings in Chapter IV, and the summary, conclusions, and recommendations in Chapter V.

The findings of the study support the position of the Texas Education Agency that the Regional Education Service Centers are service agencies and not regulatory. This definition of the centers was agreed upon by over 89 percent of the sample respondents. A majority of the sample superintendents reported a positive attitude toward the Education Service Center and the impact it has been on their position as chief administrator in the local school district.

Conclusions

The Education Service Center in Texas is a well established service unit functioning at a level between the Texas Education Agency and the local school district. The local school districts in Texas are participating in Education Service Center activities at an increasing rate each year. The public school superintendent is influenced by the Education Service Center activities and personnel in determining the content of in-service programs for the local school district staff. The time and effort expended by school personnel serving on Service Center committees are justified. The services provided by the Education Service Center have enabled the superintendent to meet his administrative responsibilities more effectively. The Education Service
Center has encouraged innovations in school administration. The Education Service Center affects the functioning of the superintendent in all areas of administration dealing with instructional services to pupils and teachers. The Education Service Center has not extended state control further into the local school district. The public school superintendents included in this study in Texas have a positive attitude toward the Education Service Center. The Education Service Center has maintained the intended role of being a service unit in the state educational family.

Recommendations

The Education Service Center should (1) continue to be a service unit only, (2) develop some standard evaluation to determine the effectiveness of each center, (3) have foundation funding for basic operation, (4) more strongly emphasize research and development, (5) make research and other information available to each of the other centers through an organized communication system, (6) include a component dealing directly with administrative problems of superintendents of schools, (7) benefit from a study of the changes that occurred in the Texas Education Agency as a result of the establishment of the centers, and (8) concentrate on providing more services directly to local school district students, teachers, and administrators.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Education Service Center is a regional institution designed to assist school districts with cooperative efforts which may range from long term planning to short term problems. There are twenty Education Service Centers located throughout Texas. They are the newest members of the state's educational family (14, p. 95).

These centers function as intermediate units between the local district and the Texas Education Agency, and as a result the position of superintendent of schools has felt the impact of this change more than any of the educational family.

Educational administration is one of the most complex activities in today's society. It has been pointed out that the minimum factors involved in dealing with problems in educational administration is upward of 4,500, with a more likely estimate of 50,000. Also that there is a high degree of interdependence and interaction among the classes of factors and the conclusion is that the school or school system as an administered entity is complicated (4, p. 95).
The advent of the Education Service Centers solved some problems, yet, in many ways the role of the superintendent of schools became more complex as a result. The semi-official status of the Education Service Centers has created many questions in the minds of school administrators and as a result the impact has varied from school district to school district.

Basically, the factor motivating the establishment of the Education Service Centers was a promise to the school children of Texas—a promise that calls for a program based on the best ideas drawn from the university and public school experimental programs across the nation and adapted to classroom teaching in every area of Texas. More important, the aim is to give every school, urban and rural, and every child, regardless of background, the chance and nudge necessary to achieve full potential (14, p. 4).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the impact of the Regional Education Service Centers on the public school superintendency in Texas and the desired future development of the centers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of the Education Service Centers on the public school superintendency in Texas and the desired future development of the Centers.
The study has involved a survey of the different aspects of the operation of the Education Service Centers in relationship to the following: (a) number of schools receiving services from the centers, (b) the extension or withdrawal of state control at the local level, (c) problems related to the administration of a school system as a result of the operation of the centers, (d) the extent of assistance provided by the centers, and (e) the future development of the Education Service Centers.

An analysis has been made of data accumulated in the process of planning and implementing the Education Service Centers. Minutes of representative centers were studied along with reports made by the centers to the Texas Education Agency. In the process of analysis particular attention was given to the matter of changing emphasis in the efforts of the Education Service Centers.

Questions for Which Answers Were Sought

To carry out the purpose of this study, the following questions were formulated:

I. What percentage of the selected local school districts participate in some service provided by the Education Service Centers?

II. Have Education Service Centers assisted and/or influenced in-service education for local school district personnel?
III. Are local school district personnel needed on Education Service Center study and advisory committees and groups to determine and evaluate service needs?

IV. Has the operation of the Education Service Centers enabled the superintendent to meet his administrative responsibilities more effectively in areas of planning and decision making?

V. How have the Education Service Centers encouraged innovations in school administration?

VI. Has participation in Education Service Center programs required additional resources?

VII. In what areas of school administration are the Education Service Centers most affecting the functioning of the superintendent of schools in Texas?

VIII. Has the operation of the Education Service Centers affected the autonomy of the local school district?

IX. What are the attitudes of public school superintendents concerning the effect of the operation of the Education Service Center on the superintendency?

X. What services should the Education Service Centers provide the public schools and what relationship should be developed for the future relative to the centers and the public school superintendency?

Background and Significance of the Study

The Texas Regional Education Service Centers have been in operation four years as of July 1, 1971. Enough time has
elapsed for the centers to become fully established in the educational family of the state. As a result, this seems an appropriate time to study the degree and scope of the impact the Education Service Centers have had on the functions of the superintendent of schools.

Many questions have been raised concerning the effects of an intermediate educational unit in relationship to the overall administration of the public schools. Morphet and Johns pointed out that there is almost certain to be at least some further realignment of state and local responsibilities during coming years (9, p. 282). It is, therefore, very important that the implications of such shifts in power be carefully thought through so wise decisions may be made.

The Education Service Centers fit into the scheme of things in some fashion. The nature of the role given to this intermediate unit determines the impact it will have on school administration in general and the superintendency specifically. One of the first steps would be to decide on the criteria that should be used in determining responsibilities reserved for the state, for the intermediate unit, and those that should be assigned to the local school district. There are many facets to the criteria needed to make the decisions concerning the assignment of responsibilities in administering the schools. One element of the criteria would necessarily be the influence it would have on
the chief administrator's position in the local school district.

Thus, it is apparent that the paramount need is the determination of the effect the present role of the Education Service Centers has been on the superintendency in the state of Texas.

McClure reports that in some instances, intermediate organization was resisted as an unwanted arm of the state. In others, the intermediate unit was considered at times as a protector of the local district against unwanted state-level control. But in all instances, the intermediate unit, when established, was created by state action and was a political subdivision of the state and organized in part to assist in carrying out the state's educational function (8, p. 3).

Changes in society, new and different demands upon educational systems require educators to consider and develop new ways of restructuring aspects of school organization to provide more effective and efficient educational programing (2). There are multiple forces that provide impetus for changes; however, the problem of how best to organize to provide socially responsive and educationally sound systems to help insure quality education in a mass, technologically oriented society still remains.

The complexities of the problem are faced by both urban and rural. The multiplicity of agencies in urban areas
emphasizes the need for coordination and for the organization of new and larger structures for educational governance to provide more effective utilization of other related community resources and organizations (7). Yet, there is pressure for accountability, decentralization, and "local" control. Inadequate financing and small pupil population are forcing rural school districts to organize to obtain or share services which alone they cannot provide. Though this is necessary, there is still real pressure to remain independent and unique to a community (2).

Until recently, the predominantly used alternative to these problems has been consolidation. However, the intermediate unit or the Regional Education Service Center are seen by many educators and political scientists as an alternative and, in many instances, a superior solution to consolidation (9, p. 286).

The development of some type of multidistrict or multicounty intermediate service agency as an integral part of a state's formal education structure is a movement that has been increasing in strength since the early 1960's. The demise of the old office of county superintendent and the growth of some other form of intermediate or middle echelon organization has had a tremendous impact on the public school superintendent in the states where this has occurred (6).
In Texas, however, the State Education Agency emphasizes that the Education Service Centers are not intermediate administrative units. The service centers were created as independent agencies to provide services in a more efficient and effective way than was previously possible (12). The centers have been protected from regulatory functions. The Texas Attorney General has ruled that Education Service Centers are local education agencies and are eligible to receive various forms of state and federal assistance.

Participation in the Texas Education Service Centers by local school districts is voluntary. The Texas Education Agency does, however, channel various funds through the Education Service Centers and provides incentives for cooperative efforts in some cases.

Burbank surmises that the changing times are fast casting the school superintendent in new, strange, and sometimes uncomfortable roles in the school organization. If he is to survive as an individual in his work he must learn how to cope with these new forces (1, p. 23). The Education Service Center in Texas is one of the new forces the superintendent of schools has had to cope with. The interaction resulting from this situation and its effects on the superintendency is of vital importance to the educational atmosphere of Texas.

The review of literature has revealed no other studies of this aspect of the Education Service Center and the superintendency. In addition to the review of literature,
personal contacts were made with key Texas Education Agency personnel, Education Service Center staff members, and public school superintendents to determine the general attitude toward this type of study. The feelings expressed were unanimous. It was agreed that a study of the Education Service Centers and their relationship to the superintendency in Texas is most appropriate at this time.

The importance of the superintendent's attitude, function, and effectiveness in relationship to the Education Service Center and the original intent in the establishment of these intermediate units and the effect this will have on education in Texas in the future prompted the interest for this study.

Definition of Terms

Education Service Center: The Education Service Center is a regional institution designed to assist local school districts in making ideas, services, information, and teaching materials available to them. The state of Texas is divided into twenty regions, with one Education Service Center serving each. The Texas Education Agency emphasizes that the centers are service units only with no regulatory or enforcement responsibilities or authority.

Superintendent: The chief administrator in a local school system.
Intermediate unit: The intermediate unit is a unit of school administration functioning at the level between the local district and the State Department of Education and is predominantly an administrative unit which functions in a regulatory capacity.

Limitations
This study was limited to determining the purpose of Regional Education Service Centers in Texas and analyzing the impact on the superintendency in Texas schools and the desired future development of the centers.

Basic Assumptions
It was assumed that the utilization of stratified random samples of different-sized school districts in the twenty regions would be generally representative of public schools in the state of Texas.

It was assumed that four years is sufficient time to establish programs of service and patterns of administration in the Education Service Centers and the local school districts.

Procedures for Collection of Data
A review of literature and a study of the original materials derived from the actual planning of the Education Service Centers in Texas was utilized to develop an understanding of the function of the public school superintendent and the Education Service Center. A meeting was held with
the twenty executive directors of the Education Service Centers. A summary of this investigation was presented and suggestions were solicited from the executive directors. Questions were answered and the executive directors were asked to assist in gaining a good return from the forthcoming survey questionnaire. The executive directors agreed to provide a letter of endorsement on each of the Education Service Center letterheads. The letter of endorsement from the Education Service Center in which the selected school was located was placed in the envelope along with the survey questionnaire.

The survey of the impact of the Education Service Centers on the public school superintendency should provide qualified evidence as to the changes brought about by this arrangement. Data were gathered on the number of schools participating, the effect on local autonomy, the direct effect on the superintendent, assistance in planning and decision making, and desired future development of the Education Service Centers.

The Survey Instrument

The survey questionnaire was constructed to elicit the opinions of practicing superintendents in school districts of varying sizes as to the impact the operation of the Education Service Centers have had on their position. The questionnaire along with instructions was submitted to seven
persons currently serving as a superintendent of schools in Texas and also, serving as an executive committee member of the Texas Association of School Administrators. These served as an advisory panel. The members of this panel were selected on the basis of their experience and leadership in the field of educational administration. The knowledge and judgment of this group were utilized to determine the scope, content, and clarity of the wording of the instrument.

The instrument was then submitted to a jury panel of five members. The jury panel membership was composed of individuals from the same source and with similar qualifications to the advisory panel. Approval by three members of the jury panel was considered sufficient to include the item in the final instrument. It was felt that the advice and counsel of the two panels insured a more reliable and valid instrument and study. (See Appendix A for sample of initial questions.)

A stratified random sampling technique was utilized to determine the school districts to be selected for the study. This method was used to assure appropriate representation of the different sized school districts. The public school districts were divided into six categories based on the information found in the Texas Education Agency Annual Statistical Report for the school year 1968-69. This report was the latest available which included the needed information.
The report lists all public schools alphabetically by number of Average Daily Attendance. The groups set up for this study were as follows: Group I, over 10,000 A.D.A.; Group II, 5,000 to 9,999 A.D.A.; Group III, 1,500 to 4,999 A.D.A.; Group IV, 1,000 to 1,499 A.D.A.; Group V, 500 to 999 A.D.A.; Group VI, 499 or less A.D.A. This grouping assured a more balanced sample in terms of school size. In order to provide a manageable sample, a 16 per cent sample was drawn from each category utilizing a table of random numbers. A return of 67 per cent of the survey questionnaires was considered adequate to provide the data for the study.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The data obtained from the questionnaires and that found in the Texas Education Agency materials were compiled and reported in tables. The grouping utilized in drawing the samples was also used in reporting the results in the tables. The percentages of answers were recorded for each by school categories. The data from the Texas Education Agency materials were summarized in tables relating to the information section of the instrument.

Conclusions and recommendations were drawn from data collected from the survey instrument, review of literature, meeting with Education Service Center executive directors, and Texas Education Agency materials.
Summary

Chapter I introduced the study, stating the problem, the purpose of the study, the questions to which answers were sought, background and significance of the study, the definition of terms, limitations, basic assumptions, procedures for collection of data, development of the survey instrument, and procedures for analysis of data.

A study of literature and supplemental information related to the intermediate and service unit of school administration, the development and characteristics of the public school superintendency and the establishment of the Education Service Centers in Texas are presented in Chapter II. The details of the procedures taken in completing the study are reported in Chapter III. An analysis of the data gathered by the use of the questionnaire prepared for this study is presented in Chapter IV. A summary of the study, conclusions, and the recommendations based upon this investigation are given in Chapter V.
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CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND
SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

The review of literature and supplemental data was undertaken to provide an understanding of the historical development of educational intermediate and service units. A basic understanding of this problem was essential prior to the development of the instrument for surveying the impact of Education Service Centers on the public school superintendency in selected public schools in Texas. This review of literature was also undertaken to provide an understanding of the historical development of the school superintendency and the recognized responsibilities and characteristics of the effective superintendent. A third purpose for the review of literature and supplemental data was to trace the development and operation of the Education Service Centers in Texas.

The materials reviewed included books, unpublished dissertations, journal articles, government reports, professional organization reports, Texas Education Agency records and reports.

The review of literature is presented in the following organizational sequence: (1) the historical background of
educational intermediate and service units, (2) the historical background of the development of the school superintendency, and (3) the development and operation of the Education Service Centers in Texas.

The Historical Background of Educational Intermediate and Service Units

Beem and James describe the intermediate unit of school administration as the office or agency in an intermediate position between the state department of education and local school districts (5, p. 2). Twenty-seven of the fifty states have some form of an intermediate unit (19). In most states, mainly in the Midwest and West, the intermediate unit of school administration is often coterminous with the county; however, there are several states where the intermediate unit boundaries include several counties and school districts. The remaining twenty-three states have no intermediate unit of school administration (19).

In many states the county superintendent's office is described as the intermediate unit of school administration (61, p. 15). This description is correct if the county is not a single school district. The office of the county superintendent was the beginning of the first intermediate unit. The office was originally created to assist state educational officials in operating the early elementary schools. The county superintendent was created by legislation and/or
constitutional provision in the different states to improve the educational opportunities of children (21, p. 34).

In the beginning of the development of public schools, the most logical geographical and legal unit for the administration of schools and other functions of government was the county. County school offices were thought to be the most suitable administrative unit for assisting the state education agencies, and the county superintendent became the intermediary between the state department of education and the local school district (1, p. 1).

During the early years of the development of public school education, there was a real need for a professional school official with some familiarity with conditions as they existed in the many small local school districts. The small districts especially needed a regional educational official to coordinate and enforce state regulations. The structuring of such an agency followed existing county lines in many states. However, even before the county superintendent's office became an intermediate unit, the township in some midwestern states was serving this function (23, p. 276).

In Michigan the territorial laws of 1827 and 1829 provided for township officials who would have some jurisdiction over schools and who were required to divide the township into school districts. Thus, the township became the first intermediate unit in Michigan (5, p. 2).
The Michigan constitution of 1835 abolished the township officials and provided only for local officials to supervise the schools (5, p. 3). Apparently this arrangement was not satisfactory for in 1837 a law was passed creating school inspectors for each of the townships. In 1867, Michigan provided for an elective office of county superintendent of schools. This plan was repealed in 1875, and the plan of township inspectors was re-established. In 1891, the plan of having a chief county school officer was re-established under the title of the county commissioner of education (5). From 1829 to 1891 there was a constant controversy to determine whether the county or the township was to become the intermediate unit of school administration in Michigan.

During this period of time, there was much reluctance to relinquish any control at the township level to the larger unit, the county. This controversy was finally ended in Wayne County, Michigan in 1937 when board members of local school districts were authorized to select a county board of education. That board in turn was to select a county superintendent of schools. This plan was made uniform for the state in 1947 (5).

In contrast to the development of the intermediate unit of school administration in Michigan, Texas developed a similar type of unit by different means. According to a published Texas Education Agency bulletin, the intermediate
The school code of 1876 made the first provision for an intermediate office in Texas, providing that county judges act as ex-officio county school superintendents. An act passed by the Texas Legislature in 1887 provided for the creation of the office of county superintendent. The office could be established in any county in the State "when in the judgement of the County Commissioner's Court it was advisable." This act provided for the election of some person of educational attainments, good moral character and executive ability, a qualified voter of the county and the holder of a first grade teacher's certificate.

Many Commissioners' Courts did not establish the office in their counties since the Legislative Act of 1887 was entirely permissive. In 1907, a more positive act was passed. It required that a county superintendent be elected in all counties in which the number of scholastics exceeded 2,000. By the school year 1918-19, county superintendents were serving in 140 counties of the State.

Through the years, the statute of 1907 has remained the basic law upon which the office of the county superintendent rests. From time to time changes have been made but most of them have been minor, having to do with such things as salary, length of term, and certain administrative duties.

In general the duties of the county superintendent can be divided into four categories: first, those duties that are clerical and statistical, such as preparation of the school census, apportioning of county funds and transferring scholastics; second, those duties in which he serves as administrative officer for common school districts and independent school districts under 150 scholastics; third, those duties in which he serves as professional advisor and executive secretary to the county board; fourth, those duties that pertain to educational leadership in his county, such as supervision of matters pertaining to public education, and the professional leadership that he must exercise in advancing the general school program of the State as defined by the Legislature, the State Board of Education and the State Commissioner of Education (61, pp. 15-16).
The powers and duties of the county superintendent remained relatively the same from 1931 to 1949. In 1949 the legislative act known as the Gilmer-Aiken Foundation School Program was passed and added a number of responsibilities to the county superintendent (61, p. 18). The 1949 acts gave the county superintendent several responsibilities in connection with the administration of the Minimum Foundation Program. These additional duties in order of their inclusion in the Act as reported in a Texas Education Agency bulletin are:

1. The approval of the transfer for one year of the entire scholastic enrollment of a school district, both white and colored, to a contiguous district.

2. The recommendation and supervision of special service teachers employed under cooperative agreements among school districts. The county superintendent shall also certify such cooperative agreements to the State Commissioner of Education.

3. The approval of exceptional children teacher units under cooperative agreements and the certification of these to the State Commissioner of Education.

4. The recommendation and supervision of supervisors and/or counselors employed under cooperative agreement among school districts. The certification of these agreements to the State Commissioner of Education.

5. In conjunction with the County School Board, and subject to the approval of the State Commissioner of Education, the setting up of the most economical pupil transportation system for the county.

6. Jointly with the County School Board, the approval of all scholastic transfers having any effect upon pupil transportation.

7. The approval of the requisitions of local school boards for the purchase of buses, tires and tubes (61, p. 19).
In addition to the above listed duties and responsibilities of the county intermediate unit there are sixty-nine other separate responsibilities and/or duties designated by law (61, pp. 56-57).

Presently, in the state of Texas, the county superintendents' office is diminishing in number. Multiple forces have had a pronounced effect upon the office of the county superintendent in recent years. These forces are composed of such things as the diminishing number of common school districts, the migration of rural population to urban centers, federal aid programs requiring new cooperative arrangements, changing state laws, the changing economy, new educational demands, and advances in transportation and communication (46).

Michigan and Texas developed intermediate units of educational administration that were coterminous with the county. New York was one of the earliest states to develop such an intermediate unit (19). A description of the development of the intermediate unit in New York state will provide another perspective of the historical development of the agencies.

Hoyt pointed out that in New York state the law established a body known as the town commission as early as 1795. This town commission was to apportion state school money among the several school districts of the town, to confer with district trustees about the qualifications of teachers,
and to exercise some supervision over the total school system. This law was strengthened in 1812. Two years later, the commissioners began to serve more as a policy board and employed inspectors to carry out their administrative duties (39, p. 3).

Stewart and others state that the town commissioners arrangement continued without alteration until 1841. At this point in time, the New York State Legislature passed a law providing for a deputy superintendent, apparently deputy to the state superintendent. The deputy was to be appointed by an elected county board of supervisors (63, p. 4). Half of the deputy superintendent's salary was to be paid from state funds, an arrangement giving an indication of extending state control. In 1843 the town commissioners and town inspectors were eliminated and a town superintendent was created (63, p. 5). From 1843 to 1856 the town superintendent and the deputy superintendent operated at the county level, which actually served as an intermediate unit (63, p. 6). In 1856 the town superintendent was eliminated and an elected county superintendency was established encompassing almost all the duties of the town superintendency (63, p. 7). This arrangement remained in effect for more than fifty years.

In a report published by the Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo, the development of the present-day intermediate unit in New York State began in 1910. In 1910 the elected county superintendent
was abolished and supervisory districts, each comprised of a number of towns, were established. Initially there were 208 supervisory districts. Each had a district board of school directors which selected the superintendent of schools. Even with this arrangement, the superintendent seemed to be directly responsible to the state commissioner of education (7).

Stewart and others indicate that the supervisory district arrangement continued until 1948. In 1948 the New York Legislature authorized local school boards to form Boards of Cooperative Educational Services as a corporate body extension of local districts and subject to their control (63, p. 13). The Boards of Cooperative Educational Services were established pending the creation of intermediate districts. However, they seemed to work so effectively that the intermediate districts were never formed (63, p. 14).

The expressed purpose of the Boards of Cooperative Educational Services organization was to provide shared programs and services, particularly in rural areas where limited resources often restrict depth and breadth of offerings in individual school districts (7, p. 1).

According to a handbook published by the New York State Education Department, the Boards of Cooperative Educational Services are required to share services which cannot be rendered singly by the local district. However, these
services should not replace currently operating sound programs. Services should be those which can meet standards to justify expenditures. Shared personnel cannot be provided to one district for more than 60 per cent of their time. Shared services should not hinder reorganization efforts. Services are approved on a one-year basis only. Sparse population, distance, and other factors are considered in determining specific services. Teachers are subject to the same certification requirements as local district personnel and may not be employed by the cooperative and school district at the same time (52, pp. 7-8).

As reported in a recent study by the Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo, each Board of Cooperative Educational Service is an area public education agency created by order of the New York State Commissioner of Education on petition by local boards of education. Except for administrative costs, Boards of Cooperative Educational Service activities are not imposed upon local districts but are the direct result of local districts' requests. Programs are supported by contract costs paid to Boards of Cooperative Educational Services by local districts. The Boards of Cooperative Educational Services also receive state aid for most of their programs (7).

The New York State Education Department's "Handbook on Boards of Cooperative Services" outlines the major duties
and/or responsibilities of the Boards of Cooperative Educational Services as

(1) appoint superintendents, (2) prepare budgets to operate educational programs, (3) furnish upon request part-time educational services to districts too small to employ full-time teachers, (4) make available services to supplement local staff, (5) determine needs by survey and research projects, (6) introduce new programs to fill these established needs, (7) operate vocational-technical education programs, (8) work with physically handicapped and mentally retarded children, (9) improve lines of communication, and (10) provide supervisory service responsibility to the supervisory district program (52, p. 6).

Bones reviewed the development of the intermediate unit in ten states (8). The summary description of the development of the intermediate unit in the three states presented on the preceding pages generally provides the same background as found by Bones in his review of the ten states.

Morphet, Johns, and Reller explain that the continued existence of inadequate school districts, the apparent impossibility of eliminating all of them in the near future, and the development of new problems have seemed to make at least the temporary continuation of some kind of intermediate unit essential in many states (49, p. 276). Cooper and Fitzwater basically agree with this concept when they state that there has been a growing recognition of education as a state function and the need for a workable number of intermediate offices to facilitate communication between the state and a great number of local school districts (15, p. 108).
Heeding emphasized that the intermediate unit should be an important source of supplemental service and that these services should be expanded to include the technical and specialized services needed in local school districts (34). In support of this view Holowach found in his study that local educational agencies will work to maximize the amount of services and support obtainable from an intermediate unit (38).

A statement found in a publication of the San Diego County Department of Education points out the need for an intermediate unit and emphasizes the services that should be rendered. It is stated in this manner:

In California, education is a function of the state, which establishes general requirements and basic financial support. Immediate responsibility for operating the schools rests with the local school district. Between the state and local levels is the intermediate unit of educational service, in this area the Department of Education, San Diego County. The Department provides leadership and coordination for improvement of educational programs in all the school districts within the county. In addition, it contributes to regional and statewide efforts. Accomplishment of these goals often entails coordination activities of other educational institutions--colleges, universities, research centers--and business, industry, and public agencies (58, p. 1).

Morphet, Johns, and Reller summarize by stating that in several states there is a tendency to encourage intermediate units to assume the responsibility for providing the professional services needed to help make possible equality of educational opportunity for children in all districts of the
state. The implementation of such a concept will require a sound plan, adequate financial support, and very competent professional personnel who can work well with all types of school districts. The emphasis should always be on service, not on control. The general policies and plan need to be developed cooperatively by the districts and the intermediate unit leaving to each district the functions and responsibilities that can best be carried out by the district (49, pp. 278-279).

Cooper and Fitzwater examined the evolution of the intermediate unit over 150 years of American history, and their conclusions are:

1. There has been a growing recognition of education as a state function and the need for a workable number of intermediate offices to facilitate communication between the state and a great number of local school districts.
2. In the early stages the intermediate unit was seen essentially as an extension of the arm of the state department of education.
3. Over the years, there has been a gradual transfer of the functions of the intermediate office from a lay board to a professional or semi-professional officer.
4. Progress toward making the intermediate office more than a perfunctory one has been slow for people resisted any encroachments upon their exercise of control of education at the local district level.
5. In recent years, the intermediate unit has come to be viewed by many people as an agency to provide to small local school districts services which they cannot ordinarily provide for themselves (15, pp. 108-109).

Morphet, Johns, and Reller predict that there is almost certain to be at least some further realignment of state and
local responsibilities during the years in the near future. They further point out that it is important that the implications of such shifts in power be carefully thought through so wise decisions may be made (49, p. 282).

The Historical Background of the School Superintendency

The public school has had a different role in the United States from that found in other countries. The public school has served as an agent of social change and mobility. It has been the major contributor to the building of the American society (27, p. v).

Over a century ago when the nation began a rapid economic expansion, the public schools also were caught up in a wave of change and rapid growth. As society went about redefining its goals, the public school system also found it necessary to do so (26, p. 6).

Gilland describes the conditions of education in the early years of this country when he points out that there were no superintendents of schools at the time of the adoption of the federal Constitution (26, p. 6). In fact, he states that it was in 1837 before a superintendent of schools was appointed, with Louisville, Kentucky being the first city to have a superintendent (26, p. 15).

As cities grew in population the school enrollments increased so rapidly that the lay boards of education, who had administered the schools in the past, found the job too big
to handle (26, p. 8). Administering the schools became a complex and cumbersome affair when schools grew to the point of having ten or more teachers (26, p. 31). It is doubtful if any private enterprise which expended as much money as was annually expended by the public school systems at that time could have continued to function with the type of organization that was used in the schools (26, p. 25).

Early in the history of local school systems it became apparent that if education was to keep pace with needs of society, responsibility for leadership would have to be established (9, p. 4). Since lay boards were not able to provide this leadership and teachers were too heavily involved with teaching, a position unique among educational administrators in the nations of the world was created—the office of the public school superintendency (17, p. 9).

Campbell commented on the creation of the office of superintendent of schools by pointing out that during our early history school management was a function performed by lay citizens (12, p. 9). He stated further that with the growth of cities and the merger of school districts within cities, the problems of school administration became too demanding for part-time, lay school board members and this led to the creation of the office of superintendent of schools (12, p. 10). Burbank brings out the fact that the professional status of the superintendent of schools has evolved through several phases in fairly quick succession
Cubberly points out that the first superintendents had little if any qualifications beyond teaching experience and possible service as a principal (17, p. 70).

In the review of literature it was found that the development of the public school superintendency took place in several different stages. The number of developmental stages varied from three to five. However, Daniel E. Griffiths' classification of the stages of development were the most common classification used by the different writers. Griffiths identified the development of the superintendency in three distinct stages. He set the first period from 1837-1910, the second period from 1910-1945, and the third from 1945 to the present (27, p. vii).

According to Balliot the first period in which the superintendent of schools entered began rather slowly (4, p. 483). Callahan declared that the superintendent of schools became clearly identifiable as a force in American education about the time the Civil War ended in 1865 (10, p. 2). Corey noted that the year 1865 saw the founding of the superintendent's national association, today called the American Association of School Administrators (51, p. 8). Gilland stated that in 1865 there were fewer than fifty superintendents of schools (26, pp. 15-16). Griffiths related that during this first period of development the chief school administrators saw themselves, and others saw them, as scholarly educational leaders and, depending on the
man, to some extent as philosophers (27, p. 2). Seeley explained more specifically that chief school administrators saw themselves as students of education and as teachers of teachers and as educational leaders in the community (60, p. 260). He noted also that when they talked about the job, as they frequently did in journals and in professional meetings, they generally stressed the educational position and not the business or public relations position, although there were some men who, even in those early years, argued that the superintendent needed to give attention to the business and public relations side in order to survive (60, pp. 261-262).

Callahan reports that in the early years and indeed until 1900, the most prominent superintendent was William Torrey Harris (10, p. 7). Callahan noted that Harris' training was in the classical tradition at Yale (10, p. 156). Harris illustrates very well the image the superintendent had during the initial stage of development. He wrote and spoke on a wide variety of topics from art to philosophy to elementary education. This was a man who was widely acclaimed as a leader in philosophy as well as education.

Harris saw the task of the superintendent as follows:

The efficient superintendent sets into working order three educative influences to support the one great work of education in the school system: namely, an educative influence in wise measures and correct insight, for the members of the school board; second, an educative influence resulting in insight
into methods, and a growth in personal self-control, and besides these a culture in literature and art and science, for the teachers; thirdly, for the community, an enlightened public opinion which knows what the schools are actually doing and can intelligently explain merits and defects, and tell what changes are desirable for onward progress (31, p. 172).

Harris' description of the task of the superintendent of schools illustrates the common concept of this position during the first period of development. Thomas M. Balliot was another prominent educator who wrote about the conception of the superintendency. Balliot was superintendent of schools in Springfield, Massachusetts for many years. These were his views in 1891:

As it is the first business of the lawyer to know law, and of the physician to know medicine, so it will soon be recognized that the first business of the superintendent of schools and of the principal of a normal school is to know that which he is supposed to direct or teach—education.

He ought to be above all things else a teacher of pedagogics, a teacher of teachers. The superintendent ought to be the educational advisor of the board and his counsel ought to command the same respect on their part as that of the city solicitor on a question of law, or that of the city physician on a question of sanitation or public health.

The superintendent ought also to make it his duty to fashion and shape the educational thought of the community.

It is quite true that in many communities the superintendent must take an active interest in the matter of school house architecture, in the management of financial affairs of the schools, and in various other matters important to the schools; but he is never justified in allowing his time and strength to be absorbed in these directions to the extent of rendering it impossible for him to either carefully study
educational questions or teach his teachers pedagogics (4, pp. 483-484).

Harris and Balliot were contemporaries and published the above statements within a three-month period of time. Thus, the support each of the views provides the other, emphasizes the strength of this concept of the school superintendency during its first period of development.

Griffiths notes that as the first period in the development of the school superintendency reached its climax, a number of obvious trends were developing. Foremost among the trends was the changing self-image of the superintendent. Some of the pressures causing the changes were the social conditions, business ideology becoming dominant, and national efforts to make the curriculum more practical (27, p. 16).

Callahan describes a marked change in the way superintendents viewed themselves at the end of the first period of development as compared to the view in earlier years (10, p. 3). He also pointed out that American schools, because of the nature of their pattern of organization, support and control, were especially vulnerable and responded quickly to the strongest social forces (10, p. 1). Callahan reports that the strongest force of the period was industrialism (10, p. 2). Griffith supports this view when he notes that the early superintendent held the self-image of the scholar and his twentieth-century counterpart embraced the image of
the businessman as he took on more and more responsibility for fiscal management (27, p. 17).

The school superintendency was well established during the 1837-1910 period of development. The responsibilities expanded from instruction and advising the board of education to a position of executive officer of the board with broad responsibilities stretching across the spectrum of school activities (51, pp. 9-10).

The second period of development beginning in 1910 and ending in 1945 saw the manager superintendent emerge (1, p. 3). Superintendents were fascinated with the techniques of mass production and with the organizational structure of large corporate enterprises. This led school superintendents to apply the same techniques to education (1, p. 3). Callahan agrees that the second period began with the increased popularity of the business ideology and the great reform movement (10, p. 5).

It seems that by 1910 the prestige of business and the businessman was in the ascendancy and most Americans were urging that business methods be applied to the operation of public schools. Callahan summarized his study of the superintendency by saying,
So I was not really surprised to find business ideas and practices being used in education. What was unexpected was the extent, not only of the power of the business-industrial groups, but of the strength of the business ideology in the American culture on the one hand and the extreme weakness and vulnerability of schoolmen, especially superintendents, on the other. I had expected more professional autonomy and I was completely unprepared for the extent and degree of capitulation by administrators to whatever demands were made upon them. I was surprised and then dismayed to learn how many decisions they made or were forced to make, not on educational grounds, but as a means of appeasing their critics in order to maintain their positions in the schools (10, pp. i-ii).

Griffiths describes the platoon system as one illustration of the public schools adhering to business and industrial management techniques (27, p. 23). Callahan's description of the platoon system shows how the plan varied markedly from tradition. He notes that instead of assigning each child to a desk in a classroom, the auditorium, shops, gymnasiums, laboratories, and playgrounds were integral parts of the school plant. Half of the children could use the latter facilities and therefore there would be need for only half as many classroom spaces. Callahan concludes that this plan became known as the platoon system since the children would move from teaching station to teaching station. This plan of organization was used in all grades (10, pp. 129-130).

Books and journal articles were widely published on the subject of the platoon system. This can be easily understood because this system offered advantages of sorts to
children and at the same time saved money. The platoon system provided the opportunity for the study of nature, art, music, and industrial education which fit in very well with the growing Dewey progressive education movement. Add this factor to the growing urbanization of the American society, and the resultant increase of school enrollment and classroom needs made the platoon a natural.

Callahan states the reasons he believes the system was successful:

The reasons for the success and extensive growth of the platoon school are not hard to determine. Most important was the financial saving which was possible through its use; of importance also was the argument that the plan provided an enriched educational program for the children. Clearly this combination was hard to beat. The Gary School Plan was also presented by some educators as being an example of the application of scientific management to education. This claim gave it the halo effect of that magic name, identifying its users with the ultimate in efficiency. Its success was also due to the fact that it provided an answer to the problem of the shortage of classrooms—a problem which resulted from the increasing school population and one which was particularly acute after World War I. Finally, the platoon school was pictured as requiring exceptional administrative ability. Consequently its adoption not only enabled administrators to economize and defend themselves against the charge of inefficiency, it also enabled them to prove their administrative ability at the same time (10, p. 130).

Griffiths states that concurrently with the introduction of the platoon school came an increasing emphasis on the preparation of records, reports, and cost accounting (27, p. 26). It seems that most superintendents were
notorious for the lack of an adequate system or method of record keeping. Therefore, it was imperative, according to business ideology, that a uniform system of accounting be developed for the nation's schools. Burbank indicates that this movement gave rise to more annual superintendents' reports (9, p. 26).

However, even with the push for superintendents to become business manager types, much of the public and many within the profession had a somewhat different view of the superintendent of schools. In 1916 Cubberley described the superintendent as a heroic, almost superhuman, figure. He felt that the superintendency is the office up to which and down which authority, direction, and inspiration flow. He is the organizer and director of the work of the schools in all their different phases. Cubberley goes on to say that the superintendent is the executive officer of the school board, and also its eyes, ears, and brains. He is the supervisor of the instruction in the schools and also the leader, advisor, and friend of the teachers (17, p. 132).

As the second period of the development of the superintendency continued, other change became noticeable. Hack states that the inherent values of education are derived from the total society. He continues by noting that education has a relative, though constantly changing, significance assigned to it. He emphasizes that in a given setting at a given time education might be assigned only the responsibility
of passing on the cultural heritage, whereas in another era it might be given the monumental task of creating a new social order (29, p. 370).

According to Griffiths the self-image of the superintendent as a businessman reached its maximum about 1930. He felt that around 1930 several mediating forces caused change. Griffiths describes how the public became disenchanted with business leadership as the Great Depression gathered momentum (27, p. 31). Moehlman set 1930 as the time when education really came under the influence of a democratic ideology. He goes on to point out that there was an unusual emphasis placed upon the need for democratization of the administrative activity of the schools and the need for the return to the older principle of increasing community participation in educational problems and processes (47, p. 309).

An illustration of the democratic ideology is found in a summary of Benjamin's concept of the duties and responsibilities of a superintendent of schools. His beliefs are summarized as follows:

1. Since men live and work and play in communities, large and small, all education must be carried on for community purposes, even when seemingly most individualistic in its effects.

2. Particular communities and groups of cooperating communities should determine themselves how they want their ways changed, and that as a community educational leader,
the superintendent should inform them, inspire them, and lead them to make this determination wisely.

3. The educational administrator in any community must be concerned with the total community pattern of changing human ways and that he must not confine himself to schools alone in attempting to improve education.

4. The one best administrative system is the system of cooperative learning—not directing teachers and learners, but working with them toward commonly held goals, not telling the community of educational goals and procedures, but deciding with the community what goals should be employed.

5. In the furtherance of these principles the superintendent should pledge his skills, his energy, and his ambition to the end that his people will come to the place where they can order all their own ways for their own benefit and change all their own ways for attainment of all their own goals (6, pp. 25-26).

Another discussion of what democracy meant operationally is found in Koopman, Miel, and Misner's book Democracy in School Administration. A summary of what these authors suggested as the basic principles of democratic administration were as follows:

1. To facilitate the continuous growth of individual and social personalities by providing all persons with opportunities to participate actively in all enterprises that concern them.
2. To recognize that leadership is a function of every individual, and to encourage the exercise of leadership by each person in accordance with his interests, needs, and abilities.

3. To provide means by which persons can plan together, share their experiences, and cooperatively evaluate their achievements.

4. To place the responsibility for making decisions that effect the individuals.

5. To achieve flexibility of organization to the end that necessary total enterprise with the group rather than with one or a few adjustments can readily be made (42).

Griffiths emphasizes that although the introduction of democracy as an ideology had some effect on superintendents, it is not possible to say that it did mediate the strong thrust towards the businessman stereotype (27, p. 32).

The third period in the development of the superintendency begins as World War II ends. This period has been defined as a time of transition. Callahan outlines several factors concerning school administration which were relevant in the development of the school superintendency at this point in time. He points out that there were more than 100,000 school districts in the United States at the close of World War II. However, the district reorganization movement was well underway and the number of school districts were decreasing rapidly. Callahan continues by noting that
by 1961 the number of school districts had dropped to 37,153 and the trend continued downward. He stated that this trend has caused an increase in large school districts and the resultant demand for more well-trained administrators (10, p. 253).

Morphet, Johns, and Reller agree that by 1954 the concept of the superintendent as a democratic educational statesman was disappearing. They noted that the new educational leader was expected to contribute and even lead in the development of the democratic way of life but would do this more as an applied social scientist than as an educational statesman. Morphet, Johns, and Reller go on to say that the superintendent would be a person who understood human beings and organizations, and he would use this understanding to keep the organization running effectively (48, p. 86).

The thirtieth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators in support of the above conclusion stated that superintendents of schools are learning to work more democratically with classroom teachers, principals, and other staff members, so that the whole profession of teaching is sharing increasingly in the many and varied obligations of school management (1, p. 5).

In the period after 1954, the approach to educational administration and leadership was more realistic and less idealistic. Burbank points out that the stress was placed
upon analyzing educational leadership or finding out what it was rather than what it should be (9, p. 5). Morphet, Johns, and Reller stated that leadership is defined in terms of leader behavior. And his behavior was seen as effective if the person was getting the job done and if he was maintaining the solidarity of the group (48, p. 86).

In this development there were two major groups approaching agreement on the kind of person the superintendent should be and the kind of training he needed. One group was a relatively small but increasingly influential group of professors of educational administration. This group organized on a national basis in 1947 and called themselves the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (27, p. 36). The other group was the American Association of School Administrators who represented superintendents in the field.

Griffiths lists several factors which contributed to the change and while all these factors influenced both the professors and the superintendents, they did so in varying degrees and for different reasons (27, p. 41). One important reason was a dissatisfaction with the notion of "democratic administration" (25, p. 11). In the beginning, this discontent was not expressed forcibly. It was difficult to oppose anything connected with democracy. Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell indicate that in later years the complaints were expressed openly until by 1962 it was clear that the concept
had run its course (25, p. 13). Most leaders in public school administration would have agreed with the statement about democratic administration made by Andrew Halpin in 1958.

Halpin said,

You will note that this description of leadership omits any reference to "democratic" leadership. This is deliberate, for the notion of "democratic" leadership, as this idea has been applied in education, has degenerated into an empty slogan and has immobilized more leaders than it has liberated.

Yet we repeatedly encounter superintendents who fear to take a stand who hesitate to initiate structure, lest they be accused of being anti-democratic. This is nonsense, for the superintendents who adopt this attitude eventually lose the respect of their staffs; teachers can quickly spot the phony who tries to hide his own ineptness in the soggy oatmeal of a pseudo group-process (30, pp. 2-3).

Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell point out that another factor in the change of the concept of the superintendency closely related to the demise of the democratic process was the rapid development of the social sciences during and after World War II (25, pp. 8-20). This development had resulted in a massive accumulation of knowledge and a good part of it was devoted to an analysis of organizations and to the administrative process. Fortunately for school administrators this knowledge was available just when they needed it. The preview of literature shows that the job of the superintendent was becoming more and more demanding as the American people expected more of their schools. One
leader in the field, Daniel Davies, made an analysis of the situation in the fall of 1951. Discussing the increasing complexity of the job, especially when the schools came under attack, he concluded that the job was impossible, but if it was to be managed at all, more knowledge was needed. He stated that so much of what we do is opportunistic response to the emergency of the moment or copied from other organizational fields such as the military, business, and industry. Davies felt that any good physical scientist has his theory or theories to guide him in research and decision making but the administrators are still, comparatively, operating at the alchemist stage (18, p. 12).

Fortunately, the knowledge developed by the social scientist was made available and some of the leaders among the professors of educational administration were eagerly applying it to their field, and leaders among the superintendents were hopeful that this knowledge would enable them to cope more adequately with their difficult and complex job.

Griffiths described another major factor involved in the change in educational administration as being the work of the Kellogg Foundation. He points out that between 1950 and 1960 the Foundation spent more than seven million dollars on research and development in educational administration. Most of the expenditures were in the form of grants to eight major universities (27, pp. 35-36). Miller states that as a result of the Kellogg grants establishing the Cooperative
Programs in Educational Administration, money was made available for faculty teaching and research, for graduate fellowships, for teaching materials, and for the support of experimental programs (45, pp. 545-546). For the first time at a few universities a small number of professors of educational administration had the resources to really study their problems.

Miller describes two things that happened when this occurred. One, they became aware of the studies that had been carried out in the social sciences which were applicable to their field and two, they became aware of their own deficiencies in knowledge and in training. He adds that the universities began with Kellogg money, to bring outstanding social scientists onto their faculties. Miller concluded that with these sharp critical minds applied to the field the democratic conception was doomed and for the first time educational administrators had solid research studies to enable them to improve their practice (45, pp. 550-551).

Another major factor contributing to the change in the conception of the superintendency as noted by Callahan, was the resurgence of criticism which hit the schools between 1950 and 1954. He emphasized that this development had much greater impact upon administrators in the field than it did on professors of educational administration (10, pp. 252-253). In this development there occurred a reenactment of the 1912-13 pattern of criticism and response. As has been
pointed out previously, because of the legal and institutional structure in education, school superintendents are extremely vulnerable to pressure. Callahan stated that this vulnerability is always present and is a continuous operating factor in accounting for developments in public education (10, p. 7).

The authors of the 1952 yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators described the situation thusly:

School superintendents never appeared more expendable than at this mid-century. Dismissals and forced resignations were paralleled by an almost equal number of physical break-downs, sometimes fatal. Dismissals in large population centers received extensive news coverage; those in small communities were less widely reported. That superintendents served as hazardously in rural districts and in small population centers as in large seemed true on the basis of general observation (1, p. 62).

Campbell, Cunningham, McPhee, and Nystrand discuss some of the causes of the upsurge of criticism in the early 1950's. They felt that it was a combination of the societal hysteria produced by McCarthyism, the financial difficulty caused by increasing enrollment, and the demand for expanded educational services (12, pp. 214). These same authors comment on the impact of social science on educational administration. They point out that the impact is graphically illustrated in present-day literature (12, p. 215).

The authors of a bulletin of the American Association of School Administrators entitled The Education of a School...
Superintendent confirms the social scientist concept of the present-day school superintendent. They note that the school superintendency is vitally related to the culture of the community, the state, and the nation. Every issue and change has implications for administrative policy and practices and constitutes a challenge to the superintendent's insight and understanding of cultural affairs. The authors conclude with the thought that the dynamic quality, the soundness, and the effectiveness of school administration in serving the pupils, the teachers, and citizenry depend in large measure upon the superintendent's understanding of the culture of the times (2, p. 7).

The personal characteristics of the present-day superintendent is an area of vital interest. A summary of Sachs' list of characteristics follows:

1. A good superintendent has personal insight—he is able to understand and evaluate his own point of view.

2. A good superintendent encourages the expression and exchange of ideas—he can make it possible for others to express themselves as well as indicate their point of view.

3. A good superintendent has insights into individuals and society—he is able to understand and to express empathy with others who may disagree with him.

4. A good superintendent has creative ability—he is able also to release the creative energies of other people.
5. A good superintendent integrates various points of view—he can utilize the ideas of his staff and successfully translate them into a plan of action (57, p. 388).

The conception of today's superintendent of schools is that of the social scientist and perhaps, as Griffiths points out, a return to the philosopher-superintendent of the nineteenth century (27, p. 41).

The Development of Education Service Centers in Texas

Texas established twenty Regional Education Service Centers as a result of the authorization of the Fifty-ninth Legislature in 1965 (36). The legislature authorized the establishment of state-supported regional media centers (4, p. 1). In April of the same year this legislation was passed, Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, one part of which, Title III, provided for planning and developing supplementary educational centers and services (64, p. 1). As a result of the addition of this authorization, the definition of the Regional Education Service Center was broadened to include provisions for a broad range of supplementary services.

The State Plan for the Establishment of Education Service Centers Including Regional Education Media Centers published by the Texas Education Agency listed the services to be provided the local school districts as follows:
1.1 Regional educational planning to meet immediate and long-range educational needs of the region and as a part of state-wide planning.

1.2 Educational Services as established by planning and by the needs and desires in the region.

1.3 Media services as mandates by Article 2654-3d, Vernon Civil Statutes, including,

1.3-1 Basic Media services:
   1.3-1.1 A materials lending library containing 16 and 8 mm motion picture or improvements thereof with provision for processing and servicing, 35 mm slides or improvements thereof, filmstrips, remedial and enrichment programmed instructional materials, and disc recordings.
   1.3-1.2 Visual duplication service to reproduce transparencies, slides, filmstrips, and charts or improvements thereof.
   1.3-1.3 A magnetic tape duplication service for audio and video tape.
   1.3-1.4 A delivery and dissemination system for materials and service.
   1.3-1.5 Professional leadership training services to the districts for coordination of media and curriculum.
   1.3-1.6 Acquisition and utilization of materials that will be coordinated with the curriculum of local school districts.

1.3-2 Optional media services, which may include but are not limited to the following:
   1.3-2.1 Equipment repair service with local school districts paying for such service.
   1.3-2.2 Evaluate services of new equipment, materials, and techniques.
   1.3-2.3 Graphics staff to produce transparency masters, charts, and/or to render other services (66, pp. 1-2).
The Texas Education Agency, which administers the state's responsibility for Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, early decided that coordination between these centers and services and the Regional Media Centers established by the Texas legislature would strengthen services and make them more available to all schools. In addition, this coordination would provide the machinery, the Education Service Centers, facilitating the involvement of all schools, regardless of size, in educational planning for the state (64, p. 2).

Prior to the decision of the Texas Education Agency concerning the establishment of the Education Service Centers, the Office of Planning in the Texas Education Agency conducted an in-depth study of the feasibility of providing services on a regional basis. This study included the relationships of Title III, the State Department of Education, higher education institutions, regional laboratories, and research and development centers (65, p. 2).

Therefore, the establishment of the Education Service Centers became an integral part of the state education planning machinery. The State Board of Education gave final approval to the state plan for the establishment of the Education Service Centers in March of 1967 (65, p. 4).

The State Plan for the Establishment of Education Service Centers Including Regional Education Media Centers included provisions of organization as follows:
1. Each local school district in Texas, through its board of trustees, was asked to select a representative to the Joint Committee for the region, the first planning group involved in the development of the centers.

2. Members of the Education Service Center Board of Directors were to be elected by the Joint Committee and the members of the Board of Directors were to be lay citizens (66, pp. 7-9).

Strong emphasis was placed upon planning the program of each Education Service Center in terms of local district needs. Consequently, there is great variation among the twenty regions (64, p. 5). Basically, the Education Service Centers were designed as regional institutions to assist school districts with cooperative efforts which could range from long term planning to short term problems (68, p. 4). The operation of the Education Service Centers were keyed to one objective. However, the objective has several components. The components are designed to make quality ideas, services, information, and teaching materials available to local schools whenever and wherever they are needed and desired (68, p. 4).

There are three sources of funding for the Education Service Centers. The sources of funds are the local school districts, state, and federal government (68, p. 11). Each of the projects within the centers have a different blend of funding.
Participation in the services of the Education Service Center by local school districts is strictly voluntary (68, p. 11). The center has no administrative control over school districts in its area. It is there to offer services which may never have been available or within reach of the local school district. The school district may participate in all services the center has to offer, or only those it may receive without charge. The local school may choose not to participate at all (67, p. 8).

The Texas Education Agency places strong emphasis on the fact that the Education Service Centers are not intermediate administrative units but are concerned with providing services for the local school district and not to the local district (64, p. 8). There is an extreme emphasis on comprehensive educational planning in establishing priorities, goals, and plans of action. Independently each Education Service Center listed educational personnel development as one of its greatest needs, and therefore, the state has set this as its number one priority (64, p. 19).

In 1968 the Governor's Committee on Public School Education recommended several sweeping changes which would affect the Regional Education Service Centers. One of the recommendations suggested the phasing out of county school administration. The committee pointed out that the county school boards and superintendents should be phased out as incumbents complete their present terms of office. The
remaining functions of such county administrations should be transferred to independent school districts and the Texas Education Agency (62, p. 30). Following this recommendation, the Governor's Committee on Public School Education addressed themselves to the Regional Education Service Centers. The committee recommended replacing the twenty Education Service Centers with a smaller number of regional branch offices of the Texas Education Agency, each serving a minimum of 100,000 students (62, p. 30). The recommendation included the statement that the branch offices should absorb existing services and personnel so far as practical which were available in the existing Education Service Centers (62, p. 30).

The Governor's Committee noted that many of the administrative functions and consultative services now provided by the Texas Education Agency from its Austin office could be offered more effectively from regional offices on a decentralized basis (62, p. 30).

The Texas Education Agency continues to emphasize the service aspect of the Education Service Centers, while such groups as the Governor's Committee on Public School Education persist in promoting the idea of changing the concept to that of a regional branch office of the Texas Education Agency. There are advantages to both concepts and only the future will reveal the direction selected by the people of Texas.
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CHAPTER III

COLLECTION OF DATA

The problem of this study was to determine the impact of the Regional Education Service Centers on the superintendency in Texas and the desired future development of this relationship. The following procedures were designed to obtain appropriate data: (1) a comprehensive review of literature and supplemental data, (2) selection of an advisory panel, (3) construction of the initial survey questionnaire, (4) selection of a jury panel, (5) validation of the initial questionnaire, (6) construction of the final questionnaire, (7) selection of the stratified, random sample of schools, and (8) administration of the final questionnaire.

Comprehensive Review of Literature and Supplemental Data

The review of literature and supplemental data was undertaken to provide an understanding of the historical development of educational intermediate and service units and the public school superintendency. Another purpose for the review of literature and supplemental data was to trace the development and operation of the Education Service Centers in Texas. A basic understanding of these areas of
concern was essential prior to the development of the instrument for surveying the impact of Education Service Centers on the public school superintendency in selected public schools in Texas.

Selection of the Advisory Panel

In order to develop a questionnaire that would be reliable and valid, an advisory panel of seven members was selected from the twenty-four officers and executive committee members of the Texas Association of School Administrators. These educators represent a cross-section of school administrators in Texas. The executive committee is composed of a member from each of the twenty Texas State Teachers Association districts whose boundaries coincide with those of the Education Service Centers.

The advisory panel (Appendix B) was selected and described as follows: (1) a superintendent of schools in a consolidated school district of some 2,600 students with varied experience in the area of coordinating education services among schools and working with Education Service Centers, with a master's degree; (2) a superintendent of a county seat school system of some 10,000 students and varied background of educational administrative experience, with a Doctor of Education degree from a Texas university; (3) a superintendent of a suburban school district with approximately 5,200 students, a financial base of about $62,000.00
tax value behind each student, experienced as an educational administrator and statesman, with a master's degree; (4) a superintendent of a suburban school district of approximately 23,000 students, with tenure of about twenty-five years during the time the school district was growing from some 1,500 students to the present size, with broad experience in meeting the needs of various sized schools, and having a master's degree; (5) a superintendent of a West Texas county seat school system of some 3,700 students, comprehensive experience as a school administrator and innovator in the area of needed school services, with a master's degree; (6) an assistant superintendent in charge of personnel in a county seat school system of approximately 15,000 students, experienced in allocating personnel to provide desired services, with a master's degree; (7) a superintendent of a school system of about 850 students with varied experience in several administrative roles during his career, having experience in meeting the particular needs of the smaller school districts, with a master's degree.

The service rendered by the advisory panel was to clarify wording and interpretation of questions on the initial questionnaire and to recommend deletion or addition of questions concerning the study. Each of the selected members were contacted and provided an explanation of what their role would be and were asked to serve on the advisory panel. Each person contacted agreed to serve.
Developing the Initial Questionnaire

A review of literature, a review of Regional Education Service Center Consolidated Applications, minutes of the board of directors for three Education Service Centers, and consultation with Education Service Center Executive Directors, public school superintendents, and Texas Education Agency staff members preceded the development of the questions for the initial questionnaire. Twenty multiple choice questions (Appendix A) were developed to provide specific data upon which to base answers to the several questions indicated in the purpose of this study.

The initial questionnaire and appropriate sections of the study proposal were mailed to each panel member. They were requested to study the material and prepare written recommendations and return the information in an enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. The advisory panel members responded according to instructions and the information was returned within eight days.

The written recommendations were studied and one item was added in the preliminary data section of the questionnaire. This addition resulted from a suggestion of one of the panel members concerning the fact that distance from the Education Service Center could be a factor in the impact it had on the superintendency. A number of suggestions were made and incorporated into the questionnaire concerning the clarification of some questions. Each panel member felt
that the sequence of the questions was appropriate and the questionnaire comprehensive enough to gain the data needed to conduct the study. This procedure resulted in retaining the original twenty questions with six minor modifications and the addition of an information blank in the first section of the instrument (Appendix E).

Selection of the Jury Panel

The seventeen remaining members from the list of the officers and executive committee members of the Texas Association of School Administrators were considered for the jury panel. Each of the selected jury panel members was a veteran school administrator with background experiences especially qualifying him to serve in this capacity. The five members (Appendix F) selected were (1) the president of the Texas Association of School Administrators and superintendent of a school system of approximately 2,400 students with many years of service as a school administrator; (2) the vice president of the Texas Association of School Administrators and superintendent of a school system of some 4,000 students, also having many years of experience as a school administrator, with a master's degree; (3) the immediate past president of the Texas Association of School Administrators and superintendent of a school system of over 3,000 students, accumulating many years of service in the field of educational administration, with a Doctor of Education degree from a Texas university; (4) a superintendent of a school
system of about 2,500 students, experienced in the area of coordinating services outside the school district, having several years of experience as a school administrator, with a master's degree; (5) a superintendent of a school system of about 3,000 students, who served on the advisory council for an Education Service Center, has many years of service as a school administrator, and has a master's degree.

Each selected prospective jury panel member was called by telephone and requested to participate in validating the questionnaire. His role in approving or disapproving the items on the questionnaire was explained. Each agreed to participate and return the information within a week after receipt of the mailed material.

Validation of the Initial Questionnaire

The initial questionnaire of twenty items was sent to the jury panel to complete the procedure for validating the individual items. A copy of the questionnaire (Appendix G), accompanied by a letter of instruction (Appendix H), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope was mailed to the members of the panel. The individual jury member was to determine whether each item would provide appropriate information and if the item were clearly stated. A column was provided in the left margin of the questionnaire to allow for the validity response. Letters "A," "B," and "C" were typed in the margin preceding each item number. The members of the
jury panel were asked to indicate their decision by circling the "A" if the question was clearly stated and appropriate. If the jury member was undecided on an item, he was to circle the "B." If the item was unclear and inappropriate to the study, the jury member was asked to circle the "C."

A space was provided at the end of the questionnaire for the jury member to make his suggestions for additions or corrections. The jury members were requested to certify the acceptance of the questionnaire as printed or with noted exceptions. It was decided that approval of an item by three of the five members of the jury panel would justify inclusion in the final questionnaire.

Construction of the Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire was constructed based on the responses of the jury panel. The panel gave unanimous approval to seventeen of the twenty items and the other three items were approved by four of the members. As a result of this procedure, all items were ruled valid and included in the final questionnaire. The jury panel suggested no changes. Therefore the questionnaire was prepared for mailing.

The questions were typed on four legal length pages, photographed, and reduced in size to enable the printing to be done on standard eight-and-one-half-inch by eleven-inch paper. These were printed by offset press on a single-fold, four-page leaflet. A light blue paper stock was selected
to give the questionnaire a distinctive appearance which would make it readily identifiable. This questionnaire was used to survey a randomly selected sample equal to 16 percent of the public school superintendents in the school systems of Texas.

Selection of the Stratified, Random Sample

Part I of the 1968-69 Texas Education Agency Annual Statistical Report was used to develop the list of public schools in Texas as needed for this study (2, pp. 1-21). This list is compiled by the Texas Education Agency using the Superintendent's Annual Report as the source for their information. The schools are grouped by average daily attendance and schools are listed alphabetically in each group. This bulletin was the latest published statistical report available.

The schools were listed in twelve different groups based on the average daily attendance. These group sizes were Group I, over 50,000 A.D.A.; Group II, 10,000 to 49,999 A.D.A.; Group III, 5,000 to 9,999 A.D.A.; Group IV, 1,500 to 4,999 A.D.A.; Group V, 1,000 to 1,499 A.D.A.; Group VI, 500 to 999 A.D.A.; Group VII, 300 to 499 A.D.A.; Group VIII, 200 to 299 A.D.A.; Group IX, 100 to 199 A.D.A.; Group X, 50 to 99 A.D.A.; Group XI, 25 to 49 A.D.A.; and Group XII, 24 or less A.D.A. In order to reduce the groups to a more manageable number, Groups I and II and Groups VII
through XII were combined to bring the total number of groups to six. The revised group sizes were Group I, more than 10,000 A.D.A.; Group II, 5,000 to 9,999 A.D.A.; Group III, 1,500 to 4,999 A.D.A.; Group IV, 1,000 to 1,499 A.D.A.; Group V, 500 to 999 A.D.A.; and Group VI, 499 or fewer A.D.A. This grouping assured a more balanced sample in terms of school size. A 16 per cent random sample from each group was determined to be a manageable sample. Therefore, a random sample of 16 per cent was drawn from each group utilizing a table of random numbers (1, pp. 133-134).

The schools in each group were numbered consecutively. An impartial party drew two numbers between one and fifty from a box to provide the column and row for the beginning number in the table of random numbers. Schools equal to 16 per cent were drawn from each category. This list was checked against the 1970-71 Texas Education Agency Public School Directory for current addresses (3). Six schools no longer existed and alternate schools were drawn from the appropriate category to maintain the total sample of 200 schools (Appendix I).

Administration of the Final Questionnaire

Prior to administering the validated questionnaire, a meeting with the executive directors of the twenty Education Service Centers was arranged through officials of the Texas Education Agency. The executive directors met as a group and
the subject of this study was discussed. The group gave unanimous support to the study and agreed to provide letters of endorsement typed on the letterhead of each of the Education Service Centers to be sent to the selected superintendents along with the questionnaire and cover letter. The validated questionnaire was then administered to the previously selected sample to collect data for the study. A cover letter (Appendix J) explaining the purpose of the study and requesting participation, a letter of endorsement (Appendix K) from the appropriate Education Service Center executive director, a survey instrument (Appendix L), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to the superintendent, by name, of each of the 200 schools in the sample. The superintendent or his designated representative was asked to respond by checking one or more choices to each of the survey questions.

The schools in the sample were listed according to the Education Service Center region number. The listing showed school districts from each Education Service Center represented in the randomly selected sample. Based on further comparison, the geographic distribution was found to be well balanced with every area of the state adequately represented.

The questionnaires were assigned to the appropriate reporting group, checked on the working list and on the Education Service Center list as they were returned. The
reporting groups were determined according to the previously
designated grouping based on average daily attendance, which
provided six groupings.

Approximately fifteen days after the initial mailing,
a follow-up letter (Appendix M) was sent to non-respondents
asking their participation in the study. A second question-
aire and self-addressed, stamped envelope were enclosed for
their convenience. As a result of the procedures described,
a return of 168 usable questionnaires was realized. This
represented an 84 per cent return, which exceeded the
standard considered acceptable by 17 per cent.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The information presented here was obtained by compiling the results of the questionnaire, "A Survey of the Impact of the Operation of Regional Education Service Centers on the Superintendency in Selected Texas School Districts." The survey questionnaire was designed to elicit responses that would provide data from which answers could be derived for the ten questions in the section, "Questions for Which Answers Were Sought." These questions were the following:

I. What percentage of the selected local school districts participate in some service provided by the Education Service Centers?

II. Have Education Service Centers assisted and/or influenced in-service education for local school district personnel?

III. Are local school district personnel needed on Education Service Center study and advisory committees and groups to determine and evaluate service needs?

IV. Has the operation of the Education Service Centers enabled the superintendent to meet his administrative responsibilities more effectively in areas of planning and decision making?
V. How have the Education Service Centers encouraged innovations in school administration?

VI. Has participation in Education Service Center programs required additional resources?

VII. In what areas of school administration are the Education Service Centers most affecting the functioning of the superintendent of schools in Texas?

VIII. Has the operation of the Education Service Centers affected the autonomy of the local school districts?

IX. What are the attitudes of the public school superintendents concerning the effect of the operation of the Education Service Center on the superintendency?

X. What services should the Education Service Center provide the public schools and what relationship should be developed for the future relative to the centers and the public school superintendency?

The answer to Question I concerning the percentage of schools participating in Education Service Center activities was derived from Item 1 of the questionnaire. Item 2 of the questionnaire was to be utilized to give reasons for non-participation of a school in Education Service Center activities. The degree to which Education Service Center personnel assisted in providing in-service education to local school personnel, raised in Question II, was concluded from data from Item 3. The answer to Question III regarding the need for local school personnel to be involved on
committees of the Education Service Centers was determined from data supplied by Item 4 of the questionnaire. Question IV, concerning the assistance of Education Service Centers to superintendents in the planning and decision making process, was answered with data provided by Items 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the questionnaire. The answer to Question V regarding encouraging innovation was provided by Item 9 of the questionnaire. Question VI concerning the need for additional resources for participation in Education Service Center activities was concluded from data reported by Item 10 of the questionnaire. The answer to Question VII regarding the areas of administration the Education Service Centers are most affecting in relationship to the functioning of the superintendent of schools was derived from data provided by Items 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 of the questionnaire. Question VIII, regarding the autonomy of the local school district, was answered with data from Item 16 of the questionnaire.

The answer to Question IX concerning the attitudes of public school superintendents toward Education Service Centers was concluded from data from Item 17 of the questionnaire. Question X, regarding the future of Education Service Centers was answered with data reported by Items 18, 19, and 20 of the questionnaire.

The data from each of the twenty items on the survey questionnaire are presented in a separate table and explained.
These data are presented in percentage of the sample for each possible answer. These answers are presented by groups of schools and by totals of schools in the sample.

The data presented in the tables in this section indicate the number of schools in the sample and the distribution by groups. Also reported are the number of potential returns and the actual returns by groups with the percentage of returns by groups.

Because this study is concerned with the impact the Education Service Centers have made on the public school superintendency, the administrative experience of the surveyed superintendents and the distance of the local school districts from the centers are reported in categories.

As shown in Table I, 200 sample schools were included in the study. The 200 sample schools represent slightly more than 16 per cent of the 1,234 public school districts

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE RETURNS BY GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Returns</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Texas in the 1968-69 school year. Also, Table I indicates that 168 public school superintendents or their authorized representative responded to the questionnaire for a total response of 84 per cent. This is 17 per cent above the 67 per cent of the total sample that was considered acceptable to provide suitable data from which to draw conclusions relating to the questions posed by the study. Within two weeks, a response equaling 72 per cent had been received. One reminder was mailed, which increased the return to 84 per cent in a three-week period.

Groups I through V returned 100 per cent of the questionnaires. Group VI returned 76 of 108 questionnaires for a 70.4 per cent response. Each of the groups' percentages and the total percentage of 84 per cent were well above the level set as acceptable. Therefore, no further attempt was made to elicit additional responses.

Table II reports the experience of the responding superintendents. The data are presented by groups of schools and by totals of schools in the sample.

Among the schools of Group I, 42.8 per cent of the superintendents have fifteen through nineteen years experience in school administration, 28.6 per cent with over twenty years experience, 14.3 per cent with ten through fourteen years experience, 14.3 per cent with five through nine years experience, and none with less than five years experience. Group II had no superintendent with twenty
TABLE II

NUMBER OF YEARS EXPERIENCE OF SUPERINTENDENTS FROM SAMPLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Response in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total years of administrative experience of superintendent: (a) 20 years or more, (b) 15 through 19 years, (c) 10 through 14 years, (d) 5 through 9 years, (e) less than 5 years.

years or more experience in school administration, 50 per cent with fifteen through nineteen years experience, 16.7 per cent with ten through fourteen years experience, 16.7 per cent with five through nine years experience, and 16.7 per cent with less than five years experience. Group III had the highest percentage of superintendents of all groups with twenty or more years of experience in school administration, with 50 per cent falling in this bracket, 17.9 per cent with fifteen through nineteen years experience, 14.2 per cent with ten through fourteen years experience, 17.9 per cent with five through nine years experience, and none with under five years experience.
Group IV had the youngest superintendents of all groups in terms of years of administrative experience, with 12.5 per cent having twenty years experience or more, 6.3 per cent with fifteen through nineteen years experience, 37.5 per cent with ten through fourteen years experience, 25 per cent with five through nine years experience and 18.7 per cent with less than five years experience. Group V weighed heavily on the experience side with 42.9 per cent having twenty years experience or more, 11.4 per cent with fifteen through nineteen years experience, 20 per cent with ten through fourteen years experience, 17.1 per cent with five through nine years experience and 8.6 per cent with less than five years experience. Group VI was more evenly distributed among the categories of experience, with 26.3 per cent having twenty years or more experience in school administration, 14.5 per cent with fifteen through nineteen years experience, 14.5 per cent with ten through fourteen years experience, 19.7 per cent with five through nine years experience, and 25 per cent with less than five years of experience. The total indicates that those superintendents with twenty years or more experience compose the largest group of the respondents, registering 31.5 per cent of the total, with the remaining categories ranging from 19 per cent to 15.5 per cent.

Table III shows the percentages of schools in each group that are located within a 25, a 50, a 75, a 100, and
over 100-mile radius of the Education Service Centers.
Initially, it was felt that the distance from the school
district to the Education Service Center might have some
bearing on the participation in center activities. However,
this relationship failed to materialize upon analysis of
the data compiled from the survey questionnaire.

TABLE III

SCHOOL DISTRICT DISTANCE FROM EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Response in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of miles from school district to Education Service Center: (a) 0-25 miles, (b) 26-50 miles, (c) 51-75 miles, (d) 76-100 miles, (e) over 100 miles.

Group I schools were all located within 50 miles of an
Education Service Center, with 85.7 per cent within 25 miles
and 14.3 per cent within 50 miles. A majority of the schools
in Group II were within 50 miles of an Education Service
Center, with 33.3 per cent within 25 miles, 33.3 per cent
within 50 miles, 16.7 per cent within 75 miles and 16.7 per
cent within 100 miles. Group III shows about the same
distribution as Group II, with 35.8 per cent within 25 miles, 35.8 per cent within 50 miles, 14.2 per cent within 75 miles, and 14.2 per cent within 100 miles. Group IV began to show a wider distribution of the school districts, with 25 per cent within 25 miles of an Education Service Center, 43.8 per cent within 50 miles, 12.5 per cent within 75 miles, 12.5 per cent within 100 miles, and 6.2 per cent over 100 miles. The distribution of the school districts in Group V clustered within the 25 to 75-mile brackets, with smaller percentages outside this range, with 22.9 per cent within 25 miles, 28.6 per cent within 50 miles, 34.3 per cent within 75 miles, 11.4 per cent within 100 miles, and only 2.8 per cent over 100 miles. Group VI continued the cluster between 25 and 75 miles from the Education Service Center, with only 9.2 per cent of the school districts within 25 miles, 38.2 per cent within 50 miles, 34 per cent within 75 miles, 12 per cent within 100 miles, and 6.6 per cent over 100 miles.

Extent of District Participation:
Question I

The data presented in this section represent the views of superintendents as reported on the survey questionnaires. The data presented in Table IV represent survey Item 1, and indicate the percentage of each survey group participating in one or more Education Service Center activity for each of the five school years between 1967-68 and 1971-72.
### TABLE IV

**DISTRICT PARTICIPATION IN CENTER ACTIVITIES***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Your district has participated in one or more Regional Service Center Activity in (a) 1967-68, (b) 1968-69, (c) 1969-70, (d) 1970-71, (e) 1971-72, (f) did not participate at any time.

During the initial year of operation of the Education Service Centers, 57.1 per cent of Group I schools participated, with 71.4 per cent the second year, 100 per cent the third year and each succeeding year thereafter. The first year of operation of the Education Service Centers showed Group II schools participating at an 83.3 per cent level, and at a 100 per cent level thereafter. Group III schools participated in the center services at 85.7 per cent the first year, 96.4 per cent the second year, and 100 per cent each succeeding year. Group IV schools were slower to join in the activities of the Education Service Center, beginning at 68.8 per cent in the first year, 87.5 per cent the second year, 93.8 per cent the third year, 93.8 per cent the fourth
year, and reaching 100 per cent participation in the fifth and last year. Group V joined in the activities of the centers at a level of 68.6 per cent the first year, 85.7 the second year, and 100 per cent each succeeding year. Group VI followed a pattern of participation similar to that of Group IV, with 71 per cent the first year, 87 per cent the second year, 93.4 per cent the third year, 98.7 per cent the fourth year, and 100 per cent participation in Education Service Center activities the fifth year. Including all sample schools, 72.6 per cent participated the first year, 88.1 per cent the second year, 96.4 per cent the third year, 98.8 per cent the fourth year, and 100 per cent the fifth year.

Survey item 2 was designed to elicit responses as to the reasons for non-participation of school districts in Education Service Center activities. Since all schools surveyed were found to be participating in one or more Education Service Center activity, survey item 2 was not applicable.

Service Center Influence on Local District In-Service Education: Question II

The data presented in Table V report the opinions of superintendents on survey item 3. A total of 28 per cent of all schools indicated the feeling that the Education Service Center had influenced the content of in-service education for the school staff extensively by assisting in planning and implementation. None
of the Group I schools felt influenced extensively. The largest percentage in each group was indicated as "moderately, assisted in planning and acquiring consultants." Group I indicated 71.4 per cent; Group II indicated 50 per cent; Group III indicated 46.4 per cent; Group IV indicated 50 per cent; Group V indicated 57.2 per cent; Group VI indicated 55.3 per cent; and the sample totaled 54.2 per cent.

TABLE V

EXTENT OF INFLUENCE THE CENTER HAS ON LOCAL IN-SERVICE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Education Service Center activities and personnel have influenced the content of in-service education for your staff (a) extensively, assisted in planning and implementation, (b) moderately, assisted in planning and acquiring consultants, (c) little, provided materials as requested, (d) not at all.

Eighteen and one-half per cent of the schools indicated the Education Service Center influenced in-service education for the school staff "little, provided materials as requested." Group I schools indicated 28.6 per cent; Group II
schools indicated 33.3 per cent; Group III schools indicated 17.9 per cent; Group IV schools indicated 31.2 per cent; Group V schools indicated 11.4 per cent; and Group VI schools indicated 17.1 per cent. Only one school in the entire sample indicated that the Education Service Center influenced the in-service education of the local school staff "not at all." This school was in Group VI.

The Need for Local Personnel on Service Center Committees: Question III

The data presented in Table VI report the opinions of superintendents on survey item 4. This item concerns itself with the need for involvement of local school personnel on Education Service Center study and advisory committees.

The respondents indicated, with a 60.1 per cent opinion, that local school personnel serving on Education Service Center study and advisory committees was "needed and beneficial to both agencies." This opinion was not as strong in Group V, with 42.9 per cent agreeing with the total sample opinion. Group V indicated, with a 54.3 per cent opinion, that local school district personnel serving on Education Service Center advisory and study committees should be limited to "needed only in special situations." Thirty-two and one-tenth per cent of the schools agreed with the majority opinion of Group V. Only 6.5 per cent of the respondents indicated that participation was "needed only when required by law and/or the Texas Education Agency."
TABLE VI
THE NEED FOR LOCAL PERSONNEL ON CENTER COMMITTEES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The involvement of local school personnel in Education Service Center study and advisory committees and groups is (a) needed and beneficial to both agencies, (b) needed only in special situations, (c) needed only when required by law and/or the Texas Education Agency, (d) not needed and is a waste of valuable time and effort.

The lowest level of opinion was 1.2 per cent of the schools indicating that local school district personnel serving on Education Service Center advisory and study committees was "not needed and is a waste of valuable time and effort."

Service Center Assistance to Superintendents in the Areas of Planning and Decision Making: Question IV

Table VII reports data from survey item 5 which seeks to determine the extent of assistance rendered by the Education Service Center to the local school district in the area of planning.
TABLE VII

SERVICE CENTER INFLUENCE ON PLANNING IN THE LOCAL DISTRICT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Education Service Center staff affected planning in your district by (a) training you and your staff, (b) providing the expertise and the manpower, (c) providing materials for local training and implementation of planning, (d) providing no assistance in the planning process.

"Providing materials for local training and implementation of planning" was the major area of assistance in the planning process of local school districts as evidenced by a response of 56 per cent of the schools. All groups individually rated this item at 50 per cent or above. The second item which received considerable support was "providing the expertise and the manpower," with 44 per cent indicating receiving assistance in this category also. Twenty-eight and six-tenths per cent of the respondents indicated that the Education Service Center personnel had trained the superintendent and his staff in the planning process. Only 10.7 per cent indicated "no assistance in the planning
process." Some of the schools indicated assistance in more than one category.

Table VIII reports the opinions of the respondents as to the extent the Education Service Centers have provided research findings from pilot projects which would assist in decision making in priority areas at the local school district level as posed in survey item 6.

**TABLE VIII**

RESEARCH FINDINGS PROVIDED TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY SERVICE CENTERS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Education Service Center has provided research findings from pilot projects that have (a) served as a basis for decision making in priority areas in your district, (b) influenced decisions in priority areas to a moderate degree in your district, (c) little effect on local school district decisions, (d) no effect on local school district decisions.

As reflected by the data, 40.5 per cent of the respondents were "influenced to a moderate degree" in the decision making process by research findings from pilot projects.
provided by the Education Service Centers. On the other hand, 38.1 per cent of the respondents indicated "little effect on the local school district decisions," and 7.1 per cent of the schools reported "no effect." Only 15.5 per cent indicated that the research information provided by the Education Service Centers "served as a basis for decision making in priority areas." Group II and Group IV indicated the highest level of direct assistance, with 50 and 25 per cent respectively. Group II also indicated the highest level of response to "little effect on local school district decisions," with 50 per cent. There were not other significant differences noted between individual groups and the total sample.

The data presented in Table IX indicate the results of electronic data processing in the local school district as provided by the Education Service Centers. Respondents, in some cases, gave multiple responses to survey item 7, which is the source of these data.

The highest percentage of the schools indicated that they "do not participate in electronic data processing," as reflected by a 77.8 per cent response. The 28.6 per cent in Group I which report "not participating in the electronic data processing" provided by the Education Service Center indicated that each had their own computer. The remaining school districts which indicated "not participating in electronic data processing" are reported by groups, with
TABLE IX
RESULTS OF SERVICE CENTER ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Education Service Center electronic data processing has resulted in (a) a more efficient record keeping program, (b) a more accurate basis for administrative decisions, (c) increased local cost for same services previously done mechanically or by hand, (d) the addition of personnel for the purpose of working with the electronic data processing, (e) none of these—do not participate in electronic data processing.

Group II having 33.3 per cent, Group III having 64.3 per cent, Group IV having 68.7 per cent, Group V having 91.4 per cent, and Group VI having 88.2 per cent "not participating in electronic data processing" provided by the Education Service Centers. According to these data, 22.2 per cent of the schools participate in the electronic data processing provided by the Education Service Centers. Of the participating school districts, over one-half, or 13.7 per cent, of the total sample indicate that electronic data processing provides "a more efficient record keeping program."

Approximately one-third, or 71.1 per cent, feel that
electronic data processing provides "a more accurate basis for administrative decisions." Only 4.2 per cent of the schools reported increased cost for electronic data processing services compared to the previous method of providing similar services. The only schools which indicated "the addition of personnel for the purpose of working with the electronic data processing" were found in Group I, where 28.6 per cent reported adding personnel.

Data regarding Education Service Center assistance to local districts with state and federal education programs are shown in Table X. These answers were in response to survey item 8.

The total sample reflects the opinion at the 38.7 per cent level that the Education Service Center assists the local school district in securing and coordinating state and federal education programs "when requested to do so by the local school district." The data indicate, by a 33.3 per cent level, that this service is provided "in an efficient and effective manner." A significant 17.3 per cent of the respondents indicated receiving "no assistance at all." Ten and seven-tenths per cent indicate that assistance is provided "when there is more than one school district involved in the project." Group I and II schools failed to register a response in the category indicating "no assistance at all."
TABLE X
SERVICE CENTER ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL DISTRICTS WITH STATE AND
FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Education Service Center assists the local school district in securing and coordinating state and federal education programs (a) in an efficient and effective manner, (b) when directed to do so by the Texas Education Agency, (c) when requested to do so by the local school district, (d) when there is more than one school district involved in the project, (e) none at all.

Service Center Activities Motivating
Administrative Motivation:
Question V

The data presented here deal with the influence the Education Service Centers have exerted on school superintendents to encourage innovation in school administration.

The data in Table XI report responses to survey item 9 concerning how the Education Service Centers have encouraged innovation in school administration. This question was designed in such a manner that multiple answers were possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Education Service Center has encouraged innovation in school administration by (a) providing research results for decision making, (b) bringing superintendents and other school administrators together to share ideas and planning, (c) providing supplementary services to local school districts, (d) other.

In response to this question, 81 per cent of the respondents indicate that "bringing superintendents and other school administrators together to share ideas and planning" was the most important factor in encouraging innovation in school administration. Group II respondents felt equally strongly about "providing research results," "bringing superintendents and other school administrators together to share ideas and planning," and "providing supplementary services to local school districts," as each category was rated at the 50 per cent level. Group I school respondents placed stronger emphasis on "providing supplementary services to
the school district" by giving it a rating of 57.1 per cent. In the "other" category, such statements were made as "no encouragement at all," "provided consultants," and "held awareness conferences." With the previously noted exception, the individual groups responded in a consistent pattern in comparison to the sample total.

The Relationship of Local Resources to Participation in Center Activities:
Question VI

The data presented in this section represent the views of school superintendents as reported from survey item 10 relating to whether additional resources were required at the local school district level to allow participation in Education Service Center activities. Table XII shows these data.

Participation in Education Service Center programs by Group I schools required no "additional administrative personnel," 14.2 per cent required "additional clerical staff," 42.9 per cent required "additional administrative expenses and time only," and 42.9 per cent required "no additional resources." Participation by Group II required no "additional administrative personnel," no "additional clerical staff," 33.3 per cent required "additional administrative expense and time only," and 66.7 per cent required "no additional resources."
TABLE XII

LOCAL RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR PARTICIPATION IN CENTER PROGRAMS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participation in Education Service Center programs required (a) additional administrative staff, (b) additional clerical staff, (c) additional administrative expenses and time only, (d) no additional resources.

Participation in Education Service Center programs by Group III schools indicated 3.6 per cent required "additional administrative personnel," 3.6 per cent required "additional clerical staff," 64.2 per cent required "additional administrative expense and time only," and 28.6 per cent required "no additional resources." Group IV requirements resembled Groups I and II as no additional administrative or clerical personnel were required; 56.3 per cent required "additional administrative expenses and time only," and 43.7 per cent required "no additional resources." Group V schools required no "additional administrative personnel," 8.6 per cent required "additional clerical staff," 57.1 per cent required
"additional administrative expense and time only," and 40 per cent required "no additional resources." Participation in Education Service Center activities by Group VI schools required 1.3 per cent "additional administrative personnel," 2.6 per cent "additional clerical staff," 53.9 per cent "additional administrative expense and time only," and 50 per cent required "no additional resources."

Over 95 per cent of the respondents required no more than additional administrative expenses and time to enable the schools to participate in Education Service Center activities.

Effect of Service Centers on the Functions of the Superintendent: Question VII

The data presented in this section deal with the areas of school administration the Education Service Centers are affecting most as far as the functioning of the superintendent of schools in Texas is concerned.

The data in Table XIII report responses to survey item 11 indicating the improvement in the local school district as a result of services received from the Education Service Center.

In response to this question, 82.1 per cent of the total sample indicate that services received from the Education Service Center resulted in improving "teacher in-service." Another category receiving a strong response of 66.1 per cent was "services to pupils." "Curriculum development"
TABLE XIII
CENTER SERVICES WHICH IMPROVED THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The services received from the Education Service Center have improved local school district (a) administrative organization, (b) teacher in-service, (c) services to pupils, (d) curriculum development, (e) none.

showed a 53 per cent response, which indicates strong assistance for improvement to the local school district by the Education Service Center in this category also.

A response of 30.4 per cent of the superintendents to the category concerning "administrative organization" indicates that assistance is being rendered directly to the superintendent of schools in many cases. Only 4.8 per cent of the schools report "no assistance" by the Education Service Center for improvement in the local district.

Data provided in Table XIV reflect the opinion of superintendents concerning whether the operation of the Education Service Center has affected his administrative responsibilities
as posed in survey item 12. Approximately 50 per cent of the respondents reacted to two categories within the question.

**TABLE XIV**

EFFECT OF SERVICE CENTER OPERATION ON RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SUPERINTENDENT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The operation of the Education Service Center has affected your administrative responsibilities significantly by (a) assuming responsibility for coordination of some services on a regional basis, (b) serving as a liaison between the Texas Education Agency and the local school district, (c) developing more cooperation between local school districts, (d) other.

Forty-eight and two-tenths per cent of the respondents indicated that "assuming responsibility for coordination of some services on a regional basis" by the Education Service Center affected the superintendent's administrative responsibilities significantly. "Serving as a liaison between the Texas Education Agency and the local school district" was viewed as significantly affecting administrative responsibilities by 43.5 per cent of the superintendents. In the
category of "developing more cooperation between local school districts," 48.2 per cent of the schools considered this factor to significantly affect administrative responsibilities of the superintendent of schools. Only 10.7 per cent gave "other" responses, using statements such as "no effect," "little effect," and "too much confusion."

Table XV presents data on the opinion of superintendents of schools concerning the extent to which the operation of the Education Service Center has affected his function as explored by survey item 13.

### TABLE XV

**THE EXTENT OF SERVICE CENTER INFLUENCE ON THE SUPERINTENDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Group</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In your opinion, the operation of the Education Service Center has affected your function as superintendent of schools (a) extensively, to the point of strongly affecting board policy and daily decision, (b) moderately, influencing decisions in some programs or situations, but not all, (c) little, provides some guidance or influence occasionally, (d) none.*
The majority of the superintendents indicated by a 60.1 per cent response that they feel the operation of the Education Service Center affects their function as superintendent of schools "moderately, influencing decisions in some programs or situations, but not all." Seventy-one and four-tenths per cent of Group I concur with the conclusion of the sample, with 14.3 per cent feeling "little effect," and 14.3 per cent feeling "no effect." Group II schools differ somewhat as 16.7 per cent report that the function of the superintendent is affected "extensively, to the point of strongly affecting board policy and daily decisions," 66.7 per cent agreed with the total sample by indicating a "moderate effect," and 16.7 per cent feel "little effect." Group III school respondents feel the operation of the Education Service Centers affect the function of the superintendent of schools somewhat as 3.6 per cent indicate the influence to be "extensive," 67.9 per cent "moderate," 14.2 per cent "little," and 10.7 per cent "none."

Group IV differed from the sample totals and the individual groups, as indicated by none feeling "extensively affected," only 37.5 per cent "moderately" affected, 62.5 per cent "little" affected, and no schools reported "none." Group V reported no "extensive effect," 65.7 per cent "moderate" effect, 31.4 per cent "little" effect, and 5.7 per cent reported "none." Group VI coincides closely with the sample totals as indicated by 7.9 per cent of the
respondents feeling that the operation of the Education Service Center affected the function of the superintendent of schools "extensively, to the point of strongly affecting board policy and daily decisions," 57.9 per cent felt the effect "moderately, influencing decisions in some programs or situations, but not all," 26.3 per cent felt the effects to be "little, provides some guidance or influence occasionally," and 6.6 per cent felt the effects were "none."

Table XVI reports data on service provided by the Education Service Center that has influenced the superintendency most, as posed in survey item 14.

**TABLE XVI**

THE SERVICE AFFECTING THE SUPERINTENDENT MOST*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The service provided by the Education Service Center that has affected the superintendency most is (a) academic, (b) media, (c) computer, (d) administrative, (e) other.
Seventy-three and eight-tenths per cent of the total sample, consisting of 85.7 per cent of Group I, 83.3 per cent of Group II, 64.3 per cent of Group III, 75 per cent of Group IV, 80 per cent of Group V, and 72.4 per cent of Group VI report that "media" is the service provided by the Education Service Center that has affected the superintendency the most. Twenty and eight-tenths per cent indicated "academic" services to be the most influence. "Computer" services rated the level of 12.5 per cent with Group I schools rating it at a high of 57.1 per cent, and Group VI schools indicating a low of 1.3 per cent. A response to "administrative" services of 20.8 per cent indicates interest in services directly to the superintendent of schools. Only 5.4 per cent indicated "other" services and listed such items as "planning," "consultants," and "in-service."

Table XVII reports data on the attitudes of superintendents concerning the additional time the operation of the Education Service Center requires the superintendent to be away from the local school district. Survey item 15 explores the justification for this use of time and effort.

A total of 52.4 per cent of the schools reported that the additional time required of the superintendent of schools away from the local school district as a result of the operation of the Education Service Center was "at times beneficial and other times wasteful." In breaking this down by groups, Group I indicates 14.3 per cent; Group II, 33.3
TABLE XVII

REQUIREMENT OF SUPERINTENDENTS' TIME IN OPERATION OF CENTERS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does operation of the Education Service Center require you to spend more time away from your school district? If so, is this (a) time well spent for the benefit of the children in the district, (b) at times beneficial and other times wasteful, (c) unnecessary in most instances, (d) completely unnecessary and undesirable.

per cent, Group III, 57.1 per cent; Group IV, 62.5 per cent; Group V, 65.7 per cent; and Group VI, 47.4 per cent. Thirty-seven and one-half per cent of the respondents indicated that this was "time well spent for the benefit of the children in the district." The pattern in this response showed Group I with 57.1 per cent, Group II with 66.7 per cent, Group III with 32.1 per cent, Group IV with 25 per cent, Group V with 31.4 per cent, and Group VI with 40.8 per cent. Only 8.9 per cent felt the time used by the superintendent away from the local school district to be "unnecessary and/or undesirable."
The Effect of the Operation of the Service Centers on Local School District Autonomy: Question VIII

The data presented in this section reflects the opinions of the superintendents from the sample schools in regard to whether the establishment and operation of the Education Service Centers has affected the autonomy of the local school districts. Table XVIII reports data from survey item 16 regarding the subject of state control being extended further into the local school district.

TABLE XVIII

THE EXTENT OF STATE CONTROL AT THE LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT LEVEL*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In your opinion has the establishment and operation of the Education Service Center extended state control further into the local school district (a) to a more favorable level, (b) more than is desirable, (c) less than is desirable, (d) to no greater degree than before.

The major response reported by the schools was "to no greater degree than before," as indicated by 67.8 per cent.
This response indicates a strong feeling on the part of the superintendents emphasizing that state control is not extended into the local school district as a result of the operation of the Education Service Centers. Seventy-one and four-tenths per cent of Group I support the sample opinion, while 83.3 per cent of Group II, 82.1 per cent of Group III, 68.7 per cent of Group IV, 65.8 per cent of Group V, and 60.5 per cent of Group VI join in the majority opinion. A response of 19 per cent of the schools was elicited by the item which stated "to a more favorable level," indicating that state influence had been extended further into the local school district but was considered favorable. Only 13.2 per cent of the respondents indicated that state control had entered into the local school district "more than is desirable" as a result of the operation of the Education Service Centers.

The Attitude of the Superintendents Toward the Service Centers: Question IX

The data presented in this section report the attitude of the public school superintendents concerning the effect of the operation of the Education Service Center on the superintendency. Table XIX reports data from survey item 17 which provides an opportunity for respondents to react to more than one item if desired.

A majority of the superintendents indicated by 52.4 per cent that the Education Service Center was "some
TABLE XIX

THE EFFECT ON THE FUNCTION OF THE SUPERINTENDENT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The effect the operation of the Education Service Center has on your functioning as a superintendent of schools is (a) positive and helpful, (b) some assistance, (c) negligible, (d) undesirable.

assistance in their function as superintendent of schools. Broken down by groups it is found that Group I reported 42.9 per cent; Group II, 33.3 per cent; Group III, 50 per cent; Group IV, 62.5 per cent; Group V, 57.1 per cent; and Group VI, 51.3 per cent. Thirty-eight and one-tenth per cent of the respondents indicated that the Education Service Centers had a "positive and helpful" effect in their function as superintendent of schools. The response ranged from a high of 50 per cent with Group II to a low of 31.3 per cent with Group IV. Only 10.1 per cent indicated a "negligible" effect and .6 per cent an "undesirable" effect. There seems to be an overall positive attitude toward Education Service Centers based on the response of the total sample.
Present and Future Services and Role of the Education Service Centers: Question X

The data presented here deal with the services the Education Service Centers should provide the public schools and the relationship that should be developed for the future, relative to the centers and the public school superintendency.

The data in Table XX report responses to survey item 18 covering what the major role of the Education Service Center should be. Multiple responses to the items listed in the question were expected.

**TABLE XX**

**THE MAJOR ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE SERVICE CENTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The major role and/or function of the Education Service Center should be (a) to improve the administrative organization, structure, and operation of school districts within a predetermined area, (b) to provide services to pupils and teachers in local schools, (c) a research and development center for all school districts regardless of size, (d) other, (e) all of the above.*
The role of the Education Service Center which ranked highest was "to provide services to pupils and teachers in local schools," as reflected by a 60.7 per cent response. The role ranking second was "a research and development center for all school districts regardless of size," with a 48.2 per cent response. The role ranking third, with a 25 per cent response, was "to improve the administrative organization, structure, and operation of school districts within a predetermined area." Four and two-tenths per cent of the respondents indicated "other" reactions. Some of these were "become a direct arm of the Texas Education Agency," "become a clearing house and dissemination agent for educational strategies," and "should have more authority delegated from Texas Education Agency." Twenty-three and eight-tenths per cent of the schools indicated that the Education Service Center should fill all the roles listed in survey item 18.

Table XXI reports data from survey item 19. This question deals with the definition of the position of Education Service Centers according to the Texas Education Agency. At this time the Texas Education Agency emphasizes that the Education Service Centers are service agencies only and not regulatory agencies. This question is designed to elicit the opinion of the superintendents as to whether this is the case or not.
**TABLE XXI**

**THE DEFINITION OF THE EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER**

*The Texas Education Agency has emphasized that the Education Service Centers are service agencies only and not regulatory agencies. In your opinion, this is (a) the intent and the actual situation, (b) the intent but not the situation, (c) neither the intent nor the situation, (d) other.*

In response to this question, 89.3 per cent of the superintendents indicated that the Education Service Centers were operating according to the Texas Education Agency definition as reflected by the reaction to the item "the intent and the actual situation." Group I supported this view with a 100 per cent response. Group II had 83.3 per cent; Group III, 96.4 per cent; Group IV, 87.5 per cent; Group V, 91.5 per cent; and Group VI, 85.5 per cent. Only 7.7 per cent of the sample responded to "the intent but not the situation," and 3 per cent to "neither the intent nor the situation."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Texas Education Agency has emphasized that the Education Service Centers are service agencies only and not regulatory agencies. In your opinion, this is (a) the intent and the actual situation, (b) the intent but not the situation, (c) neither the intent nor the situation, (d) other.*

In response to this question, 89.3 per cent of the superintendents indicated that the Education Service Centers were operating according to the Texas Education Agency definition as reflected by the reaction to the item "the intent and the actual situation." Group I supported this view with a 100 per cent response. Group II had 83.3 per cent; Group III, 96.4 per cent; Group IV, 87.5 per cent; Group V, 91.5 per cent; and Group VI, 85.5 per cent. Only 7.7 per cent of the sample responded to "the intent but not the situation," and 3 per cent to "neither the intent nor the situation."
Table XXII records the data from survey item 20 concerning the opinion of the superintendents about the future position the Education Service Centers should hold in the educational structure of Texas. Some respondents reacted to more than one item in the question.

**TABLE XXII**

**THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE SERVICE CENTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Groups</th>
<th>Responses in Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group V</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group VI</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Education Service Center should (a) remain as it is presently, (b) become more of a service agency, (c) become a regional office of the Texas Education Agency, (d) be abandoned because of its ineffectiveness, (e) other.

The highest level of response was 41.7 per cent, indicating the desire for the Education Service Centers to "become more of a service agency." Individual group reactions showed Group I at 14.3 per cent, Group II at 33.3 per cent, Group III at 53.6 per cent, Group IV at 25 per cent, Group V at 34.3 per cent, and Group VI at 47.4 per cent. Thirty-nine and three-tenths per cent of the respondents
indicated that the Education Service Centers should "remain as it is presently." Group I showed the highest rating of this item, with a 57.1 per cent response and Group II the lowest rating, with no schools in this group responding to this item. The remaining groups ranged from 32.1 per cent to 50 per cent. A response of 17.3 per cent of the schools indicated a desire for the Education Service Center to "become a regional office of the Texas Education Agency." Group II strongly supported this view, with a 50 per cent response, while Group I failed to support it at all. Five and four-tenths per cent of the schools felt that the centers should "be abandoned because of their ineffectiveness." Three and six-tenths per cent reacted to "other" with such statements as "serve small district with limited resources," "have serious doubts about Education Service Center concept," and "Education Service Centers should be governed by the needs of local districts only."

In order to organize the study of the impact the Education Service Centers have made on the public school superintendency in Texas, ten questions were formulated. An instrument was developed and administered to gather the needed data.

The detailed summary of this chapter has been presented in Chapter V in the process of answering the formulated questions used as a basis for this study.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to determine the impact of the operation of Education Service Centers on the public school superintendency in Texas as perceived by local school district superintendents. A further purpose was to determine the relationship that should be developed for the future, relative to the Education Service Centers and the public school superintendency.

Attention was given to a survey of factors affecting the impact of the Education Service Centers on the public school superintendents. Factors were considered such as (a) number of schools receiving services from the centers, (b) extension or withdrawal of state control at the local level, (c) problems related to the administration of the school system as a result of the operation of the centers, (d) extent of assistance provided by the centers, and (e) future development of the Education Service Centers.

This study involved a review of the literature concerned with the historical development of the intermediate and/or service unit of school administration and the historical development of the public school superintendency.
A review of supplemental materials and literature associated with the development of the Education Service Centers in Texas was also carried out. In addition, conferences with superintendents of schools and Texas Education Agency staff members were held to elicit their views concerning the subject of this study. Also, the study was discussed in a meeting of the twenty Education Service Center executive directors. A survey questionnaire was utilized to secure data and information on the impact the Education Service Centers had made on the public school superintendency.

The survey questionnaire used in the study was developed following conferences with superintendents of schools, Texas Education Agency staff members, and the executive directors of the Education Service Centers and after reviewing literature and supplemental materials. A seven-member advisory panel was established to assist in the development of the questionnaire and a five-member jury panel was utilized to validate the instrument. The survey questionnaire was mailed to the superintendents of a randomly selected stratified sample equal to 16 per cent of the 1,234 school districts in Texas. Questionnaires were mailed to 200 superintendents and 168 responses were returned. The 84 per cent return of the questionnaire was 17 per cent above the 67 per cent of the total sample that was approved as acceptable to provide appropriate data from which to draw conclusions relating to the questions posed by the study.
The data drawn from the questionnaires and presented in this study represent the combined judgments and opinions of the superintendents as to the impact the Education Service Centers have made on the public school superintendency in the sample schools. It was assumed that the utilization of a stratified, random sample, selected by a table of random numbers, would provide data generally representative of the public schools of the state of Texas. The 84 per cent response of the sample schools, which represented over 16 per cent of all school districts in Texas, has added support to the validity of the assumption.

To present the findings of this study, the previously formulated questions will be listed and a summary of the findings pertaining to the question will follow. The questions have been answered here in terms of the findings in Chapter IV.

I. What percentage of the selected local school districts participate in some service provided by the Education Service Centers?

The first year of operation for the Education Service Centers was 1967-68. In that year, none of the groups of schools had 100 per cent participation. The data show that only 72.6 per cent of the schools in the total sample participated in some service in the initial year of operation of the Education Service Centers. Progress in providing needed services for local school districts is indicated by
the data which showed an increase in participation by the schools from 72.6 per cent in 1967-68 to 88.1 per cent in 1968-69, 96.4 per cent in 1969-70, 98.8 per cent in 1970-71 and to a unanimous 100 per cent in 1971-72.

II. Have Education Service Centers assisted and/or influenced in-service education for local school district personnel?

The data have shown that Education Service Center activities and personnel have influenced the content of in-service education to the local school staff extensively in 28 per cent of the sample schools. The majority of the respondents indicated that this influence was moderate, while 19.1 per cent revealed little or no influence from the Education Service Centers. The extensively influenced schools were assisted in planning and implementing the in-service education and those influenced moderately were assisted in planning and acquiring consultants. The larger schools received less extensive assistance than did the smaller schools. However, the larger schools received a much higher level of moderate assistance in their in-service education activities.

III. Are local school district personnel needed on Education Service Center study and advisory committees and groups to determine and evaluate service needs?

Yes, local school district personnel are needed on study and advisory committees for the Education Service
Centers in order to determine and evaluate service needs. The data support this with a majority of the schools responding with 60.1 per cent of the schools agreeing with this position. Thirty-two and one-tenth per cent of the respondents felt that local school district personnel were needed on Education Service Center advisory and study committees in special situations. Six and five-tenths per cent of the sample felt that local personnel service was needed only when required by law and/or the Texas Education Agency. Only 1.2 per cent felt no need for local school district personnel to serve on Education Service Center study and advisory committees.

IV. Has the operation of the Education Service Centers enabled the superintendent to meet his administrative responsibilities more effectively in areas of planning and decision making?

The Education Service Centers have assisted 28.6 per cent of the responding schools in the planning process by training the superintendent and his staff. Forty-four per cent of the schools were assisted in the planning process by the Education Service Centers providing the expertise and the manpower. A majority of the schools were provided materials for local training and implementation of planning, while 10.7 per cent received no assistance from Education Service Centers.
Fifteen and five-tenths per cent felt that Education Service Centers provide research findings that serve as a basis for decision making. A majority, 78.6 per cent, of the responding sample schools indicated moderate to little research findings have been provided for decision making at the local school level.

Only 22.2 per cent of the schools participated in electronic data processing in cooperation with the Education Service Centers. Thirteen and seven-tenths per cent of the schools, or a majority of the schools participating in Education Service Center electronic data processing, felt that a more efficient record keeping program was provided.

The data show that the Education Service Centers assisted 33.3 per cent of the respondents in securing and coordinating state and federal education programs in an efficient and effective manner. At the same time, 38.7 per cent indicated that this assistance was provided only when the local school district requested it.

V. How have the Education Service Centers encouraged innovations in school administration?

The data conclusively indicate, by an 81 per cent response, that the Education Service Centers have encouraged innovation in school administration most by bringing superintendents and other school administrators together to share ideas and planning. Little influence was felt from research results being provided by the Education Service Centers, as
indicated by a 16.7 per cent response of the schools, while
31 per cent felt that supplementary services were more of an
influence to innovation in school administration.

VI. Has participation in Education Service Center pro-
gams required additional resources?

Participation in Education Service Center programs has
required very little additional resources at the local
school district level. Fifty-four and eight-tenths per cent
of the respondents indicated that additional administrative
expense and time was required, and 44.6 per cent needed no
additional resources. The remaining respondents reported
the major expense of the addition of either clerical or ad-
ministrative personnel as a result of participating in Edu-
cation Service Center programs.

VII. In what areas of school administration are the
Education Service Centers most affecting the functioning of
the superintendent of schools in Texas?

The Education Service Centers have rendered several ad-
ministrative services to local school districts which
affected the function of the superintendent of schools.
Thirty and four-tenths per cent of the responding schools
felt that the Education Service Centers had assisted in im-
proving local school district administrative organization.
Eighty-two and one-tenth per cent of the respondents indi-
cated that teacher in-service was an important service
received from the Education Service Centers. Sixty-six and
one-tenth per cent indicated services to pupils. Fifty-three per cent of the schools felt that assistance in curriculum development was another important service rendered by the Education Service Center. Only 4.8 per cent indicated no influence on the functioning of the superintendent of schools.

Most superintendents responding indicated that the Education Service Center affected their responsibilities significantly in several categories. Forty-eight and two-tenths per cent reported their responsibilities being affected by the Education Service Centers assuming responsibility for coordination of some services on a regional basis. Forty-three and five-tenths per cent indicated that administrative responsibilities were affected by the Education Service Centers serving as a liaison between the Texas Education Agency and the local school district. In addition, 48.2 per cent of the superintendents reported that the Education Service Centers affected their administrative responsibilities significantly by assisting in developing more cooperation between local school districts.

In response to the level of influence exerted on the superintendent by the Education Service Centers, only 4.8 per cent indicated extensive influence. Sixty and one-tenth per cent of the respondents did report a moderate influence in making decisions for some programs or situations, but not
all. Twenty-eight per cent felt little influence and 6.5 per cent indicated no influence by the Education Service Centers.

The particular services which have affected the superintendent most are reflected by the total sample indicating 73.8 per cent for media, 20.8 per cent for administrative, 12.5 per cent for computer, and 20.8 per cent for academic services.

The time necessary for the superintendent to acquire and develop the services provided by the Education Service Center was deemed beneficial by most of the respondents. This is reflected by 37.5 per cent who indicated that it was time well spent and 52.4 per cent who reported that at times it was beneficial. Only 7.1 per cent indicated that the time spent was unnecessary in most instances, and 1.8 per cent reported that the time utilized was completely unnecessary and undesirable.

VIII. Has the operation of the Education Service Centers affected the autonomy of the local school district?

A majority of the responding superintendents indicated, by 67.8 per cent, that the establishment and operation of the Education Service Centers has extended state control into the local school district to no greater degree than before. A 19 per cent response indicated that state control had been extended into the local school district to a more favorable level, while 13.2 per cent reported more
than is desirable, and none reported less than is desirable. The data reflect that little influence was felt by the local school district superintendent in regard to the operation of the Education Service Center and the autonomy of the local school districts.

IX. What are the attitudes of the public school superintendents concerning the effect of the operation of the Education Service Centers on the superintendency?

The data support the fact that superintendents of schools feel the Education Service Centers to be a positive and helpful member of the educational family. This was reflected by 38.1 per cent who indicated the effect of the operation of the Education Service Centers on the superintendency to be positive and helpful, while 52.4 per cent reported receiving assistance. Only 10.1 per cent indicated the effect was negligible and .6 per cent undesirable.

X. What services should the Education Service Center provide the public schools and what relationship should be developed for the future relative to the centers and the public school superintendency?

The data indicate support for the role of the Education Service Centers to be that of rendering direct services to students and personnel of the local school districts. The most strongly supported role, as indicated by 60.7 per cent of the respondents, is to provide services to pupils and teachers. Forty-eight and two-tenths per cent
felt that the role of a research and development center for all school districts regardless of size would be desirable. Twenty-five per cent of the respondents felt the role of the Education Service Centers should be to improve the administrative organization, structure, and operation of local school districts.

A majority, 89.3 per cent, of the respondents indicated that the Texas Education Agency intended the Education Service Centers to be service agencies only and this has been the actual result. Only 7.7 per cent of the schools felt that this was the intent but not the situation, and 3 per cent felt that it was neither the intent nor the situation. The data support the fact that the Education Service Centers are service agencies and not regulatory agencies.

The answer regarding the future role of the Education Service Centers relative to the public school superintendency is clear. Eighty-one per cent of the respondents indicated the desire for the Education Service Centers to remain as they are presently organized and become more of a service agency. Seventeen and three-tenths per cent of the respondents felt that the Education Service Centers should become a regional office of the Texas Education Agency and 5.4 per cent felt that the education service center should be abandoned because of its ineffectiveness.
Conclusions

1. The Education Service Center in Texas is a well-established service unit functioning at a level between the Texas Education Agency and the local school district.

2. The local school districts in Texas are participating in Education Service Center activities at an increasing rate each year.

3. The public school superintendent is influenced by Education Service Center activities and personnel in determining the content of in-service programs for the local school district staff.

4. The time and effort expended by local school district personnel serving on Education Service Center study and advisory committees are justified.

5. The services provided by the Education Service Center have enabled the superintendent to meet his administrative responsibilities more effectively.

6. The activities of the Education Service Center have encouraged innovations in school administration.

7. The Education Service Center affects the functioning of the superintendent of schools in all areas of administration dealing with instructional services to pupils and teachers.

8. The Education Service Center has not extended state control further into the local school district operation.
9. The public school superintendents in Texas have a positive attitude toward the Education Service Center.

10. The Education Service Centers have maintained the intended role of being a service unit in the state educational family.

Implications

1. Some form of standard evaluation should be implemented to determine the effectiveness of each Education Service Center.

2. Some basis should be established to provide foundation funding for each Education Service Center.

3. Research and information developed by individual Education Service Centers should be made available to each of the other centers by a communications program designed for this purpose.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made as a result of the study:

1. The future role of the Education Service Center should continue to be one of service.

2. Research and development should be emphasized more strongly at the Education Service Center level.

3. Each Education Service Center should include a component dealing directly with administrative problems of superintendents of schools.
4. A study should be made of the changes in operation in the Texas Education Agency that occurred as a result of the establishment of the Education Service Centers.

5. It is further recommended that this or a similar study be conducted periodically to assist in directing the further development of the Education Service Centers in Texas.

6. In the future, the Education Service Centers should concentrate on providing more services directly to the local school district students, teachers, and administrators.
APPENDIX A

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF THE OPERATION OF REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS ON THE SUPERINTENDENCY IN SELECTED TEXAS SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Identifying Data

No school or person will be identified by name, number, or implication in the analysis of this data.

District Name ___________________________ County ___________________________
Education Service Center Region Number ___________________________
Total years administrative experience of superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 thru 19 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 thru 14 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 thru 9 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total School District Enrollment ___________________________

Instructions

Please check one or more of the choices to each of the survey questions. You are reminded to read each statement carefully before making your choice, keeping in mind that your opinion is what is being sought.

1. Your district has participated in one or more Regional Education Service Center activity in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) 1967-68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 1968-69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 1969-70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 1970-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 1971-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Did not participate at any time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. If your district did not participate in any of the activities of the Regional Education Service Center, the reason or reasons were
   ___ a) appropriate services were not available.
   ___ b) inadequate local funds.
   ___ c) concern for loss of district autonomy.
   ___ d) lack of understanding of role of Education Service Center.
   ___ e) feeling that the Education Service Center was just another arm of the Texas Education Agency.
   ___ f) Other (list) __________________________.

   **NOTE:**

   If your school district has never participated in any service provided by the Education Service Center you may stop at this point.

3. The Education Service Center activities and personnel have influenced the content of inservice education for your staff
   ___ a) extensively, assisted in planning and implementation.
   ___ b) moderately, assisted in planning and acquiring consultants.
   ___ c) little, provided materials as requested.
   ___ d) none.

4. The involvement of local school personnel in Education Service Center study and advisory committees and groups are
   ___ a) needed and beneficial to both agencies.
   ___ b) needed only in special situations.
   ___ c) needed only when required by law and/or The Texas Education Agency.
   ___ d) not needed and are a waste of valuable time and effort.

5. The Education Service Center staff affected planning in your district by
   ___ a) training you and your staff.
   ___ b) providing the expertise and the manpower.
   ___ c) providing materials for local training and implementation of planning.
   ___ d) provided no assistance in the planning process.
6. The Education Service Center has provided research findings from pilot projects that have
   ____ a) served as a basis for decision making in priority areas in your district.
   ____ b) influenced decisions in priority areas to a moderate degree in your district.
   ____ c) little affect on local school district decisions.
   ____ d) no affect on local school district decisions.

7. The Education Service Center electronic data processing has resulted in
   ____ a) a more efficient record keeping program.
   ____ b) a more accurate basis for administrative decisions.
   ____ c) increased local cost for same services previously done mechanically or by hand.
   ____ d) the addition of personnel for the purpose of working with the electronic data processing.
   ____ e) None of these - do not participate in data processing.

8. The Education Service Center assists the local school district in securing and coordinating state and federal education programs
   ____ a) in an efficient and effective manner.
   ____ b) when directed to do so by the Texas Education Agency.
   ____ c) when requested to do so by the local school district.
   ____ d) when there is more than one school district involved in the project.
   ____ e) none at all.

9. The Education Service Center has encouraged innovation in school administration by
   ____ a) providing research results for decision making.
   ____ b) bringing superintendents and other school administrators together to share ideas and planning.
   ____ c) providing supplementary services to the school district.
   ____ d) Other (list) ____________________________.
10. Participation in Education Service Center programs required
   _____ a) additional administrative staff.
   _____ b) additional clerical staff.
   _____ c) additional administrative expenses and time only.
   _____ d) no additional resources.

11. The services received from the Education Service Center have improved local school district
   _____ a) administrative organization.
   _____ b) teacher inservice.
   _____ c) services to pupils.
   _____ d) curriculum development.
   _____ e) none.

12. The operation of the Education Service Center has affected your administrative responsibilities significantly by
   _____ a) assuming responsibility for coordination of some services on a regional basis.
   _____ b) serving as a liaison between the Texas Education Agency and the local school district.
   _____ c) developing more cooperation between local school districts.
   _____ d) Other (list) ________________________________.

13. In your opinion, the operation of the Education Service Center has affected your function as superintendent of schools
   _____ a) extensively, to the point of strongly affecting board policy and daily decisions.
   _____ b) moderately, influences decisions in some programs or situations, but not all.
   _____ c) little, provides some guidance or influence occasionally.
   _____ d) none.
14. The service provided by the Education Service Center that has affected the superintendency most is
   ___ a) academic.
   ___ b) media.
   ___ c) administrative.
   ___ d) computer
   ___ e) Other (list) ________________________________.

15. Does operation of the Education Service Center require you to spend more time away from your school district? If so, is this
   ___ a) time well spent for the benefit of the children in the local school district.
   ___ b) at times, beneficial and other times wasteful.
   ___ c) unnecessary in most instances.
   ___ d) completely unnecessary and undesirable.

16. In your opinion, has the establishment and operation of the Education Service Center extended state control further into the local school district
   ___ a) to a more favorable level.
   ___ b) more than is desirable.
   ___ c) less than is desirable.
   ___ d) to no greater degree than before.

17. The effect the operation of the Education Service Center has on your functioning as a superintendent of schools is
   ___ a) positive and helpful.
   ___ b) some assistance.
   ___ c) negligible.
   ___ d) undesirable.

18. The major role and/or function of the Education Service Centers should be
   ___ a) to improve the administrative organization, structure and operation of school districts within a predetermined area.
b) to provide services to pupils and teachers in local schools.

c) a research and development center for all school districts regardless of size.

d) Other (list) ________________________________

 e) all of the above.

19. The Texas Education Agency has emphasized that the Education Service Centers are Service agencies only and not regulatory agencies. In your opinion, this is

 a) the intent and the actual situation.
 b) the intent but not the situation.
 c) neither the intent nor the situation.
 d) Other (list) ________________________________

20. The Education Service Center should

 a) remain as it is presently.
 b) become more of a service agency.
 c) become a regional office of the Texas Education Agency.
 d) be abandoned because of its ineffectiveness.
 e) Other (list) ________________________________
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE ADVISORY PANEL

Mr. Weyman E. Martin
Superintendent of Schools
Little Cypress-Mauriceville Independent School District
Route 2, Box 1065
Orange, Texas  77630  Telephone:  (713) 883-2232

Dr. Charles Mathews
Superintendent of Schools
Longview Independent School District
P.O. Box 151
Longview, Texas  75601  Telephone:  (214) 753-0206

Mr. Frank Monroe
Superintendent of Schools
Highland Park Independent School District
7015 Westchester Drive
Dallas, Texas  75205  Telephone:  (214) 521-4103

Mr. James W. Martin
Superintendent of Schools
Arlington Independent School District
1203 Pioneer Parkway
Arlington, Texas  76010  Telephone:  (817) 274-7354

Mr. Bill Hood
Superintendent of Schools
Snyder Independent School District
2901 37th Street
Snyder, Texas  79526  Telephone:  (915) 573-5401

Mr. Lloyd Matson
Assistant Superintendent of Personnel
San Angelo Independent School District
100 N. Magdalen
San Angelo, Texas  76901  Telephone:  (915) 655-5741

Mr. Gerald Shelly
Superintendent of Schools
Seagraves Independent School District
P.O. Box 845
Seagraves, Texas  75359  Telephone:  (806) 546-2035
Dear Mr. Shelley:

The public school superintendency is a position in today's society that is experiencing rapid changes. In Texas, one of the major change agents making an impact on the superintendency seems to be the Education Service Centers.

I am doing a survey study of the impact the Education Service Center is on the public school superintendency. A panel of seven superintendents presently serving on the Texas Association of School Administrators Executive Committee is being selected and ask to give advise as to the appropriateness of each of the items in the survey questionnaire.

My purpose in writing to you is to ask you if you would be so kind as to serve as a member of the panel. This will require some of your valuable time and effort, but not an excessive amount.

If you agree to serve, the instrument, along with instructions will be sent to you. A card is enclosed on which you may indicate your decision.

The study will provide data for a doctoral dissertation which I am preparing under the direction of Dr. Paul F. Smith at North Texas State University.

Thank you for your interest in education.

Sincerely,

Forrest E. Watson
Superintendent
APPENDIX D

November 1, 1971

Dear

Your agreement to serve on the Advisory Panel for the development of the questionnaire to be used in preparation of my dissertation is very much appreciated.

Information is included in the following paragraphs which should provide the necessary instructions to complete the task.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Forrest E. Watson
Superintendent

FEW:ds

Advisory Panel Instructions

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to elicit the opinion of randomly selected superintendents in Texas. The opinions concern the following "Problem and Purposes":

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine the impact of the Regional Education Service Centers on the public school superintendency in Texas and the future development of the relationship.

Purpose of the Study

Four major purposes of the Regional Education Service Centers have been identified in the Texas State Plan. The purposes are to develop and
provide: regional educational planning to meet immediate and long range educational needs of the region and as a part of statewide planning; educational services as established by planning and by the needs and desires in the region; participation in appropriate statewide educational programs as requested by the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education; media services as State Law mandates.

The purpose of this investigation is to seek conclusions concerning such questions as the following as they relate to the impact the Education Service Centers have had on the public school superintendency in Texas and the future development of this relationship:

1. What percentage of the selected local school districts participate in some service provided by the Education Service Centers?

2. Has the operation of the Education Service Centers affected the autonomy of the local school district?

3. To what extent have the Education Service Centers assumed administrative responsibilities formerly delegated to the local superintendent of schools?

4. Has the operation of the Education Service Centers enabled the superintendent to meet his administrative responsibilities more effectively?

5. In what area or areas of administration are the Education Service Centers rendering the greatest service to the superintendent?

6. What services to public school superintendents should the Education Service Centers emphasize in the future?

7. What relationship should be designed for the future relative to the Education Service Center and the public school superintendency?

In light of the stated problem and purposes, the advisory panel member should make suggestions for changes of any item in the questionnaire that does not appear appropriate or seems unclear. Those items which seem appropriate and clear need no comments.

After any needed notations are made on the back of the questionnaire sheets or a separate sheet, the questionnaire along with the suggestions should be placed in the self-addressed envelop provided and returned.

This information is needed to enable the investigator to meet a November 16th deadline. Your help in this matter will be much appreciated.
APPENDIX E

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF THE OPERATION OF REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS ON THE SUPERINTENDENCY IN SELECTED TEXAS SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Identifying Data

No school or person will be identified by name, number, or implication in the analysis of this data.

District Name [ ] County [ ]
Education Service Center Region Number [ ]
Total years administrative experience of superintendent

- 70 years or more
- 15 thru 19 years
- 10 thru 14 years

Total School District Enrollment [ ] Distance from Service Center [ ] Miles

Instructions

Please check one or more of the choices for each of the survey questions. You are reminded to read each statement carefully before making your choice, keeping in mind that your opinion is what is being sought.

1. Your district has participated in one or more Regional Education Service Center activity in

   a) 1967-68
   b) 1968-69
   c) 1969-70
   d) 1970-71
   e) 1971-72
   f) Did not participate at any time

2. If your district did not participate in any of the activities of the Regional Education Service Center, the reason or reasons were

   a) Appropriate services were not available
   b) Inadequate local funds
   c) Concern for loss of district autonomy
   d) Lack of understanding of role of Education Service Center
   e) Feeling that the Education Service Center was just another arm of the Texas Education Agency
   f) Other (list)

NOTE

If your school district has never participated in any service provided by the Education Service Center you may stop at this point.

3. The Education Service Center activities and personnel have influenced the content of in-service education for your staff

   a) Extensively, assisted in planning and implementation
   b) Moderately, assisted in planning and acquiring consultants
   c) Little, provided materials as requested
   d) Not at all

4. The involvement of local school personnel in Education Service Center study and advisory committees and groups is

   a) Needed and beneficial to both agencies
   b) Needed only in special situations
   c) Needed only when required by law and/or the Texas Education Agency
5. The Education Service Center staff affected planning in your district by
   a) training you and your staff
   b) providing the expertise and the manpower
   c) providing materials for local training and implementation of planning
   d) providing no assistance in the planning process

6. The Education Service Center has provided research findings from pilot projects that have
   a) served as a basis for decision making in priority areas in your district
   b) influenced decisions in priority areas to a moderate degree in your district
   c) little effect on local school district decisions
   d) no effect on local school district decisions

7. The Education Service Center electronic data processing has resulted in
   a) a more efficient record keeping program
   b) a more accurate basis for administrative decisions
   c) increased local cost for same services previously done mechanically or by hand
   d) the addition of personnel for the purpose of working with the electronic data processing
   e) none of these - do not participate in data processing

8. The Education Service Center assists the local school district in securing and coordinating state and federal education programs
   a) in an efficient and effective manner
   b) when directed to do so by the Texas Education Agency
   c) when requested to do so by the local school district
   d) when there is more than one school district involved in the project
   e) none at all

9. The Education Service Center has encouraged innovation in school administration by
   a) providing research results for decision making
   b) bringing superintendents and other school administrators together to share ideas and planning
   c) providing supplementary services to the school district
   d) other (list) ____________________________________________________________________________

10. Participation in Education Service Center programs required
    a) additional administrative staff
    b) additional clerical staff
    c) additional administrative expenses and time only
    d) no additional resources
11. The services received from the Education Service Center have improved local school district
   a) administrative organization
   b) teacher inservice
   c) services to pupils
   d) curriculum development
   e) none

12. The operation of the Education Service Center has affected your administrative responsibilities significantly by
   a) assuming responsibility for coordination of some services on a regional basis
   b) serving as a liaison between the Texas Education Agency and the local school district
   c) developing more cooperation between local school districts
   d) other (list) ___________________________

13. In your opinion, the operation of the Education Service Center has affected your function as superintendent of schools
   a) extensively, to the point of strongly affecting board policy and daily decisions
   b) moderately, influencing decisions in some programs or situations, but not all
   c) little, provides some guidance or influence occasionally
   d) none

14. The service provided by the Education Service Center that has affected the Superintendency most is
   a) academic
   b) media
   c) computer
   d) administrative
   e) other (list) __________________________

15. Does operation of the Education Service Center require you to spend more time away from your school district? If so, is this
   a) time well spent for the benefit of the children in the district
   b) at times beneficial and other times wasteful
   c) unnecessary in most instances
   d) completely unnecessary and undesirable

16. In your opinion, has the establishment and operation of the Education Service Center extended state control further into the local school district
   a) to a more favorable level
   b) more than is desirable
   c) less than is desirable
   d) to no greater degree than before
17. The effect the operation of the Education Service Center has on your functioning as a superintendent of schools is

  ___ a) positive and helpful
  ___ b) some assistance
  ___ c) negligible
  ___ d) undesirable

18. The major role and/or function of the Education Service Centers should be

  ___ a) to improve the administrative organization, structure and operation of school districts within a predetermined area
  ___ b) to provide services to pupils and teachers in local schools
  ___ c) a research and development center for all school districts regardless of size
  ___ d) other (list) __________________________
  ___ e) all of the above

19. The Texas Education Agency has emphasized that the Education Service Centers are service agencies only and not regulatory agencies. In your opinion, this is

  ___ a) the intent and the actual situation
  ___ b) the intent but not the situation
  ___ c) neither the intent nor the situation
  ___ d) other (list) __________________________

20. The Education Service Center should

  ___ a) remain as it is presently
  ___ b) become more of a service agency
  ___ c) become a regional office of the Texas Education Agency
  ___ d) be abandoned because of its ineffectiveness
  ___ e) other (list) __________________________
APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE JURY PANEL

Mr. G. E. Thompson
Superintendent of Schools
Kermit Independent School District
P.O. Drawer S
Kermit, Texas 79745 Telephone: (915) 586-3381

Mr. O. E. Hendricks
Superintendent of Schools
New Braunfels Independent School District
P.O. Box 1061
New Braunfels, Texas 78130 Telephone: (512) 625-2356

Dr. Terrell W. Ogg
Superintendent of Schools
Mt. Pleasant Independent School District
P.O. Box 1117
Mt. Pleasant, Texas 75455 Telephone: (214) 724-6686

Mr. J. D. Carlisle
Superintendent of Schools
Sinton Independent School District
P.O. Box 1337
Sinton, Texas 78387 Telephone: (512) 364-2293

Mr. N. L. Douglas
Superintendent of Schools
Belton Independent School District
P.O. Box 269
Belton, Texas 76513 Telephone: (817) 939-1881
APPENDIX G

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF THE OPERATION OF REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS ON THE SUPERINTENDENCY IN SELECTED TEXAS SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Identifying Data

No school or person will be identified by name, number, or implication in the analysis of this data.

District Name ________________________________ County _____________________

Education Service Center Region Number ___________________

Total years administrative experience of superintendent

_______ 20 years or more          _______ 5 thru 9 years
      15 thru 19 years            _______ less than 5 years
      10 thru 14 years

Total School District Enrollment _______ Distance from Service Center _______ Miles

Instructions

Please check one or more of the choices for each of the survey questions. You are reminded to read each statement carefully before making your choice, keeping in mind that your opinion is what is being sought.

A B C  1. Your district has participated in one or more Regional Education Service Center activity in

_______ a) 1967-68          _______ e) 1971-72
 _______ b) 1968-69          _______ f) Did not participate
 _______ c) 1969-70          _______ at any time
 _______ d) 1970-71

A B C  2. If your district did not participate in any of the activities of the Regional Education Service Center, the reason or reasons were

_______ a) Appropriate services were not available.
 _______ b) inadequate local funds
c) concern for loss of district autonomy  
d) lack of understanding of role of Education Service Center  
e) feeling that the Education Service Center was just another arm of the Texas Education Agency  
f) other (list) ________________________________

NOTE

If your school district has never participated in any service provided by the Education Service Center you may stop at this point.

ABC 3. The Education Service Center activities and personnel have influenced the content of in-service education for your staff  
   a) extensively, assisted in planning and implementation  
   b) moderately, assisted in planning and acquiring consultants  
   c) little, provided materials as requested  
   d) not at all

ABC 4. The involvement of local school personnel in Education Service Center study and advisory committees and groups is  
   a) needed and beneficial to both agencies  
   b) needed only in special situations  
   c) needed only when required by law and/or the Texas Education Agency  
   d) not needed and is a waste of valuable time and effort

ABC 5. The Education Service Center staff affected planning in your district by  
   a) training you and your staff  
   b) providing the expertise and the manpower
c) providing materials for local training and implementation of planning

d) providing no assistance in the planning process

6. The Education Service Center has provided research findings from pilot projects that have

a) served as a basis for decision making in priority areas in your district

b) influenced decisions in priority areas to a moderate degree in your district

c) little effect on local school district decisions

d) no effect on local school district decisions

7. The Education Service Center electronic data processing has resulted in

a) a more efficient record keeping program

b) a more accurate basis for administrative decisions

c) increased local cost for same services previously done mechanically or by hand

d) the addition of personnel for the purpose of working with the electronic data processing

e) None of these - do not participate in data processing

8. The Education Service Center assists the local school district in securing and coordinating state and federal education programs.

a) in an efficient and effective manner

b) when directed to do so by the Texas Education Agency

c) when requested to do so by the local school district

d) when there is more than one school district involved in the project.

e) none at all
9. The Education Service Center has encouraged innovation in school administration by

_____ a) providing research results for decision making
_____ b) bringing superintendents and other school administrators together to share ideas and planning
_____ c) providing supplementary services to the school district.
_____ d) other (list)

10. Participating in Education Service Center programs required,

_____ a) additional administrative staff
_____ b) additional clerical staff
_____ c) additional administrative expenses and time only
_____ d) no additional resources

11. The services received from the Education Service Center have improved local school district

_____ a) administrative organization
_____ b) teacher inservice
_____ c) services to pupils
_____ d) curriculum development
_____ e) none

12. The operation of the Education Service Center has affected your administrative responsibilities significantly by

_____ a) assuming responsibility for coordination of some services on a regional basis
_____ b) serving as a liaison between the Texas Education Agency and the local school district
c) developing more cooperation between local school districts

d) other (list) ____________________________

13. In your opinion, the operation of the Education Service Center has affected your function as superintendent of schools.

a) extensively, to the point of strongly affecting board policy and daily decisions.

b) moderately, influencing decisions in some programs or situations, but not all

c) little, provides some guidance or influence occasionally

d) none

14. The Service provided by the Education Service Center that has affected the Superintendency most is

a) academic

b) media

c) computer

d) administrative

e) other (list) ____________________________

15. Does operation of the Education Service Center require you to spend more time away from your school district? If so, is this

a) time well spent for the benefit of the children in the district

b) at times, beneficial and other times wasteful

c) unnecessary in most instances

d) completely unnecessary and undesirable

16. In your opinion, has the establishment and operation of the Education Service Center extended state control further into the local school district
a) to a more favorable level
b) more than is desirable
c) less than is desirable
d) to no greater degree than before

ABC 17. The effect the operation of the Education Service Center has on your functioning as a superintendent of schools is

a) positive and helpful
b) some assistance
c) negligible
d) undesirable

ABC 18. The major role and/or function of the Education Service Centers should be

a) to improve the administrative organization, structure and operation of school districts within a predetermined area
b) to provide services to pupils and teachers in local schools
c) a research and development center for all school districts regardless of size
d) other (list)
e) all of the above

ABC 19. The Texas Education Agency has emphasized that the Education Service Centers are Service agencies only and not regulatory agencies. In your opinion, this is

a) the intent and the actual situation
b) the intent but not the situation
c) neither the intent nor the situation
d) other (list)
20. The Education Service Center should

____ a) remain as it is presently

____ b) become more of a service agency

____ c) become a regional office of the Texas Education Agency

____ d) be abandoned because of its ineffectiveness

____ e) other (list) ____________________________
Mr. G. E. Thompson  
P.O. Drawer S  
Kermit, Texas  79745  

Dear Mr. Thompson:  

Your assistance is requested in establishing the validity of a survey questionnaire to be used as a part of a doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University. The dissertation is being prepared under the direction of Dr. Paul F. Smith, Chairman, Division of Educational Leadership.  

The study will involve a survey of the impact of the Education Service Centers on the public school superintendency in Texas.  

As you react to the questionnaire, decide whether or not each of the items will provide the researcher with needed information. If an item is appropriate and clear, circle the "A" in the left margin. If you are undecided, circle the "B". If you feel the item is inappropriate or unclear, circle the "C". At the close of the questionnaire there is a place for your comments.  

You are one of five outstanding educators in Texas that will react to the questionnaire before it is actually used in the study. Your candid opinion is very important to the success of this project. A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.  

Your assistance in this endeavor is much appreciated.  

Sincerely,  

Forrest E. Watson  
Superintendent
APPENDIX I

Alphabetical List of School Samples

1. Abbott Independent School District  Hill
2. Alanreed Independent School District  Gray
3. Alice Independent School District  Jim Wells
4. Alpine Independent School District  Brewster
5. Alto Independent School District  Cherokee
6. Alton Independent School District  Hidalgo
8. Antelope Independent School District  Jack
10. Arp Independent School District  Smith
11. Asherton Independent School District  Dimmit
12. Athens Independent School District  Henderson
13. Avalon Independent School District  Ellis
16. Beeville Independent School District  Bee
17. Belton Independent School District  Bell
18. Bertram Independent School District  Burnet
22. Bluff Dale Common School District  Erath
23. Boling Independent School District  Wharton
24. Bonham Independent School District  Fannin
25. Borden Independent School District
27. Bridgeport Independent School District
29. Bryan Independent School District
30. Bryson Independent School District
31. Buffalo Independent School District
32. Bula Independent School District
33. Burkeville Independent School District
34. Cedar Hill Independent School District
35. Celeste Independent School District
36. Center Point Independent School District
37. Chico Independent School District
38. Cisco Independent School District
40. Cleburne Independent School District
41. Clifton Independent School District
42. Clyde Independent School District
43. Comanche Independent School District
44. Comstock Independent School District
45. Cooper Independent School District
46. Coppell Independent School District
47. Corsicana Independent School District
48. Crawford Independent School District
49. Crowley Independent School District

Borden
Robertson
Wise
Wheeler
Brazos
Jack
Leon
Bailey
Newton
Dallas
Hunt
Kerr
Wise
Eastland
Armstrong
Johnson
Bosque
Callahan
Comanche
Val Verde
Delta
Dallas
Navarro
Mc Lennan
Tarrant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cuero Independent School District</td>
<td>DeWitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daingerfield Independent School District</td>
<td>Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhart Independent School District</td>
<td>Dallam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Independent School District</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson Independent School District</td>
<td>Navarro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dell City Independent School District</td>
<td>Hudspeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison Independent School District</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deport Independent School District</td>
<td>Lamar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Independent School District</td>
<td>Red River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dime Box Independent School District</td>
<td>Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driscoll Independent School District</td>
<td>Nueces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Independent School District</td>
<td>Van Zandt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Independent School District</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin Independent School District</td>
<td>Bastrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Independent School District</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustace Independent School District</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evant Independent School District</td>
<td>Coryell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Independent School District</td>
<td>Freestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris Independent School District</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flatonia Independent School District</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floydada Independent School District</td>
<td>Floyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Davis Independent School District</td>
<td>Jeff Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankston Independent School District</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost Independent School District</td>
<td>Navarro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville Independent School District</td>
<td>Cooke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Galveston Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Giddings Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Gladewater Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Gold Burg Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Gonzales Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Gordon Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Gorman Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Grapevine Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Gregory-Portland Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Hamilton Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Hawkins Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Hempstead Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Hobbs Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Hubbard Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Hunt Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Huntington Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Ingram Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Iola Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Iowa Park Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Irving Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Italy Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Itasca Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Joshua Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Karnes City Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Kaufman Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Keller Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Kemp Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Kerens Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Kopperl Rural High School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>La Vega Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Lasara Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Latego Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Lewisville Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Liberty Hill Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Lipan Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Llano Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Loop Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Lott Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Loving Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Lufkin Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Luling Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Mc Adoo Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Mc Caney Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Mc Faddin Common School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Marathon Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Marble Falls Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Marlin Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Matador Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Martins Mill Independent School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
125. Meridian Independent School District  
126. Miami Independent School District  
127. Midlothian Independent School District  
128. Midway Independent School District  
129. Milano Independent School District  
130. Mildred Independent School District  
131. Mobearie Independent School District  
132. Moody Independent School District  
133. Moran Independent School District  
134. Munday Independent School District  
135. Newcastle Independent School District  
136. New Waverly Independent School District  
137. Nordheim Independent School District  
138. Normangee Independent School District  
139. Oakwood Independent School District  
140. Paige Independent School District  
141. Palestine Independent School District  
142. Pasadena Independent School District  
143. Pecos Independent School District  
144. Perrin Independent School District  
145. Pflugerville Independent School District  
146. Plainview Independent School District  
147. Plano Independent School District  
148. Ponder Independent School District  
149. Post Independent School District  

Bosque  
Roberts  
Ellis  
Mc Lennan  
Milam  
Navarro  
Wheeler  
Mc Lennan  
Shackleford  
Knox  
Young  
Walker  
Dewitt  
Leon  
Leon  
Bastrop  
Anderson  
Harris  
Reeves  
Jack  
Travis  
Hale  
Collin  
Denton  
Garza
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Pottsville Independent School District</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Quinlan Independent School District</td>
<td>Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Randolph Field Independent School District</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Ranger Independent School District</td>
<td>Eastland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Red Oak Independent School District</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Riesel Independent School District</td>
<td>Mc Lennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Rio Grande City Independent School District</td>
<td>Starr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Rio Hondo Independent School District</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>River Road Independent School District</td>
<td>Potter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Roaring Springs Independent School District</td>
<td>Motely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Roby Independent School District</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Round Rock Independent School District</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>S &amp; S Cons. Rural High School District</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>San Antonio Independent School District</td>
<td>Bexar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Independent School District</td>
<td>Nueces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>San Isidro Independent School District</td>
<td>Starr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Sabine Pass Independent School District</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>San Perlita Independent School District</td>
<td>Willacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>San Saba Independent School District</td>
<td>San Saba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>San Vincente Independent School District</td>
<td>Brewster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Skidmore-Tynam Independent School District</td>
<td>Bee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Slidell Independent School District</td>
<td>Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Snook Independent School District</td>
<td>Burleson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Snyder Independent School District</td>
<td>Scurry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Springtown Independent School District</td>
<td>Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Stamford Independent School District</td>
<td>Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stinnett Independent School District</td>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Strawn Independent School District</td>
<td>Palo Pinto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Strong Common School District</td>
<td>Shelby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>South Plains Common School District</td>
<td>Floyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Sulpher Springs</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Temple Independent School District</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Throckmorton Independent School District</td>
<td>Throckmorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Tolar Independent School District</td>
<td>Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Tomball Independent School District</td>
<td>Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Trinidad Independent School District</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Troy Independent School District</td>
<td>Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Valentine Independent School District</td>
<td>Jeff Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Van Independent School District</td>
<td>Van Zandt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Wallis Independent School District</td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Waxahachie Independent School District</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Wells Independent School District</td>
<td>Cherokee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>West Independent School District</td>
<td>Collingsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>West Hardin Independent School District</td>
<td>Hardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Whitewright Independent School District</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Whitney Independent School District</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>White Oak Independent School District</td>
<td>Gregg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Wink Independent School District</td>
<td>Winkler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Winters Independent School District</td>
<td>Runnels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Woodson Independent School District</td>
<td>Throckmorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Wylie Independent School District</td>
<td>Collin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Dear Fellow Administrator:

Your help is requested to aid in completing a study concerning the impact the Regional Education Service Centers have had on the public school superintendency in Texas. The study is being prepared as a part of a doctoral dissertation under the direction of Dr. Paul F. Smith, chairman of the Division of Educational Leadership, North Texas State University. The questionnaire is being sent to a randomly selected sample of public school superintendents.

The identification information requested on the questionnaire will be used for analysis purposes only. No school identification will be revealed by fact or implication.

Your response or the response of your designated representative will be an important contribution to the study. The completion of the questionnaire should require no more than ten minutes. Your consideration in returning the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope to enable me to meet a December 14, 1971, schedule will be much appreciated. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Forrest E. Watson  
Superintendent
APPENDIX K

October 26, 1971

Dear ______________________:

The study that Forrest Watson is undertaking at this time concerning "The Impact of the Regional Education Service Centers on the Public School Superintendency In Texas" is timely and should be of benefit to education in Texas.

Your assistance in this study is urged. Would you please cooperate by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to Mr. Watson in the accompanying self-addressed envelope.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,
APPENDIX I
A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF THE OPERATION OF REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS ON THE SUPERINTENDENCY IN SELECTED TEXAS SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Identifying Data
No school or person will be identified by name, number, or implication in the analysis of this data.

District Name __________________________ County __________________________
Education Service Center Region Number __________________________
Total years administrative experience of superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Number of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years or more</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 thru 19 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 thru 14 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total School District Enrollment ______ Distance from Service Center ___ Miles

Instructions
Please check one or more of the choices for each of the survey questions. You are reminded to read each statement carefully before making your choice, keeping in mind that your opinion is what is being sought.

1. Your district has participated in one or more Regional Education Service Center activity in
   a) 1967-68
   b) 1968-69
   c) 1969-70
   d) 1970-71
   e) 1971-72
   f) did not participate at any time

2. If your district did not participate in any of the activities of the Regional Education Service Center, the reason or reasons were
   a) appropriate services were not available
   b) inadequate local funds
   c) concern for loss of district autonomy
   d) lack of understanding of role of Education Service Center
   e) feeling that the Education Service Center was just another arm of the Texas Education Agency
   f) other (list) ________________________________

NOTE
If your school district has never participated in any service provided by the Education Service Center you may stop at this point.

3. The Education Service Center activities and personnel have influenced the content of in-service education for your staff
   a) extensively, assisted in planning and implementation
   b) moderately, assisted in planning and acquiring consultants
   c) little, provided materials as requested
   d) not at all

4. The involvement of local school personnel in Education Service Center study and advisory committees and groups is
   a) needed and beneficial to both agencies
   b) needed only in special situations
   c) needed only when required by law and/or the Texas Education Agency
5. The Education Service Center staff affected planning in your district by
   a) training you and your staff
   b) providing the expertise and the manpower
   c) providing materials for local training and implementation of planning
   d) providing no assistance in the planning process

6. The Education Service Center has provided research findings from pilot projects that have
   a) served as a basis for decision making in priority areas in your district
   b) influenced decisions in priority areas to a moderate degree in your district
   c) little effect on local school district decisions
   d) no effect on local school district decisions

7. The Education Service Center electronic data processing has resulted in
   a) a more efficient record keeping program
   b) a more accurate basis for administrative decisions
   c) increased local cost for same services previously done mechanically or by hand
   d) the addition of personnel for the purpose of working with the electronic data processing
   e) None of these - do not participate in data processing

8. The Education Service Center assists the local school district in securing and coordinating state and federal education programs
   a) in an efficient and effective manner
   b) when directed to do so by the Texas Education Agency
   c) when requested to do so by the local school district
   d) when there is more than one school district involved in the project
   e) none at all

9. The Education Service Center has encouraged innovation in school administration by
   a) providing research results for decision making
   b) bringing superintendents and other school administrators together to share ideas and planning
   c) providing supplementary services to the school district
   d) other (list)

10. Participation in Education Service Center programs required
    a) additional administrative staff
    b) additional clerical staff
    c) additional administrative expenses and time only
    d) no additional resources
11. The services received from the Education Service Center have improved -

- a) administrative organization
- b) teacher inservice
- c) services to pupils
- d) curriculum development
- e) none

12. The operation of the Education Service Center has affected your administrative responsibilities significantly by

- a) assuming responsibility for coordination of some services on a regional basis
- b) serving as a liaison between the Texas Education Agency and the local school district
- c) developing more cooperation between local school districts
- d) other (list)

13. In your opinion, the operation of the Education Service Center has affected your function as superintendent of schools

- a) extensively, to the point of strongly affecting board policy and daily decisions
- b) moderately, influencing decisions in some programs or situations, but not all
- c) little provides some guidance or influence occasionally
- d) none

14. The service provided by the Education Service Center that has affected the Superintendency most is

- a) academic
- b) media
- c) computer
- d) administrative
- e) other (list)

15. Does operation of the Education Service Center require you to spend more time away from your school district? If so, is this

- a) time well spent for the benefit of the children in the district
- b) at times beneficial and other times wasteful
- c) unnecessary in most instances
- d) completely unnecessary and undesirable

16. In your opinion has the establishment and operation of the Education Service Center extended state control further into the local school district

- a) to a more favorable level
- b) more than is desirable
- c) less than is desirable
- d) to no greater degree than before
17. The effect the operation of the Education Service Center has on your functioning as a superintendent of schools is

   a) positive and helpful
   b) some assistance
   c) negligible
   d) undesirable

18. The major role and/or function of the Education Service Centers should be

   a) to improve the administrative organization, structure and operation of school districts within a predetermined area
   b) to provide services to pupils and teachers in local schools
   c) a research and development center for all school districts regardless of size
   d) other (list)
   e) all of the above

19. The Texas Education Agency has emphasized that the Education Service Centers are service agencies only and not regulatory agencies. In your opinion, this is

   a) the intent and the actual situation
   b) the intent but not the situation
   c) neither the intent nor the situation
   d) other (list)

20. The Education Service Center should

   a) remain as it is presently
   b) become more of a service agency
   c) become a regional office of the Texas Education Agency
   d) be abandoned because of its ineffectiveness
   e) other (list)
Dear Fellow Superintendent:

About two weeks ago you were mailed a questionnaire concerning the impact of Regional Education Service Centers on the Public School Superintendency in Texas. As of this date I have not received your completed questionnaire.

This is a random sample study and as a result your individual response is very important. For your convenience, I am enclosing another copy of the questionnaire. If for some reason you are unable to participate, would you return the blank questionnaire in the enclosed envelope. Thank you for your time and effort in this matter. I appreciate your help very much.

Sincerely,

Forrest E. Watson
Superintendent
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