

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF SENATE BILL 408  
ON A SELECTED GROUP OF  
TEXAS SCHOOLS

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

E. V. Huppstetter  
Committee Chairman

Earl McCallor  
Committee Member

Hayden W. ...  
Committee Member

Swane Kingerly  
Dean of the College of Education

Robert B. Touloussi  
Dean of the Graduate School

Kirkman, Marvin W., A Survey of the Impact of Senate Bill 408 on a Selected Group of Texas Schools. Doctor of Education (Administrative Leadership), August, 1972, 222 pp., 29 tables, bibliography, 73 titles.

The problem of this study has been to review the cooperative involvement in the development and implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 408, and evaluate the impact of the operation of this legislation on selected public schools of Texas. The background study included a review of literature, a personal conference with numerous state legislators and public school officials, and a review of data at the Texas Education Agency. The survey technique, using a jury-validated instrument, was used to collect data on the operation of the legislation in a stratified, random sample of Texas public schools.

The study was organized around factors of SB 408 that are influencing public school policy, economy, instructional program, and management. The twenty-five statements on the survey instrument were keyed to these areas of the public school program to provide logical sequence for the presentation of the findings.

The introduction and the statement of the problem and purposes were presented in Chapter I, the review of the literature relative to the national trend toward educational

cooperatives in Chapter II, the review of the conceptualization, development, and implementation of SB 408 in Chapter III, the collection of data and a report of the findings in Chapter IV, and the focus, conclusions, and recommendations in Chapter V.

The findings of the study support the basic idea that many educational media services can be provided to large and small schools efficiently through the Regional Educational Media Centers (REMC's) and at the same time focus the services on specific priority needs identified in the cooperating school districts. The program was intended to improve the quality of education for all children. The intent was being met as indicated by participation of over 88 per cent of the children in the sample schools. Schools with adequate to excellent collections of media materials increased to 96 per cent in 1971. Schools with adequate to excellent media staff development programs increased to 98 per cent in 1971. A majority of the sample schools reported the improvement of media program planning, stronger communications and working relationships among cooperating educational institutions, increased local media budgets, and expanded educational opportunities to all children. Little hardship was involved in implementation of the Act.

Media technology has become a priority area of concern to the Texas Educational System. The cooperative approach provided by SB 408 has been accepted by small schools and

is becoming attractive to large schools as a vehicle to facilitate planning, structuring, and operating new and expanded media services.

#### Recommendations

Effectiveness of the present SB 408 program could be improved through

- (1) an extension of SB 408 to utilize REMC's to coordinate all state resources available to local public schools for media services,
- (2) involvement of more school districts, especially those with less than 1,000 Average Daily Attendance, on advisory committees for media programs,
- (3) additional efforts to replicate successfully demonstrated media technology to meet individual school needs,
- (4) additional cooperative efforts between all REMC units to develop and produce localized educational materials,
- (5) a deliberate scheme for delineating, obtaining, and utilizing information about local school desires, needs, and goals as input to REMC decision-making for planning, developing, and implementing area cooperative media programs,
- (6) a deliberate scheme to actively involve business and industry of the area in the conceptualization, development, and operation of media services that utilize modern technology, and

(7) an extension of SB 408 to provide means for REMC's to utilize educational television and computer assisted management of materials as tools to facilitate the use of media services in local schools.

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF SENATE BILL 408  
ON A SELECTED GROUP OF  
TEXAS SCHOOLS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the  
North Texas State University in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirement

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Marvin W. Kirkman, B.S., M.Ed.

Denton, Texas

August, 1972

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Background and Significance of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations	
Basic Assumptions	
Formulation of the Survey Instrument	
Procedures for Collection of Data	
Procedures for Analysis of Data	
Summary	
Bibliography	
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	16
State Legislation for Educational Cooperatives	
Federal Interest in Legislation For Cooperation in Education	
Legal Arrangements for Educational Media Services to Schools from 1905 to 1967	
An Isolated Case - State Legal Arrangements For Educational Media Services for Texas Public Schools from 1918 - 1965	
Conclusions Drawn from the Review	
Bibliography	
III. DEVELOPMENT OF SB 408 . . . . .	56
Setting the Stage for Regional Education Media Centers in Texas	
Passage of SB 408	
Implementation of Senate Bill 408	
Pertinent Provisions of the 1967 State Plan	
Concluding Statements	
Bibliography	

	Page
IV. THE SURVEY OF SAMPLE SCHOOLS . . . . .	122
Development of the Survey Instrument	
Selection of Sample Schools	
Administration of the Survey Instrument	
Analysis of Data Gathered by the Survey	
Instrument on Characteristics of	
Sample Schools	
Presentation of Information from the	
Survey Instrument Related to Local	
School Policy	
Presentation of Information from the	
Survey Instrument Related to Local	
School Economy	
Presentation of Information from the	
Survey Instrument Related to Local	
School Instructional Program	
Presentation of Information from the	
Survey Instrument Related to Local	
School Management	
Bibliography	
V. A SYNTHESIS OF THE SURVEY . . . . .	172
The Focus	
Conclusions	
Recommendations	
Bibliography	
APPENDIX . . . . .	186
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	216
VITA . . . . .	223



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Distribution of Sample Returns by Categories . . . . .	130
II. Distribution of Students by Average Daily Attendance in Responding Schools . . . . .	131
III. Percentage of Population Average Daily Attendance by Categories and Percentage of the Population Average Daily Attendance Represented in the Sample by Categories . . . . .	133
IV. Per cent of the Sample Average Daily Attendance Represented by Responding and Nonresponding Schools . . . . .	134
V. Responses to Survey Statement Number One . . . . .	135
VI. Responses to Survey Statement Number Two . . . . .	136
VII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Three . . . . .	138
VIII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Four . . . . .	139
IX. Responses to Survey Statement Number Five . . . . .	141
X. Responses to Survey Statement Number Six . . . . .	142
XI. Responses to Survey Statement Number Seven . . . . .	144
XII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Eight . . . . .	145
XIII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Nine . . . . .	147
XIV. Responses to Survey Statement Number Ten . . . . .	149
XV. Responses to Survey Statement Number Eleven . . . . .	150
XVI. Responses to Survey Statement Number Twelve . . . . .	151
XVII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Thirteen . . . . .	153
XVIII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Fourteen . . . . .	154

Table	Page
XIX. Responses to Survey Statement Number Fifteen . . . . .	155
XX. Responses to Survey Statement Number Sixteen . . . . .	156
XXI. Responses to Survey Statement Number Seventeen . . . . .	158
XXII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Eighteen . . . . .	159
XXIII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Nineteen . . . . .	161
XXIV. Responses to Survey Statement Number Twenty . . . . .	162
XXV. Responses to Survey Statement Number Twenty-one . . . . .	164
XXVI. Responses to Survey Statement Number Twenty-two . . . . .	165
XXVII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Twenty-three . . . . .	166
XXVIII. Responses to Survey Statement Number Twenty-four . . . . .	168
XXIX. Responses to Survey Statement Number Twenty-five . . . . .	169

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The increase in demands upon educational systems and societal changes require government officials to consider and develop new ways of restructuring aspects of school organization to provide more effective and efficient educational programing. The forces that provide impetus for changes have been identifiable, but a big problem remains -- how best to organize to provide socially responsive systems to help insure quality education for all pupils (6, p. 17).

The problem is complex; it involves both urban and rural education. In most urban areas, the multiplicity of agencies suggests the need for new larger structures for educational governance to provide greater coordination with other related community organizations (2). At the same time there is pressure for accountability, decentralization, and additional "local" control (3, pp. 2-3). Insufficient pupil population and inadequate financing are forcing rural school districts to organize to obtain or share services which singly they cannot provide; yet, in these districts there is pressure to remain independent and unique to the "local" community (9).

Until recently, the predominantly used alternative to these problems has been consolidation of school districts (7, p. 8). However, over the past several years the

intermediate schools and/or the educational cooperatives have been viewed by many legislators, school officials, and citizens as an alternative and, in many instances, a superior solution to consolidation (4, p. 8).

The most noticeable thrusts for cooperation in education of a formal nature seem to have come from State and Federal levels of interest. To provide the necessary improvements in education, some States have passed legislation for some type of intermediate or middle-echelon units or voluntary cooperative educational structures as a means to increase the quality, quantity, efficiency, and economy of education within their boundaries. In some cases the legislation is permissive, allowing cooperation between or among schools at an intermediate level (6, pp. 111-112).

In 1965 the Fifty-ninth Texas Legislature enacted Senate Bill 408, which provided funds and direction for the "educational cooperative" concept as an alternative approach to meeting both urban and rural school district needs and concerns for local district autonomy, economic efficiency, and equality in educational media services. The Texas Education Agency reported that the basic idea behind the bill was that many services could be provided to local schools more economically and effectively through area cooperatives than could be obtained by individual districts working alone, and that all services would be geared to specific needs identified in the participating school districts (10, p. 2).

In accordance with the provisions of SB 408, the State Board of Education, at its January meeting in 1967, voted to establish Regional Education Media Centers--each of which would operate within the regulations of the bill and could provide the following services:

1. A materials lending library containing 16 and 8mm motion picture films with provision for processing and servicing, 35mm slides, filmstrips, remedial and enrichment programmed instructional materials, and disk recordings.
2. Visual duplication service to reproduce transparencies, slides, filmstrips, and charts.
3. A magnetic tape service for duplication of audio and video tape.
4. A delivery and dissemination system for media materials and services.
5. Professional leadership training services to the local districts for coordination of media and curriculum.
6. Acquisition and utilization of materials that will be coordinated with the curriculum of the districts (1).

The regional centers were also given the authority to offer optional media services such as equipment repair, media evaluation, and services to graphics staffs.

According to the General and Special Laws of Texas, individual school districts would be admitted to membership on the following basis:

The State shall further allot and pay to each approved Center annually an amount determined on the basis of not to exceed One Dollar (\$1.00) per scholastic in average daily attendance for the next preceding school year in the district or districts that are participants in an approved Center. School districts as participant members in the Center shall each provide for and pay to the proper Center a proportionate amount determined

on its ADA for the next preceding school year matching the amount provided by the State (10).

#### Statement of the Problem

This study is a survey of the impact of SB 408 on a selected group of Texas schools.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were (1) to review the development of SB 408, and (2) to analyze the impact of this action upon a selected group of public schools.

The study involved a survey of the influence that provisions of SB 408 have had on the school program in terms of the following: (a) policy, (b) economy, (c) instructional program, and (d) management.

#### Background and Significance of the Study

The Texas Education Agency (11, p.3) reported that the cooperative arrangement between the State and public school districts has produced over \$13,500,000 for educational media services housed at the Regional Education Media Centers. This partnership provided over \$4,000,000 for services during the 1970-71 school year which involved 93 per cent of the local public school districts, and 88 per cent of the public school children in Texas (12).

The first two years, following the enactment of the law in 1965, were allocated to orientation of local school officials to provisions of the Act and to efforts for

developing an organizational frame-work for its operation. Media materials and consultative services have been available to local schools since September, 1967. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations based upon a study of the operation of SB 408 over this six-year span of time should be very beneficial to legislators, the State Board of Education, local Boards of Education, ESC Boards of Directors, and others responsible for planning, structuring, and operating educational media services under provisions of the law in subsequent years. It should provide invaluable input for other similar cooperative activities currently in operation.

For those that favor cooperation between and among educational institutions as a means for solving some common problems, the passage of this Act was considered a significant move by the legislature. It is anticipated that when fully supported and exploited by all area school districts the legislation has the potential to (1) help districts improve educational practices, (2) help districts respond more rapidly to community demands and needs for services, (3) help districts obtain adequate allotments of state and federal "earmarked" funds to spread "high risk" and "marginal relevant" educational media projects over a wide area and receive less criticism if the programs do not prove to be effective during the first few years of operation, and (4) help the districts perpetuate the present local autonomy

in operation while at the same time providing much of the flexibility and service capability of large districts (8).

The greatest controversy involved the geographic boundaries of the areas to be served by Regional Education Media Centers and their relationship to rural and urban school districts. The question of representation on the regional board of directors according to district pupil enrollment was another major concern. As with any new program there has been a wide divergence of opinion among local school officials concerning the desirability of the existence of the Regional Education Media Centers.

These concerns and issues need to be reviewed in terms of the records and opinions of participating school districts. Has SB 408 produced a workable alternative for establishing a flexible responsive system to help insure quality in educational services for all children regardless of their niche in society? Has this formal cooperative approach been a move toward economic efficiency of media services, as well as toward a sharing of information to help solve common media problems? Has the requirement for cooperation between and among participating districts facilitated the accomplishment of state goals prior to dealing with local district goals? Has the cooperative approach under SB 408 encouraged local schools to experiment with marginal or socially relevant programs that might lead to better ways of meeting local school needs?



### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions have been formulated:

REMC--Regional Education Media Center is an organizational component of more than one entire Texas school district that is approved to house, circulate, and service educational media for the public free schools of the districts which are participant members thereof.

Media Materials--16 and 8 mm motion picture, 35mm slides, filmstrips, remedial and enrichment programmed instructional materials, and disk recordings.

Media Services--duplicating services for audio tapes, video tapes, transparencies, slides, filmstrips, and charts; delivery and dissemination system for materials and services; and professional leadership training services to the districts for coordination of media and curriculum.

Educational Cooperative--is the consolidation of the capability of two or more educational institutions attempting to enlarge the scope, quality, and accessibility of selected programs and services of its membership.

Voluntary Educational Cooperative--a cooperative arrangement motivated and developed by two or more local educational institutions in response to common problems recognized by the constituents.

TEA--The Texas Education Agency (State Department of Education).

Guidelines--interpretations of program policies produced by TEA or ESC for the operation of SB 408.

LEA--a local (elementary and secondary) education agency.

ESC--Education Service Centers are organizational structures now administering the REMC's in each of the twenty regions that were created by SB 408. ESC's operate the REMC's and other educational services available to public schools.

#### Limitations

This study was limited to SB 408 and its impact upon a selected group of public independent school districts in Texas that have paid, no less than a year's allotment for membership to a Regional Education Media Center. No attempt was made to compare SB 408 with provisions of other state or federal legislation. Moreover, no attempt was made to include public independent school districts presently serving as satellite districts (individual school districts with a minimum of 50,000 average daily attendance) to the Regional Education Media Center. Satellite school districts are receiving benefits from SB 408 in ways that are not available to non-satellite districts. The purposes of this study are directed at the non-satellite district arrangement.

#### Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that dividing the districts into categories and utilizing a random sample from each category would

be generally representative of public school districts of the State of Texas.

It was assumed that six years has provided sufficient time to clarify and interpret all provisions of the Act.

It was assumed that four years of participation in SB 408 has provided sufficient experience to develop a basis to make practical observations about the operation of the law.

It was assumed that the public school officials would respond honestly to the survey instruments.

#### Formulation of the Survey Instrument

A questionnaire with instructions was designed and submitted to seven persons experienced in the evaluation and/or the operation of SB 408. They were selected from institutions of higher education, Texas Education Agency, Regional Education Media Centers, and public school districts. The insight of this group was utilized to determine the final content and to clarify the wording and interpretation of the questionnaire. Necessary contacts were made to panel members in the formulation of the questionnaire to develop the most effective instrument possible for the major data gathering process.

After appropriate objectives, content, and administrative procedures were established in cooperation with the advisory panel, the questionnaire was presented to a jury panel of five members with qualifications similar to those of the advisory panel. The role of the jury panel was to test the

validity of questions on the survey instrument. Approval of three or more members of the jury panel was considered sufficient to justify the inclusion of a question in the final questionnaire.

The validated questions were balanced on a single-fold, light-green, four-page leaflet. The intent of the process was to produce an attractive, readily identifiable instrument that would facilitate and expedite the response of the local school officials.

#### Procedures for Collection of Data

A review of the literature dealing with the background and development of SB 408 was undertaken to produce data to describe the basic need for the law. A study of selected planning documents, position papers, guidelines, and the State Plan, Procedures And Policies For The Operation Of Regional Education Service Centers under SB 313 was undertaken to provide data on the organizational framework for implementation of the law. Data was gleaned from selected applications, evaluations, and reports of Centers to the Texas Education Agency to provide quantitative data on the level of effort and overall change in management at the local level.

A survey of the operation of SB 408 in the participating public schools was undertaken to provide evidence, though not totally objective in nature, as to the effectiveness in

meeting basic needs of schools. Data relative to the impact of SB 408 upon schools in the sample were gathered on local school policy development, economic efficiency, improvement in instructional program, and changes in administrative procedures.

A proportional stratified random sampling technique was utilized to enhance the possibility of a more representative sample for the study. The school districts participating in provisions of SB 408 were divided into four categories. For convenience, the Texas Education Agency Statistical Report for the school year 1969-70 was used to provide the basic list and groupings. The report lists all public schools alphabetically and by size of Average Daily Attendance. For this study districts were placed in the following categories: Category I, included 413 districts each having under 500 A.D.A.; Category II, included 203 districts each having 500 to 999 A.D.A.; Category III, included 263 districts each having 1,000 to 4,999 A.D.A.; and Category IV, included 76 districts each having over 5,000 A.D.A. In order to facilitate management of the data, a sample of ten per cent was drawn from each category utilizing a table of random numbers. A return of approximately 80 per cent from each category was considered adequate to support the objectives of the study.

The validated questionnaire was administered to the selected schools in the sample to collect data for the study.

A cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and requesting participation, a survey instrument, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope was mailed to the superintendent, by name, of each of the 96 districts in the sample. The superintendent, or his designated representative, was asked to respond by checking one or more choices to the survey questions.

#### Procedures for Analysis of Data

Data from the survey instrument were compiled and reported in tables in Chapter IV. The school districts in the sample were grouped according to the criteria used in setting up categories listed in the proportional stratified random sampling technique. The percentage of answers were recorded for each question by school categories. The data from the Texas Education Agency records were summarized and related to appropriate objectives of the study.

Conclusions and recommendations were drawn from data collected from the survey, a study of Texas Education Agency records, a review of literature, and a review of the development of Senate Bill 408.

#### Summary

Chapter I has as its purpose the introduction and delineation of the problem of the study. The discussion in the Background and Significance section attempts to reveal

the appropriateness of the timing of this evaluation. The latter sections of the chapter have outlined briefly the procedures taken in completing the study.

All sections of Chapter I are devoted to setting the stage for the content and arrangement of the remainder of the study. Chapter II reviews the literature related to state and federal legislation for cooperation in education, and the historical background of the development of educational media services.

Chapter III reviews the development of Senate Bill 408 as it was perceived, planned, structured, and implemented by state and local school officials.

Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data relative to the impact of Senate Bill 408 upon the operation of local schools.

Chapter V is devoted to a summary of the findings, conclusions reached, and recommendations based on the findings of the study.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education. The Federal-State Partnership in Education, Fifth Annual Report of the Advisory Council, Washington, D.C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
2. American Association of School Administrators, Better Education Through Effective Intermediate Units, Washington, D.C., National Education Association, 1963.
3. Bost, W. G., "Educational Cooperative--A Priority Development Program for the Seventies," Appalachian Advance, IV (January-February, 1970), 2-3.
4. Cramer, J. W., "Consolidation Not Always the Answer," Appalachian Advance, II (May, 1958), 8.
5. Cutter, Virginia M., and Charles W. Nix, "Education Service Centers--Agents of Change," The Texas Outlook, 51 (September, 1967), 42.
6. Elazar, Daniel J., "The American Partnership: The Next Half Generation," Designing Education for the Future, No. 1, edited by Edgar D. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan, New York, Citation Press, (1967), 111-112.
7. Fitzwater, C. O., "Patterns and Trends in State School System Development," Journal on State School System Development, 1 (Spring, 1967), 5-32.
8. Fox, Karl A., "A New Strategy for Urban and Rural America," Appalachia, II (August, 1969), 10-13.
9. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Project Report (Identification, Synthesis, Evaluation and Packaging of "Shared Service" Research and Development Efforts in Rural Areas), Portland, Oregon, The Laboratory, 1969.
10. Texas Education Agency, State Plan: Procedures and Policies for the Operation of Regional Education Service Center (Revised), Austin, Texas Education Agency, January, 1970.



11. Texas Education Agency, State Plan for the Establishment of Educational Service Centers Including Regional Education Media Centers, Austin, State Printing Office, March, 1967.
12. Texas Education Agency, Texas Education Service Center: Promise of Opportunity, Austin, State Printing Office, October, 1969.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The discussion in this chapter represents a review of selected literature about the environment from which the content and operational procedures for Senate Bill 408 emerged. An attempt will be made to trace the movement in education toward particular cooperative arrangements between and among public school districts, and the encouragement given to such action by state and federal legislation. Some of the cooperative arrangements operating in various areas of the country were described by proponents of SB 408 in support of their push for passage of the bill, and the enacted legislation contains some provisions similar to those arrangements. The material reviewed includes books, articles, various state department reports, related studies, federal government reports, and unpublished materials available at numerous state and national meetings held to discuss and explore the potential of trends toward regionalism in education across the nation.

The review will be presented in the following sequence:

- (1) selected state legislation for educational cooperatives;
- (2) federal interest in legislation for cooperation in education;
- (3) selected legal arrangements for educational

media service to schools from 1905 to 1967; (4) an isolated case--legal arrangements for educational media services to public schools in Texas from 1918 to 1965; and (5) conclusions drawn from the review.

#### State Legislation for Educational Cooperatives

A number of states have enacted legislation for some type of cooperative educational structure as a means to increase the economic efficiency of education within their boundaries, and to provide a way whereby local education agencies might share information to help them solve mutual problems.

The distinguishing elements of various enabling state legislation for educational cooperatives reflect how each state has attempted to meet its own unique educational needs through cooperative arrangements.

In 1948, the New York State Legislature passed legislation authorizing local school boards to form Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) as a legal extension of local districts and subject to their control. New York established the BOCES pending the creation of intermediate districts. However, the BOCES seemed to work so effectively that the intermediate districts were never established. The primary purpose of the BOCES organization was to provide shared programs and services, particularly

in rural areas where limited resources often restricted the educational offerings of individual school districts. For the most part establishment of BOCES followed the jurisdiction of the district superintendency (30, p. 13).

Functions and services provided by the BOCES units were not limited by law. However, the operation of the units were paid for by the receiving local districts according to student enrollment. In the case of state-approved services, the State picked up one-half of the total cost. This type of arrangement has given the State some control over the establishment of educational priorities and services to be provided by the BOCES units. BOCES units may consolidate or cooperate in various ways in order to make them more effective in providing needed educational services (21, pp. 401-402).

All financial transfers between the units and the Local Education Agencies (LEA's) are made at the state level with proper certification by the involved parties. LEA's were given the power to levy and collect taxes for all functions. Once they join, they are also responsible for their weighted share of the administrative costs regardless of program participation. Any profits at the end of the year must be transferred back to the LEA's (21, pp. 403-410).

Public meetings of eligible voters are required for purposes of capital outlay expenditures involving buildings,

lands, or properties. Property owned by BOCES is tax exempt, but this is not true for leased or rented properties (21, p. 412).

In addition to the BOCES concept, the New York State Department of Education has proposed sixteen regional centers for educational planning and development that would be financed by federal, state, and private sources. It is proposed that each center be administered by a regional council appointed by the commissioner of education and have a small permanent staff of professional and support personnel. Institutions of higher learning, post-secondary schools, school districts, libraries, and museums would be included within each center. As problems are identified, staff members of regional centers would act as catalytic and cooperative agents in utilization of the entire resources of the region for the solution of problems (17).

The Iowa Legislature in 1964 enacted legislation providing for statewide patterns of merged areas, subject to approval by the State Board of Education. Iowa approached its problems in a unique manner by conforming the regional agency development around area vocational schools and community college organization. The State board originally approved fifteen "merged" areas for vocational schools or community colleges. Ten were designated for community colleges offering vocational school opportunities. "Merged" area boards, consisting of five to nine members elected by

popular vote, can levy taxes for operation; and the voters can levy additional taxes for facilities. Legislation also provided for the combination of two or more county intermediate districts. These combined intermediate districts would thus meet the State board policy of matching the "merged" area established for vocational schools or community colleges. Some counties have combined and others are in the process of study (10, p.44).

A sixteenth area has been proposed under the plan for the establishment of the sixteen multi-county intermediate districts. These centers have been designated to receive all Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title IV funds for regional library and materials centers and some ESEA IV funds for special education services. (Proposed legislation for the mandated establishment of these centers is anticipated in 1972.) According to the superintendent of the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, the regional education service agency has top priority and will be a vehicle for changing classroom instruction through the provision of services. Each center thus needs computer facilities for fiscal reporting, computer-aided instruction, and so on. Currently, there are nine combinations of at least eight sections of counties established in the multi-district organizations (10, p. 44).

To show the success of these multi-district organizations, the superintendent of schools for the Joint County System of

Cedar, Johnson, Linn, and Washington Counties indicated that the joint county system was about to introduce a cooperative buying program for the purchase of paper supplies and audio-visual equipment with the estimated saving to local districts of 15 to 25 per cent. With the addition of two delivery vans to the Joint County Media Center at the beginning of the 1968-1969 school year, over 36,000 books and 25,465 films had been used by the close of the first semester as compared to 35,851 books and 25,534 films used during the entire 1967-1968 school year (33).

On June 12, 1964, the Wisconsin Assembly Bill No. 254 created intermediate service units to function "as a convenience for local districts in cooperatively providing special educational services." The creation of these nineteen service units replaced the old system of fifty-one county superintendents of schools who were elected by popular vote (3, p. 1).

Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESA's) were designed to function at a level beneath the local school districts. Their major purpose is to serve as a vehicle whereby local school districts may cooperatively operate any and all services and programs for the improvement of education programs and opportunities (19).

While the State provides a fixed administrative allotment for the CESA's, no funds or priorities were established for program and/or service operations. This was left entirely to

the local school districts to plan and finance on a shared basis. No taxing power or specific supervisory functions were designated for the CESA's. However, promoting consolidation of local school units into larger, more efficient units was designated as a function of CESA. This has caused considerable anxiety and apprehension among many local educators and citizens' groups, and has manifested itself in some opposition to CESA's within the State.

The success of the CESA is greatly dependent upon the abilities and skills of chief executives designated as "coordinators." However, the absence of any state priorities for programs and services as well as state financial incentives has caused difficulties for many of the CESA's in reaching their potentials. Many officials involved in a current state study of the CESA's feel that some state priorities should be established for the CESA units with additional state funds given for program operational purposes. Others feel that a limited tax levying authority for the agencies might help.

The Nebraska Legislature passed Legislative Bill 301 in August of 1965 which "created nineteen multi-county educational service units designed to provide supplementary services for local school districts" (10, p. 56). Emphasis was placed on those services that contribute to quality education which local school districts could not provide because of population or financial reasons.



In 1965, Nebraska had fewer than 1.5 million people and 318,881 school pupils. It had 2,546 school districts ranging in enrollment from one pupil to more than 59,000. One hundred sixty-three school districts had enrollments of fewer than 300 pupils, and only two had enrollments of more than 10,000. In addition, most districts had no supervisory services or provisions for teacher in-service growth and development.

One of the major purposes or strengths of the Nebraska service unit is its designated role of coordinating, planning, and administering federally financed programs for school districts which, because of their size, lack of staff, etc., are now unable or ineligible to receive federal funds. The nineteen multi-county service units are designed to cover all areas or school districts within the State. Size ranges from two to nine counties. Each unit is controlled by a board elected by the people. Each involved county is entitled to one board member, with four members being elected at large. The boards are empowered to levy taxes for educational purposes within a specified limit on all real and personal properties within the boundaries of each service unit. Provisions are spelled out whereby a county may either withdraw or be included in the service units by a vote of its populace. However, legislation is currently proposed to prevent school systems from being able to withdraw from the intermediate units at any time by a popular vote (24, p. 60).

Texas established twenty Regional Education Service Centers (RESC) through the authorization of the legislature in 1965 for the establishment of state-supported regional media centers and a subsequent broadening of the definition to include provisions for a broad range of supplementary services. The Office of Planning in the Texas Education Agency had conducted an in-depth study of the feasibility of providing services on a regional basis, including the relationships of Title III, state department of education, higher education institutions, regional laboratories, and research and development centers. Therefore, the establishment of these education service centers became an integral part of the state education planning machinery. The major efforts of these educational service centers are to provide locally oriented bases for planning, operate regional media centers, coordinate and encourage development of Title III programs, and provide additional regional services (24, p. 80).

Although local school district membership is permissive, all districts are represented on the joint committees for planning each center's operations. The policy making group (board of directors) is composed of lay members elected by an advisory group (joint committee). Advisory groups to each center are: (1) the joint committee, a professional group representing local school districts and four-year higher education institutions approved for teacher training

programs, and (2) an advisory committee, composed of teachers, supervisors, and principals served by the RESC. This type of arrangement seems to permit maximum participation and input by professional educator groups while at the same time ultimate control resides with a lay board (28, pp. 1-2).

The guidelines for the RESC are established by the State Education Agency. The operational guidelines of the centers seem to parallel those established by the SEA itself. The State agency guidelines deal with policy while those for the centers deal with local operations. This approach appears to have the effect of extending the influence and effectiveness of the SEA while at the same time providing maximum autonomy and participation of local school districts (28, pp. 5-6).

House Bill No. 40, presented in the General Assembly of the Pennsylvania Session of 1969, on January 22, 1969, as amended on July 15, 1969, provided that all local school districts be assigned to and be eligible to receive services of an intermediate school unit. The former sixty-six county school districts were divided into twenty-nine intermediate school units. The cities of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia were established as separate intermediate units (28, pp. 6-8).

This bill had the effect of abolishing the old county board of school directors and transferring all powers and functions to the intermediate units. Several school functions and services are designated but do not limit the operations

of the intermediate units. These designated functions and services are subsidized by the State. Other services beyond these are financed totally from local funds (27, p. 10).

Provisions are made for contracting services with non-public schools. Also, any local school district may become partially or completely independent of the intermediate unit if (1) the service(s) is to be financed solely with local district funds, and (2) if the intermediate unit board of directors determines that such independent action will not adversely affect the services to be rendered to the remaining districts by the intermediate unit (28, pp. 10-15).

On June 3, 1969, both houses of the United States Congress approved the New Hampshire-Vermont Interstate School Compact. This permissive legislation authorized the two states to formulate plans for the establishment and operation of an interstate school district. The major purpose of this act was to improve educational opportunities within the two states, and specifically at or near their boundaries (20).

Governance of the interstate school district was to be by an elected interstate board of directors subject to the approval of both the New Hampshire and the Vermont State Boards of Education. This unique arrangement has important implications for other states with similar problems of providing adequate educational opportunities at or near their boundaries due to problems of finances, law, population density, etc. (20).

House Bill No. 1149, signed into law by the Tennessee Legislature on February 27, 1970, established permissive legislation to enable local school districts and/or local governmental units to cooperate in any way feasible in order to provide better services at more economical costs (5).

The effect of this law seems to permit maximum flexibility for local school and governmental units in developing cooperative programs. However, local responsibilities for traditional services provided remain intact along with the basic or original governmental units. The law provides for wide degrees of control or veto power by the State Attorney-General and by the affected reference groups within the structure of the State government. All financial arrangements are developed at the local levels subject to approval at the appropriate state levels. No special state financial arrangements currently exist for cooperatives (5).

In 1970, the advisory council on State Departments of Education reported that thirty-three states had been identified as having legislation that permitted the existence of educational cooperatives and/or intermediate school districts. Two states (Missouri and North Carolina) had no legislation to prevent school systems from cooperating; however, a cooperative could not be established as a separate legal organization. California, Michigan, Oregon, and Pennsylvania mandated local school districts participation

in some cooperative structure. Among the twelve states that had no legislation regarding educational cooperatives, it had not been possible to determine whether any had laws strictly prohibiting cooperation among local school districts. Twenty-nine states had permissive legislation about educational cooperatives. Twelve states had legislation permitting "body corporate status." It had not been possible to ascertain whether legislation of any kind existed in five states (1).

#### Federal Interest in Legislation For Cooperation in Education

The year 1965 became a dividing point between basically individual activity and open implementation of cooperative activity. In 1965 the Federal Government encouraged educational cooperation through several important pieces of legislation. The Higher Education Act (PL 89-329) encouraged cooperation between higher education and community agencies through Title I, Community Service and Continuing Education, by requiring institutions of higher education to work closely with, and make their resources available to, communities for the solution of community problems.

The U. S. Office of Education stated that Title III provided assistance to strengthen developing higher education institutions in several ways: (1) cooperation between cooperating institutions (bilateral); (2) consortia of developing institutions to work on common or similar problems; (3)

connection of a cooperating institution with a consortium of developing institutions; and (4) other arrangements (e.g., "hidden" bilateral) (25).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), PL 89-10, and its amendments probably did most to encourage educational cooperation. All five original titles encouraged, or at least did not discourage, cooperation. As ESEA evolved, several programs required interagency or regional planning as a condition for funding. Title I provides funds for the improvement of education for disadvantaged youth through the utilization of a wide variety of non-school social agencies and programs. Also, the guidelines of Title I (as amended) indicate that a school system may apply for a grant up to one per cent of its entitlement of \$2,000--whichever amount is greater--for planning purposes relative to expanded, more effective, or more efficient use of Title I funds. A number of districts could join and pool these planning funds to obtain consultant aid or a full-time planner to effect regional planning for Title I (9).

Title III, PACE (Programs to Advance Creativity in Education), was particularly aimed at educational innovation and supplementary educational centers. Most PACE projects encourage (or demand) cooperation between and among agencies with a view toward the improvement of education. As the funding of Title III has changed from the Federal to the

state level, some states have used Title III for statewide regional development to promote planning and educational cooperation for the utilization of Title III funds (25).

Title IV provides, among other things, for the development of regional educational laboratories originally conceived to serve a regional need and foster some kind of educational cooperation (1).

Title V also encourages cooperation. Section 507 provides for the interchange of personnel between the U. S. Office of Education and the State Education Agency and other state public organizations in education. Section 505 encourages multi-state cooperation for the identification and solution of common problems. As of June, 1970, thirty-one Section 505 projects are operating or have been operated. These Title V projects have shown that states can cooperate for improvement of education (1).

Title V has also provided that 10 per cent of state Title V funds be allocated to local districts to encourage local and multi-district educational planning and to assist with administrative activity. Some states have suggested, in their guidelines for the administration of this section, that priority be given for funding to districts that have formed cooperative arrangements or that are planning to work cooperatively. It would have been possible under Title V for a state to make funds available for the development and administration of regional education agencies (1).



The ESEA's recognition and influence in strengthening cooperative programs between school districts is especially evident in the definition of an eligible "local education agency" under Title II, III, and V. After careful consideration, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare modified their original definition, which was accepted by the House of Representatives, to broaden or clarify the inclusion of cooperative organizations. The modified definition found in Section 601, (f) Title VI, of PL 89-10 reads as follows:

The term "local education agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control and direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary and secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary and secondary schools. Such a term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

The concepts of agencies which perform a service function for and the inclusion of such combinations of school districts or counties as are recognized should be emphasized because of the thrust they gave to cooperative endeavors (1).

The Federal Government also provides for cooperation between education and other agencies in the Model Cities Program in the development of area vocational and technical schools,

and in the development of regional academic and/or development districts under various acts such as the Appalachian Redevelopment Act (1).

Legal Arrangements for Educational Media  
Services to Schools from 1905 to 1967

The concept of cooperation between governmental agencies to provide educational media services to the public school classrooms was initiated as early as 1905 when the St. Louis Educational Museum was established. The Museum procured, housed, and distributed exhibits, stereographs, slides, study prints, and charts to supplement and enrich the school system's instructional program. During the very first school year approximately 500 deliveries were made to the school district's classrooms. By 1909, similar museums were operating in Reading, Pennsylvania, and Cleveland, Ohio (27, pp. 89-91).

Even though experiences received from these museum ventures pointed up the need for a system of exchanges for the procurement, housing, and handling of films and other educational media materials, there was little commercial interest in the field because the public school systems were unable or unwilling to purchase these new services. Nonetheless George Klein, who was assisted by Thomas A. Edison, established the first film library in the United States at Chicago in 1910. This development was followed by the establishment of the Bureau of Commercial Economics in Washington, D.C. in 1913

and the Motion Picture Bureau of the Young Men's Christian Association in 1914. During this period Henry Ford was also collecting and distributing films to schools free of charge (13, pp. 7-8).

Most of the schools interested in utilizing educational media as a tool in the hands of the classroom teacher continued to seek ways to develop distributing agencies that would collect and distribute films particularly suitable for use in teaching. The Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin developed such an agency in 1914. This program involved the collection of educational films to lend to schools throughout the state by a newly organized Visual Instruction Bureau.

In 1916, the North Carolina State Legislature established the Bureau of Commercial Services as a division of the State Department of Education. The State Legislature appropriated twenty-five thousand dollars for the purchase of films which were housed at the agency and made available to schools and social organizations in the state. The legislation required two-thirds of the distribution cost as the only expense to schools participating in the services. Due to objections raised by non-theatrical producers and the distributors union, it became necessary for North Carolina to charge schools for total distribution cost and also establish a media materials rental fee (22, p. 115).

The National University Extension Association was organized in 1915. The primary purpose of the association was to establish bureaus for film distribution. The association received its most challenging assignment from the establishment of the Federal Division of Extension in December, 1918. The Association was given the responsibility of salvaging and finding some use for materials released by the United States Government at the end of World War I. In 1919, the Association distributed some 25,000 lantern slides and 4,300 reels of motion picture film to various distribution centers across the nation (13, p. 8).

According to a nationwide study made by McClusky in 1923, there were sixteen city school systems with organized departments of visual education and similar administrative units were operating in twenty-three universities, state museums, and state departments of education. Administrative personnel of some visual instruction divisions of state departments were beginning to realize the desirability of providing leadership and financial support not only for lending libraries, but also for publications, teacher in-service training, and certification regulations for audio-visual instruction (19, pp. 99-319).

In a discussion on the historical background of instructional film distribution, Saettler stated that the 1930's brought about the development of several rather effective audio-visual agencies. He listed as examples The American

Institute of Cinematography, The American Film Center, The International Film Center, and The Association of School Film Libraries as agencies that were created during this decade (27, p. 113).

In 1930, the St. Louis County Cooperative Audio-Visual Center was organized for the purpose of housing and circulating educational models and museum exhibits among participating school districts in the county. By 1933, the services at the Center had been expanded to include lantern slides, 16mm silent films, and 16mm sound films. The Center's approach in providing educational media to County schools added another dimension to the cooperative concept by involving all participating school districts in the process for selecting new materials at the Center (18, pp. 11-12).

Other cooperative programs were developed as a result of various school districts establishing the availability of instructional materials as a major priority need. Cook County, Illinois, and Los Angeles County, California, initiated county-wide cooperatives in 1936. Cook County began the actual distribution of materials to more than fifty separate school systems in January of 1937. The Los Angeles County Division of Audio-Visual Education was organized when more than half of the school districts in the County voluntarily contributed films to the Center. Continuous support came from an annual

appropriation of the school districts. The amount appropriated by each district was based on the number of pupils within that district.

The second World War generated an unprecedented need in the United States to train millions of individuals as rapidly and as effectively as possible. To assist in meeting this need the U. S. Office of Education formed the Division of Visual-Aids for War Training. The Division actually established a model for the cooperative management and utilization of instructional media materials in the training process. The Division was involved in planning, research, policy making, administration of fiscal and contractual obligations, and supervision of all aspects of production and distribution. This was a time of great difficulty, yet, between January, 1942, and June, 1945, the Division produced 457 visual aids units, 457 sound motion picture films, 432 silent filmstrips, and 457 instructor's manuals. Cumulative data revealed that during some of the most intensive thirty-day training periods, more than 200,000 prints of 16mm training films--almost a quarter of a million projections--were shown to military personnel (27, pp. 158-169).

After World War II state departments of education began to exert more leadership in advancing the use of instructional media materials. Records reveal that many states increased their teacher education requirements and budgeted more money

for the purchase of instructional media materials. Virginia, for example, appropriated \$125 million in order to furnish projectors, films, filmstrips, maps, slides, and other instructional media materials for every school in the state (27, pp. 170-182).

In 1946, a review of state records made by the Research Division of the National Education Association revealed the following:

1. Ten states furnished consultant services to advise local district personnel on the proper use of audio-visual materials.

2. Seven states reviewed and recommended educational films for classroom use.

3. Seven states inspected and recommended educational media equipment for classroom use.

4. Nine states were endeavoring to promote the use of media materials in the instructional program.

5. Eleven states had established supervisory units responsible for audio-visual education.

6. Nine states had established special budget allocations exclusively for the audio-visual program.

7. The largest number of professional audio-visual workers in any single state office was four.

8. Nine states distributed audio-visual materials to local school systems (2, pp. 131-170).

Although post-war growth in county audio-visual programs was not as visible as that in state audio-visual programs, progress was recorded. The rise of county programs during the 1900's enabled increasing numbers of smaller school districts to enjoy the advantages of centralized audio-visual services. Notable county programs were established in Washington, Florida, North Carolina, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, New Jersey, and California. In California every county had an audio-visual coordinator, and many developed large centralized libraries of audio-visual materials (27, p. 183).

A research project funded by the U. S. Office of Education (2, pp. 131-170) in 1946 revealed the following concerning state departments of education:

1. An organizational unit devoted to audio-visual education was established in the State Department of twenty-one states.
2. Forty-two full-time professional staff members were assigned to audio-visual education responsibilities.
3. Eight states reported having an identifiable budget for audio-visual education programs.
4. Twenty-seven states distributed audio-visual materials to school districts.
5. Forty-five states advised teachers and administrators on the use of audio-visual education materials.
6. Forty-five states reported that various state funds to local schools could be used for audio-visual education purposes.



7. Twenty-seven states prepared and published audio-visual education documents.

A study of the status of audio-visual education in the country was concluded in 1963. The purpose of the study was:

. . . to describe current practices and activities of the fifty state departments of education related to new educational media and audio-visual education and possible future trends in these areas of education (22, p. 26).

The study revealed the following:

1. Provisions for distributing some type of audio-visual services were established in forty-three states. Twenty-seven of the forty-three states reported that audio-visual materials were distributed only within the state department of education, while the remaining sixteen states also distributed audio-visual materials to public schools usually through a state film library. Motion pictures were the most commonly distributed item to both the state department units and the public schools. However, ten states distributed tapes and eleven distributed filmstrips.

2. Two-thirds of the schools in the study had experienced growth in the materials distribution centers serving public schools. Most of the growth was brought about by additional public schools requesting services from the units.

3. An equivalent of fifty-four full-time positions were assigned to audio-visual education in the state departments.

4. Approximately sixty per cent of the states had an organizational unit responsible for the state audio-visual education program.

5. On the question in the study related to budget allocation for the state audio-visual program, eighteen states had an identifiable budget; fifteen states reported estimated budgets; and seventeen states provided neither identifiable nor estimated budget information (22, pp. 23-47).

A summary report which compared selected aspects of the 1960-1961 and 1964-1965 status in audio-visual education and identified some of the significant changes in new educational media programs in the fifty states was published in 1966. The report revealed the following pertinent facts:

1. There was an increase in state leadership in the development of audio-visual programs. While 60 per cent of the states had organizational units to manage the audio-visual programs in 1960-1961, 78 per cent reported such units in 1964-1965.

2. Most state departments were involved in long range planning for educational media programs that contemplated services beyond the loan of 16mm films.

3. The 1964-1965 survey data showed a sharp increase in the distribution of new educational media to schools throughout their respective states.

4. Production of audio-visual materials at the state level declined. However, those continuing production activities were moving into new areas such as educational television, audio tape recording, and computer-managed instruction kit development.

5. A majority of the states were actively promoting the smaller area cooperative approach rather than continuing to expand the state level centralization approach to providing educational media services to local school districts (29, pp. 128-129).

The area cooperative service concept advocates the establishment of several decentralized centers in strategic locations in the state. Green referred to their type of center as an instructional media center or an educational media center. Centers of this nature had existed in a number of school districts for some time, but not on a state or national scale (12, p. 319).

The need existed to unite building, district, regional, and state efforts to provide educational materials when and where they were needed. An educational media center's services might include conceptualization and production of materials; testing and servicing of equipment; development of teachers, television laboratories, and studios; lending materials libraries and distribution; computer software and hardware centers; and mobil services of many kinds. The area cooperative approach to providing equal educational media services to local school districts received additional impetus from the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965 (12, p. 320).

Most of the twelve original titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act included provisions pertaining to the

development and/or use of educational media. The act gave each state the responsibility of administering all provisions of each title assigned to their state. The state also was assigned the responsibility of developing and submitting a plan to the U. S. Office of Education that would delineate specific priority needs and proposed solutions to solve these problems. The state plan had to explicate state fiscal policies to insure that all federal funds were directed toward the objectives of the Act (4, pp. 11-12).

Title II of the Act provided federal funds to augment local effort in the library program. The funds could be expended for films, filmstrips, processed slides, transparencies, recorded magnetic tapes and disks, pictorial and graphic works, pamphlets, and books (4, pp. 11-12).

According to Bildersee, one of the primary purposes of Title III of the Act was to develop:

. . . a program for making grants for supplementary centers and services, to stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed educational services available in sufficient quantity or quality, and to stimulate and assist in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs (4, p. 11).

A review of the operation of the Elementary and Secondary Act since 1965 revealed that provisions of the legislation has greatly assisted the development and implementation activities of cooperative efforts for new curriculum design and educational media support services. Resources purchased with funds

available from the Act were used in the establishment of region educational media centers in California, New York, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Utah, New Jersey, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Alabama, Texas, and Alaska. These states made the regional education media center an integral and significant foundation of their expanded media services available to local school districts.

An Isolated Case - State Legal Arrangements  
For Educational Media Services For Texas  
Public Schools From 1918 - 1965

The Visual Instruction Bureau formally organized at the University of Texas in 1919 was permitted to receive World War I visual materials from the Federal Division of Extension and distribute same to educational institutions. The Bureau maintained and distributed films to the public school districts and other organizations on a non-profit basis. The user paid only a nominal rental fee plus the cost of transportation (13, p. 9).

By the mid 1930's, the Visual Instruction Bureau was having difficulty in meeting the requests for films. The increased demands led to the establishment of several local district and area cooperative lending audio-visual libraries. The local school district libraries were organized by the larger school systems, while the cooperative lending libraries were formed to house and distribute films to member school districts in a county or multi-county arrangement. These

cooperative library arrangements were permissible under provisions of educational legislation as long as local district funds were utilized to purchase annual membership in these cooperatives (13, p. 9).

State records revealed that by 1956 there were fifty-two school districts with some type of audio-visual library. Each of the five largest libraries in public schools had over 1,000 film titles; seven had 500 to 999 titles; six had 300 to 499; sixteen had 100 to 299 titles; while sixteen had less than 100 titles. The public school libraries were located in all sections of the state with the majority located in the north and east sections (13, p. 10).

By the mid 1950's there were nine county cooperative film lending libraries and eleven multi-county cooperative film lending libraries in the state. The county cooperatives had in excess of 3,000 film titles; and the multi-county cooperatives had in excess of 5,000 film titles.

In addition to film distribution available to local school districts from the University of Texas, twelve other colleges and universities established lending libraries for circulation of films to both campus and off-campus users. This arrangement was helpful in acquainting teachers and prospective teachers with films and their uses, as well as supplying them to schools and other related organizations. These institutions had access to more than 6,000 titles (13, p. 10).

In 1944, the Radio and Visual Education Division of the State Department of Education initiated the State Film Library when it accepted as a gift over 400 films from the National Youth Administration. The agency acquired additional films until the library had approximately 900 titles, which made it the largest single film distribution center in the state in 1945. The fiftieth State Legislature enacted House Bill 295, in 1947, which appropriated \$250,000. for the purchase of films for use in the public schools of Texas. From this allocation over 500 films and 2,500 filmstrips were added to the State Film Library during a two-year period (13, p. 10).

The Texas Education Agency, in its Thirty-fourth Biennial Report, stated that all public and private schools accredited by the Texas Education Agency were eligible to participate in the services available at the State Film Library. Schools could use the materials by paying for the cost of insurance and transportation both ways (33, p. 73).

The Radio and Visual Education division of the Texas Education Agency was discontinued with the enactment of the Gilmer-Aikin law (13, p. 10). The State Film Library was transferred to the Textbook Division of the Agency where it continued to provide the same type services to local school districts. According to the Texas Education Agency, 16,425 shipments were made to 709 different schools across the state during the 1950-1951 school year (35, p. 38). The Texas

Education Agency further stated, however, that additional funds for new films were not appropriated by the State Legislature and as the films became worn, school usage declined. In the two-year period from 1958 to 1960, 14,962 shipments were made to less than 400 different schools; and services were discontinued completely in 1961 (11, p. 64).

The State Board of Education appointed a special advisory committee in 1955 to make a study of instructional services available to the public schools of Texas. Recommendations from the committee and other advisory committees suggested to the Board that to meet the educational media needs of local school districts, regional film libraries should be developed and maintained through a state-local film library program (36, p. 17).

In 1958, the news letter of the Texas Audio-Visual Education Directors Association carried a small article on the regional film libraries concept which states, "a tentative agreement concerning the establishment of regional film libraries received the unanimous support of the Hale-Aikin Committee of 24" (36, p. 17).

The State Board of Education and the Texas State Teachers Association proposed, in 1962, that state legislation be enacted to appropriate funds for the establishment of area film libraries to provide equal educational media services to all public schools of Texas. The design included



an arrangement for the state to purchase educational media materials with a fifty-cent per capita allowance from the State Foundation School Fund and matching local funds from participating school districts.

#### Conclusions Drawn From the Review

Within the coverage of the literature reviewed relative to enabling state legislation and federal encouragement for the establishment of educational cooperatives, it is believed that the following general conclusions may reasonably be stated:

1. More recent state legislation provides some state baseline support for the regional agencies and, in some cases, incentives are built into the formula for support of programs in the cooperatives. Recent legislation is also more permissive in allowing a greater variety of programs and in allowing authority for taxing, if there is a local referendum in favor of it. On the other hand, legislation mandating educational regionalism indicates that the regional agency is to become an arm of the State Education Agency for specific tasks which the agency is required to perform.

2. Cooperatives which do not receive baseline funding or are not given legal provisions for state matching funds find it difficult to operate in many instances. A major continuing concern for cooperatives not receiving any state

funds is the location of financing for operation. Various organizational strategies and program development techniques have been proposed to find the funds for operation of these cooperatives.

3. There are clear indications that federal legislation has provided impetus for cooperation in education. Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title III funds have been particularly used for the development of planning regional services on a state-wide basis. Some states are channeling all Title III funds into the regional unit.

4. It appears that some type of intermediate unit between the local school system and the State Education Agency is essential since public education is obviously involved in a period of profound change, and modern conditions will probably continue to dictate further change. Studies and reports reviewed in this chapter reveal that most recent developments have emphasized the regional concept of multi-district cooperation with coordinative planning and supplementary service functions. Since 1965, there has been a considerable movement toward the establishment of intermediate units on a regional basis with many States contemplating this alternative. The most attractive aspect of this type of an agency to the local education systems seems to be the ability to maintain local autonomy while obtaining needed specialized services for students. A matter of prime consideration for

the establishment of multi-county intermediate units is that this structure provides an opportunity to equalize the financial base at a more localized level than has previously existed.

5. The southeastern United States, which has few of the regional cooperative units, probably has the most potential for their development. Most of the recent emergence of voluntary educational cooperatives and investigations of legislative councils, gubernatorial committees, and State Education Agencies into regional education service agencies has occurred in this area. The movement seems to reveal that the single county office of county superintendent is waning and other structures must be found to provide the services.

6. It is felt that the large personnel demands of regional education agencies suggest that institutions of higher learning should be aware of the need to produce additional educational experiences and training activities to prepare personnel for the specific roles in the educational cooperatives.

7. There is evidence that educational cooperatives provide ways for schools to respond more rapidly to social demands. It appears that marginal or socially relevant programs can be experimented with more easily in the cooperative. In many regional units "high risk" ventures have been spread over several school districts, and there has been little

criticism of the particular programs that did not prove to be effective during their first few years of operation.

8. With the increased complexity of education and the specialized services and programs increasing in number and scope, it seems that local education agencies have not been able to keep up effectively and economically with the demand. Therefore, regional approaches to delivering services that meet the specialized educational needs of youth are increasingly being required and established.

9. A continuation of the rapid expansion and increase in the number and type of educational cooperatives seems inevitable. The move toward cooperation that appeared to have originated as a function of, or for assistance to, small and rural schools by striving to offer equality of educational opportunity afforded students of large urban and suburban school districts, is now becoming attractive to large school systems as a vehicle to facilitate the development and implementation of new and expanded services. The participation and support of large and small size school districts should push the educational cooperative arrangement to the top of most states' list of priority needs.

10. Each year since 1960 additional school districts have joined in various kinds of cooperative arrangements. These cooperative ventures have provided a place for such activities as program development, planning, state and

federal project development and implementation, and for working with community groups. The cooperative has also provided a single location for foundations and other organizations to work directly with a number of school districts.

11. It is apparent from the review of literature that technology is slowly becoming a major priority area of concern of this nation's educational system. The state departments of education have been generally slow to develop and/or provide instructional media services for the schools under their jurisdiction. There have been a few exceptions in those states where the state legislature appropriated the funds necessary for these services. The Federal Government has provided the impetus for a number of states to become involved in media services. World War I and II films and other materials were distributed on a proportionate basis to the states, thus establishing many instructional media libraries. The National Defense Act of 1958 provided funds for massive instructional media research, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided funds for purchasing media materials and equipment. More and more of the states are contemplating the regional service center as the vehicle that best coordinates their resources to provide media services to local school districts.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, The Federal-State Partnership in Education, Fifth Annual Report of the Advisory Council, Washington, D.C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
2. American Association of School Administrators, Regional Educational Service Agency Prototypes, Operational Statutory Arrangements and Suggestions for Implementation, Washington, D.C., National Education Association, Department of Rural Education, 1967.
3. Belton, John Raynor, "Wisconsin's New District Educational Service Agencies," Journal on State School Systems Development, 1 (May, 1969), 203-222.
4. Bildersee, Max U., "The Education Improvement Act: A New Responsibility," Education Screen and Audio-Visual Guide, 44 (May, 1965), 15.
5. Bradley, W. A., House Bill No. 1149, The Tennessee General Assembly, 1970.
6. Brooker, Floyd E., Training Films for Industry, Washington, D.C., Federal Security Agency, U. S. Office of Education Bulletin 13, 1946.
7. Brown, James W., Richard B. Lewis, and Fred F. Harewood, "Selecting, Creating, and Using Learning Resources," AV Instruction: Media and Methods, Vol. 58, New York, McGraw-Hill Inc., (1969), 68-70.
8. Bruce, William C., "ABC's of Implementing Titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," School Board Journal, 151 (July, 1965), 9-13.
9. Downing, H. E., Audio-Visual Staff and Organization in State Departments of Education, Washington, D.C., National Education Association Research Division, February, 1948.
10. Fitzwater, C. O., State School System Development: Patterns and Trends, Denver, Colo., Education Commission of the States, 1968.

11. Green, Joseph, "The Media Sixties Reviewed," The Clearing House, 44 (January, 1970), 319-320.
12. Holland, B. F., The Status and Prospects of Film Distribution in Texas, Austin, Texas, The University of Texas, 1958.
13. Iowa Center for Research in School Administration, The Multi-County Regional Education Service Agency in Iowa, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, prepared for the Linn County Board of Education by the University of Iowa College of Education, 1967.
14. Kahl, William C., Wisconsin's Cooperative Educational Service Agencies, Madison, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, February 15, 1968.
15. Keesler, Clifton L., "How to Create a State Media Center," Iowa Department of Public Instruction, 45 (October, 1966), 46.
16. Liasson, Joy and Michael Spina, "The New York Regional Center Network: A Regional Educational Planning Resource," Journal of the New York State School Boards Association, Inc., 34 (June, 1970), 15.
17. McCarty, Henry R., and Horace C. Harlsell, The Cooperative Approach to Audio-Visual Programs, Washington, D.C., National Education Association of the United States, June, 1962.
18. McClusky, F. Dean, "The Administration of Visual Education, A National Survey," unpublished report made to the National Education Association in 1923.
19. New York General Assembly, Establishment of Boards of Cooperative Educational Services Pending the Creation of Intermediate District, New York, State Printing Office, 1958, 401-423.
20. Noel, Francis, et al, Practices of State Departments of Education in New Educational Media/Audio-Visual Education During 1960-61, Los Angeles, California, University of Southern California Press, 1963.
21. Raden, Bonnie, "Audio-Visuals for Alaska," Educational Screen and Audio-Visual Guide, (February, 1970), 32.
22. Sacramento State College Foundation, States Audio-Visual Education Study: A Summary Report, Sacramento, California, 1966.

23. Saettler, Paul, A History of Instructional Technology, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968.
24. Stewart, Robert C., et al, The Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Syracuse, N.Y., Bureau of School Services, School for Education, Syracuse University, 1964.
25. Summer, Ernestine, and Winogene Bergmann, "The New Instructional Materials Center," Audio-Visual Instruction, Vol. 10 (June-July, 1965), 458-59.
26. Tanzman, Jack, "Audio-Visual Advisory," School Management, Vol. 11 (May, 1967), 43-58.
27. Terman, G. E., "The IMC Idea: Regional Development Demanded," Educational Screen and Audio-Visual Guide, Vol. 44 (December, 1965), 17 and 45.
28. Texas Education Agency, Thirty-Fourth Biennial Report 1944-46, Bulletin No. 473, Austin, State Printing Office, 1954.
29. Texas Education Agency, Forty-First Biennial Report 1958-60, Bulletin No. 610, Austin, State Printing Office, 1960.
30. Texas Education Agency, Thirty-Eighth Biennial Report 1952-54, Bulletin No. 566, Austin, State Printing Office, 1954.
31. Texas Education Agency, State Plan: Procedures and Policies for the Operation of Regional Education Service Center (Revised), Austin, Texas Education Agency, January, 1970.
32. Tucker, Bill F., "Highlights of TEXAVED/TAET," Educational Resources and Techniques, Vol. 10 (Spring, 1970), 16-17.
33. The Iowa Research Committee on the Intermediate Administrative Unit, Effective Intermediate Units in Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, April, 1960.
34. U. S. Office of Education, Regulations Pursuant to Titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Federal Register, Vol. 32, No. 27, Part II, February 9, 1967.



35. U. S. Congress, New Hampshire-Vermont Interstate School Compact, Public Law 91-12, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, June 3, 1969.
36. U. S. Office of Education, ESEA Title I Program Guide #24, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, November 16, 1966.

## CHAPTER III

### DEVELOPMENT OF SB 408

The review of the development of SB 408 was undertaken to provide a basic understanding of the problem prior to the design and utilization of instruments for surveying the impact of the Bill on a selected group of Texas public schools. The review was also made to ascertain the degree to which local public school officials were involved in development activities. Materials reviewed were state legislative library files, annual reports of three Education Media Centers and Texas Education Agency records, and other materials.

The review will be presented in the following scope and sequence: (1) action by various concerned groups that seemed to set the stage for the development of Regional Education Media Centers in Texas, (2) progress of Senate Bill 408 in the State Legislature, (3) operation of the legislation at all levels of the educational structure, and (4) some concluding statements relative to cooperation inherent in provisions of the act.

#### Setting the State for Regional Education Media Centers in Texas

The first widely supported proposal for statewide legal arrangements to establish regional libraries for films and other audio-visual aids on a state-local matching financial

basis was included as a part of the legislative program adopted by the Texas State Teachers Association (TSTA) House of Delegates in Fort Worth on November 29, 1958, and proposed to the Fifty-sixth Legislature. The program was prepared by the TSTA Legislative Committee, in cooperation with all segments of the education profession, to activate the Hale-Aikin Citizens Committee recommendations (from a grass roots study of schools in 254 counties) for an improved public school program (1, p. 17).

The TSTA-proposed regional film library legislation was on the working docket of the Fifty-sixth Legislature as HB 210 and SB 20, "setting up film libraries on a state-local cooperative basis." The Texas Outlook reported that "HB 210 never got out of the House Appropriations Committee, and SB 20 was reported favorable from the Senate Education Committee, but received no floor action" (3, p. 9).

In October, 1960, The Texas Outlook stated that "the Texas State Teachers Association will go to bat again before the 1961 Texas Legislature for what public schools need, and for what Texans have said they want for their children" (5, p. 22). Bill E of the TSTA proposed legislative program for 1961 reads "establish regional libraries for films and other audio-visual aids to be financed on a matching basis by the State and participating local districts."

The proposed legislation was introduced as SB 47 and HB 65 in the Fifty-seventh Texas Legislature. Senator Doyle

Willis of Fort Worth was the author of SB 47, and Representative Ronald Roberts of Hillsboro was the author of HB 65 (2, p. 15). TSTA stated that SB 47 was reported favorably by the Senate Finance Committee but did not receive floor action, and that HB 65 never left the House Appropriations Sub-Committee (10, p. 9).

A "Three-Point" legislative program to be proposed to the Fifty-eighth Legislature was approved by the TSTA House of Delegates in Austin on October 27, 1962. The program included regional film libraries, state minimum sick leave programs for teachers, and teacher retirement improvements. The regional film library proposal sought state legislation that would enable "local school districts to join together to provide an adequate library of audio-visual materials" (14, p. 18). The proposed measure asked the state to put up an amount not in excess of fifty-cents per pupil for purchase of films, and local school districts were to match the state funds, with local school district participation being voluntary.

In January, 1963, TSTA stated that solid backing had already been established in the Fifty-eighth Legislature for the TSTA-proposed legislation on film libraries. In the spring of 1962, during the campaigns for nomination, TSTA asked legislative candidates of both parties to answer "yes" or "no" to the statement "I would favor a bill creating regional film libraries." Of the thirty-one Senators

seventeen responded with a "yes" and two said "no." The other twelve Senators did not commit themselves. Concerning the same statement ninety Representatives responded with a "yes" and eleven said "no." Two of the Representatives reported as undecided and other Representatives did not choose to respond (8, p. 14).

The TSTA proposed legislation was authored by Senator Andy Rogers of Childress, as SB 90, and it was authored by Representative Menton Murray of Harlingen as HB 196 (26, p. 18). The essence of the legislation was reported thus:

. . . this bill would permit local districts to join voluntarily in establishing regional film centers or would permit continued participation in existing centers.

The State would provide not to exceed fifty cents per pupil in average daily attendance, to be matched by local districts participating. State funds would be used by a local board of directors for films and/or other operating costs.

Cost to the State would be about \$500,000. a year (26, p. 19).

In July, 1963, The Texas Outlook stated that due to Joint Rule 9-a which would not permit its consideration until after the general appropriation bill passed both houses, and because the big money bill did not pass until the closing house of the session, there was not opportunity to consider the film bill.

The Texas Outlook further stated that the film bill was approved in the Senate, reported favorable from the House Committee, and needed only floor action to become law (4, pp. 9-10).

## Passage of SB 408

In the early part of 1964, TSTA asked legislative candidates in the Democratic and Republican primaries to answer "yes" or "no," with brief comments if desired, to the statement "I would support a bill creating regional film centers." Twenty-seven of the candidates for Senate seats responded with "yes," with a condition accompanying six of the replies; five of the candidates stated that they were undecided; and four did not choose to comment. Concerning the identical statement, 226 candidates seeking election to the State House of Representatives responded with "yes," with a condition accompanying fourteen of the replies; twenty-two responded with "no;" eleven stated that they were undecided; and thirty-seven did not submit a response (17, p. 13).

The proposed legislation on regional film libraries to the Fifty-ninth Legislature was authored and introduced (March 11, 1965) by Senators Kazen and Bates in the form of SB 408, which read

S.B. No. 408, A bill to be entitled An Act to authorize and provide for the establishment of Regional Media Centers pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the State Board of Education and the Central Education Agency for the purposes and subject to provisions and limitations herein contained, thereby to provide for a system or program for the local development, operation and distribution of educational media services, professional and material, for participating public school districts of Texas; to provide for a governing board or board for each Center and prescribing

certain duties and functions; providing for financing of the Centers' programs, by district participation in the Center and the State on a formula basis, the State's share or cost therein to be paid out of the Minimum Foundation School Fund, and permitting additional financing thereof from other sources; providing for review of the Centers by audit and accreditation divisions of the Agency; providing for the expenditure of such Center funds; providing for a severability clause and an effective date of this Act, and declaring an emergency (23, p. 429).

The bill was amended May 21, 1965, on motion of Senator Kazen as follows:

Amend S.B. 408 by striking out the provision of Section 13 and substituting in lieu thereof the following: No state funds shall be expended for the purposes of this Act until the 1967-68 school year (23, p. 1693).

The Senate was informed (23, p. 2081) by the House that the House had passed House Bill 447 (22, p. 228), which was the companion bill.

The bill received final passage in the Senate on May 31, 1965, and was signed by the Governor on June 1, 1965 (23, p. 2152).

The School Code (11, pp. 127-129) under Article 2654-3d described the law in thirteen sections.

#### Section 1. Authorization

The State Board of Education is hereby authorized to provide for the establishment and a procedure for the operation of Regional Education Media Centers by rules and regulations adopted under the provisions of this law thereby to provide educational media materials, equipment, maintenance thereof, and services to the public free school districts of this state who participate therein.

Section one provided for the establishment and general procedures for the operation of Regional Education Media Centers. A broad representation of public school districts were to be involved in all state planning and organizational structuring activities. The section provided a cooperative design for the development and implementation of major provisions of the legislation. It appears that the legislature intended for the appropriateness of services at the REMC to be a major determinant of local education agency participation.

#### Section 2. Purposes

Such Centers approved by the Central Education Agency as meeting such regulation requirements are hereby established for the purpose of developing, providing and making available to participating school districts, among other educational media services, the following:

- a. Lending library service for educational motion picture films, 16 and 8mm or improvements thereof, with such processing and servicing as is needed to maintain this program.
- b. Lending library service for 35mm slides, or improvements thereof, film strips and disk recordings.
- c. A comprehensive lending library collection of programmed instruction materials for both remedial and enrichment purposes.
- d. Educational magnetic tape duplicating service for both audio and visual tapes, with the Agency central duplicating faculty servicing the Regional Centers for program materials.



- e. Overhead and other projection transparency duplicating service to provide visuals from prepared master copies.
- f. Professional and other services to assist schools in effective and utilization of all Center materials and services.

In this section general kinds of educational media services allowable under provisions of the law are enumerated. The specific type and number of services within the guidelines were left to the discretion of the local governing Board of Directors at each Center. The local Governing Boards were given the responsibility for identifying priority needs of school districts in their respective regions and then focusing resources on these selected problems.

### Section 3. Physical Sites

Such regional Centers shall be located throughout the State to the end that each school district would have opportunity to be served and participate in an approved Center, on a voluntary basis. No Center shall be approved unless the same shall serve an area having a minimum of 50,000 eligible scholastics in average daily attendance for the next preceding school year. Provided, however, that certain Agency approved exceptions or deviations for sparsely populated areas may be made as to the potential requirement.

In section three parameters for the geographical sites of Centers were outlined on the basis of scholastics. These broad guidelines directed the State Education Agency to consult with representatives from public free schools and establish specific locations for each Center.

This section also delineated the permissiveness available in the legislation, which allowed public free school districts to join the Centers' program each school year on a voluntary basis. This actually meant that participation for one year in the REMC Program did not necessarily determine the response of the local school district to the program in subsequent years.

#### Section 4. Definition of a Center

- a. Regional Education Media Center for purposes of this Act is defined to be an area center, composed of one or more entire Texas school districts, that is approved to house, circulate and service educational media for the public free schools of the districts which are participant members thereof.
- b. Each Center shall be governed in its local administration by a Regional Media Board comprised of five or seven members locally to be determined and recommended in the initial application for Center approval.
- c. The State Board of Education shall adopt uniform rules and regulations to provide for the local selection, appointment, and continuity of membership for regional center boards. Vacancies shall be filled by appointment by the remaining members of the regional board for the unexpired term; all members to serve without compensation.

Section four is divided into three parts. The first part (a) defines the Center in terms of geographic boundaries, minimum number of participating school districts, and the major tasks to be performed by the Center. This provision

served as a basis for the development of regional centers to serve multi-county arrangements.

The second part (b) describes the operational governing body and the procedures for all school districts in the area to participate in the election of the board members. This provision provided for local education agency participation in planning, structuring, implementing, and evaluating decisions relative to the Centers' program.

In part three (c) provisions were made for the Agency to establish uniform rules and regulations especially important for local selection of the first board members in each of the new organizations. It seemed to be the thinking of the legislature, in providing this method for selecting the membership of each Center board, that all members shall be selected at large from the area.

The provisions delineated in this section assured local orientation and control of the Centers' operation.

#### Section 5. Staffing

The Regional Media Board is authorized to employ an executive director for its respective Center and such other personnel, professional and clerical, as it deems necessary to carry out the functions of the Center, and to do and perform all things which it deems proper for the successful operation thereof, and to pay for all such by warrants drawn on proper funds available for such purpose.

In Section five provisions were made for governing boards of Centers to employ needed personnel without regard to state and local personnel standards established for local school districts that were to be served by the Centers.

#### Section 6. District Withdrawal

Any school district which is a participant member of a Regional Education Media Center may elect to withdraw its membership in the Center for a succeeding scholastic year thereby electing no longer to support nor to receive its services for any succeeding year; provided, however, that title to and all educational media and property purchased by the Center shall remain with and in the Center.

In Section six the steps a district and Center must follow in the event a district decides to withdraw from membership in the Center's program are outlined. These provisions revealed that participation would be on a voluntary basis, but once the school district joined the Centers' program it would be mandatory that the district cooperate with other districts of the cooperative. It is apparent that local education agency participation will further the equality of media services for all members of the cooperative.

#### Section 7. State Review

The Central Education Agency, through its audit and accreditation divisions, shall review for purposes of continuity and standardization these services of the several Centers.

In Section seven the Texas Education Agency is directed to account for expenditures of the Centers according to public school laws. These provisions established the same type of working relationship, in financial matters, between the Agency and Centers as exists between the Agency and public free school districts. The governing unit -- the Education Service Center -- of the REMC is considered in this provision as a local education agency.

#### Section 8. Expenditures

The cost incident to setting up of the Centers, the operation thereof and the purchase of educational media supplies and equipment shall be borne by the state and each participating district to the extent and in the manner provided in this Act.

Section eight made provisions for state funds to be expended for "setting up" activities prior to the selection of Center governing boards. The initial "setting up" activities were to be carried out by local public school representatives.

This section also made provisions for the unique arrangement of pooling funds from two or more school districts with state funds to provide equal educational media services to participating school districts. This section can be considered the most unique feature of the Bill. Its provisions established, for the first time in Texas, legal arrangements for local public schools in pooling resources and receiving matching state funds from the state minimum foundation formula.

### Section 9. State Initial Allotment

One initial allotment to each Center is an amount determined on the basis of twenty cents (20¢) per scholastic in average daily attendance the next preceding school year in district(s) participant in the Center to be paid from the minimum Foundation School Fund for the purpose of original financing for the operation and setting up of the Center, provided the Center is established and operated for the school year 1965-66 and/or 1966-67.

In Section nine provisions were made to encourage implementation of the legislation on September 1, 1965. However, the Fifty-ninth Legislature reversed this action prior to completing business in regular session. See Section thirteen of the law under discussion.

### Section 10. State Annual Allotments

- a. The state shall further allot and pay to each approved Center annually an amount determined on the basis of not to exceed One Dollar (\$1.00) per scholastic in average daily attendance for the next preceding school year in the district or districts that are participants in an approved Center. School districts as participant members in the Center shall each provide for and pay to the proper Center a proportionate amount determined on its ADA for the next preceding school year matching the amount provided by the state.
- b. The funds or amounts provided by the state shall be used only to purchase educational media or equipment for the Center which have had prior approval of its Regional Media Board and by the Central Education Agency through its budgetary system.

- c. The matching funds provided by the participant district(s), including any donated or other local source funds, may be used to pay for costs of administration of and/or servicing by the Center and to purchase supplemental educational media. Provided, no Center shall enter into obligations which shall exceed funds available and/or reasonably anticipated as receivable for the then current school year.

Section ten is divided into three parts. The first part (a) describes the formula for allocation of state funds to the Educational Media Cooperatives. A maximum of state funds available to Centers, if participating districts were willing to appropriate a proportionate amount, was established; but no restrictions were placed on the minimum amount of funds for the transaction. The unit base for the formula was described as the local school district's pupil average daily attendance for the prior year.

The second part (b) describes the constraints connected with the allocation and expenditure of state funds flowing to the Center under provisions of the law. This provision assured the existence of a tangible inventory of items purchased with state funds and having some resale value. This meant that all materials at the Centers must be recorded as State Property.

The third part (c) described the limits for expenditure of local source funds allocated to the Regional Education Media program, and the extent to which these

obligated. This provision equipped the local school districts with the power to inactivate the regional media services after any given school year.

#### Section 11.

Annually, pursuant to such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Agency, the governing board of each such Center shall determine the rate per pupil based on ADA the next preceding school year, not to exceed the One Dollar (\$1.00) limit prescribed in this Act, which shall constitute the basis for determination of total amount to be transmitted by participant district(s) to the Center and as matching funds from the state's contribution to this program.

In Section eleven provisions were made for the governing board of each Center, in cooperation with representation from local districts, to decide the amount of local and state funds that will be allocated to the Regional Education Media Center program each school year. These provisions assured cooperation between and among local public free school districts in the development and implementation of equal media services for participating districts.

#### Section 12. State Source Funds

The state's share of the cost in the Regional Education Media Centers program herein authorized shall be paid from the Minimum Foundation Program Fund, and this cost will be considered by the Foundation Program Committee in estimating the funds needed for Foundation Program purposes, provided that nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit a Center from receiving and utilizing matching funds in any amount for which it may be eligible from federal sources.



Section twelve identified the state allocation for Regional Education Media Center operations as Minimum Foundation Funds, and available federal discretionary funds (funds expended at state level for state responsibilities). The state funding arrangement assured continued funding unless the state legislature discontinued the provision. The federal fund arrangement was supplemental and subject to annual appropriations by the U. S. Congress.

Section twelve further described provisions available to the Center to seek and utilize available resources outside the State and Center partnership arrangement. This provision equipped local school districts with a framework for exploiting the potential of the educational media cooperative concept. Federal funds could be pooled with local funds at the local school level and then transferred to the REMC.

### Section 13. Initial Funding

No state funds shall be expended for the purposes of this Act until the 1967-1968 school year.

Even though the provision outlined in Section thirteen did delay actual implementation of the legislation in schools, it is evident that the holding action did provide time for the Texas Education Agency to involve a broad representation of public school officials in the design and formulation of procedures and policies for the operation of regional media services, prior to September 1, 1967.

### Implementation of Senate Bill 408

Something over two years were spent in the formulation of a State Plan for the operation of Regional Media Centers. During this time a number of events and activities in Texas and on the national scene contributed to the progress and final design of the plan.

About the same time SB 408 was enacted the United States Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Act, one part of which, Title III, provided for the development of supplemental centers and services. A number of these units were in operation in the State during the 1965-1966 school year (13).

Since many of the supplemental centers and services funded under Title III included educational media services, and since the Texas Education Agency administered the State's responsibility for Title III, it was decided in the spring of 1966 that coordination between these centers and services and the State's regional media centers would strengthen services available to all schools. It was further anticipated that such coordination would provide the resources and framework to involve all schools--large and small--in state-wide educational planning and in the development of regional services. This decision expanded the concept of regional centers to include not only media services, but also a broad range of other educational services needed by local school districts (21).

With full knowledge of the decision to move toward the coordination of program activities of SB 408 and Title III projects, the staff of the Texas Education Agency--in cooperation with an advisory committee on regional education media centers composed of educators from public schools, colleges, universities, and lay-citizens--began planning for the regional media centers authorized by the Fifty-ninth Legislature. This phase of the planning process produced the first draft of Tentative Regulations and Guidelines for Developing Regional Media Centers.

Area meetings were held in July and August of 1966 to obtain the reaction of local school officials on the tentative regulations and guidelines. District units of the Texas Association of School Administrators served as convenors of the local orientation and discussion sessions. Officers of the association were responsible for recording the concerns, recommendations, and suggestions of local school officials and reporting same to the Texas Education Agency (7).

Primary concerns expressed by local school officials at these meetings were (1) the degree of local control of Center operations, (2) local representation to the governing board of the Center, (3) geographical area to be served by the Centers, and (4) funding sources for the Center program. These topics occupied a great deal of the time in most of the area meetings (25).

Recorded results of each area meeting were reported to the Texas Education Agency. The data was included in the context evaluation phase of the state planning process, and the information did influence in some instances the alteration of tentative operational procedures proposed at that time for the State Plan. This was especially true as concerned with the change from twenty-six regions in the first draft of the Tentative Regulations and Guidelines to twenty regions appearing in the second draft. Local school officials from most sections of the state recommended that the geographical boundaries and numbers of the Regional Educational Media Centers coincide with the geographical boundaries of the twenty Texas State Teachers Association districts (16).

Simultaneously with this planning, the staff of the Texas Education Agency was making an in-depth study of the feasibility for providing various educational services on a regional basis. The relationship of such services to the Title III program in Texas, institutions of higher learning, the new regional laboratories and centers for educational research and development being funded under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the State Department of Education formed an integral part of the study (25).

The advisory committee on Innovation and Assessment composed of educators from public schools, colleges,

universities, and lay-citizens met in Austin in late fall of 1966; and in light of the study made by the Agency staff of regional services and of changing educational needs and goals, revised the state guidelines and State Plan for Title III. One major goal developed for the revised State Plan was to provide educational services within a region with each Title III project funded in the State (25).

As a result of all this study a second draft of a Tentative State Plan for the Establishment of Education Service Centers Including Regional Media Centers was presented in December, 1966, to the committee of the whole of the State Board of Education for reaction. Further refinement of the Plan followed.

The second draft was widely circulated throughout the state to obtain the reactions of local school officials and lay-citizens. The Texas Association of School Administrators was again requested to convene the local groups and disseminate the results.

Only one item in the second draft received strong reaction from the local groups. An extensive discussion was had in most sections of the state about the membership of the governing board:

Board Membership - Any adult over twenty-one years of age, a citizen of the United States of America, and a resident of the region being served by the center, who is not engaged in

education or who is not a member of a local board of school trustees, may be elected to Board membership. No member of the Board shall be in the business of vending or servicing materials or equipment to Regional Media Centers (18).

A majority of those in attendance in a few area meetings, and a strong minority in other meetings recommended that the provisions for Board Membership be changed to specify that only local public school educators "may be elected to Board Membership." Expanding the provision for Board Membership in the tentative plan to include local public school educators as eligible for election to board membership was offered as an alternative in the debate by some area groups.

To clear the way for the New State Plan, Senate Bill 313 was introduced in the legislature. The purpose of the proposal was to broaden the scope of possible services provided through regional centers. This bill in no way altered media services to be offered under provisions of SB 408. The General and Special Laws of Texas (12) outlined fundamental provisions of the proposed bill in two sections as follows:

Regional Education Service Centers; Establishment and Operation. -- Section 1. The State Board of Education is hereby authorized to provide for the establishment and a procedure for the operation of Regional Education Service Centers by rules and regulations adopted under provisions of this law and the provisions of Senate Bill No. 408, Acts of the 59th Legislature, to provide educational services to the school districts and to coordinate educational planning in the region.

Under provisions of this section the Regional Education Media Center outlined in SB 408 could become a component of the Regional Education Service Center operation. None of the fundamental provisions of SB 408 would be altered by the Act. Furthermore, most of the organizational structure of the Regional Education Service Center established to implement Senate Bill 313 would be based on provisions of SB 408. In other words, SB 408 would remain, after its consolidation with SB 313, as the vehicle for distributing media services available at the Education Service Center to participating schools, whether or not the services were purchased by provision of SB 408 or by other sources.

Section 2. The governing board of each Regional Education Service Center is authorized, under rules and regulations of the State Board of Education, to enter into contracts for grants from both public and private organizations and to expend such funds for the specific purposes in accordance with the terms of the contract with the contracting agency.

Under Section two legal arrangement would be provided for the Centers' governing board to enter into contractual agreements with public and private organization for the purpose of supplementing services available under SB 408, and providing other educational services. The section also proposed to provide a way for the Center board to allow private and parochial schools to join the media center by paying a membership fee per pupil in average daily attendance equal to the matching fund requirements of both the state and district for free public school participation.

In January, 1967, the Texas Education Agency gained approval from the United States Office of Education to direct some of the resources available to Texas under Title III, ESEA, to establish a Center in each of the regions in the Tentative State Plan. Some of the Centers were to be established in conjunction with an on-going Title III project; others were to be established as new projects. Each of the regions were to receive \$67,000 for a period, May 1, 1967, through April 30, 1968, for the purpose of planning the Center and engaging essential staff.

At its regular meeting in March, 1967, the Board of Education gave final approval to the State Plan for the Establishment of Regional Education Media Centers under SB 408 and Regional Education Service Centers proposed under Title III.

Senate Bill 313 was enacted into law in early April of 1967 (24, pp. 640-650). At its April meeting the State Board of Education gave final approval to the "State Plan For The Establishment Of Education Service Centers Including Regional Education Media Centers."

#### Pertinent Provisions of the 1967 State Plan

Pertinent provisions of the Plan according to the Texas Education Agency (20, pp. 1-20), and commentaries regarding the actual implementation and operation of media services under the Plan are as follows:



## Preface

The State Board of Education hereby provides for the establishment and operation of Regional Education Service Centers, including Regional Education Media Centers, throughout the state for the purpose of providing services to participating school districts. This is done in accordance with the provisions of Article 2654-3d and Article 2654-3e of Vernon's Civil Statutes and these regulations.

The preface clearly points out that regional education media centers were to become an integral part of the Regional Education Service Center's organizational structure and according to provisions of Article 2654-3d (Senate Bill 408), and Article 2654-3e (Senate Bill 313). However, it is apparent that provisions of Article 2654-3e did not in any way alter the basic intent of Article 2654-3d. Article 2654-3e gave the governing board of the centers authority to seek and utilize resources available to enhance media services provided under SB 408, but these additional resources were to be subject to provisions of SB 408 when they were integrated into the media program. The education media programs under SB 408 have become prominent components of all Education Service Centers.

### 1.0 Purposes

Each Board of Directors shall develop and provide the following basic services to its member schools:

- 1.1 Regional educational planning to meet immediate and long range educational

needs of the region and as a part of statewide planning.

- 1.2 Educational services as established by planning and by the needs and desires in the region.
- 1.3 Participate in appropriate statewide educational programs as requested by the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education.
- 1.4 Media services, as mandated by Article 2654-3d, V.C.S., including
  - 1.4-1 Basic media services:
    - 1.4-1.1 A materials lending library containing 16 and 8mm motion picture or improvements thereof with provision for processing and servicing, 35mm slides or improvements thereof, filmstrips, remedial and enrichment programmed instructional materials, and disc recordings.
    - 1.4-1.2 Visual duplication service to reproduce transparencies, slides, filmstrips, and charts or improvements thereof.
    - 1.4-1.3 A magnetic tape duplicating service for audio and video tape.
    - 1.4-1.4 A delivery and dissemination system for materials and services.
    - 1.4-1.5 Professional leadership training services to the districts for coordination of media and curriculum.

- 1.4-1.6 Acquisition and utilization of materials that will be coordinated with the curriculum of local school districts.
- 1.4-2 Optional media services, which may include but are not limited to the following:
  - 1.4-2.1 Equipment repair service with local school districts paying for such service.
  - 1.4-2.2 Evaluative services of new equipment, materials, and techniques.
  - 1.4-2.3 Graphics staff to produce transparency masters, charts, and/or render other services.

In addition to a listing of basic and optional media services, section 1.0 presented the requirement that planning to meet immediate and long-range educational needs of the region must be within the confines of state-wide planning. This requirement was re-emphasized in the encouragement that educational media services should be established first on the basis of planning and then on needs and desires of the region. It appears that under this provision the Texas Education Agency is in a position to influence and even exercise some control over the establishment of educational media priorities and services provided by the Centers. This provision is cited at times by school officials when they tag the Education Service Center as a "Little TEA."

All provisions of Section 1.0 are based upon SB 408 with the exception of sub-section 1.1 and 1.3, which set up a broader base for planning the immediate and long-range needs

of the region, and a wider range of possible requests by the Commissioner of Education for regions to participate in state-wide educational programs.

## 2.0 Geographical Regions

In order that each school district may have opportunity to be served and participate in an approved regional education service center, each of the geographical areas described below is hereby designated a region for educational services.

### 2.1 Regions defined (\*County and \*\*City where Center physical plants are located)

Region I Cameron, Hidalgo\*, Jim Hogg, Starr, Webb, Willacy, and Zapata counties. (\*\*Edinburg)

Region II Aransas, Bee, Brooks, Duval, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Kelberg, Live Oak, McMullen, Nueces\*, and San Patricio counties. (\*\*Corpus Christi)

Region III Calhoun, Colorado, DeWitt, Goliad, Jackson, Karnes, Lavaca, Matagorda, Refugio, Victoria\*, and Wharton counties. (\*\*Victoria)

Region IV Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Galveston, Harris\*, Liberty, and Waller counties. (\*\*Houston)

Region V Hardin, Jasper, Jefferson, Newton, Orange\*, and Tyler counties. (\*\*Beaumont)

Region VI Austin, Brazos, Burleson, Grimes, Houston, Leon, Madison, Milam, Montgomery, Polk, Robertson, San Jacinto, Trinity, Walker\*, and Washington counties. (\*\*Huntsville)

- Region VII Anderson, Angelina, Cherokee, Gregg\*, Harrison, Henderson, Nacogdoches, Panola, Raines, Rusk, Sabine, San Augustine, Shelby, Smith, Upshur, Van Zandt, and Wood counties. (\*\*Kilgore)
- Region VIII Bowie, Camp, Cass, Delta, Franklin, Hopkins, Lamar, Marion, Morris, Red River, and Titus\* counties. (\*\*Mount Pleasant)
- Region IX Archer, Baylor, Clay, Foard, Hardeman, Jack, Know, Montague, Throckmorton, Wichita\*, Wilbarger, and Young counties. (\*\*Wichita Falls)
- Region X Collin, Dallas\*, Ellis, Fannin, Grayson, Hunt, Kaufman, and Rockwall counties. (\*\*Richardson)
- Region XI Cooke, Denton, Erath, Hood, Johnson, Palo Pinto, Parker, Somervell, Tarrant\*, and Wise counties. (\*\*Fort Worth)
- Region XII Bell, Bosque, Corryell, Falls, Freestone, Hamilton, Hill, Lampasas, Limestone, McLennan\*, Mills, and Navarro counties. (\*\*Waco)
- Region XIII Bastrop, Blanco, Burnet, Caldwell, Comal, Fayette, Gillespie, Gonzales, Guadalupe, Hays, Kendall, Lee, Llano, Travis\*, and Williamson counties. (\*\*Austin)
- Region XIV Callahan, Comanche, Eastland, Fisher, Haskell, Jones, Mitchell, Nolan, Scurry, Shackelford, Stephens, Stonewall, and Taylor\* counties. (\*\*Abilene)

- Region XV Brown, Coke, Coleman, Concho, Crockett, Edwards, Irion, Kimble, McCulloch, Mason, Menard, Runnels, San Saba, Schleicher, Sterling, Sutton, Tom Green\*, and Val Verde counties. (\*\*San Angelo)
- Region XVI Armstrong, Briscoe, Carson, Castro, Childress, Collingsworth, Dallam, Deaf Smith, Donley, Gray, Hall, Hansford, Hartley, Hemphill, Hutchinson, Lipscomb, Moore, Ochiltree, Oldham, Parmer, Potter\*, Randall, Roberts, Sherman, Swicher, and Wheeler counties. (\*\*Amarillo)
- Region XVII Bailey, Borden, Cochran, Cottle, Crosby, Dawson, Dickens, Floyd, Gaines, Garza, Hale, Hockley, Kent, King, Lamb, Lubbock\*, Lynn, Motley, Terry, and Yoakum counties. (\*\*Lubbock)
- Region XVIII Andrews, Brewster, Crane, Culberson, Ector\*, Glasscock, Howard, Jeff Davis, Loving, Martin, Midland, Pecos, Presidio, Reagan, Reeves, Terrell, Upton, Ward, and Winkler counties. (\*\*Odessa)
- Region XIX El Paso\*, and Hudspeth counties. (\*\*El Paso)
- Region XX Atascosa, Bandera, Bexar\*, Dimmit, Frio, Kerr, Kinney, La Salle, Maverick, Medina, Real, Uvalde, Wilson, and Zavala Counties. (\*\*San Antonio)

- 2.2 The State Board of Education shall review the assignment of counties to regions annually and may realign boundaries as necessary. The annual review shall consider the Annual Operation Reports, the Annual Fiscal Reviews of the regions, and the advice of the State-Wide

Advisory Commission on Education Service Centers and the Planning Council. Should realignment of regional boundaries be made:

- 2.2-1 The Commissioner of Education shall notify the Chairman of each Board of Directors involved. The Chairman of the Board of Directors in each of the regions affected shall:
  - 2.2-2.1 determine the total contribution made by all school districts affected and the state matching funds for those school districts within a county or counties changed.
  - 2.2-2.2 transfer an equitable share of materials, as determined by the Boards involved, to the region gaining a county or counties.
- 2.3 All boundary lines shall coincide with county lines except where a school district is in two or more counties in which case it shall be served from the region encompassing its county of jurisdiction. Further exception may be made in assignment of a county line district when evidence of hardship and other unusual circumstances is presented to support a request for reassignment to the adjoining region.
- 2.4 The regional education service center shall utilize the resources of and coordinate planning with institutions of higher education and other cultural institutions.
- 2.5 The location of the regional education service center in each of the geographic regions shall be established by action of the Board of Directors subject to approval of the State Board of Education.

2.5-1 Selection of the center site shall be based on the following criteria:

2.5-1.1 proximity to the area of highest concentration of pupils.

2.5-1.2 availability of economical transportation facilities to serve the region.

2.5-1.3 availability of cultural and educational facilities in the immediate vicinity.

2.5-1.4 criteria established by the Board of Directors to ensure that the center effectively performs its function.

2.6 A media satellite center may be located in a geographic region by action of the Board of Directors subject to approval by the State Board of Education.

2.6-1 A media satellite center providing distribution services described in 1.4-1.1 through 1.4-1.4 of these policies may be established in metropolitan cities with a minimum of 50,000 average daily attendance in a single school district, or in areas of extremely sparse population covering two or more counties with the satellite center located a minimum of 150 highway miles from the center, provided:

2.6-1.1 no school district within the region shall receive a smaller proportionate service than the satellite.

2.6-1.2 the Board of Directors and the Executive Director of the center are directly responsible for the operation of the satellite.



- 2.6-1.3 a demonstrated cooperative effort prevails between the operation of the satellite and the center.
  - 2.6-1.4 the city in which the satellite is located has a minimum of 5,000 population.
  - 2.6-1.5 the satellite location has cultural and educational opportunities not available in the surrounding communities.
  - 2.6-1.6 the satellite is economical to the operation of the center.
- 2.6-2 Any satellite center may withdraw its membership from a regional education service center under the same circumstances designated in 3.2 except that its inventory upon initial entrance into center participation may be removed but media and materials acquired during participation in the center shall remain with the center.
- 2.6-3 A satellite center desiring to cease operations but desiring to continue participation may do so by notification of its intention to the Board of Directors at least 120 days prior to the date of ceasing services and delivery of all media materials to the center no later than thirty (30) days after the satellite ceases to operate.
- 2.7 Educational services other than those provided for under 1.4-1.1 through 1.4-1.3 of these policies may be provided by the Board of Directors at locations throughout the region that will facilitate the effective operation of the program of the center.

In section 2.0 general methods for media distribution within the region as well as the initial establishment criteria and annual review geographic boundaries of education service centers were delineated. Provisions of SB 408 served as the

minimum, and in some instances as the maximum, criteria considered in drafting the boundaries of regions. Under the Act, regional media centers were to be so located throughout the state that each school district would have the opportunity to be served by and participate in an approved center; and that center should serve, if possible, an area having a minimum of 50,000 in average daily attendance. There is evidence that such matters as possible location of media centers, ease of travel within a region, and 50,000 minimum average daily attendance were considered in the drawing of regional boundaries (21). The centers vary in size from Region XIX, the smallest region, to Region XVIII which covers an area equal to the state of Indiana. They vary in number of students served (grades 1-12) from Region XV with 46,000 to Region IV with 415,000 in average daily attendance (21).

By establishing multi-county areas for each regional center, the State Plan did shun an alternative for selecting one school district to become an area Center, outlined in section 4. a. of SB 408 as "Regional Education Media Centers for purposes of this Act is defined to be an area center, composed of one or more entire Texas school districts, that is approved to house, circulate, and service educational media for the public free schools of the districts which are participant members thereof" (18). Most of the school districts

in the State with 50,000 or more average daily attendance advocated implementation of this alternative to meet their priority areas of concern in providing educational media to the instructional programs.

The satellite center arrangement within regions, allowed under provisions of SB 408, was included in the State Plan to provide ways to meet peculiar needs of a region with sparsity and/or density in its population distribution. The section clearly points out that the arrangement is to be under complete control of the center's governing board, and the transaction must be advantageous to all participant members of the center. It seems that state and regional needs were major constraints contemplated in the establishment of a satellite arrangement at Dallas Independent School District, in Region X, at Houston Independent School District in Region IV, and at Edinburg Independent School District in Region I (25).

### 3.0 Eligibility for Receiving Media Services

- 3.1 A public school district of Texas may establish eligibility for receiving media services by action of the local board of trustees, payment of its proportionate share of the cost, and compliance with the policies as established by the State Board of Education. A school district may participate in media services of the regional education service center serving its particular geographic region as may be designated by the State Board of Education.

- 3.2 Any school district that is a participant in media or other services requiring a local contribution may elect to discontinue its participation in the services for a succeeding scholastic year provided title to all educational materials and property purchased by the center shall remain with and in the center.

Section 3.0 describes the establishment of local school district eligibility, under SB 408, as voluntary. However, after the local board of trustees decides to join the center, the district must cooperate with other participating districts in the planning, structuring, and implementation of media services and conform to policies developed by the State Board of Education. To receive media services from the center, each district is required to contribute, at least financially, to the development of media services on the basis of state and regional priority needs. This provision seems to be magnified by the requirement that if the district decides to withdraw from membership in the center, fruits of its contributions are to remain with the center.

The Texas Education Agency stated that at the close of the 1970-1971 school year seven regions had experienced a decrease in local district membership from their peak enrollment. The loss ranged from one per cent of the total pupil average daily attendance in Region XX to 44 per cent of the pupil average daily attendance in Region XIII (7).

4.0 Joint Committee of the Regional Education Service Center

4.1 There shall be established in each region a Joint Committee of the regional education service center to be made up of:

4.1-1 one representative from each twelve-grade school district, selected by the appropriate board of trustees.

4.1-2 one representative designated by the county board of trustees to represent all of the school districts with fewer than twelve grades in the county.

4.1-3 one representative from each four-year institution of higher education within the region which conducts an approved teacher education program, selected by the appropriate board of trustees.

4.2 Each member of the Joint Committee shall serve at the will of the local Board of School Trustees. No member of the Joint Committee shall be in the business of vending or servicing materials or equipment to regional education service centers.

4.3 It shall be the duty of the Joint Committee to determine whether the Board shall be composed of five (5) or seven (7) members, to elect the membership of the Board of Directors, and to serve that Board in an advisory capacity. The Joint Committee may establish an executive committee or other subcommittees to assist in its advisory function to the Board.

4.4 In order to initiate the establishment of a center in each region:

4.4-1 Notify each local Board of Trustees of its responsibility for naming a representative to the Joint Committee and provide each with instructions for discharging this responsibility.

- 4.4-2 At the organizational meeting, the Joint Committee shall:
- 4.4-2.1 Elect a permanent chairman and such other officers as the Committee may determine to be required.
  - 4.4-2.2 Provide for the election of Board members.
- 4.5 The chairman of the Joint Committee shall call an organizational meeting of the Board of Directors which shall organize by electing a chairman, vice-chairman, and secretary, adopt rules or procedures to govern its operation, and take the initial action toward preparation of an application for the establishment of a regional education service center.
- 4.6 The Board of Directors shall submit the application to the Board of Trustees of each participating school district for its consideration.
- 4.7 The official application, with the record of action of each Board of Trustees, shall be transmitted to the Texas Education Agency by the Board of Directors.
- 4.8 The Commissioner of Education shall formulate a recommendation on each application. The application and recommendation shall then be presented to the State Board of Education for its consideration.
- 4.9 Upon approval by the State Board of Education, the center shall be officially authorized and the Board of Directors empowered to proceed as outlined in the approved application.

In section 4.0 guidelines for local orientation and control of the organizational structure and operational procedures for providing media services to local school districts are outlined. Local school districts working together cooperatively are, under these provisions, in a position to guide

implementation activities. The essence of the section seems to be the encouragement for cooperation in the operation of regional media programs to establish equality in services available to pupils in participating districts.

The section also brings out the importance of equal representation and active participation by each public educational institution in the region on various advisory councils, and for the cooperative approach to provide media services for local districts. Equal representation, especially on the Joint Committee as referred to in this section, indicated that all public educational institutions within the region are, because of the establishment of regional boundaries, a member of the center, and would be considered in state planning as participating or non-participating members.

#### 5.0 The Board of Directors

5.1 Membership - The Board of Directors shall be comprised of five (5) or seven (7) members as determined by the Joint Committee.

5.2 Selection of Membership to the Board of Directors - The Joint Committee shall elect the membership of the original Board of Directors by a majority vote of its membership. This original Board shall determine the term of office of each of its members by drawing lots for place numbers in accordance with the following.

For five-member (5) boards:

Place 1	3 years
Place 2	2 years
Place 3	1 year
Place 4	3 years
Place 5	2 years

For seven-member (7) boards:

Place 1	3 years
Place 2	2 years
Place 3	1 year
Place 4	3 years
Place 5	2 years
Place 6	1 year
Place 7	3 years

The initial term of office shall begin on September 1 of 1967. Each of the initial members shall serve from the time of election until September 1, 1967 in addition to their regular term. At a meeting held May 1 - August 31 (see Section 5.7-8), beginning in 1970, the Joint Committee shall elect members to fill vacancies that will become vacant on August 31 of that year. The members thus elected shall hold office for a term of three years beginning September 1, immediately following such election.

- 5.3 Board Membership - Any adult over twenty-one (21) years of age, a citizen of the United States of America, and a resident of the region being served by the center, who is not engaged professionally in education or who is not a member of a local board of school trustees, may be elected to Board membership. No member of the Board shall be in the business of vending or servicing materials or equipment to regional education service centers.
- 5.4 Re-election to Board Membership - Members of the Board of Directors are eligible for re-election.
- 5.5 Unexpired Terms - Should a vacancy occur due to death or resignation, a thirty-day (30) period shall elapse after due notice has been given to the chairman of the Board of Directors before the vacancy is filled. Notice of such vacancy shall be given to the authorized representative of the schools within the region involved at the beginning of the thirty-day (30) interval. Vacancies for an unexpired term shall be filled by appointment by the remaining members of the Board of Directors.



- 5.6 Compensation - All members of the Board of Directors shall serve without compensation.
- 5.7 Meetings of the Board of Directors
- 5.7-1 Regular Meetings - The Board of Directors shall meet quarterly, at a time and place to be established by the Board in its rules or procedure.
- 5.7-2 Special Meetings of the Board may be called by the chairman or by a majority of the Board's membership. Notice of called meetings shall be given to each member of the Board in writing at least seven (7) days prior to each special meeting.
- 5.7-3 Quorum - On five-member (5) boards, three (3) shall constitute a quorum. On seven-member (7) boards, four (4) shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.
- 5.7-4 Minutes - Official minutes of the Board shall be kept in the office of the Executive Director and shall be available to each citizen for examination.
- 5.7-5 Transaction of Business - Business may be transacted provided a quorum is present and all members have been properly notified. A majority vote of members present is necessary to secure passage.
- 5.7-6 Public Meetings - All meetings shall be open to the public except that portion of any meeting devoted to the discussion of personnel.
- 5.7-7 Members of the Board of Directors attending official meetings of the Board shall be reimbursed for actual travel and living expenses.

5.7-8 Meetings with Joint Committee - The Board of Directors shall hold a meeting each year at some date between May 1 and August 31. At this meeting the Joint Committee shall elect members to fill vacancies occurring on the Board, evaluate the program, and advise the Board of any desired action. Notice of this meeting shall be sent to members of the Joint Committee and members of the Board at least thirty (30) days prior to the meeting. The Board may hold additional meetings with the Joint Committee or its subcommittees for advisory purposes.

In section 5.0 provisions were made to assure local control of the organizational structure for management of regional media services, and at the same time prevent domination of the program by any particular alignment of local education agencies based on size and/or needs. Involvement and representation of non-educational sectors of the region seem to be another concern of the designers of this State Plan. This section outlines two ways to meet these concerns as: (1) only laymen are permitted to serve on the Board of Directors of Centers, and (2) each member must be elected "at large" in the region by all representatives of public education agencies whether or not they have joined or received services from particular programs of the center.

There is evidence that provisions of this section are encouraging the coordination of available resources in the region to provide services to local school districts. The Board of Directors are required to make reports to the Joint Committee at least one time per year as to the progress in this area of responsibility.

## 6.0 Functions of the Board of Directors

The Board of Directors shall be the policy forming and evaluative body of the regional education service center, and it shall perform these functions:

- 6.1 Select an executive director and develop administrative policies for the center after conferring with the Commissioner of Education.
- 6.2 Develop and approve an annual operating budget for the operation of the center and submit copies of the budget to the Commissioner of Education.
- 6.3 Approve all fiscal arrangements, policies, and agreements.
- 6.4 Enter into contracts for grants from both public and private organizations and expend such funds for the specific purposes in accordance with the terms of the contract with the contracting agency.
- 6.5 Formulate policies to govern the operation of the center.
- 6.6 Confirm the appointment of professional personnel upon recommendation by the executive director.
- 6.7 Coordinate an annual evaluation of the activities of the center.
- 6.8 Make annual reports covering all activities and expenditures of the center to the Commissioner of Education.
- 6.9 Plan for the utilization of all available educational and cultural resources and services, including colleges and universities, located both within and outside the region.
- 6.10 Formulate policies for the utilization of the Joint Committee in an advisory capacity. The Board of Directors shall hold additional meetings with the Joint Committee or its subcommittees, as necessary, in order to utilize their advisory services.

6.11 Acquire, hold title and sell real property for service center purposes in accordance with statutes governing the authority of Boards of Trustees of Independent School Districts.

Section 6.0 describes the scope within which the Board of Directors of Centers may function as a policy forming and evaluative body. Under provisions of this section it is imperative that the Board of Directors confer with the Commissioner of Education on all major decisions. It is evident, from conversations with all Executive Directors of Centers, that all Boards of Directors have been in a quandary at times as to the Boards' authority over functions of the Center in the various state and/or federal funded programs. In some functions of the Center the Board of Directors are requested to handle affairs according to statutes governing the authority of Boards of Trustees of Independent School Districts, while other decisions are to be delayed until counsel is received from the Commissioner of Education. A review of the operating budgets of media programs revealed that the provisions outlined in this section may become more of an asset than a liability to center programs since most of the operating funds are coming by way of the Texas Education Agency.

#### 7.0 Statewide Advisory Commission

There is hereby established a Statewide Advisory Commission on Education Service Centers composed of the chairman of each Board of Directors. It shall be the responsibility of this Advisory Commission to meet upon call by the Commissioner of Education to advise with him on the operation of regional service centers. This commission shall meet at least once each year.

Section 7.0 describes the required procedures to establish two-way communications between the Board of Directors and the State Commissioner of Education. It seems that the arrangement not only produced information about the status of services at the center and the working relationship between the center and local education agencies, but it also provided a channel for concerns of non-educational organizations relative to the center's operation to reach the Commissioner and the State Board of Education.

There are indications that these conferences have been extremely advantageous to the center operation, especially at the regional and local school district levels. Visits with all Executive Directors of the Education Service Centers revealed that very favorable reports concerning the meetings of the Statewide Advisory Commission on Education have been made to Joint Committees by Boards of Directors.

## 8.0 Staff

8.1 Executive Director - The Executive Director of the regional education service center shall hold a graduate degree and be a person who has demonstrated, through experience in education, a high degree of ability in administration, program development, and experimental programs. He shall serve at the pleasure of the Board of Directors.

## 8.2 Duties of the Executive Director

8.2-1 Perform all duties and functions as required by the Board of Directors.

- 8.2-2 Submit required reports to the Board of Directors for their approval and forwarding to the Texas Education Agency and member school districts.
  - 8.2-3 Maintain records pertaining to all functions of the center.
  - 8.2-4 Appoint staff members subject to confirmation by the Board of Directors.
  - 8.2-5 Recommend to the Board of Directors the acquisition of instructional media and equipment requested through the Advisory Committee.
  - 8.2-6 Serve as a member of the Planning Council of the Commissioner of Education.
  - 8.2-7 Participate in groups concerned with metropolitan planning and with other planning functions affecting all or a portion of his region.
- 8.3 Other Staff - In addition to the Executive Director, the Board of Directors may employ other professional staff members and such clerical and technical staff as may be recommended by the Executive Director to carry out adequately the functions of the center. Salary and contract arrangements shall be established by the Board.
- 8.4 Teacher Retirement - Employees of the regional education service center shall be eligible to contribute to and participate in the Teacher Retirement System of Texas.

With the exception of general position specifications for the Executive Director, provisions included in section 8.0 were directed at giving the Board of Directors in each region a free hand in management of personnel needed to provide services to local school districts and the Texas Education Agency.

Apparently, it was felt by the planners that due to the variety of educational services anticipated in center programs that regular state personnel standards governing Boards of Trustees of Independent School Districts would not be appropriate for the new institutions. State records reveal, however, that most of the centers have failed to capitalize on this provision by maintaining personnel management standards comparable only to the local school districts which they serve.

#### 9.0 Planning Council

There is hereby established a Planning Council composed of the Executive Director of each regional education service center. It shall be the responsibility of this Planning Council to meet upon call by the Commissioner of Education to assist in the development of comprehensive plans for programs to be carried out through the regional education service centers in cooperation with the Texas Education Agency, member schools, and institutions of higher learning.

Section 9.0 describes the arrangement required to develop ways to utilize the Education Service Center as the primary vehicle to coordinate resources and get local education agencies involved in State sponsored programs. Executive Directors of Centers are required, under provisions of this section, to represent local education agencies while serving as a team member of the task force to develop comprehensive educational plans on the State level; and additionally serve at the regional level as a convener of dialogue sessions

between local education agencies and the Texas Education Agency, a disseminator of information relative to needs, desires, and requirements of each agency, and a coordinator of the action taken by both parties to implement the State sponsored programs. There is evidence that provisions outlined in this section are possibly the most difficult for Education Service Centers to accomplish.

#### 10.0 Financing

10.1 State Funds - The State shall allow and pay to each approved center from the Minimum Foundation School Fund annually an amount not to exceed one dollar (\$1.00) per scholastic in average daily attendance of the next preceding school year in districts participating in the center, provided each district pays to the center a sum at least equal to the State share.

10.1-1 Funds provided by the State shall be used only to purchase materials or equipment for the center as approved by its Board and the Texas Education Agency.

10.1-2 The State's share shall be determined on the basis of the average daily attendance as established by the Texas Education Agency. Such amount as approved will be transmitted to the depository bank of the center from the Minimum Foundation Program Fund.

10.1-3 The center shall meet criteria adopted by the State Board of Education in order to continue to receive funds.

10.2 Local Funds - Matching funds from local sources shall be paid annually to the center depository bank in accordance with policy established by the Board of Directors. Local school districts may pay the center any sum in excess of the amount necessary



to match maximum State funds. Matching funds from local districts and other funds which are eligible may be used to pay the cost of administration and operation of the center as well as to purchase educational media and equipment. Each public school district participant of a center shall pay the same amount per pupil in average daily attendance. This share shall be a minimum of fifty cents (\$.50) per pupil to the end that sufficient funds to carry on the program of the center are available.

10.3 Application for State Funds - Annually the Board of Directors shall submit to the Texas Education Agency the following for review and approval (Forms shall be provided by the Texas Education Agency):

10.3-1 Fiscal Review (11.6) - Due November 1

10.3-2 Operation Report (12.1-5) - Due November 1

10.3-3 Audit Report (11.3) - Due December 1

The maximum of State funds per scholastic in average daily attendance and the minimum share per pupil for local education agencies are described in section 10.0 to assure sufficient funds for each center to carry on an adequate media program. Local school districts are encouraged by the provisions to pool resources in excess of matching funds for the maximum state allocation in order to enhance media services available at the center.

Texas Education Agency records reveal that media materials such as master transparencies and copies, audio and visual tapes, and media repair services are purchased from the centers with local funds above the required membership fee (6).

## 11.0 Fiscal

- 11.1 Depository Bank - Each Board of Directors shall select a depository bank for its funds and shall notify the Texas Education Agency of the selection. Selection of a depository bank shall be in accordance with rules and regulations of selecting depository banks by independent school districts of the State.
- 11.2 Accounting - The Board of Directors shall operate under the accounting procedures established for independent school districts in Guide for Texas Public Schools: Budgeting, Accounting, and Auditing. Bulletin 613. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary, and all employees handling funds of the center shall be placed under bond.
- 11.3 Auditing - The Board of Directors shall arrange for the audit of center funds under rules pertaining to independent school districts and report the findings of the audit to member schools and the Texas Education Agency.
- 11.4 Obligation Authority - No center shall enter into obligation which shall exceed funds available or reasonably anticipated as available from the then current school year.
- 11.5 Inventory - The center shall maintain a continuing inventory of all property and have this report available at all times for member schools and the Texas Education Agency.
- 11.6 Fiscal Review - Annually the Texas Education Agency shall make a review of the Fiscal Report from the center. The Fiscal Report shall include:
- 11.6-1 an amended budget for the prior fiscal year ending August 31 and a projected budget for the succeeding fiscal year

11.6-2 a summary inventory of media and equipment

11.6-3 a report of delinquent payments from the preceding year.

Section 11.0 outlines provisions for the management of fiscal affairs of the center that are very similar to procedures established for independent school districts -- with one major exception which pertains to financial obligations. Since the centers are not authorized by legislation to levy a tax of any nature the indebtedness of the institution can not exceed funds available for one operating year.

#### 12.0 Evaluation

12.1 Services performed by the center shall be evaluated by:

12.1-1 The staff of the center.

12.1-2 An advisory committee of teachers, supervisors, and principals from school districts served by the center. The advisory committee should be composed of at least twelve (12) members chosen by the Board of Directors.

12.1-3 The Joint Committee.

12.1-4 The Board of Directors to assure that the services of the center are in agreement with the Act, the application, and State Board of Education policies. Annually the Board of Directors shall submit an operation report to the Texas Education Agency. The Annual Operation Report shall include:

12.1-4.1 A statistical survey of services performed

- 12.1-4.2 A summary of services or policy changes for the ensuing year of operation.
  - 12.1-4.3 Staff and Board of Directors membership changes
  - 12.1-4.4 A Statement of Intent from each participating school including average daily attendance, rate of contribution, and total contribution of each member school.
- 12.1-5 The Texas Education Agency to the end that initial and continued approval of funds for the center shall be based in part on the following criteria:
- 12.1-5.1 Demonstrated capability for planning, operating, and evaluating instructional media collections, services and activities.
  - 12.1-5.2 Compliance with policies for collections, services, and activities established by the State Board of Education.
  - 12.1-5.3 Maintenance of effective working relationships among schools served by the center.
  - 12.1-5.4 Participation in Agency-sponsored statewide studies and activities for improving competencies of the staff.

Section 12.0 describes the general procedures and requirements for the evaluation of center programs. The provisions assure each party concerned with center programs an opportunity to advise the Board of Directors on possible changes to enhance

and/or augment services available to local education agencies and the Texas Education Agency.

Texas Education Agency records reveal that evaluation activities in each region are becoming more comprehensive each year and consequently more useful to the centers as changes are made in organizational structure and operational procedures for providing services to local school districts. Prior to implementing provisions of the state plan on the local level, each elementary and secondary school district in Texas -- through its Board of Trustees -- was encouraged to select a representative to the Joint Committee for their respective region as the first local planning task force involved in the development of the Centers. The names, occupation, and position of each representative was submitted to the Texas Education Agency for confirmation (16).

A superintendent in each region was nominated by the State Commissioner of Education as temporary chairman of the Joint Committee. These school officials met in Austin in late March of 1967 and discussed tentative procedures for the organizational meeting of the Joint Committees.

Organizational meetings of the Joint Committees were held in April, 1967. Appropriate officers were elected and five of the Committees chose to elect an executive committee to assist in the advisory function to the Board, while the other committees chose not to elect such subcommittees.

In early May, 1967, the State Commissioner of Education appointed an advisory committee composed of educators from public schools, colleges, and universities to recruit, screen, and recommend the best qualified educators interested in the Executive Director's position in each region. The committee made its recommendations to the Commissioner during the latter part of May in 1967, and a copy of the recommendations was forwarded to the Board of Directors of each Region as they were organized (13).

In May, 1967, the State Board of Education established within the State Department of Education an office of Education Service Centers, under the direction of an Assistant Commissioner for Service Centers. The office administered the State's responsibility under SB 408 which provided funds to be matched by local school districts for the purchase of educational media distributed by the Centers (13). In addition, the office had the responsibility for administration of programs under Title III and other federally funded programs assigned to regional centers.

The Joint Committee in each region elected seven member Boards of Directors in May, 1967. Most of the Directors were reported to be former members of local boards of trustees (25). The organizational meeting of the Board of Directors in each region was arranged by the Joint Committee Chairman,

and he presided over the meeting until all board members had taken the oath of office and a chairman of the Board was elected.

Each Board of Directors was requested to appoint the Center's Executive Director and select a site for the Center's physical plant prior to September 1, 1967. In making the latter decision, each Board considered such factors as concentration of population, availability of facilities, and accessibility of the location to all parts of the region (25). All sites were confirmed and published by the Texas Education Agency in early July, 1967.

The twenty Executive Directors for the Centers were appointed by Boards and confirmed by the State Commissioner of Education in June, July, and August of 1967. Fifteen of the Executive Directors were on the list of educators recommended by the Commissioner's Advisory Committee for nominating persons qualified for the position.

The Educational Media Component was the first major program implemented by the Center. State funds for the program became available shortly after September 1, 1967, and local matching funds were submitted to the Center during September, October, and December of 1967. Strong emphasis was placed upon providing media services according to priority needs of the local school districts within the region. Consequently,

there were great variations among services and structures of the Media Components, and other programs of the Centers (7).

In most regions the distribution of media materials to local education agencies began around the first of November, 1967. Early services available to local school districts consisted of 16mm and 8mm films and filmstrips; but before the first year was over audio tapes, slides, art prints, disc recordings, overhead transparencies, and 35mm slides were added to the list of media services. By August 31, 1971, 35mm filmstrips, overhead master transparency kits, micro-forms, self-instruction programs, multi-media instruction kits, study prints, living materials, simulation materials, diazo transparencies, and teacher training experiences were added to the list of services (6).

For the first operational year (1967-1968) of the program eleven regional Boards established \$1.00 per average daily attendance as the local membership fee to the media component, three Boards set the fee at \$.75, and five Boards set the fee at \$.50. For the fourth operational year (1970-1971) fourteen Boards set \$1.00 per average daily attendance as the local membership fee, one Board set the fee at \$.80, two Boards set the fee at \$.75, one Board set the fee at \$.60, one Board set the fee at \$.55, and one Board set the fee at \$.50 (25).



Slightly over eighty per cent of the school districts in the State having seventy-eight per cent of the State's total pupil enrollment purchased membership in the media program provided by SB 408 during the 1967-1968 school year. The percentage of student enrollment involved in each region ranged from ten per cent in Region X to one hundred per cent in Region XIX. During the 1970-1971 school year there were 1,109 school districts--containing over eighty-eight per cent of the State's total pupil population--purchased membership in the media program. The percentage of student enrollment for each region involved ranged from sixty-eight per cent in Region X to one hundred per cent in Regions II, IV, VIII, and IX (7). This constant increase in the enrollment of local school districts in the REMC programs is a good indication that participation by all public school districts in Texas is very probable and could become a reality in a few years.

The interest and active participation of something over seventy-five per cent of the State's pupil average daily attendance in the State's media program, under SB 408, during the first four years of operation provided resources for the procurement of much needed services. According to the Texas Education Agency material inventories and media distribution records of the twenty media centers as of August 31, 1969, (reports of the 1970-1971 school year were not available at the time of this writing) there was:

## Media Inventory and Lending:

(Statewide totals for 1969-1970)

	<u>No. of Titles</u>	<u>No. of Prints</u>	<u>Bookings</u>	<u>Audience</u>
16mm films	38,715	74,781	842,727	105,189,964
35mm filmstrips	13,424	17,939	22,262	1,951,625
35mm slides	10,199	11,288	25,281	1,947,745
8mm films	1,642	1,642	1,537	77,190
Audio tapes	16,515	19,209	8,465	531,725
Video tapes	301	306	42	320
Disc recordings	8,435			180,415
Overhead transparencies	60,231	80,582	16,345	505,770
Overhead transparency masters	96,437		10,729	2,267,550
Microforms	168,577	261,444	500	
Self-instruction programs	736	736	735	1,330
Multi-media instruction kits	1,233	1,233	5,491	768,401
Study prints	2,444	2,444	962	112,600
Living materials	320 (items)		18,217	2,578,350
Simulation materials	115	115	117	15,760
Other	1,709		3,496	164,500

Visual Services - Duplications purchased by the local  
school districts from REMC's

Diazo transparencies	76,159
Thermal transparencies	7,558
Offset transparencies	1,800

Other	173
Slides	2,950

In addition to the materials outlined above, staff members of the twenty centers spent approximately 5,600 hours in assisting 43,012 teachers in learning to prepare and use media more effectively. According to the Texas Education Agency, "without the Regional Media Program, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to provide services such as these" (7).

The 1969 enrollment of public elementary and secondary school districts having eighty-three percent of the State's average daily attendance, the considerable inventories, the distribution records of centers, the five-year projected plan documents of centers, and the participation by local education agency officials in planning, structuring, and implementation of the legislation at all organizational levels does present evidence that provisions of SB 408 have truly had an impact upon the equality of media materials available to participating school districts and the working relationships among these districts.

#### Concluding Statements

This is an attempt to summarize the review of the development of SB 408 on the basis of cooperation apparent between public institutions concerned with the operation of

educational media services available under provisions of the legislation. Cooperation has been the cornerstone of media component programs; therefore, definite working and communicative relationships exist between media components of the Education Service Centers and other agencies and groups.

Media Components and the Texas Education Agency have developed a close relationship by mutual sharing of leadership responsibilities in the field. The staffs of both organizations seem to freely call upon one another for the solutions of mutual and individual problems that arise. Although the Agency evaluated the media programs, a relationship not unlike that of partners in any endeavor prevails (25).

Under provisions of the State Plan, the relationship between the Media Component and most of the member schools has developed into a solid bond as Center programs began to solve some of the regional media problems. In a number of participating school districts, personnel on every level are becoming involved in activities for planning and evaluating the Center program. Through this involvement local school personnel seem to sense the potential of the Media Center as a vehicle to aid them in obtaining needed media services.

The Office of School Surveys of the University of Texas conducted an evaluation of selected Education Service Centers at the end of the first year of operation. Three of their findings pertained to media services. They were as follows:

a. All respondents valued availability on demand higher than any other characteristic of media services.

b. The media component of the Service Centers was a quantum change in improving the quality of media services available.

c. Media-related services were the most used of any of the Center's services (13).

A very close working relationship developed almost instantly between the media components of the twenty Service Centers. In addition to the formal structure for exchanging information and integrating programs--namely, the Planning Council composed of the Executive Directors of the Regions--informal contacts and networks of information established between Board members and the staffs of different Centers have provided valuable ways for exchanging ideas and practices to assist media components in solving regional media problems as well as management difficulties in the operation of programs.

The relationship of the media component to the other components of the Education Service Center arose from the evaluation and in-service development that resulted from analysis

of needs for supporting learning experiences. Internal relationships within the Education Service Center and the interaction between media components and other components supporting learning experiences developed a field in which Boards of Directors and Center staff members found ample scope for their inventiveness and ingenuity. It would be impossible, in the limited space of this paper, to itemize the ways in which the media component contributed to the strengthening of Education Service Center programs and supporting services. Suffice it to say that the media component served as the "launching pad" for the organizational structure and operational procedures for programs in other components of the Education Service Center. The reader might want to view the numerous examples of this influence which are outlined in paragraphs 4.0 through 4.9 of the State Plan for Supplementary Education Centers and Services. A copy can be obtained from the materials library of the Texas Education Agency.

The relationship between media components and existing satellites has demonstrated the capability and potential of Centers to bring about a cooperative effort in providing media services for large school districts. There must be active cooperation between the satellite school districts and other member school districts for the satellite arrangement to function according to provisions of SB 408. Good cooperation is currently evident in the operation of satellite units.

The cultivation of communications and mutual assistance between Centers and institutions of higher education, both within and outside their particular regions, has added valuable resources to the regional media effort. Teacher-training institutions, in particular, were the primary point of contact which produced demonstration projects, internships, and the sharing of educational resources. Research and Development Centers in institutions of higher learning have provided Centers with valuable consultant services and techniques for utilization and change.

The National Regional Research Units, developed and operated under provisions of Title III and IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Media Components have developed a close working relationship. The rich resources connected with the innovative and exemplary programs developed by the Research Centers have added new dimensions to the services of the Media Centers. Media techniques, materials and equipment that were designed, tried, evaluated, and found successful, have been disseminated through the Media Component. On the other hand, the Media Component has served as a vehicle through which the research units could gather data from local school districts to aid them in selecting pertinent research projects.

A cooperative relationship has been developed between the Media Component and existing film cooperatives. Personnel

of the Media Component, by and large, feel that the mission of both units are parallel and have similar problems. The relationship has become close enough in most regions so that the Media Component contracted for rental of 16mm film and other materials from film cooperatives for a period of time in order to better utilize funds for other media services.

The Media Component of each region developed a working relationship with many other educational institutions and cultural organizations, too numerous to mention in this space. It should be pointed out that the Media Components have attempted to implement provisions of the State Plan For Establishing Regional Education Media Centers in cooperation with broad representation from local communities.



## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Cutter, Virginia M. and Charles W. Nix, "Education Service Centers--Agents of Change," The Texas Outlook, 51 (September, 1967), 42.
2. Haskew, L. D., et al, Getting Started: The Education Service Center Surveys and Studies, Austin, University of Texas, 1968.
3. Moss, R. E., "Media Center Development . . . Texas," Educational Resources and Techniques, 7 (September, 1967), 4-5.
4. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "A Legislative Program for Texas Schools," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 42, No. 12 (December, 1958).
5. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "A Legislative Potpourri--Legislation and Education," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 45, No. 3 (March, 1961).
6. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "After the Legislature Adjourns--What Happens Next?" The Texas Outlook, Vol. 43, No. 6, (June, 1959).
7. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "All in All . . . A Good Session," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 47, No. 7 (July, 1963).
8. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "An Equation for Legislatures," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 44, No. 10 (October, 1960).
9. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "Educational Improvements Recommended," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 47, No. 1 (January, 1963).
10. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "For TSTA Program--Prospects Good in Special Session," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 45, No. 7 (July, 1961).
11. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "Legislative Warmup for 1963," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 47, No. 1 (January, 1963).
12. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "Salary Increase Endorsed," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 48, No. 5 (May, 1964).

13. Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "TSTA Sponsored Bills," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 47, No. 3 (March, 1963).
14. Texas Education Agency, A Position Paper on Regional Education Media Services in Education Service Centers, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1970.
15. Texas Education Agency, Forty-First Biennial Report 1958-60, Bulletin No. 610, Austin, State Printing Office, 1960.
16. Texas Legislature, General and Special Laws of Texas Passed by the Regular Session of the 59th Legislature, Austin, State Printing Office, 1967.
17. Texas Legislature, General and Special Laws of Texas Passed by the Regular Session of the 60th Legislature, Austin, State Printing Office, 1967.
18. Texas Education Agency, Regulations and Guidelines for Developing Regional Educational Media Centers, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1966.
19. Texas Education Agency, State Plan For The Establishment Of Educational Service Centers Including Regional Education Media Centers, Austin, State Printing Office, March, 1967.
20. Texas Education Agency, State Plan For The Establishment Of Educational Service Centers Including Regional Education Media Centers, Austin, State Printing Office, March, 1968.
21. Texas Education Agency, State Plan--Procedures and Policies for the Operation of Regional Education Service Centers, Austin, State Printing Office, January, 1970.
22. Texas Education Agency, Texas Education Service Centers: Promise of Opportunity, Austin, State Printing Office, October, 1969.
23. Texas Legislature, Journal of the House of Representatives of the 59th Legislature of the State of Texas, Vol. I - II, 1965.
24. Texas Legislature, Senate Journal, State of Texas 59th Legislature, Vol. II, 1965-66.

25. Texas Legislature, Senate Journal, State of Texas, 60th Legislature, Vol. II, 1965-66.
26. Texas Education Agency, Toward Comprehensive Educational Planning in Texas, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1969.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE SURVEY OF SAMPLE SCHOOLS

One purpose of this study, along with a review of the development of SB 408, was to analyze the impact of the law upon public schools through its application in Texas. To carry out the latter purpose, a survey was made of sample schools and the information obtained from this data are presented in the following pages.

#### Development of the Survey Instrument

In order to design and structure an effective survey instrument, an advisory panel of seven members was selected from persons with experience in application and operation of SB 408 and persons having served as outside consultants to the operation. These were selected from institutions of higher learning, regional education media centers, public schools, and the Texas Education Agency. The persons considered consisted of superintendents, department heads at the Texas Education Agency, directors and associate directors of education service centers, and college professors currently serving as a consultant to at least one regional media center. A list of forty-five names was compiled with the advice of a representative of the Texas Education Agency, a representative of the Regional Education Media Centers, and a college advisor.

A seven member advisory panel (Appendix B) was selected and described as follows: (1) a professor with a considerable amount of experience working with more than one regional media center; (2) an associate director of an education service center who has been responsible for the management functions in the development of a media component; (3) an assistant commissioner in the Texas Education Agency responsible for teacher education and instructional services, experienced as a college professor, as a public school administrator, and as a director of an education service center in 1967 and 1968; (4) a director of an education service center experienced as a state legislator, as a public school administrator, and as a college professor; (5) a superintendent of a medium size public school district experienced as a curriculum director and as a director of an education service center; (6) the director of instructional media in the Texas Education Agency from 1965 to the present time; and (7) an associate superintendent of a large school district responsible for program development, recognized as a leader and coordinator of the early planning and structuring of regional education media centers in Texas.

The role of the advisory panel was to clarify wording and interpretation of statements on the proposed survey instrument and to recommend additional statements appropriate to the study. Each member was contacted and asked to participate and each accepted.

A review of literature, a review of education service center reports, a review of related state legislative files, a review of Texas Education Agency records relative to regional education media programs, and consultation with several directors of media components of education service centers and superintendents of public schools preceded the development of statements for the tentative survey instrument. Twenty-five statements encouraging multiple responses from the local school officials (Appendix A) were constructed with at least four and as many as nine keyed to provide specific data upon which to base conclusions relative to the impact of the operation of SB 408 on the policy, economy, instructional program, and management of local school districts.

The tentative instrument and pertinent sections of the study proposal were mailed to each advisory panel member. Each member was requested to review the material, to prepare written recommendations, and to indicate whether or not he felt that a personal or telephone interview would enhance his contributions to the study. Three members were interviewed in person and two were interviewed by telephone. Due to conflicting schedules two members were not interviewed, but did respond in writing.

A number of suggestions were made by the panel and accepted in the clarification of statements to facilitate the checking of appropriate responses by local school officials.

This procedure resulted in the design of an initial survey instrument (Appendix C).

The thirty-eight remaining members from the list of forty-five chosen for selection to the advisory panel were considered as a validation panel to check the clarity and appropriateness of statements on the initial survey instrument. It was considered important that each validation panel member have more than six years of public school experience with three of these recorded between 1965 and 1971. The five members (Appendix D) selected were superintendents experienced in administration of public schools representative of each category of sample schools in the study.

The initial survey instrument of twenty-five statements was sent to the validation panel members in order to obtain their approval for validation of the individual statements. A copy of the initial instrument (Appendix F), accompanied by a letter of instruction (Appendix E) and a self-addressed stamped envelope, was mailed to each member of the panel. Each member was requested to contemplate whether or not each statement would provide appropriate information and if each statement was clearly stated. A validity response was arranged in the left margin of the initial survey instrument. Numbers "1," "2," and "3" were placed in the margin preceding the suggested responses to each statement. Panel members were encouraged to respond by circling the "1" if the statements were clearly stated and appropriate. If the panel member was undecided on

the clarity or appropriateness of a statement, he was to circle the "2." If the statements were unclear or inappropriate to the study, the panel member was asked to circle the "3."

A space was provided at the end of the instrument for the panel member to submit additional comments and/or recommendations. It was decided that acceptance of a statement by three of the five members of the validation panel would constitute validity and justify inclusion in the final survey instrument.

The final survey instrument was constructed from the initial development and twenty of the responses received unanimous approval and the other five received approval of four of the five members of the panel. All statements were ruled valid and included in the final survey instrument. No additions were recommended. Statement twenty-two was revised to read "favorable reports about REMC services have been received from." The "C" response suggested for statement twenty-five was revised to read "evaluation of media services." All statements with the changes noted were included in the survey instrument.

The statements were typed on four (eight and one-half by eleven inch) pages, photographed, and reduced in size. These were printed by off-set press on a single fold, four-page leaflet. A pastel green paper stock was selected to provide an attractive and readily identifiable survey instrument. These



statements were used to obtain information from a randomly selected group, equal to ten percent of the non-satellite public school districts in Texas participating for no less than one school year in the REMC program.

#### Selection of Sample Schools

The 1969-1970 Annual Statistical Report was used for a working list of public schools (3, pp. 1-38). This official list of schools is grouped by average daily attendance and schools are listed alphabetically in each group. This report covered the third year of the REMC operation and was the latest published statistical report available. The group sizes were Group I, under 500 A.D.A.; Group II, 500 to 999 A.D.A.; Group III, 1,000 to 4,999 A.D.A.; Group IV, over 5,000 A.D.A. In order to facilitate management of the data a sample of ten percent was drawn from each category utilizing a table of random numbers (1, pp. 132-135).

The schools in Group I were given a code number from 001 to 413, Group II from 001 to 203, Group III from 001 to 263, and Group IV from 01 to 76. An impartial party was asked to point a pencil at the entry point in the table of random numbers for each group. It was decided to move down the column of the table from the entry point. If the table number was larger than the code number it was passed over for the next appropriate table number. The process was continued until a sample size equal to ten percent were selected from each

category. This list was checked against the 1970-1971 Public School Directory for current addresses (4, pp. 1-38). Four schools in Group I no longer existed and alternate schools were drawn to maintain the total sample of ninety-six schools (Appendix G).

#### Administration of the Survey Instrument

The validated survey instrument was mailed to the selected sample school districts to obtain data appropriate for the study. A cover letter (Appendix H) explaining the intent of the study and soliciting participation, a survey instrument (Appendix I), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were mailed to the superintendent, by name, of each of the ninety-six school districts in the sample. The superintendent, or his designated representative, was asked to respond by checking one or more choices to the statements on the survey instrument.

The school districts in the sample were located and circled on a state highway map to evaluate the geographic distribution of the random sample. The eastern, southern, northern, and western portions of the state were well represented by the sample in each category.

Twelve days after the initial mailing, a follow-up letter (Appendix J) was forwarded to non-respondents again soliciting their participation in the study. A second survey instrument and a self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to the superintendent, by name, of each of the ninety-six school districts in the sample.

local official's convenience. The two mailings resulted in a return of eighty-five usable survey instruments. One instrument of the first mailing and two of the second were returned with notes stating that the school districts had not participated at all in the REMC program. These responses, along with an official report that one school had consolidated with another school, accounted for an additional four instruments. Seven of the survey instruments were not returned. The collection exceeded the 80 per cent return considered acceptable in the study proposal by 14 per cent.

Analysis of Data Gathered by the Survey  
Instrument on Characteristics  
Of Sample Schools

The information recorded in Tables I, II, III, and IV was gleaned from the name of the school district and the average daily attendance reported on returned survey instruments.

Table I reveals that a total of 85 schools returned survey instruments for a total response of 89 per cent. This is above the 80 per cent established in the study proposal as acceptable to provide appropriate data from which to draw conclusions relating to the purposes outlined for the study.

School administrators returned 71 per cent of the survey instruments in twelve days and with one reminder, the response increased to 89 per cent return in thirty-eight days. Group I representing all sample schools under 500 Average Daily Attendance returned 85 per cent of the survey instruments.

TABLE I  
DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE BY CATEGORIES

Category	Number of Schools	Number of Returns	Per Cent
Group I	41	35	85
Group II	20	18	90
Group III	27	24	89
Group IV	8	8	100
Total	96	85	89

Group II representing all sample schools from 500 Average Daily Attendance through 999 Average Daily Attendance returned eighteen of twenty survey instruments for a 90 per cent response. Group III representing all sample schools with 1,000 Average Daily Attendance through 4,999 Average Daily Attendance returned 24 of 27 survey instruments for an 89 per cent response. Group IV representing all sample schools with over 5,000 Average Daily Attendance returned 100 per cent of the survey instruments. Since the lowest response of 85 per cent in Category I was above the standard set as acceptable, no further efforts were made to elicit responses. Among the schools in Group I an additional school was reported consolidated and two schools returned a blank survey instrument with notes stating that the districts had never participated

in the REMC program. These were dropped from consideration as was one school in Group III that stated it had never joined the REMC program.

As shown in Table II, the responding schools represent 189,857 students in Average Daily Attendance equal to 96 per cent of the sample school Average Daily Attendance of 197,693.

TABLE II  
DISTRIBUTION OF THE STUDENTS BY AVERAGE DAILY  
ATTENDANCE IN RESPONDING SCHOOLS

Category	Sample Schools	Per Cent	Responding Schools	Per Cent
Group I	11,973	6	10,403	5
Group II	13,658	7	12,251	6
Group III	54,532	28	49,673	26
Group IV	117,530	59	117,530	59
Total	197,693	100	189,857	96

Group I schools, while representing 43 per cent of the sample schools, actually represent only 6 per cent of the student Average Daily Attendance. Group II, representing 21 per cent of the sample schools, represent 7 per cent of the student Average Daily Attendance. Group III, representing 28 per cent of the sample schools, represent 28 per cent of

student Average Daily Attendance. Group IV, while representing only 8 per cent of the sample schools, actually represent 59 per cent of the student Average Daily Attendance. In terms of responding schools, Group I responses from 35 schools was equal to 5 per cent of the sample Average Daily Attendance, Group II responses from 18 schools was equal to 6 per cent of the sample Average Daily Attendance, Group III responses from 24 schools was equal to 26 per cent of the sample Average Daily Attendance, and Group IV responses from 8 schools was equal to 59 per cent of the sample Average Daily Attendance.

Table III reveals the student Average Daily Attendance of all schools in the population under study by categories and the percentage of the sample schools Average Daily Attendance of the population Average Daily Attendance in each category.

Group I schools, while representing 43 per cent of the population schools, actually represented only 5 per cent of the population Average Daily Attendance. Group II schools, representing 21 per cent of the population schools, represent 9 per cent of the population Average Daily Attendance. Group III schools representing 28 per cent of the population schools, represent 30 per cent of the population Average Daily Attendance, and Group IV schools, while representing 8 per cent of the population schools, actually represent

TABLE III

PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE BY  
CATEGORIES AND PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION  
AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE REPRESENTED  
IN THE SAMPLE BY CATEGORIES

Category	Population A.D.A.	Per Cent	Sample A.D.A.	Per Cent of Category
Group I	80,629	5	11,973	15
Group II	153,119	9	13,658	9
Group III	538,264	30	54,532	10
Group IV	1,012,324	56	117,530	12
Total	1,784,336	100	197,693	11

56 per cent of the population Average Daily Attendance. The sample school Average Daily Attendance of 197,693 represents 11 per cent of the total population Average Daily Attendance. This indicated a high validity of the random sample.

Table IV reflects the percentage of the sample represented by responding and non-responding schools. The fact that the non-responding schools represent 4 per cent of the sample Average Daily Attendance would tend to support the validity of responses to the survey instrument described in the following sections of this chapter.

TABLE IV  
 PERCENTAGE OF THE SAMPLE AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE  
 REPRESENTED BY RESPONDING AND  
 NONRESPONDING SCHOOLS

Category	Responding Schools	Per Cent	Nonresponding Schools	Per Cent
Group I	10,403	87	1,570	13
Group II	12,251	90	1,407	10
Group III	49,673	91	4,859	9
Group IV	117,530	100	0	0
Total	189,857	96	7,836	4

Presentation of Information from the Survey  
 Instrument Related to Local School Policy

The findings presented in this section were gleaned from the responses to statements 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the survey instrument entitled "A Survey of the Impact of SB 408 on a Selected Group of Public Schools." These five statements with suggested responses were formulated to collect data from which information could be provided concerning the influence of SB 408 on public school policy.

The responses shown in Table V reflect the percentage of each survey group participating in the REMC program for each of the four years between 1967 and 1971.

Among the sample schools of Group I, 80 per cent partic-



TABLE V  
 RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER ONE\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample			
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Group I	80	88	97	100
Group II	83	89	100	100
Group III	71	92	100	100
Group IV	75	75	100	100
Total	78	86	98	100

\*Your district participated (paid a fee) in the REMC program in (a) 1967-1968, (b) 1968-1969, (c) 1969-1970, (d) 1970-1971.

100 per cent in the fourth year. Eighty-three per cent of Group II schools participated the first year and increased to 100 per cent the third and fourth year. Among Group III schools, 71 per cent participated the first year with a jump to 92 per cent the second year and to 100 per cent the third and fourth years. In Group IV schools 75 per cent participated the first and second year, but 100 per cent were involved during the third and fourth year. It is interesting to compare the sample schools participation of 78 per cent the first year, 86 per cent the second year, 98 per cent the third year, and 100 per cent the fourth year with the total participation of State Average Daily Attendance of 78 per cent the first

year, 84 per cent the second year, 86 per cent the third year, and 88 per cent the fourth year as reported by the Texas Education Agency (5).

The results of Survey Statement Number Two as recorded in Table VI depicts the reasons sample schools joined the REMC program. Among the reasons reported most often was "to gain access to media services the district cannot afford when working alone," which received a 91 per cent response from Group I schools, a 90 per cent response from Group II schools,

TABLE VI  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER TWO\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample			
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Group I	77	91	43	0
Group II	67	90	61	0
Group III	63	96	42	0
Group IV	50	63	63	0
Total	68	90	48	0

\*Reasons for becoming a member of the REMC were (a) to get media services at less cost to the district, (b) to gain access to media services this district cannot afford when working alone, (c) to help build media services to meet long range needs of schools in the Region, (d) other.

a 96 per cent response from Group III schools, and a 63 per cent response from Group IV schools for a total of 90 per cent

recorded from sample schools. The next most mentioned reason was "to get media services at less cost to the district," which received a 77 per cent response from Group I schools, 67 per cent from Group II schools, 63 per cent response from Group III schools, and 50 per cent response from Group IV schools for a total of 68 per cent reporting such from sample schools. The third reason most indicated was "to help build media services to meet long-range needs of schools in the region," which received a 43 per cent response from Group I schools, a 61 per cent response from Group II schools, a 42 per cent response from Group III schools, and a 63 per cent response from Group IV schools, totalling a response of 48 per cent from sample schools.

The findings shown in Table VII reflect the reasons for non-participation.

Among the reasons stated the most frequently listed was "contrary to district policy," receiving a 6 per cent response from Group I, and 11 per cent response from Group II, a 13 per cent response from Group III, and a 25 per cent response from Group IV for a 10 per cent indication from sample schools. The second most common reason was "lack of funds for local fee." This received a 12 per cent response from Group I schools, a 6 per cent response from Group II, an 8 per cent response from Group III, and no responses from Group IV for an 8 per

TABLE VII  
 RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER THREE\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(nr)
Group I	6	0	12	3	79
Group II	11	0	6	0	83
Group III	13	0	8	8	71
Group IV	25	0	0	0	75
Total	10	0	8	4	78

\*Reasons for non-participation, if applicable, were (a) contrary to district policy, (b) insufficient staff, (c) lack of funds for local fee, (d) other, (nr) no response.

cent overall response from sample schools. Two schools in Group III reported that "the Board of Education had not been sold on the REMC program" as the reason for non-participation, and one school in Group I stated "the REMC program had been a disappointment" as a reason. None of the sample schools checked "insufficient staff" as a reason for non-participation. Seventy-eight per cent of the sample schools did not respond to Survey Statement Number Three which is consistent with the 78 per cent recorded in Table V as the lowest participation percentage by sample schools during the four years the REMC has been in operation.

The findings, gleaned from Survey Statement Number Four and shown in Table VIII, reflect the views of local school

officials regarding the actions schools have taken to allow personnel to participate in the REMC program.

TABLE VIII  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER FOUR\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(nr)
Group I	37	14	17	30	14
Group II	56	17	44	0	17
Group III	33	29	50	4	13
Group IV	12	0	50	12	25
Total	38	18	35	15	15

\*Actions taken in your district to allow personnel to participate in services, activities and events at the REMC required (a) changes in personnel professional growth policies, (b) changes in personnel travel policies, (c) new policies allowing personnel to serve as consultants to the REMC, (d) other, (nr) no response.

Thirty-seven per cent of Group I schools, 56 per cent of Group II schools, 33 per cent of Group III schools, and 12 per cent of Group IV schools totalling a 38 per cent response from sample schools indicated that changes in personnel growth policies were necessary to allow participation in the REMC program. Fourteen per cent of Group I schools, 17 per cent of Group II, 29 per cent of Group III, and no responses from Group IV for a total of 18 per cent revealed that changes in personnel travel policies were necessary. Seventeen per cent of Group I schools,

44 per cent of Group II, 50 per cent of Group III, and 50 per cent of Group IV or a total of 35 per cent indicated that it was necessary to develop new policies to allow local personnel to serve as consultants to the REMC program. Twenty per cent of the schools in Group I stated that current policies permitted all types of participation, 10 per cent in Group I along with 4 per cent in Group III and 12 per cent in Group IV stated that no official action at the local level was necessary for any type of participation. Fifteen per cent of the sample schools did not respond to this survey statement.

The responses to Survey Statement Number Five recorded in Table IX depict the views of local school officials relative to the influence of the REMC operation on annual payments made by local school districts. Fifty-four per cent of Group I schools, 50 per cent of Group II, 54 per cent of Group III, and 75 per cent of Group IV--for a total of 55 per cent response from sample schools--stated that the issue of annual payments to the REMC is an integral part of the instructional program and so considered as routine. The annual payments to the REMC is considered at one designated meeting of the local board of trustees in 43 per cent of Group I schools, 50 per cent of Group II, 42 per cent of Group III, and 25 per cent of Group IV showing a total of 43 per cent of the sample schools. Four of the schools in

TABLE IX  
 RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER FIVE\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(nr)
Group I	0	43	54	0	3
Group II	0	50	50	0	0
Group III	4	42	54	0	0
Group IV	0	25	75	0	0
Total	1	43	55	0	1

\*The REMC operation has resulted in the Board of Trustees placing the question of annual payment to the Center on its agenda as (a) an individual item considered at more than one meeting each year, (b) an individual item considered at one meeting each year, (c) a routine item considered as an integral part of the annual instructional program budget, (d) other, (nr) no response.

Group III, equal to one per cent of the sample schools, indicated the payment is considered as an individual item and appears on the agenda at more than one meeting of the local Board of Trustees.

Presentation of Information from the Survey  
 Instrument Related to Local School Economy

The information presented in this section was provided by the responses from statements 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the survey instrument. The four statements were designed to gather data from which conclusions could be drawn regarding the impact of SB 408 on public school economy.

The responses drawn from Survey Statement Number Six, and shown in Table X, represent the action by local school districts to utilize services received from the REMC.

TABLE X  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER SIX\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample					
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(nr)
Group I	3	6	3	17	83	0
Group II	6	6	0	22	67	6
Group III	0	4	0	25	70	0
Group IV	0	25	0	0	65	12
Total	2	7	1	19	74	2

\*Actions taken in your district to utilize services received from the REMC has required (a) additional administrative staff, (b) additional clerical staff, (c) additional instructional staff, (d) additional staff expenses only, (e) managing with regular staff and expense budget, (nr) no response.

The responses were from 83 per cent of Group I schools, 67 per cent of Group II, 70 per cent of Group III, and 65 per cent of Group IV; thus giving a 74 per cent response from sample schools and indicating utilization of services from the REMC with regular staff budgets. Additional staff expenses were considered necessary to utilize services from the REMC by 17 per cent of the schools in Group I, 22 per cent in Group II, and 25 per cent in Group III indicating a total of 19 per cent



in this category. Six per cent of the schools in Group I, 6 per cent in Group II, 4 per cent in Group III, and 25 per cent in Group IV--a 7 per cent response from sample schools--stated additional clerical staff were necessary to utilize services received from the REMC. Only 3 per cent of the schools in Group I and 6 per cent in Group II--a 2 per cent response from sample schools--indicated additional administrative staff was necessary. Six per cent of schools in Group II and 12 per cent in Group IV, or only 2 per cent of the sample schools, did not respond to Survey Statement Number Six. Only 3 per cent of the schools, all in Group I, reported the addition of instructional personnel.

Survey Statement Number Seven provided the information reported in Table XI regarding the influence of the REMC program on the expenditure of funds to improve facilities in local school districts.

The greatest influence was on the purchase of additional audio-visual equipment in local schools to facilitate the use of REMC materials. Sixty per cent of the schools in Group I, 80 per cent in Group II, 80 per cent in Group III, and 75 per cent in Group IV; equal to 72 per cent overall response; indicated that some audio-visual equipment had been purchased. Seven per cent of the sample schools felt it necessary to purchase additional furniture and fixtures to utilize services from the REMC. Five per cent of the sample schools reported

TABLE XI  
 RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER SEVEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample					
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(nr)
Group I	6	3	9	60	20	17
Group II	6	0	0	80	6	6
Group III	0	0	13	80	8	4
Group IV	12	0	0	75	0	12
Total	5	1	7	72	11	10

\*The REMC operation has influenced the spending of funds to improve facilities as evidenced by (a) making classroom alterations, (b) building new physical plant space, (c) purchase of additional furniture and fixtures for existing classrooms, (d) purchase of additional audio-visual equipment to facilitate use of REMC materials, (e) other, (nr) no response.

making some classroom alterations, and 1 per cent deemed it necessary to erect new physical plant space to utilize the media services. Seventeen per cent of the schools in Group I, 6 per cent in Group II, 4 per cent in Group III, and 12 per cent in Group IV--a 10 per cent response overall--did not respond to Survey Statement Number Seven. Eleven per cent of the sample schools responded to this survey statement with the comment "none."

The responses presented in Table XII represent views of the local school officials regarding the one dollar per average daily attendance maximum financial allotment allowable

under SB 408 for each party. All but 3 per cent of the schools in Group I and 6 per cent in Group II responded to this survey statement.

TABLE XII  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER EIGHT\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample						
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(nr)
Group I	3	14	0	9	80	0	3
Group II	0	11	6	11	80	0	6
Group III	21	13	0	4	63	0	0
Group IV	12	3	0	12	62	0	0
Total	8	14	1	8	73	0	2

\*In your district, school officials in evaluating the maximum (\$1.00 per ADA for both state and districts) money transactions under SB 408 have (a) advocated an increase in the state allotment, (b) advocated an increase in the district allotment, (c) advocated a decrease in the state allotment, (d) advocated a decrease in the district allotment, (e) advocated no changes in the state or district allotments, (f) other, (nr) no response.

Seventy-three per cent of the sample schools would advocate that the maximum allotment for the State and local school districts remain at its present level. On the other hand, 8 per cent of the sample schools would like to see an increase in the State allotment, 14 per cent would advocate an increase in the district allotment, 1 per cent says

decrease the State allotment, and 8 per cent encourage a decrease in the district allotment. Thirteen per cent of the schools in Group III, a group equal to 4 per cent of the sample schools, advocated that the State allotment should be increased and the district allotment decreased. It is interesting to note that no schools in Group I, III, or IV advocated a decrease in the State allotment while 6 per cent of Group II wanted a decrease. No schools in Group II advocated an increase in the State allotment and 3 per cent in Group I, 21 per cent in Group III, and 12 per cent in Group IV were inclined to favor an increase. Only 1 per cent of the sample schools advocated a decrease in the State allotment. Overall 73 per cent of the sample schools advocated no changes.

Responses recorded in Table XIII describe the views of local officials regarding supporting information to the annual decision by the district on membership to the REMC program.

"Appropriate materials received from the REMC" was reported as the most common influence on district membership from year to year in the REMC program by 78 per cent of the sample schools.

The statement received a 71 per cent response from the schools in Group I, an 83 per cent response from Group II, a 79 per cent response from Group III, and an 88 per cent from Group IV. "Low cost connected with services from the

TABLE XIII  
 RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER NINE\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(nr)
Group I	71	63	63	6	3
Group II	83	56	72	0	0
Group III	79	75	62	4	0
Group IV	88	50	25	0	0
Total	78	64	61	4	1

\*In your district, the annual payment in the REMC operation has been justified on the basis of (a) appropriate materials received from the REMC, (b) low cost connected with services from the REMC, (c) quality of the experiences received by personnel from in-service training sponsored by the REMC, (d) other, (nr) no response.

REMC" received a 64 per cent response for second place, and "quality of the experiences received by personnel from in-service training sponsored by the REMC" was third with a 61 per cent response. Six per cent of the schools in Group I and 4 per cent in Group III stated that "no justification" was necessary for action on membership to the REMC. Only 3 per cent of the schools in Group I or 1 per cent of the total response, did not reply to Survey Statement Number Nine. Responses to statement "c" seem to indicate that the REMC's may be meeting more of the personnel development needs of Group II schools than the needs of the other three groups.

Presentation of Information from the Survey  
Instrument Related to Local School  
Instructional Program

The information presented in this section was provided by statements 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 of the survey instrument. These nine statements were designed to collect data so that conclusions could be drawn regarding the impact of SB 408 on the instructional program of local school districts. The data generated by each of these statements will be displayed in a separate table. The responses by local officials will be recorded in percentages of the sample for each particular response. In addition, these will be recorded by categories of schools and by totals of schools in the sample.

Table XIV reports information on the involvement of local district personnel in the selection of materials received from the REMC. Fifty-eight per cent of the sample schools involve principals, librarians, and teachers in the selection of materials with 49 per cent of Group I, 72 per cent of Group II, 60 per cent of Group III, and 63 per cent of Group IV responding to the suggested approach. Ninety-eight per cent of the sample schools involve teachers, 72 per cent involve professional librarians, and 69 per cent involve principals. Only teachers select the materials in 37 per cent of Group I schools, in 11 per cent of Group II schools, and in 17 per cent of Group III schools. It is interesting to note that professional librarians help select the material

TABLE XIV  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER TEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Group I	60	63	100	49	0
Group II	89	83	100	72	0
Group III	67	71	91	60	0
Group IV	75	88	100	63	12
Total	69	72	98	58	1

\*The materials received from the REMC have been selected by (a) building principals, (b) professional librarians, (c) teachers, (d) all of the above participating, (e) other.

in 63 per cent of Group I schools, in 83 per cent of Group II schools, in 71 per cent of Group III schools, and 88 per cent of Group IV schools. Twelve per cent of the schools in Group IV reported that "committee members on selection team" select materials received from the REMC program.

The Survey Statement Number Eleven presented in Table XV provides an estimate of the condition of the media program in the sample schools in terms of State Standards (see Appendix K, columns 4 and 5). Among the Group I schools, 54 per cent considered their audio-visual materials deficient in most areas, 23 per cent judged theirs to be an adequate supply of selected items, 11 per cent indicated it as a major priority need, and only 6 per cent indicated an excellent supply

that would meet most needs. Among Group II schools, 78 per cent indicated deficient, 11 per cent indicated adequate, and 11 per cent indicated audio-visual materials as a major priority need. Seventy-one per cent of Group III schools indicated deficient while 29 per cent indicated an adequate

TABLE XV  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER ELEVEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(nr)
Group I	6	23	54	11	6
Group II	0	11	78	11	0
Group III	0	29	71	0	0
Group IV	38	50	12	0	0
Total	6	25	60	7	2

\*In your district in 1966-1967 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Standards (a) an excellent supply to meet most needs, (b) an adequate supply of selected items, (c) deficient in most areas, (d) a major priority need, (nr) no response.

supply to meet most needs. Among Group IV schools, 50 per cent indicated adequate, 38 per cent indicated excellent, and 12 per cent indicated a deficient supply to meet most needs.

Among the 98 per cent of the sample responding to the statement, nearly 67 per cent indicate a deficiency in most areas or a major priority need, while 31 per cent indicated an adequate to excellent collection.



Survey Statement Number Twelve was identical to Survey Statement Number Eleven except it sought data as of the 1970-1971 school year. The information recorded in Table XVI reveals the degree of change caused by SB 408 as defined by the responding local school officials. Among the Group I schools the percentage reporting an excellent supply increased from six to 40 per cent, while those reporting deficient supply decreased from 54 per cent to 3 per cent, and those reporting an adequate supply increased from 23 to 57 per cent. Those reporting a major need decreased from 11 per cent to none.

TABLE XVI

## RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER TWELVE\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample			
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Group I	40	57	3	0
Group II	34	66	0	0
Group III	33	67	0	0
Group IV	50	50	0	0
Total	38	61	1	0

\*In your district in 1970-1971 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Standards (a) an excellent supply to meet most needs, (b) an adequate supply of selected items, (c) deficient in most areas, (d) a major priority need.

Among the Group II schools, the percentage reporting an excellent supply to meet most needs increased from none to 34

per cent, while those reporting deficiencies decreased from 78 per cent to none. Those reporting an adequate supply increased from 11 to 66 per cent. Group III schools reporting an excellent supply increased from none to 32 per cent, while those reporting a deficient supply decreased from 71 per cent to none, and those reporting an adequate supply increased from 29 to 67 per cent.

Among the sample schools a major need for audio-visual materials decreased from 7 per cent to none, deficient supplies decreased from 60 to 1 per cent, an adequate supply increased from 25 to 61 per cent, and an excellent supply increased from 6 to 38 per cent. These responses are supported by the 1971 annual report of the Texas Education Agency concerning materials available in each of the Regional Education Media Centers (6).

The information in Table XVII describes the responses to Survey Statement Number Thirteen concerning the impact on local school curriculum. In reaction to this statement 77 per cent of the sample indicates that the REMC program had been responsible for publication of a catalog listing materials at the REMC available for each teacher. The reports from Group I, II, III, and IV indicate 20 per cent, 29 per cent, 25 per cent, and 12 per cent respectively. The second highest response was 32 per cent of the sample that indicated "curriculum guides listing materials at the REMC." This response was

TABLE XVII  
 RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER THIRTEEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample			
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Group I	20	23	80	14
Group II	28	50	80	0
Group III	25	46	63	0
Group IV	12	25	100	0
Total	22	32	77	5

\*The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening instructional programs as evidenced by (a) new study units based on material at the REMC, (b) curriculum guides listing materials at the REMC, (c) catalog listing materials at the REMC for each teacher, (d) other.

indicated by 23 per cent of Group I, 50 per cent of Group II, 46 per cent of Group III, and 25 per cent of Group IV schools. Development of new study units based on material at the REMC was indicated by 20 per cent of Group I schools, 28 per cent of Group II schools, 25 per cent of Group III schools, and by 12 per cent of Group IV schools. Fourteen per cent of the Group I schools, representing 5 per cent of the sample, reported that REMC services had not strengthened the local program. These responses are supported by the 1971 Texas Education Agency annual progress report of the Education Service Center Programs (2).

The display in Table XVIII depicts the information gleaned from responses to Survey Statement Number Fourteen, which explores the effects of the REMC program in encouragement of extended utilization of media services. According to the reports from 71 schools, representing 81 per cent of the

TABLE XVIII  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER FOURTEEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample			
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Group I	23	80	46	6
Group II	44	94	56	0
Group III	29	75	46	0
Group IV	25	100	50	0
Total	29	81	48	2

\*The REMC operation has encouraged extended utilization of media services as evidenced by (a) additional materials designed by local teachers, (b) additional teacher requests for materials and equipment, (c) additional in-service training requests by teachers and teacher aides, (d) other.

sample, the REMC operation has influenced "teacher requests for materials and equipment"; 41 schools, representing 48 per cent of the sample, reported an influence on "in-service training requests" by teachers and teacher aides; and 25 schools, representing 29 per cent of the sample, reported an influence on materials designed by local teachers. Six per cent of Group I schools, representing 2 per cent of the sample, reported "no encouragement."

The graphic presentation of responses from Survey Statement Number Fifteen in Table XIX provides an estimate of the condition of staff development in sample schools at the beginning of participation in the REMC program. Among the Group I schools, 46 per cent considered their staff development program as deficient in most areas, 23 per cent judged

TABLE XIX  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER FIFTEEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(nr)
Group I	14	23	46	17	6
Group II	11	22	56	11	0
Group III	17	13	71	0	0
Group IV	12	62	12	12	0
Total	14	24	52	11	2

\*In your district in 1966-1967 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was (a) an adequate program to meet most needs, (b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff, (c) deficient in most areas, (d) a major priority need, (nr) no response.

theirs to be an adequate program, 17 per cent had a major priority need, and 14 per cent indicated an adequate program to meet most needs. Among the Group II schools, 56 per cent rated their program as deficient, 22 per cent adequate, 11 per cent excellent, and 11 per cent indicated a need for improvement. Seventy-one per cent of Group III schools indicated a

deficiency in their program, while 13 per cent felt they had an adequate program. Among Group IV schools, 52 per cent indicated a deficiency, 24 per cent indicated an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff, 14 per cent indicated an adequate program to meet most needs, and 12 per cent reported staff development as a major need.

Survey Statement Number Sixteen was identical to the previous Survey Statement except it sought data pertaining to the 1970-1971 school year. The information revealed in

TABLE XX  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER SIXTEEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample			
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Group I	80	17	3	0
Group II	50	44	6	0
Group III	44	56	0	0
Group IV	88	12	0	0
Total	65	33	2	0

\*In your district in 1970-1971 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was (a) an adequate program to meet most needs, (b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff, (c) deficient in most areas, (d) a major priority need.

Table XX reveals the degree of change influenced by SB 408 as viewed by the responding local school officials. Among the Group I schools the percentage reporting an adequate staff

development program to meet most needs increased from 14 to 80 per cent, schools reporting an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff decreased from 23 to 17 per cent, schools reporting a deficiency in most areas decreased from 46 per cent to 3 per cent, and those reporting a major priority need decreased from 17 per cent to none. There was an increase from 11 to 50 per cent in Group II schools reporting an adequate program to meet most needs, an increase from 22 to 44 per cent in those indicating an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff, a decrease from 56 to 6 per cent in the responses to "deficient in most areas," and a decrease from 11 per cent to none in the number of schools indicating "a major priority need." Responses revealed there was an increase from 17 to 44 per cent in Group III schools indicating "an adequate program to meet most needs," an increase from 13 to 56 per cent in the schools indicating "an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff," a decrease from 71 per cent to none in the schools indicating a "deficiency in most areas," and a decrease from 12 per cent to none in the schools indicating "a major priority need." These responses are supported by the 1971 annual report of the Texas Education Agency concerning staff development sessions held at the Education Service Centers for local school district personnel (6).

The information in Table XXI is a compilation of the responses to Survey Statement Number Seventeen, which

explores the effect SB 408 had in encouraging innovations in instruction or organization as evidenced by "team planning and teaching," "continuous progress or non-graded plans," "individualized instruction," "teaching kits based on REMC materials," and the final option of listing "others."

TABLE XXI  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENTS NUMBER SEVENTEEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample					
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(nr)
Group I	9	6	70	30	6	6
Group II	33	17	56	44	0	0
Group III	33	17	63	37	4	4
Group IV	25	0	63	63	0	0
Total	22	11	60	39	4	4

\*The REMC operation encouraged innovation in instruction of organization was evidenced by (a) team planning and teaching, (b) continuous progress or non-graded plan, (c) individualized instruction, (d) teaching kits based on REMC materials, (e) other, (nr) no response.

Sixty per cent of the sample indicated involvement in individualized instruction as evidence of innovation encouraged by SB 408. The response was reported by 70 per cent of Group I schools, 56 per cent of Group II schools, 63 per cent of Group III schools, and 63 per cent of Group IV schools. Thirty-nine per cent indicated involvement in use of "teaching



kits based on REMC materials." Twenty-one per cent of the sample reported involvement in "team planning and teaching." Four per cent of the sample schools consisting of schools from Groups I and III did not answer this question. Ninety-four per cent of the sample schools indicated involvement on one or more of the innovations suggested. Four per cent listed other responses and among these were: (1) encouraged greater utilization of media, and (2) none.

The information presented in Table XXII describes the responses to Survey Statement Number Eighteen concerning the

TABLE XXII  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER EIGHTEEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample			
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
Group I	60	17	9	23
Group II	72	22	28	0
Group III	50	42	13	4
Group IV	76	12	0	12
Total	61	29	13	12

\*The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in (a) improved programs in most curricular areas, (b) improvements of selected programs, (c) the development of new programs, (d) little effect on instructional programs.

impact of SB 408 on various instructional programs. In response to this statement 61 per cent of the sample reported

that SB 408 had resulted in "improved programs in most curricular areas." The second highest response was 29 per cent of the sample listing "improvements of selected programs" such as: (1) elementary math and science, (2) art, (3) reading, (4) health, and (5) kindergartens. The next highest response was 13 per cent of the sample indicating "the development of new programs." The fourth highest response was 12 per cent of the sample indicating "little effect on instructional program." This response was indicated by 23 per cent of Group I, 12 per cent by Group IV, 4 per cent by Group III, but by none of the Group II schools.

Presentation of Information from the Survey  
Instrument Related to Local School  
Management

The information presented in this section was produced by statements 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 of the survey instrument. The statements were designed to generate data from which conclusions could be drawn regarding the impact of SB 408 on the management of local school districts. The information collected by each of these statements will be displayed in a separate table. The responses will be recorded in percentages of the sample for each possible response. The responses will be recorded by categories of schools and by totals of schools in the sample.

Table XXIII reports on the influence of SB 408 that resulted in local school personnel serving on REMC program committees as explored by Survey Statement Number Nineteen.

Fifty-two per cent of the sample schools reported that provisions of SB 408 have resulted in local personnel serving on the REMC's program planning committees. This response was reported by 29 per cent of Group I schools, 56 per cent of

TABLE XXIII  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER NINETEEN\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample					
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(nr)
Group I	29	29	29	20	29	6
Group II	56	39	56	56	0	11
Group III	71	29	46	46	8	4
Group IV	88	63	63	50	0	0
Total	52	34	38	33	14	6

\*The REMC operation has resulted in district personnel serving on the REMC media (a) planning committee, (b) materials selection committee, (c) policy advisory committee, (d) evaluation committee, (e) other, (nr) no response.

Group II schools, 71 per cent of Group III schools, and 88 per cent of Group IV schools to rank as the most usual resulting situation. The second largest response was 38 per cent of the sample that indicated local personnel were serving on regional policy advisory committees as a result of the law. Thirty-four per cent of the sample reported that the regional program has resulted in local personnel serving on REMC materials selection committees, while 33 per cent reported

participation on evaluation committees. Of the four groups reporting, Group I reported the lowest percentage of participation on REMC committees and Group II reported the highest participation. Fourteen per cent of the sample, consisting only of schools in Group I and III, reported no participation on any REMC program committees.

Table XXIV presents the kinds of local personnel serving on various REMC program committees gleaned from the responses to Survey Statement Number Twenty. Seventy per cent of the

TABLE XXIV  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER TWENTY\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample					
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(nr)
Group I	77	17	11	54	14	0
Group II	80	50	33	67	0	6
Group III	46	60	60	67	4	8
Group IV	38	50	100	89	0	0
Total	70	39	38	64	7	4

\*Lists of personnel assigned to serve on various REMC committees have included (a) the superintendent, (b) principals, (c) specialist (librarians, media coordinator, etc.), (d) teachers, (e) others, (nr) no response.

sample indicated that the superintendent had served on various REMC committees. This response was indicated by 77 per cent of Group I schools, 80 per cent of Group II schools, 46 per

cent of Group III schools, and 38 per cent of Group IV schools. Sixty-four per cent reported that teachers have served on various committees. This response was indicated by 54 per cent of Group I schools, 67 per cent by Group III, and 89 per cent by Group IV schools. Thirty-nine per cent of the sample indicated participation by principals, while 38 per cent reported involvement by specialists. Seven per cent of the sample, consisting of schools in Group I and III, reported no participation by local personnel on REMC committees. Four per cent of the sample did not submit any response to this survey statement.

Table XXV depicts information gathered by Survey Statement Number Twenty-one in regard to the influence of the REMC operation in strengthening working relationships between and among various educational institutions. Seventy per cent of the sample schools selected "other components of the Education Service Center" as the most common outcome of the REMC operation. This response was indicated by 74 per cent of Group I, 60 per cent of Group II, 70 per cent of Group III, and 88 per cent of Group IV schools. The second most mentioned result was a firmer relationship with the "Texas Education Agency" indicated by 48 per cent of the sample. The response was indicated by 49 per cent of Group I, 56 per cent by Group II, 50 per cent of Group III, and by 25 per cent of Group IV schools. Receiving lesser percentages from the sample were the suggested statements concerning the working relationship

TABLE XXV  
 RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER TWENTY-ONE\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample					
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(nr)
Group I	20	6	49	74	6	3
Group II	33	11	56	60	0	6
Group III	17	8	50	70	8	0
Group IV	12	0	25	88	0	0
Total	21	7	48	70	5	2

\*The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening working relationships between your district and (a) institutions of higher education, (b) business/industry, (c) Texas Education Agency, (d) other components of the Education Service Center, (e) other, (nr) no response.

between local districts and "institutions of higher learning," and the same relationship for "business and industry." These statements received a total response of only 28 per cent from the sample. Five per cent of the sample consisting of schools in Group I and II indicated that "no influence" has been detected. Two per cent did not submit a response to the statement.

The information recorded in Table XXVI represents the local officials' views gathered by Survey Statement Number Twenty-two, and is relative to amicable reports received about the REMC services. Ninety-six per cent of the sample indicated that teachers make periodic reports concerning the REMC

services. The response was indicated by 97 per cent of Group I schools, 100 per cent of Group II, 96 per cent of Group III, and 88 per cent of Group IV schools. Sixty per cent of the sample indicated receiving favorable reports from the administrative staff. This particular statement received a 51 per cent response from Group I schools, 50 per cent from Group II,

TABLE XXVI  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER TWENTY-TWO\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
Group I	23	51	97	23	9
Group II	28	50	100	17	0
Group III	54	71	96	25	0
Group IV	12	88	88	25	0
Total	32	60	96	22	4

\*Favorable reports about REMC services have been received from (a) school board members, (b) administrative staff, (c) teachers, (d) pupils, (e) others.

71 per cent from Group III, and a 88 per cent response from Group IV schools. Forty-four per cent of Group III schools indicated receiving favorable reports from Board members and this compared to 28 per cent of Group II schools, 23 per cent of Group I schools, and only 12 per cent of Group IV schools indicated such reports from their Board of Trustees. About an equal percentage in each category of the sample indicated

favorable reports from pupils. Six per cent of Group I schools indicated favorable reports from "parents," and 2 per cent indicated that "no" reports had been received.

Table XXVII displays the results of Survey Statement Number Twenty-three which gathered data related to the impact of new techniques used by the REMC for disseminating information about technology, research, recent developments, and resources

TABLE XXVII

RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER TWENTY-THREE\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(nr)
Group I	43	31	20	17	14
Group II	39	50	33	0	17
Group III	42	50	50	0	4
Group IV	25	25	63	0	0
Total	40	52	35	7	11

\*The REMC operation has resulted in strengthening communications as evidenced by new techniques for disseminating information about media (a) innovative and exemplary programs, (b) research and development activities, (c) resources beyond the REMC operation available to schools, (d) others, (nr) no response.

available to abet the utilization of media services in local school districts. The display reveals that 52 per cent of the sample indicated dissemination of information about media research and development activities as having the most influence



upon communications in the school's educational media programs. Forty per cent of the sample indicated that dissemination of information about media innovation and exemplary programs had made an impact on communications. Thirty-five per cent of the sample indicated that the REMC operation has improved the communications related to media resources beyond the regional service available to local school districts. Seventeen per cent of Group I schools indicated other results of the new techniques. Among those listed were: (1) public relations programs, (2) increased participation, and (3) no influence on communications.

The influence of the REMC operations, as viewed by the respondents, and as it regards media planning activities in local schools is portrayed in Table XVIII and was revealed by data drawn from Survey Statement Number Twenty-four. Fifty-five per cent of the sample indicated that the REMC operation has influenced the expansion of long and short range media plans of the local districts, while 49 per cent indicated "expanded techniques for self-evaluation," and 44 per cent of the sample indicated "expanded techniques for identifying needs" collected the highest percentage of the responses from Group I and II, "expanded long and short range goals" motivated the highest percentage from Group III, and "expanded techniques for self-evaluation" generated the highest percentage of responses from Group IV. Nine per cent of the sample indicated that no influence of the REMC

TABLE XXVIII  
 RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER TWENTY-FOUR\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample				
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(nr)
Group I	40	43	31	20	6
Group II	39	50	33	0	6
Group III	50	50	54	0	8
Group IV	63	50	25	12	0
Total	44	55	49	9	6

\*The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening media planning in your district as evidenced by (a) expanded techniques for identifying needs, (b) expanded long and short range goals, (c) expanded techniques for self-evaluation, (d) other, (nr) no response.

operation on local school media planning had been detected. Six per cent of the sample that included schools from Group I, II, and III did not submit a response to Survey Statement Number Twenty-four.

Table XXIX depicts the results of Survey Statement Number Twenty-five which attempted to generate data relative to the status of research or evaluation activities in local schools concerning the utilization of REMC services. Thirty-six per cent of the sample indicated that "Evaluation of Media Services" activities were underway or were completed. This response was indicated by 31 per cent of Group I schools, 39 per cent of Group II schools, 38 per cent of Group III schools,

and 63 per cent of Group IV schools. Of the remaining suggestions in the survey statement "evaluation of instructional improvement" received a 26 per cent response from the sample, "testing pupil gain" also received a 26 per cent response,

TABLE XXIX  
RESPONSES TO SURVEY STATEMENT NUMBER TWENTY-FIVE\*

Survey Groups	Answers in Percentage of Sample					
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(nr)
Group I	9	27	31	27	17	31
Group II	6	39	39	39	0	22
Group III	17	38	38	21	4	29
Group IV	12	0	63	12	12	12
Total	11	30	36	26	9	27

\*If your district has developed research or evaluation projects relating to utilization of REMC services in your school, please check the types (a) Evaluation of administrative procedures, (b) Evaluation of instructional improvement, (c) Evaluation of media services, (d) Testing pupil gain, (e) other, (nr) no response.

and "evaluation of administrative procedures" received only an 11 per cent response from the sample. When totalled, these responses reveal that 92 per cent of the sample schools were evaluating some phase of the utilization of media services being received from the REMC. Nine per cent of the sample consisting of schools in Group I, III, and IV indicated that no research or evaluation activities related to utilization

of REMC media services has been initiated. Twenty-nine per cent of the sample consisting of schools in all four groups did not submit a response to this survey statement.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
2. Texas Education Agency, Annual Report on Education Service Center Programs, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1971.
3. Texas Education Agency, 1969-70 Statistical Report, Part I, Austin, Texas, State Printing Office, 1971.
4. Texas Education Agency, 1970-71 Public School Directory, Bulletin 703, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1970.
5. Texas Education Agency, Regional Media Services Percentage of ADA Participating, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1971.
6. Texas Education Agency, Media Services Regional Education Service Centers, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1971.

## CHAPTER V

### A SYNTHESIS OF THE SURVEY

This chapter will present (within constraints established by the scope and purpose of the survey) general commentaries about the procedures and results of this survey as they relate to the planning, structuring, and implementing decisions for the development of SB 408 and the impact of those decisions upon selected Texas schools. The sections delineating the conclusions and recommendations will also (based on the findings of the survey) furnish "feed-back" and/or "recycling" information for the continuation of, or planned changes in, the operation of SB 408 in subsequent years.

#### The Focus

The plan (Chapter I) for this study was motivated by an urge to ascertain just how the local public school officials in Texas actually feel about current legal arrangements for providing various educational services to public schools on a regional basis, and to determine whether or not the size of the school--in pupil enrollment--would influence feelings on the subject. The urge was further stimulated by some involvement and rather extensive observations of the development of the Education Service Centers in Texas, and

visitation to a number of intermediate units in other states of the nation similar to these centers.

A short examination of the available material relating to this complex subject revealed that in order to heed the urge and conduct a meaningful study on these concerns, the selection of one program component of the Education Service Centers would be necessary. Since SB 408 was the initial and basic legislation for the Education Service Centers, and since the law set up the Educational Media Component, the decision was made to use it as the object of the study.

Procedures outlined in the plan led to the utilization of the "context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation, and product evaluation" (CIPP) model for the process of developing the study (1, pp. 218-239). Chapter II presented the (context) information about the first state enabling legislation for cooperation in education, and the movement of the concept to various sections of the nation. Chapter III presented the necessary (input) information about development of SB 408 for fabricating the survey instrument for the study. Chapter IV presented the (process and product) information about the activities for structuring and implementing the survey to collect opinions and judgments of the local officials on the impact of SB 408 in their schools. Chapter V presents in the following paragraphs some (product) information about the accomplishments of the study, and according to the plan, the general purposes of the study

were (1) to review the development of SB 408, and (2) to analyze the impact of this action upon a selected group of public schools in Texas. It was felt that the findings, conclusions, and recommendations from a study based on these purposes would be highly beneficial to legislators, the State Board of Education, local Boards of Trustees, Education Service Center Boards of Directors, and the others responsible for planning, structuring, and operating educational media services under provisions of SB 408 in subsequent years.

In an attempt to accomplish the stated purposes, special attention was given to the examination of all data and literature concerning the factors influencing public school operation such as (a) policy, (b) economy, (c) instructional program, and (d) management.

To achieve the first stated purpose a comprehensive review of selected literature about cooperation in education, the essence of SB 408, was made (Chapter II) in conjunction with a study of the available data (Chapter III) relative to the development of SB 408 from conceptualization through its fourth year of operation in a selected group of public schools in Texas. The literature reviewed was limited to material about existing enabling legislation in various states for educational cooperatives, provisions of federal legislation that encourage cooperation in education, selected state legal arrangements for educational media cooperatives that provide services to public elementary and/or secondary schools, and



information about the special legal arrangements for audio-visual services available to Texas schools from 1918 to 1965. This action placed emphasis on aspects of the selected literature that pertained to the effects of existing cooperation in education on state and local public school policy, economy, instructional program, and management.

The study of available information concerning the development of SB 408 consisted of tracing its progress from the first detected proposals concerning the enactment of state legislation for educational media cooperatives among local schools to the sixth year after the law was passed by the Texas Legislature. The study involved an examination of appropriate State Legislative Library files, Education Service Center reports, and Texas Education Agency records. The undertaking dealt mostly with information depicting the involvement of local school officials, and the immediate effect or potential effect of the statewide planning, structuring, and implementing decisions regarding the impact of SB 408 on local school policy, economy, instructional program, and management. This action additionally furnished important data for the fabrication of a valid and reliable survey instrument used in the study.

To implement the second stated purpose of this study, a survey instrument was developed (Chapter IV) in cooperation with a seven-member advisory panel following the review of literature concerning existing educational cooperatives and

a review of the available information regarding the development of SB 408. The survey instrument was validated by a five-member jury of experienced educators with special knowledge of the development of this particular legislation. The survey instrument was mailed to the superintendents of a randomly selected and stratified sample equal to 10 per cent of the non-satellite independent school districts participating no less than one year in the Regional Education Media program. Eighty-five usable responses were received from representatives of the ninety-six sample schools. This return of 89 per cent was well above the 80 per cent of the total sample that was set as acceptable to provide appropriate data from which to draw conclusions relating to the purposes of the study.

The information gleaned from the data collected by the survey instrument and displayed in Chapter IV of this study represents the combined opinions and judgments of the superintendents or their designated representative as to the impact of SB 408 on the sample schools. It was assumed that the utilization of a stratified random sample, selected through a table of random numbers, would provide data generally representative of all the public schools within the State participating in the regional media program. The sample size of 10 per cent, the response by 89 per cent of the sample schools, and the 96 per cent of the Average Daily Attendance of the total sample represented by the responding schools have added support to the validity of this assumption. It

was further assumed that two years for statewide program planning and four years of actual operation in local schools have provided sufficient time and evidence upon which to base substantive observations of program results.

Information from the survey instrument relating to local school policy revealed that 78 per cent of the sample schools joined the first year of the Regional Education Media Center (REMC) operation, 86 per cent the second year, 98 per cent the third year, and 100 per cent purchased membership for the fourth year. Ninety per cent of the sample group participate to gain access to services the district could not afford working alone, 68 per cent felt their membership would bring about services at lower cost, and 48 per cent felt that their membership would also help establish services to meet overall needs of the cooperatives. Eighty-five per cent of the sample schools changed personnel policies in some manner. Fifty-five per cent of the schools considered membership as a special Board of Trustee's action item each year, while 44 per cent considered it routinely. Only one per cent reviewed the issue of membership more than one time per year.

Responses related to local school economy indicated that only 24 per cent of the sample increased personnel budgets to utilize services received from the REMC, but 72 per cent of the sample purchased additional audio-visual equipment, five per cent made classroom alterations, one per cent added new physical plant space, and 11 per cent had other added expenses. Twenty-five per cent of the sample advocated some

type of change in the financial arrangement of the REMC program. However, 95 per cent of the sample stated that the present standards can be justified on the basis of services now available.

In responding to the survey statements regarding the possible impact of SB 408 on the local school instructional program 60 per cent of the sample schools stated that their audio-visual materials supply increased from deficient in most areas in 1967 to an adequate supply of selected items, or an excellent supply to meet most needs. A major priority need for materials was overcome in seven per cent of the sample schools. Fifty per cent of the sample indicated that staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment improved from deficient in most areas in 1967 to an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff or an adequate program to meet most needs of all staff members. A major priority need for staff development in 11 per cent of the sample schools was eliminated. Sixty-one per cent of the sample stated that the law resulted in improved programs in most curricular areas, and 60 per cent indicated these improvements enhanced individualized instruction while 39 per cent of the sample felt that it encouraged the development of teaching kits based on REMC materials. Eighty-one per cent of the sample reported that the REMC program has encouraged teacher requests for media materials and equipment, which has resulted in a catalog listing of materials at the REMC

for each teacher according to the response from 77 per cent of the schools. Classroom teachers in 55 per cent of the sample schools have a free hand in selecting and ordering needed materials from the catalog listings.

Results of the survey statements seeking the opinions and judgments of superintendents or their elected representatives concerning the impact of SB 408 on local management reveal that 85 per cent of the officials detected an influence on local school long and short range media program planning. Ninety-four per cent of the sample provide for personnel to serve on REMC Committees, with the superintendent heading the list of participants from 70 per cent of the sample, teachers are second in line according to 64 per cent, and principals and specialists tie for third place with a 38 per cent response from the sample schools. Eighty-two per cent of the sample reported that the law has resulted in strengthening communications among educational institutions, which parallels and/or supports the strengthening of working relationships between educational institutions indicated by 93 per cent of the sample, and the receipt of favorable reports from involved persons that were reported by 96 per cent of the sample schools.

#### Conclusions

Within the framework and limitations established in the plan for this study, it is believed that the following general conclusions may reasonably be stated:

1. The literature reviewed concerning related legislation uncovered the fact that a high percentage of recent state educational legislation provides considerable state baseline support for regional agencies as evidenced by the incentives built into most of the laws for support of programs in the cooperatives.

2. According to the literature there are clear indications that federal legislation provides an impetus to cooperation in education as evidenced by utilization of funds available to state agencies and/or local school districts from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Education Personnel Development Act of 1968, and extensive federal interest in occupational education.

3. It appears that some type of intermediate unit between the local school system and state education agencies is essential as evidenced by the fact that in 1970 thirty-three states had been identified as having legislation that permitted the existence of educational cooperatives and/or intermediate school districts. Recent educational developments have emphasized the regional concept of multi-district cooperation with coordinative planning and supplementary functional services.

4. The move toward cooperation is now becoming attractive to the large school systems as a vehicle to facilitate planning, structuring, and implementing new and expanded services as evidenced by recorded participation of large school districts.

5. The literature revealed that media technology is slowly becoming a priority area of concern of this nation's educational system. The state departments of education have heretofore been generally slow to develop and/or provide instructional media services for the schools under their jurisdiction.

6. SB 408 has demonstrated the capability and potential for bringing about a cooperative effort to provide media services for large school districts of the state as shown by the membership of all five schools with more than 50,000 Average Daily Attendance and thirty-one of the thirty-seven schools with 10,000 to 49,999 Average Daily Attendance.

7. SB 408 is widely approved by local school officials as evidenced by 1,119 of the 1,202 Texas school districts, representing 88 per cent of the State's Average Daily Attendance, submitting a membership fee for the program during the 1970-1971 school year.

8. Large numbers of local school officials of Texas were involved in the development of SB 408 as evidenced by information recorded by The Texas Education Agency and various professional teacher organizations.

9. The development of SB 408 had an important influence on policy decisions of the sample schools as evidenced by their participation in the REMC program, changes in local personnel policies reported by 85 per cent of the sample,

and the response from 48 per cent of the sample schools indicating that one reason for joining the REMC was to help build media services to meet the needs of area schools.

10. The law has influenced the economy of participating school districts, above the membership fee, as evidenced by the purchase of additional audio-visual equipment, an increase in personnel budgets, or the purchase of additional physical facilities indicated by 82 per cent of the sample schools. Seventy-three per cent of the sample would like to see the current financial arrangements perpetuated in subsequent years, and 78 per cent consider these arrangements justifiable on the basis of services available at the REMC.

11. The instructional programs of sample schools have been influenced by the provisions of SB 408 as evidenced by 67 per cent of the sample schools reporting deficient media services in 1967 and then indicating adequate to excellent services available in 1971.

12. Management of the sample schools has been influenced by the development of SB 408 as evidenced by 52 per cent of the sample schools serving on program planning committees of the REMC, a stronger working relationship with the Texas Education Agency claimed by nearly 50 per cent of the sample, stronger planning or communications reported by over 85 per cent of the sample schools, and the acceptance of the REMC program by teachers claimed by 96 per cent of the school



13. Within the scope and limitations of this survey it can be reasonably stated that SB 408 has had about the same impact on sample schools except in the following areas:

a. School districts having above 4,999 Average Daily Attendance have a higher percentage of representation on the REMC program planning committees.

b. The augmentation of audio-visual materials available to teachers was much greater for school districts having under 10,000 Average Daily Attendance.

c. The legislation had a much higher degree of influence on the working relationship between school districts with less than 10,000 Average Daily Attendance and the Texas Education Agency.

#### Recommendations

Based upon this study of Senate Bill 408 and the conclusions derived from it, the following recommendations are made:

1. Results of the development of SB 408 should be included in the data from which information is provided for development decisions on subsequent state legislation for educational services to be managed by Education Service Centers.

2. The Texas Education Agency should equip Education Service Centers with sufficient authority to better coordinate resources available for media services to local schools.

3. Education Service Centers should augment efforts to involve more school districts with less than 1,000 Average Daily Attendance on advisory committees for media programs.

4. Participating schools should capitalize on the potential of the REMC's to coordinate the development of new and/or the adaptation of successfully demonstrated media technology that can be localized to meet individual school needs.

5. Further study should be given the question of how successful the REMC's might be in coordinating a state-wide educational television network to enhance and augment existing media services.

6. The Texas Education Agency should alter satellite arrangements to coincide with all provisions of SB 408.

7. The State Legislature should enact legal arrangements for REMC's to annually initiate and coordinate feasibility studies on the exchange of state financed professional teacher pre-training media films.

8. The Texas Education Agency should consolidate components of appropriate REMC's in the utilization of video tape services and to create the potential to develop localized educational films.

9. Local officials should augment efforts of evaluating the operation of SB 408 as it relates to the progress of their school program.

10. Schools should utilize SB 408 to provide appropriate media services--on a cost plus basis--for business, industry and community organizations.

## CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Stufflebeam, Daniel I., et al, Educational Evaluation and Decision Making, Itasca, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

(Sample)

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF SB 408  
ON A SELECTED GROUP OF TEXAS SCHOOLS

Identifying Data

ADA

---

District Name

Instructions

Please Note: SB 408 created Regional Education Media Centers in Texas. REMC will be used in this survey to refer to the media component of the Education Service Center in your area.

Please check one or more of the choices to the survey questions.

Absolute anonymity is assured. No school or person will be identified by name, number, or implication.

A report of the results of the study will be provided if desired.

1. Your district participated (paid a fee) in the REMC program in
    - a) 1967-1968.
    - b) 1968-1969.
    - c) 1969-1970.
    - d) 1970-1971.
  
  2. Reasons for becoming a member of the REMC were
    - a) to increase the cost-effectiveness ratio of media services in the district.
    - b) to gain access to media services this district cannot afford when working alone.
    - c) to assist in the development of the capability to solve immediate and projected media problems of area schools.
    - d) other. (List)
-

3. Reasons for non-participation, if applicable, were
- a) contrary to district policy.
  - b) insufficient staff.
  - c) lack of funds for local fee.
  - d) other. (List)
- 
4. Actions taken in your district to allow personnel to participate in services, activities and events at the REMC required
- a) changes in personnel professional growth policies.
  - b) changes in personnel travel policies.
  - c) new policies allowing personnel to serve as consultants to the REMC.
  - d) other. (List)
- 
5. The REMC operation has resulted in the Board of Trustees placing the question of membership to the Center on its agenda as
- a) an individual item considered at more than one meeting each year.
  - b) an individual item considered at one meeting each year.
  - c) a routine item considered as an integral part of the annual instructional program budget.
  - d) other. (List)
- 
6. Actions taken in your district to utilize services received from the REMC has required
- a) additional administrative staff.
  - b) additional clerical staff.
  - c) additional instructional staff.
  - d) additional staff expenses only.
  - e) managing with regular staff and expense budget.
7. The REMC operation has influenced the spending of funds to strengthen facilities by
- a) making classroom alterations.
  - b) building new physical plant space.
  - c) purchase of additional furniture and fixtures for existing classrooms.
  - d) purchase of additional audio-visual equipment to facilitate use of REMC materials.
  - e) other. (List)
- 
8. In your district, school officials in evaluating the maximum (\$1.00 per ADA for both state and districts) money transactions under SB 408 have
- a) advocated an increase in the state allotment.
  - b) advocated an increase in the district allotment.
  - c) advocated a decrease in the state allotment.
  - d) advocated a decrease in the district allotment.
  - e) advocated no changes in the state or district allotments.
  - f) other. (List)

9. In your district, membership in the REMC operation has been justified by data on
- a) quantity and quality of material received from the REMC.
  - b) low cost-effectiveness ratio connected with services from the REMC.
  - c) quantity and quality of the experiences received by personnel from in-service training sponsored by the REMC.
  - d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
10. The materials received from the REMC have been selected by
- a) building principals.
  - b) professional librarians.
  - c) teachers.
  - d) all of the above participating.
  - e) others. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
11. In your district in 1966-1967 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Library Standard
- a) an excellent supply to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate supply of selected items.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.
12. In your district in 1970-1971 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Library Standard
- a) an excellent supply to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate supply of selected items.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.
13. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening instructional programs as evidenced by
- a) new study units based on material at the REMC.
  - b) curriculum guides listing materials at the REMC.
  - c) catalog listing materials at the REMC for each teacher.
  - d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
14. The REMC operation has encouraged extended utilization of media services as evidenced by
- a) additional materials designed by local teachers.
  - b) additional teacher requests for materials and equipment.
  - c) additional in-service training requests by teachers and teacher aides.
  - d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_

15. In your district in 1966-1967 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was
- a) an adequate program to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.
16. In your district in 1970-1971 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was
- a) an adequate program to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.
17. The REMC operation encouraged innovation in instruction or organization as evidenced by
- a) team planning and teaching.
  - b) continuous progress or non-graded plan.
  - c) individualized instruction.
  - d) teaching kits based on REMC materials.
  - e) other. (List)
- 
18. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in
- a) improved programs in most curricular areas.
  - b) improvements of selected programs. (List)
  - c) the development of new programs.
  - d) little effect on instructional programs.
- 
19. The REMC operation has resulted in district personnel serving on the REMC media
- a) planning committee.
  - b) materials selection committee.
  - c) policy advisory committee.
  - d) evaluation committee.
  - e) other. (List)
- 
20. Lists of personnel assigned to serve on various REMC committees have included
- a) the superintendent.
  - b) principals.
  - c) specialist (librarians, media coordinator, etc.).
  - d) teachers.
  - e) others. (List)
-



21. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening working relationships between your district and
- a) institutions of higher education.
  - b) business/industry.
  - c) Texas Education Agency.
  - d) other components of the Education Service Center.
  - e) other. (List)
- 
22. Positive reports of public approval of REMC services have been received from
- a) school board members.
  - b) administrative staff.
  - c) teachers.
  - d) pupils.
  - e) others. (List)
- 
23. The REMC operation has resulted in strengthening communications as evidenced by new techniques for disseminating information about media
- a) innovative and exemplary programs.
  - b) research and development activities.
  - c) resources beyond the REMC operation available to schools.
  - d) others. (List)
- 
24. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening media planning in your district as evidenced by
- a) expanded techniques for identifying needs.
  - b) expanded long and short range goals.
  - c) expanded techniques for self-evaluation.
  - d) other. (List)
- 
25. If your district has developed research or evaluation projects relating to utilization of REMC services in your school, please check the types.
- a) Evaluation of administrative procedures
  - b) Evaluation of instructional improvement
  - c) Evaluation of the economic efficiency of media services
  - d) Testing pupil gain
  - e) Other. (List)
-

APPENDIX B

SEVEN MEMBER ADVISORY PANEL

Mr. Harlan Ford  
Assistant Commissioner  
Texas Education Agency  
Austin, Texas 78700

Dr. John E. Uxer  
Executive Director  
Region XIX Education Service Center  
6501-C Trowbridge  
P. O. Box 10716  
El Paso, Texas 79997

Mr. Bill Ford, Superintendent  
Denison Independent School District  
Mirick Avenue  
Denison, Texas 75020

Dr. M. B. Nelson  
Professor  
East Texas State University  
P. O. Box 3043  
East Texas State Station  
Commerce, Texas 75428

Mr. Rogers Barton  
Associate Superintendent  
Dallas Independent School District  
3700 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75204

Mr. George Lipscomb  
Director of Instructional Media  
Texas Education Agency  
Austin, Texas 78700

Mr. Ray Hardison  
Associate Director  
Education Service Center Region X  
210 Abrams Road  
Richardson, Texas 75080

APPENDIX C

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF SB 408  
ON A SELECTED GROUP OF TEXAS SCHOOLS

Identifying Data

ADA

District Name

Instructions

Please Note: SB 408 created Regional Education Media Centers in Texas. REMC will be used in this survey to refer to the media component of the Education Service Center in your area.

Please check one or more of the choices to the survey questions.

Absolute anonymity is assured. No school or person will be identified by name, number, or implication.

A report of the results of the study will be provided if desired. If you want a copy please check \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Your district participated (paid a fee) in the REMC program in
  - \_\_\_ a) 1967-1968.
  - \_\_\_ b) 1968-1969.
  - \_\_\_ c) 1969-1970.
  - \_\_\_ d) 1970-1971.
  
2. Reasons for becoming a member of the REMC were
  - \_\_\_ a) to get media services at less cost to the district.
  - \_\_\_ b) to gain access to media services this district cannot afford when working alone.
  - \_\_\_ c) to help build media services to meet long range needs of schools in the Region.
  - \_\_\_ d) other. (List)

3. Reasons for non-participation, if applicable, were
- a) contrary to district policy.
  - b) insufficient staff.
  - c) lack of funds for local fee.
  - d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Actions taken in your district to allow personnel to participate in services, activities and events at the REMC required
- a) changes in personnel professional growth policies.
  - b) changes in personnel travel policies.
  - c) new policies allowing personnel to serve as consultants to the REMC.
  - d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
5. The REMC operation has resulted in the Board of Trustees placing the question of annual payment to the Center on its agenda as
- a) an individual item considered at more than one meeting each year.
  - b) an individual item considered at one meeting each year.
  - c) a routine item considered as an integral part of the annual instructional program budget.
  - d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
6. Actions taken in your district to utilize services received from the REMC has required
- a) additional administrative staff.
  - b) additional clerical staff.
  - c) additional instructional staff.
  - d) additional staff expenses only.
  - e) managing with regular staff and expense budget.
7. The REMC operation has influenced the spending of funds to improve facilities as evidenced by
- a) making classroom alterations.
  - b) building new physical plant space.
  - c) purchase of additional furniture and fixtures for existing classrooms.
  - d) purchase of additional audio-visual equipment to facilitate use of REMC materials.
  - e) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_

8. In your district, school officials in evaluating the maximum (\$1.00 per ADA for both state and districts) money transactions under SB 408 have
- a) advocated an increase in the state allotment.
  - b) advocated an increase in the district allotment.
  - c) advocated a decrease in the state allotment.
  - d) advocated a decrease in the district allotment.
  - e) advocated no changes in the state or district allotments.
  - f) other. (List)
- 
9. In your district, the annual payment in the REMC operation has been justified on the basis of
- a) appropriate materials received from the REMC.
  - b) low cost connected with services from the REMC.
  - c) quality of the experiences received by personnel from in-service training sponsored by the REMC.
  - d) other. (List)
- 
10. The materials received from the REMC have been selected by
- a) building principals.
  - b) professional librarians.
  - c) teachers.
  - d) all of the above participating.
  - e) others. (List)
- 
11. In your district in 1966-1967 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Standards
- a) an excellent supply to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate supply of selected items.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.
12. In your district in 1970-1971 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Standards
- a) an excellent supply to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate supply of selected items.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.
13. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening instructional programs as evidenced by
- a) new study units based on material at the REMC.
  - b) curriculum guides listing materials at the REMC.
  - c) catalog listing materials at the REMC for each teacher.
  - d) other. (List)
-

14. The REMC operation has encouraged extended utilization of media services as evidenced by  
\_\_\_a) additional materials designed by local teachers.  
\_\_\_b) additional teacher requests for materials and equipment.  
\_\_\_c) additional in-service training requests by teachers and teacher aides.  
\_\_\_d) other. (List)
- 
15. In your district in 1966-1967 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was  
\_\_\_a) an adequate program to meet most needs.  
\_\_\_b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff.  
\_\_\_c) deficient in most areas.  
\_\_\_d) a major priority need.
16. In your district in 1970-1971 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was  
\_\_\_a) an adequate program to meet most needs.  
\_\_\_b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff.  
\_\_\_c) deficient in most areas.  
\_\_\_d) a major priority need.
17. The REMC operation encouraged innovation in instruction or organization was evidenced by  
\_\_\_a) team planning and teaching.  
\_\_\_b) continuous progress or non-graded plan.  
\_\_\_c) individualized instruction.  
\_\_\_d) teaching kits based on REMC materials.  
\_\_\_e) other. (List)
- 
18. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in  
\_\_\_a) improved programs in most curricular areas.  
\_\_\_b) improvements of selected programs. (List)  
\_\_\_c) the development of new programs.  
\_\_\_d) little effect on instructional programs.
19. The REMC operation has resulted in district personnel serving on the REMC media  
\_\_\_a) planning committee.  
\_\_\_b) materials selection committee.  
\_\_\_c) policy advisory committee.  
\_\_\_d) evaluation committee.  
\_\_\_e) other. (List)
-

20. Lists of personnel assigned to serve on various REMC committees have included  
 a) the superintendent.  
 b) principals.  
 c) specialist (librarians, media coordinator, etc.).  
 d) teachers.  
 e) others. (List)
- 
21. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening working relationships between your district and  
 a) institutions of higher education.  
 b) business/industry.  
 c) Texas Education Agency.  
 d) other components of the Education Service Center.  
 e) other. (List)
- 
22. Positive reports of public approval of REMC services have been received from  
 a) school board members.  
 b) administrative staff.  
 c) teachers.  
 d) pupils.  
 e) others. (List)
- 
23. The REMC operation has resulted in strengthening communications as evidenced by new techniques for disseminating information about media  
 a) innovative and exemplary programs.  
 b) research and development activities.  
 c) resources beyond the REMC operation available to schools.  
 d) others. (List)
- 
24. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening media planning in your district as evidenced by  
 a) expanded techniques for identifying needs.  
 b) expanded long and short range goals.  
 c) expanded techniques for self-evaluation.  
 d) other. (List)
- 
25. If your district has developed research or evaluation projects relating to utilization of REMC services in your school, please check the types.  
 a) Evaluation of administrative procedures  
 b) Evaluation of instructional improvement  
 c) Evaluation of the economic efficiency of media services  
 d) Testing pupil gain  
 e) other. (List)
-

APPENDIX D

FIVE MEMBER VALIDATION PANEL

Dr. Wayne Hendrick, Superintendent  
Plano Independent School District  
1717 17th Street  
Plano, Texas 75074

Mr. Norman Hall, Superintendent  
Andrews Independent School District  
405 N. W. 3rd  
Andrews, Texas 79714

Mr. C. O. Chandler, Superintendent  
Victoria Independent School District  
1611 E. North  
Victoria, Texas 77901

Mr. W. C. Andrews, Superintendent  
Gregory-Portland Independent School District  
Box 338  
Gregory, Texas 78359

Mr. Paul Manning, Superintendent  
Texas City Independent School District  
Box 1150  
Texas City, Texas 77590



APPENDIX E

dallas independent school district

October 8, 1971

Nolan Estes  
General Superintendent

Dear

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 done under the direction of Dr. Vaughn Huffstutler, Professor, Division of Educational Leadership.

The study will involve a survey of factors influencing public school operations related to Senate Bill 408 (legislation for Regional Education Media Centers) in terms of local school economy, policy, administration, and instructional program. A validated questionnaire, printed on a single fold, four page leaflet, will be sent to a random sample of superintendents in Texas.

As you react to the questionnaire, decide whether or not each of the 25 items will provide the researcher with needed information. If an item is appropriate and clear, circle the "1" in the left hand margin. If you are undecided, circle the "2". If the item is inappropriate or unclear, circle the "3". At the close of the questionnaire there is a place for your comments, corrections, and deletions. It is the researcher's intent that the final questionnaire be an efficient and effective instrument. Your assistance in the task is greatly appreciated. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Marvin W. Kirkman  
1204 Edgefield Drive  
Plano, Texas 75074

encl.

APPENDIX F

A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF SB 408  
ON A SELECTED GROUP OF TEXAS SCHOOLS

Identifying Data

ADA

District Name

Instructions

Please Note: SB 408 created Regional Education Media Centers in Texas. REMC will be used in this survey to refer to the media component of the Education Service Center in your area.

Please check one or more of the choices to the survey questions.

Absolute anonymity is assured. No school or person will be identified by name, number, or implication.

A report of the results of the study will be provided if desired. If you want a copy please check \_\_\_\_\_.

Validity

- Response 1. Your district participated (paid a fee) in the REMC program in
- 1        \_\_\_ a) 1967-1968.  
2        \_\_\_ b) 1968-1969.  
3        \_\_\_ c) 1969-1970.  
         \_\_\_ d) 1970-1971.
2. Reasons for becoming a member of the REMC were
- 1        \_\_\_ a) to get media services at less cost to the district.  
2        \_\_\_ b) to gain access to media services this district cannot afford when working alone.  
3        \_\_\_ c) to help build media services to meet long range needs of schools in the Region.  
         \_\_\_ d) other. (List)

- 1 3. Reasons for non-participation, if applicable,  
 2 were  
 3  a) contrary to district policy.  
 b) insufficient staff.  
 c) lack of funds for local fee.  
 d) other. (List)
- 
- 1 4. Actions taken in your district to allow personnel  
 2 to participate in services, activities and events  
 3 at the REMC required  
 a) changes in personnel professional growth  
 policies.  
 b) changes in personnel travel policies.  
 c) new policies allowing personnel to serve  
 as consultants to the REMC.  
 d) other. (List)
- 
- 1 5. The REMC operation has resulted in the Board of  
 2 Trustees placing the question of annual payment  
 3 to the Center on its agenda as  
 a) an individual item considered at more than  
 one meeting each year.  
 b) an individual item considered at one  
 meeting each year.  
 c) a routine item considered as an integral  
 part of the annual instructional program  
 budget.  
 d) other. (List)
- 
- 1 6. Actions taken in your district to utilize services  
 2 received from the REMC has required  
 3  a) additional administrative staff.  
 b) additional clerical staff.  
 c) additional instructional staff.  
 d) additional staff expenses only.  
 e) managing with regular staff and expense budget.
- 
- 1 7. The REMC operation has influenced the spending of  
 2 funds to improve facilities as evidenced by  
 3  a) making classroom alterations.  
 b) building new physical plant space.  
 c) purchase of additional furniture and fixtures  
 for existing classrooms.  
 d) purchase of additional audio-visual equipment  
 to facilitate use of REMC materials.  
 e) other. (List)
-

8. In your district, school officials in evaluating the maximum (\$1.00 per ADA for both state and districts) money transactions under SB 408 have
- 1  
2  
3
- a) advocated an increase in the state allotment.
  - b) advocated an increase in the district allotment.
  - c) advocated a decrease in the state allotment.
  - d) advocated a decrease in the district allotment.
  - e) advocated no changes in the state or district allotments.
  - f) other. (List)
- 

9. In your district, the annual payment in the REMC operation has been justified on the basis of
- 1  
2  
3
- a) appropriate materials received from the REMC.
  - b) low cost connected with services from the REMC.
  - c) quality of the experiences received by personnel from in-service training sponsored by the REMC.
  - d) other. (List)
- 

10. The materials received from the REMC have been selected by
- 1  
2  
3
- a) building principals.
  - b) professional librarians.
  - c) teachers.
  - d) all of the above participating.
  - e) others. (List)
- 

11. In your district in 1966-1967 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Standards
- 1  
2  
3
- a) an excellent supply to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate supply of selected items.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.

12. In your district in 1970-1971 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Standards
- 1  
2  
3
- a) an excellent supply to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate supply of selected items.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.

13. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening instructional programs as evidenced by
- 1  
2  
3
- a) new study units based on material at the REMC.
  - b) curriculum guides listing materials at the REMC.
  - c) catalog listing materials at the REMC for each teacher.
  - d) other. (List)
14. The REMC operation has encouraged extended utilization of media services as evidenced by
- 1  
2  
3
- a) additional materials designed by local teachers.
  - b) additional teacher requests for materials and equipment.
  - c) additional in-service training requests by teachers and teacher aides.
  - d) other. (List)
15. In your district in 1966-1967 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was
- 1  
2  
3
- a) an adequate program to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.
16. In your district in 1970-1971 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was
- 1  
2  
3
- a) an adequate program to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.
17. The REMC operation encouraged innovation in instruction or organization was evidenced by
- 1  
2  
3
- a) team planning and teaching.
  - b) continuous progress or non-graded plan.
  - c) individualized instruction.
  - d) teaching kits based on REMC materials.
  - e) other. (List)

18. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted  
 1 in  
 2     a) improved programs in most curricular areas.  
 3     b) improvements of selected programs. (List)  
    c) the development of new programs.  
    d) little effect on instructional programs.
19. The REMC operation has resulted in district  
 1 personnel serving on the REMC media  
 2     a) planning committee.  
 3     b) materials selection committee.  
    c) policy advisory committee.  
    d) evaluation committee.  
    e) other. (List)
20. Lists of personnel assigned to serve on various  
 1 REMC committees have included  
 2     a) the superintendent.  
 3     b) principals.  
    c) specialist (librarians, media coordinator,  
 etc.).  
    d) teachers.  
    e) others. (List)
21. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted  
 1 in strengthening working relationships between  
 2 your district and  
 3     a) institutions of higher education.  
    b) business/industry.  
    c) Texas Education Agency.  
    d) other components of the Education Service  
 Center.  
    e) other. (List)
22. Positive reports of public approval of REMC  
 1 services have been received from  
 2     a) school board members.  
 3     b) administrative staff.  
    c) teachers.  
    d) pupils.  
    e) others. (List)
23. The REMC operation has resulted in strengthening  
 1 communications as evidenced by new techniques for  
 2 disseminating information about media  
 3     a) innovative and exemplary programs.  
    b) research and development activities.  
    c) resources beyond the REMC operation available  
 to schools.  
    d) other. (List)

- 1        24. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted  
in strengthening media planning in your district  
as evidenced by
- 2         a) expanded techniques for identifying needs.  
 b) expanded long and short range goals.
- 3         c) expanded techniques for self-evaluation.  
 d) other. (List)
- 
- 1        25. If your district has developed research or eval-  
uation projects relating to utilization of REMC  
services in your school, please check the types.
- 2         a) Evaluation of administrative procedures  
 b) Evaluation of instructional improvement
- 3         c) Evaluation of the economic efficiency of  
media services  
 d) Testing pupil gain  
 e) other. (List)
- 

Please list any additional comments or recommendations you have relative to the statements in the remaining space on this page or on the back of any page.

APPENDIX G

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF SAMPLE SCHOOLS

	ADA
Alba-Golden Independent School District	354
Alice Independent School District	6,508
Anson Independent School District	845
Anthony Independent School District	333
Avery Independent School District	360
Bells Independent School District	412
Bledsoe Independent School District	190
Belton Independent School District	2,989
Boyd Independent School District	521
Boys Ranch Independent School District	393
Brady Independent School District	1,295
Butler Independent School District	229
Bynum Independent School District	200
Canutillo Independent School District	1,300
Celeste Independent School District	266
Celina Independent School District	411
Center Point Independent School District	190
Chilton Independent School District	312
Clarendon Independent School District	553
Coleman Independent School District	1,185
Community Rural High School District	433
Gross Roads Independent School District	196



Crosby Independent School District	1,950
Cushing Independent School District	340
Daingerfield Independent School District	2,186
Delmar Independent School District	310
Dripping Springs Independent School District	688
Eagle Pass Independent School District	6,600
Eagle Mountain-Saginaw Independent School District	2,400
Everman Independent School District	2,960
Frenship Independent School District	1,750
Galveston Independent School District	12,500
Garrison Independent School District	666
Gatesville Independent School District	1,738
Georgetown Independent School District	1,745
Gilmer Independent School District	1,959
Gonzales Independent School District	2,296
Grady Independent School District	156
Granger Independent School District	378
Groom Independent School District	330
Harlingen Consolidated Independent School District	10,081
Hart Independent School District	689
Henderson Independent School District	3,000
Higgins Independent School District	161
High Island Independent School District	216
Hudson Independent School District	988
Industrial Independent School District	735
Junction Independent School District	800

Keller Independent School District	1,327
Kermit Independent School District	2,200
Leon Independent School District	349
Leveretts Chapel Independent School District	270
Lexington Independent School District	565
Lockney Independent School District	985
Lubbock Independent School District	31,642
Luling Independent School District	1,238
Mart Independent School District	758
McAdoo Independent School District	112
McLean Independent School District	350
Mexia Independent School District	1,840
Midland Independent School District	17,500
Milano Independent School District	300
Millsap Independent School District	510
Mumford Independent School District	125
Newton Independent School District	1,336
New Diana Independent School District	548
Oakwood Independent School District	382
Panhandle Independent School District	789
Paradise Independent School District	248
Pearland Independent School District	3,418
Phillips Independent School District	670
Ponder Independent School District	138
Prosper Independent School District	302

Ranger Independent School District	619
Rice Community Independent School District	1,640
Rising Star Independent School District	249
Riviera Independent School District	475
Robstown Independent School District	4,700
Rochester County Line Independent School District	215
Round Rock Independent School District	1,800
Santo Independent School District	289
Santa Anna Independent School District	338
Scurry-Rosser Independent School District	354
Shepherd Independent School District	565
Slaton Independent School District	1,800
Taft Independent School District	1,891
Three Rivers Independent School District	740
Tyler Independent School District	14,699
Union Grove Independent School District	370
United Independent School District	1,625
Valley Mills Independent School District	355
Waco Independent School District	18,000
Wallis Independent School District	380
Wells Independent School District	325
Zapata Independent School District	1,175

APPENDIX H

dallas independent school district

November 6, 1971

Nolan Estes  
General Superintendent

Under the supervision of Dr. Vaughn E. Huffstutler of North Texas State University, I am making a statewide study of factors influencing public school operations under Senate Bill 408, which established the Regional Education Media Centers. Your experiences with and knowledge of the operation of this law will be of real value to me in this study.

Will you please complete or designate someone to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the attached envelope? A prompt return will be most helpful and greatly appreciated. The completion of the questionnaire should require less than fifteen minutes without reference to records. No data requested in the questionnaire will be used to identify your school in reports of the study.

Thanks in advance for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Marvin W. Kirkman  
Planning Specialist

encl.

## APPENDIX I

### A SURVEY OF THE IMPACT OF SB 408 ON A SELECTED GROUP OF TEXAS SCHOOLS

#### Identifying Data

ADA

District Name \_\_\_\_\_

#### Instructions

Please Note: SB 408 created Regional Education Media Centers in Texas. REMC will be used in this survey to refer to the media component of the Education Service Center in your area.

Please check one or more of the choices to the survey questions.

Absolute anonymity is assured. No school or person will be identified by name, number, or implication.

A report of the results of the study will be provided if desired. If you want a copy please check \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Your district participated (paid a fee) in the REMC program in  
\_\_\_\_ a) 1967-1968.  
\_\_\_\_ b) 1968-1969.  
\_\_\_\_ c) 1969-1970.  
\_\_\_\_ d) 1970-1971.
2. Reasons for becoming a member of the REMC were  
\_\_\_\_ a) to get media services at less cost to the district.  
\_\_\_\_ b) to gain access to media services this district cannot afford when working alone.  
\_\_\_\_ c) to help build media services to meet long range needs of schools in the Region.  
\_\_\_\_ d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
3. Reasons for non-participation, if applicable, were  
\_\_\_\_ a) contrary to district policy.  
\_\_\_\_ b) insufficient staff.  
\_\_\_\_ c) lack of funds for local fee.  
\_\_\_\_ d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Actions taken in your district to allow personnel to participate in services, activities and events at the REMC required  
\_\_\_\_ a) changes in personnel professional growth policies.  
\_\_\_\_ b) changes in personnel travel policies.  
\_\_\_\_ c) new policies allowing personnel to serve as consultants to the REMC.  
\_\_\_\_ d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
5. The REMC operation has resulted in the Board of Trustees placing the question of annual payment to the Center on its agenda as  
\_\_\_\_ a) an individual item considered at more than one meeting each year.  
\_\_\_\_ b) an individual item considered at one meeting each year.  
\_\_\_\_ c) a routine item considered as an integral part of the annual instructional program budget.  
\_\_\_\_ d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_

6. Actions taken in your district to utilize services received from the REMC has required
- a) additional administrative staff.
  - b) additional clerical staff.
  - c) additional instructional staff.
  - d) additional staff expenses only.
  - e) managing with regular staff and expense budget.
7. The REMC operation has influenced the spending of funds to improve facilities as evidenced by
- a) making classroom alterations.
  - b) building new physical plant space.
  - c) purchase of additional furniture and fixtures for existing classrooms.
  - d) purchase of additional audio-visual equipment to facilitate use of REMC materials.
  - e) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
8. In your district, school officials in evaluating the maximum (\$1.00 per ADA for both state and districts) money transactions under SB 408 have
- a) advocated an increase in the state allotment.
  - b) advocated an increase in the district allotment.
  - c) advocated a decrease in the state allotment.
  - d) advocated a decrease in the district allotment.
  - e) advocated no changes in the state or district allotments.
  - f) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
9. In your district, the annual payment in the REMC operation has been justified on the basis of
- a) appropriate materials received from the REMC.
  - b) low cost connected with services from the REMC.
  - c) quality of the experiences received by personnel from in-service training sponsored by the REMC.
  - d) other. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
10. The materials received from the REMC have been selected by
- a) building principals.
  - b) professional librarians.
  - c) teachers.
  - d) all of the above participating.
  - e) others. (List) \_\_\_\_\_
11. In your district in 1966-1967 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Standards
- a) an excellent supply to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate supply of selected items.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.
12. In your district in 1970-1971 school year audio-visual materials available to personnel were by State Standards
- a) an excellent supply to meet most needs.
  - b) an adequate supply of selected items.
  - c) deficient in most areas.
  - d) a major priority need.

13. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening instructional programs as evidenced by  
 \_\_\_ a) new study units based on material at the REMC.  
 \_\_\_ b) curriculum guides listing materials at the REMC.  
 \_\_\_ c) catalog listing materials at the REMC for each teacher.  
 \_\_\_ d) other. (List)
14. The REMC operation has encouraged extended utilization of media services as evidenced by  
 \_\_\_ a) additional materials designed by local teachers.  
 \_\_\_ b) additional teacher requests for materials and equipment.  
 \_\_\_ c) additional in-service training requests by teachers and teacher aides.  
 \_\_\_ d) other. (List)
15. In your district in 1966-1967 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was  
 \_\_\_ a) an adequate program to meet most needs.  
 \_\_\_ b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff.  
 \_\_\_ c) deficient in most areas.  
 \_\_\_ d) a major priority need.
16. In your district in 1970-1971 school year staff development in utilization of audio-visual materials and equipment was  
 \_\_\_ a) an adequate program to meet most needs.  
 \_\_\_ b) an adequate program to meet most needs of selected staff.  
 \_\_\_ c) deficient in most areas.  
 \_\_\_ d) a major priority need.
17. The REMC operation encouraged innovation in instruction or organization was evidenced by  
 \_\_\_ a) team planning and teaching.  
 \_\_\_ b) continuous progress or non-graded plan.  
 \_\_\_ c) individualized instruction.  
 \_\_\_ d) teaching kits based on REMC materials.  
 \_\_\_ e) other. (List)
18. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in  
 \_\_\_ a) improved programs in most curricular areas.  
 \_\_\_ b) improvements of selected programs. (List)  
 \_\_\_ c) the development of new programs.  
 \_\_\_ d) little effect on instructional programs.
19. The REMC operation has resulted in district personnel serving on the REMC media  
 \_\_\_ a) planning committee.  
 \_\_\_ b) materials selection committee.  
 \_\_\_ c) policy advisory committee.  
 \_\_\_ d) evaluation committee.  
 \_\_\_ e) other. (List)
20. Lists of personnel assigned to serve on various REMC committees have included  
 \_\_\_ a) the superintendent.  
 \_\_\_ b) principals.  
 \_\_\_ c) specialist (librarians, media coordinator, etc.).  
 \_\_\_ d) teachers.  
 \_\_\_ e) others. (List)

21. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening working relationships between your district and
- a) institutions of higher education.
  - b) business/industry.
  - c) Texas Education Agency.
  - d) other components of the Education Service Center.
  - e) other. (List)
- 
22. Favorable reports about REMC services have been received from
- a) school board members.
  - b) administrative staff.
  - c) teachers.
  - d) pupils.
  - e) others. (List)
- 
23. The REMC operation has resulted in strengthening communications as evidenced by new techniques for disseminating information about media
- a) innovative and exemplary programs.
  - b) research and development activities.
  - c) resources beyond the REMC operation available to schools.
  - d) others. (List)
- 
24. The influence of the REMC operation has resulted in strengthening media planning in your district as evidenced by
- a) expanded techniques for identifying needs.
  - b) expanded long and short range goals.
  - c) expanded techniques for self-evaluation.
  - d) other. (List)
- 
25. If your district has developed research or evaluation projects relating to utilization of REMC services in your school, please check the types.
- a) Evaluation of administrative procedures
  - b) Evaluation of instructional improvement
  - c) Evaluation of media services
  - d) Testing pupil gain
  - e) other. (List)
-



APPENDIX K

TEXAS STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES

CLASSROOM TEACHER UNITS	NUMBER OF BOOKS	ANNUAL AMOUNT SPENT ON BOOKS	AUDIO-VISUAL MATERIALS	ANNUAL AMOUNT SPENT ON AUDIO-VISUAL MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT	OTHER RESOURCES	SIZE OF CENTRAL LIBRARY	STAFF
up to 20	at least \$3,000	\$600 or \$4.00 to \$6.00 per student, whichever is greater	materials from at least five (5) categories (films, slides, transparencies, etc.) for each curriculum area	\$2.00 to \$6.00 per student	<u>ELEMENTARY</u> (grades 1-6; 1-8) 10-15 magazines 1 news service 1 general magazine index pamphlets <u>JUNIOR HIGH</u> (grades 6 or 7-9) 25-50 magazines 3 newspapers 1 general magazine index <u>SENIOR HIGH</u> (grades 9-12 or 10-12) 50-125 magazines 3 newspapers 1 general magazine index	seating space for 45-55 students (30-35 sq. feet per student); conference, workroom, storage, and office area	1 librarian
21-40	five titles per student	\$4.00 to \$6.00 per student	materials from at least five (5) categories (films, slides, transparencies, etc.) for each curriculum area	\$2.00 to \$6.00	"	seating space for 10% of enrollment (30-35 sq. ft. per student); conference, workroom, storage, and office area	2 librarians 1 clerk
41-80	five titles per student	\$4.00 to \$6.00 per student	materials from at least five (5) categories (films, slides, transparencies, etc.) for each curriculum area	\$2.00 to \$6.00	"	seating space for 10% of enrollment (30-35 sq. ft. per student); conference, workroom, storage, and office area	3 librarians 2 clerks

## BIBLIOGRAPHIES

CONSOLIDATED CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHIES  
BY CATEGORIES

Books

- Holland, B. F., The Status and Prospects of Film Distribution in Texas, Austin, Texas, The University of Texas, 1958.
- Noel, Francis, et al, Practices of State Departments of Education in New Educational Media/Audio-Visual Education During 1960-61, Los Angeles, California, University of Southern California Press, 1963.
- Saettler, Paul, A History of Instructional Technology, New York, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1968.
- Sax, Gilbert, Empirical Foundations of Educational Research, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Stufflebeam, Daniel I., et al, Educational Evaluation and Decision Making, Itasca, Illinois, F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Articles

- Belton, John Raynor, "Wisconsin's New District Educational Service Agencies," Journal on State School Systems Development, 1 (May, 1969), 203-222.
- Bildersee, Max U., "The Education Improvement Act: A New Responsibility," Education Screen and Audio-Visual Guide, 44 (May, 1965), 15.
- Bost, W. G., "Educational Cooperative--A Priority Development Program for the Seventies," Appalachian Advance, IV (January-February, 1970), 2-3.
- Brown, James W., Richard B. Lewis, Fred F. Harewood, "Selecting, Creating, and Using Learning Resources," AV Instruction: Media and Methods, 58, New York, McGraw-Hill Inc., (1969), 68-70.
- Bruce, William C., "ABC's of Implementing Titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," School Board Journal, 151 (July, 1965), 9-13.

- Cramer, J. W., "Consolidation Not Always the Answer," Appalachian Advance, II (May, 1968), 8.
- Cutter, Virginia M., and Charles W. Nix, "Education Service Centers--Agents of Change," The Texas Outlook, 51 (September, 1967), 42.
- Elazar, Daniel J., "The American Partnership: The Next Half Generation," Designing Education for the Future, No. 1, edited by Edgar D. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan, New York, Citation Press, (1967), 111-112.
- Fitzwater, C. O., "Patterns and Trends in State School System Development," Journal on State School System Development, 1 (Spring, 1967), 5-32.
- Fox, Karl A., "A New Strategy for Urban and Rural America," Appalachia, II (August, 1969), 10-13.
- Green, Joseph, "The Media Sixties Reviewed," The Clearing House, 44 (January, 1970), 319-320.
- Keesler, Clifton L., "How to Create a State Media Center," Iowa Department of Public Instruction, 45 (October, 1966), 46.
- Liasson, Joy, and Michael Spina, "The New York Regional Center Network: A Regional Educational Planning Resource," Journal of the New York State School Boards Association, Inc., 34 (June, 1970), 15.
- Moss, R. E., "Media Center Development . . . Texas," Educational Resources and Techniques, 7 (September, 1967), 4-5.
- Raden, Bonnie, "Audio-Visuals for Alaska," Educational Screen and Audio-Visual Guide, (February, 1970), 32.
- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "A Legislative Program for Texas Schools," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 42, No. 12, (December, 1958).
- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "A Legislative Potpourri--Legislation and Education," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 45, No. 3, (March, 1961).
- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "After the Legislature Adjourns--What Happens Next?" The Texas Outlook, Vol. 43, No. 6, (June, 1959).

- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "All in All . . . A Good Session," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 47, No. 7 (July, 1963).
- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "An Equation for Legislatures," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 44, No. 10 (October, 1960).
- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "Educational Improvements Recommended," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 47, No. 1 (January, 1963), 12.
- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "For TSTA Program--Prospects Good in Special Session," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 45, No. 7 (July, 1961), 21.
- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "Legislative Warmup for 1963," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 47, No. 1 (January, 1963).
- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "Salary Increase Endorsed," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 48, No. 5 (May, 1964).
- Sturgeon, L. P., et al, "TSTA Sponsored Bills," The Texas Outlook, Vol. 47, No. 3 (March, 1963).
- Summer, Ernestine, and Winogene Bergmann, "The New Instructional Materials Center," Audio-Visual Instruction, Vol. 10 (June-July, 1965), 458-59.
- Tanzman, Jack, "Audio-Visual Advisory," School Management, Vol. 11 (May, 1967), 43-58.
- Terman, G. E., "The IMC Idea: Regional Development Demanded," Educational Screen and Audio-Visual Guide, Vol. 44 (December, 1965), 17 and 45.
- Tucker, Bill F., "Highlights of TEXAVED/TAET," Educational Resources and Techniques, 10 (Spring, 1970), 16-20.

#### Reports

- Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, The Federal-State Partnership in Education, Fifth Annual Report of the Advisory Council, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Iowa Center for Research in School Administration, The Multi-County Regional Education Service Agency in Iowa, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, prepared for the Linn County Board of Education by the University of Iowa College of Education, 1967.

- Kahl, William C., Wisconsin's Cooperative Educational Service Agencies, Madison, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, February 15, 1968.
- Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Project Report (Identification, Synthesis, Evaluation and Packaging of "Shared Service" Research and Development Efforts in Rural Areas), Portland, Oregon, The Laboratory, 1969.
- Sacramento State College Foundation, States Audio-Visual Education Study: A Summary Report, Sacramento, California, 1966.
- Texas Education Agency, Forty-First Biennial Report 1958-60, Austin, State Printing Office, 1960.
- Texas Education Agency, Annual Report on Education Service Center Programs, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1971.
- Texas Education Agency, 1969-70 Statistical Report, Part I, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1971.
- Texas Education Agency, Media Services Regional Education Service Centers, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1971.
- Texas Education Agency, Regional Media Services Percentage of ADA Participating, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1971.
- Texas Education Agency, Thirty-Fourth Biennial Report 1944-46, Bulletin No. 473, Austin, Texas, State Printing Office, 1954.
- Texas Education Agency, Thirty-Eighth Biennial Report 1952-54, Bulletin No. 566, Austin, Texas, State Printing Office, 1954.
- Texas Education Agency, Toward Comprehensive Educational Planning in Texas, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1969.
- The Iowa Research Committee on the Intermediate Administrative Unit, Effective Intermediate Units in Iowa, Des Moines, Iowa, Department of Public Instruction, April, 1960.

## Public Documents

Bradley, W. A., House Bill No. 1149, The Tennessee General Assembly, 1970.

Brooker, Floyd E., Training Films for Industry, Washington, D.C., Federal Security Agency, U.S. Office of Education Bulletin 13, 1946.

New York General Assembly, Establishment of Boards of Cooperative Educational Services Pending the Creation of Intermediate District, New York, State Printing Office, 1958, 401-423.

Texas Education Agency, State Plan For The Establishment Of Educational Service Centers Including Regional Education Media Centers, Austin, State Printing Office, March, 1968.

Texas Legislature, General and Special Laws of Texas Passed by the Regular Session of the 59th Legislature, Austin, State Printing Office, 1967.

Texas Education Agency, Regulations and Guidelines for Developing Regional Educational Media Centers, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1966.

Texas Legislature, General and Special Laws of Texas Passed by the Regular Session of the 60th Legislature, Austin, State Printing Office, 1967.

Texas Education Agency, State Plan for the Establishment of Educational Service Centers Including Regional Education Media Centers, Austin, State Printing Office, March, 1967.

Texas Education Agency, State Plan: Procedures and Policies for the Operation of Regional Education Service Center (Revised), Austin, Texas Education Agency, January, 1970.

Texas Education Agency, Texas Education Service Center: Promise of Opportunity, Austin, State Printing Office, October, 1969.

Texas Education Agency, 1970-71 Public School Directory, Bulletin 703, Austin, Texas, Texas Education Agency, 1970.

Texas Legislature, Journal of the House of Representatives of the 59th Legislature of the State of Texas, Vol. I - II, 1965.

- Texas Legislature, Senate Journal, State of Texas 59th Legislature, Vol. II, 1965-66.
- Texas Legislature, Senate Journal, State of Texas 60th Legislature, Vol. II, 1965-66.
- U. S. Office of Education, ESEA Title I Program Guide #24, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, November 16, 1966.
- U. S. Congress, New Hampshire-Vermont Interstate School Compact, Public Law 91-12, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1969.
- U. S. Office of Education, Regulations Pursuant to Titles I, II, and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Federal Register, Vol. 32, No. 27, Part II, February 9, 1967.

#### Publications of Learned Organizations

- American Association of School Administrators, Better Education Through Effective Intermediate Units, Washington, D.C., National Education Association, 1963.
- American Association of School Administrators, Regional Educational Service Agency Prototypes, Operational Statutory Arrangements and Suggestions for Implementation, Washington, D.C., National Education Association, Department of Rural Education, 1967.
- Downing, H. E., Audio-Visual Staff and Organization in State Departments of Education, Washington, D.C., National Education Association Research Division, February, 1948.
- Haskew, L. D., et al, Getting Started: The Education Service Center Surveys and Studies, Austin, University of Texas, 1968.
- McCarty, Henry R. and Horace C. Harlsell, The Cooperative Approach to Audio-Visual Programs, Washington, D.C., National Education Association, June, 1962.
- Stewart, Robert C., et al, The Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Syracuse, N.Y., Bureau of School for Education, Syracuse University, 1964.



## Unpublished Materials

McClusky, F. Dean, "The Administration of Visual Education,  
A National Survey," unpublished report made to the  
National Education Association in 1923.