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The purpose of this study was to compare the legal costs of Texas public school districts during the school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83 with the preventive law practices utilized by those districts. A survey was made of Texas superintendents' knowledge of school law. The data were contrasted with legal costs and the preventive law practices of the district.

Two survey instruments were developed, and the case study approach was utilized. A survey was sent to the 1,101 Texas public school superintendents. The twenty-five item instrument was designed to solicit information regarding the amount of money spent by districts and the types of preventive law practices that school districts use to reduce legal costs. A legal awareness questionnaire was developed and administered to 72 of the 542 superintendents who responded to the first survey instrument. Three school districts were selected to be case study sites. The data from the instruments were analyzed to determine if a relationship existed between a district's legal costs and its preventive law practices, a district's legal costs and the superintendent's knowledge of school law, and a superintendent's knowledge of school law and the district's preventive law practices.
The major conclusions of the study were as follows: (1) The larger the school district, the more money the district spends on legal costs. (2) Districts that incorporate preventive law activities do not necessarily have lower legal costs. (3) The differences in legal costs of a district and the types of preventive law activities utilized by the district are generally associated with district size, rather than with the absence or presence of the specific preventive law activity. (4) The legal knowledge possessed by the superintendent does not have an impact on the legal costs of the district. (5) The superintendent's knowledge of school law does not affect the number of preventive law activities used in the district.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the past thirty years, public schools have experienced a steady increase in involvement in federal and state court litigation. As one example, Zirkel found in his research that the number of federal court decisions affecting public schools during the four year period 1967 to 1971 (N = 1273) was more than ten times the number for the ten year period 1946 to 1956 (N = 112). Although Zirkel's findings indicated a leveling off in federal cases, the findings revealed an upsurge in the number of civil cases involving public school students as the number of cases more than doubled in the three year period from 1977 (N = 217) to 1980 (N = 527) (12).

The actual amount of money spent by school districts on litigation is unclear. Preliminary research by Hawkins revealed that neither state departments of education nor federal sources maintain records that specifically reflect the cost of litigation in public schools, and further revealed that much of a school district's legal expense is for needless litigation (4, p. 56).

In addition to the limited data available regarding legal costs, there is also little information about the specific practices and procedures that school districts use
to prevent or reduce litigation. Hawkins stresses the need for educators to take the leadership role in redirecting the focus for conflict resolution by using approaches other than legal processes. Hawkins reminds educators that there is a tremendous need for the application of prevention in education as the sacrifice of financial resources represents a serious educational loss to the youth of this nation (4, p. 54).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was the legal costs of public school districts in the state of Texas. At the time of the study, a need existed to reduce escalating legal costs and to redirect dollars spent on legal costs to more appropriate educational uses.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the legal costs of Texas public school districts during the school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83 with the preventive law practices utilized by those districts. A survey was made of Texas superintendents' knowledge of school law. The data were contrasted with legal costs and the preventive law practices of their districts.
Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. How much did Texas public school districts spend on legal costs during school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83?

2. What are Texas public school districts doing to prevent or reduce litigation?

3. How much do Texas superintendents know about school law?

4. Is there a relationship between a school district's legal costs and its preventive law practices?

5. Is there a relationship between a school district's legal costs and the superintendent's knowledge of school law?

6. Is there a relationship between the superintendent's knowledge of school law and the district's preventive law practices?

Review of the Literature

The base for the preventive law approach was provided at the midpoint of the twentieth century by Louis M. Brown (12). Based on information learned from the medical profession, Brown encouraged law professors and practitioners to focus on legal health and the early detection of legal risks.
Brown and his partner, Dauer, conceptualize preventive law by contrasting it to curative law. According to Brown and Dauer, there are at least three characteristics that distinguish preventive law from curative law— the chronological element, the allocation of decision making, and the extent and variety of choices (2, p. 7). More specifically, preventive law focuses on things that might occur in the future whereas curative law focuses on things that have already happened. In the curative stage or in litigation, the client determines the objective and the lawyer determines the means to achieve the objective. In the preventive stage, however, the objectives and means are indistinguishable and the lawyer and client have to be sensitive to both legal and extralegal issues. Finally, in the preventive realm, the choices are far greater than in the curative situation in that the facts have not already occurred.

Brown popularized the concept of a legal audit, a systematic process to legal hygiene which includes data collection, analysis, recommendation, and follow-up. According to Brown and Dauer, lawyers must monitor their clients’ performance and assist them in identifying legal problems (2, p. 9). This is in keeping with the basic premise of preventive law which emphasizes that lawyers can best serve their clients by focusing on consultation and planning rather than looking to litigation as the solution for all problems.
Although Brown and Dauer advocate the use of preventive law primarily from a lawyer's standpoint and although their major focus has been in business and commercial law, there are many who feel the concepts are applicable to school practice. Bednar, for example, believes that the school attorney should perform the same type of legal analysis as would occur in the curative situation (1, p. 6). In other words, a particular matter should be thought through from beginning to end. The substantive legal rules should be determined in order to assess what facts will yield what results. A plan should be developed and reviewed for effectiveness at various intervals. The major difference is that the facts haven't happened. The school attorney's mission is to create in the present the facts in the future in order to produce legal results that are consistent with the outcomes desired by the educators.

Background and Significance of the Study

Information on legal costs and preventive law practices of public school districts is very limited. As indicated earlier, the amount of money school districts spend on litigation has not been available in that records are not maintained at state or federal levels. A careful review of Dissertation Abstracts International, Education Index, ERIC files, and law libraries resulted in the fact that there are no empirical studies and few articles on preventive law as applied to education or to law in general. As a result,
this study was begun with the intent of expanding and contributing to knowledge in this area.

The application of the concept of preventive law in the field of education has been very limited. Kaplin briefly mentioned the concept in his text on the law of higher education (5, p. xii). According to Kaplin, there are two basic ways that legal counsel can perform its function--through preventive law and through treatment law. Kaplin differentiated between the two by stating that preventive law involves a continual setting of legal parameters within which administrators should operate in order to avoid litigation or disputes with governmental agencies whereas treatment law focuses on actual challenges to institutional practices and on affirmative legal steps by the institution to protect its interests.

Zirkel supports the position that there have been limited applications of the preventive law concept in education. According to Zirkel, preventive law in higher education is largely limited to a comprehensive inventory instrument for private colleges and universities and a desk book for administrators that advocates the use of preventive legal planning (12).

Efforts to put preventive law into a practical form have been very limited. A review of the literature revealed two preventive law models that have been developed specifically for educational applications.
McClung developed a preventive legal review procedure that is to be used prior to final policy adoption and implementation of new educational programs. The model includes the basic steps of anticipation of potential legal challenges, evaluation of the legal merits of possible challenges, consideration of the policy issues raised by anticipated legal challenges, and modification, as appropriate, of the proposed policy (8, pp. 39-40).

More recently, Zirkel developed the "Legal Audit Instrument for Public School Curriculum." This instrument was designed to assist educators in determining the probability of lawsuits and the compliance costs regarding curricular issues in seven major areas: bilingual education; special education; religious instruction; sex, health, and related education; achievement and psychological testing; teaching methods or coverage; and literary and instructional materials (12).

Even staff members at the Education Commission of the States (ECS), an organization founded upon preventive law goals, recognize that educators are not utilizing preventive approaches. Lines, the center's former director, stresses that preventive law is needed to limit the role of the courts in policy making in that the judiciary usually lacks expertise in the particular policy area and in that litigation is expensive and time-consuming. Lines believes that everyone has a role to play in the preventive approach—the
legal profession, the policymakers, the universities, and
the courts, but the practice of preventive law is difficult
because there is little research for guidance (7).

Bednar supports Lines' conclusion by stating that
preventive law concepts have immediate utility in many areas
of school practice. According to Bednar, "there is room for
original research on the forms preventive law analysis might
take in particular school law problem areas. . . . Very
little of our scholarly legal literature is being written
from an overtly preventive point of view (1, p. 13)."

The present study was significant in that it:
1. identified the amount of money that was spent by Texas
   school districts on legal costs during 1980-81, 1981-82
   and 1982-83;
2. uncovered effective practices that Texas public school
   districts utilize to prevent or reduce litigation;
3. determined how much Texas superintendents know about
   school law;
4. determined the relationship between a school district's
   legal costs and its preventive law practices;
5. determined the relationship between a school district's
   legal costs and the superintendent's knowledge of
   school law; and,
6. determined the relationship between a superintendent's
   knowledge of school law and the district's preventive
   law practices.
Assumptions

It was assumed that all superintendents received the survey and had the opportunity to respond. It was further assumed that the responses received on the survey instruments were the opinions held by the superintendents of the school districts, and that all superintendents responded honestly to the instruments used to determine legal costs and preventive law practices in Texas public school districts.

Definition of Terms

Legal Costs—The money a school district spends on the development of school board policies and administrative regulations; conferences, workshops, in-service sessions, journals, publications, and materials that relate to school law; liability insurance; attorney fees; and other related court costs.

Preventive Law—"A concentration on the minimization of future legal problems and on the maximization of future rights" (3, p. 6).

Preventive Law Practices—The formal policies, procedures, and other strategies and activities that school districts use to prevent or reduce legal costs.
Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to public school districts in the state of Texas as identified by the Texas Education Agency. No attempt was made to survey non-public schools, colleges, or universities. In addition, no attempt was made to survey all aspects of preventive law practices that could be utilized by a district. Instead, preventive law practices were limited to those areas delineated in the questionnaire.

Due to the fact that detailed financial information was requested, it was not feasible to collect information from nonrespondents. This type of information was not readily obtainable over the telephone and since the survey covered the entire state of Texas, individual interviews were impractical. Every effort was made, however, to solicit a good response rate.

A limited number of superintendents was able to respond to the second survey due to the nature of the survey. Only responses from superintendents who responded to the first survey and who were in attendance at the School Administrators' Advisory Conference on Education in Austin, Texas, or who were in attendance at other statewide meetings where there were appropriate opportunities to administer the survey directly to superintendents were included in the second component of the research project.
Case studies of three school districts were included in the study. These in-depth interviews allowed the researcher to follow up on leads and obtain greater depth and clarity. This adaptability gained by the interpersonal situation, however, could have resulted in subjectivity and possible bias due to response effects.

Procedures for Data Collection

The research approach consisted of three major activities. Two survey instruments were developed and disseminated, and the case study approach was utilized after data from the two surveys were received and analyzed.

The first major activity in the research project was the development of a survey instrument that was used to solicit information from superintendents of Texas public school districts regarding the amount of money spent by districts on legal costs and the types of preventive law practices that school districts employ to reduce such costs. After a review of the literature and after personal interviews with lawyers from the Texas Association of School Boards and lawyers from two Texas public school districts, a tentative draft of the survey instrument, *A Statewide Survey: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices*, was developed.

In order to validate the survey, a panel of twelve superintendents was selected from the Texas Public School District Refined ADA Groupings, an information booklet
published by the Texas Education Agency (10). These superintendents were asked to serve as panel members to evaluate the survey instrument as to its relevance to the study and in terms of its clarity. Revisions were made based on the panel's recommendations and the twenty-five item questionnaire was finalized (See Appendix, pp. 147-148).

The questionnaire was mailed to the superintendents of the 1,101 public school districts in Texas. The survey instrument was accompanied by a cover letter signed by the Director of the Legal Division of the Texas Association of School Boards and a professor of education law from North Texas State University (See Appendix, pp. 149-156). For convenience of reply, the survey was self-addressed and postage was provided.

The next major activity in the research project was the development of a second survey instrument. The instrument, Legal Awareness Questionnaire, was designed to assess Texas superintendents' knowledge of school law. It consisted of twenty true-false questions that related to Supreme Court and Texas court decisions that affect education (See Appendix, p. 158-159). The survey was patterned after surveys developed by Zirkel (11) and Menacker and Pascarella (9) and was designed after a thorough review of the book, A Texas Teacher's Guide to School Law (6).

Validation of the survey instrument was conducted by Kemerer, author of the previously-delineated book, and
lawyers from the Texas Association of School Boards. Each of the questions was checked for clarity and appropriateness. Revisions were made based on input that was received.

The third major activity focused on case studies of three Texas public school districts. The responses to the questions that related to preventive law practices on the survey instrument, A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices, were used to determine the three districts with the highest number of reported preventive strategies. Loosely-structured interview guides were developed and utilized during the interview process.

In addition to the three major activities previously delineated, the final component of the project will be the dissemination of the findings. This research project was sponsored by a grant from North Texas State University and was co-sponsored and supported by the Texas Association of School Boards. Professors, lawyers, and the researcher are in the process of planning and presenting sessions on preventive law as well as developing a monograph on the subject. The findings of the research project will be highlighted to board members, administrators, and school attorneys.

Procedures for Data Analysis

The survey instrument, A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices,
was designed to collect data regarding the legal costs of a district and the preventive practices of that district. The data were analyzed to compare each responding district’s legal costs with its preventive law practices. Legal costs, the continuous variable, was compared across groups according to the preventive law variables on the survey.

The survey consisted of two types of questions. In most instances, respondents checked all of the answers that apply. In some instances, the respondents checked one answer only. On questions that directed the respondent to check all that apply, legal costs were compared across groups for each of the responses—one group consisting of districts which have that practice and the other consisting of districts which do not. For those questions that asked the respondent to select one of a number of options, the legal costs were compared across groups consisting of districts that chose the same option. For simplicity, an analysis of variance procedure was used to test for significance in both cases.

The second survey instrument, Legal Awareness Questionnaire, was formulated to collect data regarding superintendents’ knowledge of school law. The instrument was administered to superintendents individually with instructions to avoid guessing. A score was calculated for each superintendent that responded. This score was the number answered correctly.
A superintendent's knowledge of school law was correlated with the district's legal costs from the first survey using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The relationship of the superintendent's knowledge of school law and the district's legal practices was analyzed using analysis of variance in the same manner, discussed above, that the legal costs were compared according to the responses from the first survey.

Interviews from the case studies were transcribed and evaluated. Data were analyzed for similarities and differences. This searching through the data brought about an iterative process where generalizations were posited.


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In preparation for this study, a review of the literature was conducted. The focus of the review was on two major areas that related to the study: educators' knowledge of school law and the role of the public school attorney.

Educators' Knowledge of School Law

Studies concerning educators' knowledge of school law were fairly limited, with the majority being dissertations. For purposes of this focus on preventive law, studies that related specifically to teachers' knowledge, studies that related only to administrators' knowledge, and combination studies were included in the review.

Teachers' Knowledge of School Law

A number of studies that focus on educators' knowledge of school law have been limited to teacher samples. Doerfler (8) and Methven (18) similarly found that elementary and secondary teachers have limited knowledge levels of school law. In a more recent study that consisted of 400 elementary teachers from 14 different school systems in Georgia, Bates (2) found that a high percentage of the sample did not have a thorough knowledge of their legal duties and liabilities in the areas of corporal punishment,
school records, supervision, negligence, minimum work week, field trip permission slips, foreseeability, and accidents. Age, sex, teaching experience, training in school law, grade level taught, degrees, and school district size and location weren't significant correlates with teachers' knowledge of duties and liabilities. Potter (23) also found that elementary teachers in Alabama were not knowledgeable of school law as evidenced by a mean score of 68.6 percent correct responses on a fifty-item school law test. Sex and experience were not found to be statistically significant correlates.

Ogletree and Garrett (21), however, found more encouraging results regarding the knowledge level of teachers in Illinois. The majority of the 125 Chicago area elementary and secondary school teachers surveyed to determine the extent of their knowledge of school law gave correct responses to most legal issues. Those teachers who had taken a school law course, however, had a higher percentage of correct responses than those who had not taken a school law course.

### Administrators' Knowledge of School Law

Studies sampling only administrators have not been frequent. Two studies that focused on administrators' knowledge of landmark court decisions revealed serious deficiencies. Kirsch (14) in a study of twenty randomly selected suburban high school principals found that only 55
percent were familiar with the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District*. Gascue (11) in a study of all Nevada high school administrators employed during the 1981-82 school year not only found a gap in school administrators' knowledge of *Goss v. Lopez*, but found that administrators relied upon the in loco parentis doctrine and local procedures instead of a knowledge of the law as it relates to due process for students.

Other studies that focused on administrators' knowledge levels of school law revealed similar results. Swikard (30) studied 202 high school principals to determine the personnel action they would take in response to 24 items which related to teachers' first amendment right of speech. Fewer than 10 percent of the principals in each of the three groups gave lawful responses to 80 percent or more of the items representing speech. In a national study, Stephens (27) found serious deficiencies in the legal knowledge possessed by principals. Less than 25 percent responded correctly to questions relating to teacher tenure, maternity leave, single-sex high schools, and English instruction for non-English-speaking students. It was also noted in the study that the respondents' overall scores had a significant inverse relationship with the recency of their school law training.
Several studies have been conducted to determine administrators' knowledge of federal legislation and regulations concerning handicapped students. Boyle (4) surveyed school site administrators in the San Diego Unified School District to determine if administrators were knowledgeable of Public Law 94-142 and if they supported it. The findings revealed that the majority of the administrators were not only knowledgeable but were able to identify the seven mandates of Public Law 94-142 and were supportive of it. Olson (22) investigated Virginia public secondary school principals' knowledge of and attitude toward Public Law 94-142 and the relationship of such to the provision of special education services at the building level. A mean score of only 14.18 was obtained on the 29-item instrument designed to assess knowledge, and a mean score of 70.82 out of 100 was obtained on the instrument used to assess attitude. Williams' (34) study in southern Illinois supported the conclusion that principals and other administrators have moderate levels of knowledge and attitude concerning the requirements of Public Law 94-142.

Researchers have found, however, that school officials have relatively high levels of knowledge regarding school prayer. In the study by Stephens (27), 88 percent of the respondents chose the correct response regarding the constitutionality of school prayer, and 64 percent chose the
correct response regarding the constitutionality of released
time programs.

Combination Studies of Knowledge of School Law

In a national sample of educators belonging to Phi
Delta Kappa, Zirkel (36) found that Kappans are not general-
ly knowledgeable of Supreme Court decisions affecting
educators in that the mean score of the respondents was 10.7
on a 20—item test. The mean score of administrators and
teachers as groups didn’t differ at a significant level, and
sex, age, affiliation, role, experience, and location were
not significant factors. As a result of Zirkel’s findings
and the contradictory fact that others felt that the Supreme
Court had taken away much of policy making ability at the
local level, Menacker and Pascarella (17) conducted a study
of teachers and administrators in inner—city and suburban
public schools in Chicago to determine their knowledge of
education—related Supreme Court rulings. Although their
findings did not totally support Zirkel’s position that
educators lack knowledge about important Supreme Court
decisions, the adjusted mean score of 64 percent correct for
all 299 respondents was disappointing.

The Role of the School Attorney

A second area of importance in this preventive law
study is an understanding of the role of the public school
attorney. How districts use an attorney compared and con-
trusted with how knowledgeable educators are of school law added a level of knowledge that was important in this study.

Extent and Frequency of Use of School Attorneys

Data from studies that addressed the use of attorneys by public school districts revealed that it is a common practice for a school district to employ outside counsel. Although the studies did not reflect uniform practices by school districts, research during the past three decades confirmed that a large number of school districts employed attorneys. In a 1960 study, Stover (29) found that a school attorney was employed by most of the Pennsylvania school districts that had chief school administrators. Ward (31), in a 1975 comprehensive study that encompassed all school districts in the state of Arkansas, concluded that the attorney was an integral part of the school organizational structure in almost all districts in Arkansas. Similarly, Corkill (6) in a 1976 study of the public school districts in Chicago found that 90 percent of the public school districts in Chicago suburbs employed a school attorney.

Other studies have focused on the frequency of use of attorneys in districts that employ them. A preliminary survey conducted by the American Association of School Administrators (28) revealed that only 24 percent of the districts use an attorney most or all of the time for special education cases, 20 percent never use an attorney in administrative hearings, and the remainder of the districts
use an attorney only in limited instances. Studies consistently revealed, however, that the size of the district is the key factor in determining whether or not a district utilized the services of an attorney. In an early study in Michigan, Roesch (26) found that larger school districts appeared to have a greater need for a school attorney than did smaller districts. In a study of two western states, Price (24) determined that larger districts were more likely to employ an attorney on a continuing basis. Similarly, Fessler (9) in a 1971 Missouri study found that smaller districts were more likely to employ an attorney on a one-time basis while larger districts employed an attorney on a retainer basis. Oebser's (20) study in the state of Washington confirmed previous research finding in that his study revealed that large districts administer in a more bureaucratic manner and tend to have a greater need for legal services.

Although studies revealed that a large number of districts employed and utilized attorneys, inconsistencies have been found regarding school district budgeting practices for legal services. In a research study by Wolfe (35), 61 percent of the superintendents in Illinois budgeted specifically for legal services while 82 percent of the districts expended for legal services. In a later study of thirty-two elementary school superintendents in the same state, Bultinck (5) found that school budgets for attorney fees had
been increased in that superintendents frequently used the services of an attorney to stay in compliance with state and federal mandates and court decisions. Mugge (19), however, reported in his findings that unit school district superintendents in Illinois were reluctant to suggest that a portion of a school district’s budget be allocated for legal services.

Similar to the relationship between use of attorney and size of district, there appeared to be a parallel relationship between size of district and amount of money spent on legal fees. Hines (12) found that the increased size of the district was related to the increased amount of money spent on legal fees by school boards. Fever (10) supported this position in his study in that he found that there was a definite relationship of size or location of school district to expenditure for legal fees.

Selection and Compensation of School Attorneys

Several studies have focused on the practices that are utilized by school districts in the selection and compensation of school attorneys. As evidenced by the findings of Davis (7), Jones (13), and White (33), research studies reflected that most attorneys are selected by the board and the superintendent working together. In White’s study (33), for example, it was found that the board and the superintendent selected the school attorney in 66 percent of the responding school districts in Texas.
In a nationwide study of selected school superintendents, Davis (7) found that more attorneys were employed by board resolution than by any other method. This finding was confirmed by Corkill (6) in his study of school attorneys in the public school districts in Chicago suburbs. This employment practice was consistent with the preferences of many attorneys. In White’s study (33), the Board of Directors of the Texas Council of School Attorneys which represented more than 100 legal firms that engaged in school law practice, developed a model that conceptualized the ideal role of the school attorney. In that model, it was clearly delineated that attorneys wanted to be employed through board action in the form of a resolution.

According to the research, an important consideration in the selection of a school attorney is knowledge of school law. Roesch (26) ascertained that knowledge of school law was the most important consideration in the selection of the school attorney and cost was the second most important consideration. Wolfe (35) in his study of public school districts in Illinois also determined that knowledge of school law was the most important consideration. Although school attorneys have generally not been prepared by their law schools for school law practice and have had to rely on independent study and experience as the major factors for gaining expertise in school law, research studies showed that school attorneys were generally perceived to be
knowledgeable of school law. In the nationwide study by Davis (7), a majority of the boards of education and superintendents rated their attorneys as having excellent knowledge of school law. White (33) confirmed this finding in his study of school attorneys in Texas in that only 3 percent of the respondents felt their attorneys were not knowledgeable in school law.

Compensation has been another focus of many studies. Until the early part of the 1970s, the majority of school districts favored the retainer method for compensating school attorneys. However, Lupato (16) in a study of public school attorneys in Indiana, revealed that the hourly method was emerging as the preferred method of compensation. Rissmann (25) in a study of Minnesota school attorneys confirmed Lupato's findings in that she found that an hourly fee basis was the most frequent method of payment for school attorneys. There appeared to be a great deal of variation among school districts in the fees paid to school attorneys. White (33) found that no trend emerged in Texas school districts that might establish a normal percentage basis that school districts could refer to in compensating attorneys for a bond issue or for determining a standard hourly rate for civil rights cases.

**Scope of Services**

Several studies have focused on the services that are provided by school attorneys and the amount of time that
attorneys spend in school-related matters. Lupato (16) in his study of all public schools in Indiana determined that 10.3 hours per month was the average amount of time spent by a school attorney on legal affairs. Jones (13), in a study of Mississippi school attorneys, determined that school attorneys only spent about 25 percent of their time on school-related matters. The amount of time that attorneys spent on school matters changed dramatically if the attorney was required to attend school board meetings. In the Indiana study, Lupato (16) found that the majority of school attorneys were required to attend all board meetings. White (33), however, found that such a practice is common for large school districts only in Texas. Price (24) and Oebser (20) found that most attorneys attended board meetings only upon request. The school attorneys in the study by Davis (7) couldn’t agree on which school board meetings to attend, but the attorneys in White’s study (33) revealed that the ideal practice was for school attorneys to attend only board meetings in which legal matters are discussed.

The services that school attorneys provided are quite numerous. In a Michigan study, Roesch (26) found that most attorneys either couldn’t provide full services on all school problems or chose not to do so. The studies by Stover (29), Price (24), and Davis (7) revealed that attorneys do not become involved in educational matters. Corkill (6) found that there was little evidence that the school
attorney was trying to impact the educational scene by exerting extra-legal influence upon boards. In a Wyoming study, Davis (7) found that most attorneys voiced opinions only on those matters referred to them. Superintendents appear to concur with such a philosophy as evidenced by the fact that 89 percent of the superintendents surveyed by White (33) felt that the role of the attorney was to be a consultant to the board only on those matters referred to the attorney.

The most frequent service rendered by school attorneys was the provision of legal counsel. Knighton (15) summarized the role of the attorney by stating that effective school attorneys provided prompt legal services, were knowledgeable of the law as it related to education, and understood the community in which the district was located. Bednar (3) further defined the attorney’s role by stating that the attorney should play a major role in providing preventive legal planning. This preventive planning would include control of costs, discouragement of litigation, and assurance of a good defense if a lawsuit is filed.

**Working Relationships Between Attorneys and School Districts**

Studies that focused on the working relationships between the school attorney and the school district indicated that the relationship between superintendents, boards of education, and attorneys was generally perceived to be
satisfactory to all concerned (6,9,13,31). Most attorneys received direction from the superintendent and board acting together. This practice seemed to be acceptable to all parties involved. As an example, Price (24) surveyed all superintendents and school attorneys in Colorado and New Mexico. In both states, superintendents and attorneys agreed that direction for the attorney should come from the superintendent and board acting together. Similarly, in the Davis study (7), it was found that school attorneys received their direction from the superintendent and board of education acting together.

This good working relationship between the school attorney and the school district was especially significant in that most studies revealed that the attorney's functions were either not defined or were poorly defined (1,6,16). As an example, Rissmann (25) in her study of Minnesota school attorneys found that the majority of the districts did not have written policies for their employed attorneys and that the description of the school attorney's functions was not done at all in the majority of the districts with enrollments less than 400 and was vaguely defined in others. Corkill (6) concluded that a need existed to develop specificity in the employment arrangements. Fessler (9) found that verbal agreements were generally used rather than written agreements between the attorneys and school districts. However, attorneys in the Texas study by White (33)
indicated that the duties and responsibilities of attorneys should be clearly defined by board policy. In a study by Wells (32), failure of Michigan school officials to delineate procedures regarding attorneys had created difficulties in some school districts' attorney-board-superintendent relationships.

Summary

The research concerning educators' knowledge of school law consistently revealed that educators have serious deficits in their legal knowledge of school-related issues. Demographic factors such as sex, age, experience, and location were not found to be significantly related to the level of legal knowledge.

Although the studies concerning the school attorney's role in public education were limited in number, there was consistency in many of the findings. School districts normally employ at least one attorney on a regular basis. The frequency of use appeared to be largely a matter of the size of the district. Most attorneys were recommended, employed, and received direction from the board and the superintendent acting together. A major consideration in the selection of an attorney was the attorney's knowledge of school law. Legal counsel was the major service provided by attorneys and attorneys did not generally become involved in matters that were strictly educational in nature. Finally, there appeared to be a satisfactory relationship between the
superintendent, board members, and the attorney even though
most school districts did not formally delineate the
functions and duties of the school attorney.
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The purpose of this chapter is to describe the procedures employed in gathering and analyzing the data regarding the amount of money Texas public school districts spent on legal costs, the types of preventive law practices that districts utilized to prevent or reduce litigation, and the amount of legal knowledge possessed by superintendents. Although a quantitative research approach was primarily used in the study, qualitative research was also included in order to add an additional dimension to the study. Direct quotations from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts about preventive law practices were considered to be important to the researcher as this qualitative data would add depth and detail to the study.

The rationale for including qualitative data can further be understood by the following parable. It seems there was a man who lived in a country that had no fruit. The man was a scholar and one who spent a great amount of time reading. Often in his reading, the man came across references to fruit. The scholar became so inquisitive about what fruit was like that he set out for a country that had fruit. Upon arriving in the country, the man received
directions to an apple orchard. It was springtime and the apple trees were in bloom. The man approached an apple tree, removed a blossom, and tasted it. He didn't like the taste or texture of the flower, so he went to several other trees and sampled their blossoms. Finally, he left the orchard and returned home only to report to his friends that fruit was an over-rated food. Being unable to recognize the difference between the blossom and the fruit, "the scholar never realized that he had not experienced what he was looking for (4, p. 21)."

It is the concern for recognizing the difference between the "blossom and the fruit" that resulted in the researcher expanding the study to include both qualitative and quantitative research. The selection of the population for the study, the development of the instruments, and the procedures for the collection and analysis of data are described in this chapter.

Selection of Population for Study

The Texas Education Agency reported a total of 1,101 public school districts in the state of Texas as of August, 1983 (5). For reporting purposes, that agency divided the districts into twelve groups based upon the refined average daily attendance (ADA) of each district. The twelve groupings and the number and percent of school districts assigned to each group are presented in Table I.
TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF TEXAS DISTRICTS BY GROUPS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number of Districts</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,500 - 4,999</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000 - 1,499</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>300 - 499</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200 - 299</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>100 - 199</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50 - 99</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25 - 49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24 or less</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Superintendents from every district in the twelve groups were encouraged to participate in the study. It was determined that a good response rate from districts in each of the groups was important to the study.

Development of the Instruments

For the purposes of this study, it was necessary to develop two survey instruments and a set of interview guides. A separate review of each of the instruments and the interview guides is included.
Development of Survey Instrument #1

In order to solicit information from superintendents of Texas public school districts, the first instrument, A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices, was designed to answer the following questions:

1. How much money did Texas public school districts spend on legal costs during school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83?

2. What are Texas public school districts doing to prevent or reduce litigation?

3. Is there a relationship between a school district's legal costs and its preventive law practices?

Items on the questionnaire were determined after a review of the literature and following personal interviews with several lawyers from public school districts and from the Texas Association of School Boards. A panel of twelve superintendents was selected to validate the instrument. Each panel member was sent a copy of the proposed questions and was asked to evaluate each question in terms of its relevance to the study and its clarity (See Appendix, pp. 147-148). Eight of the twelve superintendents, 67 percent, responded. Based on the panel's recommendation, revisions were made and the final questionnaire was printed (See Appendix, pp. 151-156).
The survey instrument was divided into two major sections. The first section consisted of a series of questions that related to a school district’s preventive law practices regarding legal counsel, school board policies, administrative regulations, school law changes, and legal liability insurance. Respondents were asked to answer the questions by checking the appropriate spaces. The second component of the survey addressed the cumulative legal costs of a school district for school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83. District personnel were asked to delineate the amount of money expended during the three-year time span for legal liability insurance, attorney fees and other related court costs. In addition, respondents were asked to identify the type and the amount of the attorney’s contractual fee arrangement and were asked to describe the amount of money spent on various legal costs by using a scale of 1 to 7.

Development of Survey Instrument #2

The second instrument, Legal Awareness Questionnaire, was designed to solicit information on how much Texas public school superintendents know about school law. This instrument consisted of twenty true-false questions that related to Supreme Court and Texas court decisions that affect education. The questionnaire was patterned after surveys developed by Zirkel (6) and Menacker and Pascarella (3). These two surveys tested educators awareness of Supreme Court decisions. In addition, questions for the survey were

In order to validate the survey, Kemerer, author of the previously-delineated book, and attorneys from the Texas Association of School Boards reviewed each question to check for clarity and appropriateness of statements. Revisions were made based on the input that was received and the final instrument was printed (See Appendix, pp. 158-159).

The two instruments together were designed to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between a school district's legal costs and the superintendent's knowledge of school law?

2. Is there a relationship between the superintendent's knowledge of school law and the district's preventive law practices?

**Development of the Interview Guides**

In this component of the study, qualitative research was utilized. Qualitative research is descriptive in that data collection is in the form of words rather than numbers. The data include interview transcripts and field notes. The researcher is concerned with the participant's perspectives.

In order to collect additional information regarding school districts' preventive law activities, three separate interview guides were developed. The guides were designed to be used with the superintendent, the board president, and
the school attorney of selected districts. Each interview
guide consisted of a list of questions that was used to
bring focus to the conversations. The interview guides were
used as a framework that assisted the researcher in deter-
mining which questions to ask and which information to
pursue in greater depth.

A list of questions was identified that would allow the
researcher to explore and probe in order to gain more infor-
mation about the subject. Because each research subject
would be interviewed only once, fairly standard open-ended
questions were used in that the questions were written out
in advance. The interviewer was, however, free to pursue any
other direction and had the flexibility to explore subjects
in greater depth when needed.

The questions were designed to gain additional informa-
tion about a district’s preventive law practices. The
manner in which the school attorney was utilized, the proc-
ess for developing board policies and administrative
regulations, and the methods used to keep staff members
informed of legal information were of major importance to
the interviewer.

Procedures for Collection of Data

Collection of Data: Survey Instrument #1

The survey instrument, A Statewide Study: Texas Public
School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices,
was mailed to all 1,101 public school districts in Texas.
Each questionnaire was addressed to the superintendent of schools. The survey was accompanied by a cover letter that was signed by the Director of Legal Division of the Texas Association of School Boards and a professor of education law and administration from North Texas University (See Appendix, pp. 149-156). The cover letter informed the superintendents of the purpose of the study and the importance of their participation. Superintendents were encouraged to complete the survey and return it immediately.

After the initial mail-out, an additional letter was sent to all superintendents who had not responded (See Appendix, p. 150). After an analysis of the response rate of superintendents from each of the twelve ADA groupings previously identified, personal contacts were made to further encourage superintendents to participate in the study. Five hundred forty-two responses were received that were complete enough to be used in the study. This provided a 49 percent return.

Collection of Data: Survey Instrument #2

Only superintendents who responded to the first survey were invited to participate in the second component. The 541 superintendents who completed the survey, A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices, were notified in writing that there was a need for additional assistance from all superintendents who had participated in the initial survey.
Superintendents were informed that the second component consisted of a survey instrument that contained only twenty items. Due to the nature of the instrument, however, the instrument would have to be individually administered to each participant. Specific dates that the instrument would be administered were determined, and additional options were given so that the superintendents had the flexibility to arrange a more convenient time (See Appendix, p. 157). Several meetings were arranged in order to accommodate the superintendent's schedules. A total of seventy-two superintendents responded to both survey instruments.

Collection of Data: Case Studies

Three school districts were selected as case study sites. In order to determine the three districts, information from the survey instrument, A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices, was used. The responses to questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 21 were analyzed and the three districts with the most preventive law practices as determined by the response to the previously-delineated questions were selected.

The selected school districts represented three different ADA groups. School District A was from the 1,500-4,999 ADA grouping, School District B was from the 50,000+ ADA grouping, and School District C was from the 10,000-49,000 ADA grouping. The researcher traveled to each of the
three sites to do fieldwork and met with available research subjects including the superintendent, the board president, and the school attorney. The interview process was utilized as the dominant strategy for data collection.

The researcher spent a minimum of one hour with each of the available research subjects. During the interview process, an interview guide was used in order to provide the framework needed to explore, within the limited amount of available time, the areas of legal counsel, school board policy development, administrative regulation development, and school law changes. This process did not limit the interviewer from exploring other relevant topics and from collecting data on unexpected dimensions. A tape recorder was used during the fieldwork stage.

After each interview was completed, the interviewer reflected on the specific aspects of the interview. Questions that were asked were further assessed for relevancy and were reformulated as appropriate. As the researcher generated ideas from the interviews, the researcher recorded additional thoughts and feelings that surfaced and included these thoughts in the field notes in the form of observer comments.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

Research Questions

Research questions 1 and 2, regarding the school districts' legal costs and preventive practices, were analyzed
by tabulating the results of survey instrument #1 showing
the responses to each question broken down by ADA grouping.
Only question 21, because of its complexity, was tabulated
without showing the ADA breakdown.

Research question 3, regarding the superintendents'
knowledge of school law, was analyzed by reporting the
distribution of scores on survey instrument #2. Research
questions 4 and 6 were analyzed using two-way analysis of
variance. With both question 4 and 6, the two independent
variables were the responses to the questions on survey
instrument #1 and ADA grouping. With question 4, two analy-
yses were performed. In the first analysis, the dependent
variable was the district’s total legal costs for 1982-83.
In the second analysis, the dependent variable was the
district’s total legal costs for the three year period,
1980-81 to 1982-83.

Research question 5 was analyzed using the Pearson
Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. Two relationships
were examined: first, the relationship between legal costs
for 1982-83 and the superintendent’s score on survey instru-
ment #2; second, the relationship between legal costs for
the three year period, 1980-81 to 1982-83, and the superin-
tendent’s score on survey instrument #2.

Case Studies

After the fieldwork was completed, the researcher
transcribed all interviews that were conducted in each of
the districts. This descriptive process included a reconstruction of the dialogues between the interviewer and the research subjects (See sample in Appendix, pp. 160-167).

After the interview transcripts were transcribed and checked for completeness and accuracy, data analysis was conducted. The process utilized was patterned after the procedures developed by Bogdan and Biklen (1). Each of the interviews was read a minimum of two times. During that process, the key themes were identified by the researcher, and a preliminary list of coding categories was developed. Each preliminary code was assigned a number, the data were reread, and final coding category numbers were assigned to units of data.

Copies of the coded transcripts were made and each page was further coded in order to identify the school district, the person being interviewed, and the page number of the interview. The coding process for this component was as follows:

- A-S-1 (School District A - Superintendent - Page 1)
- A-BP-1 (School District A - Board President - Page 1)
- B-S-1 (School District B - Superintendent - Page 1)
- B-A-1 (School District B - Attorney - Page 1)
- B-BP-1 (School District B - Board President - Page 1)
- C-S-1 (School District C - Superintendent - Page 1)
- C-A-1 (School District C - Attorney - Page 1)
After proper coding, the interview transcripts were cut apart and similar units of data were placed in folders. Each folder of data was analyzed, and similarities and differences in the responses of the research subjects from the three groups were noted.

An inductive analysis of data was completed. The researcher did not search out data to prove or disprove hypotheses held before entering the study. Instead, theory developed from the bottom up from the disparate pieces of data that were collected and found to be interconnected.

Summary

This chapter has described the procedures followed in fulfilling the purposes of the study. The selection of the population, the development of the two instruments and the three interview guides, the procedures for collection of the data, and the procedures for analysis of the data were discussed.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter describes the results of the survey that was designed to ascertain the amount of legal costs of Texas public school districts and the types of preventive law strategies utilized by Texas public school administrators, the results of the legal awareness questionnaire that was utilized to determine the amount of legal knowledge possessed by superintendents of Texas public school districts, and data from the case studies of three Texas public school districts. The responses to the questionnaires were tabulated and analyzed, and the data from the case studies were evaluated.

For purposes of reporting, the 542 responding school districts from the twelve ADA groups identified by the Texas Education Agency were regrouped into six ADA groups. The four largest ADA groups were left as previously delineated (50,000+; 10,000-49,999; 5,000-9,999; and 1,500-4,999), and 1,000-1,499 and the 500-999 groups were combined into one group, and all school districts with less than 500 ADA were combined to form one group. The numbers and percent of districts in each of the six ADA groups that responded to the survey are presented in Table II.
TABLE II
RESPONSE OF DISTRICTS BY ADA GROUPING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33/53</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19/34</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131/215</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160/304</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195/490</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542/1,101</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ethnic make-up of the districts that participated in the survey is presented in Table III.

TABLE III
ETHNIC MAKE-UP OF STUDENT POPULATION AS PERCENT OF ENROLLMENT PER CATEGORY (N = 542)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>29.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>25.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six research questions were addressed in the study. The first three questions focused on legal costs of school districts, preventive law practices used by districts, and superintendents' knowledge of school law. The remaining questions focused on the relationships between legal costs and preventive law practices, legal costs and
superintendents' knowledge of school law, and superintendents' knowledge of school law and preventive law practices. The results of each of the six research questions are presented in detail.

Legal Costs of School Districts

The following three items from the questionnaire, *A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Activities*, related to the first research question, How much did Texas public school districts spend on legal costs during school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83?

1) What is the total amount of money that your district has paid for legal liability insurance during the three school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83?

2) What is the total amount of money that your district has paid for attorney fees during the three school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83?

3) In addition to liability insurance costs and attorney fees, what is the total amount of money that your district has spent on related legal costs such as settlements, court costs, etc., during the three school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83?

The amount of money paid for legal liability insurance by the responding districts during the three school years is reported in Table IV. With the exception of the 10,000-49,999 ADA group in the school years 1980-81 and 1982-83,
the larger the district, the more the district paid for legal liability insurance.

TABLE IV

MONEY SPENT FOR LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FROM 1980-81 TO 1982-83 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>2915.51</td>
<td>4528.60</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>3142.26</td>
<td>7659.66</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>2667.00</td>
<td>17,418.18</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>843.85</td>
<td>1525.90</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>502.85</td>
<td>746.38</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1436.09</td>
<td>8985.20</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1981-82 school year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>3514.06</td>
<td>4568.38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>3097.10</td>
<td>5740.68</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>1325.26</td>
<td>1500.47</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>933.16</td>
<td>1709.35</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>528.16</td>
<td>1185.16</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1182.13</td>
<td>2768.63</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1982-83 school year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>19,037.50</td>
<td>18,174.31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>3859.45</td>
<td>4793.86</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>4577.78</td>
<td>10,208.25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>1634.86</td>
<td>2732.19</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>1032.48</td>
<td>2005.92</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>636.87</td>
<td>1342.70</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1465.02</td>
<td>3682.88</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The amount of money paid for attorney fees during the three school years is summarized in Table V. As evidenced by these data, the larger the school district, the more
money spent on attorney fees. The average attorney fees for school years 1980-81 and 1981-82 remained fairly constant, but the total averages for school year 1982-83 increased dramatically due to the increase in the amount spent for attorney fees by school districts with 1,500-4,999 ADA.

**TABLE V**

MONEY SPENT FOR ATTORNEY FEES FROM 1980-81 TO 1982-83 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1980-81 school year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>$242,276.50</td>
<td>$222,234.02</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>46,286.84</td>
<td>55,570.21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>17,619.84</td>
<td>26,069.77</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>4975.85</td>
<td>10933.70</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>927.75</td>
<td>1963.25</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>691.29</td>
<td>2593.29</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6949.13</td>
<td>32,327.06</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1981-82 school year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>248,178.75</td>
<td>132,571.28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>48,243.18</td>
<td>56,791.68</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>15,179.31</td>
<td>19,496.12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>4301.97</td>
<td>6465.52</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>1210.26</td>
<td>2793.53</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>750.21</td>
<td>2223.88</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6967.97</td>
<td>29,612.66</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1982-83 school year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>230,300.00</td>
<td>136,409.04</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>48,684.93</td>
<td>50,784.01</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>16,166.21</td>
<td>22,647.10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>13,018.61</td>
<td>78,757.83</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>1794.86</td>
<td>4315.10</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>897.33</td>
<td>2474.22</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9229.81</td>
<td>47,684.50</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Related legal costs for the three years are reported in Table VI. It is of interest that no funds were reported expended during the 1980-81 school year by the largest districts (50,000 or more), but the same districts reported more than $100,000 in related legal costs during the following two year time span.

Table VI

LEGAL COSTS OTHER THAN LIABILITY INSURANCE AND ATTORNEY FEES FROM 1980-81 TO 1982-83
BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of District</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>14,796.30</td>
<td>57,499.48</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>631.57</td>
<td>2139.84</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>2820.00</td>
<td>24,132.44</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>385.88</td>
<td>2620.85</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>77.14</td>
<td>546.24</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1746.28</td>
<td>18,710.04</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82 school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>122,896.25</td>
<td>216,832.66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>16,022.63</td>
<td>56,073.62</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>1189.73</td>
<td>2735.36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>928.19</td>
<td>4625.02</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>103.43</td>
<td>540.14</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>175.24</td>
<td>1619.88</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2242.52</td>
<td>24,273.14</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83 school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>128,390.25</td>
<td>243,629.66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>8722.48</td>
<td>18,291.41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>6848.26</td>
<td>15,633.53</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>1279.14</td>
<td>4785.26</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>390.11</td>
<td>2086.63</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>321.65</td>
<td>2432.05</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2258.65</td>
<td>22,123.62</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The composite legal costs for each of the ADA groups were determined for each of the three school years. Legal costs for school year 1980-81 are reported in Table VII.

**TABLE VII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>$252,276.50</td>
<td>$211,014.82</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>63,998.67</td>
<td>71,827.20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>21,393.66</td>
<td>29,420.22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>10,462.36</td>
<td>46,747.43</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>2,157.49</td>
<td>4,466.69</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>1,271.29</td>
<td>2,810.89</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,131.51</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,152.12</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VIII reports the composite legal costs for the 1981-82 school year.

**TABLE VIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>$381,075.00</td>
<td>$305,886.40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>67,779.88</td>
<td>90,851.83</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19,466.16</td>
<td>23,165.99</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>6,555.44</td>
<td>8,815.09</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>2,246.87</td>
<td>3,459.46</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>1,454.62</td>
<td>3,486.06</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,392.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,577.44</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the total population mean for the six groups for the 1981-82 school year closely paralleled the total
population mean for the 1980-81 school year, legal costs for the 50,000 or more ADA group increased substantially in 1981-82 while the legal costs for the 1,500-4,999 ADA group decreased dramatically in 1981-82.

The composite legal costs for the 1982-83 school year are reported in Table IX. The 1,500-4,999 and the 5,000-9,999 ADA groups reported increases in legal costs of 143.0 per cent and 41.7 percent, respectively, as compared to the previous school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADA Grouping</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>61,266.88</td>
<td>56,148.39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>27,590.21</td>
<td>33,617.39</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>15,932.62</td>
<td>79,109.24</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>3,217.47</td>
<td>5,405.45</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>1,855.86</td>
<td>4,137.02</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$47,862.45</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The composite legal costs for the three year span of time are reported in Table X. The larger the district, the greater the amount of money spent on legal costs. As Table X shows, the range of legal costs was from just over $4,500 for districts with less than 500 ADA to over $1,000,000 for districts with 50,000 or more ADA.
TABLE X

COMPOSITE LEGAL COSTS FOR 1980-83 SCHOOL YEARS
BY ADA GROUPING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>193,045.42</td>
<td>184,762.88</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>68,450.05</td>
<td>78,189.45</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>32,950.92</td>
<td>95,847.88</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>7,621.83</td>
<td>10,675.39</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>4,581.77</td>
<td>8,126.86</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,477.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,054.81</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the three questions that requested specific dollar amounts spent on legal costs, superintendents were asked to use a scale of 1-7 to identify the amount of money the district spent on various types of legal costs. Responding districts reported spending the most money on legal liability insurance and the development of school board policies. Table L (See Appendix, pp. 168-171) summarizes those responses.

The final question that was asked that related to legal costs was one which directed responding districts to identify the type of contractual fee arrangement that the district had with the attorney. Tabulation of the responses to this question is presented in Table XI. The summary in Table XI confirms that the majority of the districts use the hourly method, over retainer, as the favored compensation procedure.
### Table XI

**Contractual Fee Arrangement with Attorney by Size of District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Arrangement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retainer only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retainer plus additional charges (by the case)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By the hour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preventive Law Practices Used by Districts

Research question two, What are Texas public school districts doing to prevent or reduce litigation?, was addressed through twenty questions that were included on the survey instrument, *A Statewide Study: Texas Public School*
District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Activities, and was further verified from information collected from the three case studies. Five major categories of questions were asked that related to preventive law practices including questions about legal counsel, school board policies, administrative regulations, school law changes, and legal liability insurance.

**Legal Counsel**

The following five questions related specifically to the area of legal counsel and were included on the survey instrument, *A Statewide Study: Texas Public School Districts Legal Costs and Preventive Law Activities.*

1) What type of legal service does your district use?
2) Which of the following is your district's primary source for legal services?
3) How knowledgeable in your view is the primary source identified in question #2 regarding school law?
4) Who has authority to contact the attorney when services are needed?
5) How often does the school attorney attend school board meetings?

The first question regarding the type of legal service used directed respondents to check all answers that applied. The two types of legal services most commonly used by districts from all six ADA groups were the TASB attorney and the local attorney.
The data from Table XII reflect that almost 90 percent of the responding districts reported using the service of attorneys from the Texas Association of School Boards. More than 70 percent indicated that the district used a local attorney. Thus, many districts used the services of both.

TABLE XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TASB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XII—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education service center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The larger the district, the more likely it was for the district to use a local attorney. All responding districts in the ADA groups of 5,000–9,999 and larger reported using a local attorney.

The second question regarding the type of legal service used was more specific in that it directed respondents to identify the district’s primary source for legal services. Table XIII summarizes the responses to this question.
### TABLE XIII

**DISTRICT'S PRIMARY SOURCE FOR LEGAL SERVICES**  
**BY SIZE OF DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Source</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education service center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Source</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Selecting</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data in Table XIII, 48 percent of the responding districts used a local attorney as their primary source for legal services. The second most common source of legal services was the TASB attorney. The majority of the larger districts used a local attorney as their primary source for legal services. More districts from the two smallest ADA groups tended to rely on the TASB attorney as the primary source. All districts of 1,500 ADA and larger reported having a primary source for legal services, but 2 percent of the districts from the two smallest ADA categories reported having no primary source.

Once a district identified its primary legal source, the superintendent was asked to determine whether the school
attorney was very knowledgeable of school law, fairly knowledgeable of school law, or not knowledgeable at all. The responses are summarized in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

HOW KNOWLEDGEABLE OF SCHOOL LAW THE DISTRICT'S PRIMARY LEGAL SOURCE WAS REGARDED BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than 95 percent of the responding districts indicated that the attorney was either very knowledgeable or fairly knowledgeable of school law as evidenced by the data represented in Table XIV. The majority of the responding districts in every ADA group except the 50,000 or more category perceived the attorney to be very knowledgeable of school law.

Table XV reports the responses to the question of who had the authority to contact the school attorney.

TABLE XV

DISTRICT PERSONNEL WHO HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE ATTORNEY WHEN SERVICES WERE NEEDED BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board President</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Selecting</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Superintendent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Central Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked who had authority to contact the attorney, 99 percent of the responding districts indicated that the superintendent had that authority. Board presidents were the next most common group to have such authority. Teachers from districts with 1,500 students or more were not allowed to contact the attorney, but 1 percent of the districts with less than 1,500 students allowed their teachers that privilege.

The final question regarding legal counsel was designed to determine how often the attorney attended school board meetings. Table XVI summarizes the responses.

### TABLE XV—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XVI
HOW OFTEN DISTRICT ATTORNEY ATTENDED SCHOOL BOARD MEETINGS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attends all meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attends meetings that pertain to legal matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attends no meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other arrangements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XVI indicates that the majority of the attorneys either attended only meetings that pertained to legal matters or attended no meetings. Attorneys from the largest ADA groups either attended all meetings or meetings that pertained to legal matters. Attorneys from the smallest groups either attended meetings that pertained to legal matters or attended no meetings.

**School Board Policies**

The second preventive area of concern was that of school board policies. The following questions were included on the survey instrument, *A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices*.

1) How were your school district’s policies developed?
2) Were the policies reviewed by an attorney?
3) Are the policies updated and reviewed by an attorney?
4) How are policies disseminated to staff members?
5) Who has a copy of the Policy Book?

The first question directed respondents to identify how district policies were developed. Almost 85 percent of the responding districts indicated that policies were developed based on the use of the IASB Policy Reference Manual. This was a popular process that was used by districts in each of the six ADA groups. Table XVII summarizes the data.
### TABLE XVII

**HOW SCHOOL DISTRICT'S POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED BY SIZE OF DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee of the board</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central administrators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASB policy reference manual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As evidenced in Table XVII, the larger districts tended to rely on central administrators, the school attorney, and the TASB Policy Reference Manual for the development of school board policies, whereas smaller districts relied more on the TASB Policy Reference Manual and central administrators.

Table XVIII confirms that the majority of the responding districts indicated that policies were reviewed by an
Twenty-three percent of the responding districts reported that they did not use an attorney to review their policies. Table XIX shows that an additional 2 percent of
the districts reported not having policies updated and periodically reviewed by an attorney.

TABLE XIX

WHETHER OR NOT THE POLICIES WERE UPDATED AND PERIODICALLY REVIEWED BY AN ATTORNEY BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, by local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, by TASB attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once policies were developed, districts were asked to identify how the policies were disseminated to staff members. The most common way, as seen in Table XX, was to send the written policy to staff members.
## TABLE XX

**HOW POLICIES WERE DISSEMINATED TO STAFF MEMBERS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orally</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In writing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-service programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All districts except those with 5,000-9,999 ADA used in-service programs as the second most favored way to disseminate policies. The 5,000-9,999 ADA group reported that staff members received policy information orally.

Almost 94 percent of the districts provided central office staff members with a copy of the policy book. Principals were the second group who most often were given copies of the book, followed by board members. Table XXI shows that every responding district that had 5,000 ADA or more provided board members, central office staff members, and principals with a copy of the policy book.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXI--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Teachers**     |    |           |         |
| 50,000 or more   | 4  | 0         | 0.0     |
| 10,000 to 49,999 | 33 | 7         | 21.2    |
| 5000 to 9999     | 19 | 1         | 5.3     |
| 1500 to 4999     | 131| 14        | 10.7    |
| 500 to 1499      | 160| 27        | 16.9    |
| Less than 500    | 195| 48        | 24.6    |
| **Total**        | 542| 97        | 17.9    |

| **Aides**        |    |           |         |
| 50,000 or more   | 4  | 0         | 0.0     |
| 10,000 to 49,999 | 33 | 2         | 6.1     |
| 5000 to 9999     | 19 | 1         | 5.3     |
| 1500 to 4999     | 131| 5         | 3.8     |
| 500 to 1499      | 160| 13        | 8.1     |
| Less than 500    | 195| 17        | 8.7     |
| **Total**        | 542| 38        | 7.0     |

| **Others**       |    |           |         |
| 50,000 or more   | 4  | 2         | 50.0    |
| 10,000 to 49,999 | 33 | 9         | 27.3    |
| 5000 to 9999     | 19 | 6         | 31.6    |
| 1500 to 4999     | 131| 45        | 34.4    |
| 500 to 1499      | 160| 33        | 20.6    |
| Less than 500    | 195| 24        | 12.3    |
| **Total**        | 542| 119       | 22.0    |

**Administrative Regulations**

In addition to the questions about board policies, four similar questions about administrative regulations were

1) In addition to formal school board policies, do you have a written set of administrative regulations?

2) If yes, how were your school district’s administrative regulations developed?

3) Were the administrative regulations reviewed by an attorney?

4) Are the administrative regulations updated and periodically reviewed by an attorney?

Table XXII gives responses to the first question.

**TABLE XXII**

WHETHER OR NOT THE DISTRICT HAD A WRITTEN SET OF ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No                        |     |           |         |
| 50,000 or more            | 4   | 0         | 0.0     |
| 10,000 to 49,999          | 33  | 3         | 9.1     |
| 5000 to 9999              | 19  | 4         | 21.1    |
| 1500 to 4999              | 131 | 60        | 45.5    |
| 500 to 1499               | 160 | 87        | 54.4    |
| Less than 500             | 195 | 109       | 55.9    |
| Total                     | 542 | 263       | 48.5    |
Slightly more of the responding districts did not have written administrative regulations than did. All of the largest districts had administrative regulations. The smaller the district, however, the less percent of districts with administrative regulations.

Of the districts that had administrative regulations, central administrators most frequently developed the regulations. Teachers, especially in the larger districts, were involved in developing administrative regulations in some of the districts as evidenced by Table XXIII.

### TABLE XXIII

**HOW DISTRICT'S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE DEVELOPED BY SIZE OF DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee of the board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Central administrators   |     |           |         |
| 50,000 or more           | 4   | 4         | 100.0   |
| 10,000 to 49,999         | 30  | 30        | 100.0   |
| 5000 to 9999             | 14  | 14        | 100.0   |
| 1500 to 4999             | 65  | 60        | 92.3    |
| 500 to 1499              | 67  | 61        | 91.0    |
| Less than 500            | 73  | 66        | 90.4    |
| Total                    | 253 | 235       | 92.9    |
Table XXIV presents a summary of the responses of districts with administrative regulations as to whether or not an attorney reviewed the regulations. Since this question
allowed multiple responses, the sum of the responses is greater than the sum of the respondents.

TABLE XXIV

WHETHER THE ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE REVIEWED BY AN ATTORNEY BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, by local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, by TASB attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly 20 percent of the districts that had administrative regulations had them reviewed by the local attorney. Within this group the tendency to use the local attorney
decreased consistently with size of the district. Over 24 percent had the regulations reviewed by the TASB attorney. Within this group, the proportions vary less with district size.

Table XXV summarizes the responses to the question of periodic updating and review of regulations by an attorney.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, by local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Yes, by TASB attorney        |     |           |         |
| 50,000 or more               | 4   | 1         | 25.0    |
| 10,000 to 49,999             | 30  | 3         | 10.0    |
| 5000 to 9999                 | 14  | 5         | 35.7    |
| 1500 to 4999                 | 65  | 16        | 24.6    |
| 500 to 1499                  | 67  | 19        | 28.4    |
| Less than 500                | 73  | 15        | 20.6    |
| Total                        | 253 | 59        | 23.3    |

| No                           |     |           |         |
| 50,000 or more               | 4   | 0         | 0.0     |
| 10,000 to 49,999             | 30  | 13        | 43.3    |
| 5000 to 9999                 | 14  | 6         | 42.9    |
| 1500 to 4999                 | 65  | 38        | 58.5    |
| 500 to 1499                  | 67  | 49        | 73.1    |
| Less than 500                | 73  | 54        | 74.0    |
| Total                        | 253 | 160       | 63.2    |
The pattern of the responses in Table XXV corresponds to the pattern found in Table XXIV. It is not surprising that districts not employing an attorney to review regulations when they were first developed would not use the attorney to review regulations when they were updated.

School Law Changes

The fourth area of concern was that of how staff members stay informed of school law changes. The following four questions were asked on the survey instrument, A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices.

1) How do you personally stay abreast of changes in school law?

2) How are administrators in your district kept informed of legal principles and changes in the law?

3) How are teachers kept informed of legal principles and changes in the law?

4) What legal sources does your district subscribe to?

Superintendents who responded to the survey reported that the two major ways they stay informed of changes in school law were by reading material and by attending conferences. Table XXVI summarizes the responses.
### TABLE XXVI
HOW RESPONDENTS STAYED ABREAST OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attend conferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading material</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School attorney</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Selecting</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-service programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No special effort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Districts from five ADA groups agreed that reading material and attending conferences were the two most common ways for the superintendent to stay informed. Superintendents from the 50,000+ ADA group all agreed that the two ways to stay informed were by reading material and by use of the school attorney.

Administrators, however, are kept informed of legal principles and changes in the law through staff meetings and
written communications as evidenced by the data from Table XXVII. These two more common methods were true for all six ADA groups; however, the 50,000+ ADA group also used in-service programs.

**TABLE XXVII**

**HOW ADMINISTRATORS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES AND CHANGES IN THE LAW BY SIZE OF DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When respondents were asked how teachers were kept informed of legal principles and changes in the law, in-service programs were identified as the technique used by most districts, and staff meetings were the second most common technique used. Table XXVIII summarizes these responses. Districts in the three largest ADA groupings relied more on written communications and staff meetings, but districts in the three smallest ADA groupings relied on in-service programs and staff meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No formal program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXVIII
HOW TEACHERS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES AND CHANGES IN THE LAW BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-service programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff meetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No formal program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE XXVIII -- Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District superintendents were asked to identify the legal sources that were subscribed to by the district. Table XXIX delineates the major legal sources that were available at the time of the study. The question was asked to determine whether districts actively subscribe to professional materials. Table XXIX confirms that more than 82 percent of the responding districts subscribed to at least one publication. The publication that had the largest rate of readership among the survey districts was Texas School Law News (82.5 percent), followed by Texas Register (35.2 percent), Education Daily (14.0 percent), NOLPE Publications (9.0 percent), and West's Education Law Reporter (3.9 percent). In addition 8.5 percent of the respondents reported subscribing to at least one other publication.

"Since the study was completed, other national and statewide legal publications have become available and may well alter the percentages reported from the 1984 survey."
### TABLE XXIX

**LEGAL SOURCES TO WHICH DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED BY SIZE OF DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Daily</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **NOLPE Publications** |    |           |         |
| 50,000 or more        | 4  | 2         | 50.0    |
| 10,000 to 49,999      | 33 | 9         | 27.3    |
| 5000 to 9999          | 19 | 7         | 36.8    |
| 1500 to 4999          | 131| 20        | 15.3    |
| 500 to 1499           | 160| 7         | 4.4     |
| Less than 500         | 195| 4         | 2.1     |
| **Total**             | 542| 49        | 9.0     |

| **Texas Register**    |    |           |         |
| 50,000 or more        | 4  | 2         | 50.0    |
| 10,000 to 49,999      | 33 | 17        | 51.5    |
| 5000 to 9999          | 19 | 10        | 52.6    |
| 1500 to 4999          | 131| 53        | 40.5    |
| 500 to 1499           | 160| 54        | 33.8    |
| Less than 500         | 195| 55        | 28.2    |
| **Total**             | 542| 191       | 35.2    |

| **Texas School Law News** |    |           |         |
| 50,000 or more         | 4  | 3         | 75.0    |
| 10,000 to 49,999       | 33 | 28        | 84.9    |
| 5000 to 9999           | 19 | 17        | 89.5    |
| 1500 to 4999           | 131| 120       | 91.6    |
| 500 to 1499            | 160| 141       | 88.1    |
| Less than 500          | 195| 138       | 70.8    |
| **Total**              | 542| 447       | 82.5    |
### Legal Liability Insurance

The final area of concern is that of legal liability insurance. Two questions were asked.

1. Does your district purchase legal liability insurance for anyone associated with the district?

2. For whom does the district provide legal liability insurance?

Almost 90 percent of the responding districts indicated that they purchased legal liability insurance for at least one person associated with the district. The percent of districts purchasing liability insurance for at least one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West's Education Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
employee of the district did not vary markedly with change in ADA grouping. Table XXX reports the results.

**TABLE XXX**

WHETHER THE SCHOOL DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR ANYONE ASSOCIATED WITH THE DISTRICT BY SIZE OF DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final question directed respondents to identify the personnel for whom legal liability insurance was provided. As evidenced by the data in Table XXXI, board members were most commonly covered followed by superintendents and principals. More than 63 percent of the districts reported covering all staff members. More school districts reported purchasing legal liability insurance for teachers than for central administrators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superintendent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Staff Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XXXI—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Selecting</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All staff members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 9999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 to 4999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, preventive practices from five major areas were analyzed. Based on data from the survey instrument, *A Statewide Survey: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices*, the following were noted.

The two types of legal counsel most often used by the responding Texas districts were the local attorney and the TASB attorney. Larger districts in the study tended to favor using a local attorney while smaller districts relied
on a TASB attorney. The superintendent was the person who most often had the authority to contact the attorney. Most attorneys either did not attend board meetings or only attended those meeting that pertained to legal matters. Attorneys from the larger districts, however, tended to attend all board meetings or the meetings that pertained to legal matters.

The majority of the responding districts used the TASB Policy Reference Manual as the major tool for developing school board policies. Larger districts relied on the expertise of central administrators and the school attorney in addition to the TASB Policy Reference Manual. Smaller districts relied on central administrators and the TASB Policy Reference Manual but did not use the assistance of an attorney. Most of the responding districts had their policies reviewed by an attorney. The larger districts used a local attorney to review the policies; the smaller districts relied on TASB attorney assistance. The same arrangements were noted in terms of updating policies. Policies were most often disseminated in writing and through information presented at in-service programs. Central administrators, principals, and board members were the groups that most often had copies of the policies.

The majority of the responding districts of 5,000 ADA or more had administrative regulations. These operating procedures were developed by central administrators and were
usually not reviewed by an attorney. The responding districts from the three largest ADA groups reviewed and updated their administrative regulations more often than did smaller districts.

Superintendents from the responding districts were kept abreast of changes in school law by reading and attending conferences. Many superintendents from the two largest ADA groups also used the school attorney for this purpose. Administrators were kept informed through information presented at staff meetings and by written communications. Teachers, however, were usually informed of the changes during in-service programs and staff meetings.

Approximately 90 percent of the responding districts purchased legal liability insurance for employees and/or board members. Board members and superintendents were the two groups most often covered by the insurance.

Preventive Law Practices: Data from Case Studies

In order to further research the concept of preventive law, the three school districts that reported the highest number of preventive law practices as evidenced by responses to fifteen items on the survey instrument, A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices, were chosen to be case study sites. The researcher's primary mission was to learn more about the specific preventive law practices that were utilized by the
district and perceived to be effective in reducing or avoiding litigation.

Each district selected for this component of the study was from a different ADA grouping. School District A, the district that reported utilizing the most preventive law practices, represented the 1,500 to 4,999 ADA group. School District B, one of the largest school districts in Texas, represented the 50,000 or more ADA group. School District C was from the 10,000 to 49,999 ADA group.

One of the major areas researched was additional information about the types of legal counsel used by the districts. School District A used a local attorney as the primary source. The attorney had thirty years of experience in school law, and the superintendent perceived the attorney to be very knowledgeable of school law. The attorney for School District A only attended board meetings when requested to do so. In addition to the school attorney, the services of TASB were utilized primarily in policy development.

School District B also relied on a local attorney as its primary outside source for legal services. The superintendent rated the attorney very knowledgeable of school law. In discussing the selection of the attorney, respondents from School District B emphasized the need to choose a lawyer who is "concerned with preventing litigation rather than one who tells you what you want to hear; for a good lawyer analyzes the situation, reviews the alternatives and risks,
and lets the policy maker determine the decision." The school attorney for School District B only attended board meetings that related to legal matters. In addition to the local attorney, one of the central administrators was responsible for identifying legal concerns and submitting them to the school attorney.

School District C followed a similar pattern in that the district used a local attorney, perceived the attorney to be very knowledgeable of school law, and directed the attorney to attend only board meetings that related to legal matters. The local attorney selected for this district had been a board member and had at one time provided legal services free of charge.

Although some attention was given during the interviews to the traditional ways in which attorneys are used by school districts, the three districts highlighted preventive law activities that the school attorney should be allowed and encouraged to engage in to assist the district in taking a proactive stance. It was the consensus of the districts that the attorney should serve in an advisory capacity and should be contacted before the fact rather than called after serious problems arise. The attorney from School District B felt that a school attorney should conduct a legal inventory of the district. This process would include analyzing outstanding law suits, reviewing policies and procedures, and identifying problem areas. In addition, the school
attorney should assist in developing formal documentation systems and specimen letters to be used to assist staff members in thinking through the process.

The second area of focus was on the development and dissemination of board policies and administrative regulations. School District A relied on a consultant from TASB and on a committee of board members to develop board policies. The school attorney was not involved in the development process but did participate in the final review. The school attorney emphatically stated that the school attorney needs to review all board policies and policy changes. He said, "I consider TASB an intellectual approach and I consider mine an on the ground field approach . . . but each one (TASB policies) sometimes needs a little bit of fine tuning to really build in the character of the district."

School District B felt that it was important to have input from numerous groups prior to finalizing board policies. Citizen committees, central administrators, the school attorney, and the TASB Policy Reference Manual were all important to the policy-making process. The local attorney was always responsible for reviewing policies.

School District C had developed a formal review system for policy development. The attorney was asked to write the policy if the policy was of a highly technical matter or involved complicated legal issues, and the staff was asked to analyze the policy and make suggestions prior to
presentation to the board. For routine policies, the
process was reversed and policies were written by the staff
and then reviewed by the attorney. School District C also
used the services of TASB but always had the local attorney
review the TASB policy recommendations to determine if the
policy met the district's needs.

All three school districts had developed sets of written
administrative regulations. Central administrators were
primarily responsible for developing the regulations. The
attorney from School District B pointed out the need for the
attorney to be involved to some extent in the review of
administrative regulations because often they are written
with such specificity that they conflict with the intent of
the general policy that has been written and approved by the
board.

A key area that surfaced in this component of the study
was the need for good communication. Respondents felt that
people had to know or feel like they were in the know before
they could get involved in making things work. The attorney
from School District A stressed the need to be "straight
up." According to the attorney, "... if you're pretending
to be something you're not, you've got a problem."

In terms of how the communication process related to
development, School District C never adopted a policy until
it had been placed on the agenda for first reading and then
placed on the following agenda for action. This practice
afforded the local media the opportunity to publicize the specifics of the policy and gave time for feedback from citizens and staff. Immediately following each board meeting, a communication was prepared that summarized all actions taken by the board. The communication was disseminated to all staff members the following day.

School District A also devised formal communication systems to help inform the community. This district was primarily a Mexican-American community, and the superintendent attended their churches and was available after services to respond to questions and concerns.

Other techniques that were used to keep the staff informed included sending copies of State Board rules and regulations to appropriate staff members, having cluster breakfasts with teachers to determine legal concerns, having the attorney and other school law specialists speak at convocations and in-service meetings, and designating one central staff member to attend all State Board meetings and disseminate a written report to appropriate staff members.

The attorney from School District B emphasized that communication was one of the three essential components of a preventive law program. The other two components included commitment of the superintendent, board, and attorney to taking a preventive approach, and compromise, knowing when to "hold them and when to fold them."
The final focus of the interviews was to determine why it was perceived that some school districts have more litigation than other districts of similar size. The superintendent of School District C felt it was due to the attitude of the people in the district, the quality of leadership, and the expertise of the attorney. The attorney for School District A related, "... less litigation is not a function of day to day administration; it is a function of the amount of diversity in the community, for the less homogeneous the district is, the more likely you are to have litigation."

Legal Awareness of Texas Superintendents

Research question three, How much do Texas superintendents know about school law?, was answered by the results of the Legal Awareness Questionnaire, a twenty-item true-false questionnaire that was individually administered to superintendents who had participated in the first survey, A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices. Table XXXII reflects that seventy-two superintendents participated in the survey. The distribution of these seventy-two scores may be considered approximately normal since the mean, median and mode all converge at a score of about fourteen. One third of the superintendents scored below 70 percent correct (fourteen out of twenty).
TABLE XXXII

SCORE DISTRIBUTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS’ PERFORMANCE ON THE LEGAL AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean = 13.77; S.D. = 1.73; Median = 14.00; Mode = 14.00.

Relationship of Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices

The fourth research question was designed to determine if there was a relationship between a school district’s legal costs and its preventive law practices. A two-way ANOVA was used to address this question. A total of 168 analyses were performed. Eighty-four of the analyses used legal costs for the 1982-83 school year as the dependent variable, and the remaining eighty-four analyses used the total costs for the three school years from 1980-1983 as the dependent variable. The independent variables were the eighty-four preventive law practices which were the subject of the main survey instrument, A Statewide Survey: Texas Public School Districts Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices, and district size. Each analysis used district
size as one independent variable and one of the eighty-four preventive law practices as the other independent variable.

Four patterns of significance were found when these 168 analyses were completed. As was expected, in all analyses a significant difference (alpha = .05) in legal costs was found across district size groups. Significance of difference (alpha = .05) in legal costs across preventive law practice groups varied as did interaction between the two independent variables. Four combinations of significance were found. These four combinations are as follows:

1. Only District Size Significant.
   a. Significant difference in legal costs across district size.
   b. No significant difference in legal costs across preventive law practices.
   c. No significant interaction.

2. All Variables Significant.
   a. Significant difference in legal costs across district size.
   b. Significant difference in legal costs across preventive law practices.
   c. Significant interaction.

   a. Significant difference in legal costs across district size.
b. No significant difference in legal costs across preventive law practices.

c. Significant interaction.

4. No Interaction.

a. Significant difference in legal costs across district size.

b. Significant difference in legal costs across preventive law practices.

c. No significant interaction.

Analyses which follow pattern #1 revealed that all of the difference in legal costs between districts could be explained on the basis of district size and not on the basis of the preventive law practice under examination. Patterns #2 and #4 revealed that there was a difference in legal costs between school districts which did and did not utilize the given preventive law practice. In pattern #2 there was also a significant interaction. This means that the pattern of significance in difference in legal costs for those who did or did not utilize the given preventive law practice may vary according to size of the district.

Pattern #3 did not show an overall significant difference in legal costs across the preventive law practice groups, but it did show a significant interaction. This means that there may have been a significant difference in legal costs across preventive law practice groups for some size districts and not for others. Or it may mean that the
pattern of difference in legal costs for different size
districts was different for those who did than for those who
did not practice the particular preventive law practice. Or
it may mean both of these things.

The concern of this study was with preventive law
practices more than with size of district. For each case
where a significant difference in legal costs across preven-
tive law practices was found the table of means and standard
deviations was studied to elucidate the reason for the
differences found. Since the ANOVAs were used to attempt to
explain the distribution of the total variance in legal
costs among districts and not to compare the differences in
means of experimental groups, no tests for simple effects
were performed when interactions were found.

The twenty questions from the preventive law section of
the survey instrument, *A Statewide Survey: Texas Public
School Districts' Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices*,
were analyzed in terms of the relationships between the
preventive law practices and the legal costs for the 1982-83
school year and for the 1980-83 school years. Table XXXIII
shows the frequency and percent of the analyses that fit
each of the four patterns. Pattern #2 and pattern #4 are
the two patterns that are most relevant to this study. As
evidenced by Table XXXIII, only five of the eighty-four
preventive law practices that were compared with the 1982-83
legal costs and only six of the eighty-four preventive law
practices that were compared with the 1980-83 legal costs fit the two patterns.

**TABLE XXXIII**

**PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOUND IN 168 ANALYSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>1982-83 Legal Costs</th>
<th>1980-83 Legal Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern #1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern #2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern #3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern #4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All actual tables of comparison may be found in the Appendix and summary tables of the preventive law practice, the table number, and the pattern number (abbreviated "P" in Tables XXXIV through XLVIII) are presented for discussion.

The first five questions from the survey were questions that related to information about the district's legal counsel. Question one directed the respondent to identify the types of legal service that the district used. Table XXXIV summarizes the patterns of significance for the preventive law practices in question one. As evidenced by the data, the difference in legal costs between districts was primarily a result of district size and not a result of the type of legal counsel used. There was, however, a
significant interaction between the two independent variables for districts that used a TEA attorney.

**TABLE XXXIV**

**PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: TYPE OF LEGAL SERVICE USED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83 Table</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>1980-83 Table</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB attorney</td>
<td>LIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LIV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA attorney</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LVI</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education service center</td>
<td>LVII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LVIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No legal service</td>
<td>LIX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other legal service</td>
<td>LXI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LXII</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspection of Tables LV and LVI (See Appendix, pp. 176-177) reveals that for most ADA groupings, using a TEA attorney is associated with lower costs; however, in districts with ADA of 5,000-9,999 and 500-1,499 using a TEA attorney is associated with higher costs.

The second question on the survey asked respondents to identify their primary source for legal services. Tables LXIII and LXIV (See Appendix, pp. 184-187) compare the legal costs by district size and the districts' primary source of legal services. In both analyses, the difference in legal costs between districts could be explained on the basis of district size.

The third question related to how knowledgeable the attorney was of school law. Tables LXV and LXVI (See Appendix, pp. 188-191) compare the legal costs by district size.
and how knowledgeable the attorney was reported to be. In both comparisons, all differences were associated with district size.

Question four was designed to determine who in the district could contact the attorney when services were needed. Question four uncovered more significant differences (with respect to legal costs) between districts differing on preventive law practices than did any other question on the survey. Table XXXV reports the patterns of significance.

### TABLE XXXV

**PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: WHO HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board president</td>
<td>LXVII</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>LXIX</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>LXXI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy superintendent</td>
<td>LXXXIII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other central staff members</td>
<td>LXXV</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>LXXVII</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>LXXIX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>LXXXI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether or not the board president could contact the school attorney showed no overall relationship to legal costs; however, there was a significant interaction. Inspection of Tables LXVII and LXVIII (See Appendix, pp. 192-193) shows that in districts with ADA of 1,500 or more,
districts in which the board president could not contact the school attorney had lower legal costs than districts of the same size in which the board president could contact the school attorney. Among the districts with ADA below 1,500, there was little or no difference in legal costs.

The question of other school board members' being able to contact the school attorney also showed a significant interaction with size of district in its relationship to legal costs. School districts with ADA of 5,000 or more tended to show higher legal costs if other board members could contact the school attorney. For smaller districts, the pattern tended to be reversed, i.e., other board members contacting the school attorney when needed was associated with lower costs.

There was no relationship between superintendents contacting the school attorney and legal costs. Inspection of Tables LXXI and LXXII (See Appendix, pp. 196-197) reveals the reason. Only 5 out of 542 school districts did not allow the superintendent to contact the school attorney when services were needed.

The issue of whether or not the deputy superintendent could contact the school attorney when services were needed was found to be associated with difference in legal costs. Tables LXXIII and LXXIV (See Appendix, pp. 198-199) indicate that there was a consistent pattern of higher legal costs when the deputy superintendent was allowed to contact the
school attorney when services were needed. The difference was found for all districts except for those in the 5,000 to 9,999 grouping during the 1982-83 school year.

Very few districts allowed any other employees to contact the school attorney. Significant overall differences in costs were found among all districts when considering whether other central staff members and principals could contact the school attorney. However, the pattern across districts of the six ADA groupings is not consistent. The large difference in costs for the districts in the largest ADA grouping appears to have accounted for most of the overall difference. Among the four districts with ADA of 50,000 or more, allowing other central staff members or principals to contact the school attorney was associated with higher legal costs.

No significant differences were found among districts on the issue of whether or not teachers or others could contact the school attorney. Very few districts allow teachers or others to contact the school attorney, as evidenced in Tables LXXIX--LXXXII (See Appendix, pp. 204-207).

The fifth question on the survey assessed how often the school attorney attended school board meetings. The comparison of legal costs by size of district and how often the school attorney attended board meetings is summarized in Tables LXXXIII and LXXXIV (See Appendix, pp. 208-211). In both cases, a pattern #1 analysis resulted.
Questions six through ten were related to the area of school board policies. Question six examined who developed the school board policies. The patterns of significance for these preventive law variables are summarized in Table XXXVI.

**TABLE XXXVI**

**PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: HOW DISTRICT POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of board members</td>
<td>LXXV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central administrators</td>
<td>LXXXVII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>LXXXIX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB Policy Reference Manual</td>
<td>XCI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School attorney</td>
<td>XCIII</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside consultant</td>
<td>XCV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>XCVII</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significant variable was the school attorney.

There was a difference in legal costs between school districts which did and did not utilize a school attorney to develop board policies. Districts which used the school attorney in policy development had higher legal costs than those that did not. Though there was a significant interaction, inspection of Tables XCIII and XCIV (See Appendix, pp. 220-221), shows that the legal costs for districts using the attorney to help develop policies were higher regardless of district size. The presence of interaction in this case shows that the amount of difference in legal costs among
districts that differed in this aspect of policy development varied according to district size.

The seventh question on the survey examined whether the policies were reviewed by an attorney. Table XXXVII summarizes the patterns of significance for this question.

**TABLE XXXVII**

**PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: WHETHER POLICIES WERE REVIEWED BY THE ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, local attorney</td>
<td>XCIX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, TASB attorney</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>CIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the preventive variables showed any significant relationship with either the legal costs for 1982-83 or the legal costs for 1980-83. Inspection of Table C (See Appendix, p. 227), shows that review by the local attorney was associated with higher legal costs for districts under 50,000 ADA; however, the amount of difference was not statistically significant.

Whether or not policies were updated and periodically reviewed by an attorney, question eight, was independent of legal costs. All differences in costs between districts were accounted for by the size of the districts, as shown in Table XXXVIII.
TABLE XXXVIII

PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: WHETHER POLICIES WERE UPDATED AND REVIEWED BY THE ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, local attorney</td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, TASB attorney</td>
<td>CVII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>CIX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question nine on the survey addressed how districts disseminated policies to staff members. Table XXXIX reports the patterns of significance.

TABLE XXXIX

PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: HOW POLICIES WERE DISSEMINATED TO STAFF MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orally</td>
<td>CXI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In writing</td>
<td>CXIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>CXV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other methods</td>
<td>CXVII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The practice of disseminating policies to staff members through in-service programs was associated with higher costs among school districts of 5,000 ADA or more and with lower costs among school districts with 4,999 ADA or less. This pattern was true for the single year costs reported for
1982-83 school year and for the costs reported for the three
year period of 1980-83.

The final question on the survey that related to school
board policies was designed to ascertain who had copies of
the policy book. Table XL summarizes the results.

Although the main effect representing whether or not
teachers had a copy of the policy was not significant, there
was a significant interaction between district size and this
practice. Examination of Tables CXXV and CXXVI (See Appen-
dix, pp. 252-253) shows that while the pattern varied for
districts of different sizes, districts which gave the
teachers a copy of the policy book generally had lower legal
costs.

**TABLE XL**

**PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: WHO HAD COPIES OF THE POLICY BOOK?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table P</td>
<td>Table P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>CXXIX 1</td>
<td>CXX 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central office staff members</td>
<td>CXXI 1</td>
<td>CXXII 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>CXXIII 1</td>
<td>CXXIV 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>CXXV 3</td>
<td>CXXVI 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aides</td>
<td>CXXVII 1</td>
<td>CXXVIII 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>CXXIX 1</td>
<td>CXXX 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next five questions dealt with administrative
regulations. The eleventh question on the survey determined
whether districts had administrative regulations. Table
CXXXI (See Appendix, p. 258) compares legal costs for
1982-83 by ADA and whether or not the districts had administrative regulations. All of the differences in this analysis were accounted for by district ADA. Table CXXXII (See Appendix, p. 259) compares legal costs for 1980-83 by ADA and whether or not the districts had administrative regulations. In this analysis there was no overall difference by the preventive legal practice, but there was an interaction between the practice and district ADA. Examination of Table CXXXII shows that there was a varying amount of difference in legal costs between districts that did or did not have written administrative regulations when grouped according to ADA. Generally, districts with written administrative regulations had greater legal costs, although in districts with ADA between 5,000 and 9,999, the pattern was reversed.

Question twelve asked respondents about the process used to develop their administrative regulations. Table XLI summarizes the patterns of significance for this question. These results indicate that there was no significant relationship between who developed the administrative procedures and legal costs.
TABLE XLI

PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: HOW ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE DEVELOPED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of board members</td>
<td>CXXXIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central administrators</td>
<td>CXXXV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>CXXXVII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td>CXXXIX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside consultant</td>
<td>CXLIX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CXLIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question thirteen asked whether the administrative regulations were reviewed by an attorney. Table XLII summarizes the patterns of significance found.

Legal costs varied within ADA groupings according to whether administrative regulations were reviewed by TASB attorney or not. Districts in the groupings 50,000 or more, 5,000 to 9,999, and 500 to 1,499 that had regulations reviewed by TASB attorney showed higher legal costs. The reverse was true in the other ADA groupings.

TABLE XLII

PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: WHETHER ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE REVIEWED BY AN ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, local attorney</td>
<td>CXLV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, TASB attorney</td>
<td>CXLVII</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>CXLIX</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In most ADA groupings districts which had regulations reviewed by any attorney showed about the same or higher legal costs than those that did not have regulations reviewed at all. The exception being districts in the ADA grouping 1,500 to 4,999, where legal costs were much higher for those districts that did not have regulations reviewed.

Question fourteen addressed whether the administrative regulations were updated and periodically reviewed by an attorney. Table XLIII summarizes the analyses.

TABLE XLIII

PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: WHETHER ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE UPDATED AND PERIODICALLY REVIEWED BY AN ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, local attorney</td>
<td>CLI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, TASB attorney</td>
<td>CLIII</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed and updated</td>
<td>CLV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legal costs were greater in districts where a local attorney reviewed and updated the regulations except in ADA groupings of 1,500 to 4,999 and less than 500. Legal costs were greater in districts where a TASB attorney reviewed and updated the regulations except in ADA groupings of 10,000 to 49,999, 1,500 to 4,999, and less than 500. Legal costs were greater in districts where the regulations were reviewed and updated (as opposed to being not reviewed and updated at
all) except in the ADA grouping 1,500 to 4,999, where the pattern was reversed.

The next four questions on the survey related to the area of school law changes. The fifteenth question addressed how the superintendent stayed abreast of changes in school law. Table XLIV summarizes the analyses.

**TABLE XLIV**

PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: HOW THE SUPERINTENDENT STAYED ABREAST OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th></th>
<th>1980-83</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School law conferences</td>
<td>CLVII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLVIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading material</td>
<td>CLIX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relies on school attorney</td>
<td>CLXI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLXII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relies on a staff member</td>
<td>CLXIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLXIV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service training</td>
<td>CLXV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLXVI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No special effort</td>
<td>CLXVII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLXVIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CLXIX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLXX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences in legal costs between districts can be explained on the basis of district size and not on the basis of differences in how the superintendent stays abreast of changes in school law, regardless of what method was used.

Question sixteen asked how the district kept administrators informed of legal principles and changes in the law. Of the methods of keeping administrators informed of legal principles and changes in school law, staff meetings showed a significant relationship to legal costs. Districts with ADA over 10,000 or less than 500 showed greater legal costs.
to be associated with the presence of in-service programs. Districts with ADA between 500 and 9,999 showed the opposite relationship. Districts with ADA over 50,000 showed lower legal costs to be associated with staff meetings. All other district groupings displayed the opposite relationship. Table XLV reports the results.

TABLE XLV

PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: HOW ADMINISTRATORS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES AND CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83 Table</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>1980-83 Table</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written communications</td>
<td>CLXXI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLXXII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>CLXXIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLXXIV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meetings</td>
<td>CLXXV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CLXXVI</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal program</td>
<td>CLXXVII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLXXVIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CLXXIX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLXXX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question seventeen asked how teachers were kept informed of legal principles and changes in school law. Districts with ADA over 50,000 or under 500 that indicated no formal program for keeping teachers informed of changes in the law also reported greater legal costs than those districts of the same size that had some program for that purpose. Districts with ADA between 500 and 49,999 that indicated some program for keeping teachers informed reported greater legal costs than those districts of the same size that had no formal program. Table XLVI summarizes the results.
TABLE XLVI

PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: HOW TEACHERS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL PRINCIPLES AND CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communications</td>
<td>CLXXXI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service programs</td>
<td>CLXXXIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meetings</td>
<td>CLXXXV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal program</td>
<td>CLXXXVII</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CLXXXIX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final question that related to school law changes asked the superintendent to identify the legal sources that were subscribed to by the district. Table XLVII reports the patterns of significance for each of the legal sources.

TABLE XLVII

PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: WHAT LEGAL SOURCES THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Daily</td>
<td>CXCI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOLPE Publications</td>
<td>CXCIII</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Register</td>
<td>CXCV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas School Law News</td>
<td>CXCVII</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West's Education Law Reporter</td>
<td>CXCIX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether or not the district subscribes to Education Daily, NOLPE Publications, or Texas School Law News is...
related to legal costs. In each case, the pattern of relationship varies according to ADA.

Districts with ADA of 10,000 or more or ADA between 500 and 1,499 showed greater costs to be associated with subscribing to *Education Daily*. Other districts showed the opposite.

Districts with ADA of 5,000 or more showed greater legal costs to be associated with subscribing to *NOLPE Publications*. Districts with ADA of 1,500 to 4,999 showed lower legal costs to be associated with subscribing to *NOLPE Publications*. Districts with ADA under 1,500 showed about the same costs whether they subscribed to *NOLPE Publications* or not. Districts with ADA of less than 50,000 that subscribed to *Texas School Law News* had higher legal costs than districts of that size that did not subscribe.

The final two questions on the survey related to the area of legal liability insurance. Question nineteen asked whether the school district purchased legal liability insurance for anyone associated with the district. Tables CCIII and CCIV (See Appendix, pp. 330-331) compare the legal costs by size of district and whether the district purchased legal liability insurance for anyone in the district.

In both Table CCIII and Table CCIV, a significant interaction is indicated between the two independent variables. Whether purchasing legal liability insurance was associated with higher or lower legal costs depended on the
size of the district. Purchasing legal liability insurance was associated with lower legal costs in districts with ADA of 50,000 or more and districts with ADA less than 500. In districts of other sizes, the opposite was true.

The final question that dealt with preventive law practice, question twenty, related to which staff members the district purchased legal liability insurance for during the years 1980-83. Whether or not legal liability insurance was purchased for board members, central staff members, principals, or teachers was related to legal costs for the years 1980-83, but the pattern varied according to district size. The same was true of principals in 1982-83. Table XLVIII summarizes the results.

**TABLE XLVIII**

**PATTERNS OF SIGNIFICANCE: FOR WHOM THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preventive Law Practice</th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1980-83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members</td>
<td>CCV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>CCVII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central staff members</td>
<td>CCIX</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>CCXI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>CCXIII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All staff members</td>
<td>CCXV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>CCVII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purchasing legal liability insurance for board members was associated with lower costs for 1980-83 for districts
with ADA of 50,000 or more or less than 500. The opposite was true for other sized districts.

Purchasing legal liability insurance for central staff members was associated with lower costs for 1980–83 for districts with ADA of 10,000 or more. The opposite was true for districts with ADA between 1,500 and 9,999. Districts with ADA less than 1,500 showed about the same costs regardless of their practice of purchasing legal liability insurance for central staff members.

Purchasing legal liability insurance for principals was associated with lower costs for 1982–83 for districts with ADA of 50,000 or more. All other sized districts showed the opposite relationship for 1982–83 legal costs. Purchasing legal liability insurance for principals was associated with lower costs for 1980–83 for districts with ADA of 10,000 or more. All other sized districts showed the opposite relationship for 1980–83 legal costs.

Purchasing legal liability insurance for teachers was associated with lower costs for 1982–83 for districts with ADA of 10,000 or more. All other sized districts showed the opposite relationship for 1982–83 legal costs.

In summary, this component of the study addressed the relationship between a school district's legal costs and its preventive law practices. In most instances, all differences in legal costs could be explained on the basis of district size.
The first area under examination was the relationship between legal costs and the types of legal services used by districts. The difference in legal costs was primarily a result of district size and not a result of the type of legal counsel used. All differences in legal costs and the attorney’s knowledge of school law and how often the attorney attended school board meetings were also associated with district size. There was no difference in legal costs for districts that allowed the board president, board members, the superintendent, teachers, or others specified by the district to contact the attorney when services were needed, but there were higher costs for districts that allowed the deputy superintendent, other central staff members, and principals to contact the attorney.

The second group of preventive law activities that were assessed related to the area of school board policies. For districts that used board members, central administrators, teachers, the TASB Policy Reference Manual, or outside consultants to develop the policies, the difference in legal costs was due to the size of the district.

Those that used a school attorney, however, had higher legal costs regardless of district size. If the attorney reviewed the policies, districts less than 50,000 ADA had higher legal costs. For districts that had the attorney review and update the policies, difference in legal costs was due to the size of the district.
The difference in legal costs for districts that disseminated policies orally, in writing, or other district-determined ways was attributed to district size. For districts that used in-service programs to disseminate policies, districts of 5,000 ADA or more had higher legal costs while districts of less than 5,000 reported lower costs. There was no difference in legal costs for districts that disseminated copies of the policy book to board members, central office staff, principals, aides, or others specified by the district. Districts that gave teachers a copy of the policy book generally had lower legal costs.

All differences in legal costs and whether a district had administrative regulations and who developed them were accounted for by district size. If the regulations were reviewed by any type of attorney, the district generally had the same or higher legal costs than did those who did not have the regulations reviewed.

The preventive area of school law changes was also examined in relationship to legal costs. District size accounted for all differences in terms of how the superintendent kept abreast of changes in school law. For administrators, district size explained the difference in terms of whether administrators were sent written communications, were not involved in a formal program, or whether other district-determined methods were used. Districts of 10,000 ADA or more or less than 500 ADA generally had greater legal
costs. Districts of less than 50,000 ADA that informed administrators of legal information during staff meetings also had higher legal costs.

All difference in legal costs could be attributed to district size for districts that used written communications, in-service programs, staff meetings, or other district-determined ways to inform teachers. Districts with 500 to 49,999 ADA that used some type of formal program for keeping teachers informed reported greater legal costs than those districts of the same size that had no formal program. There was some difference in legal costs for districts that subscribed to certain legal publications.

The final preventive area under examination was legal liability insurance. All difference in legal costs and whether districts purchased legal liability insurance for superintendents, all staff members, or others specified by the district was due to district size. There was, however, a difference in legal costs for those districts that purchased the insurance for board members, central staff members, principals, and teachers.

Relationship of Legal Costs and Superintendent's Knowledge of School Law

The fifth research question was designed to address whether there was a relationship between a school district's legal costs and the superintendent's knowledge of school law. As evidenced by the data from Table XLIX, there was
not a relationship between the legal costs of the district and the superintendent's knowledge of school law.

TABLE XLIX

RELATIONSHIP OF LEGAL COSTS AND THE SUPERINTENDENT'S KNOWLEDGE OF SCHOOL LAW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.0334</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>.0345</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship of Superintendent's Knowledge of School Law and the District's Preventive Law Practices

Eighty-four analyses were carried out in order to address the sixth research question dealing with the relationship of the superintendent's knowledge of school law and the district's preventive law practices. In each of the eighty-four analyses, no relationship was found between the superintendent's knowledge of school law and the district's preventive law practices.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FOR FURTHER STUDY

In this chapter a summary of the findings of the study is presented, and conclusions that resulted from the analysis of data are delineated. Recommendations for further study related to legal costs and preventive law activities are highlighted as the final component of the study.

Six major concerns were addressed in this study. The first concern was to determine how much money Texas public school districts spent on legal costs during the school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83. Secondly, the study sought to determine what Texas public school districts did to prevent or reduce litigation. The third concern focused on the amount of legal knowledge possessed by Texas superintendents. The final concerns of the study were directed at determining whether relationships existed between a school district's legal costs and its preventive law practices, between a school district's legal costs and the superintendent's knowledge of school law, and between the superintendent's knowledge of school law and the district's preventive law practices.
In order to appropriately address these concerns, the 1,101 school districts in Texas were divided into six groups based on their enrollment as reported to the Texas Education Agency in 1983 (1). The superintendent of each of the 1,101 districts received a twenty-five item questionnaire. The superintendents’ responses to the survey were utilized to confirm the amount of money spent on legal costs by school districts and the types of preventive practices used by the districts.

The three school districts that reported the highest number of preventive law activities as determined by responses to fifteen of the questions on the survey were chosen to be the case study sites. Data from these districts were collected to further verify and expand information about preventive law practices in school districts.

The 542 superintendents that responded to the first survey were contacted and asked to participate in a second survey. Seventy-two superintendents participated in this phase of the study. The superintendents responded to a twenty-item true-false legal awareness questionnaire. The responses to the questionnaire were used to determine the amount of legal knowledge possessed by Texas superintendents.

The superintendents’ responses to the two survey instruments were utilized to determine whether relationships existed between a district’s legal costs and its preventive
law practices, a district's legal costs and the superintendent's knowledge of school law, and the superintendent's knowledge of school law and the district's preventive law practices. The following is a summary of the major findings of the study.

Summary of Findings Regarding Legal Costs of School Districts

1. The larger the school district, the more money the district spends on legal costs.

2. Districts spend more money for legal liability insurance and for development of school board policies than for other types of legal services.

3. The most popular method for compensating the school attorney is the hourly method.

Summary of Findings Regarding Preventive Law Activities of School Districts

Legal Counsel

1. The two types of legal counsel most often used by Texas public school districts are the local attorney and the TASB attorney or a combination of both.

2. Larger districts (1,500 ADA or more) rely more often on a local attorney for legal services while smaller districts rely on legal assistance from the Texas Association of School Boards.

3. Texas superintendents generally perceive their attorneys to be very knowledgeable of school law.
4. The superintendent has more authority than any other staff member or board member to contact the attorney when services are needed.

5. Most school attorneys either do not attend board meetings or only attend meetings that pertain to legal matters. Attorneys from larger districts, however, normally attend all board meetings or those that pertain to legal matters.

School Board Policies

1. The TASB Policy Reference Manual is the major resource used in developing school board policies. Larger districts also rely on the expertise of central administrators and the school attorney. Smaller districts rely on the TASB service and assistance from central administrators.

2. Most districts have their policies reviewed and updated by an attorney. Larger districts (10,000 ADA or more) use a local attorney to review the policies. Smaller districts rely on the services of the Texas Association of School Boards.

3. The major technique that districts use to disseminate school board policies is to send the written policies and updates to staff members and board members.

4. Board members, central office staff members, and principals generally are the district personnel most likely to have copies of the policy book.
Administrative Regulations

1. More of the responding school districts in Texas do not have written sets of administrative regulations than do. Larger districts (5,000 ADA or more), however, generally have written administrative regulations.

2. Administrative regulations are normally developed by central administrators.

3. Districts that have administrative regulations generally do not have them reviewed and updated by an attorney.

School Law Changes

1. The two leading methods that superintendents employ to stay abreast of changes in school law are attendance at conferences and reading of materials. Superintendents from districts of 10,000 ADA or more generally rely on the school attorney in addition to these techniques.

2. The two leading methods districts utilize to keep administrators abreast of changes in school law are attendance at staff meetings and written communications.

3. The two major ways teachers are kept informed of legal principles and changes in the law are in-service programs and staff meetings.
Legal Liability Insurance

1. Texas public school districts generally purchase legal liability insurance for district personnel and/or board members.

2. The two groups most often covered by legal liability insurance provided by the district are board members and superintendents.

Summary of Findings Regarding Legal Awareness of Superintendents

Superintendents have a limited knowledge of legal issues as evidenced by the fact that forty-eight of the seventy-two superintendents scored 70 percent or higher on the legal awareness questionnaire.

Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between a District's Legal Costs and Its Preventive Law Activities

Legal Counsel

1. The difference in a district's legal costs and the type of legal counsel used is due to district size rather than to the type of legal counsel used.

2. The difference in a district's legal costs and the attorney's knowledge of school law is a result of district size and not the result of the level of legal knowledge possessed by the school attorney.

3. All differences in legal costs and how often the attorney attends school board meetings are associated
with district size rather than the frequency with which the attorney attends board meetings.

4. There is a difference in legal costs for districts that allow the board president, board members, deputy superintendent, other central staff members, and principals to contact the school attorney.

**School Board Policy**

1. The difference in legal costs for districts that use board members, central administrators, the *TASB Policy Reference Manual*, or outside consultants to develop policies is due to the size of the district rather than to the process utilized.

2. Districts that use a local attorney to develop policies have higher legal costs regardless of district size.

3. The difference in legal costs for districts that disseminate policies orally, in writing, or in other ways specified by the district is attributed to district size rather than to the technique utilized.

4. Districts of 5,000 ADA or more that disseminate policies through in-service programs have higher legal costs; districts of less than 5,000 ADA that use this technique have lower legal costs.

5. There is no difference in legal costs for districts that disseminate copies of the policy book to board members, central office staff, principals, and aides, but districts that provide teachers with copies of the
policy book have lower legal costs regardless of district size.

**Administrative Regulations**

1. All differences in legal costs and whether a district has administrative regulations are accounted for by district size rather than by the absence or presence of administrative regulations.

2. The process used in developing administrative regulations is not associated with a difference in legal costs.

3. Districts of all sizes that have their administrative regulations reviewed by an attorney have higher legal costs than those who do not.

**School Law Changes**

1. All differences in legal costs and the technique used to keep superintendents informed are accounted for by district size.

2. District size accounts for the differences in legal costs of districts and whether districts send written communications to administrators, have no formal program to keep administrators informed, or use other district-determined methods. Districts of 10,000 ADA or more or less than 500 ADA that use in-service programs generally have greater legal costs.
3. All differences in legal costs and whether districts use written communications, in-service programs, staff meetings, or other district-determined methods to inform teachers are due to district size. Districts with 500 to 49,999 ADA that use some type of formal program for keeping teachers informed have greater legal costs than districts of the same size that have no program.

**Legal Liability Insurance**

There is a difference in legal costs for districts that purchase legal liability insurance for board members, central staff members, principals, and teachers, but district size explained the difference for districts that purchased insurance for superintendents, all staff members, and other district-specified members.

**Summary of Findings Regarding the Relationship Between a District’s Legal Costs and the Superintendent’s Knowledge of School Law**

The data from the legal costs survey and the legal awareness questionnaire were analyzed to determine if a relationship existed between a district’s legal costs and the superintendent’s knowledge of school law. The findings reveal there is no relationship between the two.
Summary of Findings Regarding Relationship Between a Superintendent’s Knowledge of School Law and the District’s Preventive Law Activities

The data from the preventive law activities component of the survey and the legal awareness questionnaire were analyzed to determine if a relationship existed between the superintendent’s knowledge of school law and the district’s preventive law activities. In no cases were any significant differences in knowledge of school law based on the differences in preventive law practices.

Conclusions

Based on the data from the survey instrument, Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Activities, and the legal awareness questionnaire, the following conclusions have been reached.

1. The more students a district has, the greater the legal costs of the district.

2. Districts that incorporate preventive law activities do not necessarily have lower legal costs.

3. The differences in legal costs of a district and the types of preventive law activities utilized by the district are generally associated with district size rather than with the absence or presence of the specific preventive law activity.

4. The legal knowledge possessed by the superintendent
does not have an impact on the legal costs of the district.

5. The superintendent’s knowledge of school law does not affect the number of preventive law activities used in the district.

Analysis of Data and Significance of the Study

Several of the findings and conclusions that have been determined in this study merit additional discussion by the researcher. It was determined in this study that the amount of legal costs was generally associated with district size rather than with preventive strategies that were used. In thinking about that concept, the attorney from one of the case study sites added an interesting perspective to the finding when he indicated that diversity is what he perceives to be the cause of litigation.

The larger the school district, the more possibility exists for a heterogeneous population. This diversity could result in conflicting types of demands being placed on the school district which could eventually result in litigation. The diversity in the ethnic make-up of the district is an example of how diversity may lead to higher legal costs in a district. Anglo students and parents, for example, may be interested in flying the Rebel flag while black students and parents find this practice to be offensive. After the decision is made by school officials, the losing side may
determine that litigation is the effective way to resolve the matter.

A second major finding of the study is that districts that use preventive law strategies do not necessarily have lower legal costs. Many of the preventive law activities that are used by districts center around assistance from the school attorney. When the attorney is used whether it is in prevention or in litigation, legal costs increase due to compensation of the attorney. As a result, it is not surprising to learn that districts that use the school attorney to develop school board policies have higher legal costs. Nor is it surprising to learn that districts that use their attorneys on a regular basis to provide workshops, develop documentation systems, or assist with legal matters in any manner have higher legal costs. It has been determined that prevention costs money but the question of whether it saves money if litigation occurs remains unanswered.

The final area of review relates to the specific findings that could result in lower legal costs for a school district. It was determined in the study that districts that provide teachers with a copy of the policy book have lower legal costs. It does not appear to be a common practice for districts to provide teachers with policy books. The major explanation given by districts is that they do not believe that it would be worth the expense in
printing individual copies when copies are normally available at the central and campus levels. Perhaps this finding is related to another area that surfaced in the case studies—the need for good communication. Teachers may be more suspect and may be more prone to file grievances or become involved in litigation when they perceive themselves to be deprived of information. It may be worth it to a district to have written policy information readily available regardless of whether teachers spend time reviewing the information.

Based on the findings, the other area that districts should be attentive to if the district is concerned with reducing legal costs is who and how many different staff members are allowed to contact the school attorney. Districts that allow other central staff members and/or principals to contact the school attorney have higher legal costs. If this is a practice of the district, perhaps the district should investigate the matter to determine if any revision is needed.

Limitations of the Study

Prior to concluding the review of the findings and the analysis of the significance of the study, it is essential that the researcher re-emphasize and expand upon the limitations of the study. The study focused on three major types of information that previously had not been reported by school districts in that districts are not required by
state or federal agencies to maintain or disseminate such information. Specifically, the data needed for the study included financial information regarding the legal costs of the district, technical information about the types of strategies used by districts to reduce or prevent litigation, and verification of the amount of legal knowledge possessed by superintendents.

The study was limited in that the information was not readily attainable. Although 542 districts responded to the first survey instrument which was designed to collect information on legal costs and preventive law strategies, more than that number of districts did not respond. It is possible that districts that did not respond were reluctant to do so due to the fact that the district had high legal costs and did not want to report the figures.

In addition, the study was limited in that the researcher delineated the preventive law strategies and the superintendent responded on a survey instrument as to whether or not these strategies were used in the district. More opportunities were needed for the superintendent to describe other types of preventive practices that were used in the district. The case study approach enabled the researcher to gather some additional information, but only three sites were included in this component and the researcher spent only one hour with each research subject.
The verification of the legal awareness of superintendents was the most difficult to determine. Superintendents were asked to take a true-false test that was administered by the researcher. Only 72 of the 542 superintendents elected to participate in this part of the study.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study focused on legal costs, preventive law strategies, legal awareness, and the relationships between these variables. As a result of this study, the researcher identified associated areas that need further study in order to expand the limited information that is available.

Although it was determined in the study that legal costs are generally associated with the size of the district, additional studies that focus more on the relationship between legal costs and the homogeneity or heterogeneity of the district are recommended. For example, the legal costs of school districts that are more homogeneous in make-up should be studied and compared to districts of similar size that are heterogeneous in make-up.

In addition, a case study of a school district that has experienced major changes in population, community involvement in school matters, or other aspects should be conducted over an extended period of time to determine what impact the changes have on legal costs. Finally, attention should be given to studies that assist in determining whether prevention makes a difference in the actual outcome of litigation.
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1. Texas Education Agency, Texas Public School District
   Refined ADA Groupings, Austin, Texas, August 12, 1983.
You have been selected to be one of twelve school superintendents requested to form a professional jury to validate the attached questionnaire. Upon validation, the instrument will be used to survey public school districts in Texas as to the amount of money that school districts spend on legal costs and the types of preventive strategies that school districts utilize to keep legal costs as low as possible.

This research is being conducted by North Texas State University and by the Texas Association of School Boards. Your expertise as superintendent of a Texas public school district is vital to the success of this research.

Please review each of the twenty-five questions that are a part of the survey instrument. Determine whether the questions and the answers are clear and relevant. Use the attached response sheet and mark each of the questions and answers by using the following code:

- **A** = ACCEPT If the question and all answers are stated appropriately and are relevant to the study, circle "A" by the appropriate number.
- **D** = DELETE If you do not feel the question should be included in the survey, circle "D" by the appropriate number.
- **M** = MODIFY If the question or any of the answers are not clear or are not relevant, circle "M" by the appropriate number and rewrite the question or the answers in the space that is provided.

If you believe other questions not listed in the questionnaire should be considered, please list them on the back of the response sheet. Feel free to make any additional comments that you think would strengthen the survey instrument. Place the response sheet and your suggestions in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope and return by Friday, February 24.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Cathy Zollars
Research Associate
PANEL MEMBER RESPONSE TO THE INSTRUMENT, "TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT LEGAL COSTS AND PREVENTIVE LAW PRACTICES"

1. A D M

2. A D M
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6. A D M

7. A D M

8. A D M
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10. A D M

11. A D M

12. A D M

13. A D M

14. A D M

15. A D M

16. A D M

17. A D M

18. A D M

19. A D M

20. A D M

21. A D M

22. A D M

23. A D M

24. A D M

25. A D M

NAME OF PANEL MEMBER

SCHOOL DISTRICT

DATE:
Dear Superintendent:

As you are aware, litigation involving Texas public school districts has escalated greatly in recent years. In order to analyze the amount of money Texas school districts spend on legal costs and to uncover effective preventive law strategies, we are asking you to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

We believe this research sponsored in part by a faculty research grant at North Texas State University and in part by the Texas Association of School Boards will be of considerable help in giving school districts a measuring stick to calculate reasonable legal costs for districts their size. In addition, this study will be useful to school districts in that effective strategies for keeping legal costs as low as possible will be identified.

You will be kept fully informed of the results of this statewide project through communications from the Texas Association of School Boards. Also, we are laying the groundwork for a statewide conference on legal costs and preventive law to which you and members of your Board and administrative staff will be invited.

We ask that you personally take the few minutes necessary to complete this questionnaire. Please do so at your earliest convenience and preferably within ten days of receipt of this letter. We assure you that your comments will be kept in complete confidence and that any findings that are released will be done in such a manner that no individual school district will be identified.

When you have finished the questionnaire, please fold once, staple, and place it in the mail. No postage is necessary. We appreciate your taking your time to contribute to this important research.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Kemerer
North Texas State University

John Aldridge
Texas Association of School Boards

SPONSORED BY NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY AND THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS
Dear Superintendent:

Several weeks ago, we mailed you a questionnaire entitled, "A Statewide Study: Texas Public School District Legal Costs and Preventive Law Practices." The questionnaire is a part of a study that is being sponsored by North Texas State University and the Texas Association of School Boards.

The purpose of this statewide study is to analyze the amount of money school districts spend on legal costs and to uncover effective preventive law strategies. The findings should be useful to school districts in that they will provide districts with a measuring stick by which to calculate reasonable legal costs. In addition, effective strategies for keeping legal costs as low as possible will be identified and disseminated to all participating districts.

As of this date, we have not received information from your district. Your feedback is important to the success of this study. We ask that you please spend the few minutes necessary to complete the enclosed questionnaire. If you have already returned the original questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

Your comments will be kept in complete confidence. Any findings that are released will be done in such a manner that no individual school district will be identified.

Thank you for taking your time to contribute to this important research. When you have finished the questionnaire, please fold once, staple, and place it in the mail. No postage is necessary.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Kemerer
North Texas State University

John Aldridge
Texas Association of School Boards
A STATEWIDE STUDY

TEXAS PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT LEGAL COSTS AND PREVENTIVE LAW PRACTICES

SPONSORED BY
NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY AND TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS

Co-Project Directors: Dr. Frank R. Kemerer North Texas State University
John Aldridge, Esq. Texas Association of School Boards

Research Associate: Cathy Zollars Grand Prairie I.S.D.
TEXAS STUDY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT
LEGAL COSTS AND PREVENTIVE LAW PRACTICES

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT

NAME OF SUPERINTENDENT

SIZE OF DISTRICT (Choose one from the ADA groupings listed below.)
(6-7)
1. ____ 50,000 +
2. ____ 10,000 - 49,999
3. ____ 5,000 - 9,999
4. ____ 1,500 - 4,999
5. ____ 1,000 - 1,499
6. ____ 500 - 999
7. ____ 300 - 499
8. ____ 200 - 299
9. ____ 100 - 199
10. ____ 50 - 99
11. ____ 25 - 49
12. ____ 24 or less

ETHNIC MAKE-UP OF STUDENT POPULATION (Give percent of each category.)

   White
      (8-9)
   Hispanic
      (10-11)
   Black
      (12-13)
   Asian or Pacific Islander
      (14-15)
   American Indian or Alaskan Native
      (16-17)

TAX BASE (Report dollar amount.) __________________________

SECTION ONE: PREVENTIVE LAW PRACTICES

Please answer the following questions by checking the appropriate spaces:

PART A: LEGAL COUNSEL

(18-23) 1. What type of legal service does your school district use?
   (Check all that apply)
   ___ Local Attorney
   ___ TASB
   ___ TEA
   ___ Education Service Center
   ___ None
   ___ Other (Please specify.)

(24) 2. Which of the following is your school district's primary source for legal services?
   1. ___ Local Attorney
   2. ___ TASB
   3. ___ TEA
   4. ___ Education Service Center
   5. ___ None
   6. ___ Other (Please specify.)
3. How knowledgeable in your view is the primary source identified in question #2 regarding school law? (If “none” was checked in question #2, skip to question #4.)
1. Very knowledgeable of school law
2. Fairly knowledgeable of school law
3. Not knowledgeable of school law

4. Who has authority to contact the attorney when services are needed? (Check all that apply.)
   - Board President
   - Board Members
   - Superintendent
   - Deputy Superintendent
   - Other Central Staff Members
   - Principals
   - Teachers
   - Others (Please specify.)

5. How often does the school attorney attend School Board Meetings?
1. Attends all School Board Meetings
2. Attends only Board Meetings that pertain to legal matters
3. Does not attend any Board Meetings
4. Other arrangements (Please specify.)

PART B. SCHOOL BOARD POLICIES

6. How were your school district’s policies developed? (Check all that apply.)
   - Committee of Board Members
   - Central Administrators
   - Teachers
   - School Attorney
   - Outside Consultant
   - Other (Please specify.)

7. Were the policies reviewed by an attorney? (Check all that apply.)
   - Yes, by local attorney
   - Yes, by TASB attorney
   - No

8. Are the policies updated and periodically reviewed by an attorney? (Check all that apply.)
   - Yes, by local attorney
   - Yes, by TASB attorney
   - No

9. How are policies disseminated to staff members? (Check all that apply.)
   - Policies presented orally to administrators and administrators expected to communicate to other staff members
   - Policy Book and updates sent in writing to staff members
   - In-service programs
   - Other methods (Please specify.)

10. Who has a copy of the Policy Book? (Check all that apply.)
    - Board Members
    - Central Office Staff Members
    - Principals
    - Teachers
    - Aides
    - Others (Please specify.)
PART C: ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

11. In addition to formal school board policies, do you have a written set of administrative regulations? (If no, skip to Part D.)
   — Yes (1)
   — No (2)

12. If yes, how were your school district's administrative regulations developed? (Check all that apply.)
   — Committee of Board Members
   — Central Administrators
   — Teachers
   — TASB
   — Outside Consultant
   — Other (Please specify.)

13. Were the administrative regulations reviewed by an attorney? (Check all that apply.)
   — Yes, by local attorney
   — Yes, by TASB attorney
   — No

14. Are the administrative regulations updated and periodically reviewed by an attorney? (Check all that apply.)
   — Yes, by local attorney
   — Yes, by TASB attorney
   — No

PART D: SCHOOL LAW CHANGES

15. How do you personally stay abreast of changes in school law? (Check all that apply.)
   — Attend conferences that relate to school law
   — Subscribe to and read material that relates to school law
   — Expect school attorney to keep me informed
   — Have staff member whose responsibility is to keep me informed
   — Schedule in-services for administrators on school law
   — Make no special effort to stay informed
   — Other (Please specify.)

16. How are administrators in your district kept informed of legal principles and changes in the law? (Check all that apply.)
   — Written communications
   — In-service programs
   — Staff meetings
   — No formal program to keep administrators informed
   — Other (Please specify.)

17. How are teachers in your district kept informed of legal principles and changes in the law? (Check all that apply.)
   — Written communications
   — In-service programs
   — Staff meetings
   — No formal program to keep teachers informed
   — Other (Please specify.)

18. What legal sources does your district subscribe to? (Check all that apply.)
   — Education Daily
   — NOLPE Publications
   — Texas Register
   — Texas School Law News
   — West's Education Law Report
   — Other (Please specify.)
PART E: LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE

(22) 19. Does your school district purchase legal liability insurance for anyone associated with the district?
   —— Yes (1)
   —— No (2)

(23-29) 20. For whom does the district provide legal liability insurance? (Check all that apply.)
   —— Board Members
   —— Superintendent
   —— Central Staff Members
   —— Principals
   —— Teachers
   —— All Staff Members
   —— Others (Please specify.)

PLEASE LIST BELOW ANY OTHER PREVENTIVE PRACTICES THAT YOUR DISTRICT UTILIZES TO REDUCE THE POSSIBILITY OF LITIGATION THAT HAVE NOT BEEN PREVIOUSLY ADDRESSED IN THIS SURVEY:

________________________________________________________________________

SECTION TWO: LEGAL COSTS

(30-42) 21. Using a scale of 1 to 7, circle the number that best describes the amount of money that your district spends on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for employment-related cases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for special education cases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for student discipline cases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for student attendance cases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for desegregation cases</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal awareness in-service sessions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals, publications, and materials that relate to school law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences and workshops that relate to school law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of school board policies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of administrative regulations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal liability insurance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YOU MAY WISH TO REFER QUESTIONS 22, 23, 24, AND 25 TO THE FINANCE OFFICER.

(43) 22. What is your contractual fee arrangement with your attorney?
   1. ___ Retainer only. If so, what amount?
   2. ___ Retainer plus additional charges (by the case). If so, what amount for school year 1982-83?
   3. ___ By the hour. If so, what hourly amount for school year 1982-83?

(44-64) 23. What is the total amount of money that your district has paid for legal liability insurance during the three school years 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83? (Round to the nearest dollar.)
   1980-81 ___________________________ (44-50)
   1981-82 ___________________________ (51-57)
   1982-83 ___________________________ (58-64)
24. What is the total amount of money that your district has paid for attorney fees during the school years — 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83? (Round to the nearest dollar.)

1980-81 .................................................. (6-12)
1981-82 .................................................. (13-19)
1982-83 .................................................. (20-26)
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25. In addition to liability insurance costs and attorney fees, what is the total amount of money that your district has spent on related legal costs such as settlements, court costs, etc., during the three school years 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83? (Round to the nearest dollar.)

1980-81 .................................................. (27-33)
1981-82 .................................................. (34-40)
1982-83 .................................................. (41-47)

PLEASE RETURN QUESTIONNAIRE BY FOLDING, STAPLING, AND MAILING. NO POSTAGE IS NECESSARY. THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.
Dear Superintendent:

Several months ago, you participated in a study that was sponsored by the Texas Association of School Boards and North Texas State University. The purpose of the study was to analyze the amount of money Texas public school districts spend on legal costs and to uncover effective practices that school districts utilize to prevent litigation.

The results of the study will soon be released. The findings should be useful to school districts in that they will provide districts with a measuring stick by which to calculate reasonable legal costs. In addition, preventive strategies utilized by districts will be available to respondents.

Prior to finalizing this study, it is necessary to request additional assistance from selected Superintendents. Your response to twenty questions is greatly needed. Due to the design of the survey, it is necessary that the survey be administered to you by our research associate.

In order to collect this information as quickly and efficiently as possible, our research associate will be at the School Administrators Advisory Conference on Education in Austin, Texas, on January 28-30. A table identified with the sign, "Preventive Law Study," will be set up outside the meeting room of the Red, Red Rose on January 28 from 5 to 8 p.m. and will be set up in the lobby area on the main floor of Palmer Auditorium on Tuesday, January 29, from 8 A.M. - 5 P.M.

Please locate this table and participate in this important study. The survey should take no more than ten minutes of your time. If neither time is convenient, please contact Cathy Zollars at the Sheraton Crest Hotel to arrange a more appropriate time or you may contact her at her office at (214) 264-6141 prior to or after the conference.

Thank you for participating in this study. We appreciate your taking your time to contribute to this important research.

Sincerely,

Frank R. Kemerer
North Texas State University

John Aldridge
Texas Association of School Boards
LEGAL AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME OF SCHOOL DISTRICT -------------------------------

DIRECTIONS: ANSWER BY CIRCLING (T) TRUE OR (F) FALSE. (DO NOT GUESS.)

1. If there are substantial numbers of students enrolled in a district who are of limited English-speaking ability, the school district must provide special language instruction to assist students in overcoming the handicap.  
   T F

2. The federal copyright law applies to copying of books and materials but not to the copying of computer programs.  
   T F

3. The Supreme Court has ruled that the Bible may not be used in any fashion in the public school curriculum.  
   T F

4. Assuming that there is not an immediate threat to safety, student suspensions for even brief periods of time must include a process for telling students what (s)he has been charged with and an opportunity for hearing the student's responses to the charge.  
   T F

5. Texas teachers have the statutory authority to suspend unruly students from their classes.  
   T F

6. Due process requirements are not constitutionally required for academic decisions involving student promotion and retention.  
   T F

7. It is permissible under Texas law for school districts to use academic sanctions to punish students for misbehavior, such as giving a zero to a student for sleeping in class.  
   T F

8. The U. S. Supreme Court has recently ruled that public employee complaints about working conditions are constitutionally protected under the First Amendment.  
   T F

9. Texas does not allow public employees with the exception of police and firefighters to engage in collective bargaining.  
   T F

10. Except for the use of excessive force in student discipline, educators in Texas are generally protected by state law from damage suits as long as they are acting in the scope of their duties and are exercising discretion and reasonable judgment.  
    T F

11. Handicapped students may be removed from the school as means of discipline if the misbehavior relates to the handicapping condition.  
    T F
T  F  12. Under federal law, school authorities do not have the right to preview student publications and delete certain materials.

T  F  13. Teachers may use additional texts or supplemental readings even though the district has instructed them to use only specific ones.

T  F  14. By law, all term contract employees have the right to resign on or before August 1 preceding the beginning of the new school year.

T  F  15. Professional term contract employees must be notified by April 1 as to whether or not their contract will be renewed the following year.

T  F  16. The use of sniffer dogs on lockers and parked cars is not a search.

T  F  17. Student religious organizations may meet on school property before or after school as long as the students do not meet during the school day or are forced to go.

T  F  18. Texas law permits term contract teachers to be suspended without pay if they are criminally indicted for a felony involving moral turpitude.

T  F  19. A district legally may limit a teacher to no more than five days of absence for religious observances.

T  F  20. It is against the law to have a prayer at a public meeting such as a school board meeting.
Mr. Aldridge, Director of Legal Services for the Texas Association of School Boards contacted the attorney for School District A by letter concerning the purpose of the interview. It was difficult to get an appointment with the attorney, but after several phone contacts, a time was agreed upon.

The interview was conducted in the attorney's office. The attorney appeared anxious during the interview but was fully cooperative.

Z: What services do you regularly provide to the District?

G: Primarily advisory, checking contracts, uh, handling, uh, appeals from various types of complainants, students, teacher, uh, reviewing and revising their board policies and interpreting and fashioning contracts to comply with them.

Z: Why do you think that you were selected as the attorney for this district, and I understand you have been for quite a few years?

G: Well, uh, I guess the answer to that is that there are very few of us who specialize in school law, and that for persons who have been in the school business are aware that you probably need someone who is aware of the particular problems in hearing school problems, and I think that's probably the reason.

Z: So you did specialize?

G: I've been doing school law for almost thirty years.

Z: Do you attend school board meetings?

G: Not for School District A. I attend them if I am requested to be there but as a normal routine matter, the answer to that is no.

Z: And when the school district contacts you, who is normally the contact person?

G: Usually the Superintendent. Well, that's not true. The Superintendent with respect to matters over which she has primary concern; the Assistant Superintendent if it deals with, uh, board policies uh, curriculum, I guess maybe with the teacher, with the, I guess the area they now refer to as certified in other words the teaching personnel; the business man when it relates to the non-teaching personnel in handling matters that relate to ad valorem contracts, and worker's compensation, and matters that are not specifically unique to teachers.

Z: So really there is a freedom in the school district then for the top administrators to feel free to contact you?

G: I think that's right. In other words, each district does it a little different.

Z: You mentioned school board policy. What role do you play in the development of their school board policy?
G: I really prefer to review, and sometimes they’re better at it than others, but I really prefer to read all of their school board policies and policy changes that have what I call a legal impact. If they're strictly matters that relate to non heavily legal involved matters, that that's strictly a policy or business matter. When it relates to contracts, grievances, due process matters, religious matters, then I really like to review them.

Z: I know that TASB has a policy service and they address many of those issues, but do you still prefer to also review those that have been fashioned around that?

G: Yes. Uh, TASB does an excellent job but quite frankly I consider TASB an intellectual approach, and I consider mine an on the ground field approach and each particular, it's like having a 40 regular suit. A 40 regular suit fits a 40 regular. It doesn't fit a 41 long or a 40 short. So what happens is they form the numbers of a set of policies but each one sometime needs a little bit of fine tuning to really build in the character of the district. Some districts are a good deal more, well the way they relate to their employees, some are extremely, uh, uh, and I hate to use the word conservative and liberal, it doesn't mean anything but some are extremely employer conscious and some are simply, uh, they don't pay that much attention to it.

Z: Do you get involved at all in the development of or the review of administrative regulations?

G: Only if asked.

Z: Do you think that that is something a school district needs in addition to board policy or do you think the policy pretty well suffices?

G: Oh, I think there are places, no I think there are places where administrative regs are needed. The board policies themselves really cannot meet all the situations. There are areas for example, that need, uh, a quick change or a quick sort of, uh, flexibility, and I think there is certainly uh, a place for administrative regulations in implementing, or sort of detailing, how a particular policy is to be implemented.

Z: Do you get involved in any of the activities in keeping the staff members informed about changes in law?

G: Seminars? That sort of thing?

Z: Seminars, in-service, staff development...

G: No, not out there. They handle their own.

Z: What are some examples of things that you do in assisting that district in preventing or reducing litigation?
G: I guess one of the main things that, that, that I find that those people who take my advice have less litigation than those that don't because in all areas where there are matters of extreme principle and you're out, uh, before the public, no matter what you do, sometime there's a tendency to take a position that's probably going to cost you money. I think the Board uh, and the Superintendent and staff have been, uh, very, I think they, first thing, of course is to try to be fair and the next thing is to try to have a realistic approach as to what your likelihood is of winning a lawsuit or winning litigation. Then even if you win, unlike, uh, tort litigation, uh, all the players are there the next day. They don't go away. They don't just pay off and leave. The answer is you've got to live in the shambles you make the next morning. So the answer is that I think it's primarily that the people out there, uh, I, think it is a community, it's been, it's been historically small and close and I think they desire to, to have a balanced approach between the needs of the employees and the needs of the taxpayer or the citizen, if you will, if you assume there's a pull and tug between raising taxes and paying teachers which there certainly is and I think the main thing is you have, uh, people who have the, uh, respect of their particular community that they're trying, uh, to balance these particular demands and I think, less litigation is not so much function, I don't think of the day to day administration. I really think it's a function of the fact that the board and the administration has the confidence of the community.

Z: Why do you think that some districts of comparable size have much more litigation than others?

G: They may be more heterogeneous uh, any time you have, this is my own particular idea, any time you have a large number of different types of demands, the greater number of demands, the greater number of, uh, if you had for example, a community that is almost, uh, universally Baptist, you're likely to have less religious, less First Amendment, less, uh, a lesser number of problems than if you had one that was so equally divided between, uh, Jewish, Catholic, uh, agnostic, atheist, and this sort of thing. An if you have, for example a larger number of different cultures, you're likely to have more, more, uh, problems. If your community is more transient, where people don't have not known their neighbors and they're not seeing their neighbors but they're seeing an entity, I think diversity is a cause of litigation. The greater diversity you have in a school district, the more likely you're going to have litigation.

Z: In our study, our preventive study, we found that by being preventive, we're not talking about reducing costs, we're actually talking about spending money, especially spending money on attorneys to engage in legal counseling, etc. Is there anything you've seen done with school districts that you think is really a preventive strategy that you think other school districts or educators should consider?

G: I really think the answer is to be straight up. I think really the problem is, is meely-mouthing. I think if you're pretending to be something you're not, you've got a problem.

Z: Thank you, Mr. , for taking your time to answer these questions on this Friday afternoon.
Mr. John Aldridge, Director of Legal Services for the Texas Association of School Boards, contacted Superintendent C by letter concerning the purpose of the interview. Superintendent C was most receptive to such and was most accommodating when I contacted him to schedule the interview.

The interview was conducted in Superintendent C's office (School District C Administration Building). Superintendent C appeared relaxed and willing to spend the time needed to accomplish the task.

Z: I am interested in some information about your school attorney. I've already had the opportunity to interview Attorney C and I am curious about the process that you used in selecting this school attorney.

D: Well, uh, I really can't take any credit for selecting Attorney C. He was a school attorney here when I came to School District C. His background, as you are aware, uh, he was on the school board here years ago—thirty years ago, I guess, uh, twenty years ago, and, uh, served more or less, I think, as a school attorney even then just as a courtesy cause it's a small town, a small school, and probably didn't have much need for a school attorney in those days. But then, after he got off the school board, the community began to grow. The board continued to use his services on a fee basis and, uh, so that just evolved into what has been a long term relationship. He's been very successful. He's made tremendous contributions to the district and is very well respected here. Some of the outstanding things that he did, uh, I guess the most outstanding law suit that he won, was the integration suit back in about 1970 when he got freedom of choice for School District C and it's still intact and he's still employed, so, that's unique of itself. That is kinda the background.

Z: How do you determine whether or not he attends the school board meetings and when he does what is his function?

D: He does not regularly attend school board meetings. He comes when we know any kind of a hearing whether it be a student hearing or employee. That decision is made really by me as to when he needs to be at the board meeting and, uh, he does present the school's side in any hearing that is conducted before the board of education. Uh, I've asked him to do that and he's really very good at it, uh, he would only probably average coming to a board meeting half a dozen times a year.

Z: I'm interested secondly in school board policy development and administrative regulation development. Would you describe your district's process for developing school board policies?
D: In the past our practice has been that, uh, if it was a highly technical or involved very, a great number of legal issues, I would ask Attorney C to write the policy to start with and then we would analyze it and make suggestions on what have you before it went to the board. If it's, uh, just a routine policy of some sort, we may ask him to take a look at what we have written and to make any technical corrections if he sees that need to be made and discuss it that way. Same thing with administrative regulations. We write those, our staff does, and, uh, except in a case where it's dealing purely with law-something legal- we may ask him to do a paragraph or we may ask him to write a whole reg but, that's unusual.

D: Uh, the last few months, I'm sure you're aware, we've contracted with TASB to update all our policies and try to get us in compliance because of HB 72 and all that. We will still ask him to take a look at it and make sure that those policies, uh, do what School District C wants them to do. He is so aware of our own needs and, uh, our own desires that he can pick' em out pretty well. And we find frankly that as all good lawyers tend to do, there are some disagreements about what the law says from time to time and we would like to have his opinion as well as TASB opinion and any others that we can get. Uh, we want to be as right as we can be.

Z: After the policies are written and the administrative regulations, the hard part then is communicating to everyone. What do you, how do you do that here in this district? It's a large district.

D: OK, in the communication process we do two or three things. One is, we never adopt a policy until it has had, uh, almost never adopt, unless it's had at least one reading, uh, publicly at the board table discussed by the school board. They have options, of course, to make any changes they want and then it goes on the next agenda two weeks later for action. OK we get the publicity surroundings that that is necessary through the local media as well as we publish what we call "School Board Notes" the same night the board meets. Our communications department stays and puts together "School Board Notes" and prints them and they are in all the teachers' mail boxes the next morning when they come to work. So that immediately after any action item, or that's not just board policies, that's all things our "School Board Notes" are in the schools the first thing the next morning and it includes that. We also send out, we have a record of who has a copy of board policies and administrative regs and where they're located. We send those out through the communications department and ask that they be put in the proper place in the book. Uh, if they're in the libraries, the librarian is charged with that; if they're in the principal's office, the principal is asked to do that. Uh, we try to keep the board policy handbooks that they use up to date so it's uh, a joint effort but primarily I attribute most of it to our communications department.

Z: You must have short board meetings to be able to stay up here and get all that done between then and the next morning.
Z: What are some of the activities that you do in your district to keep your staff informed about legal principles and legal changes?

D: We do several things. First of all, I try to put in the hands of all our principals, uh, those board rules and regulations that come out that affect them and or their teachers and or the pupils, uh, just simply send out copies. Secondly, uh, I personally spend some time each year in staff development with the administrators going over, uh, new laws, new legislation and trying to make sure that everyone is up to date as much as possible with what's happening. Uh, I give them handouts and there may be a handout that comes from TASB or TASA or some other source or maybe things that we put together in this office to help them better understand what the law actually says. At the convocation each year which I speak to all staff members, I go over things with them that I feel are of utmost importance and that they need to be more familiar with. Uh, naturally I send out newsletters from time to time to staff, maybe a personal, a kind of a letter to the staff from me that explains something. Uh, our communications department does a super job and we send out what we call, uh, "Staff Update" and, uh, another publication, the name has slipped me, that goes to every citizen in the community four times a year and we have things in it you know, just brief synopsis of laws that are affecting schools and, uh, we try to get that in the hands of 60,000 parents, uh, by first class mail and then we just simply tell our staff over and over and over. Then 3 times a year, I have what we call cluster breakfasts and I meet with groups of teachers for breakfast representing all of the buildings and we do this three times a year so that I talk to three different teachers from every building every year. Uh, I try to keep the group to ten or fifteen teachers and, uh, I talk about things that they want to talk about, legal or otherwise, and answer their questions so that they can go back and from a teacher's point of view tell their colleagues what they've learned.

Z: Do you use your school attorney at all in doing any in-service sessions?

D: Yes, uh, we use our attorney very regularly. Uh, generally speaking at least once a year, he and I will do sometimes a dog and a pony show. He and I together will meet with all the staff sometimes it's a convocation, sometimes after convocation. Uh, we use him at least once or twice a year to go over and update our principals with what's happening and then generally once and twice a year we have him go over certain issues with the board of education, uh, so that they understand better what's happening in certain areas. Uh, so we use him for staff development very regularly.

Z: Who would you say are key people in this district that are really the ones that make you have such a preventive approach? I mean obviously everybody has to be involved, but who do you really rely on to keep you out of legal problems.
D: You talking about one or two individuals? Uh, probably the two that I depend upon the most are the Assistant Superintendent for Administration who is the hearing officer for all kinds of student cases and the Assistant Superintendent for Personnel who deals with all the personnel matters and, uh, those two individuals are very key and they have to know what they are doing and they certainly must know the law. Let's close that door!

Z: So the three of you then spend a lot of time together and go to a lot of conferences and sessions-- to try to stay updated?

D: Yes, and I also give a lot of attention to the other assistant superintendents, the other two. They know as much as I can teach them. In fact one of the other, the other Assistant Superintendent for Educational Operations, has as a part of her job, to attend all State Board meetings so that she knows exactly what's happening when it happens, and then she comes back and informs the rest of us and therefore we have a very up to date method of keeping up with what the State Board is up to.

Z: You don't mind then spending money then to try to keep well informed?

D: I think that that's the best money we can spend. It saves us a lot of money in the long run.

Z: That's true. I think the same philosophy is probably true with an attorney, that you actually have to spend money to keep yourselves in line and often people don't realize that that's needed. Why do you think that some of the districts of comparable size have much more litigation than others?

D: I guess there are a lot of reasons, several reasons. One, uh, I guess we'd have to say is the attitude of the people in the school district itself. If you have, uh, citizens and or staff who, uh, are schooled in the thought that everything oughta be litigated and that there is no such answer as "no" or that there is no such answer as "we are going to do it this way" uh, without a lawsuit, then you are going to naturally have, uh, more litigation if that is a personality of a district that exists and I think that it may be. Other, other things, of course, that affect it, uh, are attitudes on the part of the leadership in the school itself—the board of education, the superintendent, must take responsibility for some of that, uh, if their attitude is one of confrontational, they're probably going to have a little bit more than some others, uh, my own personality is somewhat that way. If somebody pushes, I don't like to be shoved and I think there has to be a, I think there has to be a clear understanding that you don't let people run over you, but, at the same time, if you're wrong admit it, change it, and get on about your business. Uh, I don't ever like to lose a lawsuit. Uh, and I think that bad law comes from bad lawsuits. And I think that those of us who are responsible for saying "ok, we'll go to court on this issue" should be very careful that we're right so that we do not either hurt our own district or the colleagues in other districts by getting a ruling that is bad for people, bad for children, bad for staff, or bad for anybody. Uh, I don't know where that magic line is, uh, but I do believe that it can be learned and I think that good administrators and good school board members usually know if they're treading on real thin ice. And sometimes, on some occasions,
D: I've recommended to our board that we take the chance, uh, knowing full well it was a toss up. Uh, I'm talking about litigation, for example, with taxes where the banks sued us. Uh, we did not settle like some of our neighbors did and ended up that we were right and the Supreme Court held in our favor we didn't give back a million dollars to the banks in taxes; others did. Uh, we could have lost, but the only thing we would have lost would have been attorney fees so we thought it was worth the gamble and it paid off. That's just one example of one that we knew going in could go either way. There are others that, uh, you know going in that chances are your going to lose, uh, but even so you may think it's worth it uh, -PR wise, in our case and point would be, we used to have before 72 a policy that if kids, came to school drinking, they were automatically expelled and we went to court on that and won it. The parents of some kids said, "you can't do that," and we said, "yes we can and we'll find out," and the state court ruled in our favor. Uh, we felt in a case like that that we were so right that we were willing to say all right if anybody is going to change the rule on this one, it will have to be a judge or a court. And so I think that you make those kinds of administrative decisions, too. But where you are dealing with lots of money, when you are dealing with lawsuits because you have simply done something to someone's civil rights, then you're silly if you go to court and then lose a big suit if you can solve it otherwise, in my judgment. Uh, back to your original question, I don't guess I know why, uh, I think it's I guess it's the leadership. I guess it's the combination of having a good lawyer to advise you, it's using good judgment, trying to deal with people in a humane manner, uh, all of those things have to be a part of it.

Z: Leadership is an interesting point. Obviously you provide a kind of quality leadership that is needed as evidenced by what goes on in this district. You have been very successful and what do you owe that to? I am going to put you on the spot and make you embarrass yourself.

D: The best thing I've ever had going for me has been a good staff and good school board members.

D: Do you want to start over?

Z: Yes. Would you tell me what you owe your success to—very obviously you've been successful in this district?

D: That is again a question that is almost impossible to answer. Uh, if I've had any success, and some people might question that, uh, but if I have, I attribute most of it to the good luck of being able to hire outstanding people to work with me and being fortunate that the community is willing to elect good school board trustees who are willing to provide, uh, a climate in which we can offer good education, uh. A board of trustees can provide the climate for success or failure and they must share that responsibility whether they want to or not. School has been that the school superintendent, school board are a team working on the same projects together and it's not a superintendent on one side and the school board on the other—each trying to outdo the other or each trying to upstage the other. It's a matter of a very close working relationship and an understanding what it is that's good.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for employment-related cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for special education cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for student discipline cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attendance cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees for desegregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal awareness in-service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals, publications, and materials that relate to school law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences and workshops that relate to school law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of school board regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of administrative regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal liability insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Size</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$6,283.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$17,880.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1,819.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$3,852.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$1,397.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$2,112.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT USED
A LOCAL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$15,708.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$36,431.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$4,193.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$9,180.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$3,548.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$5,160.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE LIII

### COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT USED TASB ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$407,750.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$367,720.33</td>
<td>$376,766.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$497,756.90</td>
<td>$437,011.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$66,271.22</td>
<td>$60,975.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$457,622.00</td>
<td>$34,039.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$22,744.40</td>
<td>$32,942.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,167.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$10,454.92</td>
<td>$15,241.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>$17,161.26</td>
<td>$87,272.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,280.43</td>
<td>$4,048.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>$3,374.78</td>
<td>$5,597.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$2,541.54</td>
<td>$5,257.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$1,631.96</td>
<td>$3,692.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE LIV

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983**

**BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT USED**

**TASB ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50,000 or more</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000,750.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,014,522.33</td>
<td>$1,004,032.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10,000 to 49,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$181,329.40</td>
<td>$144,341.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$198,139.35</td>
<td>$202,587.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5,000 to 9,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$138,608.25</td>
<td>$73,583.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$49,741.20</td>
<td>$70,133.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,500 to 4,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$24,792.46</td>
<td>$33,776.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>$34,780.85</td>
<td>$104,884.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500 to 1,499</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$5,133.57</td>
<td>$6,752.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>$8,039.57</td>
<td>$11,164.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than 500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$5,569.81</td>
<td>$10,548.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$4,259.15</td>
<td>$7,177.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$9,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$454,503.67</td>
<td>$327,393.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$147,400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$67,205.41</td>
<td>$60,624.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$54,957.19</td>
<td>$52,180.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$21,207.91</td>
<td>$27,560.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$36,365.88</td>
<td>$40,852.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$20,350.76</td>
<td>$106,836.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$10,704.48</td>
<td>$14,002.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$2,441.57</td>
<td>$3,574.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$4,033.15</td>
<td>$6,751.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$1,867.53</td>
<td>$3,628.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$1,841.06</td>
<td>$4,725.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE LVI
COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT USED
LEGAL SERVICES OF TEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,191,305.67</td>
<td>$901,811.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$470,400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$211,759.47</td>
<td>$189,192.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$173,161.75</td>
<td>$183,922.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$62,726.18</td>
<td>$73,994.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$76,320.38</td>
<td>$88,185.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$33,559.10</td>
<td>$111,612.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$32,231.23</td>
<td>$73,900.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$6,653.33</td>
<td>$9,754.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$8,640.00</td>
<td>$11,541.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$4,852.85</td>
<td>$8,546.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$4,238.20</td>
<td>$7,596.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,591.77</td>
<td>$8,126.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference ($p < .05$) on cost between ADA groups; no difference ($p > .05$) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE LVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT USED THE LEGAL SERVICE OF THE EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>4  $377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>32 $61,258.19</td>
<td>$57,046.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$61,258.19</td>
<td>$57,046.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$61,545.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 $28,921.56</td>
<td>$34,072.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$28,921.56</td>
<td>$34,072.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,626.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>118 $16,808.35</td>
<td>$83,306.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$16,808.35</td>
<td>$83,306.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$7,983.69</td>
<td>$7,555.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>145 $3,218.74</td>
<td>$5,452.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>$3,218.74</td>
<td>$5,452.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3,205.20</td>
<td>$5,099.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>159 $1,807.32</td>
<td>$4,044.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$1,807.32</td>
<td>$4,044.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$2,070.22</td>
<td>$4,578.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LVIII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT USED LEGAL SERVICES OF THE EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$194,413.03</td>
<td>$187,549.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$149,282.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$71,776.94</td>
<td>$79,060.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,566.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$34,531.71</td>
<td>$100,802.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$18,602.15</td>
<td>$14,325.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>$7,418.50</td>
<td>$10,306.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$9,587.40</td>
<td>$14,039.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$4,326.73</td>
<td>$7,468.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$5,708.22</td>
<td>$10,615.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE LIX

**Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether the District Used Legal Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50,000 or more</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10,000 to 49,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5,000 to 9,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,500 to 4,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500 to 1,499</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>$3,266.27</td>
<td>$5,461.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,314.25</td>
<td>$1,636.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than 500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>$1,893.73</td>
<td>$4,203.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$838.57</td>
<td>$1,187.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (*p < .05*) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (*p > .05*) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>$7,756.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,358.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,591.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some service</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>$4,692.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,603.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,591.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE LXI

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT USED OTHER LEGAL SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$64,351.29</td>
<td>$56,540.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$13,458.50</td>
<td>$10,689.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$28,361.89</td>
<td>$34,418.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13,700.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$16,858.49</td>
<td>$85,017.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$10,120.22</td>
<td>$13,993.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$3,059.49</td>
<td>$5,335.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$4,323.35</td>
<td>$5,900.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$1,684.81</td>
<td>$4,131.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$3,646.82</td>
<td>$3,863.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LXII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT USED
OTHER LEGAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$204,167.16</td>
<td>$185,196.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,769.50</td>
<td>$79,780.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,455.62</td>
<td>$102,737.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,463.17</td>
<td>$10,880.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,232.87</td>
<td>$7,949.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference \((p < .05)\) on cost between ADA groups; no difference \((p > .05)\) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
## TABLE LXIII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND DISTRICT'S PRIMARY SOURCE OF LEGAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$64,351.29</td>
<td>$56,540.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$13,458.50</td>
<td>$10,689.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$28,979.28</td>
<td>$34,026.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,587.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$23,574.37</td>
<td>$105,273.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$4,784.29</td>
<td>$7,173.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$7,224.00</td>
<td>$5,307.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$10,946.57</td>
<td>$17,009.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$16,525.94</td>
<td>$80,951.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$3,846.92</td>
<td>$6,610.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$2,510.74</td>
<td>$3,988.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,695.00</td>
<td>$1,774.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$231.00</td>
<td>$326.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$474.67</td>
<td>$513.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$5,796.73</td>
<td>$7,239.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$3,199.97</td>
<td>$5,417.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Size</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$2,254.52</td>
<td>$4,573.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$1,461.36</td>
<td>$4,061.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,181.50</td>
<td>$4,483.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$533.33</td>
<td>$503.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,467.50</td>
<td>$1,261.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3,706.60</td>
<td>$3,174.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$1,888.70</td>
<td>$4,173.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE LXIV

**Comparison of All Legal Costs for the Years 1980 to 1983**

**By District Size and the District's Primary Source of Legal Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$204,167.16</td>
<td>$185,196.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$20,658.50</td>
<td>$14,083.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$71,654.33</td>
<td>$79,162.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,773.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$33,904.06</td>
<td>$98,014.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$47,131.34</td>
<td>$125,822.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$13,573.65</td>
<td>$16,437.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education service center</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$11,463.75</td>
<td>$9,018.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$20,718.37</td>
<td>$29,030.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$33,904.06</td>
<td>$98,014.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$7,556.56</td>
<td>$10,677.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$9,105.53</td>
<td>$12,169.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$6,240.96</td>
<td>$9,531.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$4,409.20</td>
<td>$2,310.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education service center</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$231.00</td>
<td>$326.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$860.67</td>
<td>$850.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$11,462.64</td>
<td>$10,817.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$7,556.56</td>
<td>$10,677.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE LXIV—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local attorney</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$5,336.99</td>
<td>$9,340.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASB</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$3,827.00</td>
<td>$7,271.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$4,464.70</td>
<td>$9,704.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education service center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,533.33</td>
<td>$1,418.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,806.50</td>
<td>$979.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$9,780.60</td>
<td>$8,110.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$4,660.19</td>
<td>$8,192.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$280,375.00</td>
<td>$180,135.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$475,080.50</td>
<td>$463,410.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$71,653.56</td>
<td>$58,473.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$18,190.43</td>
<td>$15,193.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$103,135.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$40,743.91</td>
<td>$39,217.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$9,503.88</td>
<td>$7,946.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$17,504.54</td>
<td>$92,008.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$12,600.93</td>
<td>$16,673.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$6,802.25</td>
<td>$7,587.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$16,043.64</td>
<td>$79,405.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Size</td>
<td>Legal Costs for 1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$3,150.94</td>
<td>$5,048.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$3,803.30</td>
<td>$7,000.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,580.00</td>
<td>$2,889.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>$3,269.88</td>
<td>$5,443.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>$1,941.99</td>
<td>$4,262.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$1,740.30</td>
<td>$4,145.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,108.40</td>
<td>$1,293.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$1,877.93</td>
<td>$4,177.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
#### TABLE LXVI

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND THE RESPONDENT’S RATING OF THE DISTRICT’S PRIMARY SOURCE OF LEGAL SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$700,375.00</td>
<td>$424,794.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,321,783.50</td>
<td>$1,204,038.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$232,202.68</td>
<td>$193,860.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$51,717.71</td>
<td>$45,046.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$203,408.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$88,836.82</td>
<td>$87,666.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$40,418.25</td>
<td>$56,482.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$35,265.05</td>
<td>$110,542.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$29,159.47</td>
<td>$31,992.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$13,210.25</td>
<td>$11,105.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$33,177.46</td>
<td>$96,183.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE LXVI—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$6,880.53</td>
<td>$9,126.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$11,034.18</td>
<td>$15,324.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowledgeable of school law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$6,800.00</td>
<td>$6,816.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>$7,751.03</td>
<td>$10,735.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Less than 500 |        |          |         |
| Very knowledgeable of school law | 146    | $4,694.73 | $8,133.32 |
| Fairly knowledgeable of school law | 40     | $4,522.97 | $8,961.86 |
| Not knowledgeable of school law | 5      | $3,526.40  | $3,846.14  |
| Total         | 191    | $4,628.18 | $8,204.78 |

| Grand total   | 542    | $33,477.63 | $131,815.73 |

Two-way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$51,251.67</td>
<td>$62,203.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$66,989.86</td>
<td>$53,118.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$18,390.00</td>
<td>$19,605.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$31,836.46</td>
<td>$38,382.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$8,441.84</td>
<td>$11,983.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$22,460.30</td>
<td>$107,578.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$3,586.40</td>
<td>$5,447.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$2,951.68</td>
<td>$5,388.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$1,836.48</td>
<td>$4,054.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$1,873.89</td>
<td>$4,684.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
# TABLE LXVIII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE BOARD PRESIDENT
HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE LXIX

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER BOARD MEMBERS HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$147,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$454,503.67</td>
<td>327,393.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$65,370.79</td>
<td>62,118.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$55,697.29</td>
<td>48,574.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$20,419.77</td>
<td>30,798.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$43,126.17</td>
<td>36,994.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>$16,809.60</td>
<td>87,277.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$12,022.75</td>
<td>15,715.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$3,353.70</td>
<td>5,665.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$2,627.13</td>
<td>4,118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$1,805.67</td>
<td>4,034.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$2,018.41</td>
<td>5,624.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$470,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,191,305.67</td>
<td>$901,811.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$192,821.63</td>
<td>$186,013.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$193,349.14</td>
<td>$190,055.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$45,975.85</td>
<td>$71,437.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$117,144.17</td>
<td>$74,846.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>$34,710.50</td>
<td>$104,893.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$25,106.13</td>
<td>$33,750.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$8,006.55</td>
<td>$11,542.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$5,954.70</td>
<td>$5,351.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>$4,663.66</td>
<td>$8,448.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$4,316.54</td>
<td>$7,061.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
## Table LXXI

Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether the Superintendent Had Authority to Contact the School Attorney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$62,947.09</td>
<td>$56,197.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$16,043.64</td>
<td>$79,405.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$802.00</td>
<td>$562.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$3,248.04</td>
<td>$5,432.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>$1,865.42</td>
<td>$4,145.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LXXII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE SUPERINTENDENT
HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LXXIII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$277,575.00</td>
<td>$184,095.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$477,880.50</td>
<td>$459,450.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$36,198.75</td>
<td>$28,525.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$75,591.52</td>
<td>$63,278.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$27,798.80</td>
<td>$37,866.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$25,136.22</td>
<td>$30,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$8,413.53</td>
<td>$12,754.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$35,035.16</td>
<td>$147,161.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$3,163.08</td>
<td>$5,461.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$4,613.33</td>
<td>$3,754.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>$1,813.82</td>
<td>$4,034.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,912.50</td>
<td>$6,523.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; a difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LXXIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE LXXV

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER OTHER CENTRAL STAFF MEMBERS HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$153,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$452,637.00</td>
<td>329,978.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$58,592.90</td>
<td>51,298.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$65,380.69</td>
<td>64,886.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$27,138.38</td>
<td>31,540.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>51,961.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$16,341.76</td>
<td>83,223.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$12,218.85</td>
<td>15,881.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$3,263.69</td>
<td>5,516.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,207.29</td>
<td>1,494.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$1,759.73</td>
<td>4,032.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$5,446.00</td>
<td>11,714.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; a difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,214,772.33</td>
<td>$871,325.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$177,819.55</td>
<td>$159,995.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$216,469.85</td>
<td>$222,533.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$67,534.44</td>
<td>$71,968.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$73,333.33</td>
<td>$127,017.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$32,538.19</td>
<td>$100,175.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$36,697.23</td>
<td>$40,795.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$7,687.74</td>
<td>$10,880.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$6,181.29</td>
<td>$4,292.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$4,402.05</td>
<td>$7,570.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$13,163.75</td>
<td>$23,262.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE LXXVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER PRINCIPALS HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$802,761.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$611,790.00</td>
<td>$53,979.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$62,137.00</td>
<td>$90,508.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$612,667.00</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$29,123.00</td>
<td>$33,901.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$8,787.71</td>
<td>$12,760.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$85,883.83</td>
<td>$257,563.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$3,208.68</td>
<td>$5,483.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$3,262.77</td>
<td>$5,088.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$4,167.36</td>
<td>$3,601.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$3,499.32</td>
<td>$8,064.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; a difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE LXXVIII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER PRINCIPALS HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,173,167.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$181,168.40</td>
<td>$164,216.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$311,815.67</td>
<td>$363,178.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$72,252.83</td>
<td>$78,627.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$25,861.91</td>
<td>$55,942.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$103,250.25</td>
<td>$262,802.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$7,430.16</td>
<td>$10,559.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$8,609.69</td>
<td>$11,418.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>$4,197.37</td>
<td>$7,375.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$6,874.50</td>
<td>$11,563.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,591.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE LXXIX

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER TEACHERS HAD AUTHORITY TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$3,234.80</td>
<td>$5,418.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$3,234.80</td>
<td>$5,418.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$462.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,205.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,205.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,766.67</td>
<td>$568.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE LXXX

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983**  
**BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER TEACHERS HAD AUTHORITY**  
**TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$7,666.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$462.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,666.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$4,573.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5,084.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE LXXXI

Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether Others Had Authority to Contact the School Attorney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>ICT</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$36,699.00</td>
<td>$54,902.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$106,945.67</td>
<td>$57,383.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$28,547.33</td>
<td>$34,324.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,362.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>$15,781.43</td>
<td>$79,702.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$25,684.50</td>
<td>$16,218.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>$1,858.72</td>
<td>$4,137.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,972.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LXXXII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER OTHERS HAD AUTHORITY
TO CONTACT THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE LXXXIII

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND HOW OFTEN THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$477,880.50</td>
<td>$459,450.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$277,575.00</td>
<td>$184,095.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertaining to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$62,755.08</td>
<td>$63,928.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only meetings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$71,728.65</td>
<td>$52,619.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertaining to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$12,339.75</td>
<td>$7,442.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$33,639.88</td>
<td>$35,969.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only meetings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$23,793.11</td>
<td>$35,570.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertaining to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$38,370.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,587.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$11,273.43</td>
<td>$13,735.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only meetings</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$11,481.17</td>
<td>$15,175.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertaining to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$41,554.63</td>
<td>$183,440.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$6,304.17</td>
<td>$8,374.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>$16,141.93</td>
<td>$79,706.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Size</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$12,959.25</td>
<td>$18,641.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only meetings</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$3,210.29</td>
<td>$4,431.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertaining to legal matters</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$1,763.83</td>
<td>$2,273.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$1,763.83</td>
<td>$2,273.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$5,211.50</td>
<td>$7,239.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$3,233.30</td>
<td>$5,463.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,821.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only meetings</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$2,986.32</td>
<td>$4,405.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertaining to legal matters</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$1,763.83</td>
<td>$2,273.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$2,760.39</td>
<td>$7,017.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$1,887.68</td>
<td>$4,195.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LXXXIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND HOW OFTEN THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY
ATTENDED BOARD MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only meetings pertaining to legal matters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only meetings pertaining to legal matters</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only meetings pertaining to legal matters</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only meetings pertaining to legal matters</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE LXXXIV—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$25,356.00</td>
<td>$31,715.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertaining to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal matters</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$8,586.05</td>
<td>$9,540.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$4,400.82</td>
<td>$5,402.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$11,070.90</td>
<td>$14,143.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$7,717.66</td>
<td>$10,805.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All board meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,357.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pertaining to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal matters</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$8,704.85</td>
<td>$11,463.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$2,277.86</td>
<td>$2,365.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other arrangements</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$5,505.68</td>
<td>$9,303.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$4,659.93</td>
<td>$8,236.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LXXXV

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT'S POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED BY A COMMITTEE OF BOARD MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$605,255.50</td>
<td>$279,314.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$150,200.00</td>
<td>$3,959.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$42,520.33</td>
<td>$41,392.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$76,889.00</td>
<td>$62,887.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$23,553.50</td>
<td>$27,337.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$32,075.44</td>
<td>$40,731.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>$17,700.34</td>
<td>$88,102.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$8,793.73</td>
<td>$13,483.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$3,276.38</td>
<td>$5,798.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$3,046.49</td>
<td>$4,111.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$1,929.31</td>
<td>$4,472.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$1,588.26</td>
<td>$2,591.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE LXXXVI

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED
BY A COMMITTEE OF BOARD MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,586,958.50</td>
<td>$829,024.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$435,200.00</td>
<td>$49,780.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$144,083.27</td>
<td>$131,600.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$233,847.22</td>
<td>$214,751.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$73,156.60</td>
<td>$74,453.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$63,220.56</td>
<td>$86,376.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>$34,471.91</td>
<td>$105,718.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$26,808.42</td>
<td>$35,053.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$7,635.87</td>
<td>$11,500.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$7,581.07</td>
<td>$7,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$5,008.23</td>
<td>$8,975.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$3,028.26</td>
<td>$3,275.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$42,212.33</td>
<td>$33,937.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$65,501.22</td>
<td>$59,634.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$26,643.75</td>
<td>$42,377.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$27,842.60</td>
<td>$32,678.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$8,377.00</td>
<td>$11,292.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$22,516.80</td>
<td>$107,636.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$2,527.58</td>
<td>$3,910.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$4,104.47</td>
<td>$6,796.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$1,776.07</td>
<td>$4,451.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$1,975.54</td>
<td>$3,639.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE LXXXVIII

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED BY CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$180,099.83</td>
<td>$127,881.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$195,922.22</td>
<td>$197,035.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$66,606.25</td>
<td>$102,595.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$68,941.73</td>
<td>$74,856.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$20,472.10</td>
<td>$21,668.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$43,825.31</td>
<td>$129,006.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$6,239.61</td>
<td>$8,846.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$9,398.97</td>
<td>$12,488.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$4,670.90</td>
<td>$8,584.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$4,448.09</td>
<td>$7,439.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT'S POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED BY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$605,255.50</td>
<td>$279,314.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$150,200.00</td>
<td>$3,959.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$49,986.35</td>
<td>$46,241.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$78,621.54</td>
<td>$66,756.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$26,996.21</td>
<td>$35,967.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$29,253.40</td>
<td>$29,603.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$16,359.03</td>
<td>$85,303.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$13,419.05</td>
<td>$17,843.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$3,029.64</td>
<td>$5,472.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$4,065.93</td>
<td>$5,097.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>$1,926.02</td>
<td>$4,398.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$1,484.68</td>
<td>$2,324.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE XC

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED
BY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,586,958.50</td>
<td>$829,024.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$435,200.00</td>
<td>$49,780.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$158,333.15</td>
<td>$139,358.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$246,448.92</td>
<td>$234,915.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$73,061.93</td>
<td>$89,451.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$55,536.80</td>
<td>$34,977.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$33,878.46</td>
<td>$103,029.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,483.32</td>
<td>$29,192.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$7,267.13</td>
<td>$10,889.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$9,224.10</td>
<td>$9,662.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>$4,784.65</td>
<td>$8,620.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$3,508.48</td>
<td>$4,679.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between
ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey
variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE XCI

**Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by Size of District and Whether the District's Policies Were Developed by TASB Policy Reference Manual**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$55,901.33</td>
<td>$52,678.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$62,459.22</td>
<td>$57,778.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$24,123.00</td>
<td>$30,899.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$11,985.25</td>
<td>$19,119.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$16,330.67</td>
<td>$82,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$1,328.38</td>
<td>$1,727.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$3,584.01</td>
<td>$5,791.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$1,548.76</td>
<td>$2,842.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$1,927.77</td>
<td>$4,389.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE XCII

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983**  
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED  
USING THE IASB POLICY REFERENCE MANUAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 47,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$180,319.67</td>
<td>$148,918.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$195,873.37</td>
<td>$194,177.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$220,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$60,030.61</td>
<td>$71,043.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$33,582.33</td>
<td>$47,670.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$32,887.24</td>
<td>$99,544.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$3,181.73</td>
<td>$3,334.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$8,483.34</td>
<td>$11,382.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$3,539.11</td>
<td>$5,524.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$4,825.94</td>
<td>$8,619.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE XCIII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED BY THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$31,345.31</td>
<td>$27,155.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$80,715.90</td>
<td>$61,912.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$23,811.79</td>
<td>$36,136.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$38,169.80</td>
<td>$25,529.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$15,900.46</td>
<td>$89,132.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$16,045.72</td>
<td>$19,975.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>$2,979.89</td>
<td>$5,212.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$4,563.75</td>
<td>$6,348.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$1,706.05</td>
<td>$3,961.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$2,923.21</td>
<td>$5,195.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; a difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE XCIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED
BY THE SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$114,350.00</td>
<td>$108,186.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$244,197.45</td>
<td>$207,631.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$68,705.64</td>
<td>$90,261.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$67,734.40</td>
<td>$32,125.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$32,245.93</td>
<td>$106,890.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$35,430.52</td>
<td>$37,833.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>$6,937.56</td>
<td>$10,024.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$11,499.38</td>
<td>$13,398.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$4,182.68</td>
<td>$7,674.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$7,425.29</td>
<td>$10,591.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference \((p < .05)\) on cost between ADA groups; a difference \((p < .05)\) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE XCV

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT'S POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED BY AN OUTSIDE CONSULTANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$57,450.97</td>
<td>$57,994.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$88,932.25</td>
<td>$32,802.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$24,736.12</td>
<td>$31,737.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$51,850.00</td>
<td>$33,552.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>$16,128.87</td>
<td>$80,023.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$7,559.33</td>
<td>$6,112.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$3,338.53</td>
<td>$5,497.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$571.43</td>
<td>$443.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$1,809.13</td>
<td>$4,124.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$2,510.08</td>
<td>$4,433.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE XCVI

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED
BY AN OUTSIDE CONSULTANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$188,458.21</td>
<td>$194,906.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$226,302.75</td>
<td>$88,851.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$61,991.24</td>
<td>$72,725.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$123,350.00</td>
<td>$136,683.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>$33,305.48</td>
<td>$96,933.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$17,823.00</td>
<td>$11,849.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$7,893.09</td>
<td>$10,837.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,692.86</td>
<td>$1,311.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$4,453.59</td>
<td>$7,965.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$6,376.31</td>
<td>$10,341.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,615.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE XCVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED BY OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$367,720.33</td>
<td>$376,766.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$407,750.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$16,087.55</td>
<td>$80,906.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$16,087.55</td>
<td>$80,906.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$12,704.83</td>
<td>$19,065.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>$3,247.28</td>
<td>$5,457.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>$3,247.28</td>
<td>$5,457.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$2,813.64</td>
<td>$4,849.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>$1,928.06</td>
<td>$4,234.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>$1,928.06</td>
<td>$4,234.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$520.00</td>
<td>$458.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE XCVIII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DEVELOPED
BY OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,014,522.33</td>
<td>$1,004,032.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000,750.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$33,297.17</td>
<td>$98,017.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$25,737.33</td>
<td>$22,956.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>$7,760.53</td>
<td>$10,872.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$5,743.09</td>
<td>$7,647.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>$4,702.55</td>
<td>$8,302.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,347.40</td>
<td>$2,903.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE XCIX

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT'S POLICIES WERE REVIEWED BY THE LOCAL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$77,727.75</td>
<td>$108,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$77,727.75</td>
<td>$108,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$77,727.75</td>
<td>$108,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$7,522.67</td>
<td>$1,634.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,660.88</td>
<td>$66,641.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$66,641.30</td>
<td>$56,124.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$24,530.13</td>
<td>$37,836.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$29,924.73</td>
<td>$31,924.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$29,924.73</td>
<td>$31,924.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$17,855.01</td>
<td>$97,768.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$17,855.01</td>
<td>$97,768.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$12,380.37</td>
<td>$14,719.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$2,933.91</td>
<td>$5,144.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$2,933.91</td>
<td>$5,144.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$4,308.76</td>
<td>$6,277.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>$1,675.63</td>
<td>$3,660.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>$1,675.63</td>
<td>$3,660.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$2,887.52</td>
<td>$6,189.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE C

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983**
**BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE REVIEWED**
**BY THE LOCAL ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$23,660.67</td>
<td>$13,924.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$209,983.90</td>
<td>$185,446.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$57,835.25</td>
<td>$89,311.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$76,169.91</td>
<td>$72,561.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$27,154.22</td>
<td>$100,660.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$43,662.20</td>
<td>$86,283.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$6,940.78</td>
<td>$10,257.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$10,242.85</td>
<td>$11,961.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>$4,190.49</td>
<td>$7,226.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$6,821.52</td>
<td>$11,986.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,591.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CI

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S POLICIES WERE REVIEWED BY TASB ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$36,050.00</td>
<td>$48,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$102,761.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$77,727.75</td>
<td>$108,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$55,860.07</td>
<td>$49,269.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$65,772.56</td>
<td>$62,353.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$44,527.50</td>
<td>$34,483.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$23,073.60</td>
<td>$33,081.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$9,270.84</td>
<td>$13,857.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$18,554.81</td>
<td>$93,000.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$2,537.50</td>
<td>$3,770.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$3,583.61</td>
<td>$6,093.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$1,362.61</td>
<td>$2,254.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$2,305.58</td>
<td>$5,273.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE REVIEWED
BY TASB ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,173,167.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$163,780.40</td>
<td>$139,582.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$217,432.94</td>
<td>$216,397.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$148,737.25</td>
<td>$58,340.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$47,040.13</td>
<td>$69,268.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$21,976.51</td>
<td>$30,484.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$37,270.63</td>
<td>$111,423.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$6,687.13</td>
<td>$10,005.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$8,125.13</td>
<td>$11,033.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$3,126.46</td>
<td>$4,662.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$5,908.68</td>
<td>$10,165.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE III

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S POLICIES WERE REVIEWED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF DISTRICT</th>
<th>LEGAL COSTS FOR 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$77,727.75</td>
<td>$108,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$77,727.75</td>
<td>$108,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$17,239.31</td>
<td>$84,708.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$7,170.12</td>
<td>$8,773.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$3,475.09</td>
<td>$5,750.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$2,418.18</td>
<td>$4,117.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>$2,105.56</td>
<td>$4,816.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$1,419.75</td>
<td>$2,521.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE CIV

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 **
**BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE POLICIES WERE REVIEWED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$35,484.80</td>
<td>$102,425.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$15,959.00</td>
<td>$14,070.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$8,102.43</td>
<td>$10,670.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$6,130.74</td>
<td>$10,690.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>$5,500.39</td>
<td>$9,329.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$2,977.44</td>
<td>$5,097.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on costs between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CV

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S POLICIES WERE UPDATED AND REVIEWED BY LOCAL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$147,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$454,503.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$54,772.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$62,710.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$25,571.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$29,833.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$16,544.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$13,959.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>$3,053.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$4,193.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>$1,750.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$2,830.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CVI

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE UPDATED AND
REVIEWED BY THE LOCAL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$470,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,191,305.67</td>
<td>$901,811.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$173,996.00</td>
<td>$245,445.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$197,278.63</td>
<td>$174,148.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$56,845.20</td>
<td>$78,814.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$81,344.33</td>
<td>$80,075.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$33,079.91</td>
<td>$108,299.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$32,534.81</td>
<td>$33,227.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>$6,899.34</td>
<td>$10,161.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$11,925.39</td>
<td>$12,755.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,531.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>$4,403.45</td>
<td>$7,794.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$6,233.63</td>
<td>$10,861.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE CVII

**Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by Size of District and Whether the District's Policies Were Updated and Reviewed by TASB Attorney**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>50,000 or more</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$802,761.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10,000 to 49,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$56,181.56</td>
<td>$48,385.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$66,053.06</td>
<td>$63,720.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5,000 to 9,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$38,363.33</td>
<td>$29,419.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$22,618.00</td>
<td>$35,351.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,500 to 4,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$8,582.57</td>
<td>$13,490.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$18,115.80</td>
<td>$89,788.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500 to 1,499</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$2,546.12</td>
<td>$4,108.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$3,588.99</td>
<td>$5,990.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than 500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$1,391.20</td>
<td>$2,284.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$2,262.43</td>
<td>$5,226.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CVIII

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983**

**BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE UPDATED AND REVIEWED BY TASB ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,173,167.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$160,677.88</td>
<td>$135,173.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$223,509.00</td>
<td>$221,610.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$111,769.83</td>
<td>$73,291.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$48,456.31</td>
<td>$74,571.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$20,806.10</td>
<td>$30,977.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$36,558.29</td>
<td>$107,736.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$6,206.82</td>
<td>$8,724.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$8,404.89</td>
<td>$11,581.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$3,153.71</td>
<td>$4,699.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$5,831.33</td>
<td>$10,085.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CIX

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT'S POLICIES WERE UPDATED AND REVIEWED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated &amp; reviewed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated &amp; reviewed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$62,494.66</td>
<td>$56,594.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not updated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$21,978.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated &amp; reviewed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$27,773.18</td>
<td>$35,384.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not updated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$26,035.00</td>
<td>$17,444.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated &amp; reviewed</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$17,382.02</td>
<td>$85,413.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not updated</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$7,388.79</td>
<td>$10,947.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated &amp; reviewed</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$3,571.53</td>
<td>$5,711.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not updated</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$2,222.71</td>
<td>$4,341.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated &amp; reviewed</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$2,150.60</td>
<td>$4,829.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not updated</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$1,352.33</td>
<td>$2,504.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CX

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER DISTRICT’S POLICIES
WERE UPDATED AND REVIEWED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXI

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DISSEMINATED ORALLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$452,637.00</td>
<td>$329,978.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$153,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$57,607.92</td>
<td>$60,953.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$71,024.11</td>
<td>$42,209.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$24,931.34</td>
<td>$33,881.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$32,695.75</td>
<td>$35,014.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$19,223.16</td>
<td>$94,008.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$8,170.31</td>
<td>$12,570.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$3,482.04</td>
<td>$5,844.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$2,519.95</td>
<td>$3,998.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>$1,950.25</td>
<td>$4,592.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$1,627.33</td>
<td>$2,761.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference \((p < .05)\) on cost between ADA groups; no difference \((p > .05)\) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE
DISSEMINATED TO STAFF MEMBERS ORALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,214,772.33</td>
<td>$871,325.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$201,139.88</td>
<td>$208,783.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$171,460.22</td>
<td>$102,498.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$72,936.91</td>
<td>$85,625.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$62,280.63</td>
<td>$71,914.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$38,953.36</td>
<td>$113,164.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$18,791.31</td>
<td>$21,639.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$7,891.99</td>
<td>$11,138.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$6,909.59</td>
<td>$9,427.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>$4,677.63</td>
<td>$8,560.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$4,349.70</td>
<td>$7,031.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$20,670.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$62,535.53</td>
<td>$56,564.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$24,366.00</td>
<td>$19,804.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$27,969.53</td>
<td>$35,290.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$6,817.86</td>
<td>$11,600.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$17,672.71</td>
<td>$86,140.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$2,956.89</td>
<td>$7,192.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$3,316.31</td>
<td>$4,584.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$1,912.52</td>
<td>$5,002.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$1,904.20</td>
<td>$3,173.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE
DISSEMINATED TO STAFF MEMBERS IN WRITING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXV

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DISSEMINATED THROUGH IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE CXVI

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983**  
**BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DISSEMINATED TO STAFF MEMBERS THROUGH IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$470,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,191,305.67</td>
<td>$901,811.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$180,075.63</td>
<td>$162,782.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$210,647.29</td>
<td>$216,243.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$48,029.27</td>
<td>$58,203.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$145,028.00</td>
<td>$104,730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$35,988.23</td>
<td>$121,193.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$28,336.54</td>
<td>$30,291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$7,533.29</td>
<td>$10,533.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$7,738.61</td>
<td>$10,936.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$5,065.99</td>
<td>$8,793.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>$4,191.71</td>
<td>$7,566.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CXVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DISSEMINATED BY OTHER METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXVIII
COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER POLICIES WERE DISSEMINATED
TO STAFF MEMBERS BY OTHER METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,191,305.67</td>
<td>$901,811.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$470,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$199,770.94</td>
<td>$187,393.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$88,800.00</td>
<td>$125,582.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$68,561.71</td>
<td>$81,691.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$67,501.00</td>
<td>$57,155.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$33,389.99</td>
<td>$100,685.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$28,965.46</td>
<td>$25,768.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>$7,724.81</td>
<td>$10,655.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$6,940.19</td>
<td>$9,610.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>$4,308.75</td>
<td>$7,640.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$6,728.77</td>
<td>$11,247.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE CXIX

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER BOARD MEMBERS HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXX

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER BOARD MEMBERS
HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,335.44</td>
<td>$16,438.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$12,335.44</td>
<td>$16,438.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$36,234.80</td>
<td>$102,679.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,668.68</td>
<td>$10,184.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$6,668.68</td>
<td>$10,184.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$7,879.03</td>
<td>$10,828.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,747.16</td>
<td>$3,896.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$2,747.16</td>
<td>$3,896.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$5,437.01</td>
<td>$9,366.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXXI

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$5,629.50</td>
<td>$4,474.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,257.13</td>
<td>$80,330.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,719.45</td>
<td>$1,278.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>$3,328.06</td>
<td>$5,576.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$1,450.50</td>
<td>$1,809.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>$1,897.08</td>
<td>$4,304.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXXII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF
MEMBERS HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$11,566.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,624.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$4,544.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>$7,848.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$4,347.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>$4,605.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXXIII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER PRINCIPALS HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,386.75</td>
<td>$21,026.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,012.80</td>
<td>$80,288.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,041.36</td>
<td>$1,206.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>$3,378.12</td>
<td>$5,560.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$356.89</td>
<td>$1,357.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>$2,173.09</td>
<td>$4,646.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXXIV

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983**  
**BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER PRINCIPALS HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$28,101.75</td>
<td>$42,172.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$33,103.65</td>
<td>$97,135.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$3,082.64</td>
<td>$2,949.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$7,956.94</td>
<td>$10,965.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$3,063.77</td>
<td>$6,271.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$5,063.84</td>
<td>$8,595.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXXV

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER TEACHERS HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$68,840.23</td>
<td>$59,572.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$33,137.29</td>
<td>$29,248.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$27,750.78</td>
<td>$34,584.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$24,700.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$17,231.56</td>
<td>$83,643.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$5,077.21</td>
<td>$3,527.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$3,129.32</td>
<td>$5,454.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$3,651.67</td>
<td>$5,235.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$2,058.61</td>
<td>$4,642.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$1,234.92</td>
<td>$1,781.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CXXVI

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER TEACHERS
HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$212,117.23</td>
<td>$201,221.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$122,207.29</td>
<td>$76,982.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$68,608.39</td>
<td>$80,453.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,600.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$34,325.57</td>
<td>$101,241.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$21,462.71</td>
<td>$15,761.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$7,669.27</td>
<td>$11,159.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$7,388.15</td>
<td>$8,040.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$4,951.20</td>
<td>$8,753.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3,450.40</td>
<td>$5,731.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
**TABLE CXXVII**

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER AIDES HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75 ($308,279.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$64,398.13 ($56,492.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$12,732.50 ($11,225.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88 ($56,148.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$27,750.78 ($34,584.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$24,700.00 ($56,148.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21 ($33,617.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$16,300.25 ($80,649.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$6,668.20 ($4,823.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62 ($79,109.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$3,201.42 ($5,543.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$3,398.92 ($3,638.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47 ($5,405.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$1,897.02 ($4,258.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,424.82 ($2,589.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86 ($4,137.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49 ($58,973.99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXXVII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER AIDES HAD A COPY
OF THE POLICY BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$197,155.26</td>
<td>$189,714.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$129,343.00</td>
<td>$63,324.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$68,608.39</td>
<td>$80,453.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,600.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$33,454.48</td>
<td>$97,656.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$20,261.20</td>
<td>$18,443.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$7,570.94</td>
<td>$10,875.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$8,197.31</td>
<td>$8,401.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$4,787.58</td>
<td>$8,426.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$2,426.82</td>
<td>$3,131.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference \((p < .05)\) on cost between ADA groups; no difference \((p > .05)\) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXXIX

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER ANY OTHERS HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$475,080.50</td>
<td>$463,410.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$280,375.00</td>
<td>$180,135.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$565,761.96</td>
<td>$58,291.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$49,280.00</td>
<td>$51,178.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$26,667.15</td>
<td>$29,625.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$29,590.17</td>
<td>$44,216.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$7,010.35</td>
<td>$9,195.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$32,984.07</td>
<td>$133,693.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$3,010.14</td>
<td>$5,403.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$4,015.36</td>
<td>$5,419.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$1,906.07</td>
<td>$4,379.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$1,498.08</td>
<td>$1,556.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXXX

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER ANY OTHERS HAD A COPY OF THE POLICY BOOK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean (1980 to 1983)</td>
<td>SD (1980 to 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,321,783.50</td>
<td>$1,204,038.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$700,375.00</td>
<td>$424,794.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$209,279.04</td>
<td>$188,604.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$149,755.78</td>
<td>$177,147.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$56,321.31</td>
<td>$60,955.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$94,729.00</td>
<td>$108,997.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$25,117.67</td>
<td>$62,434.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$47,921.11</td>
<td>$138,792.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$7,187.43</td>
<td>$10,584.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$9,293.64</td>
<td>$11,028.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>$4,534.37</td>
<td>$8,426.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$4,919.50</td>
<td>$5,846.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXXXI

**Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether the District Had a Written Set of Administrative Regulations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$38,017.67</td>
<td>$56,515.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$26,925.79</td>
<td>$34,850.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$26,925.79</td>
<td>$34,850.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$34,737.75</td>
<td>$36,381.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$29,661.78</td>
<td>$34,256.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$23,323.62</td>
<td>$111,446.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$23,323.62</td>
<td>$111,446.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$8,780.12</td>
<td>$13,804.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$16,342.74</td>
<td>$80,958.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$3,660.00</td>
<td>$5,236.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$3,660.00</td>
<td>$5,236.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$3,055.36</td>
<td>$5,684.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$3,318.42</td>
<td>$5,484.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$2,080.92</td>
<td>$5,362.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$2,080.92</td>
<td>$5,362.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$1,513.83</td>
<td>$2,354.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$1,741.29</td>
<td>$3,850.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXXXII
COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT HAD A
WRITTEN SET OF ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$82,346.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$62,457.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$100,486.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$70,908.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$43,964.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$22,582.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$33,700.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$8,787.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$7,100.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$7,834.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$4,323.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$4,154.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>$4,222.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE CXXXIII

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT'S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE DEVELOPED BY A COMMITTEE OF BOARD MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$67,183.77</td>
<td>$59,308.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$40,244.00</td>
<td>$27,444.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$26,540.21</td>
<td>$35,037.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13,700.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$23,147.30</td>
<td>$110,616.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$6,528.80</td>
<td>$3,337.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$3,296.12</td>
<td>$5,067.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$4,490.71</td>
<td>$5,533.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$2,487.79</td>
<td>$5,917.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$591.56</td>
<td>$592.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$221,744.35</td>
<td>$195,583.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$89,526.50</td>
<td>$64,545.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$62,279.00</td>
<td>$83,223.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,700.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$43,313.32</td>
<td>$132,248.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$20,591.20</td>
<td>$15,894.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$7,998.12</td>
<td>$10,712.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$10,559.29</td>
<td>$12,576.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$5,496.66</td>
<td>$10,351.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,924.67</td>
<td>$1,789.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXXXV

**Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether the District’s Administrative Regulations Were Developed by Central Administrators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,302.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$26,925.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$7,455.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$24,639.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$1,475.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>$3,791.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$2,429.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$2,241.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXXXVI

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER CENTRAL ADMINISTRATORS
DEVELOPED THE ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXXXVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE DEVELOPED BY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Costs for 1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$454,503.67</td>
<td>$327,393.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$147,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$64,933.62</td>
<td>$62,210.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$60,460.89</td>
<td>$43,564.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$31,091.10</td>
<td>$40,212.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$14,870.40</td>
<td>$13,061.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$25,499.77</td>
<td>$118,857.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$7,634.21</td>
<td>$12,284.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$3,275.77</td>
<td>$5,035.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$3,891.25</td>
<td>$5,402.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$2,107.46</td>
<td>$4,626.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$2,852.33</td>
<td>$8,105.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXXXVIII

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER TEACHERS DEVELOPED THE ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,191,305.67</td>
<td>$901,811.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$470,400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$228,971.33</td>
<td>$211,190.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$146,117.89</td>
<td>$108,482.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$70,495.20</td>
<td>$96,023.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$38,730.80</td>
<td>$34,905.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$47,884.14</td>
<td>$141,718.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$16,588.50</td>
<td>$18,673.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$8,163.37</td>
<td>$10,978.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$8,529.94</td>
<td>$10,640.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$5,329.09</td>
<td>$10,209.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$4,484.48</td>
<td>$8,918.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference \((p < .05)\) on cost between ADA groups; no difference \((p > .05)\) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXXXIX

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE DEVELOPED BY TASB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$64,932.81</td>
<td>$59,863.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$64,932.81</td>
<td>$59,863.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$54,875.25</td>
<td>$30,386.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$19,706.10</td>
<td>$28,066.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$19,706.10</td>
<td>$28,066.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$37,640.40</td>
<td>$44,584.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$26,956.72</td>
<td>$122,111.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$26,956.72</td>
<td>$122,111.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$6,159.00</td>
<td>$7,010.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$3,510.90</td>
<td>$5,168.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$3,510.90</td>
<td>$5,168.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$2,845.73</td>
<td>$4,784.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$2,481.00</td>
<td>$6,132.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$2,481.00</td>
<td>$6,132.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,382.20</td>
<td>$1,802.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXL

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER TASB HELPED TO DEVELOP
THE ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,819.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,819.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$215,146.15</td>
<td>$199,514.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$132,414.75</td>
<td>$59,272.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$45,787.90</td>
<td>$66,651.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$88,145.40</td>
<td>$106,370.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$48,531.28</td>
<td>$145,547.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$20,055.65</td>
<td>$20,934.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$8,420.82</td>
<td>$11,373.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$7,245.45</td>
<td>$7,393.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$5,406.76</td>
<td>$10,710.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3,779.00</td>
<td>$3,866.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXL1

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT'S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE DEVELOPED BY AN OUTSIDE CONSULTANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
**TABLE CXLII**

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER AN OUTSIDE CONSULTANT HELPED TO DEVELOP THE ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more No</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999 No</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$199,300.83</td>
<td>$189,854.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$343,735.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999 No</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$62,279.00</td>
<td>$83,223.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$26,700.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,900.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999 No</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499  No</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$8,285.59</td>
<td>$10,978.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$7,266.67</td>
<td>$8,052.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500  No</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$5,171.35</td>
<td>$9,913.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXLIII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE DEVELOPED BY OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$367,720.33</td>
<td>$376,766.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$407,750.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$64,784.68</td>
<td>$57,417.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$46,891.50</td>
<td>$55,707.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$22,225.54</td>
<td>$107,431.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,578.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$3,240.28</td>
<td>$4,918.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$6,350.00</td>
<td>$7,752.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$2,285.69</td>
<td>$5,661.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXLIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983
BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER ANY OTHERS DEVELOPED
THE ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,014,522.33</td>
<td>$1,004,032.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000,750.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$209,243.93</td>
<td>$191,871.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$132,314.50</td>
<td>$156,149.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$42,195.50</td>
<td>$128,485.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,950.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$7,779.58</td>
<td>$10,037.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$16,250.00</td>
<td>$21,031.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$4,976.06</td>
<td>$9,828.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$17,600.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE CXLV

### COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT'S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE REVIEWED BY A LOCAL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$802,761.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$45,805.75</td>
<td>$36,426.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$75,449.17</td>
<td>$64,984.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$24,367.55</td>
<td>$33,005.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$29,305.00</td>
<td>$41,422.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$25,022.57</td>
<td>$117,959.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$8,389.00</td>
<td>$7,134.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$3,444.49</td>
<td>$5,246.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$3,135.88</td>
<td>$3,775.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,874.50</td>
<td>$1,235.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXLVI

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER REGULATIONS WERE REVIEWED BY A LOCAL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CXLVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE REVIEWED BY A TASB ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$802,761.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$65,861.22</td>
<td>$58,899.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$43,167.00</td>
<td>$23,717.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$21,774.89</td>
<td>$29,008.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$31,548.17</td>
<td>$42,513.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$26,472.40</td>
<td>$121,030.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$6,524.00</td>
<td>$6,977.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$3,070.14</td>
<td>$4,712.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$4,727.40</td>
<td>$6,346.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$2,547.49</td>
<td>$6,207.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,241.59</td>
<td>$1,760.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE CXLVIII

**Comparison of All Legal Costs for the Years 1980 to 1983 by District Size and Whether Regulations Were Reviewed by a TASB Attorney**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,173,167.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$214,918.52</td>
<td>$195,644.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$106,886.33</td>
<td>$36,873.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$48,524.33</td>
<td>$69,986.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$76,981.17</td>
<td>$99,117.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$47,668.62</td>
<td>$144,341.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$21,241.31</td>
<td>$20,866.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$7,378.84</td>
<td>$9,651.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$11,587.87</td>
<td>$14,463.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>$5,474.58</td>
<td>$10,840.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$3,695.24</td>
<td>$3,864.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference \((p < .05)\) on cost between ADA groups; no difference \((p > .05)\) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CXLIX

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT’S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE REVIEWED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$73,951.84</td>
<td>$63,489.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$45,697.18</td>
<td>$38,201.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$29,371.10</td>
<td>$40,260.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$18,310.40</td>
<td>$16,707.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$6,945.50</td>
<td>$6,362.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$35,789.70</td>
<td>$147,251.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$3,597.00</td>
<td>$5,287.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$3,301.30</td>
<td>$5,019.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$2,192.34</td>
<td>$4,505.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$2,355.92</td>
<td>$6,327.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CL

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER REGULATIONS WERE REVIEWED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$244,006.42</td>
<td>$210,092.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$135,212.45</td>
<td>$123,476.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$72,675.80</td>
<td>$95,027.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$34,369.60</td>
<td>$35,556.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$19,169.15</td>
<td>$17,401.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$62,429.30</td>
<td>$174,570.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$9,409.15</td>
<td>$12,530.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$7,559.65</td>
<td>$9,785.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$5,957.11</td>
<td>$10,454.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$4,550.31</td>
<td>$9,502.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reviewed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
Table CLI

Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether the District's Administrative Regulations Were Updated and Reviewed by a Local Attorney

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$147,400.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$454,503.67</td>
<td>$327,393.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$59,999.62</td>
<td>$57,801.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$66,338.76</td>
<td>$57,186.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$24,367.55</td>
<td>$33,005.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$29,305.00</td>
<td>$41,422.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$24,644.80</td>
<td>$116,972.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$8,860.25</td>
<td>$7,321.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$3,406.69</td>
<td>$5,171.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3,455.17</td>
<td>$4,410.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,299.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$2,346.38</td>
<td>$5,827.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,529.00</td>
<td>$1,124.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CLII

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER REGULATIONS WERE UPDATED AND REVIEWED BY LOCAL ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$470,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,191,305.67</td>
<td>$901,811.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$162,561.38</td>
<td>$174,094.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$235,891.82</td>
<td>$197,816.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$54,648.91</td>
<td>$77,555.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$74,367.00</td>
<td>$99,885.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$45,696.17</td>
<td>$139,702.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$22,130.08</td>
<td>$15,786.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$7,960.81</td>
<td>$10,735.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$11,402.83</td>
<td>$12,477.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$5,289.89</td>
<td>$10,205.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,895.67</td>
<td>$1,580.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
**TABLE CLIII**

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT'S ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS WERE UPDATED AND REVIEWED BY A TASB ATTORNEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$802,761.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$65,861.22</td>
<td>$58,899.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$43,167.00</td>
<td>$23,717.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$20,967.40</td>
<td>$27,468.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$35,117.80</td>
<td>$46,515.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$26,232.22</td>
<td>$120,974.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$7,349.63</td>
<td>$11,451.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$3,080.14</td>
<td>$4,753.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$4,588.19</td>
<td>$6,156.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$2,491.23</td>
<td>$6,126.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$1,333.80</td>
<td>$1,861.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CLIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER REGULATIONS WERE UPDATED AND REVIEWED BY A TASB ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,173,167.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$214,918.52</td>
<td>$195,644.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$106,886.33</td>
<td>$36,873.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$46,341.90</td>
<td>$66,343.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$87,037.40</td>
<td>$107,339.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$47,552.53</td>
<td>$144,299.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$21,640.38</td>
<td>$22,379.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$7,432.86</td>
<td>$9,728.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$11,132.38</td>
<td>$14,091.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$5,366.85</td>
<td>$10,703.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3,967.93</td>
<td>$4,048.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
## Table CLV

**Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether the District's Administrative Regulations Were Updated and Reviewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDATED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDATED</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$65,517.83</td>
<td>$55,588.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT UPDATED</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$60,702.75</td>
<td>$60,313.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,591.80</td>
<td>$56,541.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDATED</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$31,112.33</td>
<td>$42,301.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT UPDATED</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$17,542.00</td>
<td>$15,061.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$25,684.20</td>
<td>$33,925.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDATED</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$9,287.94</td>
<td>$11,875.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT UPDATED</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$33,637.19</td>
<td>$147,338.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$21,976.99</td>
<td>$106,681.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDATED</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$3,654.33</td>
<td>$5,276.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT UPDATED</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$3,267.65</td>
<td>$5,023.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3,410.67</td>
<td>$5,085.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDATED</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$2,129.74</td>
<td>$4,330.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT UPDATED</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$2,415.71</td>
<td>$6,518.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$2,289.35</td>
<td>$5,628.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$20,824.49</td>
<td>$80,726.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLVI

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER REGULATIONS WERE UPDATED AND REVIEWED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$227,736.28</td>
<td>$195,004.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$168,683.83</td>
<td>$180,367.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,115.30</td>
<td>$188,407.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$77,784.22</td>
<td>$99,325.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$33,091.33</td>
<td>$31,956.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$59,907.07</td>
<td>$80,720.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$22,365.24</td>
<td>$20,186.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$59,492.35</td>
<td>$174,990.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$41,713.17</td>
<td>$127,629.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$9,322.15</td>
<td>$12,552.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$7,610.72</td>
<td>$9,779.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$8,243.71</td>
<td>$10,833.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$5,702.50</td>
<td>$10,064.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$4,662.96</td>
<td>$9,786.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$5,122.85</td>
<td>$9,865.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$54,015.67</td>
<td>$103,479.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CLVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE SUPERINTENDENT STAYED ABDREAST OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW BY ATTENDING SCHOOL LAW CONFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CLVIII

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE RESPONDENT STAYED ABEREAST OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW BY ATTENDING CONFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>50,000 or more</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000,750.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,014,522.33</td>
<td>1004032.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10,000 to 49,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$16,106.67</td>
<td>$19,384.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$210,739.30</td>
<td>$184,608.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5,000 to 9,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,773.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$71,654.33</td>
<td>$79,162.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$88,427.33</td>
<td>$78,162.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,500 to 4,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$23,838.86</td>
<td>$27,125.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>$33,465.31</td>
<td>$98,329.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500 to 1,499</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$7,897.54</td>
<td>$18,678.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$7,597.45</td>
<td>$9,766.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than 500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$5,364.50</td>
<td>$7,384.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>$4,182.24</td>
<td>$8,230.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$9,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLIX

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT STAYED ABREAST OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW BY READING SCHOOL LAW PERIODICALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$60,386.97</td>
<td>$56,805.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,227.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$15,668.92</td>
<td>$79,357.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,104.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,413.43</td>
<td>$1,704.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$3,300.01</td>
<td>$5,503.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$1,002.79</td>
<td>$1,772.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>$2,036.01</td>
<td>$4,462.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 TO 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$209,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$192,546.84</td>
<td>$187,698.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$63,022.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$32,719.60</td>
<td>$96,181.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$4,306.71</td>
<td>$5,054.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$7,773.50</td>
<td>$10,847.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$3,469.38</td>
<td>$6,019.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>$4,816.69</td>
<td>$8,502.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLXI

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER OR NOT THE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT STAYED ABEREAST OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW BY RELYING ON SCHOOL ATTORNEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999 No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$55,498.00</td>
<td>$42,618.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$62,548.85</td>
<td>$59,342.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999 No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$19,515.36</td>
<td>$23,525.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$38,693.13</td>
<td>$43,266.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999 No</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$17,310.15</td>
<td>$92,503.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$12,297.47</td>
<td>$15,653.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499 No</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>$3,269.33</td>
<td>$5,612.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$2,937.40</td>
<td>$4,193.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500 No</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>$1,697.15</td>
<td>$3,985.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$2,887.46</td>
<td>$4,980.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLXIII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE SUPERINTENDENT STAYED ABEREAST OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW BY RELYING ON A STAFF MEMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$475,080.50</td>
<td>$463,410.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$280,375.00</td>
<td>$180,135.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$44,181.41</td>
<td>$46,406.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$79,420.19</td>
<td>$61,205.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$23,806.33</td>
<td>$32,495.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$34,076.86</td>
<td>$37,105.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$16,244.45</td>
<td>$83,921.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$13,521.13</td>
<td>$15,928.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$3,150.41</td>
<td>$5,372.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,296.40</td>
<td>$6,687.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$1,735.81</td>
<td>$3,871.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$5,637.17</td>
<td>$9,098.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLXIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY
DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE RESPONDENT STAYED ABRSEAST OF
CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW BY RELYING ON A STAFF MEMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50,000 or more</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,321,783.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$700,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10,000 to 49,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$149,363.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$239,457.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5,000 to 9,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$58,516.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$85,479.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1,500 to 4,999</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$28,479.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$67,528.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>500 to 1,499</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$7,522.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$10,702.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than 500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$4,337.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$12,291.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLXV

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE SUPERINTENDENT STAYED ABREAST OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW BY IN-SERVICE TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CLXVI

Comparison of all legal costs for the years 1980 to 1983 by district size and whether the respondent stayed abreast of changes in school law by scheduling in-service programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,321,783.50</td>
<td>1204038.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$700,375.00</td>
<td>$424,794.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$125,782.17</td>
<td>$117,126.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$273,761.33</td>
<td>$220,391.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$68,177.00</td>
<td>$86,025.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$68,825.50</td>
<td>$71,752.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$35,942.33</td>
<td>$118,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$27,944.88</td>
<td>$31,039.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$7,253.89</td>
<td>$10,602.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$8,622.98</td>
<td>$10,934.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$4,442.42</td>
<td>$7,912.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$5,197.25</td>
<td>$9,110.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE CLXVII

### COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE SUPERINTENDENT MADE ANY EFFORT TO STAY ABRÉE OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$3,249.65</td>
<td>$5,432.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$673.00</td>
<td>$106.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effort Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$3,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,887.89</td>
<td>$4,216.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Total</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>$1,887.89</td>
<td>$4,216.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effort Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,108.09</td>
<td>$1,091.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLXVIII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE RESPONDENT MADE ANY EFFORT TO STAY ABBREAST OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$7,692.68</td>
<td>$10,724.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,025.00</td>
<td>$318.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>$4,669.14</td>
<td>$8,281.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effort</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,539.50</td>
<td>$1,728.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND Total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLXIX

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE SUPERINTENDENT STAYED AVERSE OF CHANGES IN SCHOOL LAW BY OTHER MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 OR MORE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 TO 49,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$60,229.35</td>
<td>$57,446.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$77,348.50</td>
<td>$36,467.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 TO 9,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$29,929.82</td>
<td>$34,873.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$7,703.50</td>
<td>$260.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 TO 4,999</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$8,986.62</td>
<td>$13,405.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$73,981.29</td>
<td>$238,570.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 TO 1,499</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>$2,998.37</td>
<td>$5,189.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$5,919.67</td>
<td>$7,339.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 500</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$1,844.29</td>
<td>$4,253.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,976.94</td>
<td>$2,707.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.64</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
# TABLE CLXX

Comparison of all legal costs for the years 1980 to 1983 by district size and whether the respondent stayed abreast of changes in school law by other means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$196,064.48</td>
<td>$189,841.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$196,064.48</td>
<td>$189,841.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$146,250.00</td>
<td>$80,833.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$65,487.65</td>
<td>$77,777.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$65,487.65</td>
<td>$77,777.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$93,630.50</td>
<td>$108,806.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$21,116.04</td>
<td>$25,619.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$21,116.04</td>
<td>$25,619.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$131,856.64</td>
<td>$272,426.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>$7,276.61</td>
<td>$10,563.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>$7,276.61</td>
<td>$10,563.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$11,879.58</td>
<td>$11,605.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$4,613.25</td>
<td>$8,340.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$4,613.25</td>
<td>$8,340.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$4,252.18</td>
<td>$5,581.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
Comparing the legal costs for the years 1980 to 1983 by district size and whether administrators were kept informed of legal matters by written communications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$125,499.50</td>
<td>$124,056.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$38,028.00</td>
<td>$15,474.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$202,362.10</td>
<td>$191,372.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$38,028.00</td>
<td>$15,474.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$72,029.12</td>
<td>$82,058.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$14,833.90</td>
<td>$15,947.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$36,215.24</td>
<td>$103,647.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$4,680.32</td>
<td>$5,353.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$8,737.58</td>
<td>$11,928.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$3,184.25</td>
<td>$6,074.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$5,639.36</td>
<td>$9,274.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,591.77</td>
<td>$8,126.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,591.77</td>
<td>$8,126.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
**TABLE CLXXIII**

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER ADMINISTRATORS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS BY IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>$147,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$147,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$454,503.67</td>
<td>$327,393.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,828.71</td>
<td>$42,554.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$39,828.71</td>
<td>$42,554.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$67,038.69</td>
<td>$56,629.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,621.67</td>
<td>$35,811.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$31,621.67</td>
<td>$35,811.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$23,961.90</td>
<td>$33,005.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,936.89</td>
<td>$131,279.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$25,936.89</td>
<td>$131,279.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$10,334.99</td>
<td>$12,736.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,764.27</td>
<td>$6,822.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$3,764.27</td>
<td>$6,822.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$2,792.18</td>
<td>$3,961.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,408.41</td>
<td>$3,113.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$1,408.41</td>
<td>$3,113.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$2,346.60</td>
<td>$4,998.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLXXIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER ADMINISTRATORS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS BY IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
## TABLE CLXXV

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER ADMINISTRATORS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS BY STAFF MEETINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$802,761.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$38,321.33</td>
<td>$37,142.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$63,561.43</td>
<td>$57,651.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,362.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$28,547.33</td>
<td>$34,324.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$4,582.00</td>
<td>$2,921.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>$16,769.96</td>
<td>$81,932.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$1,791.22</td>
<td>$3,823.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$3,507.01</td>
<td>$5,640.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$1,036.05</td>
<td>$1,253.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$2,265.76</td>
<td>$4,944.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CLXXVI

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER ADMINISTRATORS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS BY STAFF MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$21,173,167.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$144,587.00</td>
<td>$148,494.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$197,891.27</td>
<td>$189,422.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$27,086.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$70,748.06</td>
<td>$79,793.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$12,257.89</td>
<td>$9,455.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>$34,477.45</td>
<td>$99,146.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$3,708.81</td>
<td>$6,115.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$8,416.20</td>
<td>$11,231.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$3,752.58</td>
<td>$6,561.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$4,996.37</td>
<td>$8,800.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CLXXVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT HAD ANY PROGRAM FOR KEEPING ADMINISTRATORS INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CLXXVIII

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT HAD ANY PROGRAM FOR KEEPING ADMINISTRATORS INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$199,078.09</td>
<td>$184,387.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$72,029.12</td>
<td>$82,058.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$38,028.00</td>
<td>$15,474.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>$33,115.29</td>
<td>$97,604.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$28,808.60</td>
<td>$29,031.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$8,099.85</td>
<td>$10,988.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$2,216.54</td>
<td>$2,532.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>$4,794.08</td>
<td>$8,159.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$3,201.77</td>
<td>$7,924.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$61,570.16</td>
<td>$57,019.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$51,562.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,328.61</td>
<td>$80,321.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,360.00</td>
<td>$3,485.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>$3,104.02</td>
<td>$5,222.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$5,120.89</td>
<td>$8,066.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>$1,893.78</td>
<td>$4,237.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,154.30</td>
<td>$1,119.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
**TABLE CLXXX**

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER ADMINISTRATORS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS BY OTHER MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CLXXXI

Comparison of 1982-83 legal costs by district size and whether teachers were kept informed of legal matters by written communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$802,761.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$43,975.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$68,784.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$20,198.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$28,976.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$9,470.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$19,793.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$2,859.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$3,443.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$1,672.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$2,056.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CLXXXII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER TEACHERS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS BY WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,173,167.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$123,546.30</td>
<td>$101,276.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$223,262.43</td>
<td>$205,689.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$30,918.33</td>
<td>$16,473.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$75,487.25</td>
<td>$83,460.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$21,934.59</td>
<td>$25,603.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$39,533.84</td>
<td>$119,299.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$6,478.03</td>
<td>$9,010.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>$8,345.46</td>
<td>$11,592.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$4,403.89</td>
<td>$7,952.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$4,776.87</td>
<td>$8,352.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLXXXIII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER TEACHERS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS BY IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$475,080.50</td>
<td>$463,410.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$280,375.00</td>
<td>$180,135.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$44,731.82</td>
<td>$62,902.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$69,534.41</td>
<td>$52,010.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$14,420.78</td>
<td>$16,650.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$39,442.70</td>
<td>$41,040.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$34,372.81</td>
<td>$158,691.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$9,972.15</td>
<td>$13,740.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$4,288.20</td>
<td>$8,302.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$2,917.66</td>
<td>$4,260.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$1,730.64</td>
<td>$3,769.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$1,917.03</td>
<td>$4,317.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,127.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CLXXXIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER TEACHERS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS BY IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE CLXXXV

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER TEACHERS WERE KEPT INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS BY STAFF MEETINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$477,880.50</td>
<td>$459,450.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$277,575.00</td>
<td>$184,095.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$63,283.50</td>
<td>$51,555.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$60,390.09</td>
<td>$59,124.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$21,897.00</td>
<td>$16,312.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$28,260.00</td>
<td>$35,358.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$9,139.53</td>
<td>$10,248.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$19,251.97</td>
<td>$96,264.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$2,943.23</td>
<td>$4,917.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$3,365.13</td>
<td>$5,668.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$2,060.55</td>
<td>$4,470.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$1,722.29</td>
<td>$3,918.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference ($p < .05$) on cost between ADA groups; no difference ($p > .05$) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,286,583.50</td>
<td>1253818.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$735,575.00</td>
<td>375,014.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$178,810.80</td>
<td>167,310.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$199,234.39</td>
<td>195,116.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$58,286.00</td>
<td>44,123.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$69,545.82</td>
<td>82,107.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$32,099.72</td>
<td>86,711.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$33,366.84</td>
<td>100,484.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$7,709.57</td>
<td>10,806.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$7,574.59</td>
<td>10,656.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$4,913.78</td>
<td>9,540.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$4,365.13</td>
<td>7,090.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CLXXXVII

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT HAD ANY FORMAL PROGRAM FOR KEEPING TEACHERS INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CLXXXVIII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT HAD ANY PROGRAM FOR KEEPING TEACHERS INFORMED OF LEGAL MATTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,173,167.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$208,358.03</td>
<td>$186,772.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$39,919.33</td>
<td>$41,117.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$72,029.12</td>
<td>$82,056.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$38,028.00</td>
<td>$15,474.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$34,165.32</td>
<td>$100,755.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$22,802.00</td>
<td>$34,050.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$8,064.61</td>
<td>$11,151.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$4,522.35</td>
<td>$5,691.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some program</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,321.56</td>
<td>$7,276.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No program</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$6,200.89</td>
<td>$12,230.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE CLXXXIX

Comparation of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether Teachers Were Kept Informed of Legal Matters by Other Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$61,570.16</td>
<td>$57,019.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$51,562.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>$16,121.47</td>
<td>$79,710.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,751.50</td>
<td>$1,168.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$3,084.34</td>
<td>$5,144.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$13,735.00</td>
<td>$16,312.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>$1,816.19</td>
<td>$4,102.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,363.20</td>
<td>$5,641.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXC

Comparison of all legal costs for the years 1980 to 1983 by district size and whether teachers were kept informed of changes in the law by other means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXCII

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO EDUCATION DAILY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$277,575.00</td>
<td>$184,095.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$477,880.50</td>
<td>$459,450.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$46,300.65</td>
<td>$43,714.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$77,168.50</td>
<td>$64,526.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$33,484.29</td>
<td>$36,934.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$11,086.80</td>
<td>$13,781.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$17,243.81</td>
<td>$91,494.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$12,191.85</td>
<td>$16,778.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$3,004.46</td>
<td>$5,139.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$5,626.15</td>
<td>$7,678.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$1,880.05</td>
<td>$4,198.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,093.67</td>
<td>$728.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$52,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### TABLE CXCII

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO EDUCATION DAILY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$735,575.00</td>
<td>$375,014.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,286,583.50</td>
<td>$1,253,818.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$143,095.65</td>
<td>$128,372.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$246,117.06</td>
<td>$222,297.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$82.868.71</td>
<td>$84,861.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$28,077.80</td>
<td>$36,621.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$84,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$34,886.66</td>
<td>$110,048.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$27,428.35</td>
<td>$30,279.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$7,154.47</td>
<td>$10,191.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$12,906.62</td>
<td>$14,610.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>$4,630.32</td>
<td>$8,238.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3,052.67</td>
<td>$2,375.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CXCIII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO NOLPE PUBLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$150,200.00</td>
<td>$3,959.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$605,255.50</td>
<td>$279,314.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$53,453.29</td>
<td>$58,990.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$82,103.11</td>
<td>$43,980.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$23,277.67</td>
<td>$30,871.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$34,983.14</td>
<td>$39,270.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$17,121.72</td>
<td>$85,822.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$9,333.10</td>
<td>$11,116.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$3,185.61</td>
<td>$5,449.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3,913.71</td>
<td>$4,614.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$1,856.85</td>
<td>$4,173.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,808.25</td>
<td>$1,923.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; a difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE CXCIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO NOLPE PUBLICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$435,200.00</td>
<td>$49,780.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,586,958.50</td>
<td>$829,024.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,819.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$177,722.33</td>
<td>$197,129.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$233,907.00</td>
<td>$149,143.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$58,663.92</td>
<td>$71,154.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$85,226.29</td>
<td>$92,406.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$33,710.45</td>
<td>$103,665.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$28,735.50</td>
<td>$24,876.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>$7,511.60</td>
<td>$10,598.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$10,031.14</td>
<td>$12,944.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$4,579.53</td>
<td>$8,182.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,688.75</td>
<td>$5,574.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; a difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CXCV

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO TEXAS REGISTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$475,080.50</td>
<td>$463,410.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$280,375.00</td>
<td>$180,135.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$48,138.00</td>
<td>$47,786.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$73,623.47</td>
<td>$61,885.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$33,364.44</td>
<td>$41,592.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$22,393.40</td>
<td>$25,674.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$7,188.42</td>
<td>$10,553.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$28,801.43</td>
<td>$123,277.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>$2,943.04</td>
<td>$5,278.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$3,756.17</td>
<td>$5,658.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$1,569.01</td>
<td>$3,714.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$2,586.02</td>
<td>$5,021.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## Table CXXXII

**Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether the District Subscribed to Texas School Law News**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$802,761.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$29,838.80</td>
<td>$43,954.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$66,879.04</td>
<td>$56,874.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,293.50</td>
<td>$1,829.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$30,683.94</td>
<td>$34,272.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$15,268.45</td>
<td>$16,930.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$15,993.50</td>
<td>$82,538.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$2,143.84</td>
<td>$2,901.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$3,362.14</td>
<td>$5,660.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$1,219.02</td>
<td>$2,343.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>$2,119.90</td>
<td>$4,663.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE CXCVIII

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO TEXAS SCHOOL LAW NEWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,173,167.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$128,433.40</td>
<td>$142,897.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$204,583.29</td>
<td>$191,109.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,386.50</td>
<td>$7,617.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$75,869.29</td>
<td>$79,489.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$26,147.91</td>
<td>$28,503.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$33,574.52</td>
<td>$99,815.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$5,923.11</td>
<td>$7,624.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$7,850.74</td>
<td>$11,023.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$3,162.44</td>
<td>$5,814.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>$5,168.02</td>
<td>$8,861.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,591.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CXCIX

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO WEST'S EDUCATION LAW REPORTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$64,065.07</td>
<td>$57,760.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$33,285.00</td>
<td>$27,832.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$28,063.65</td>
<td>$35,453.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$23,566.00</td>
<td>$13,952.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>$16,182.00</td>
<td>$80,019.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,292.33</td>
<td>$3,509.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>$3,093.59</td>
<td>$5,286.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$5,295.89</td>
<td>$7,178.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$1,759.80</td>
<td>$3,854.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$6,442.50</td>
<td>$11,705.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference \( p < .05 \) on cost between ADA groups; no difference \( p > .05 \) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE CC

**COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO WEST’S EDUCATION LAW REPORTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$204,279.30</td>
<td>$189,476.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$80,706.67</td>
<td>$69,302.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$69,668.53</td>
<td>$82,095.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$58,093.00</td>
<td>$44,396.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>$32,897.55</td>
<td>$96,846.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$35,227.67</td>
<td>$39,344.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>$7,399.77</td>
<td>$10,622.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$11,347.44</td>
<td>$11,514.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$4,403.91</td>
<td>$7,571.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$13,075.00</td>
<td>$23,283.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.*
## TABLE CCI

**Comparison of 1982-83 Legal Costs by District Size and Whether the District Subscribed to Any Other Legal Publications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$475,080.50</td>
<td>$463,410.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$280,375.00</td>
<td>$180,135.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$63,496.13</td>
<td>$57,235.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$26,713.50</td>
<td>$8,056.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$31,302.38</td>
<td>$35,507.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$7,792.00</td>
<td>$4,118.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$9,328.74</td>
<td>$13,534.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$95,839.60</td>
<td>$283,326.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$3,150.34</td>
<td>$5,425.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$3,976.54</td>
<td>$5,318.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$3,217.47</td>
<td>$5,405.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>$1,838.98</td>
<td>$4,263.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$2,044.63</td>
<td>$2,366.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CCII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT SUBSCRIBED TO ANY OTHER SCHOOL LAW PERIODICALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 TO 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,321,783.50</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$700,375.00</td>
<td>$424,794.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$700,375.00</td>
<td>$424,794.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$201,862.71</td>
<td>$187,198.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$13,986.00</td>
<td>$36,430.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$56,377.50</td>
<td>$36,430.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>$184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$78,662.06</td>
<td>$81,417.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$13,986.00</td>
<td>$36,430.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$13,986.00</td>
<td>$36,430.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$26,636.15</td>
<td>$56,495.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>$109,359.60</td>
<td>$288,302.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$13,986.00</td>
<td>$36,430.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>$95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$7,507.66</td>
<td>$10,755.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>$8,912.85</td>
<td>$10,028.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$8,912.85</td>
<td>$10,028.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$7,621.83</td>
<td>$10,675.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>$4,605.49</td>
<td>$8,311.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>$4,316.44</td>
<td>$5,868.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$4,316.44</td>
<td>$5,868.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>$8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$149,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$802,761.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$377,727.75</td>
<td>$308,279.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$64,401.60</td>
<td>$57,635.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$29,919.67</td>
<td>$25,561.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$61,266.88</td>
<td>$56,148.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,302.92</td>
<td>$80,326.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$4,175.50</td>
<td>$1,976.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$15,932.62</td>
<td>$79,109.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,023.39</td>
<td>$4,602.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$3,205.71</td>
<td>$4,762.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1,521.88</td>
<td>$2,602.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>$3,023.39</td>
<td>$4,602.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$1,801.65</td>
<td>$4,003.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$2,193.11</td>
<td>$4,960.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,855.86</td>
<td>$4,137.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$12,953.49</td>
<td>$58,973.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference \((p < .05)\) on cost between ADA groups; no difference \((p > .05)\) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE CCIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR ANYONE IN THE DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,173,167.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,011,079.25</td>
<td>$819,818.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$172,254.67</td>
<td>159,483.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$193,045.42</td>
<td>184,762.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$15,004.00</td>
<td>$10,501.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$32,950.92</td>
<td>95,847.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$7,731.46</td>
<td>9,868.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$3,872.35</td>
<td>$7,583.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>$7,313.60</td>
<td>9,701.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$5,916.48</td>
<td>$11,156.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$4,581.77</td>
<td>8,126.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>$33,477.63</td>
<td>$131,815.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; a difference (p < .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CCV

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR BOARD MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$407,750.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$150,200.00</td>
<td>$3,959.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$47,327.80</td>
<td>$69,118.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$67,816.36</td>
<td>$56,078.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$64,401.60</td>
<td>$57,635.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,362.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$28,547.33</td>
<td>$34,324.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$7,246.33</td>
<td>$9,283.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$17,247.96</td>
<td>$84,342.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,302.92</td>
<td>$80,326.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,299.50</td>
<td>$1,250.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$3,578.41</td>
<td>$5,786.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$3,419.04</td>
<td>$5,618.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$1,284.00</td>
<td>$1,444.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$1,848.71</td>
<td>$4,158.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$1,801.65</td>
<td>$4,003.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$12,298.95</td>
<td>$50,538.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CCVI

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR BOARD MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000,750.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$435,200.00</td>
<td>49,780.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$187,284.80</td>
<td>303,971.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$196,692.44</td>
<td>167,099.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>$189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$27,086.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$70,748.06</td>
<td>79,793.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$18,551.92</td>
<td>21,705.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$35,077.66</td>
<td>101,932.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>$97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3,343.50</td>
<td>$2,967.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$8,422.77</td>
<td>11,218.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$8,067.57</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$4,625.21</td>
<td>$4,965.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$4,343.82</td>
<td>7,754.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>$7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$30,957.86</td>
<td>$97,712.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CCVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE SUPERINTENDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE CCVIII

### COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 TO 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$735,575.00</td>
<td>$375,014.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$240,173.88</td>
<td>$292,709.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$178,742.91</td>
<td>141,119.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>$189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$64,664.40</td>
<td>$74,559.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$69,802.07</td>
<td>82,140.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$19,061.30</td>
<td>$18,940.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$36,712.92</td>
<td>106,982.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>$97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$4,609.26</td>
<td>$6,747.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$8,730.42</td>
<td>11,450.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$8,067.57</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$3,414.58</td>
<td>$3,938.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>$4,541.70</td>
<td>8,035.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>$7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$30,957.86</td>
<td>$97,712.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CCIX

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR CENTRAL STAFF MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$277,575.00</td>
<td>$184,095.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$153,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$62,233.00</td>
<td>$79,838.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$65,331.00</td>
<td>$47,581.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$64,401.60</td>
<td>$57,635.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$16,837.00</td>
<td>$18,362.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$33,862.92</td>
<td>$39,355.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$7,432.71</td>
<td>$8,296.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$19,545.80</td>
<td>$93,661.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,302.92</td>
<td>$80,326.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3,420.65</td>
<td>$6,655.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$3,418.23</td>
<td>$5,053.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$3,419.04</td>
<td>$5,618.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$1,453.84</td>
<td>$3,042.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$2,110.39</td>
<td>$4,691.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$1,801.65</td>
<td>$4,003.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$12,298.95</td>
<td>$50,538.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CCX

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR CENTRAL STAFF MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$735,575.00</td>
<td>$375,014.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$232,834.56</td>
<td>$274,688.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$178,963.05</td>
<td>144,600.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>$189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$55,570.14</td>
<td>$63,514.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$75,963.33</td>
<td>$87,386.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$88,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$16,579.94</td>
<td>$17,230.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$39,707.91</td>
<td>112,747.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>$97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$8,074.90</td>
<td>$12,533.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$8,063.87</td>
<td>10,079.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$8,067.57</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$3,965.48</td>
<td>$7,295.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$4,721.25</td>
<td>7,843.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>$7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$30,957.86</td>
<td>$97,712.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE CCXI

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR PRINCIPALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$277,575.00</td>
<td>$184,095.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$153,000.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$62,233.00</td>
<td>$79,838.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$65,331.00</td>
<td>$47,581.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$64,401.60</td>
<td>$57,635.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$16,837.00</td>
<td>$18,362.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$33,862.92</td>
<td>$39,355.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$7,583.21</td>
<td>$8,464.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$19,364.10</td>
<td>$93,170.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,302.92</td>
<td>$80,326.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$1,632.36</td>
<td>$2,394.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$3,955.05</td>
<td>$6,179.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$3,419.04</td>
<td>$5,618.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$940.37</td>
<td>$1,118.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$2,097.94</td>
<td>$4,562.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$1,801.65</td>
<td>$4,003.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$12,298.95</td>
<td>$50,538.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CCXII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$735,575.00</td>
<td>$375,014.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$232,834.56</td>
<td>$274,688.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$178,963.05</td>
<td>$144,600.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>$189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$55,570.14</td>
<td>$63,514.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$75,963.93</td>
<td>$87,386.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$117,688.23</td>
<td>$117,688.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$16,861.33</td>
<td>$17,666.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$39,433.30</td>
<td>$112,162.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$39,433.30</td>
<td>$112,162.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>$97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$4,893.79</td>
<td>$8,075.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$9,019.71</td>
<td>$11,499.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$9,019.71</td>
<td>$11,499.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$8,067.57</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$3,623.23</td>
<td>$6,381.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$4,623.22</td>
<td>$7,920.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$4,623.22</td>
<td>$7,920.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>$7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$30,957.86</td>
<td>$97,712.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
### TABLE CCXIII

**COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Mean</strong></th>
<th><strong>SD</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$277,575.00</td>
<td>$184,095.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$153,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$64,401.60</td>
<td>$57,635.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$60,709.70</td>
<td>$75,426.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$66,247.55</td>
<td>$48,627.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$64,401.60</td>
<td>$57,635.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$16,837.00</td>
<td>$18,362.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$33,662.92</td>
<td>$39,355.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$6,969.87</td>
<td>$7,933.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$20,439.16</td>
<td>$96,233.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,302.92</td>
<td>$80,326.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$2,971.89</td>
<td>$4,552.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$3,637.96</td>
<td>$6,083.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$3,419.04</td>
<td>$5,618.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$1,467.58</td>
<td>$3,609.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$1,951.41</td>
<td>$4,174.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$1,801.65</td>
<td>$4,003.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$12,298.95</td>
<td>$50,538.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CCXIV

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$735,575.00</td>
<td>$375,014.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>$189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$223,035.10</td>
<td>$260,825.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$181,169.20</td>
<td>147,993.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>$189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$55,570.14</td>
<td>$63,514.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$75,963.33</td>
<td>87,386.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>$97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$15,578.06</td>
<td>$16,583.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$41,466.01</td>
<td>115,672.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>$97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$8,067.57</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$7,685.09</td>
<td>$10,997.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$8,254.83</td>
<td>10,935.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$8,067.57</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>$7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$4,345.44</td>
<td>$8,709.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$4,377.05</td>
<td>7,010.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>$7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$30,957.86</td>
<td>$97,712.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed a difference \((p < .05)\) on cost between ADA groups; no difference \((p > .05)\) on cost between survey variable groups; and a significant interaction.
TABLE CCXV

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR ALL STAFF MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$147,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$280,375.00</td>
<td>$180,135.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$78,504.60</td>
<td>$79,452.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$61,581.00</td>
<td>$53,964.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$64,401.60</td>
<td>$57,635.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4,816.33</td>
<td>$6,237.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$31,860.31</td>
<td>$35,039.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$9,434.57</td>
<td>$15,586.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$19,126.58</td>
<td>$94,914.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,302.92</td>
<td>$80,326.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$4,365.68</td>
<td>$7,233.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$2,998.31</td>
<td>$4,711.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$3,419.04</td>
<td>$5,618.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$1,401.22</td>
<td>$3,276.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$2,054.36</td>
<td>$4,397.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$1,801.65</td>
<td>$4,003.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$12,298.95</td>
<td>$50,538.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
### Table CCXVI

Comparison of all legal costs for the years 1980 to 1983 by size of district and whether the district purchased legal liability insurance for all staff members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$470,400.00</td>
<td>$.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$700,375.00</td>
<td>424,794.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$255,918.00</td>
<td>$208,318.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$182,965.80</td>
<td>187,565.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>$189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$9,157.33</td>
<td>$8,465.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$79,567.44</td>
<td>80,571.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$17,867.41</td>
<td>$25,833.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$39,949.56</td>
<td>113,959.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>$97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$9,803.34</td>
<td>$13,814.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$7,296.12</td>
<td>9,332.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$8,067.57</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$3,868.65</td>
<td>$7,866.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$4,681.93</td>
<td>7,365.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>$7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$30,957.86</td>
<td>$97,712.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
## TABLE CCXVII

COMPARISON OF 1982-83 LEGAL COSTS BY DISTRICT SIZE AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$236,050.00</td>
<td>$148,722.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$63,065.97</td>
<td>$58,181.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$63,065.97</td>
<td>$58,181.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$103,135.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$64,401.60</td>
<td>$57,635.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$27,590.21</td>
<td>$33,617.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$16,252.19</td>
<td>$83,217.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$16,252.19</td>
<td>$83,217.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$16,966.11</td>
<td>$18,533.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$16,302.92</td>
<td>$80,326.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$3,281.92</td>
<td>$5,537.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$3,281.92</td>
<td>$5,537.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$5,064.55</td>
<td>$6,579.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$3,419.04</td>
<td>$5,618.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$1,830.52</td>
<td>$4,090.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$1,830.52</td>
<td>$4,090.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,224.25</td>
<td>$1,416.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$1,901.65</td>
<td>$4,003.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$12,298.75</td>
<td>$50,538.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
TABLE CCXVIII

COMPARISON OF ALL LEGAL COSTS FOR THE YEARS 1980 TO 1983 BY SIZE OF DISTRICT AND WHETHER THE DISTRICT PURCHASED LEGAL LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Legal Costs for 1980 to 1983</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$623,716.67</td>
<td>$328,412.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 49,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$194,838.86</td>
<td>$192,727.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$203,408.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>$189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$195,124.50</td>
<td>$189,381.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$68,450.05</td>
<td>$78,189.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 to 4,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>$33,526.36</td>
<td>$100,712.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>$33,376.11</td>
<td>27,144.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>$97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$33,516.17</td>
<td>$97,289.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 1,499</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,868.61</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$7,868.61</td>
<td>$11,116.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$8,067.57</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$8,067.57</td>
<td>$10,919.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,384.94</td>
<td>$7,644.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$4,013.75</td>
<td>5,710.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>$7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$4,367.27</td>
<td>$7,550.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$30,957.86</td>
<td>$97,712.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-Way ANOVA showed difference (p < .05) on cost between ADA groups; no difference (p > .05) on cost between survey variable groups; and no significant interaction.
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