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The purpose of this study was three-fold:

1. To determine the amount and direction of changes in sources of funding for the Regional Education Service Centers from 1979 to 1984.

2. To determine the percent of change in programming expenditures of the Regional Education Service Centers from 1979 to 1984.

3. To rate the changes in quality of programming as perceived by the superintendents of the local school districts receiving services from 1979 to 1984.

A review of the literature and a brief history of the Regional Education Service Centers of Texas were followed by tabular and narrative descriptions of the findings. Deflated data, to account for inflation, were derived by applying Bureau of Labor statistics formulas to dollar amounts supplied by the Regional Education Service Centers.

Each of the five Education Service Centers included in the study experienced a decrease in total funds, due chiefly to a cut in federal and state support. Although local
contributions increased in four out of five of the Regions during the five-year period, the net result to the Centers was a decrease in funding ranging from 23.2 percent to 51.8 percent.

The impact on programming was severe. Of the nine major services on which data was gathered—media services, data processing, counseling/guidance, special education, migrant education, bus driver training, staff development, drug education/crime prevention, and bilingual education—two had been eliminated in all of the Regions included in the study by 1984, and some of the Regions had discontinued services in other areas as well.

Surveys for rating the services of the Education Service Centers were sent to 126 current superintendents who held the same position in 1979. The results indicated that although fewer dollars had been expended and some services had been eliminated, the quality of programming had not diminished from 1979 to 1984.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

The perennial financial problems of local school administrators and state legislators have been transformed into a concern of national emphasis. A survey of the last fifteen Annual Gallup Polls of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools revealed that financing the public schools has never ranked lower than fourth out of the ten major concerns reported (15). Nevertheless, at times, taxpayers have rejected bond issues to support education, nationally. To further exacerbate the situation, on several occasions, courts have handed down decisions regarding the inequity in distribution of state funds which had to be addressed. Consequently, while legislators battle to satisfy their constituents and "balance the budget," the impact of the decrease in funding of the Education Service Centers (ESC) has gone virtually unnoticed (31, 33, 51).

In 1965, the Fifty-Ninth Texas Legislature responded to requests by teachers, administrators, and the State Board of Education by dividing the state into twenty geographical regions for the purposes of creating state-supported media centers. In the same year, the Elementary and Secondary
Education Act (ESEA) provided federal funding for innovative projects and programs. As a result, the Sixtieth Texas Legislature meeting in 1967 extended its previous legislation to authorize twenty Education Service Centers. This authorization also provided for the coordination and development of projects funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the formation of a locally-oriented base for regional and statewide educational planning.

The philosophy upon which the concept of the Education Service Center was established and continues to operate included the following tenets.

1. Service available anywhere should be available everywhere.

2. The cost of education can be made more cost-effective through cooperative arrangements among school districts, i.e., through sharing facilities, programs, and technologies.

3. Education Service Centers are a vehicle by which access to quality education and equality in educational opportunities can be enhanced through a regional delivery system.

4. Education Service Centers can be a catalyst for bringing about change.

Since their inception in 1967, the twenty Education Service Centers of Texas have sought to meet the needs of
public education through cooperative programs for dealing with special education students, gifted-and-talented youngsters, children of migrant workers, and educationally and economically disadvantaged pupils, to name a few. Other services provided for the Independent School Districts (ISD) of a particular region are based on demand but typically include computer programming and data processing, media rental, needs assessment studies, planning and evaluation, staff development programs, and interpreting state board and legislative regulations. Funding for the Education Service Centers originates from three sources: federal, state, and local. The Education Service Centers have no power of taxation; however, they may enter into contracts with public and/or private agencies, including the Independent School Districts (ISD), for the delivery of specified services.

Lack of "hard" funding is a problem common to each of the twenty Education Service Centers of Texas. A dearth of publicity concerning the value of the Education Service Center to local districts within its domain has threatened its very existence. The general public and, in turn, the elected representatives in the state legislature are typically unaware of the work accomplished and services offered by the service centers. The teachers and pupils who are direct recipients of the Education Service Centers' efforts through media rental, staff development programs,
and consultant services are often not fully cognizant of the source of these services. District superintendents who contract for these and other offerings such as data processing output, budget planning assistance, needs assessment programs, and evaluation procedures possess a somewhat broader awareness. For this reason, the Education Service Centers usually must depend on the top administrators of the local districts for support in obtaining state funding and federal "pass-thru" monies. Unfortunately, the leaders of large districts who might provide the most solid backing are the ones least likely to depend heavily on the service centers. Small districts, on the other hand, would be hard pressed to provide adequate educational support services if it were not for the cooperative nature of the Education Service Centers. Therefore, from one legislative session to the next, the twenty Education Service Centers of Texas face an uncertain future.

As the Education Service Centers have evolved, many of their operations and activities have periodically changed for a variety of reasons (1). The State Board of Education has implemented certain changes in the governance and role of the Education Service Centers. The State Legislature has made changes in funding levels and procedures for budgeting and accounting. Because of this evolutionary process, a need has arisen to assess Education Service Center operations regarding programs, finance, management, and
other areas. In an effort to respond, in part, to that need this study was undertaken.

Statement of the Problem

The problem for this study was to determine the impact of funding changes on the programming, staffing, and general operation of selected Education Service Centers in Texas.

Purpose of the Study

From the global point of view this study was used to illuminate the work being performed by the Education Service Centers and to point out their financial situation. Specifically, this study was conducted for the following purposes:

1. To chart the increase or decrease in federal, state, and local funding and resulting changes in staffing and programming in Education Service Centers over the five year period 1979-1984.

2. To assess the impact of changes in funding of the Education Service Center on the local Independent School District during the five year period 1979-1984.

Definition of Terms

A. State Educational Agency (SEA)--an office, branch, or department of state charged with performance of a particular function, in this instance, education.
B. Texas Education Agency (TEA)—the state education agency of Texas.

C. Education Service Center (ESC)—a unique educational organization designed for service to schools without being a part of the administrative structure of the schools served and to offer an array of services to school districts within a geographically defined area or region including research, curriculum development, instructional materials, purchasing, and psychological services among others. Syn.—intermediate service unit.

D. Local Education Agency (LEA)—an independent school district in Texas.

E. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA)—directive and categorical federal aid to education which mandated a series of programs and priorities.

F. Title III—part of Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides federal funds for innovative or supplementary educational centers and services approved by the U. S. Commissioner of Education.

G. Title IV—part of Elementary and Secondary Education Act which authorizes funds for school library resources, testing materials, textbooks, supplementary educational centers and services, strengthening state and local education agencies, dropout prevention, and health services for low-income children.
H. **Title VI**--part of Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides federal funds for education of children with handicapping conditions.

I. **Average Daily Attendance (ADA)**--a statistic computed by the formula: the sum of the days attended by each student enrolled divided by the number of days school is in session; this statistic is usually figured for the period of one school year.

J. **Media Services**--services to enhance instructional programs through instructional films and multimedia kits, audiotape and transparency duplication, media equipment repair, videotaping services, media consultant services, and to serve as an education information center.

K. **Data Processing**--computer services for attendance counting, grade reporting, test scoring, scheduling, master file maintenance, payrolls, taxes, personnel accounting, fixed asset accounting, and computer assisted instruction.

L. **Special Education**--consultative services in planning and implementing comprehensive special education programs including identification and appraisal, adapted physical education, and occupational and physical therapy for children with handicapping conditions.

M. **Migrant Education**--supplementary services to ensure a continuity in learning experiences for children of migrant workers.
N. **Bilingual Education**—consultative assistance for teachers of children who lack sufficient skills in the use of the English language.

O. **Counseling/Guidance Services**—assistance to schools in planning, coordination, and implementation of guidance services to students including consultative services and special staff development sessions.

P. **Bus Driver Training**—provisions for state required training and refresher courses for school bus drivers.

Q. **Staff Development**—opportunities for educators to participate in seminars, conferences, and workshop activities.

**Limitations of the Study**

Variation of services offered and problems encountered by the twenty Education Service Centers of Texas was extensive, and therefore comparisons were limited and generalities not always feasible. However, financial constraints, the basis of this study, did provide for a commonality of both problems and solutions. Five of the twenty Education Service Centers were examined for this study, each of which was unique and yet representative of the rest. The five Regional Education Service Centers were selected largely on the basis of availability of information, geographical convenience, and variation in composition. Some of the characteristics of the Education Service Centers which merited their inclusion in the study included size
in square miles, size based on Average Daily Attendance, number of local districts served, amount of financial allotment, size of staff, accessibility, and need for services incumbent upon solution to special problems peculiar to urban regions or to rural areas, a concentration of migrant workers, and/or heavy minority populations. The selected Education Service Centers met these criteria.

Originally, six Education Service Centers had indicated their willingness to make available the data required for this study. However, repeated efforts over a period of six months resulted in a failure to obtain the necessary information from one of these centers. For that reason, the financial records from the remaining five Regional Education Service Centers were utilized.

Background and Significance for the Study

Origins and Organization

The Education Service Agency (ESA) was defined by the National Education Association in 1963 as "an agency that operates at a regional level, giving coordination and supplementary services to local school districts and serving as a link between these basic administrative units and the state education authority" (29, pp. 1-2).

Cooperative education in the United States can be traced back to the time when two or three colonial families made an agreement to share a teacher for their children.
More formal cooperatives developed from these beginnings. One of the earliest recorded regional education service activities occurred in 1829 when Delaware's County Offices were established. The Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Oregon created the office of a county school commissioner in 1849. Additional county school offices arose in the nineteenth century followed by the establishment of the Education Service Agency of today in the 1960's and 70's (29).

Today regional service agencies represent a growing pattern of educational cooperation. Three basic Education Service Agency patterns have been identified by Stephens Associates (45).

**Special District ESA's.**--A legally constituted unit of school government between the State Education Agency (SEA) and a collection of Local Education Agencies, this pattern was primarily established by the state, or the state and local agencies acting together, to provide services for both the State Education Agency and the member Local Education Agencies. As of the 1979 report, ten states, including Texas, operated under this type of organization.

**Regionalized SEA/ESA's.**--A regional branch of the State Education Agency, this pattern was created as a means of delivering services for the State Education Agency. Three variations of units of this type are in use: those providing
administrative services only, those providing general or specialized instructional services, and those providing both administrative and instructional services. Five states have opted for this type of organizational pattern.

**Cooperative ESA's.**—A loose consortium of local education agencies, this pattern seems to be supported by the view that Education Service Agencies should be established by two or more local education agencies to provide services exclusively to members of the consortium. Variations of this type of arrangement include those that are multi-purpose providing a comprehensive array of services, those that are limited-purpose providing a small number of services, and those that are single-purpose. Cooperative Education Service Agencies can be found in twelve states although not all of these are state-wide in scope.

**History of Education Service Centers in Texas**

The school code of 1876 made the first provision for an intermediate office in Texas. County judges were assigned to act as ex-officio county superintendents. An act passed by the Texas Legislature in 1887 provided that the office of County Superintendent could be established in any county when advisable. The prerequisites for holding such an office included good moral character and a first grade teacher's certificate. In 1907 a more positive act was
passed which required that a county superintendent be elected in all counties in which the number of scholastics exceeded 2000. By 1949 the duties of the County Superintendent included the supervision of special service teachers employed under co-operative agreements among several districts, approval of teacher units for exceptional children, recommendation and supervision of supervisors and counselors employed cooperatively, and establishment of a county system for pupil transportation. The principle of equality of educational opportunity was scrutinized in a 1956 "Study of the Intermediate Unit in Texas" and the conclusion reached that "an intermediate administrative office of education will be needed in Texas for many years" (49, p. 130).

In 1965, the Texas Legislature authorized the State Board of Education to develop plans and operating procedures for a state-wide system of Regional Education Media Centers (REMC) to be supported with equal amounts of state and local funds. Under Senate Bill 408, the State of Texas established Regional Education Media Centers "to provide educational media materials, equipment, maintenance thereof, and services to the public free school districts of this state who participate herein." In 1967, the Legislature broadened the scope of the 1965 legislation to include provisions for the establishment of Regional Education Service Centers (RESC). Presently there are twenty such regional centers
in the state with all areas included (Figure 1). The Regional Education Service Centers are an integral component of the Texas elementary/secondary education system funded from a combination of local, state, and federal sources (42).

The Texas School Law Bulletin (52) provides for the establishment, governance, organization, administration, funding, and evaluation of the Regional Education Service Centers. Paragraph 11.32 authorizes the State Board of Education to establish Regional Education Service Centers throughout the state so that each school district has the opportunity to be served on a voluntary basis. Each region shall have a minimum of 50,000 pupils in average daily attendance unless an exception be made for a sparsely populated area. A seven-member board, elected according to stated rules and serving without compensation, shall govern the Regional Education Service Centers. The Board of Directors is responsible for hiring a director, securing the necessary staff, and paying the bills. Basic costs for the operation of the Regional Education Service Centers shall be borne by the Foundation School Fund although the Board may enter into contracts for grants from both public and private organizations. Each Regional Education Service Center receives an annual allotment of $200,000 plus additional funds on the basis of Average Daily Attendance within the area of operation. Evaluation is accomplished through a mandatory self-study, inspection by a panel of
Fig. 1--Geographical areas of the Education Service Centers of Texas.
distinguished persons from other centers, and audit by the Central Education Agency, each of these procedures occurring every five years.

Paragraph 11.33 outlines the general powers and duties of the Regional Education Service Centers. In keeping with the original intent for establishing the centers, furnishing educational media materials to participating districts remains a central function. Specifically, Regional Education Media Centers are to be established and operated by the Regional Education Service Centers to house, circulate, and service educational media for the public schools of the districts participating. The State pays $1 per Average Daily Attendant toward the cost of setting up the Regional Education Media Centers, operating them, and purchasing educational media supplies and equipment. Local Education Agencies pay a proportionate amount, not to exceed $1 per Average Daily Attendant for costs of administration and purchase of supplemental educational media. Nothing shall prohibit a center from receiving and utilizing funds in any amount for which it may be eligible from federal sources.

In addition the State Board of Education provides an allotment for computer services to Regional Education Service Centers that qualify, whereby they might make available the services required to meet the needs of the school districts within the region. The State's share of the cost of this program is paid from the Foundation School
Fund and may not exceed $1 multiplied by the Average Daily Attendance in the participating public schools.

Regional Education Service Centers may also provide supplementary or technical assistance in the identification and instruction of handicapped children within the service area. In compliance with the approved statewide design for special education, responsibilities may include expansion and coordination of services provided by Regional Education Service Centers related to programs for handicapped children and provision for special services such as special seats, books, instructional media, and other supplemental supplies and services required for quality instruction. Finally, Regional Education Service Centers may provide other services to school districts within the rules and regulations adopted by the State Board of Education.

According to current literature (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61), the generally accepted functions of Regional Education Service Centers today seem to be regional planning, educational media services, computer services, educational services for children with handicapping conditions, guidance and counseling services, assistance with crime prevention and drug education programs, bus driver training, and inservice education for classroom teachers. In addition,
programs in bilingual and/or migrant education are supported by categorical funding where targeted populations exist.

The characteristics of the financial support of the Regional Education Service Centers of Texas have changed often through their first eighteen years of existence. In 1967-68, the initial basic support for the regional agencies was provided by federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III funds. Media funds were supplied by state/local matching funds, and Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title VI funds were used to assist programs for children with handicapping conditions. In 1969-70 programs for these children were also supported by state funds, and in the same year, state assistance for Regional Education Service Center computer services began. In 1972, the end of reliance on Title III funds for basic support resulted in the initiation of state funding equal to the 1967-68 Title III level. The Legislature also directed that the distribution include $200,000 for each Regional Education Service Center and that the remainder, approximately $6,150,000, be allocated on an Average Daily Attendance basis.

**Significance of the Study**

Any person or agency who depends upon public funding for its existence must continually justify its raison d'être. From the point of view of the administrators of the twenty Education Service Centers and the superintendents of the
approximately 1060 Independent School Districts of Texas
this study should prove significant as they seek to document
their accomplishments of the past and formulate their plans
and goals for the future to the end that their financial
needs might be met for such endeavors. From the point of
view of the legislators, state board members, and educational
lobbyists, this study should prove significant as they seek
to become aware of the services rendered by the Education
Service Centers, the benefits derived by the Independent
School Districts, and the costs incumbent upon such under-
takings.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Prior to beginning the study of the impact of funding changes on selected Education Service Centers (ESC), a review of the related literature was conducted. A computer search using the Educational Resources Information Center as the data base and covering Current Index of Journals of Education and Resources in Education index from January, 1974, through June, 1985, was performed. In addition, the Education Index was consulted, and various other references were suggested as the study progressed. The following is a summary of those findings.

Over the years thousands of school systems have joined forces to provide a variety of services for their pupils (31). Cooperatives in education, as well as other areas, range from community efforts (9, 48, 59) to national projects (42). Some arrangements are relatively simple, created for a single purpose such as career development (36, 79, 85, 94, 114, 123, 150, 191) or special education (125, 154, 171). Others are rather sophisticated organizations offering everything from inservice education for teachers to mass purchasing and data processing (46, 113, 131, 152, 158, 160, 161, 163, 164).
The Education Service Agency (ESA) was defined by the National Education Association in 1963 as "an agency that operates at a regional level, giving coordination and suplementary services to local school districts and servicing as a link between these basic administrative units and the state education authority" (102, pp. 1-2). Most Education Service Agencies (ESA) were established in the 1960's and 1970's, and by 1977, 25 million students in 12,000 local school districts were receiving some kind of education service from established Education Service Agencies (ESA) which spent $1.7 billion that year for the purpose of improving public education (102). In 1978, the Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) was described as a relatively new, remarkably vital agency in American education which was born of the need for coordination of services to rural schools and now existed in urban and suburban areas as well (61).

Three basic patterns have emerged in the area of cooperative education. Five states—Massachusetts (147), New Jersey (53), North Carolina (68, 69, 182), Oklahoma (130), and Ohio (26, 82)—are classified by Stephens (162) as Regionalized State Education Agency/Education Service Agency systems which indicates that each of the centers operates as a branch of the State Education Agency (SEA).

A second pattern, Cooperative Education Service Agency, exists in Alaska (162), Colorado (162), Connecticut (205),
Georgia (19, 69), Indiana (199), Maryland (162), Minnesota (153), Nebraska (176, 200), Ohio (26, 82, 188), Rhode Island (162), South Carolina (69, 182), and West Virginia (146, 155). Most of these Education Service Agencies (ESA) represent a loose consortium of education agencies, some multi-purpose, some limited-purpose, and some single purpose. In addition, almost half are not state-wide in scope.

Special District Education Service Agencies are legally constituted units of school government linking the state education agency with a collection of Local Education Agencies (LEA). Ten states—California (149), Illinois (202), Iowa (74), Michigan (62, 72), New York, (181), Oregon (41), Pennsylvania (49, 50, 51, 52, 53), Texas (98, 99), Washington (162), Wisconsin (47, 84, 156)—have adopted this pattern.

Other states which have unique organizations or a combination of more than one type of arrangement include Alabama (86), Arkansas (97), Kansas (71), North Dakota (75, 76, 100), Tennessee (25), and Wyoming (180). While many areas were continuing to join the cooperative education movement, the demise in the statewide system of education service agencies in Kentucky occurred in 1979 (159).

Because of a commonality of educational problems (economic, cultural, and geographic) the Appalachian region has successfully utilized a regional delivery system (18, 90, 126, 193, 194), and special interest groups such as the
League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) have joined together in cooperative efforts (64, 103, 109, 144, 145).

The education of American Indians has frequently benefited from the establishment of cooperative programs. For example, Oregon (3) educators report joint educational planning and funding between Indian tribal leaders and school district officials. Other American Indian educational cooperatives have been noted in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and elsewhere in the United States (11, 84, 106, 179).

Educational cooperatives are not unique only to the United States. Reports come from around the world chronicling activities of centers in Brazil (63), Argentina (138), Saudi Arabia (128), Australia (34), Scotland (44), Paraguay (118), India (119), the Soviet Union (141), Israel (173), Switzerland (172), and Italy (38).

The number of objectives that formal education is expected to achieve has grown incredibly over the years. The task of education has become so complex that the problems are hardly comprehensible (65). From the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (7) to the hearings before the 98th Congress concerning the creation of National Centers for Personal Computers (73), one useful strategy for solving the problems has involved regionalism and cooperation (1).

One of the arguments made for the formation of Education Service Agencies (ESA) in nearly every state
where they have been established is that they provide improved access of services to students and staff of Local Education Agencies (LEA). Because of their proximity to local districts and state and local funding, Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA) and their staffs, now numbering over 500 certified employees in Texas (35), are key tools in communicating new knowledge for educational improvement (175, 201).

As state legislatures consider the problem of equalization of educational opportunity, the solution has been and can be found through utilization of Regional Education Service Centers (RESC) as the delivery vehicle for many programs (160, 184, 186, 187, 198), providing vital services and specialized personnel to school districts that, because of economic constraints, cannot supply them independently. Especially in rural areas, Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA) have emerged as an alternative to consolidation and loss of community schools (6, 20, 21, 24, 45, 66, 80, 96, 104, 117, 127, 189).

Special services offered through Regional Education Service Agencies (RESA) or similar cooperative centers include legal services (23, 87), adult education programs (2, 33, 78, 169), and studies in a relatively new field of emphasis, higher education (67, 70, 196).

Leadership training (8, 129), educational public relations (157), and program evaluation (22, 39, 165) are
topics frequently listed among Regional Education Agency (RESA) concerns. Services which are somewhat more unusual and/or of local interest include those in the areas of bilingual education (115), migrant education (168), Latvian education (148), and educational and support programs for teenage mothers (101).

Today, one of the most prominent types of cooperative education agency is the teacher center which is concerned primarily with staff development and/or inservice education. Other types include single or limited purpose service centers organized for specific subject areas or specialized offerings and the comprehensive Regional Education Service Centers (RESC) established for the purpose of providing assistance in the above named professional areas. The latter also afford a diverse agenda which may include regional planning, program evaluation, guidance and counseling, drug education/crime prevention programs, and even bus driver training, to name a few.

The value of teacher centers (12, 37, 107, 173, 195) which are typically found in metropolitan areas is generally different from that of a Regional Education Service Center (RESC) in that it serves a distinct population, i.e., the teachers. The offerings are commonly centered around staff development (27, 40, 58, 60, 83, 100, 105, 108, 110, 122, 132, 133, 143, 185, 197), and the organization may include a university plus several school
districts (30, 166), a cooperative arrangement between several school districts (116), a multi-county cooperative (43), or an independent facility providing professional consultation (81, 139, 142, 174). Besides somewhat overlapping services, teacher centers and Regional Education Service Centers (RESC) share an often universal problem, that of funding. Some teacher centers are totally or partially federally funded (16, 88), and others must continually search for innovative and economically feasible methods of service delivery (28, 56, 166).

Single service educational cooperatives are widespread. For example, media centers (32, 89, 91, 95, 121, 124, 140, 190) are prevalent throughout the United States. In addition, universities and Local Education Agencies (LEA) combine to improve instruction in physical education (4), industrial arts (13), science (14, 17, 34, 57, 173, 178, 204), business education (15), social studies (69), health (77, 92), and mathematics (34). In certain regions, bilingual education centers are required (5, 170). With the advent of the computer came a proliferation of centers both for user education and the dispensing of data processing services (10, 55, 93, 111, 112, 120, 134, 151, 177, 183, 203). Finally, the need for management and evaluation of educational cooperatives has not gone unnoticed by those who would establish such components (135, 136, 137, 161, 167, 192).
According to Fleming (54), the last 250 years have produced a paucity of thinkers. Education, with its various agencies and centers of knowledge, stands at this point in time needing to guide society in making some vital decisions which will likely make vital differences in life and in this world. "If we can teach nothing else," says Fleming, "let it be a love of knowledge for knowledge's sake" (54, p. 11A). If this is accomplished, technology will be in the hands of a caring and increasingly wise mankind, and the world will be a better place to live. The educational service centers occupy a unique position for providing the leadership in accepting the challenge and fulfilling this mission.
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CHAPTER III

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The answers to three principal research questions were obtained by examination of documents available in the offices of the Education Service Centers, from information supplied by the directors, and from evaluations completed by the eighty-four superintendents of the independent school districts who were in the regions in both 1979 and 1984. The questions consisted of the following:

1. Has the amount of federal funding, state funding, and/or local funding changed between 1979 and 1984?

2. Has the burden of support shifted among the three major sources of revenue between 1979 and 1984?

3. How have revenues impacted the various services rendered during the five year period 1979-1984?

The nine areas of concern included media services, data processing, special education services, guidance and counseling, drug education and crime prevention, inservice education (staff development), bilingual education, migrant education, and bus driver training. Data for use in comparison was gathered as to the type (federal, state, local) and amount of funding received in 1979 and in 1984 for each of these services. In addition, the percentage
of the total budget the revenues represented in 1979 as compared with that of 1984 was computed and comparisons drawn. An examination of all school districts in the seventy-two counties served by the Regional Service Centers utilized for this study revealed that one hundred twenty-six current superintendents had held the same office in 1979. A survey requesting a comparison of services received in 1979 with those in 1984 from the respective Education Service Centers was mailed to each of these school officials. Results from Likert rating scales submitted by the eighty-four (66.7%) superintendents who responded were averaged.

Service Centers Studied

The five Regional Education Service Centers utilized for this study were Regions VII, IX, X, XI, and XII. One basis for selection of these particular regions was their variability in characteristics.

Region VII consists of seventeen counties and is composed of one hundred independent school districts, which is more than any other region in the state. One hundred twenty-five thousand students are served by this Center, whose area of responsibility spans 12,795 square miles and includes primarily the small town/rural population of East Texas.

Region IX has a smaller number of students than any other region: 34,000 enrolled in forty independent school
districts. The twelve counties contain 10,323 square miles and no large cities.

Region X has 398,000 students who attend one of the eighty-one independent school districts. The second largest city in Texas is served by this Center which consists of eight counties covering 6268 square miles.

The other large urban center included in this study is the site of Region XI Education Service Center. Within ten counties comprising 7848 square miles the eighty-two independent school districts are located. The average daily attendance of this Region is approximately 235,000.

Region XII consists of twelve counties with eighty-two independent school districts enrolling 80,000 students. The Center delivers services throughout an area of 11,054 square miles.

Each of these five Regional Education Service Centers is unique as a result of location and the student population served. This somewhat dictates the services offered and determines, to a certain extent, the problems encountered. At the same time, financial constraints provide a common basis for comparison and, in that area, the five centers utilized for the study are representative of the rest of the twenty Regional Education Service Centers of Texas.
Procedures for Collection of Data

Following the examples and recommendations established by prior studies of Education Service Centers cited in the literature (1, 2), both qualitative and quantitative methods were used. Interviews were conducted with each of the directors of the Regional Service Centers selected for this study, and pertinent documents relating to services, staffing, and funding were examined. The interview questions were open-ended whereby problems and concerns peculiar to the individual region could be addressed. On the other hand, a standard data sheet was used to glean information from the financial records. Similarly, the evaluation of services completed by the superintendents aided in determining the quality of programming offered by the Regional Education Service Centers. The purpose of utilizing qualitative data (interviews and documents) was primarily to increase understanding on the part of the investigator into the operation of the Education Service Centers of Texas and to give meaning and direction to the gathering of facts and figures regarding revenue and expenditures. The quantitative data were used to fulfill the purposes of the study and to provide information from which appropriate conclusions could be drawn.

Presentation of Data

The purpose of this study was not to reveal specific information concerning individual Regional Education Service
Centers, and for that reason, the regions included in the investigation were identified simply by "A," "B," "C," "D," and "E."

Charts and graphs were prepared to depict the changes from 1979 to 1984 in funding, staffing, and programming of the five Regional Education Service Centers being utilized for the study. Significant trends and reported strengths and weaknesses were noted, taking into account the percent of inflation which had occurred during the five years from 1979 to 1984. The Consumer Price Index published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics was applied to the data. After all computations had been made, the data were entered into tables for ease of reporting and interpretation.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results from the survey of the financial records of the five Regional Education Service Centers selected for this investigation were compiled and evaluated. Audit reports for the target years, 1979 and 1984, revealed the amount and sources of revenue for each of the regions and the expenditures which occurred in the various areas of services rendered. Since the primary thrust of this study was to determine the amount and direction of funding changes, the percent of change became one of the essential parameters. If the 1979 revenue/expenditure exceeded that of 1984, the percent change was reported as a decrease (<). If the 1984 revenue/expenditure represented the larger of the two quantities, the percent change was listed as an increase (>). Raw data were treated first, followed by an examination of deflated data in which both 1979 dollars and 1984 dollars were computed as 1967 dollars to account for economic inflation during this period. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (1, 2), the formulas for these computations were given as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
1967 \text{ dollars} &= \frac{1979 \text{ dollars}}{2.174} \\
1967 \text{ dollars} &= \frac{1984 \text{ dollars}}{3.111}
\end{align*}
\]
Although the amount of federal revenue varied widely from one region to another in 1979, an interesting observation was the equalizing effect which occurred in 1984. The centers which had previously received more revenue showed decreases while those which had been the recipients of lesser amounts recorded increases (Table I).

**TABLE I**

PERCENT CHANGE IN FEDERAL REVENUE FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN SELECTED REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS USING RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Federal Revenue-Raw Data</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,283,020</td>
<td>1,110,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>749,220</td>
<td>391,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>96,892</td>
<td>547,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>164,274</td>
<td>1,797,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2,087,358</td>
<td>519,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One reason for the variation in federal revenue was that much of the monies awarded were categorical and therefore dependent on the composition of the population of the students in the region.

On the other hand, much of the state allocations were based on a formula which established base funding plus the prescribed amount per average daily attendant. Each Regional Education Service Center suffered a decrease in state funding from 1979 to 1984 (Table II).
TABLE II
PERCENT CHANGE IN STATE REVENUE FROM 1979 TO 1984
IN SELECTED REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE
CENTERS USING RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State Revenue-Raw Data</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>&lt;Decrease Increase&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,744,988</td>
<td>1,337,517</td>
<td>&lt;23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1,658,392</td>
<td>1,642,734</td>
<td>&lt; 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1,435,639</td>
<td>988,302</td>
<td>&lt;31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4,400,858</td>
<td>2,705,626</td>
<td>&lt;38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,357,090</td>
<td>841,804</td>
<td>&lt;38.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the most prominent effect of funding changes was that concerning local contributions. The percent change generally reflected a substantial increase with one region indicating a slight decrease (Table III).

TABLE III
PERCENT CHANGE IN LOCAL REVENUE FROM 1979 TO 1984
IN SELECTED REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE
CENTERS USING RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Local Revenue-Raw Data</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>&lt;Decrease Increase&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,281,648</td>
<td>1,980,177</td>
<td>54.5%&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>526,879</td>
<td>1,190,537</td>
<td>126.0%&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>518,326</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>&lt; 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3,984,278</td>
<td>6,135,811</td>
<td>54.0%&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>438,433</td>
<td>777,498</td>
<td>77.3%&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a result of the local districts' increased funding, total revenue for most of the selected Regional Education Service Centers remained about constant as far as reported dollar figures were concerned. The exception was Region E whose total revenue decreased substantially from 1979 to 1984 (Table IV).

**TABLE IV**

PERCENT CHANGE IN TOTAL REVENUE FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN SELECTED REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS USING RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Revenue-Raw Data</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4,309,658</td>
<td>4,679,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2,934,491</td>
<td>3,224,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2,071,771</td>
<td>2,073,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10,352,906</td>
<td>10,638,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3,931,760</td>
<td>2,711,574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to perform a more meaningful examination, both 1979 and 1984 dollars were computed as 1967 dollars using the appropriate formula described previously (Table V). Since the federal government provided smaller dollars in the cases of Regions C and D and both smaller and fewer dollars in the cases of Regions A, B, and E, the decreased funding had a larger impact than was evident in Table I, and the increased funding was not as marked as it had appeared to be using raw data.
TABLE V
PERCENT CHANGE IN FEDERAL REVENUE FROM 1979 TO 1984
IN SELECTED REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE
CENTERS USING DEFLATED DATA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Federal Revenue-Deflated Data</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>&lt;Decrease</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>590,166</td>
<td>357,067</td>
<td>&lt;39.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>344,627</td>
<td>125,729</td>
<td>&lt;63.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>44,569</td>
<td>175,888</td>
<td>294.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>75,563</td>
<td>577,659</td>
<td>664.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>960,146</td>
<td>166,850</td>
<td>&lt;82.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Similarly, the deflated data for state revenues showed the reported decreases represented a greater percent change when inflation was taken into account (Table VI).

TABLE VI
PERCENT CHANGE IN STATE REVENUE FROM 1979 TO 1984
IN SELECTED REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE
CENTERS USING DEFLATED DATA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>State Revenue-Deflated Data</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>&lt;Decrease</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>802,662</td>
<td>429,932</td>
<td>&lt;46.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>762,830</td>
<td>528,041</td>
<td>&lt;30.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>660,368</td>
<td>317,680</td>
<td>&lt;51.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2,024,314</td>
<td>869,697</td>
<td>&lt;57.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>624,236</td>
<td>270,590</td>
<td>&lt;56.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the general pattern of increases in local share of the total budget was somewhat broken when deflated data was examined. In fact, Region C reported a decrease in local support in terms of 1967 dollars, and the other regions' revenues from the local districts indicated slighter increases than was evident when raw data was considered (Table VII).

TABLE VII

PERCENT CHANGE IN LOCAL REVENUE FROM 1979 TO 1984
IN SELECTED REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS USING DEFLATED DATA*

| Region | Local Revenue-Deflated Data | Percent Change |<Decrease|Increase>
|--------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------|
|        | 1979 | 1984 | <Decrease|Increase>
| A      | 589,534 | 638,508 | 8.3%> |
| B      | 242,355 | 382,686 | 57.9%> |
| C      | 238,420 | 157,666 | <33.9% |
| D      | 1,832,695 | 1,972,295 | 7.6%> |
| E      | 201,671 | 249,919 | 23.9%> |


The fact that all Regional Education Service Centers included in this study have suffered from an overall decrease in funding was grossly obvious from the figures presented in Table VIII. In terms of 1967 dollars, funding was down from 23 percent to more than 50 percent from 1979 to 1984.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Revenue-Deflated Data</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>&lt;Decrease</th>
<th>Increase&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1,982,362</td>
<td>1,504,314</td>
<td>&lt;24.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1,349,811</td>
<td>1,036,487</td>
<td>&lt;23.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>952,977</td>
<td>666,509</td>
<td>&lt;30.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4,762,146</td>
<td>3,419,651</td>
<td>&lt;28.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1,808,537</td>
<td>871,608</td>
<td>&lt;51.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


To further examine the impact of funding changes on the Regional Education Service Centers, a comparison was utilized among the three major sources of revenue for each center to determine the percentage each comprised with respect to the whole and the differences which occurred during the five year period under investigation. Changes were quite evident, but the direction of the shifts in revenue differed from one region to another.

In Regional Education Service Center A, the 1979 revenue was divided quite evenly among the three sources—federal, state, and local—each contributing approximately one-third of the total: 30 percent, 40 percent, and 30 percent, respectively. Some slight change occurred between 1979 and 1984. Federal and state revenues represented
slightly less of the total, and the local share increased somewhat (Figures 2 and 3).

Fig. 2—Revenue sources percent of total in 1979 for Regional Education Service Center A.

Fig. 3—Revenue sources percent of total in 1984 for Regional Education Service Center A.
By comparison, the amount of revenue from the various sources in Regional Education Service Center B differed widely. Over one-half of the total revenue in this center was obtained from state support. Also notable was the fact that federal revenue decreased from 25 percent in 1979 to 12 percent in 1984 while the revenue from local sources increased from 18 percent in 1979 to 36 percent in 1984 (Figures 4 and 5).

![Pie chart showing revenue sources in 1979 for Regional Education Service Center B.]

**Fig. 4—Revenue sources percent of total in 1979 for Regional Education Service Center B.**

Conversely, in Regional Education Service Center C, the local districts' contribution decreased proportionately from 1979 to 1984 apparently due to that center's obtaining substantial federal support during the latter year. The federal portion went from 4.7 percent in 1979 to 26.3 percent in 1984, the state's contribution decreased from
Fig. 5—Revenue sources percent of total in 1984 for Regional Education Service Center B.

69.3 percent to 47.7 percent, and the local share remained about the same: 25.0 percent compared to 23.7 percent (Figures 6 and 7).

Fig. 6—Revenue sources percent of total in 1979 for Regional Education Service Center C.
Regional Education Service Center D's composition was similar to that of Region C with respect to federal support which showed a large increase from 1979 to 1984, 1.6 percent to 16.9 percent. On the other hand, state support decreased from 42.5 percent to 25.4 percent. Local support increased from 38.5 percent to 57.7 percent (Figures 8 and 9).

The impact of funding changes on Regional Education Service Center E was quite evident. Not only did the total amount of revenue decrease from 1979 to 1984, but also the sources from which that revenue derived changed markedly. The financial records indicated that the percentage of federal support dropped from a substantial contribution constituting over half of the total (53.1%) in 1979 to less than one-fifth (19.1%) in 1984. This decrease in
Fig. 8—Revenue sources percent of total in 1979 for Regional Education Service Center D.

Fig. 9—Revenue sources percent of total in 1984 for Regional Education Service Center D.

Federal funding was somewhat matched by an increase in local support: 11.2 percent to 28.7 percent over the five year period, but the most noticeable change was in funds from
other sources which went from 1.2 percent to 21.1 percent (Figures 10 and 11).

Fig. 10—Revenue sources percent of total in 1979 for Regional Education Service Center E.

Fig. 11—Revenue sources percent of total in 1984 for Regional Education Service Center E.
This study was proposed to investigate the impact of funding changes on selected Regional Education Service Centers of Texas and the implications for programming and staffing. An examination of the expenditures for some of the major services offered by the various centers provided an indication of the areas involved and the direction of changes in programming and staffing which occurred as a result of the decrease in revenue as evidenced by statistics reported above.

In Regional Education Service Center A the raw data indicated only a slight increase in expenditures from 1979 to 1984 for such labor intensive services as special education, staff development, and bilingual education. Moreover, counseling/guidance and drug education/crime prevention were two services that were not funded at all as such in the 1984 budget, and bus driver training expenditures decreased by 10 percent. Conversely, the product-centered services—media and data processing—showed moderate increases, and as a result of recent government mandates to improve educational opportunities for the children of migrant workers, increased funding was available in this area for 1984 (Table IX).

In order to obtain a comparison between dollars with the same value and to eliminate the effects of inflation, the raw data was deflated according to the formulas provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (1, 2). At Education
TABLE IX
PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER A USING RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>420,653</td>
<td>584,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>1,009,091</td>
<td>1,521,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>104,263</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>808,488</td>
<td>829,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>64,547</td>
<td>281,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>24,863</td>
<td>22,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>652,117</td>
<td>691,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/Crime Prevention</td>
<td>127,232</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Center A the decreases in expenditures were more pronounced using deflated data, and four areas—media services, special education, staff development, and bilingual education—which appeared to have received larger allotments in 1984 than in 1979 actually had less buying power. Only the expenditures for assisting in improving educational opportunities for children of migrant workers enjoyed a substantial increase in 1984 over 1979 (Table X).

Records for Regional Education Service Center B reflected a somewhat similar pattern. Staff development, bus driver training, and bilingual education received decreased funding, and counseling/guidance and drug education/crime prevention were eliminated from the budget.
### TABLE X

PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER A USING DEFLATED DATA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures 1979</th>
<th>Expenditures 1984</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>193,493</td>
<td>187,953</td>
<td>&lt; 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>464,163</td>
<td>489,105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>47,959</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>371,890</td>
<td>266,480</td>
<td>&lt; 28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>29,690</td>
<td>90,384</td>
<td>204.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>11,437</td>
<td>7,167</td>
<td>&lt; 37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>299,962</td>
<td>222,303</td>
<td>&lt; 25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>58,524</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>&lt; 5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


in 1984. Special education was the only labor intensive service to show an increase in expenditures with the exception of migrant education which was the recipient of the impetus noted above. Even media services expenditures declined from 1979 to 1984, but data processing funding increased by nearly 100 percent in 1984, testifying to society's constant demand for and reliance on technology (Table XI).

The raw data supplied by Education Service Center B reflected decreases in most expenditures (six out of nine) from 1979 to 1984. Using deflated data, the areas showing fewer dollars in 1984 were seven out of nine. Not
TABLE XI
PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES
FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION
SERVICE CENTER B USING RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures 1979</th>
<th>Expenditures 1984</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>380,243</td>
<td>268,528</td>
<td>&lt; 29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>233,833</td>
<td>455,799</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>353,187</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>565,951</td>
<td>755,830</td>
<td>33.6%&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>46,205</td>
<td>undefined&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>36,150</td>
<td>34,253</td>
<td>&lt; 5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>744,484</td>
<td>658,497</td>
<td>&lt; 11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>99,164</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>29,355</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>&lt; 90.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unexpectedly, data processing sustained an increase in funding, probably owing to the fact that the emphasis on the use of the computer continued to grow. In addition, Education Service Center B became involved in migrant education in 1984, a service they had not provided at all in 1979 (Table XII).

Sharp decreases from 1979 to 1984 in special education, bus driver training, and bilingual education were noted in the audit reports of Regional Education Service Center C. Staff development, counseling/guidance, and drug education/crime prevention were services not included in the 1984 list of expenditures. Consistent with the trend found in
TABLE XII

PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER B USING DEFLATED DATA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures 1979</th>
<th>Expenditures 1984</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>174,905</td>
<td>86,316</td>
<td>&lt;50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>107,559</td>
<td>146,512</td>
<td>36.2%&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>162,460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>260,327</td>
<td>242,954</td>
<td>&lt;6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,892</td>
<td>undefined&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>16,628</td>
<td>11,010</td>
<td>&lt;33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>342,449</td>
<td>211,667</td>
<td>&lt;38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/Crime Prevention</td>
<td>45,614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>13,503</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>&lt;93.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


the other regions employed in this study, 1984 funding for data processing and media services was up slightly from 1979, and the allocation for education for children of migrant workers increased markedly in 1984 (Table XIII).

Three of the nine areas of expenditure reported by Education Service Center C in 1979 had been discontinued in 1984: counseling/guidance, staff development, and drug education/crime prevention. Moreover, comparison between the two target years using deflated data revealed sharp decreases in data processing, media services, and special education. Continuing a trend observed in the other
TABLE XIII
PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER C USING RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>87,370</td>
<td>98,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>287,079</td>
<td>327,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>43,424</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>640,178</td>
<td>453,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>43,056</td>
<td>96,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>76,189</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>44,720</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>43,979</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

regions, only services in migrant education received a higher funding level in 1984 than in 1979 (Table XIV).

Funding changes appeared to have impacted Regional Education Service Center D somewhat differently as evidenced by the amount and direction of the changes in expenditures from 1979 to 1984. However, the needs of the local districts and the population composition of the students served often dictated the programming offered and the staffing required, and those elements tended to vary widely from one region to another. As noted in the other regions employed in this study, staff development, counseling/guidance, and drug education/crime prevention were the
**TABLE XIV**

PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER C USING DEFLATED DATA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures 1979</th>
<th>Expenditures 1984</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>40,189</td>
<td>31,549</td>
<td>&lt; 21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>132,051</td>
<td>105,268</td>
<td>&lt; 20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>19,974</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt; 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>294,470</td>
<td>145,841</td>
<td>&lt; 50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>19,805</td>
<td>30,896</td>
<td>56.0%&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>35,046</td>
<td>4,822</td>
<td>&lt; 86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt; 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/ Crime Prevention</td>
<td>20,570</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>20,230</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>&lt; 99.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


services no longer provided in 1984. The same situation existed in Region D. In contrast to the other regions, special education funding increased and bus driver training was included in the 1984 budget even though it was not listed as an expenditure in 1979. Surprisingly, data processing and migrant education funding decreased along with that for bilingual education. Media services remained essentially unchanged from 1979 to 1984 (Table XV).

In Education Service Center D the deflated data produced results similar to those derived under the same procedure in the other regions. All services except two
TABLE XV
PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES
FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION
SERVICE CENTER D USING RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures 1979</th>
<th>Expenditures 1984</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                           |                   |                   | <Decrease
|                           |                   |                   | Increase>|
| Media Services            | 1,136,180         | 1,155,920         | 1.7%>          |
| Data Processing           | 4,753,523         | 2,984,824         | <37.2%          |
| Counseling/Guidance       | 107,436           | -0-               | <100.0%         |
| Special Education         | 946,087           | 1,529,523         | 61.7%>          |
| Migrant Education         | 153,149           | 99,342            | <35.1%          |
| Bus Driver Training       | -0-               | 42,886            | undefined>      |
| Staff Development         | 1,269,484         | -0-               | <100.0%         |
| Drug Education/           |                   |                   |                |
| Crime Prevention          | 74,170            | -0-               | <100.0%         |
| Bilingual Education       | 54,005            | 16,289            | <69.8%          |

received less real funding in 1984 than in 1979. A small percentage of increase was reported for special education and one activity, bus driver training, was offered in 1984 but was not included in the 1979 budget. Three areas of expenditures were eliminated from the agenda of Education Service Center D in 1984. Those were counseling/guidance, staff development, and drug education/crime prevention (Table XVI).

With the lone exception of bus driver training, the labor-intensive services received the sharpest cutbacks in funding from 1979 to 1984 in Regional Education Service Center E. The expenditures for the product-centered
### TABLE XVI

**PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER D USING DEFLATED DATA***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>&lt;Decrease</th>
<th>Increase&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>522,622</td>
<td>371,559</td>
<td>&lt;28.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>2,178,253</td>
<td>959,442</td>
<td>&lt;56.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>49,419</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>435,183</td>
<td>491,650</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>70,446</td>
<td>31,932</td>
<td>&lt;54.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>13,785</td>
<td>undefined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>583,939</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/Crime Prevention</td>
<td>34,117</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>&lt;100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>24,841</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>&lt;78.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


services, media and data processing, remained virtually unchanged. Unlike the other regions being utilized in this study, Region E had discontinued the services of counseling/guidance and drug education/crime prevention as early as 1979. As noted above, none of the Education Service Centers listed expenditures in these areas for 1984 (Table XVII).

Fewer and smaller dollars reflected by the deflated data obtained for expenditures in Education Service Center E adversely affected seven of the nine areas, and the other two services were not offered either in 1979 or 1984. As indicated by the percent changes ranging from more than
TABLE XVII

PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES
FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION
SERVICE CENTER E USING RAW DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>90,959</td>
<td>89,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>277,591</td>
<td>300,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>685,402</td>
<td>593,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>947,652</td>
<td>136,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>19,114</td>
<td>23,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>204,724</td>
<td>141,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>41,741</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 percent to 100 percent over the designated five year period (1979-1984), this Center was particularly hard hit by the decrease in funding being examined in this study (Table XVIII).

Rating of Services

From the 433 independent school districts served by the Regional Education Service Centers utilized for this investigation, 126 superintendents were asked to rate nine areas of service offered the local districts by the Centers. The superintendents chosen for inclusion in the study were all those who had also occupied the same position in 1979. Eighty-four replies were received which
TABLE XVIII
PERCENT CHANGE IN EXPENDITURES FOR MAJOR SERVICES
FROM 1979 TO 1984 IN REGIONAL EDUCATION
SERVICE CENTER E USING DEFLATED DATA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>41,839</td>
<td>28,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>127,687</td>
<td>96,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>315,272</td>
<td>190,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>435,902</td>
<td>43,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>8,792</td>
<td>7,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>94,169</td>
<td>45,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


represented two-thirds of the surveys distributed. Respondents were asked to rate the services from one to five, one representing the lowest rating and five representing the highest. In those cases in which the service was not offered by the center and/or not used by the district "No Basis for Response" was indicated. Average scores for each service were computed by the following formula:

\[
\text{Score} = \frac{\sum nR_n}{\sum R_n} / \frac{\sum nR_n}{\sum R_n}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
n &= \text{rating},
R &= \text{number of responses}
\end{align*}
\]
In 1979 the services receiving the most favorable ratings were bus driver training, media services, and staff development (Table XIX).

**TABLE XIX**

RANK ORDER OF SERVICES PROVIDED LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS AS RATED BY SUPERINTENDENTS FOR 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>No Basis for Response (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/Crime Prevention</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1984 the same three services ranked highest and in the same order. The services receiving the lowest ratings in both 1979 and 1984 were bilingual education and migrant education. These were also the two services used the least in both of the target years. The only marked change in the rank order of the services was in the area of data processing which ranked seventh in 1979 but fourth in 1984. On the other hand, it was the third least used service in both of those years (Table XX).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>No Basis for Response (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Prevention</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem for this study was to determine the impact of funding changes on the programming, staffing, and general operation of the twenty Education Service Centers of Texas between the years 1979 and 1984. This was accomplished by analyzing five Education Service Centers which are representative of the group. The answers to three principal research questions were obtained by examination of documents available in the offices of the Education Service Centers, from information supplied by the directors, and from evaluations completed by the superintendents of the independent school districts within the five regions being studied. The questions consisted of the following:

1. Has the amount of federal funding, state funding, and/or local funding changed between 1979 and 1984?

2. Has the burden of support shifted among the three major sources of revenue between 1979 and 1984?

3. How have revenues impacted the various services rendered during the five year period 1979-1984?
Findings

To assess the amount and direction of these changes, the financial records for the target years were examined and the revenues revalued to allow for inflation. All of the Regional Education Service Centers experienced a decrease in total revalued revenues. Variations occurred from one center to the other with respect to the changes in sources of funding. Half of the centers reported a decrease in federal funding while only one received less local funding in 1984 as compared with 1979. State funding was down in all centers during the designated five-year period.

In 1979 the percent of federal funding in the total revenue of the five Regional Education Service Centers studied ranged from 1.6 percent to 53.1 percent compared to 1984 when the range had narrowed from 12.2 percent to 26.3 percent. A more stable source of funding, state revenues, varied from 34.5 percent to 69.3 percent in 1979 and from 25.4 percent to 50.9 percent in 1984. Ranges in local funding percentage of total revenue for 1979 revealed a variation from 11.2 percent to 38.5 percent. In 1984 the range indicated an upward trend from 23.7 percent to 57.7 percent.

As might be expected, the decrease in total revenues which occurred from 1979 to 1984 at the five Regional Education Service Centers resulted in corresponding decreases in programming and staffing. Without exception,
the services of counseling/guidance and drug education/crime prevention were eliminated in 1984. Two of the centers discontinued providing staff development programs, and another of the centers no longer offers bilingual education services. The expenditures for special education decreased in four of the centers as did those for bus driver training. Since all of the above mentioned areas of service are labor-intensive, the decreases in funding not only reduced programs, but also, in most cases, resulted in a corresponding cut in staffing according to information obtained from directors interviewed. Product-centered services were not exempt from budget cuts. Media service expenditures decreased in each of the centers, and over half of the centers spent less to provide data processing for the local districts.

Although the quantity of services has been restricted by the fewer and smaller dollars received by the Regional Education Service Centers in 1984 compared to 1979, the quality of programming has continued to be maintained at a high level according to a survey of superintendents. Five of the nine services (media services, special education, bus driver training, staff development, and drug education/crime prevention) included on the survey received an average rating of 3.50 or above on a scale from one to five in 1979, but in 1984 six of the nine services (media services, special education, bus driver training, staff development,
data processing, and counseling/guidance) received average ratings of 3.50 or above. No service was judged to be lower than 3.00 on the average in either of the years.

Conclusions

The needs of the local districts and the population composition of the students served often dictated the programming offered and the staffing required, and those elements tended to vary widely from one region to another. However, the present investigation of selected Regional Education Service Centers of Texas pointed to the conclusion that while changes in funding have significantly impacted the programming and staffing of the centers, the local districts within the regions have continued to receive quality service enabling them to further equalize educational opportunities and to assure the citizens of Texas that service available anywhere will be available everywhere.

Specifically, the results of this study indicate the following.

1. The Regional Education Service Centers have done an excellent job of maintaining the quality of services rendered to the local districts while coping with the problems of reduced revenues.

2. The Regional Education Service Centers have dealt with reduced revenues by eliminating certain services, i.e.,
staff development, counseling/guidance, and drug education/crime prevention.

3. Most of the Regional Education Service Centers have overcome reductions in state and federal sources of income by raising additional local funds.

4. Cooperative Education Service Agencies continue to be an effective vehicle for dispensing educational services.

Recommendations

1. State funding for the Regional Education Service Centers should be increased.

2. Private funding should be sought for projects conducted to meet specific needs.

3. To combat the rising problems of crime and drug abuse, the state should provide funds to reinstate the drug education/crime prevention services.

4. With the influx of non-English speaking families into Texas and the court mandates regarding their education, the state should provide the necessary funds for bilingual education.

5. The Regional Education Service Centers should conduct a campaign to increase public awareness of their programs and services.

6. Legislators should be provided with detailed information concerning programs and activities of the Regional Education Service Centers.
Recommendations for Further Study

1. Conduct a similar investigation over the period 1984-1989 to determine the impact of HB 72 on the state and local funding of the Regional Education Service Centers.

2. Conduct a similar investigation over the period 1984-1989 to determine the impact of the Gramm-Rudman bill on federal funding of the Regional Education Service Centers.

3. Study the feasibility of reorganizing the Regional Education Service Centers as branches of the Texas Education Agency.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLE LETTER TO DIRECTORS

Director
Regional Education Service Center
Anytown, Texas

Dear Sir:

As part of my doctoral program at North Texas State University, I am gathering data from the Education Service Centers regarding the impact of the changes in funding which may have occurred over the last few years. I am particularly interested in comparing the years 1979 and 1984.

In order to obtain this information, I would appreciate your providing the data indicated on the enclosed chart. If necessary, I would be happy to come to your center on a date convenient to you to discuss my project and glean the data required from your records. The identity of the Education Service Center will not be revealed in the paper.

If you wish, you may contact me at home (817) 292-4832. Please feel free to call collect.

Sincerely,

Sara J. Brian
6221 Wrigley Way
Fort Worth, TX 76133
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE DATA SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Sources</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures*</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1984</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance/Counseling</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Staff Development)</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including ESL)</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Costs</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Units</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$__________</td>
<td>$__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes rent and/or building usage fees in categorical funding classifications.
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS

Superintendent
Anytown Independent School District
P. O. Box 9000
Anytown, Texas

Dear Sir:

As part of my doctoral program at North Texas State University, I am gathering data from the Education Service Centers regarding the impact of the changes in funding which may have occurred over the last few years. I am particularly interested in comparing the years 1979 and 1984.

To supplement this information, I am requesting your evaluation of the services your district has been rendered by the Education Service Center for your region during those years. Your prompt attention to this survey will be greatly appreciated, and your responses, which will not be identified by district or region, will be invaluable to my study.

Sincerely,

Sara J. Brian
6221 Wrigley Way
Fort Worth, Texas 76133
(817) 292-4832
APPENDIX D

SAMPLE SURVEY

Please rate the following areas of service as provided by the Education Service Center to your school district for the school year 78-79 using 1 to represent the lowest rating and 5 to represent the highest rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education (Staff Development)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/Crime Prevention</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the following areas of service as provided by the Education Service Center to your school district for the school year 83-84 using 1 to represent the lowest rating and 5 to represent the highest rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Guidance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education (Staff Development)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education/Crime Prevention</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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