

1992 REPORT ON SCHOOL FACILITIES

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

MAY 1992
DRAFT

Project Staff

Joe Wisnoski
Director
Resource Planning and Reports

Debra S. Haas
Project Manager

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	3
Contents of the Report	3
Legislative Charges and Agency Actions	3
Financing Options	5
CHAPTER 2 FACILITIES PROGRAMS IN OTHER STATES	6
CHAPTER 3 TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY BUILDING AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT	12
Information Collected	12
Uses of Data	14
Summary of Facilities Information	15
General Information and Key Findings	19
CHAPTER 4 DETERMINING THE NEEDS	21
Debt Service	21
Summary of State Bond Review Board Report	22
Standards	23
Cost Estimates	24
Explanation of Cost Calculations	25

CHAPTER 5	PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS OF THE STATE ROLE IN FUNDING SCHOOL FACILITIES	28
	Previous Attempts to Address The Facilities Issue	28
	Recommendations of the 1987-1988 Accountable Costs Committee	28
	Recommendations of the 1988 Select Committee on Education	30
	Recommendations of the School Facilities Advisory Committee	32
	Common Themes	35
CHAPTER 6	OPTIONS FOR FUNDING FACILITIES	37
	Per Capita Funding	38
	Guaranteed Yield Funding	39
	Project Funding	40
	Complimentary Programs	41
	Combination Funding	42
	Sources of Revenue	43
CHAPTER 7	CONCLUSIONS	50
APPENDICES		
APPENDIX A	DATA COLLECTION FORMS	51
APPENDIX B	SUMMARY REPORT ON SCHOOL FACILITIES INVENTORY DATA, NOVEMBER 1991	66
APPENDIX C	REPORT OF THE SCHOOL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE	94
APPENDIX D	FACILITIES COST ESTIMATES	104

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

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

Contents of the Report

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

Legislative Charges and Agency Actions

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

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

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

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

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

Financing Options

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

CHAPTER 2
FACILITIES PROGRAMS IN OTHER STATES

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

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

California

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

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

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

Florida

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

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

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

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

Illinois

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

Kentucky

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

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

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

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

New York

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

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

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

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

North Carolina

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

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

Pennsylvania

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

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

Texas

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER 3
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
BUILDING AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT (BETA)

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

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

Information Collected

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Uses of Data

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

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

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

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

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

Summary of Facilities Information

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

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

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

General Information

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Condition

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

Room Condition

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

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

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

System Condition

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

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

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

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

Educational Technology

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

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

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

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

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

General Conclusions and Key Findings

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

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

Some of the key findings to date are:

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

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