

APPENDIX A
DATA COLLECTION FORMS

Form B1

Architectural/Structural System Profile

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
 Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date:

/ /
 Month Day Year

Contact:

Surveyor:

Reviewed By:

Date:

1. County - District Number		2. Campus Number		Campus Name (please print legibly)
<input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/>	
3. A	4. Building Description	5. Building Number	6. Building Number	7. Building Number
8. A				8. H
9. B				9. C
10. C				10. R
11. D				11. R
12. E				12. R
13. F				13. R
14. G				14. W
15. H				15. W
16. I				16. W
17. J				17. R
18. K				18. R
19. L				19. R
20. M				20. C
21. N				21. R
22. O				22. H

Form B2

M/E/P Systems Profile

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date:

Month Day Year

Contact:

Surveyor:

Reviewed By:

Date:

1. County - District Number		2. Campus Number		Campus Name (please print legibly)											
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>												
3. Building Description (print legibly)		4. Building Number													
A		5. F		7. H											
C		6. M		8. R											
I		7. B		9. C											
I		8. M		10. R											
R		9. F		11. I											
C		10. P		12. R											
O		11. B		13. E											
D		12. M		14. I											
D		13. O		15. F											
.		14. O		16. F											
		15. O		17. P											
		16. O		P											
		17. O		U											
				M											
				B											
				I											
				A											
				I											
				O											
				O											
				R											
				E											
				L											
				L											

Form C

Indoor Instructional Space Profile

Survey Date:

Month Day Year

Contact:

Surveyor:

Reviewed By:

Date:

1. County - District Number		2. Campus Number		Campus Name (please print legibly)		Building Name (s)																		
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>																	
3. A C D	4. Building Number	5. Room Number	6. Room Area (SF)	7. Intended Use	8. P L O V I	9. F I R E P R I V A T E	10. F I R E P R I V A T E	11. C O M M U N I T Y	12. F I R E P R I V A T E	13. R E C R E D I T I O N	14. L I B R A R Y	15. Student Station (fixed)	16. T O I L E T R Y	17. Drinking Fountain	18. Toilet Fixtures	19. State	20. Showers	21. E X H A U S T R I A N	22. Elev. Outlets (Duplex)	23. C O U N T E R T O P	24. P H O N E J A C K E T	25. Gas Jets	26. Year Constructed	27. Y R I O V I D

Form X

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

District Ancillary Buildings

Division of Resource Planning

Survey Date:
Month Day Year

Contact: _____

Surveyor: _____

Reviewed By: _____ Date: _____

1. County - District Number <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> - <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	2. Campus Number <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	3. Action Code <input type="text"/>
--	--	--

4. Building Name <input type="text"/>	7. Zip Code <input type="text"/>
5. Street Address <input type="text"/>	12. Building Number <input type="text"/>
6. City <input type="text"/>	
8. Building Use <input type="text"/>	11. Overall Condition <input type="text"/>
9. Gross Square Footage <input type="text"/>	10. Year Built/Renovated <input type="text"/>

4. Building Name <input type="text"/>	7. Zip Code <input type="text"/>
5. Street Address <input type="text"/>	12. Building Number <input type="text"/>
6. City <input type="text"/>	
8. Building Use <input type="text"/>	11. Overall Condition <input type="text"/>
9. Gross Square Footage <input type="text"/>	10. Year Built/Renovated <input type="text"/>

4. Building Name <input type="text"/>	7. Zip Code <input type="text"/>
5. Street Address <input type="text"/>	12. Building Number <input type="text"/>
6. City <input type="text"/>	
8. Building Use <input type="text"/>	11. Overall Condition <input type="text"/>
9. Gross Square Footage <input type="text"/>	10. Year Built/Renovated <input type="text"/>

RENOVATION OF AGING SPACE ON AN ANNUAL BASIS

ESTIMATED COST: \$66 million (annually)

ASSUMPTIONS:

During the 10 year period from 1980 through 1989 school districts renovated an average of 3.3 million square feet per year. Renovation cost estimates were made using a cost of \$20 per square foot rather than \$60 per square foot for new construction.

Renovation was assumed to have taken place if the values for year renovated differed from that for year constructed. Renovation information was collected on a room by room basis, and the square footage used may represent a partial building.

SPACE NEEDS FOR PROJECTED GROWTH ON AN ANNUAL BASIS

ESTIMATED COST: \$300 million (annually)

ASSUMPTIONS:

The student population is growing at a rate of approximately 50,000 per year. For each student in attendance, a facility needs to have approximately 100 square feet of instructional and non-instructional space.

Since it is impossible to predict whether student growth will occur in areas where there is excess capacity, this estimate assumes that facilities will need to be constructed to accommodate all student growth. This will require 5,000,000 square feet of new space each year.

A construction cost of \$60 per square foot was used to calculate this estimate.

APPENDIX B
SUMMARY REPORT ON SCHOOL FACILITIES INVENTORY DATA
NOVEMBER 1991

REPORT A
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ENTIRE STATE BY SCHOOL GROUPINGS

11:08 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

SCHOOL GROUP-ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

ROOM USE	TOTAL SQ. FEET PER PUPIL	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE	MEDIAN ROOM SIZE
CLASSROOM	41.24	72,461,897	8,592,152	11.86%	18	715
LANGUAGE LABORATORY	0.88	179,914	18,417	10.24%	18	261
COMPUTER LABORATORY	1.65	1,506,614	110,600	7.34%	17	690
SCIENCE LABORATORY	2.28	468,817	20,562	4.39%	19	817
SPECIAL ED.CLASSROOM	2.36	1,631,888	252,796	15.49%	17	601
WELDING SHOP	2.64	11,990	1,133	9.45%	16	740
HOOD SHOP	6.00	26,825	1,627	6.07%	26	1495
AUTOMOTIVE SHOP	3.91	19,524			19	1683
COSMETOLY LAB	1.91	2,204			20	586
HEALTH CARE LAB	0.42	2,388			11	84
DARK ROOM	0.42	2,160	720	33.33%	17	120
VIDEO STUDIO	1.03	14,047	600	4.27%	18	343
OTHER VOCATIONAL	3.88	61,184	4,011	6.56%	15	955
ART ROOM	1.66	750,239	35,998	4.80%	16	853
HOME ECONOMICS	2.71	88,916	1,539	1.73%	19	764
DRAFTING	1.50	3,822			23	548
R.O.T.C.	1.02	372			35	372
GREENHOUSE	1.28	5,537	25	0.45%	19	171
BAND/CHORAL ROOM	1.90	1,408,366	122,727	8.71%	16	829
PRACTICE ROOM	0.61	33,920	848	2.50%	18	64
GYMNASIUM	8.05	8,520,359	95,088	1.12%	16	3773
NATATORIUM	8.73	22,995			21	3169
LOCKER/DRESSING ROOM	2.16	846,588	2,051	0.24%	22	345
WEIGHT ROOM	2.25	19,619	623	3.18%	21	614
ATHLETIC THERAPY	0.82	11,718	2,909	24.83%	18	190
KITCHEN	2.54	4,185,899	37,521	0.90%	20	1200
CAFETERIA	5.76	3,145,691	57,920	1.84%	22	2556
CAFETORIUM	6.01	6,775,354	49,580	0.73%	20	3350
STORAGE	2.50	4,345,102	183,815	4.23%	19	70
WORK ROOMS	1.15	1,606,594	42,700	2.66%	18	210
LIBRARY	3.40	5,657,556	134,392	2.38%	19	1452
AUDITORIUM	5.25	1,201,670	5,098	0.42%	28	2665
STAGE	1.29	1,708,170	9,465	0.55%	22	648
TOILET ROOM	3.04	5,329,752	180,594	3.39%	18	70
HEALTH CLINIC	0.47	743,673	19,019	2.56%	20	213
COUNSELOR OFFICE	0.48	490,593	25,538	5.21%	17	180
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	2.46	4,273,111	69,504	1.63%	19	234
LOUNGE	0.90	1,179,904	23,487	1.99%	21	310
MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	1.30	1,873,486	17,238	0.92%	16	94
CHILD/DAY CARE	3.06	35,246	3,470	9.85%	17	632
INDOOR CORRIDOR	12.44	21,033,608	164,389	0.78%	19	600
OUTDOOR CORRIDOR	0.07	31,185	2,618	8.40%	24	0
OTHER	3.17	641,199	20,222	3.15%	16	187
TOTAL		152,359,696	10,310,996			

SCHOOL GROUP-ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY

ROOM USE	TOTAL SQ. FEET PER PUPIL	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE	MEDIAN ROOM SIZE
CLASSROOM	51.01	3,004,465	174,579	5.81%	21	643
LANGUAGE LABORATORY	3.02	18,974	768	4.05%	27	611
COMPUTER LABORATORY	3.46	125,374	7,968	6.36%	21	630
SCIENCE LABORATORY	5.64	290,806	4,899	1.68%	22	816
SPECIAL ED.CLASSROOM	6.93	175,836	16,654	9.47%	23	603
WELDING SHOP	6.76	99,236	2,497	2.52%	20	2153
HOOD SHOP	5.75	120,277	4,781	3.97%	22	1395
AUTOMOTIVE SHOP	3.42	29,922			15	2009
COSMETOLY LAB	24.50	10,168			13	1174
HEALTH CARE LAB	5.40	605			12	605
DARK ROOM	0.31	4,930	137	2.78%	22	105
OTHER VOCATIONAL	9.31	238,451	1,300	0.55%	20	1520
ART ROOM	2.84	53,940	374	0.69%	26	740
HOME ECONOMICS	4.57	233,325	4,818	2.06%	25	734
DRAFTING	1.80	19,396			14	1365
R.O.T.C.	30.74	4,488			59	4488
GREENHOUSE	9.87	16,029	3,462	21.60%	16	920
AGRICULTURAL	9.93	71,693	641	0.89%	26	1728
BAND/CHORAL ROOM	3.82	119,032	1,230	1.03%	21	1182
PRACTICE ROOM	0.66	11,667			15	60
GYMNASIUM	33.21	1,802,391			27	6235
NATATORIUM	11.70	28,505			17	3710
LOCKER/DRESSING ROOM	10.67	565,915	791	0.14%	26	469
WEIGHT ROOM	3.02	101,811	2,083	2.05%	24	709
ATHLETIC THERAPY	0.98	18,272			16	228
KITCHEN	4.54	248,067	3,761	1.52%	23	744
CAFETERIA	8.72	343,762	5,470	1.59%	25	1552
CAFETORIUM	12.18	198,175			22	2513
STORAGE	7.96	471,168	13,663	2.90%	22	85
WORK ROOMS	2.64	118,847	5,333	4.49%	20	169
LIBRARY	6.53	352,899	6,010	1.70%	24	969
AUDITORIUM	9.75	280,256	2,784	0.99%	32	2956
STAGE	3.17	154,716	522	0.34%	30	653
TOILET ROOM	5.91	350,043	8,318	2.38%	20	103
HEALTH CLINIC	1.04	43,041	2,504	6.00%	23	189
COUNSELOR OFFICE	1.13	40,130	1,028	2.56%	25	150
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE	9.09	536,474	16,067	2.99%	21	189
LOUNGE	1.89	75,770	880	1.16%	24	267
MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	2.52	112,209	151	0.13%	20	53
CHILD/DAY CARE	8.77	5,041			43	896
INDOOR CORRIDOR	26.33	1,551,183	6,795	0.44%	23	313

REPORT A
 TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
 ENTIRE STATE BY SCHOOL GROUPINGS

11:08 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

SCHOOL GROUP=SECONDARY SCHOOLS

ROOM USE	TOTAL SQ. FEET PER PUPIL	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE	MEDIAN ROOM SIZE
CAFETORIUM	7.43	1,212,725			15	4152
STORAGE	6.57	5,475,239	61,901	1.13%	18	110
WORK ROOMS	2.04	1,610,157	18,777	1.17%	17	180
LIBRARY	4.57	3,752,971	15,246	0.41%	17	2000
AUDITORIUM	6.34	3,989,108	7,621	0.19%	23	4719
STAGE	2.14	1,538,696	3,144	0.20%	22	1260
TOILET ROOM	3.60	3,006,267	17,549	0.58%	18	150
HEALTH CLINIC	0.37	265,142	2,789	1.05%	19	220
COUNSELOR OFFICE	0.81	605,996	6,597	1.09%	19	169
ADMINSTRATIVE OFFICE	5.63	4,687,407	30,232	0.64%	18	163
LOUNGE	1.02	728,047	4,459	0.61%	20	340
MECHANICAL/ELECTRICAL	2.46	1,966,678	5,151	0.26%	16	120
CHILD/DAY CARE	1.04	39,128	6,635	16.96%	17	633
INDOOR CORRIDOR	23.62	19,699,903	54,115	0.27%	19	616
OUTDOOR CORRIDOR	0.15	30,401	0		21	0
OTHER	2.13	1,082,044	22,014	2.03%	17	256
TOTAL		131,622,024	2,115,369			
		379,775,160	15,387,463			

REPORT B
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE TOTAL AREA DATA

11:08 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS					
6	OVER 50,000	58,169,920	3,941,873	6.78%	24
20	25,000 TO 49,999	71,312,231	3,139,640	4.40%	16
45	10,000 TO 24,999	74,973,556	2,877,871	3.84%	17
58	5,000 TO 9,999	40,209,263	1,437,212	3.57%	16
81	3,000 TO 4,999	37,769,034	1,156,893	3.06%	19
127	1,600 TO 2,999	33,814,184	1,238,533	3.66%	19
118	1,000 TO 1,599	21,314,291	678,773	3.18%	18
205	500 TO 999	23,237,586	553,512	2.38%	19
392	UNDER 500	19,227,819	370,460	1.93%	22
DISTRICT TYPE					
8	MAJOR URBAN	66,198,748	4,524,635	6.83%	23
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	102,759,722	3,941,229	3.84%	16
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	46,038,177	1,645,487	3.57%	18
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	31,758,046	995,196	3.13%	16
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	33,757,426	1,388,175	4.11%	20
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	8,258,338	318,656	3.86%	13
266	NON-METRO STABLE	60,632,306	1,997,423	3.29%	20
493	RURAL	30,625,121	583,966	1.91%	21
HEALTH (MEDIAN=\$145,390)					
104	UNDER \$76,634	34,518,815	1,987,754	5.76%	17
105	\$76,634 TO \$92,482	22,223,957	843,914	3.80%	19
105	\$92,483 TO \$108,328	30,451,694	1,217,565	4.00%	22
105	\$108,329 TO \$125,109	20,813,425	881,778	4.24%	20
104	\$125,110 TO \$145,389	49,472,559	1,780,825	3.60%	17
105	\$145,390 TO \$170,034	40,440,812	1,110,128	2.75%	16
105	\$170,035 TO \$204,844	50,691,434	1,820,297	3.59%	18
105	\$204,845 TO \$271,616	69,123,356	3,871,808	5.60%	20
105	\$271,617 TO \$436,122	46,897,673	1,700,307	3.63%	19
104	OVER \$436,122	14,559,760	117,553	0.81%	19
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
HEALTH (ST AVG=\$186,841)					
682	UNDER \$186,841	221,999,152	8,721,436	3.93%	18
365	OVER \$186,841	157,194,333	6,610,493	4.21%	20
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
HEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP					
24	UNDER \$46,305	14,814,589	813,003	5.49%	17
54	\$46,305 TO < \$71,749	16,064,968	1,038,906	6.47%	17
74	\$71,749 TO < \$84,206	17,623,071	777,712	4.41%	19
132	\$84,206 TO < \$103,653	20,625,469	610,585	2.96%	19
23	\$103,653 TO < \$107,069	16,820,249	764,758	4.55%	25
94	\$107,069 TO < \$122,094	19,547,996	857,195	4.39%	20
57	\$122,094 TO < \$133,451	20,662,856	785,044	3.80%	18
44	\$133,451 TO < \$140,903	18,678,976	708,562	3.79%	18
41	\$140,903 TO < \$149,956	18,702,907	529,258	2.83%	16
59	\$149,956 TO < \$162,715	19,100,942	480,694	2.52%	16
32	\$162,715 TO < \$172,398	19,344,534	736,425	3.81%	15
39	\$172,398 TO < \$183,529	18,737,075	596,493	3.18%	17
45	\$183,529 TO < \$199,613	19,798,267	685,605	3.46%	22
42	\$199,613 TO < \$220,926	20,710,075	626,440	3.02%	15
39	\$220,926 TO < \$241,469	9,578,151	266,808	2.79%	18
1	\$241,469 TO < \$242,339	17,146,765	1,586,492	9.25%	29
27	\$242,339 TO < \$262,043	15,790,489	712,202	4.51%	17
39	\$262,043 TO < \$308,333	21,491,751	1,117,357	5.20%	18
21	\$308,333 TO < \$336,062	18,944,993	915,093	4.83%	20
160	\$336,062 AND OVER	35,009,362	723,297	2.07%	18
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$1,0454)					
261	UNDER 0.9481	76,508,863	3,650,324	4.77%	21
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	99,442,386	4,275,175	4.30%	19
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	107,297,729	3,453,267	3.22%	18
262	1.1897 AND OVER	95,944,507	3,953,163	4.12%	17
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$0.8896)					
261	UNDER 0.7663	70,587,985	2,610,215	3.70%	17
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	109,026,148	4,660,789	4.27%	18
262	0.8992 TO 1.0276	117,335,616	4,646,953	3.96%	20
262	OVER 1.0276	82,243,736	3,413,972	4.15%	20
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
SPT8 HIGHEST CATEGORY					
337	RESIDENTIAL	215,828,033	9,218,063	4.27%	17
309	LAND	21,617,166	632,449	2.93%	21
208	OIL AND GAS	32,105,799	571,625	1.78%	20
193	BUSINESS	109,642,487	4,909,792	4.48%	22
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
1,052	STATE TOTAL	380,027,884	15,394,767	4.05%	19

REPORT B
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE TOTAL AREA DATA

11:08 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL SQ. FEET BY USE	TOTAL PORTABLE SQ. FEET	% OF AREA IN PORTABLES	EFFECTIVE AGE
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	50,554,925	1,106,011	2.19%	22
282	5 TO UNDER 20	62,623,644	2,461,289	3.93%	18
118	20 TO UNDER 100	60,728,937	2,014,568	3.32%	17
97	100 AND OVER	205,285,979	9,750,061	4.75%	19
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	62,838	7.53%	20
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	102,996,065	4,156,330	4.04%	21
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	163,242,230	7,503,414	4.60%	20
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	81,086,018	2,510,842	3.10%	16
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	25,855,601	951,102	3.68%	13
53	10% AND OVER	6,847,970	273,079	3.99%	15
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	141,163,027	5,364,731	3.80%	18
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	72,964,061	2,790,681	3.82%	17
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	72,115,907	2,811,718	3.90%	19
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	24,049,721	565,958	2.35%	16
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	62,450,438	3,543,640	5.67%	22
12	50% AND OVER	7,284,730	318,039	4.37%	23
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	51,852,245	1,264,141	2.44%	18
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	63,047,479	2,276,796	3.61%	16
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	60,584,099	1,934,364	3.19%	16
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	44,931,912	1,498,396	3.33%	21
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	89,921,313	4,839,258	5.38%	22
179	50% AND OVER	69,690,836	3,581,812	5.14%	19
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	9,873,702	311,690	3.16%	20
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	18,945,141	669,949	3.54%	16
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	50,288,878	1,411,465	2.81%	16
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	47,205,890	1,659,491	3.52%	17
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	88,247,430	2,699,598	3.06%	19
253	50% AND OVER	165,466,843	8,642,574	5.22%	20
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	79,995,994	3,032,533	3.79%	15
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	59,619,362	1,287,394	2.16%	17
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	77,358,687	2,555,442	3.30%	19
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	115,349,490	5,984,029	5.19%	21
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	41,224,605	2,188,001	5.31%	21
33	80% AND OVER	6,479,746	347,368	5.36%	19
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	54,314,034	2,201,150	4.05%	15
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	82,031,272	3,089,094	3.77%	17
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	165,156,139	7,389,609	4.47%	20
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	78,526,439	2,714,914	3.46%	21
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=\$26,840)					
263	UNDER \$24,038	22,132,360	697,863	3.15%	18
263	\$24,038 TO UNDER \$25,043	40,307,162	1,443,685	3.58%	18
264	\$25,043 TO UNDER \$26,251	87,351,246	3,279,705	3.75%	18
262	\$26,251 AND OVER	230,237,116	9,973,514	4.33%	19
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	116,439,160	3,555,790	3.05%	17
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	68,152,010	2,118,996	3.11%	18
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	58,982,254	1,996,666	3.39%	19
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	33,285,883	1,449,161	4.35%	17
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	53,659,146	2,631,298	4.90%	19
59	50% AND OVER	49,509,431	3,642,856	7.36%	23
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	36,180,977	1,698,039	4.69%	19
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	74,715,395	2,650,552	3.55%	19
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	119,061,419	3,900,088	3.28%	18
263	33.4% AND OVER	150,070,093	7,146,088	4.76%	19
1,052	STATE TOTAL	380,027,884	15,394,767	4.05%	19

REPORT C
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE LISTING OF PUPIL TO COMPUTER RATIOS

12:10 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL PUPILS ENROLLED	TOTAL COUNT OF COMPUTERS	PUPILS TO COMPUTER RATIO
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS				
6	OVER 50,000	588,698	33,407	17.62
20	25,000 TO 49,999	713,774	53,405	13.37
45	10,000 TO 24,999	727,371	52,429	13.87
58	5,000 TO 9,999	367,370	25,802	14.24
81	3,000 TO 4,999	316,776	24,079	13.16
127	1,600 TO 2,999	271,247	20,968	12.94
118	1,000 TO 1,599	149,921	13,512	11.10
205	500 TO 999	147,609	16,042	9.20
391	UNDER 500	95,425	12,467	7.65
DISTRICT TYPE				
8	MAJOR URBAN	680,565	36,949	18.42
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	967,402	72,247	13.39
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	440,786	36,594	12.05
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	294,155	20,384	14.43
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	314,017	22,250	14.11
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	69,605	5,347	13.02
266	NON-METRO STABLE	446,325	37,867	11.79
492	RURAL	165,336	20,473	8.08
WEALTH (MEDIAN=\$145,390)				
104	UNDER \$76,634	370,759	26,297	14.10
105	\$76,634 TO \$92,482	204,692	15,015	13.63
105	\$92,483 TO \$108,328	281,313	17,079	16.47
105	\$108,329 TO \$125,109	180,116	14,695	12.26
104	\$125,110 TO \$145,389	454,813	28,334	16.05
105	\$145,390 TO \$170,034	352,616	23,838	14.79
105	\$170,035 TO \$204,844	440,718	31,356	14.06
105	\$204,845 TO \$271,616	640,020	47,808	13.39
105	\$271,617 TO \$436,122	377,555	37,734	10.01
103	OVER \$436,122	70,436	9,201	7.66
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
WEALTH (ST AVG=\$186,841)				
682	UNDER \$186,841	2,061,107	140,605	14.66
364	OVER \$186,841	1,311,931	110,752	11.85
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP				
24	UNDER \$46,305	173,249	12,098	14.32
54	\$46,305 TO < \$71,749	167,352	11,816	14.16
74	\$71,749 TO < \$84,206	169,761	11,610	14.62
132	\$84,206 TO < \$103,653	168,127	13,635	12.33
23	\$103,653 TO < \$107,069	169,170	8,686	19.48
94	\$107,069 TO < \$122,094	168,968	13,626	12.40
57	\$122,094 TO < \$133,451	186,742	11,572	16.14
44	\$133,451 TO < \$140,903	168,725	10,725	15.73
41	\$140,903 TO < \$149,956	169,239	11,888	14.24
59	\$149,956 TO < \$162,715	167,215	10,594	15.78
32	\$162,715 TO < \$172,398	172,070	10,835	15.88
39	\$172,398 TO < \$183,529	172,338	12,812	13.45
45	\$183,529 TO < \$199,613	166,765	12,122	13.76
42	\$199,613 TO < \$220,926	168,400	12,607	13.36
39	\$220,926 TO < \$241,469	73,806	6,337	11.65
1	\$241,469 TO < \$242,339	194,208	10,235	18.97
27	\$242,339 TO < \$262,043	149,570	14,109	10.60
39	\$262,043 TO < \$308,333	176,770	15,536	11.38
21	\$308,333 TO < \$336,062	170,804	10,983	15.55
159	\$336,062 AND OVER	219,759	29,531	7.44
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$1,0454)				
260	UNDER 0.9481	713,092	48,238	14.78
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	898,105	68,540	13.10
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	957,623	77,192	12.41
262	1.1897 AND OVER	804,218	57,387	14.01
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$8.8896)				
260	UNDER 0.7663	654,615	45,149	14.50
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	1,011,631	71,833	14.08
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	1,023,562	85,715	11.94
262	OVER 1.0276	683,230	48,660	14.04
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY				
337	RESIDENTIAL	2,036,272	148,464	13.72
309	LAND	144,456	15,565	9.28
207	OIL AND GAS	191,879	18,340	10.46
193	BUSINESS	1,000,431	68,988	14.50
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
1,051	STATE TOTAL	3,378,191	252,111	13.40

REPORT C
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE LISTING OF PUPIL TO COMPUTER RATIOS

12:10 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL PUPILS ENROLLED	TOTAL COUNT OF COMPUTERS	PUPILS TO COMPUTER RATIO
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)				
549	LESS THAN 5	303,736	32,801	9.26
282	5 TO UNDER 20	512,429	40,301	12.72
118	20 TO UNDER 100	558,398	37,908	14.73
97	100 AND OVER	1,998,475	140,347	14.24
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	5,153	754	6.83
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)				
434	DECLINING PUPILS	829,194	65,073	12.74
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	1,502,857	108,065	13.91
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	750,507	57,805	12.98
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	228,989	16,672	13.73
53	10% AND OVER	66,644	4,496	14.82
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)				
620	UNDER 5%	1,214,182	96,288	12.61
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	652,943	49,915	13.08
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	639,482	47,854	13.36
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	200,099	14,187	14.10
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	613,000	38,772	15.81
12	50% AND OVER	58,485	5,095	11.48
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)				
299	UNDER 5%	397,640	37,913	10.49
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	540,459	43,626	12.39
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	510,138	36,950	13.81
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	388,143	32,485	11.95
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	841,578	57,223	14.71
178	50% AND OVER	700,233	43,914	15.95
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)				
105	UNDER 5%	75,118	6,138	12.24
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	143,817	11,558	12.44
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	404,653	37,143	10.89
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	393,287	32,762	12.00
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	743,289	60,623	12.26
252	50% AND OVER	1,618,027	103,887	15.57
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)				
156	UNDER 20%	688,399	56,639	12.15
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	487,812	39,497	12.35
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	683,299	53,043	12.88
303	40% TO UNDER 60%	1,026,601	70,004	14.66
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	429,783	28,067	15.31
33	80% AND OVER	62,297	4,861	12.82
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)				
258	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	495,743	34,330	14.44
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	727,459	54,337	13.39
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	1,532,559	115,735	13.24
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	622,430	47,709	13.05
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=\$26,840)				
263	UNDER \$24,038	158,712	15,570	10.19
262	\$24,038 TO UNDER \$25,043	319,459	26,036	12.27
264	\$25,043 TO UNDER \$26,251	746,977	56,356	13.25
262	\$26,251 AND OVER	2,153,043	154,149	13.97
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)				
599	UNDER 5%	903,525	79,428	11.38
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	561,536	47,899	11.72
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	530,576	40,666	13.05
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	309,655	20,515	15.09
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	527,308	32,498	16.23
59	50% AND OVER	545,591	31,105	17.54
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)				
262	UNDER 18.6%	316,520	24,561	12.89
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	663,328	47,978	13.83
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	1,045,217	76,865	13.60
263	33.4% AND OVER	1,353,126	102,707	13.17
1,051	STATE TOTAL	3,378,191	252,111	13.40

REPORT D
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE COUNT OF COMPUTERS BY BRAND

12:09 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	APPLE II MICRO COMPUTER	MACINTOSH MICRO COMPUTER	MS-DOS MICRO COMPUTER	OTHER MICRO COMPUTERS
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS					
6	OVER 50,000	15,857	1,421	5,987	10,142
20	25,000 TO 49,999	23,462	2,857	18,936	8,150
45	10,000 TO 24,999	25,086	2,870	14,789	9,684
58	5,000 TO 9,999	13,115	2,100	6,377	4,210
81	3,000 TO 4,999	12,423	1,413	6,003	4,240
127	1,600 TO 2,999	10,027	738	6,141	4,062
118	1,000 TO 1,599	6,802	705	3,699	2,306
205	500 TO 999	7,910	563	4,548	3,021
391	UNDER 500	5,670	405	3,633	2,759
DISTRICT TYPE					
8	MAJOR URBAN	18,226	1,464	6,704	10,555
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	35,136	5,614	19,217	12,280
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	14,832	1,265	14,965	5,532
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	10,722	1,069	5,076	3,517
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	10,857	1,221	5,784	4,388
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	2,542	317	1,622	866
266	NON-METRO STABLE	18,635	1,530	10,556	7,146
492	RURAL	9,402	592	6,189	4,290
HEALTH (MEDIAN=\$145,390)					
104	UNDER \$76,634	12,456	1,143	7,947	4,751
105	\$76,634 TO \$92,482	8,076	441	3,997	2,501
105	\$92,483 TO \$108,328	9,266	653	3,718	3,442
105	\$108,329 TO \$125,109	7,069	603	3,304	3,719
104	\$125,110 TO \$145,389	14,198	1,681	7,020	5,435
105	\$145,390 TO \$170,034	11,260	1,163	7,529	3,886
105	\$170,035 TO \$204,844	13,316	1,592	9,799	6,649
105	\$204,845 TO \$271,616	23,629	3,046	11,564	9,569
105	\$271,617 TO \$436,122	16,437	2,104	11,710	7,483
103	OVER \$436,122	4,366	501	3,248	1,086
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
HEALTH (ST AVG=\$186,841)					
682	UNDER \$186,841	70,188	6,908	37,255	26,254
364	OVER \$186,841	49,885	6,019	32,581	22,267
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
HEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP					
24	UNDER \$46,305	5,598	431	3,996	2,073
54	\$46,305 TO < \$71,749	5,748	645	3,138	2,285
74	\$71,749 TO < \$84,206	6,598	297	2,673	2,042
132	\$84,206 TO < \$103,653	6,741	624	4,035	2,235
23	\$103,653 TO < \$107,069	4,785	235	1,701	1,965
94	\$107,069 TO < \$122,094	6,429	514	3,124	3,559
57	\$122,094 TO < \$133,451	6,185	550	3,371	1,466
44	\$133,451 TO < \$140,903	5,198	718	2,576	2,233
44	\$140,903 TO < \$149,956	6,331	695	2,376	2,486
44	\$149,956 TO < \$162,715	4,517	375	3,559	2,143
44	\$162,715 TO < \$172,398	5,704	636	3,183	1,312
44	\$172,398 TO < \$183,529	5,979	1,106	3,455	2,272
45	\$183,529 TO < \$199,613	4,903	401	3,440	3,378
42	\$199,613 TO < \$220,926	4,198	305	5,865	2,239
39	\$220,926 TO < \$241,469	3,102	214	2,089	932
1	\$241,469 TO < \$242,339	6,440	750	1,516	1,529
27	\$242,339 TO < \$262,043	6,594	1,378	3,240	2,897
39	\$262,043 TO < \$308,333	7,447	890	3,017	4,182
21	\$308,333 TO < \$336,062	4,360	357	2,241	4,025
159	\$336,062 AND OVER	13,216	1,806	11,241	3,268
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$1,0454)					
260	UNDER 0.9481	26,217	2,039	11,970	8,012
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	32,376	2,962	18,538	14,664
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	33,498	4,621	23,649	15,424
262	1.1897 AND OVER	27,982	3,305	15,679	10,421
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$0.8896)					
260	UNDER 0.7663	23,540	1,935	12,439	7,235
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	35,746	4,153	18,532	13,402
262	0.8992 TO 1.0276	35,282	3,954	27,571	18,908
262	OVER 1.0276	25,505	2,885	11,294	8,976
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
SPT8 HIGHEST CATEGORY					
337	RESIDENTIAL	69,877	8,532	42,568	27,487
309	LAND	7,321	626	4,415	3,203
207	OIL AND GAS	8,033	763	5,885	3,659
193	BUSINESS	34,842	3,006	16,968	14,172
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
1,051	STATE TOTAL	120,352	13,072	70,113	48,574

REPORT D
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE COUNT OF COMPUTERS BY BRAND

12:09 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	APPLE II MICRO COMPUTER	MACINTOSH MICRO COMPUTER	MS-DOS MICRO COMPUTER	OTHER MICRO COMPUTERS
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
549	LESS THAN 5	15,740	1,116	9,916	6,029
282	5 TO UNDER 20	19,358	1,597	10,658	8,688
118	20 TO UNDER 100	18,582	2,302	11,243	5,781
97	100 AND OVER	66,393	7,912	38,019	28,023
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	279	145	277	53
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
434	DECLINING PUPILS	31,276	2,035	17,245	14,517
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	53,844	5,312	27,270	21,639
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	25,059	4,363	19,644	8,739
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	8,086	998	4,853	2,735
53	10% AND OVER	2,087	364	1,101	944
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
620	UNDER 5%	44,943	4,924	30,952	15,469
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	23,657	2,820	14,252	9,186
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	22,404	2,615	12,127	10,708
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	8,891	618	2,331	2,347
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	17,854	2,018	8,966	9,934
12	50% AND OVER	2,603	77	1,485	930
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	16,557	1,518	13,039	6,799
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	22,802	3,946	10,202	6,676
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	18,421	1,862	10,808	5,859
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	13,373	1,010	9,304	8,798
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	26,875	2,901	14,960	12,487
178	50% AND OVER	22,324	1,835	11,800	7,955
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	3,268	434	1,514	922
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	5,458	793	2,967	2,340
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	16,037	2,231	13,580	5,295
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	15,888	2,206	8,555	6,113
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	28,286	2,873	17,602	11,862
252	50% AND OVER	51,415	4,535	25,895	22,042
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	24,960	4,858	19,166	7,655
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	20,202	1,682	9,427	8,186
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	25,286	2,169	15,431	10,157
303	40% TO UNDER 60%	33,702	3,030	17,548	15,724
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	13,652	1,176	7,308	5,931
33	80% AND OVER	2,550	157	1,233	921
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
258	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	16,707	1,813	10,567	5,243
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	28,080	2,945	13,163	10,149
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	54,608	6,385	33,058	21,684
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	20,957	1,929	13,325	11,498
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=\$26,840)					
263	UNDER \$24,038	7,680	827	4,048	3,015
262	\$24,038 TO UNDER \$25,043	13,096	1,263	6,240	5,437
264	\$25,043 TO UNDER \$26,251	28,028	2,952	15,752	9,624
262	\$26,251 AND OVER	71,548	8,030	44,073	30,498
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
599	UNDER 5%	36,212	4,487	25,388	13,341
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	23,258	3,477	12,144	9,020
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	19,421	1,715	12,264	7,266
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	9,985	838	4,892	4,800
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	15,166	1,089	8,288	7,955
59	50% AND OVER	16,310	1,466	7,137	6,192
% TCHRS H ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
262	UNDER 18.6%	12,098	972	7,312	4,179
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	24,318	2,259	12,413	8,988
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	34,838	3,937	23,933	14,157
263	33.4% AND OVER	49,098	5,904	26,455	21,250
1,051	STATE TOTAL	120,352	13,072	70,113	48,574

REPORT E
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANLYZE OF BUILDING CONDITION AREA

11:42 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL AREA	% TOTAL AREA RATED POOR	% TOTAL AREA RATED BELOW AVG	% TOTAL AREA RATED FAIR	% TOTAL AREA RATED GOOD	AVG AGE OF PORTABLE AREA	AVG AGE OF ALL AREA
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS								
6	OVER 50,000	58,169,920	0.51	3.89	49.15	45.92	13	24
20	25,000 TO 49,999	71,312,231	0.12	0.59	22.57	76.50	13	16
45	10,000 TO 24,999	74,973,556	0.44	2.28	28.13	68.87	13	17
58	5,000 TO 9,999	40,209,263	0.32	3.42	35.27	60.85	11	16
81	3,000 TO 4,999	37,769,034	0.44	3.03	38.92	57.33	16	19
127	1,600 TO 2,999	33,814,184	0.73	4.79	38.70	55.60	15	19
118	1,000 TO 1,599	21,314,291	0.46	2.48	39.10	57.89	14	18
205	500 TO 999	23,237,586	0.74	4.39	38.15	56.57	11	19
392	UNDER 500	19,227,819	0.74	6.27	43.97	48.82	12	22
DISTRICT TYPE								
8	MAJOR URBAN	66,198,748	0.48	3.56	46.75	48.74	12	23
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	102,759,722	0.36	0.84	21.70	76.82	11	16
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	46,038,177	0.23	2.06	28.69	68.81	18	18
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	31,758,046	0.29	4.62	40.47	54.55	11	16
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	33,757,426	0.43	4.02	46.16	49.10	15	20
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	8,258,338	0.30	3.95	32.12	63.43	8	13
266	NON-METRO STABLE	60,632,306	0.67	3.81	38.71	56.68	16	20
493	RURAL	30,625,121	0.69	5.41	40.44	53.25	13	21
HEALTH (MEDIAN=\$145,390)								
104	UNDER \$76,634	34,518,815	0.41	5.43	42.40	51.61	13	17
105	\$76,634 TO \$92,482	22,223,957	0.49	4.35	32.69	62.30	14	19
105	\$92,483 TO \$108,328	30,451,694	0.69	4.09	37.51	57.64	15	22
105	\$108,329 TO \$125,109	20,813,425	0.46	4.67	39.04	55.33	13	20
104	\$125,110 TO \$145,389	49,472,559	0.58	2.36	37.68	58.91	14	17
105	\$145,390 TO \$170,034	40,440,812	0.36	1.99	29.16	68.44	15	16
105	\$170,035 TO \$204,844	50,691,434	0.50	2.03	26.74	70.66	12	18
105	\$204,845 TO \$271,616	69,123,356	0.24	3.13	34.23	61.88	12	20
105	\$271,617 TO \$436,122	46,897,673	0.52	1.86	42.34	55.11	14	19
104	OVER \$436,122	14,559,760	0.15	1.25	28.99	69.24	10	19
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
HEALTH (ST AVG=\$186,841)								
682	UNDER \$186,841	221,999,152	0.49	3.31	34.35	61.63	14	18
365	OVER \$186,841	157,194,333	0.37	2.50	36.21	60.59	13	20
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
HEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP								
24	UNDER \$46,305	14,814,589	0.32	6.50	46.33	46.74	14	17
54	\$46,305 TO < \$71,749	16,064,968	0.36	4.86	41.54	53.06	12	17
74	\$71,749 TO < \$84,206	17,623,071	0.53	4.58	29.26	65.54	14	19
132	\$84,206 TO < \$103,653	20,625,469	0.80	4.66	40.68	53.67	12	19
23	\$103,653 TO < \$107,069	16,820,249	0.54	2.90	35.13	61.41	16	25
94	\$107,069 TO < \$122,094	19,547,996	0.31	3.60	36.73	58.82	13	20
57	\$122,094 TO < \$133,451	20,662,856	0.47	3.61	43.84	51.61	13	18
44	\$133,451 TO < \$140,903	18,678,976	1.04	3.28	33.81	61.32	18	18
41	\$140,903 TO < \$149,956	18,702,907	0.34	1.72	38.27	59.47	11	16
59	\$149,956 TO < \$162,715	19,100,942	0.39	1.73	23.57	74.25	19	16
32	\$162,715 TO < \$172,398	19,344,534	0.27	1.89	26.54	71.21	14	15
39	\$172,398 TO < \$183,529	18,737,075	0.44	1.28	19.11	79.11	9	17
45	\$183,529 TO < \$199,613	19,798,267	0.75	3.35	41.00	54.83	12	22
42	\$199,613 TO < \$220,926	20,710,075	0.28	1.32	20.22	78.10	16	15
39	\$220,926 TO < \$241,469	9,578,151	0.20	1.53	29.98	68.25	12	18
1	\$241,469 TO < \$242,339	17,146,765	0.32	9.16	60.73	28.05	14	29
27	\$242,339 TO < \$262,043	15,790,489	0.16	1.15	32.07	66.57	10	18
39	\$262,043 TO < \$308,333	21,491,751	0.18	1.27	20.12	78.25	10	17
21	\$308,333 TO < \$336,062	18,944,993	0.97	2.01	60.48	36.27	15	20
160	\$336,062 AND OVER	35,009,362	0.19	1.35	30.91	67.35	13	18
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$1,0454)								
261	UNDER 0.9481	76,508,863	0.28	5.02	41.56	52.58	14	21
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	99,442,386	0.62	2.71	44.37	52.14	15	19
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	107,297,729	0.37	2.30	29.96	67.18	14	18
262	1.1897 AND OVER	95,944,507	0.46	2.37	26.18	70.79	11	17
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$0.8896)								
261	UNDER 0.7663	70,587,985	0.28	3.78	34.40	61.43	13	17
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	109,026,148	0.34	3.19	30.67	57.37	13	18
262	0.8992 TO 1.0276	117,335,616	0.66	2.46	36.15	60.45	16	20
262	OVER 1.0276	82,243,736	0.40	2.73	29.59	67.16	12	20
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY								
337	RESIDENTIAL	215,828,033	0.30	2.43	28.01	69.12	12	17
309	LAND	21,617,166	0.73	6.26	43.56	49.28	12	21
208	OIL AND GAS	32,105,799	0.56	3.21	34.00	61.93	13	20
193	BUSINESS	109,642,487	0.62	3.33	47.76	47.75	16	22
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
1,052	STATE TOTAL	300,027,884	0.44	2.97	35.10	61.23	13	19

REPORT E
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANLYZE OF BUILDING CONDITION AREA

11:42 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	TOTAL AREA	% TOTAL AREA RATED POOR	% TOTAL AREA RATED BELOW AVG	% TOTAL AREA RATED FAIR	% TOTAL AREA RATED GOOD	AVG AGE OF PORTABLE AREA	AVG AGE OF ALL AREA
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)								
550	LESS THAN 5	50,554,925	0.61	4.22	39.01	55.98	15	22
282	5 TO UNDER 20	62,623,644	0.51	4.42	39.44	55.39	14	18
118	20 TO UNDER 100	60,728,937	0.49	3.54	34.45	61.33	12	17
97	100 AND OVER	205,285,979	0.36	2.06	33.05	64.22	13	19
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	834,399	0.00	0.23	25.58	74.19	9	20
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)								
435	DECLINING PUPILS	102,996,065	0.43	3.42	39.33	56.63	16	21
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	163,242,230	0.50	2.97	39.42	56.74	14	20
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	81,086,018	0.31	2.45	24.08	72.93	10	16
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	25,855,601	0.50	2.31	24.18	72.97	9	13
53	10% AND OVER	6,847,970	0.35	4.70	40.21	54.52	14	15
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)								
621	UNDER 5%	141,163,027	0.34	3.68	33.73	62.05	13	18
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	72,964,061	0.34	2.00	26.92	70.56	13	17
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	72,115,907	0.68	1.86	31.69	65.47	14	19
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	24,049,721	0.48	2.34	26.52	70.59	16	16
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	62,450,438	0.48	3.94	53.95	41.09	14	22
12	50% AND OVER	7,284,730	0.50	3.63	44.05	51.68	16	23
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)								
299	UNDER 5%	51,852,245	0.52	3.88	42.72	52.79	12	18
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	63,047,479	0.42	2.38	29.06	68.03	11	16
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	60,584,099	0.47	2.28	25.27	71.89	13	16
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	44,931,912	0.40	2.07	32.21	64.93	13	21
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	89,921,313	0.54	2.77	39.72	56.33	15	22
179	50% AND OVER	69,690,836	0.27	4.26	39.34	56.03	13	19
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)								
105	UNDER 5%	9,873,702	0.61	4.31	44.65	50.30	10	20
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	18,945,141	0.64	5.27	40.54	53.42	9	16
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	50,288,878	0.43	2.71	30.50	66.26	12	16
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	47,205,890	0.46	2.20	27.40	69.80	12	17
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	88,247,430	0.42	2.16	31.13	65.97	16	19
253	50% AND OVER	165,466,843	0.42	3.36	39.62	56.27	13	20
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)								
156	UNDER 20%	79,995,994	0.30	1.37	23.09	75.11	11	15
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	59,619,362	0.45	2.77	33.57	63.05	10	17
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	77,358,687	0.63	2.74	34.23	62.06	15	19
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	115,349,490	0.45	3.38	42.22	53.52	14	21
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	41,224,605	0.32	5.33	39.99	54.23	14	21
33	80% AND OVER	6,479,746	0.22	4.85	49.97	44.93	13	19
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)								
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	54,314,034	0.39	2.73	30.76	65.82	12	15
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	82,031,272	0.49	3.73	28.55	67.13	12	17
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	165,156,139	0.24	2.74	34.64	62.02	13	20
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	78,526,439	0.85	2.81	45.92	50.22	17	21
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=\$26,840)								
263	UNDER \$24,038	22,132,360	0.76	5.19	39.04	54.91	12	18
263	\$24,038 TO UNDER \$25,043	40,307,162	0.49	4.45	38.36	56.42	14	18
264	\$25,043 TO UNDER \$26,251	87,351,246	0.47	2.84	34.07	62.51	15	18
262	\$26,251 AND OVER	230,237,116	0.39	2.55	34.54	62.19	13	19
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)								
600	UNDER 5%	116,439,160	0.51	2.93	30.57	65.85	12	17
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	68,152,010	0.43	2.56	27.91	68.88	16	18
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	58,982,254	0.51	1.54	32.55	64.97	15	19
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	33,285,883	0.19	1.13	29.55	69.01	10	17
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	53,659,146	0.45	2.18	42.97	54.31	12	19
59	50% AND OVER	49,509,431	0.37	7.42	53.91	37.64	14	23
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)								
263	UNDER 18.6%	36,180,977	0.64	5.36	40.23	53.67	13	19
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	74,715,395	0.30	3.52	31.12	64.80	14	19
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	119,061,419	0.56	2.30	28.10	68.76	14	18
263	33.4% AND OVER	150,070,093	0.37	2.65	41.41	55.30	13	19
1,052	STATE TOTAL	380,027,884	0.44	2.97	35.10	61.23	13	19

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AVG	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS					
6	OVER 50,000	60	140	1,213	3,328
20	25,000 TO 49,999	46	192	1,466	2,799
45	10,000 TO 24,999	54	347	2,166	2,615
58	5,000 TO 9,999	78	167	1,132	1,262
81	3,000 TO 4,999	76	181	953	1,280
127	1,600 TO 2,999	67	219	1,032	1,338
118	1,000 TO 1,599	26	104	583	995
205	500 TO 999	20	136	738	1,243
392	UNDER 500	41	169	769	1,202
DISTRICT TYPE					
8	MAJOR URBAN	60	254	1,490	3,858
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	59	251	1,656	3,449
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	41	105	1,662	1,644
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	69	264	1,171	795
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	66	204	948	1,414
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	11	38	226	533
266	NON-METRO STABLE	117	306	1,785	2,543
493	RURAL	45	233	1,114	1,826
HEALTH (MEDIAN=\$145,390)					
104	UNDER \$76,634	51	229	2,106	1,761
105	\$76,634 TO \$92,482	24	193	699	1,212
105	\$92,483 TO \$108,328	45	88	740	1,846
105	\$108,329 TO \$125,109	33	122	492	1,301
104	\$125,110 TO \$145,389	120	287	1,126	1,908
105	\$145,390 TO \$170,034	41	142	865	1,335
105	\$170,035 TO \$204,844	32	165	1,155	1,531
105	\$204,845 TO \$271,616	90	236	1,465	3,285
105	\$271,617 TO \$436,122	30	155	1,194	1,366
104	OVER \$436,122	2	38	186	462
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
HEALTH (ST AVG=\$186,841)					
682	UNDER \$186,841	322	1,124	6,417	10,210
365	OVER \$186,841	146	531	3,611	5,797
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
HEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP					
24	UNDER \$46,305	28	92	1,258	632
54	\$46,305 TO < \$71,749	19	118	732	871
74	\$71,749 TO < \$84,206	22	142	532	1,108
132	\$84,206 TO < \$103,653	18	135	722	984
23	\$103,653 TO < \$107,069	8	20	276	1,184
94	\$107,069 TO < \$122,094	50	99	393	1,272
57	\$122,094 TO < \$133,451	77	212	661	739
44	\$133,451 TO < \$140,903	34	76	427	777
41	\$140,903 TO < \$149,956	22	37	306	666
59	\$149,956 TO < \$162,715	18	60	371	681
32	\$162,715 TO < \$172,398	18	76	396	513
39	\$172,398 TO < \$183,529	8	42	306	754
45	\$183,529 TO < \$199,613	24	104	714	549
42	\$199,613 TO < \$220,926	14	33	359	515
39	\$220,926 TO < \$241,469	5	35	277	303
1	\$241,469 TO < \$242,339	35	94	236	1,359
27	\$242,339 TO < \$262,043	12	31	406	595
39	\$262,043 TO < \$308,333	29	84	435	977
21	\$308,333 TO < \$336,062	13	61	662	475
160	\$336,062 AND OVER	14	104	559	1,053
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$1.0454)					
261	UNDER 0.9481	95	388	2,314	4,420
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	139	559	3,330	3,451
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	84	327	2,510	4,218
262	1.1897 AND OVER	150	381	1,874	3,918
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$0.8896)					
261	UNDER 0.7663	88	392	2,780	3,229
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	129	517	2,632	4,704
262	0.8992 TO 1.0276	144	362	2,710	4,476
262	OVER 1.0276	107	384	1,906	3,598
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY					
337	RESIDENTIAL	189	925	5,771	8,688
309	LAND	49	160	835	1,444
208	OIL AND GAS	36	144	794	1,186
193	BUSINESS	194	426	2,628	4,689
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
1,052	STATE TOTAL	468	1,655	10,052	16,062

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSPTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AVG	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF HEATING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	80	273	1,470	2,758
282	5 TO UNDER 20	85	405	1,896	2,677
118	20 TO UNDER 100	123	324	1,848	2,170
97	100 AND OVER	180	653	4,814	8,402
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	24	55
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	137	402	2,972	4,819
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	236	775	4,390	7,615
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	65	309	1,684	2,519
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	22	122	745	738
53	10% AND OVER	8	47	261	371
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	209	735	4,437	6,497
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	44	368	1,440	2,816
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	76	199	1,327	3,267
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	39	102	512	679
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	95	230	2,014	2,688
12	50% AND OVER	5	21	322	115
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	125	294	1,882	1,458
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	70	258	1,605	1,914
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	89	258	1,197	1,954
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	28	101	860	1,981
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	100	257	1,580	4,880
179	50% AND OVER	56	487	2,928	3,875
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	18	59	351	410
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	90	130	581	650
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	52	241	1,168	1,591
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	42	157	1,051	1,559
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	116	342	1,781	3,753
253	50% AND OVER	150	726	5,120	8,099
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	62	229	1,577	2,143
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	121	258	1,202	2,096
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	94	315	1,844	3,508
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	141	626	3,004	5,499
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	45	203	1,932	2,529
33	80% AND OVER	5	24	413	287
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	78	276	1,813	2,166
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	102	456	2,253	3,404
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	205	620	3,665	7,706
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	83	303	2,321	2,786
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=\$26,840)					
263	UNDER \$24,038	44	158	836	1,243
263	\$24,038 TO UNDER \$25,043	127	240	1,280	1,940
264	\$25,043 TO UNDER \$26,251	108	395	2,278	3,951
262	\$26,251 AND OVER	189	862	5,658	8,928
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	174	543	2,700	4,177
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	84	251	1,321	2,451
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	77	201	1,170	2,865
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	41	99	805	1,424
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	26	295	1,783	2,124
59	50% AND OVER	66	266	2,273	3,021
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	58	175	1,825	1,866
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	79	338	1,752	3,975
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	125	440	2,244	4,658
263	33.4% AND OVER	206	702	4,231	5,563
1,052	STATE TOTAL	468	1,655	10,052	16,062

I E A

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AVG	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS					
6	OVER 50,000	79	169	1,262	3,098
20	25,000 TO 49,999	77	104	1,515	2,637
45	10,000 TO 24,999	40	381	2,168	2,491
58	5,000 TO 9,999	78	147	1,080	1,238
81	3,000 TO 4,999	49	154	961	1,169
127	1,600 TO 2,999	51	185	994	1,258
118	1,000 TO 1,599	22	76	554	915
205	500 TO 999	25	139	685	1,131
392	UNDER 500	38	144	730	1,040
DISTRICT TYPE					
8	MAJOR URBAN	80	200	1,610	3,627
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	112	244	1,636	3,359
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	14	117	1,614	1,501
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	56	263	1,136	738
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	58	166	984	1,276
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	5	31	225	509
266	NON-METRO STABLE	91	256	1,715	2,373
493	RURAL	43	222	1,029	1,594
WEALTH (MEDIAN=\$145,390)					
104	UNDER \$76,634	16	219	2,121	1,707
105	\$76,634 TO \$92,482	22	185	634	1,197
105	\$92,483 TO \$108,328	51	74	751	1,687
105	\$108,329 TO \$125,109	30	136	512	1,122
104	\$125,110 TO \$145,389	129	157	1,193	1,618
105	\$145,390 TO \$170,034	35	141	823	1,270
105	\$170,035 TO \$204,844	24	172	1,077	1,438
105	\$204,845 TO \$271,616	115	253	1,485	3,122
105	\$271,617 TO \$436,122	32	123	1,153	1,318
104	OVER \$436,122	4	39	176	448
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
WEALTH (ST AVG=\$186,841)					
682	UNDER \$186,841	290	968	6,375	9,442
365	OVER \$186,841	168	531	3,550	5,485
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP					
24	UNDER \$46,305	4	98	1,281	637
54	\$46,305 TO < \$71,749	11	106	727	838
74	\$71,749 TO < \$84,206	19	143	502	1,053
132	\$84,206 TO < \$103,653	15	109	666	951
23	\$103,653 TO < \$107,069	13	21	313	1,071
94	\$107,069 TO < \$122,094	53	101	426	1,104
57	\$122,094 TO < \$133,451	96	103	738	522
44	\$133,451 TO < \$140,903	19	73	379	730
41	\$140,903 TO < \$149,956	21	28	312	624
59	\$149,956 TO < \$162,715	21	52	378	637
32	\$162,715 TO < \$172,398	14	87	353	493
39	\$172,398 TO < \$183,529	4	41	260	755
45	\$183,529 TO < \$199,613	17	109	695	472
42	\$199,613 TO < \$220,926	16	35	349	481
39	\$220,926 TO < \$241,469	8	25	271	275
1	\$241,469 TO < \$242,339	56	121	300	1,241
27	\$242,339 TO < \$262,043	13	30	406	595
39	\$262,043 TO < \$308,333	31	74	390	983
21	\$308,333 TO < \$336,062	12	47	624	492
100	\$336,062 AND OVER	15	96	555	973
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$1,0454)					
261	UNDER 0.9481	93	388	2,363	4,133
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	119	470	3,396	3,237
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	108	322	2,304	3,842
262	1.1897 AND OVER	138	319	1,862	3,715
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$0.8896)					
261	UNDER 0.7663	39	362	2,747	3,111
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	148	485	2,662	4,425
262	0.8993 TO 1.0276	170	345	2,686	4,034
262	OVER 1.0276	101	307	1,830	3,357
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY					
337	RESIDENTIAL	151	766	5,673	8,290
309	LAND	46	173	791	1,249
208	OIL AND GAS	20	140	738	1,098
193	BUSINESS	241	420	2,723	4,290
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	50
1,052	STATE TOTAL	459	1,499	9,949	14,977

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSTEMS

1 E A
12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AVG	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF COOLING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	72	274		
282	5 TO UNDER 20	72	319	1,367	2,456
118	20 TO UNDER 100	105	280	1,841	2,493
97	100 AND OVER	209	626	4,860	2,028
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	0	24	7,950
					50
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	125	368	2,820	4,475
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	258	688	4,464	7,007
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	50	270	1,693	2,432
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	19	122	701	725
53	10% AND OVER	7	51	271	338
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	200	669	4,347	6,082
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	38	263	1,487	2,555
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	73	195	1,235	3,137
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	30	89	531	608
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	111	271	2,035	2,488
12	50% AND OVER	7	12	314	107
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	105	273	1,805	1,344
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	60	232	1,524	1,847
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	87	260	1,169	1,789
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	29	92	805	1,780
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	160	264	1,607	4,572
179	50% AND OVER	18	378	3,039	3,645
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	22	52	331	371
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	69	131	544	612
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	47	217	1,103	1,502
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	41	120	1,013	1,447
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	145	350	1,768	3,388
253	50% AND OVER	135	629	5,190	7,657
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	61	218	1,493	2,060
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	97	205	1,182	2,013
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	132	343	1,790	3,135
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	152	518	3,069	5,150
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	13	193	1,984	2,361
33	80% AND OVER	4	22	431	258
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	38	284	1,768	2,032
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	96	412	2,193	3,280
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	243	551	3,727	7,055
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	82	252	2,261	2,610
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=\$26,840)					
263	UNDER \$24,038	33	141	808	1,098
263	\$24,038 TO UNDER \$25,043	122	216	1,220	1,815
264	\$25,043 TO UNDER \$26,251	77	395	2,132	3,626
262	\$26,251 AND OVER	227	747	5,789	8,438
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	153	508	2,520	3,873
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	68	239	1,251	2,196
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	119	180	1,195	2,679
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	44	93	748	1,417
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	14	205	1,806	2,037
59	50% AND OVER	61	274	2,429	2,775
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	20	167	1,775	1,730
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	70	349	1,781	3,642
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	164	361	2,124	4,273
263	33.4% AND OVER	205	622	4,269	5,332
1,052	STATE TOTAL	459	1,499	9,949	14,977

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AV	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS					
6	OVER 50,000	23	113	1,227	1,661
20	25,000 TO 49,999	31	51	1,122	1,604
45	10,000 TO 24,999	16	201	1,469	1,790
58	5,000 TO 9,999	60	247	887	878
81	3,000 TO 4,999	28	190	848	942
127	1,600 TO 2,999	106	211	885	1,041
118	1,000 TO 1,599	38	130	632	718
205	500 TO 999	21	166	704	1,104
392	UNDER 500	60	223	772	989
DISTRICT TYPE					
8	MAJOR URBAN	30	143	1,547	1,828
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	38	112	1,082	2,194
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	21	98	1,099	1,147
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	44	206	957	555
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	62	223	867	1,055
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	17	31	188	408
266	NON-METRO STABLE	108	426	1,709	1,977
493	RURAL	63	293	1,097	1,563
WEALTH (MEDIAN=\$145,390)					
104	UNDER \$76,634	48	307	1,514	1,061
105	\$76,634 TO \$92,482	39	160	673	725
105	\$92,483 TO \$108,328	44	134	1,004	1,099
105	\$108,329 TO \$125,109	35	130	541	998
104	\$125,110 TO \$145,389	48	198	1,037	1,246
105	\$145,390 TO \$170,034	63	93	813	915
105	\$170,035 TO \$204,844	21	121	797	1,186
105	\$204,845 TO \$271,616	54	182	957	2,029
105	\$271,617 TO \$436,122	30	172	995	1,001
104	OVER \$436,122	1	35	189	422
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
WEALTH (ST AVG=\$186,841)					
682	UNDER \$186,841	286	1,066	5,917	6,633
365	OVER \$186,841	97	466	2,603	4,049
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
WEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP					
24	UNDER \$46,305	15	143	892	401
54	\$46,305 TO < \$71,749	27	129	507	519
74	\$71,749 TO < \$84,206	31	139	502	567
132	\$84,206 TO < \$103,653	43	130	707	808
23	\$103,653 TO < \$107,069	13	56	538	560
94	\$107,069 TO < \$122,094	28	97	522	957
57	\$122,094 TO < \$133,451	33	145	572	605
44	\$133,451 TO < \$140,903	23	56	396	454
41	\$140,903 TO < \$149,956	13	46	265	422
59	\$149,956 TO < \$162,715	35	40	364	458
32	\$162,715 TO < \$172,398	16	42	362	333
39	\$172,398 TO < \$183,529	9	36	248	526
45	\$183,529 TO < \$199,613	2	75	438	461
42	\$199,613 TO < \$220,926	10	18	266	400
39	\$220,926 TO < \$241,469	7	69	184	255
1	\$241,469 TO < \$242,339	9	2	107	510
27	\$242,339 TO < \$262,043	30	27	247	491
39	\$262,043 TO < \$308,333	11	98	382	679
21	\$308,333 TO < \$336,062	19	80	558	381
100	\$336,062 AND OVER	9	104	463	815
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$1,0454)					
261	UNDER 0.9481	75	312	1,692	2,497
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	76	425	2,915	2,553
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	114	338	1,950	3,077
262	1.1897 AND OVER	118	457	1,963	2,555
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$0.8896)					
261	UNDER 0.7663	95	356	2,165	2,059
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	88	273	2,043	3,045
262	0.8992 TO 1.0276	123	389	2,254	3,354
262	OVER 1.0276	77	514	2,058	2,224
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
SPT8 HIGHEST CATEGORY					
337	RESIDENTIAL	174	720	4,501	5,718
309	LAND	57	194	838	1,151
208	OIL AND GAS	47	246	676	979
193	BUSINESS	105	372	2,505	2,834
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
1,052	STATE TOTAL	383	1,532	8,546	10,727

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AV	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF PLUMBING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	74	390	1,446	2,318
282	5 TO UNDER 20	157	419	1,777	1,945
118	20 TO UNDER 100	73	325	1,382	1,656
97	100 AND OVER	79	398	3,915	4,763
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	26	45
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	137	512	2,971	3,051
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	170	643	3,658	5,149
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	39	239	1,172	1,751
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	19	103	511	542
53	10% AND OVER	18	35	234	234
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	179	904	3,583	4,561
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	50	186	1,308	1,979
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	93	154	1,576	2,152
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	27	104	484	474
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	30	164	1,332	1,468
12	50% AND OVER	4	20	263	93
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	104	355	1,681	1,132
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	37	179	1,053	1,337
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	72	190	951	1,497
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	35	103	591	1,490
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	70	155	1,478	3,192
179	50% AND OVER	65	550	2,792	2,079
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	12	69	309	373
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	48	190	522	472
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	44	148	884	1,288
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	79	139	835	1,038
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	83	290	1,485	2,893
253	50% AND OVER	117	696	4,511	4,663
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	37	221	965	1,449
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	93	199	1,080	1,743
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	66	250	1,500	2,712
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	143	471	2,874	3,266
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	41	343	1,815	1,332
33	80% AND OVER	3	48	312	225
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	101	222	1,514	1,480
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	67	383	1,742	2,207
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	122	566	2,990	4,948
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	93	361	2,300	2,092
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=\$26,840)					
263	UNDER \$24,038	67	183	824	952
263	\$24,038 TO UNDER \$25,043	114	251	1,243	1,484
264	\$25,043 TO UNDER \$26,251	94	458	1,957	2,624
262	\$26,251 AND OVER	108	640	4,522	5,667
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	141	546	2,190	3,201
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	101	174	1,200	1,854
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	65	164	1,025	2,161
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	11	92	725	989
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	27	245	1,610	1,118
59	50% AND OVER	38	311	1,796	1,404
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	67	231	1,541	1,341
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	109	342	1,510	2,590
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	85	368	1,901	3,355
263	33.4% AND OVER	122	591	3,594	3,441
1,052	STATE TOTAL	383	1,532	8,546	10,727

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AV	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
ENROLLMENT GROUPINGS					
6	OVER 50,000				
20	25,000 TO 49,999	157	309	1,403	3,009
45	10,000 TO 24,999	41	112	1,295	3,198
58	5,000 TO 9,999	28	170	1,508	3,611
81	3,000 TO 4,999	66	82	865	1,685
127	1,600 TO 2,999	17	67	856	1,591
118	1,000 TO 1,599	55	153	836	1,665
205	500 TO 999	20	64	500	1,163
392	UNDER 500	24	107	630	1,408
		21	102	670	1,435
DISTRICT TYPE					
8	MAJOR URBAN	160	348	1,725	3,572
63	MAJOR SUBURBAN	63	143	1,039	4,321
23	OTHER CENTRAL CITY	12	98	1,257	2,202
72	OTHER CC SUBURBAN	40	106	1,112	1,109
66	INDEPENDENT TOWN	51	69	863	1,690
61	NON-METRO FAST GROWING	5	16	162	642
266	NON-METRO STABLE	67	250	1,412	3,110
493	RURAL	31	136	993	2,119
HEALTH (MEDIAN=\$145,390)					
104	UNDER \$76,634				
105	\$76,634 TO \$92,482	49	220	1,824	2,205
105	\$92,483 TO \$108,328	18	66	662	1,429
105	\$108,329 TO \$125,109	54	59	853	1,824
104	\$125,110 TO \$145,389	19	58	379	1,515
105	\$145,390 TO \$170,034	58	169	1,213	2,049
105	\$170,035 TO \$204,844	29	68	659	1,673
105	\$204,845 TO \$271,616	37	86	812	2,031
105	\$271,617 TO \$436,122	151	361	963	3,768
104	OVER \$436,122	13	71	1,065	1,631
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	1	8	123	572
		0	0	10	68
HEALTH (ST AVG=\$186,841)					
682	UNDER \$186,841	245	670	5,808	11,784
365	OVER \$186,841	184	496	2,745	6,913
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
HEALTH BY EQUAL PUPILS PER GROUP					
24	UNDER \$46,305				
54	\$46,305 TO < \$71,749	10	110	1,213	775
74	\$71,749 TO < \$84,206	37	82	510	1,161
132	\$84,206 TO < \$103,653	16	59	513	1,252
23	\$103,653 TO < \$107,069	19	65	670	1,143
94	\$107,069 TO < \$122,094	39	25	404	1,066
57	\$122,094 TO < \$133,451	13	46	307	1,468
44	\$133,451 TO < \$140,903	16	90	780	824
41	\$140,903 TO < \$149,956	29	60	362	882
59	\$149,956 TO < \$162,715	20	39	288	701
32	\$162,715 TO < \$172,398	24	27	315	784
39	\$172,398 TO < \$183,529	15	37	255	717
45	\$183,529 TO < \$199,613	7	27	151	973
42	\$199,613 TO < \$220,926	19	56	571	775
39	\$220,926 TO < \$241,469	2	5	155	774
1	\$241,469 TO < \$242,339	15	21	131	472
27	\$242,339 TO < \$262,043	116	275	329	1,063
39	\$262,043 TO < \$308,333	12	30	243	815
21	\$308,333 TO < \$336,062	7	49	299	1,208
160	\$336,062 AND OVER	6	28	678	511
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	7	35	379	1,333
		0	0	10	68
TOTAL TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$1,0454)					
261	UNDER 0.9481	192	483	2,110	4,607
262	0.9481 TO UNDER 1.0487	107	267	3,043	4,257
262	1.0487 TO UNDER 1.1897	55	202	1,765	5,269
262	1.1897 AND OVER	75	214	1,635	4,564
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
M&O EFF. TAX EFFORT (ST AVG=\$0.8896)					
261	UNDER 0.7663	97	244	2,488	3,837
262	0.7663 TO 0.8992	203	472	2,155	5,323
262	0.8992 TO 1.0276	62	217	2,321	5,282
262	OVER 1.0276	67	233	1,589	4,255
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
SPTB HIGHEST CATEGORY					
337	RESIDENTIAL	160	449	4,568	10,788
309	LAND	19	104	770	1,645
208	OIL AND GAS	26	131	592	1,470
193	BUSINESS	224	482	2,623	4,794
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
1,052	STATE TOTAL	429	1,166	8,563	18,765

REPORT F
TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
ANALYZE OF CONDITION OF MEP SYSTEMS

12:06 THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1992

NBR DIST	CATEGORY	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED POOR	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED BELOW AV	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED FAIR	COUNT OF LIGHTING SYSTEMS RATED GOOD
DENSITY (ST AVG=12.47 PUPILS/SQ MI)					
550	LESS THAN 5	42	197	1,174	3,259
282	5 TO UNDER 20	88	247	1,719	3,095
118	20 TO UNDER 100	52	138	1,492	2,890
97	100 AND OVER	247	584	4,168	9,453
5	SPECIAL DISTRICTS	0	0	10	68
PUPIL CHG:89/90-90/91 (ST AVG=1.86%)					
435	DECLINING PUPILS	116	280	2,419	5,690
318	0% TO UNDER 3%	238	629	4,092	8,397
159	3% TO UNDER 6%	59	163	1,287	3,190
87	6% TO UNDER 10%	12	67	528	1,058
53	10% AND OVER	4	27	237	430
PCT BLACK PUPILS (ST AVG=14.4%)					
621	UNDER 5%	131	439	3,797	7,774
141	5% TO UNDER 10%	36	143	1,149	3,485
143	10% TO UNDER 20%	50	150	1,241	3,547
72	20% TO UNDER 30%	20	45	457	836
63	30% TO UNDER 50%	178	382	1,795	2,791
12	50% AND OVER	14	7	124	332
PCT HISPANIC PUPILS (ST AVG=33.9%)					
299	UNDER 5%	49	149	1,580	2,030
170	5% TO UNDER 10%	42	92	1,004	2,762
171	10% TO UNDER 20%	68	121	757	2,619
95	20% TO UNDER 30%	33	75	611	2,365
138	30% TO UNDER 50%	148	410	1,587	4,862
179	50% AND OVER	89	319	3,024	4,127
PCT MINORITY PUPILS (ST AVG=50.5%)					
105	UNDER 5%	6	29	280	537
124	5% TO UNDER 10%	12	46	498	911
198	10% TO UNDER 20%	45	108	775	2,174
144	20% TO UNDER 30%	29	57	771	1,983
228	30% TO UNDER 50%	85	214	1,463	4,380
253	50% AND OVER	252	712	4,776	8,780
PERCENT LOW INCOME (ST AVG=39.15%)					
156	UNDER 20%	40	83	996	2,947
219	20% TO UNDER 30%	50	122	897	2,710
233	30% TO UNDER 40%	65	192	1,487	4,162
304	40% TO UNDER 60%	197	552	2,845	5,957
107	60% TO UNDER 80%	76	187	2,027	2,572
33	80% AND OVER	1	30	311	417
AVG. TEACHER EXPER (ST AVG=11.3 YRS)					
259	UNDER 9.6 YEARS	51	159	1,657	2,575
250	9.6 TO UNDER 11.1 YEARS	64	260	1,805	4,259
284	11.1 TO UNDER 12.5 YEARS	251	588	3,086	8,584
259	12.5 YEARS AND OVER	63	159	2,015	3,347
AVG. TEACHER SALARY (ST AVG=\$26,840)					
263	UNDER \$24,038	34	110	712	1,472
263	\$24,038 TO UNDER \$25,043	35	132	1,119	2,370
264	\$25,043 TO UNDER \$26,251	92	274	1,713	4,758
262	\$26,251 AND OVER	268	650	5,019	10,165
PCT MINORITY TCHRS (ST AVG=22.4%)					
600	UNDER 5%	87	241	2,032	5,336
181	5% TO UNDER 10%	50	139	939	3,038
123	10% TO UNDER 20%	52	125	940	3,351
43	20% TO UNDER 30%	29	77	593	1,748
46	30% TO UNDER 50%	64	121	1,623	2,488
59	50% AND OVER	147	463	2,436	2,804
% TCHRS W ADV DEGREE (ST AVG=31.0%)					
263	UNDER 18.6%	30	136	1,733	2,157
262	18.6% TO UNDER 25.8%	106	216	1,347	4,612
264	25.8% TO UNDER 33.4%	83	282	1,769	5,486
263	33.4% AND OVER	210	532	3,714	6,510
1,052	STATE TOTAL	429	1,166	8,563	18,765

APPENDIX C
REPORT OF THE SCHOOL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FINANCING OPTIONS
FACILITIES FUNDING PROGRAM
A REPORT OF THE SCHOOL FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Both an interim financing program (for the period prior to the completion of the inventory) and a long-term financing program should be developed.
2. Financing for both the interim and long-term programs should be through a modified guaranteed yield system, which recognizes the efforts of districts that constructed or purchased buildings from operating funds or fund balances.
3. Weighted ADA should be used in the calculation of facilities funding in order to be consistent with other funding formulas found in Senate Bill 1.
4. The committee recommends the following priorities for allocating limited state funds:
 - a. Renovation or new construction projects for eligible instructional and support spaces.
 - b. Portable buildings to meet emergency situations where permanent construction is inappropriate. Portable buildings must also meet state standards.
 - c. Debt service on projects which are brought up to state standards, including any debt on a building prior to bringing it up to standard.
 - d. Debt service on eligible projects built since 1984 which meet standards.
5. Standards for school facilities should be developed in the areas of size and space, safety, and educational appropriateness.
6. Standards should be mandatory for all instructional facilities in order to qualify for state funding.
7. Standards should be applied to existing facilities if districts wish to be eligible for financing for existing debt service. A program of grants should be established to bring existing facilities into compliance with standards.
8. An appropriate division within the Texas Education Agency should be responsible for monitoring districts and enforcing standards.
9. Additional agency staff should be hired to accommodate the workload that will be associated with increased state responsibilities for school facilities.

10. At the time that any building which was constructed with state funds is put into surplus or sold, the state should participate in the proceeds from the sale in the same proportion as it participated in construction costs.
11. Only those buildings constructed since 1984 and the passage of House Bill 72 will be eligible for funding for debt service relief.
12. Initial estimates place the annual cost of the long-term program at \$350 million per year in state money. This represents a state share of 50% of costs for debt service and new construction, on average.
13. The interim and permanent debt service and capital outlay programs should be established as a part of the Foundation School Program, and any shortfall in appropriations should be subjected to the same treatment as other appropriation shortfalls in the Foundation School Program.
14. The committee recognizes that some school districts finance new facilities with fund balances rather than debt, and recommends further study of a mechanism for reimbursing these districts.
15. The committee recognizes that there needs to be a transition period as the state moves from funding the debt service tax rate as a part of the overall guaranteed yield program to funding this tax rate separately. The committee recommends additional study in the area of transition mechanisms.

FACILITIES REPORT

INTRODUCTION

At the first meeting of the School Facilities Advisory Committee, held on December 5, 1989, Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff presented the committee with a document entitled Policy Options for Financing School Facilities. This document outlined three overall approaches for financing facilities: a per capita approach, a guaranteed yield approach, and a needs based formula financing approach.

The committee has met eight times since December. At these meetings the members have discussed possible options for financing both debt service and capital outlay for school facilities. The committee recommends both an interim financing program, for the period prior to the collection of inventory data, and a long-term financing program which will use the information collected during the inventory as a basis for decision making. The committee recommends the use of a modified guaranteed yield system for financing school facilities for both the interim and long-term options. Both options recognize construction efforts made by districts through the use of debt and through the purchase of buildings out of operating funds or fund balances.

In determining the state and local shares under a guaranteed yield system, consideration should be given to local district wealth per pupil, as well as other factors. The committee recommends the use of weighted ADA in the calculation of facilities funding in order to be consistent with other funding formulas found in Senate Bill 1.

APPROACHES TO FINANCING SCHOOL FACILITIES

Initially, the committee was presented with three standard approaches to financing school facilities. These approaches followed three different general models and are presented below.

Per Capita Financing

Under a per capita financing system, funds would be provided to school districts on a per student basis, regardless of the condition of school facilities or any demonstration of district need for facilities funds. This type of financing system would simply take a total allotment for facilities and divide it among the districts based on their total number of students.

Guaranteed Yield Financing

Under a guaranteed yield system, districts would receive funds that could be used either to finance expenses for existing debt service, or to finance new construction. Unlike the per capita system, a district would only qualify for funding if it had an existing debt service tax rate or was about to engage in the construction of a new facility. Under this financing scheme, only those districts which had a demonstrated need for funds (in the form of an I&S tax rate) would be eligible for funding.

One drawback to this model of guaranteed yield is that it does not compensate districts which have taken on construction or the addition of new space without the use of debt.

Formula (Need-Based) Financing

A formula based financing scheme provides funding to districts on the basis of demonstrated need. In order to have an effective need-based funding scheme, the state will need to develop both standards for school facilities and a data base which can be used to evaluate district facilities prior to the distribution of funds. Under this sort of financing scheme, funding could be restricted to instructional space only, or be limited for non-instructional facilities.

COMMITTEE ACTION

At subsequent meetings, the members of the committee rejected the use of a per capita financing system on a number of grounds, including the argument that such a system does not discriminate between districts that need new facilities and those that do not, nor does it make allowances for variations in need or ability to pay for new construction or renovation of facilities. The two remaining approaches, the use of a guaranteed yield system, and a per project funding model, have remained topics of discussion and were presented to the committee at the May 1990 meeting.

On May 2, 1990, the committee was presented with a variety of options including guaranteed yield and per project approaches with both high and low levels of state involvement as well as a mixed approach with a moderate level of state involvement.

After considerable discussion, the committee adopted a modified guaranteed yield approach with a high level of state involvement in prioritizing projects and allocating funds. This approach also includes funding for construction financed with operating funds or fund balances. A detailed explanation of the committee's recommendations both for interim and long-term financing programs is provided in this document.

STANDARDS AND NEEDS CRITERIA

The long-term financing option presented here assumes the use of agency approved standards for school facilities. Charges to the committee include the development of standards for public school buildings. Committee discussion indicates that standards should be developed in the areas of size and space, safety, and educational appropriateness. For funding purposes, perhaps the most important among these are the size and safety standards. For the development of facilities that can be considered to be equitable, standards must be comparable across buildings in different kinds of districts.

As yet, standards have not been established. However, several recommendations have been made related to the development and application of standards. The committee has recommended that TEA establish an internal task force to examine programmatic issues related to facilities and that the work of this task force and the data collected in the inventory be used to develop state standards for educational appropriateness. In addition to the creation of facilities

standards, needs criteria and definitions for eligible costs must also be developed in order to evaluate district applications for funds and make decisions about priorities.

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

The committee has made clear its feelings that funding should be directed primarily at classroom space in the initial stages of any funding program, and that instructional space should receive preference over construction of auxiliary space or facilities to be used for extra- or co-curricular activities. As a longer term proposition, after direct instructional needs have been satisfied, and in the event that funds are available, a funding program could be constructed to reflect preferences by varying the level of state participation according to the type of facility to be constructed.

STATE INVOLVEMENT

The committee has agreed that the state must be highly involved in the decision making processes related to prioritization of projects and allocation of funds. The committee reached this recommendation based on recognition of the fact that there may be insufficient state funds available for projects in any given year, and the state is in the best position to compare all projects and place priorities on them.

The committee acknowledged that in order to make these decisions, a comprehensive data base will be necessary. It also recognized that such a data base may not be available for a period of one to two years while the inventory is underway. For the interim period, the committee suggested a financing system to deal primarily with existing debt service. The advantage of an interim system, as seen by the committee, is the ability to flow money to school districts prior to the development of an inventory. The committee does not feel that an effective and accurate inventory can be developed in an artificially short timeframe.

REVIEW CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

Districts should be required to submit information about each building in a proposed project to confirm compliance with state requirements and standards. The review process should provide a vehicle for prioritization of projects and determinations of the appropriate allocations to districts for each project.

Discussions with the School Facilities Planning Division in the state of California provide a basis for estimating the amount of staff and time that will be required to review applications for funding. California employs seven professional staff people to work with districts in developing and evaluating building plans. On average, projects take approximately two days to review, and the office reviews 400 - 500 projects per year. With roughly the same number of school districts in Texas, it is estimated that approximately 400 applications per year can be expected in the proposed facilities financing program. The committee also recommends additional agency staff in order to accommodate the workload that will be associated with increased state responsibilities for facilities.

FINANCING PROGRAMS

The following pages provide details concerning both an interim financing scheme and a proposal for the long-term financing of school facilities. They are intended to form the basis of a policy designed to address the requirements put forth by the legislature in Senate Bill 1019, 71st Regular Session.

Both the interim and long-term programs should operate on a modified guaranteed yield basis, providing funds to districts to offset the costs of existing debt service as well as to provide financing for new construction.

In the aggregate, interest on existing debt accounts for a much greater portion of overall spending than do payments on new debt, at least in the initial years of the program. A significant portion of the funding for a long-term financing plan will be directed at relieving debt burdens. However, for any given district, new debt may be the only debt. The interim financing program should recognize both existing debt and any newly acquired debt a district may have.

The committee has also agreed that at the time that any building which was constructed with state funds is put into surplus or sold, the state should participate in the proceeds from the sale in the same proportion as it participated in construction costs. Any funds returned to the state from the sale of buildings should revert back to the facilities program fund.

INTERIM FINANCING (TWO YEAR MAXIMUM TIMEFRAME)

In the interim period, which will occur prior to the completion of an inventory of school facilities and the availability of data about the conditions of existing buildings, the committee feels that there should be some form of financing for facilities in response to both the court decision in Edgewood v. Kirby and actions taken by the legislature. Because the only data available in this time period will concern existing debt service, only limited evaluation of new projects will be possible for this program.

The use of the guaranteed yield mechanism to distribute funds for debt service will recognize both district need, in the form of property value per student, and effort, in the form of the debt service tax rate, to provide an equitable distribution of funds to districts with existing debt service. Funding provided to districts during the interim period will result in a direct decrease in the debt burden of the district, thereby lowering the district's debt service tax rate. The committee also advocates the use of some funds to provide reimbursement to districts that purchased or constructed additional classroom space with operating funds.

The amount of funding that will be available for this program has yet to be determined. However, the figure of \$100 million has been suggested by the Governor's Select Committee, the State Board of Education, and the School Facilities Advisory Committee as a potential target for the first year of a temporary program. The committee recommends that debt eligible for financing under this program must have been incurred since the passage of House Bill 72 in 1984.

This program is separate from, and in addition to the Public School Facilities Development Grants provided for in Senate Bill 1. No appropriation has been made for either the grant program or for the interim program proposed here.

LONG-TERM FINANCING

A long-term financing system for capital outlay (facilities and eligible equipment) and debt service, which evaluates projects and establishes priorities, necessitates an inventory. This financing program should address both existing district debt (since 1984) and new construction. The committee also recommends that construction financed out of tax-generated operating funds be eligible for reimbursement.

The committee recommends that only those projects undertaken since 1984 (and the passage of House Bill 72) be eligible for funding for debt service relief. The committee also recommends that projects eligible for funding under this program must have voter approval prior to the initiation of the application process. The committee recognizes that prior agency approval of a project may make it easier to pass a bond election to finance the project, however, there are lingering concerns about approving a project and committing funds to that project without voter approval.

Initial estimates indicate that the annual cost of the program will be approximately \$350 million. This estimate is based on \$1 billion in debt issued annually between 1984 and 1990 for a total of \$6 billion. Debt service payments are estimated at \$600 million per year for payment of interest and principal. If the state is to share in the costs of debt issued since 1984 at a rate of 50% statewide, the state cost for debt service will be approximately \$300 million. Similarly, the cost of servicing \$1 billion in new debt each year will be approximately \$100 million, half of which will be cost to the state.

In 1985 and 1986 many districts refinanced their debt at lower rates of interest to lower their costs. Including all refinanced debt, outstanding debt (principal only) in 1989 was approximately \$6.9 billion.

As debt incurred prior to 1990 is retired, the ratio of "old" debt to "new" debt will shift towards debt accrued since the start of the financing program, but if the amount of debt issued each year remains stable, the cost of the program should remain fairly constant as well.

LONG-TERM ALLOCATION PRIORITIES

The committee recommends that both debt service on existing buildings and funding for new construction should be eligible for allocations under the proposed school facilities funding program. The committee also recommends that in order to be eligible for funding, a proposed building must meet all state standards, and any existing building for which a debt service subsidy is sought must either meet standards at the time of application, or be brought up to standard in order to be eligible to participate in the state program.

FUNDING EXAMPLE

Hopeful ISD has had a small but steady building program for the past several years to meet the mandates of House Bill 72. Currently, Hopeful has \$8.6 million in outstanding debt, with annual debt service payments of \$831,372.

Hopeful ISD needs a new elementary school. After consulting with architects and engineers and developing plans for a new school, the assistant superintendent for business has presented the board with his estimate of the cost of the new building: \$4 million.

Hopeful is a district with 2,200 students and a property value per student of \$175,000. The total cost for the building, financed over 20 years at an annual interest rate of 7.5% is \$8,097,054, making Hopeful's annual cost for the new building \$404,853.

Hopeful ISD submits its building plan to the Texas Education Agency noting that the new facility is needed both to accommodate growth in its elementary population and the maximum class size requirement in grades kindergarten through 4.

Upon receipt of the Hopeful plan, TEA staff determine whether Hopeful's project is eligible for funding. Because Hopeful's wealth is below state average, and because the facility consists of classroom and other instructional space, staff determines this to be a fundable project.

For purposes of illustration, comparison levels of wealth and state share are included in the funding examples for each option.

WHAT HAPPENS TO HOPEFUL

Interim Program

Prior to the introduction of the interim facilities financing program, Hopeful needed a debt service tax rate of \$0.2519 per \$100 of assessed valuation in order to meet its obligations on \$8.6 million in debt. Under a guaranteed yield program in which the guaranteed tax base is \$400,000 per pupil, Hopeful will receive \$467,647 in state aid, and can reduce its I&S tax rate to \$0.0945 per \$100 of assessed valuation. Even with a partial guarantee against a maximum tax rate of \$0.04 per \$100 of assessed valuation for state aid, Hopeful would receive \$198,000 in state aid and could reduce its I&S tax rate to \$0.1645 per \$100 of assessed valuation.

Long-Term Program

After making the appropriate decisions at the district level, Hopeful submits its plan for the new elementary school to TEA. TEA staff make a determination that Hopeful is in compliance with all state required standards for a new elementary school and is therefore eligible for maximum state funding for this project.

The guaranteed yield tax rate required to raise the necessary revenue for this building is .0460 based on a guaranteed yield wealth level of \$400,000 per pupil. At this tax rate, Hopeful can raise \$177,123 annually. The annual

cost of the building is \$227,730 more than Hopeful can raise against its own tax base, and this result is the state share. The state share amounts to \$103.51 per pupil.

Without a state contribution, Hopeful would need a tax rate of \$0.1052 per \$100 of assessed valuation to raise enough revenue to meet the obligations of this new building.

APPENDIX D
FACILITIES COST ESTIMATES

REPLACE SPACE RATED BELOW FAIR

ESTIMATED COST:

\$895 million

ASSUMPTIONS:

Statewide, 14,920,426 square feet of space received a rating of below fair or poor when evaluated by the professional staff performing the inventory. Space that was rated below average is defined as "moderately deteriorated, requiring partial replacement" and space that was rated poor is defined as "highly deteriorated, requiring total replacement". Because it is impossible to know the degree to which the space rated below average would require replacement, all space receiving this rating was included in the estimate. In some cases, problems might be alleviated through remodeling or additions, however in other cases replacement will be necessary.

Replacement was estimated to cost \$60 per square foot. A \$60 per square foot construction cost will allow a district to build a facility with an average quality of finish and will allow for reasonable site and design work. This estimate does not allow for the building to be equipped with special features or for extensive site work to take place. This estimate does not reflect variations in construction cost across the state.

PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE IN OVERCROWDED DISTRICTS

ESTIMATED COST:

\$126 million

ASSUMPTIONS:

Statewide, there is a need for 2.5 million additional square feet of space to relieve overcrowded classrooms. This estimate was developed at a campus level by dividing total classroom space by enrollment to determine a classroom utilization rate. Overcrowding was considered to occur when the utilization rate indicated less than 36 square feet per student in the elementary grades and 28 square feet per student in the secondary grades.

To develop the square footage requirements, the number of overcrowded classrooms was multiplied by the recommended size of the room. The number of elementary classrooms was multiplied by 750 square feet per room. Recommended rooms sizes are 800 square feet per room for grades pre-kindergarten to 2, and 700 square feet for grades 3-6. For secondary schools, the number of classrooms was multiplied by 700 square feet.

Replacement was estimated to cost \$60 per square foot.

**ADD SCIENCE LABS TO HIGH SCHOOLS WITHOUT LABS
OR BRING LABS UP TO A MINIMUM LEVEL**

ESTIMATED COST:

\$31 million

ASSUMPTIONS:

There are 281 high schools across the state without science labs. Assuming that each school requires at least one science lab, the number of schools without labs was multiplied by 1,440 square feet per lab. \$60 per square foot was used to estimate the cost of constructing the labs.

To calculate the number of science labs requiring improvements, a count was taken of the number of labs without either emergency showers, exhaust fans, sinks, or gas jets. Costs were calculated based on an estimate for adding the necessary equipment to the labs as follows:

Add showers at \$3,000 per room.

Add exhaust fans at \$5,000 per room.

Add sinks at \$750 per room.

Add gas jets at \$1,500 per room.

There are some instances in which districts are successfully using a regular classroom as a science lab, through the use of self-contained Bunsen burners, as opposed to gas jets for example. Also, while all science labs should be equipped with a sink and exhaust fan, only a chemistry lab might require a safety shower or gas jets. Therefore, these estimates are approximate.


PROVIDE GYMNASIUMS TO SCHOOLS WITH INSUFFICIENT SPACE

ESTIMATED COST:

\$988 million

ASSUMPTIONS:

There are 694 campuses across the state without gymnasiums. There are an additional 3,139 campuses with insufficient gym space to meet their needs. Insufficient space was calculated by subtracting the amount of gym space on a campus from the amount of gym space recommended for a campus at that grade level. For elementary campuses, 4,000 square feet is recommended. At the secondary level, 6,000 square feet is recommended for junior high and middle schools and 8,000 is recommended for high schools. To develop these estimates, 7,000 square feet was used as the recommended size for a secondary school gymnasium.

The total square footage necessary to provide adequate gym space in all schools which were lacking a gym or had insufficient gym space is 16 million square feet. This estimate, which provides for only one gym for each campus without  is probably low, particularly for the secondary schools, which generally have both a girls and a boys facility.

The cost estimate was generated using a construction cost of \$60 per square foot for both new construction and additions.

PROVIDE LIBRARIES TO SCHOOLS WITH INSUFFICIENT SPACE

ESTIMATED COST:

\$621 million

ASSUMPTIONS:

There are 482 campuses across the state without libraries. There are an additional 4,041 campuses with insufficient library space to meet their needs. Insufficient space was calculated by subtracting the amount of library space on a campus from the amount of library space recommended for a campus at that grade level. For elementary campuses, 2,000 square feet is recommended, and at the secondary level, 6,000 square feet is recommended.

The cost estimate was generated using a construction cost of \$60 per square foot for both new construction and additions.

REPLACE EXCESS PORTABLE SPACE WITH PERMANENT SPACE

ESTIMATED COST:

\$197 million

ASSUMPTIONS:

Across the state there are 997 campuses with more than 20 percent of their classroom space in portable buildings. To reduce the amount of portable space in these districts to no more than 20 percent would require the replacement of 3.3 million square feet at a cost of \$60 per square foot.

To eliminate all portable space would require the replacement of 15.3 million square feet at a cost of \$922 million using a \$60 per square foot cost.