

## **APPENDIX A**

Results of Committee Survey on  
School Safety and Drug & Alcohol  
Prevention and Treatment

March 2, 1998

To: Senator Teel Bivins, Chair  
Senate Interim Committee on Education

From: Catherine Clark and Kerri Briggs

Re: Survey on School Safety and Drug & Alcohol Prevention and Treatment

---

### Information About Responding Districts

Six hundred and fourteen (614) Texas public school districts (including 6 charter schools) responded to the Survey on School Security Issues and Policies distributed in November 1997. The total number of students enrolled in responding districts was 2,539,391. This represents 66% of the total Texas student enrollment. Additional information about the analysis of this data and the sample is presented in Appendix A.

**Table 1. Responding districts by size**

Size	Responding Districts	All Texas Districts	Percent of Size Category
Small ISD (0-1600 students)	377	698	54%
Medium ISD (1600-5000 students)	124	216	57%
Large ISD (5000-50,000 students)	90	136	66%
Extra Large ISD (50,000+ students)	5	9	56%
Unknown size*	16 (drugs) 18 (safety)		

\* It was not possible to categorize some districts into a particular size category because these districts returned the survey anonymously.

**Table 2. Responding districts by percentage of low-income students (students receiving free and reduced-price lunches)**

Categories of Percent Low-Income	Responding Districts	All Texas Districts	Percent of Low-Income Category
0-40%	227	389	58%
40-50%	138	241	57%
50-60%	98	186	53%
60%+	137	243	56%
Unknown*	16 (drugs) 18 (safety)		

\*It was not possible to categorize some districts into a particular low-income category because these districts returned the survey anonymously.

## School Safety

### QUESTIONS 1 AND 2. USE OF SECURITY PERSONNEL

Among this sample of 614 districts, 31% use security personnel to provide campus security. As districts increase in total student population, there is a greater likelihood that they will employ security personnel. Only 9% of small districts in this sample use security personnel. In contrast, 93% of large districts and all the extra large districts in this sample use security personnel to provide campus security.

**Table 3: Does your district use security personnel to provide campus security?**

District Size	Yes	No	No Response
Small ISD	35	341	1
Medium ISD	65	59	
Large ISD	84	6	
Extra Large ISD	5	0	
Unknown ISD	1	16	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>2</b>

Districts that use security personnel were asked how they obtain that personnel. The most common method of providing security is to contract with local law enforcement agencies. Fifty-nine percent

(59%) of responding districts marked that response. The second most common method (48%) is to employ security personnel as members of the district staff. Twenty-six percent (26%) of districts commission their own officers. Information from question 2—the total number of full-time security personnel employed by districts—appears in Appendix B.

*Policy Consideration. Are there any barriers to effective and efficient contractual arrangements between local law enforcement agencies and school districts? What is the preparation and training of individuals who are hired by school districts to serve as security personnel?*

### QUESTION 3. EXPENDITURES ON SECURITY SERVICES

Districts were asked the total cost of security service for personnel and equipment for 1996-97 and 1997-98. Fewer than one-third of districts surveyed (29%) provided information about costs: 152 districts reported 1996-97 costs, and 177 districts reported 1997-98 costs. Among that group, districts allocate more resources to security personnel than to equipment for security purposes. Table 4 shows that more money (almost a 20% increase) is expected to be spent in the 1997-98 school year than in the previous year, but the reader should note that the reporting data base for 1997-98 includes 25 more districts (most of them small or medium-sized districts). The total expended and budgeted for security services is reported in Tables 4, 5 and 6.

**Table 4. Expenditures on security services by district size, 1996-97 and 1997-98**

1996-97 (Responses )	Security Expenditures by District Size					All Districts
	Small (24)	Medium (48)	Large (75)	Extra Large (5)	Other (0)	TOTAL <sup>1</sup> (152)
Personnel	\$1,672,925	\$2,277,906	\$23,363,502	\$10,112,169	\$0	\$37,426,502
Equipment	152,196	296,558	2,237,471	1,764,115	0	4,450,340
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,825,121</b>	<b>\$2,574,464</b>	<b>\$25,600,973</b>	<b>\$11,876,284</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$41,876,842</b>
1997-98 (Responses)	(34)	(58)	(79)	(5)	(1)	(177)
Personnel	2,286,458	3,551,784	28,387,977	11,687,629	4,500	45,918,348
Equipment	201,555	311,172	2,580,960	1,094,942	906	4,189,535
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$2,488,013</b>	<b>\$3,862,956</b>	<b>\$30,968,937</b>	<b>\$12,782,571</b>	<b>\$5,406</b>	<b>\$50,107,883</b>

<sup>1</sup> Note: One school district made an error in reporting security costs. Responses from this district were not included in calculations about security costs for either year.

Table 5 shows a direct and positive relationship between percent low-income students in the district and the level of resources for security. In 1996-97, 36% of the reporting districts had 50% or more low-income students. Their expenditures for security were 58% of the total. In 1997-98, 38% of reporting districts had 50% or more low-income students and those same districts had 57% of the reported security expenditures. In 1997-98, 23% of the reporting districts had 60% or more low-income students, and those same districts accounted for 42% of the reported planned expenditures.

*Policy Consideration. The Foundation School Program uses free and reduced price lunch counts as a proxy for student need for additional and remedial instruction. The results of this survey suggest that the same student count could serve as a proxy for district need for resources for security.*

**Table 5. Expenditures on security services by percent of low-income students (students receiving free and reduced-price lunches), 1996-97 and 1997-98.**

	Security Expenditures by Percent of Low-Income Students				All Districts
	0-40% (65)	40-50% (33)	50-60% (22)	60%+ (32)	TOTAL <sup>1</sup> (152)
1996-97 (Responses)					
Personnel	\$9,772,011	\$5,340,899	\$5,452,806	\$16,860,786	\$37,426,502
Equipment	1,736,824	530,824	815,297	1,367,395	4,450,340
TOTAL	\$11,508,835	\$5,871,723	\$6,268,103	\$18,228,181	\$41,876,842
1997-98 (Responses)	(70)	(39)	(26)	(41)	(176)
Personnel	13,233,687	6,100,939	6,805,160	19,774,062	45,913,848
Equipment	1,351,086	625,379	873,694	1,338,470	4,188,629
TOTAL	\$14,584,773	\$6,726,318	\$7,678,854	\$21,112,532	\$50,102,477

<sup>1</sup>Note: One school district made an error in reporting security costs. Responses from this district were not included in calculations about security costs for either year.

As shown in Table 6 below, average per-student security costs are roughly \$75 - \$80 per student per year, based on the results of this survey. Assuming these average per student costs are accurate, the statewide cost (state, federal and local funds) would be \$285 M to \$304 M per year statewide, with roughly half of the cost borne by local district resources (see Table 7).

**Table 6. Average expenditure per pupil for security, 1996-97 and 1997-98**

	Average expenditures	Number of responding districts*
1996-1997		
Personnel costs/per pupil	\$69.51	148
Equipment costs/per pupil	\$10.35	97
Total average/per pupil	\$74.29	152
1997-98, budgeted		
Personnel costs/per pupil	\$77.12	173
Equipment costs/per pupil	\$11.57	108
Total average/per pupil	\$82.90	176

\* Note: The differing number of responding districts accounts for the discrepancy in per pupil costs for each category (i.e., personnel and equipment) and the “total average” per pupil costs.

*Policy Consideration. Average expenditures per student per year for security are in the neighborhood of \$300 million per year if the findings from this study are representative. Resources for these expenses come primarily from district property tax resources and state foundation program allotments that are intended to provide accredited instructional programs for students. It appears from this survey that school districts are moving resources away from instruction and support for instruction to expenditures that are non-instructional.*

*School districts have an obligation to provide a safe environment for children. They do so mostly with state and local resources allocated for educational programs. The magnitude of expenditures on school security suggests that policymakers should consider a separate allocation for the additional costs of safety and security in the schools.*

**QUESTION 4. SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR SECURITY SERVICES, ALL DISTRICTS**

A majority of funds (50%) for security services come from district revenues (property tax revenues). State funds are the next largest source of funds for security services. Table 7 shows the average amount provided from the various funding sources. This information is presented by district size. Seventy percent (70%) of districts did not respond to this question. Of the 187 districts that did respond, only 8 reported expenditures in three of the four categories, and no district reported funding from all four sources.

**Table 7. Range of funding sources for security services and average by district size**

District Size	% District Average	% State Average	% Federal Average	% Private Average
<b>ALL</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
Small	43	22	27	8.5
Medium	54	26	14	6
Large	51	24	10	15
Extra Large	95	--	5	--
Other	62	--	38	--
Number of Districts Responding	180	36	38	10

**QUESTION 5. APPROVAL FOR SECURITY PRACTICES**

The survey asked whether a district administrator is authorized to approve and/or direct security practices. Of the 202 districts that answered this question, 183 districts (91% of those answering the question) said that a district administrator is authorized to approve or direct security practices. Individuals in a variety of staff roles approve security practices including superintendents, other district personnel, police chiefs, and school principals, as shown in Table 8.

**Table 8. Who approves or directs security practices?**

Approval given by:	Number	Percent
Superintendent	29	16%
Assistant superintendent	20	11%
Other district personnel	14	8%
District security directors	13	7%
Police chief	10	5%
Principal	25	14%
Did not respond	72	39%
Total	183	100%

**QUESTION 6. PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING DISRUPTIVE INCIDENTS**

Respondents were asked whether the school district has procedures or guidelines for reporting disruptive incidents to (1) a security office, (2) the school, (3) the school district, and (4) local law enforcement offices. Among those districts who responded to this question, a large majority report that they have procedures or guidelines for reporting disruptive incidents to various school and district entities. It is unclear why so many respondents did not answer this “yes or no” question. Table 9 on the next page displays the results.



**Table 9. Party responsible for receiving reports of disruptive incidents**

Report to:	Yes	No	Not applicable	No answer
Local law enforcement	177	10	2	425
School district	176	11	2	425
School	176	9	4	425
Security office	116	36	12	450

**QUESTION 7. OTHER METHODS OF ENSURING SECURITY**

In addition to hiring personnel to ensure student safety, districts report that they use a variety of other methods to ensure safe campuses. Four hundred and nineteen districts reporting using additional methods of ensuring security. More districts use “drug sniffing dogs” and “surveillance cameras” to ensure security. The following table reports on the most commonly used methods.

**Table 10. Methods for ensuring security**

Method	Distribution among Districts by Size					TOTAL
	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large	Other*	
Drug sniffing dogs	190	103	78	3	8	382
Surveillance cameras	48	43	56	4	1	152
Metal detectors	10	13	30	4	--	57
Hand-held metal detectors	3	12	24	1	1	41
Alarms	12	7	5	1	1	26
Extrapersonnel	6	3	2	--	1	12
Physical structures on campus (e.g., fences)	1	2	2	--	--	5
Education	1	1	1	--	--	3

\*Note: It was not possible to categorize some respondents into a particular size category.

**QUESTION 8. DISTRIBUTION OF SECURITY FUNDS**

Respondents were asked, “If state funds are appropriated for security, how should the funds be distributed? (Check one).” Almost 75% of those responding to this question (457) indicated a preference for distributing funds using a formula. Twelve percent of districts (71) preferred distributing funds through a grant application process, and 13% preferred some other distribution method.

## **Drug and Alcohol Prevention and Treatment**

### **QUESTION 1. SATISFACTION WITH DRUG & ALCOHOL PREVENTION & TREATMENT SERVICES**

Respondents were presented a list of eight programs or service providers that could provide drug and alcohol prevention and treatment services. The survey asked respondents to report their level of satisfaction with each provider. As Table 11 shows, districts seem generally satisfied with the programs they are using.

**Table 11. Satisfaction with various programs**

Program	Satisfied		Neutral		Not satisfied		Does not apply	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
DARE	339	57%	50	8%	14	2%	196	32%
All-Stars	14	2%	5	1%	--	--	570	93%
Stars	36	6%	14	2%	2	0.3%	536	87%
Regional Service Centers	184	30%	44	7%	7	1%	352	57%
Community Resources	204	33%	68	11%	26	4%	294	48%
Guidance Centers	94	15%	43	7%	10	2%	440	71%
TCADA	69	11%	42	7%	11	2%	465	76%
Private Providers	95	15%	51	8%	12	2%	432	70%

### **QUESTION 2. EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS**

Over half (357) districts said they do not have any evaluation procedures for determining the effectiveness of the drug and alcohol prevention and treatment services they use.

**QUESTION 3. SOURCES OF FUNDS**

Districts provided information about the sources and amounts of funds used for drug and alcohol prevention programs. The amount of money from all responding districts appears in Table 12. The amount of funding, organized by districts' percentage of low-income students, appears in Table 13.

**Table 12. Sources and amounts of funding for drug and alcohol prevention and treatment programs, by district size**

Fund Source	Amount of Funding by District Size					All Districts
	Small	Medium	Large	Extra Large	Other *	TOTAL
Federal funds	\$1,579,577	\$1,243,873	\$6,099,853	\$3,086,132	\$15,169	\$12,024,604
District funds	584,382	2,505,390	2,767,506	155,000	9,000	6,021,278
Compensatory education state funds	387,201	404,146	1,922,563	45,604	15,116	2,774,630
TCADA and other state funds	378,517	146,312	284,520	800,000	2,000	1,611,349
Criminal justice funds	113,500	711,230	499,997	0	0	1,324,727
Community resource funds	8,700	45,600	117,905	3,000	18,808	194,013
Private funds	6,650	58,900	29,500	10,820	0	105,870
Other	64,210	107,650	591,280	0	0	763,140
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$3,122,737</b>	<b>\$5,223,101</b>	<b>\$12,313,124</b>	<b>\$4,100,556</b>	<b>\$60,093</b>	<b>\$24,819,611</b>

\*Note: These costs were reported by districts whose size was not known.

**Table 13. Sources and amounts of funding for drug and alcohol prevention and treatment programs, by percent of low-income students**

Fund Source	Amount of Funding by Percent of Low-Income Students					All Districts
	0-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60%+	Other *	TOTAL
Federal funds	\$3,763,416	\$1,647,454	\$2,046,530	\$4,552,035	\$15,169	\$12,024,604
District funds	2,140,104	602,539	2,175,888	1,093,747	9,000	6,021,278
Compensatory education state funds	142,141	203,650	313,666	2,100,057	15,116	2,774,630
TCADA and other state funds	209,467	23,453	15,517	1,360,912	2,000	1,611,349
Criminal justice funds	520,478	368,281	33,354	402,614	0	1,324,727
Community resource funds	83,379	17,250	0	74,576	18,808	194,013
Private funds	57,900	22,650	12,820	12,500	0	105,870
Other	153,550	572,050	500	37,040	0	763,140
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,070,435</b>	<b>\$3,457,327</b>	<b>\$4,598,275</b>	<b>\$9,633,481</b>	<b>\$60,093</b>	<b>\$24,819,611</b>

\*Note: These costs were reported by districts who could not be placed into a low-income category.

The average reported funding for drug and alcohol prevention and treatment for this set of survey responses is about \$9.75 per student. Districts with higher proportions of low-income students spend somewhat more on such programs. In all, federal, local, and state compensatory education funds form 83% of funding for drug and alcohol programs and services. Districts rely on federal funds for roughly half of drug and alcohol prevention funds unlike school safety efforts, where local district property tax funds are the primary resource.

## Appendix A. Technical Issues

In November, 1997, Texas school districts were sent a four-page survey asking various questions about school safety and drug treatment issues. This survey was jointly sponsored by Senator Teel Bivins (Chair, Senate Interim Committee on Education) and Senator Royce West (Chair, Senate Interim Committee on Gangs and Juvenile Justice).

### The Sample

More than 600 school districts (n=614) responded to the survey. This results in a response rate of 58%. Some districts returned the survey anonymously (n=14). These districts are included in the reporting as “other” districts or “unknown” districts. In other words, it was not possible to determine how large these districts were or how many students were receiving free and reduced-price lunch. Similarly, it was not possible to match a few other districts (those from the districts with duplicate names) with district demographic information. These districts are included in the analysis as “others.”

### The Analysis

Data were analyzed separately by major topic, i.e., drug question responses were in a separate datafile from the school safety question responses. Both databases were matched with school district demographic information that is reported through Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS). Two variables in the AEIS system were used for this analysis.

*Economically disadvantaged:* The percent of economically disadvantaged students is calculated as the sum of the students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch or eligible for other public assistance, divided by the total number of students. (Source: PEIMS, October 1996).

*Total students:* This is the total number of students who were reported in membership as of October 25, 1996 at any grade, from early childhood education through grade 12 on public school campuses. (Source: PEIMS, October 1996).

Using this information, two additional variables were created for analysis purposes: size and percent low-income, based on percent of students receiving free or reduced-price lunches.

Size:	Small district	0-1600 students		
	Medium district	1600 - 5000 students		
	Large district	5000- 50,000 students		
	Extra large district	50,000+ students		
% low income	1	0-40%	3	50-60%
	2	40-50%	4	60%+

## Appendix B

Indicate total full-time employees assigned to campus security in each of the following categories: (Data are reported by district size.) No data were reported from districts of unknown size for these questions.

### SMALL DISTRICTS

<u>21</u> Administrators (total)	<u>21</u> District employed
	<u>0</u> Contract
<u>67</u> Officers (total)	<u>55</u> District employed
	<u>12</u> Contract
<u>13</u> Clerical (total)	<u>13</u> District employed
	<u>0</u> Contract

### MEDIUM DISTRICTS

<u>9</u> Administrators (total)	<u>9</u> District employed
	<u>0</u> Contract
<u>119</u> Officers (total)	<u>66.5</u> District employed
	<u>52.5</u> Contract
<u>27</u> Clerical (total)	<u>27</u> District employed
	<u>0</u> Contract



**LARGE DISTRICTS**

<u>60</u>	Administrators (total)	<u>58</u>	District employed
		<u>2</u>	Contract
<u>1145.5</u>	Officers (total)	<u>806.5</u>	District employed
		<u>339</u>	Contract
<u>81</u>	Clerical (total)	<u>80</u>	District employed
		<u>1</u>	Contract

**EXTRA LARGE DISTRICTS**

<u>31</u>	Administrators (total)	<u>31</u>	District employed
		<u>0</u>	Contract
<u>268</u>	Officers (total)	<u>254</u>	District employed
		<u>14</u>	Contract
<u>6</u>	Clerical (total)	<u>6</u>	District employed
		<u>0</u>	Contract