

**THE BEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS
FOR LATINO STUDENTS 2000-2003**

Kenneth J. Meier
Daniel Hawes
Stephen Sargent

Texas A&M University

and

Nick Theobald

University of Kansas

A REPORT OF THE
TEXAS EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE PROJECT

For further information, contact: Nick Theobald at theobald@polisci.tamu.edu
<http://teep.tamu.edu>

The Texas Educational Excellence Project (TEEP) is a program housed within the Department of Political Science at Texas A&M University. The project also has research associates at the University of Kansas, the University of Texas - Pan American, and the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee. TEEP seeks to apply scholarly research to educational policy issues in order to make recommendations for greater quality and equity in Texas school systems.

The Best School Districts in Texas for Latino Students 2000-2003

The education of minority students is a pertinent concern for education leaders and policy-makers in Texas. In recent years, minority students have made significant gains on the state exams. However, Latino students' tests scores continue to lag behind Anglo test scores. Latino students, however, have made great strides in closing this gap. In 1996, 54.2% of Latino test-takers passed the TAAS, compared to 79.8% for Anglo students, a gap of 25.6 percentage points. By 2002, Latino students cut this gap in half to 12.8 percentage points, scoring an average of 79.7% compared to an average of 92.5% for Anglos in that year. Indeed, this is evidence of significant progress. However, these statewide gains are not evenly distributed across all districts. Some school districts have made more substantial gains while others have fallen behind. The Texas Educational Excellence Project believes that by identifying those districts that do a better job in educating Latino students, Latino test performance can be further improved. The programs and policies used by the exemplary districts may then be used as a standard by which other districts can measure and improve their own performance.

The Mount Vernon Independent School District provides one such example. Taking resources and environmental factors into account, the predicted three-year average pass rate for Latino students at Mount Vernon was 74.2. The 2000-2003 Mount Vernon Latino average pass rate was, in fact, 87.65 percent. This impressive pass rate for Latino test-takers helps the district achieve the highest score in our ranking system. Their superintendent attributes their success to a number of variables. Mount Vernon Independent school district uses both extended day and extended year school programs. Tutoring is offered to all students in the district for free, and there are mentoring programs available for at risk high school students. Nutritional programs are also emphasized by the Mount Vernon school district. Their Breakfast of Champions program offers free breakfast to all students in elementary school and free or reduced breakfast to other students. Other schools that are performing well are Angleton ISD and La Joya ISD. Angleton ranked second on our list with a pass rate of 89.88 percent, which is 12.68 points higher than expected. La Joya was 12th overall on our list but ranked number one among districts with over 15,000 students (see Table 4).

The Texas Educational Excellence Project uses an analytical technique called multiple regression to identify which school district do a better job at educating Latino students. This technique allows important variables be considered, rather than simply comparing pass rates, which would ignore factors that influence performance. School districts often have little or no control over such external factors. By utilizing multiple regression, we can determine the impact of particular policy and resource related variables while holding other variables constant. Using this method, TEEP is able to rate a school district's overall performance in educating Latino students while controlling for the level of institutional resources. This provides a more valid basis of comparison of performance between individual school districts.

The model used in this analysis is based on what the literature defines as an “educational production function.” A large literature has been developed that designates various education production functions to evaluate the outputs of schools to their inputs (Burtless 1996; Smith 1995; Hanushek, 1986; 1989; 1996). In this function, performance (here identified as Latino pass rates on the TAAS and TAKS exams) is a function of various inputs into the educational process. These inputs include the district’s level of operating expenditures, percent of low-income students, the poverty level of the district, level of education of Latinos in the district, and various educational policies of the district. The prediction of how well the district should perform in educating Latino students is a result of the estimation of the established production function. Thus, with the results of the estimation, we can compare how well districts *actually* perform to how well the model *predicts* they will perform given a certain level of resources. This difference of *actual* to *predicted* is the measure of how well the districts are doing in educating Latino students. In other words, those districts that actually perform better than *predicted*, are those districts that are doing a superior job of educating Latino students.

The 2000-2003 Education Production Function

The dependent variable in our production function is the school district’s TAAS and TAKS pass rate for Latino students.¹ All school districts in Texas are required to annually administer the standardized exams to students in a variety of grades. The district averages for all grades are our dependent variables. Obviously, it would be incorrect to claim that this variable adequately captures the entire range of learning for Latino students. Indeed, we make no claims that this is an overall measure of Latino student learning. However, it is a measure of how well students do in acquiring basic skills. Thus, by rating school districts on this measure, we have a measure of how well the district does in teaching basic skills to Latino students.

The independent variables in our analysis fall into four types: school district policies, environmental constraints, teacher quality, and financial resources. School district policies include class size, student attendance (percent attending on an average day), and the percent of students enrolled in gifted classes. Performance should be negatively related to class size and positively related to the two other policy measures.

Environmental constraints are factors that hinder student performance. While school districts cannot adjust these factors, it is important to statistically control for them when assessing student performance. The measures of environmental constraint are the percentage of Latino families that live in poverty in that district and the percent of poor students (those who are eligible for free school lunches). Additionally, the educational level of Latinos within the district is measured using the percentage of Latinos in the district over age 25 with at least a high school education. This variable should be

¹ Beginning the 2002-2003 school year, Texas changed their test from the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills to the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills. While there are some differences between these two tests, the correlation between them is very high. For this reason, this analysis uses the TAAS scores for the first 2 years of data and the TAKS scores for the last year.

positively related to student performance while the poverty variables should be negatively related to student pass rates.

Teacher qualification is measured in two ways: the percent of teachers within a district with only a temporary teachers certificate in a subject specialty (as opposed to a permanent certificate), and the average number of years of teaching experience. We expect that teacher experience should contribute to student performance, while the percent of non-certified teachers should negatively affect Latino pass rates.

Among the most important factors are financial resources of the school district. However, the relationship between educational expenditures and student performance is controversial. Hanushek, in a variety of works (1986; 1989; 1996) finds no consistent relationship between money and student performance. For some time this finding has been the conventional wisdom for educational policy researchers. Lately, however, a number of researchers have qualified Hanushek's position. For example, in recent longitudinal studies, Murray (1995), Evans, Murray and Schwab (1997) and Murray, Evans and Schwab (1995) reported that districts that increased expenditures had improved student performance. A 1999 study by Bohte found that expenditures were correlated with higher test scores in Texas, even when controlling for the previous year's test scores.

In our analysis, we consider institutional resources and expenditures an important variable in our model. Financial resources are measured in three ways: instructional funds per student, average teacher salary, and the percent of funds received from the state. These measures characterize the total financial resources allocated to education, the district's ability to attract qualified teachers in a competitive marketplace, and the state's efforts to compensate for the unequal distribution of local financial resources. All of these measures should be positively related to student performance.

Texas school districts are diverse in both size and homogeneity. In order to use a set of organizations relatively similar in the tasks they perform, our analysis is limited to school districts with at least 1000 and at least 10 percent Latino students. The data analysis is a pooled time series with data from 2000 to 2003. Serial correlation, resulting from any trends in the variables over time, needs to be controlled for in any pooled time series analysis. A series of dummy variables for each year are used to control of serial correlation.

Table 1 shows the basic production function equation. Nine of the 11 variables are statistically significant. These include two of the environmental constraints, both teacher qualifications, two of the school district policies, and all three of the financial resources. Several variables are powerful predictors of Latino pass rates. The coefficients for these variables indicate the amount of change in the dependent variable – Latino pass rates – that is related to a one-unit change in the independent variable. Student attendance positively and significantly influences Latino student pass rates. That is, a one-percent increase in average attendance increase pass rates by over three percentage points on average. The percentage of Latinos over age 25 with at least a high-school diploma is

also a positive and significant predictor of Latino performance. Both teacher quality variables are statistically significant variable and in the anticipated direction, that is, increased teacher experience increases pass rates while increases in non-certified teachers decreases pass rates.

It should be noted, however, that schools have little or no control over these variables, particularly the environmental constraints. As such, it is difficult for schools to substantially improve Latino pass rates by simply adjusting the levels of these variables. However, some districts seem to better utilize the resources available to them. Furthermore, we can identify those districts by comparing the *expected* pass rates given the resources with the *actual* pass rates. This then allows us to compare school districts as to how well they perform relative to expectations. Ballinger ISD, for example, was predicted by the model to have an average Latino pass rate of 73.8 for the period of 2000-2003. Their actual average pass rate was 84.85%; meaning 11.04% more Latino students passed the TAAS than expected. This significant achievement advances Ballinger ISD from 22th place last year to eighth place for the 2000-2003 average. This improvement is, indeed, worth noting.

Using this method, the top forty districts are listed in Table 2. The first column provides the numerical score on which the districts are ranked. The second column is the average pass rate for Latino students from 2000 to 2003. The last column is the residual score for the 2003 TAKS exam only. Mount Vernon ISD performed 13.45 points better than expected, placing it in the top rank, followed closely by Angleton (+12.68) and Grand Saline (+12.21).

The best 25 school districts for Latino students in 2003 only are listed in Table 3. Mount Vernon ISD is ranked number one followed by Angleton and Grand Saline. All of these schools have consistently had excellent performance rates for Latino students. In 2002 Mount Vernon was ranked 5th on our list for Latino Student performance, while Angleton ranked third and Grand Saline placed second on the list. Large districts are distinct from smaller districts in that they face different challenges and often cannot change as rapidly as smaller district because more students are involved. Table 4 lists the ten best large districts (15,000 students or more) for Latino students. La Joya is ranked number one with a score of 10.31, followed by Galena Park (+9.85) and Aldine (+8.42).

The Appendix alphabetically lists all the districts examined in this study, along with their score. Any person interested in a specific school district can examine the Appendix to locate that district and identify their score and rank.

Conclusion

This study has identified those school districts in Texas whose test pass rates for Latino students were better than expected given their resources and constraints. These districts can serve as role models for other districts in Texas. The districts have a wide variety of programs for early diagnosis, student motivation, and parental involvement. Not all of the districts use the same approach, indicating that success can be attained in a

variety of ways. If effective programs and performances from these districts are identified, then other districts can adopt them, which will result in an overall benefit to Latino students.

Although this study only examines exemplary districts, that should not detract from the relatively low over-all pass rate for Latino students in Texas. In order to close the test gap between Latino and Anglo students, additional improvement is needed in these districts as well as other districts. Significant progress has been made in the last few years; yet, there is a great need for further improvement. Improving educational opportunities for all Texas children requires a long-term commitment to education. Improvement will require openness to innovation, as well as an emphasis on meaningful evaluation.

References

- Bothe, John, 1999. "Class Size, Teacher Salaries and Student Performance." College Station, TX: Texas Educational Excellence Project.
- Burtless, Gary. 1996. *Does Money Matter? The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement and Adult Success*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Culp, Cindy V. 2003. "Waco Trustees Grade Promotion Policy Will Increase Number of Students Retained?" *Waco Tribune*.
<http://www.wacotrib.com/news/newsfd/auto/feed/news/2003/04/10/1049951906.00353.1168.7802.html>
- Hanushek, Eric A. 1986. "The Economics of Schooling: Production and Efficiency in Public Schools." *Journal of Economic Literature* 24:1141-77.
- Hanushek, Eric A. 1989. "The Impact of Differential Expenditures on School Performance." *Educational Researcher* 23 (4): 45-65.
- Hanushek, Eric A. 1996. "School Resources and Student Performance." In *Does Money Matter? The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement and Adult Success*, Gary Burtless, ed. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Hedges, Larry V. and Rob Greenwald. 1996. "Have Times Changed? The Relation between School Resources and Student Performance." In *Does Money Matter? The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement and Adult Success*, ed. Gary Burtless. Washington: Brookings.
- Murray, Sheila E. 1995. "Two Essays on the Distribution of Education Resources and Outcomes." PhD. diss. Department of Economics, University of Maryland.
- Murray, Sheila E., William N. Evans and Robert M. Schwab. 1995. "Money Matters After All: Evidence From Panel Data on the Effects of School Resources." University of Kentucky and University of Maryland working paper: The Martin School.
- Smith, Kevin B. 1995. "Policy, Markets, and Bureaucracy: Reexamining School Choice." *Journal of Politics* 56 (May), 475-491.

Table 1. Regression Results for Latino Performance

	Latino Pass Rate
Percent Low Income	-0.081 (6.23)**
Percent Gifted	0.064 (0.99)
Attendance	3.138 (11.42)**
Average Teacher Salary K	0.417 (3.45)**
Class Size	0.452 (2.14)*
Teacher Experience	0.499 (4.44)**
Non-Certified Teachers	-0.254 (4.50)**
State Aid	0.023 (2.16)*
Instructional Expenditures	0.002 (2.80)**
High School Education	12.074 (4.77)**
% Poverty Background	-0.044 (0.02)
2001	2.474 (4.98)**
2002	5.683 (11.18)**
2003	-18.407 (30.87)**
Constant	-260.319 (9.70)**
Observations	1386
R-squared	0.69

Absolute value of t statistics in parentheses
* significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Table 2. Top 40 Districts

Rank	District	Score	Pass Rate	2003 Score
1	MOUNT VERNON ISD	13.45	87.65	15.58
2	ANGLETON ISD	12.68	89.88	13.25
3	GRAND SALINE ISD	12.21	81.70	9.88
4	LOS FRESNOS CONS ISD	11.87	84.27	12.90
5	BANGS ISD	11.58	85.68	11.02
6	HIDALGO ISD	11.23	82.32	10.94
7	MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD	11.09	86.90	10.20
8	BALLINGER ISD	11.04	84.85	8.28
9	BRAZOSPORT ISD	11.02	87.43	10.73
10	VALLEY VIEW ISD	10.99	82.20	9.34
11	DEL VALLE ISD	10.53	74.30	8.22
12	LA JOYA ISD	10.31	72.97	11.30
13	CALHOUN CO ISD	10.12	81.90	13.13
14	ALVIN ISD	10.11	80.68	6.73
15	GALENA PARK ISD	9.85	79.20	10.73
16	ORANGE GROVE ISD	9.58	82.82	7.52
17	COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD	9.29	84.03	6.87
18	BURNET CONS ISD	8.96	79.72	6.30
19	LA MARQUE ISD	8.85	77.55	2.16
20	ALICE ISD	8.67	70.25	6.25
21	SAN BENITO CONS ISD	8.66	78.12	4.32
22	GATESVILLE ISD	8.62	82.28	12.52
23	FERRIS ISD	8.61	78.68	6.80
24	DENVER CITY ISD	8.55	85.65	8.33
25	ALDINE ISD	8.42	80.90	9.32
26	GROESBECK ISD	8.34	78.40	2.87
27	PLAINVIEW ISD	7.79	75.70	5.14
28	WILLIS ISD	7.65	76.25	7.94
29	HEREFORD ISD	7.62	77.50	-0.33
30	BISHOP CONS ISD	7.39	82.30	6.82
31	SWEENY ISD	7.35	85.48	8.48
32	MARION ISD	7.32	84.62	7.97
33	YSLETA ISD	7.32	78.47	3.59
34	SHARYLAND ISD	7.27	82.10	8.76
35	EAGLE PASS ISD	7.17	75.35	6.12
36	FRENSHIP ISD	7.16	82.38	9.83
37	EARLY ISD	7.01	86.88	9.20
38	DUMAS ISD	7.00	76.97	5.06
39	CALALLEN ISD	6.93	84.85	11.76
40	KAUFMAN ISD	6.85	78.68	9.64

Table 3. Top 25 Districts for 2003

Rank	District	Score	Pass Rate	2003 Score
1	MOUNT VERNON ISD	13.45	87.65	15.58
2	ANGLETON ISD	12.68	89.88	13.25
3	CALHOUN CO ISD	10.12	81.90	13.13
4	LOS FRESNOS CONS ISD	11.87	84.27	12.90
5	GATESVILLE ISD	8.62	82.28	12.52
6	CALALLEN ISD	6.93	84.85	11.76
7	LA JOYA ISD	10.31	72.97	11.30
8	LIBERTY HILL ISD	6.39	81.62	11.03
9	BANGS ISD	11.58	85.68	11.02
10	HIDALGO ISD	11.23	82.32	10.94
11	FRISCO ISD	4.81	80.18	10.94
12	BRAZOSPORT ISD	11.02	87.43	10.73
13	GALENA PARK ISD	9.85	79.20	10.73
14	HILLSBORO ISD	6.42	74.32	10.59
15	PLEASANTON ISD	5.14	75.07	10.30
16	LLANO ISD	5.92	80.90	10.27
17	MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD	11.09	86.90	10.20
18	GIDDINGS ISD	4.69	78.18	9.92
19	GRAND SALINE ISD	12.21	81.70	9.88
20	FRENSHIP ISD	7.16	82.38	9.83
21	BARBERS HILL ISD	4.03	85.12	9.70
22	KERRVILLE ISD	6.59	79.43	9.69
23	KAUFMAN ISD	6.85	78.68	9.64
24	LA GRANGE ISD	3.74	76.12	9.62
25	VALLEY VIEW ISD	10.99	82.20	9.34

Table 4. Top 10 Large Districts (15,000 + Students)

Rank	District	Score	Pass Rate	2003 Score
1	LA JOYA ISD	10.31	72.97	11.30
2	GALENA PARK ISD	9.85	79.20	10.73
3	ALDINE ISD	8.42	80.90	9.32
4	YSLETA ISD	7.32	78.47	3.59
5	WACO ISD	5.10	72.03	1.77
6	HARLINGEN CONS ISD	4.73	78.82	4.36
7	MCALLEN ISD	4.28	76.97	3.50
8	GOOSE CREEK CISD	4.25	76.10	2.13
9	MCKINNEY ISD	4.10	74.43	8.19
10	PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD	4.09	74.97	4.71

Appendix. Scores for All Schools

Rank	District	Score	Pass Rate	2003 Score
100	ABILENE ISD	3.65	77.53	4.16
295	ALAMO HEIGHTS ISD	-6.13	79.47	-2.44
25	ALDINE ISD	8.42	80.90	9.32
20	ALICE ISD	8.67	70.25	6.25
324	ALIEF ISD	-8.57	65.78	-7.35
172	ALPINE ISD	0.15	74.78	8.14
72	ALVARADO ISD	4.80	72.93	1.59
14	ALVIN ISD	10.11	80.68	6.73
156	AMARILLO ISD	0.63	70.85	2.83
150	ANAHUAC ISD	0.81	71.55	1.75
2	ANGLETON ISD	12.68	89.88	13.25
55	ARANSAS COUNTY ISD	5.57	76.32	5.43
300	ARANSAS PASS ISD	-6.36	64.25	-3.50
310	ARLINGTON ISD	-7.37	68.18	-2.58
287	ATHENS ISD	-5.51	64.40	-3.60
8	BALLINGER ISD	11.04	84.85	8.28
188	BANDERA ISD	-0.74	71.38	1.75
5	BANGS ISD	11.58	85.68	11.02
93	BARBERS HILL ISD	4.03	85.12	9.70
180	BASTROP ISD	-0.24	68.78	-0.61
46	BAY CITY ISD	6.13	74.90	2.23
196	BELLVILLE ISD	-1.04	73.82	-5.22
92	BELTON ISD	4.03	77.25	1.93
262	BIRDVILLE ISD	-3.94	76.78	-6.45
30	BISHOP CONS ISD	7.39	82.30	6.82
88	BOERNE ISD	4.15	80.85	8.27
125	BORGER ISD	2.28	73.78	-1.44
122	BRADY ISD	2.37	75.40	2.51
9	BRAZOSPORT ISD	11.02	87.43	10.73
189	BRECKENRIDGE ISD	-0.79	71.65	-5.42
279	BRENHAM ISD	-4.99	66.95	-0.19
207	BRIDGEPORT ISD	-1.36	72.60	-3.93
83	BROOKS COUNTY ISD	4.29	70.53	8.07
319	BROWNFIELD ISD	-8.17	61.12	-15.46
230	BROWNSVILLE ISD	-2.13	70.07	-0.37
176	BROWNWOOD ISD	-0.06	70.93	0.49
170	BRYAN ISD	0.20	68.55	1.07
18	BURNET CONS ISD	8.96	79.72	6.30
39	CALALLEN ISD	6.93	84.85	11.76
110	CALDWELL ISD	3.06	75.40	3.70
13	CALHOUN CO ISD	10.12	81.90	13.13
185	CAMERON ISD	-0.63	72.97	2.00
255	CANUTILLO ISD	-3.33	68.55	-7.29
63	CANYON ISD	5.21	83.30	6.56
268	CARRIZO SPRINGS CONS ISD	-4.24	65.50	-5.28

242	CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH ISD	-2.48	72.65	-0.51
336	CASTLEBERRY ISD	-9.92	57.17	-13.08
288	CEDAR HILL ISD	-5.57	71.20	-5.99
335	CELINA ISD	-9.79	67.80	-10.93
346	CENTER ISD	-15.40	56.35	-12.53
241	CHANNELVIEW ISD	-2.47	69.85	-5.99
340	CHAPEL HILL ISD	-11.13	59.30	-6.03
117	CHILDRESS ISD	2.73	75.90	-4.19
208	CLEAR CREEK ISD	-1.39	78.82	4.52
322	CLEBURNE ISD	-8.27	65.43	-9.09
347	CLEVELAND ISD	-16.36	50.10	-13.45
154	CLIFTON ISD	0.71	74.00	-2.46
166	CLINT ISD	0.29	70.40	-0.37
66	COLEMAN ISD	5.10	76.72	-4.94
221	COLLEGE STATION ISD	-1.69	80.95	5.15
157	COLORADO ISD	0.62	74.20	0.28
17	COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD	9.29	84.03	6.87
337	COLUMBUS ISD	-9.94	66.10	-22.58
140	COMAL ISD	1.47	76.80	0.82
165	COMANCHE ISD	0.32	73.07	-4.57
61	COMFORT ISD	5.24	75.95	1.03
201	CONNALLY ISD	-1.19	73.22	-2.38
231	CONROE ISD	-2.17	73.10	2.04
86	COPPERAS COVE ISD	4.22	80.55	3.81
227	CORPUS CHRISTI ISD	-2.01	71.85	-3.10
134	CORRIGAN-CAMDEN ISD	1.94	69.60	-2.04
257	CORSICANA ISD	-3.41	66.65	-1.54
326	COTULLA ISD	-8.65	57.73	-13.75
341	CROCKETT ISD	-11.18	56.48	-8.83
135	CROSBY ISD	1.68	75.30	2.26
87	CROWLEY ISD	4.17	84.47	6.20
296	CRYSTAL CITY ISD	-6.15	58.55	-9.90
57	CUERO ISD	5.42	79.35	8.69
209	CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS ISD	-1.47	77.10	3.03
128	DALHART ISD	2.22	72.28	1.92
338	DALLAS ISD	-10.62	60.35	-5.89
220	DAYTON ISD	-1.69	66.17	-9.04
253	DECATUR ISD	-3.24	70.60	-2.99
123	DEER PARK ISD	2.31	80.65	7.90
11	DEL VALLE ISD	10.53	74.30	8.22
291	DENTON ISD	-5.84	65.90	-6.92
24	DENVER CITY ISD	8.55	85.65	8.33
119	DESOTO ISD	2.50	75.95	0.27
309	DEVINE ISD	-7.37	66.60	-10.05
120	DIBOLL ISD	2.47	70.73	2.64
193	DICKINSON ISD	-0.94	66.18	3.07

151	DIMMITT ISD	0.76	69.00	-3.85
318	DONNA ISD	-8.00	57.07	-6.15
283	DUBLIN ISD	-5.19	64.75	-4.87
38	DUMAS ISD	7.00	76.97	5.06
158	DUNCANVILLE ISD	0.54	74.53	1.72
284	EAGLE MT-SAGINAW ISD	-5.27	70.30	-5.60
35	EAGLE PASS ISD	7.17	75.35	6.12
37	EARLY ISD	7.01	86.88	9.20
281	EAST CENTRAL ISD	-5.05	71.85	-3.50
270	EAST CHAMBERS ISD	-4.49	68.07	-3.13
58	EASTLAND ISD	5.32	79.70	1.29
213	ECTOR COUNTY ISD	-1.50	66.70	2.02
239	EDCOUCH-ELSA ISD	-2.44	69.45	-6.14
97	EDGEWOOD ISD	3.81	70.12	-3.88
102	EDINBURG CISD	3.53	73.12	2.55
190	EDNA ISD	-0.82	72.20	-2.99
62	EL CAMPO ISD	5.23	79.43	0.36
301	EL PASO ISD	-6.43	66.25	-3.18
332	ELGIN ISD	-9.19	61.17	-12.91
219	ENNIS ISD	-1.68	72.78	-2.34
109	EVERMAN ISD	3.08	77.20	0.37
269	FABENS ISD	-4.27	63.47	-7.70
243	FARMERSVILLE ISD	-2.49	74.82	3.05
23	FERRIS ISD	8.61	78.68	6.80
89	FLORESVILLE ISD	4.11	74.28	7.34
101	FLOUR BLUFF ISD	3.62	79.35	4.79
305	FLOYDADA ISD	-6.88	61.62	-10.48
308	FORT BEND ISD	-7.26	72.97	-5.18
126	FORT WORTH ISD	2.25	68.38	2.91
293	FREDERICKSBURG ISD	-5.98	68.83	-9.04
36	FRENSHIP ISD	7.16	82.38	9.83
71	FRISCO ISD	4.81	80.18	10.94
313	FT STOCKTON ISD	-7.52	63.98	-9.65
339	GAINESVILLE ISD	-11.03	61.28	-14.73
15	GALENA PARK ISD	9.85	79.20	10.73
48	GALVESTON ISD	6.03	72.20	5.65
252	GARLAND ISD	-3.22	71.30	-2.72
22	GATESVILLE ISD	8.62	82.28	12.52
114	GEORGE WEST ISD	2.77	78.30	4.79
289	GEORGETOWN ISD	-5.62	71.12	4.90
75	GIDDINGS ISD	4.69	78.18	9.92
254	GLEN ROSE ISD	-3.27	75.10	3.99
47	GOLIAD ISD	6.08	80.80	3.58
304	GONZALES ISD	-6.86	61.53	-0.62
85	GOOSE CREEK CISD	4.25	76.10	2.13
139	GRAHAM ISD	1.51	77.18	0.87

137	GRANBURY ISD	1.62	73.35	-0.48
237	GRAND PRAIRIE ISD	-2.37	70.50	1.25
3	GRAND SALINE ISD	12.21	81.70	9.88
76	GRANDVIEW ISD	4.63	81.72	7.37
51	GRAPE CREEK ISD	5.93	74.50	5.05
204	GREENVILLE ISD	-1.32	65.60	-0.42
105	GREENWOOD ISD	3.35	82.12	5.76
127	GREGORY-PORTLAND ISD	2.23	81.28	3.38
26	GROESBECK ISD	8.34	78.40	2.87
53	HARLANDALE ISD	5.88	75.10	5.97
74	HARLINGEN CONS ISD	4.73	78.82	4.36
229	HAYS CONS ISD	-2.05	70.53	-2.92
343	HEARNE ISD	-14.09	56.38	-17.14
325	HEMPSTEAD ISD	-8.62	63.80	-12.82
334	HENDERSON ISD	-9.72	63.33	-5.20
29	HEREFORD ISD	7.62	77.50	-0.33
6	HIDALGO ISD	11.23	82.32	10.94
43	HILLSBORO ISD	6.42	74.32	10.59
345	HITCHCOCK ISD	-14.79	56.70	-18.98
203	HONDO ISD	-1.31	68.45	-2.79
192	HOUSTON ISD	-0.93	68.18	-2.69
162	HUDSON ISD	0.39	72.53	-4.70
273	HUMBLE ISD	-4.62	74.62	-3.81
218	HUNTSVILLE ISD	-1.63	70.72	-3.70
259	HURST-EULESS-BEDFORD ISD	-3.62	76.32	-0.46
175	HUTTO ISD	-0.01	77.40	2.78
200	INGLESIDE ISD	-1.16	72.82	-1.06
314	INGRAM ISD	-7.71	63.75	-8.54
194	IRVING ISD	-0.99	72.45	-0.08
316	JACKSONVILLE ISD	-7.81	58.65	-1.95
60	JIM HOGG COUNTY ISD	5.28	77.93	0.03
164	JOURDANTON ISD	0.36	72.30	0.58
267	JUDSON ISD	-4.19	71.55	-0.60
222	KATY ISD	-1.74	80.68	2.26
40	KAUFMAN ISD	6.85	78.68	9.64
96	KENNEDALE ISD	3.87	78.47	3.23
302	KERMIT ISD	-6.57	63.05	-4.99
42	KERRVILLE ISD	6.59	79.43	9.69
306	KILGORE ISD	-6.94	62.85	-7.04
236	KILLEEN ISD	-2.36	74.40	-0.24
132	KINGSVILLE ISD	2.05	72.45	-4.13
285	KLEIN ISD	-5.28	77.00	-0.25
95	LA FERIA ISD	3.95	78.75	-1.62
98	LA GRANGE ISD	3.74	76.12	9.62
12	LA JOYA ISD	10.31	72.97	11.30
19	LA MARQUE ISD	8.85	77.55	2.16

160	LA PORTE ISD	0.47	78.55	2.70
111	LA VEGA ISD	2.90	70.25	-5.57
232	LA VERNIA ISD	-2.18	77.95	0.64
202	LAKE TRAVIS ISD	-1.26	78.22	1.97
286	LAKE WORTH ISD	-5.50	56.05	-8.20
174	LAMAR CONSOLIDATED ISD	0.00	74.10	-2.40
294	LAMESA ISD	-5.99	63.03	-5.84
292	LAMPASAS ISD	-5.96	67.68	-4.07
225	LANCASTER ISD	-1.91	67.42	-3.27
323	LAREDO ISD	-8.55	64.80	-13.04
159	LEANDER ISD	0.52	76.78	8.10
280	LEWISVILLE ISD	-5.04	75.72	0.30
44	LIBERTY HILL ISD	6.39	81.62	11.03
317	LIBERTY ISD	-7.84	63.77	-10.06
299	LITTLE ELM ISD	-6.27	60.20	-5.65
149	LITTLEFIELD ISD	0.89	71.82	-5.05
320	LIVINGSTON ISD	-8.19	63.38	-4.57
52	LLANO ISD	5.92	80.90	10.27
244	LONGVIEW ISD	-2.69	67.05	-0.73
4	LOS FRESNOS CONS ISD	11.87	84.27	12.90
169	LUBBOCK ISD	0.21	73.10	-0.40
80	LUBBOCK-COOPER ISD	4.54	82.62	5.11
146	LUFKIN ISD	1.07	72.20	4.91
290	LULING ISD	-5.82	65.10	-10.64
274	LYFORD CISD	-4.68	65.70	-2.34
184	LYTLE ISD	-0.56	64.92	-3.49
161	MADISONVILLE CONS ISD	0.45	71.60	1.15
327	MAGNOLIA ISD	-8.68	61.72	-5.53
342	MANOR ISD	-12.23	54.42	-13.31
168	MANSFIELD ISD	0.26	78.97	1.80
115	MARBLE FALLS ISD	2.75	74.65	7.97
32	MARION ISD	7.32	84.62	7.97
344	MARLIN ISD	-14.10	53.33	-14.72
212	MARSHALL ISD	-1.49	71.45	0.82
246	MATHIS ISD	-2.80	62.92	-6.10
84	MCALLEN ISD	4.28	76.97	3.50
41	MCGREGOR ISD	6.85	81.70	6.01
90	MCKINNEY ISD	4.10	74.43	8.19
329	MEDINA VALLEY ISD	-8.89	63.38	-5.76
266	MERCEDES ISD	-4.17	68.70	-3.68
82	MERKEL ISD	4.53	79.85	-3.50
214	MESQUITE ISD	-1.51	75.03	-0.68
73	MEXIA ISD	4.73	75.60	0.15
233	MIDLAND ISD	-2.23	69.15	4.27
251	MIDLOTHIAN ISD	-3.13	76.30	-4.04
148	MINEOLA ISD	1.04	74.85	6.07

49	MINERAL WELLS ISD	6.00	75.12	4.75
103	MISSION CONS ISD	3.47	78.45	3.65
7	MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD	11.09	86.90	10.20
328	MOUNT PLEASANT ISD	-8.69	58.58	-8.63
1	MOUNT VERNON ISD	13.45	87.65	15.58
70	MULESHOE ISD	4.81	75.20	1.06
330	NACOGDOCHES ISD	-8.90	61.83	-3.40
263	NATALIA ISD	-4.03	63.20	-10.25
186	NAVASOTA ISD	-0.64	67.85	-1.88
271	NEEDVILLE ISD	-4.54	74.05	-8.12
249	NEW BRAUNFELS ISD	-2.94	71.72	-2.53
99	NEW CANEY ISD	3.74	73.38	2.36
142	NORTH EAST ISD	1.22	79.55	6.67
311	NORTH FOREST ISD	-7.37	57.53	-8.38
187	NORTHSIDE ISD	-0.64	75.70	3.41
248	ODEM-EDROY ISD	-2.91	73.68	-2.54
16	ORANGE GROVE ISD	9.58	82.82	7.52
108	PALACIOS ISD	3.12	80.30	2.04
277	PALESTINE ISD	-4.90	65.82	0.41
177	PAMPA ISD	-0.14	71.62	-1.79
124	PASADENA ISD	2.28	76.43	3.99
68	PEARLAND ISD	5.03	84.88	6.14
182	PEARSALL ISD	-0.40	69.00	-2.41
112	PECOS-BARSTOW-TOYAH ISD	2.88	70.72	2.55
171	PERRYTON ISD	0.17	72.10	-0.34
181	PFLUGERVILLE ISD	-0.38	79.12	0.35
91	PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD	4.09	74.97	4.71
265	PILOT POINT ISD	-4.13	67.43	-11.75
144	PINE TREE ISD	1.18	74.45	5.49
81	PITTSBURG ISD	4.53	73.62	-0.77
27	PLAINVIEW ISD	7.79	75.70	5.14
64	PLEASANTON ISD	5.14	75.07	10.30
54	POINT ISABEL ISD	5.59	76.70	-2.17
116	PORT ARTHUR ISD	2.74	66.53	2.19
331	POTEET ISD	-8.97	60.38	-11.40
94	PRESIDIO ISD	3.96	63.88	0.61
136	PRINCETON ISD	1.64	71.20	-2.33
118	PROGRESO ISD	2.61	67.18	0.46
67	RAYMONDVILLE ISD	5.05	71.97	-1.79
260	RED OAK ISD	-3.79	73.47	1.19
228	RICE CONS ISD	-2.02	67.70	-8.02
307	RICHARDSON ISD	-7.03	70.32	1.76
247	RIO GRANDE CITY CISD	-2.87	64.25	-3.28
79	RIO HONDO ISD	4.55	78.10	-1.78
106	ROBINSON ISD	3.30	82.85	3.51
56	ROBSTOWN ISD	5.47	71.07	3.25

275	ROCKDALE ISD	-4.74	70.75	-0.37
261	ROCKWALL ISD	-3.87	72.32	2.79
276	ROMA ISD	-4.89	60.72	-2.80
59	ROOSEVELT ISD	5.29	76.53	6.39
210	ROUND ROCK ISD	-1.47	77.03	2.70
191	ROYAL ISD	-0.87	68.93	0.93
113	ROYSE CITY ISD	2.81	72.72	4.95
282	SAN ANGELO ISD	-5.18	67.65	-6.48
315	SAN ANTONIO ISD	-7.80	65.47	-6.12
21	SAN BENITO CONS ISD	8.66	78.12	4.32
333	SAN DIEGO ISD	-9.20	56.50	-9.75
321	SAN ELIZARIO ISD	-8.22	62.03	-7.69
258	SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CONS ISD	-3.62	70.77	-3.48
50	SAN MARCOS CONS ISD	6.00	76.65	6.26
199	SANGER ISD	-1.14	71.17	4.29
211	SANTA FE ISD	-1.48	73.72	-3.10
250	SANTA ROSA ISD	-2.95	68.47	-12.58
183	SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY ISD	-0.48	75.78	1.08
235	SEALY ISD	-2.27	73.43	-5.09
178	SEGUIN ISD	-0.17	69.00	6.02
155	SHALLOWATER ISD	0.66	75.10	3.02
34	SHARYLAND ISD	7.27	82.10	8.76
297	SHELDON ISD	-6.25	66.22	-3.63
264	SHERMAN ISD	-4.05	66.75	2.94
107	SINTON ISD	3.20	72.20	0.32
240	SLATON ISD	-2.46	69.95	-6.72
238	SMITHVILLE ISD	-2.43	66.40	-0.36
145	SNYDER ISD	1.07	74.70	-0.25
141	SOCORRO ISD	1.23	73.12	2.58
133	SOMERSET ISD	2.03	71.65	0.40
205	SOUTH SAN ANTONIO ISD	-1.34	72.10	-4.01
217	SOUTHSIDE ISD	-1.57	63.08	-5.07
77	SOUTHWEST ISD	4.57	71.62	4.88
198	SPRING BRANCH ISD	-1.12	71.58	5.92
226	SPRING ISD	-1.94	75.12	2.86
298	STAFFORD MUNICIPAL SCHOOL DIST.	-6.26	70.30	-1.90
224	STEPHENVILLE	-1.87	76.33	-6.68
152	SULPHUR SPRINGS ISD	0.76	75.05	0.19
31	SWEENY ISD	7.35	85.48	8.48
130	SWEETWATER ISD	2.11	74.40	2.51
129	TAFT ISD	2.14	70.58	-0.10
256	TATUM ISD	-3.37	69.10	2.00
278	TAYLOR ISD	-4.97	65.88	-7.11
197	TEAGUE ISD	-1.12	75.72	1.42
272	TEMPLE ISD	-4.60	67.07	-2.70
104	TERRELL ISD	3.36	72.03	5.07

131	TEXAS CITY ISD	2.07	76.88	1.85
138	TOMBALL ISD	1.51	76.93	1.67
195	TROY ISD	-1.03	74.20	-7.05
173	TULIA ISD	0.04	71.22	-4.16
45	TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD	6.16	79.82	7.99
223	TYLER ISD	-1.85	69.43	2.81
121	UNITED ISD	2.45	69.82	-1.29
163	UVALDE CONS ISD	0.37	67.12	0.95
10	VALLEY VIEW ISD	10.99	82.20	9.34
215	VENUS ISD	-1.53	62.70	1.18
179	VERNON ISD	-0.20	72.75	-0.92
143	VICTORIA ISD	1.21	72.25	-0.64
65	WACO ISD	5.10	72.03	1.77
312	WALLER ISD	-7.39	62.30	-5.86
216	WAXAHACHIE ISD	-1.54	75.95	1.10
206	WEATHERFORD ISD	-1.36	72.18	-1.67
69	WESLACO ISD	4.94	78.88	4.39
234	WEST OSO ISD	-2.24	65.65	-12.21
78	WHARTON ISD	4.57	76.50	-0.17
167	WHITE SETTLEMENT ISD	0.26	72.22	1.07
147	WICHITA FALLS ISD	1.04	74.20	-0.44
28	WILLIS ISD	7.65	76.25	7.94
245	WILMER-HUTCHINS ISD	-2.77	56.90	1.15
153	WYLIE ISD	0.75	77.53	2.53
33	YSLETA ISD	7.32	78.47	3.59
303	ZAPATA COUNTY ISD	-6.67	59.70	-4.10