

**THE BEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS**  
**FOR LATINO STUDENTS 2002-2005**

Claudia Munoz

Texas A&M University – Prairie View

and

Daniel Hawes

Texas A&M University

A REPORT OF THE  
TEXAS EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE PROJECT

For further information, contact: Daniel Hawes at [dhawes@polisci.tamu.edu](mailto:dhawes@polisci.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 recommendation for greater quality and equity in Texas school systems.

## **The Best School Districts in Texas for Latino Students 2002-2005**

The education of minority students is a pertinent concern for education leaders and policy-maker in Texas. In recent years, Latino students have made significant gains on state exams. While Latino students' test scores continue to lag behind Anglo scores, Latino students 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. However, since the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year, when Texas changed their tests from the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills to the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, Latino pass rates have dropped slightly.<sup>1</sup> The Texas Educational Excellence Project believes that by identifying those districts that do a better job in educating Latino students, Latino performance can be further improved. The programs and policies used by exemplary districts may then be used as a standard by which other districts can measure and improve their own performance.

Los Fresnos CISD is an example of one such exemplary district, ranking 1<sup>st</sup> as the best school district for Latino students in Texas. Much of the success of the Los Fresnos school district may be attributed to various resources and environmental factors such as the district's special department of child nutrition and their very competitive bilingual program. This year, Los Fresnos CISD also implemented a program known as Gradespeed: Parent Connection, which offers parents an online view of teachers' grade books. One of the features of the program allows parents to log on and view their child's grades. Los Fresnos CISD's ultimate goal is to strengthen the partnership they currently enjoy with parents in order to enhance student achievement. Other districts that are performing well are Lubbock-Cooper ISD and La Joya ISD.

Lubbock-Cooper ISD administrators implemented a "Walk-through" policy that sets a minimum number of classroom walk-through appraisals to be conducted by district administrators. The emphasis on academics has produced positive results. LCISD has advanced from "Acceptable" to "Exemplary" in the TEA's academic accountability ratings. Granting safety for all students and ensuring technological improvement are also two of the main issues that LCISD has been very successful at. La Joya ISD has made notable improvement since 2003 when it was ranked 12<sup>th</sup> in the TEEP evaluation. Last year, La Joya ISD launched a program called District Improvement Plan in which one of the main goals was to implement a well balanced, challenging, and aligned curriculum instruction and assessment program to promote learning at high levels and develop advanced occupational skills. Obviously, their program was successful because this year, La Joya ISD which is among the districts with over 15,000 students, was ranked 2<sup>nd</sup> in the overall list.

The Texas Educational Excellence Project uses an analytical technique called

---

<sup>1</sup> In fact, pass rates dropped for all students in the transition from TAAS to TAKS, largely due to the higher standards of the TAKS.

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 TAKS exam) 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 2002-2005 Education Production Function**

The dependent variable in our production function is the school district's TAKS pass rate for Latino students.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 pass rates significantly dropped between these two tests due to higher standards of the latter test, the correlation between them is very high. For this reason, this analysis uses the TAAS scores for the first year of data only and the TAKS scores for the last three years. We employed the TEA's transitional passing criteria for the TAKS pass rates; thus, in 2003 districts within 2 standard errors of measurement (SEM) of the panel recommendation (PR) standard were considered passing. In 2004, the passing standard was 1 SEM of PR and in 2005 the PR was used as passing criteria.

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 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 with no degree, and the average number of years of teaching experience. We expect that teacher experience should contribute to student performance, while the percent of teachers with no degree 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 John 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 2002 to 2005. Serial correlation, resulting from any trends in the variables over time, needs to be controlled for in any pooled time series analysis. Thus, a series of dummy variables for each year are used to control of serial correlation.

Table 1 shows the basic production function equation. Six of the 11 variables are statistically significant. These include percent low-income students, percent gifted students, attendance, teacher experience, teacher salary, and the education level of Latinos in the district. 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 producing a 14 point increase in Latino pass rates with every one percent increase in high school diplomas.

It should be noted, however, that schools have little or no control over some of 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. La Joya ISD, for example, was predicted by the model to have an average Latino pass rate of 55.01 for the period of 2002-2005. Their actual average pass rate was 65.15; thus, 13.14% more Latino students passed the TAKS than expected. This significant achievement advances La Joya ISD from 12<sup>th</sup> place in the last TEEP report to second place for the 2002-2005 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 2002 to 2005. The last column is the residual score for the 2005 TAKS exam only. Los Fresnos ISD performed 13.16 points better than expected, placing it in the top rank, followed closely by La Joya (+12.68) and Valley View (+12.92).

The best 25 school districts for Latino students in 2005 only are listed in Table 3. Lubbock-Cooper ISD is ranked number one followed by Kaufman and Childress. All of these schools have made a large improvement since 2003. For instance, Lubbock-Cooper ISD was ranked 42<sup>nd</sup> on our list for Latino Student performance in 2003, while Kaufman and Childress were 16<sup>th</sup> and 52<sup>nd</sup>, respectively. 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 13.14 for 2003-2005 average followed by Galena Park (+11.79) and Aldine (+10.39). These three districts were also ranked first, second and third in 2003. .

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**

	<b>Latino Pass Rate</b>
Percent Low Income	-0.129 (10.89)**
Percent Gifted	0.194 (3.04)**
Attendance	3.149 (12.14)**
Average Teacher Salary (1000s)	0.422 (4.32)**
Class Size	0.301 (1.53)
Teacher Experience	0.665 (6.83)**
% Teachers with No Degree	-0.087 (1.54)
State Aid	-0.004 (0.34)
Instructional Expenditures	-0.000 (0.73)
High School Education	14.130 (6.20)**
% Poverty Background	3.432 (2.03)
2003	-22.316 (47.73)**
2004	-21.294 (38.79)**
2005	-27.262 (46.21)**
Constant	-246.973 (9.78)**
Observations	1468
R-squared	0.77

Absolute value of t statistics in parentheses

\* Significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

**Table 2. Top 40 Districts**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>2002-2005 Score</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>	<b>2005 Score</b>
1	LOS FRESNOS CISD	13.16	71.82	14.37
2	LA JOYA ISD	13.14	65.15	10.76
3	VALLEY VIEW ISD	12.92	70.68	12.65
4	GALENA PARK ISD	11.79	70.25	9.74
4	ANGLETON ISD	11.62	80.63	13.61
6	MOUNT VERNON ISD	11.60	77.50	12.24
7	BALLINGER ISD	11.58	74.35	8.06
8	HIDALGO ISD	11.34	70.97	8.29
9	DENVER CITY ISD	11.18	75.93	10.95
10	BANGS ISD	11.14	75.00	9.86
11	GRAND SALINE ISD	10.70	69.78	7.68
12	ALDINE ISD	10.39	71.55	9.28
13	GRANDVIEW ISD	9.99	73.72	11.70
14	ORANGE GROVE ISD	9.73	71.65	12.44
15	ALVIN ISD	9.60	71.50	11.08
16	KAUFMAN ISD	9.55	72.13	14.62
17	CALHOUN COUNTY ISD	9.45	70.10	8.33
18	QUITMAN ISD	9.37	75.10	7.65
19	LIBERTY HILL ISD	9.32	75.97	6.83
20	SOUTH TEXAS ISD	9.25	82.90	9.33
21	HILLSBORO ISD	9.25	67.20	12.12
22	DEL VALLE ISD	9.22	64.05	5.42
23	MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD	9.19	74.38	8.36
24	ROOSEVELT ISD	9.07	68.30	14.16
25	KERRVILLE ISD	9.00	72.05	10.32
26	MCKINNEY ISD	8.93	72.30	12.59
27	LLANO ISD	8.43	72.72	9.02
28	PLEASANTON ISD	8.13	67.00	6.56
29	COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD	7.85	73.93	8.86
30	SHARYLAND ISD	7.71	73.68	9.49
31	FRISCO ISD	7.62	76.22	12.31
32	GATESVILLE ISD	7.50	70.35	9.33
33	ALPINE ISD	7.50	71.25	13.55
34	WILLIS ISD	7.34	67.60	7.40
35	MIDWAY ISD	6.86	75.85	10.83
36	LUBBOCK-COPPER ISD	6.86	74.47	15.25
37	CUERO ISD	6.85	68.60	2.51
38	FRENSHIP ISD	6.81	72.28	8.65
39	DUMAS ISD	6.75	67.90	9.79
40	GIDDINGS ISD	6.72	70.20	12.34

**Table 3. Top 25 Districts for 2005**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>2002-05 Score</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>	<b>2005 Score</b>
1	LUBBOCK-COOPER ISD	6.86	74.47	15.25
2	KAUFMAN ISD	9.55	72.13	14.62
3	CHILDRESS ISD	5.31	67.63	14.53
4	LOS FRESNOS CISD	13.16	71.82	14.37
5	ROOSEVELT ISD	9.07	68.30	14.16
6	ANGLETON ISD	11.62	80.63	13.61
7	ALPINE ISD	7.50	71.25	13.55
8	ANAHUAC ISD	4.73	66.90	13.39
9	VALLEY VIEW ISD	12.92	70.68	12.65
10	MCKINNEY ISD	8.93	72.30	12.59
11	ORANGE GROVE ISD	9.73	71.65	12.44
12	GIDDINGS ISD	6.72	70.20	12.34
13	FRISCO ISD	7.62	76.22	12.31
14	MOUNT VERNON ISD	11.60	77.50	12.24
15	HILLSBORO ISD	9.25	67.20	12.12
16	GRANDVIEW ISD	9.99	73.72	11.70
17	ALVIN ISD	9.60	71.50	11.08
18	DENVER CITY ISD	11.18	75.93	10.95
19	MIDWAY ISD	6.86	75.85	10.83
20	LA JOYA ISD	13.14	65.15	10.76
21	HUDSON ISD	4.05	65.47	10.63
22	KERRVILLE ISD	9.00	72.05	10.32
23	MINEOLA ISD	4.52	68.72	10.18
24	BANGS ISD	11.14	75.00	9.86
25	DIBOLL ISD	6.03	63.68	9.85

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

<b>Rank</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>2002-05 Score</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>	<b>2005 Score</b>
1	LA JOYA ISD	13.14	65.15	10.76
2	GALENA PARK ISD	11.79	70.25	9.74
3	ALDINE ISD	10.39	71.55	9.28
4	MCKINNEY ISD	8.93	72.30	12.59
5	FRISCO ISD	7.62	76.22	12.31
6	WESLACO ISD	6.41	68.88	7.92
7	YSLETA ISD	5.76	66.53	4.57
8	PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD	5.61	63.40	5.93
9	HARLINGEN CISD	4.99	67.82	5.19
10	ABILENE ISD	4.64	67.65	3.62

**Appendix. Scores for All Schools**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>2002-05 Score</b>	<b>Pass Rate</b>	<b>2005 Score</b>
73	ABILENE ISD	4.64	67.65	3.62
333	ALAMO HEIGHTS ISD	-6.72	70.97	-8.95
12	ALDINE ISD	10.39	71.55	9.28
58	ALICE ISD	5.44	57.65	3.61
303	ALIEF ISD	-5.14	57.95	-1.91
33	ALPINE ISD	7.50	71.25	13.55
186	ALVARADO ISD	-0.35	58.03	-5.77
15	ALVIN ISD	9.60	71.50	11.08
144	AMARILLO ISD	1.11	61.53	0.80
70	ANAHUAC ISD	4.73	66.90	13.39
5	ANGLETON ISD	11.62	80.63	13.61
109	ARANSAS COUNTY ISD	2.49	62.92	-0.79
278	ARANSAS PASS ISD	-3.73	55.82	-2.09
310	ARLINGTON ISD	-5.29	61.78	-6.09
322	ATHENS ISD	-5.63	55.92	-7.18
56	AUBREY ISD	5.56	67.47	6.41
7	BALLINGER ISD	11.58	74.35	8.06
96	BANDERA ISD	3.58	67.47	4.27
10	BANGS ISD	11.14	75.00	9.86
54	BARBERS HILL ISD	5.62	78.00	7.93
216	BASTROP ISD	-1.08	59.05	-0.67
84	BAY CITY ISD	4.25	63.10	1.30
327	BELLVILLE ISD	-5.86	63.20	-5.21
142	BELTON ISD	1.20	64.25	1.02
329	BIRDVILLE ISD	-6.18	63.60	-9.50
66	BISHOP CISD	4.88	69.28	2.87
51	BOERNE ISD	5.94	75.20	8.15
220	BORGER ISD	-1.26	58.83	-2.62
123	BOYD ISD	2.08	61.05	4.93
145	BRADY ISD	1.10	63.58	2.79
57	BRAZOSPORT ISD	5.45	72.97	2.00
270	BRECKENRIDGE ISD	-3.39	57.15	-6.22
156	BRENHAM ISD	0.71	64.60	2.13
308	BRIDGEPORT ISD	-5.27	59.13	-11.91
131	BROOKS COUNTY ISD	1.81	57.05	-2.47
354	BROWNFIELD ISD	-9.35	49.33	-5.22
124	BROWNSVILLE ISD	2.06	61.35	2.90
71	BROWNWOOD ISD	4.67	64.80	8.63
161	BRYAN ISD	0.55	59.20	0.09
68	BURNET CISD	4.74	66.32	1.82
53	CALLEN ISD	5.63	75.40	4.93
167	CALDWELL ISD	0.35	62.78	-0.89
17	CALHOUN COUNTY ISD	9.45	70.10	8.33
199	CAMERON ISD	-0.62	60.63	-4.62

231	CANUTILLO ISD	-1.67	59.45	-2.74
152	CANYON ISD	0.86	72.93	0.00
240	CARRIZO SPRINGS CISD	-1.97	56.35	-0.12
219	CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH ISD	-1.23	64.30	0.78
350	CASTLEBERRY ISD	-8.93	45.97	-9.37
348	CEDAR HILL ISD	-8.79	60.22	-10.42
337	CELINA ISD	-7.42	61.17	0.10
259	CENTER ISD	-2.85	57.33	6.36
232	CHANNELVIEW ISD	-1.70	58.67	-3.26
302	CHAPEL HILL ISD	-5.06	56.40	-1.92
61	CHILDRESS ISD	5.31	67.63	14.53
181	CLEAR CREEK ISD	-0.12	73.38	3.41
347	CLEBURNE ISD	-8.68	56.88	-6.92
355	CLEVELAND ISD	-9.37	46.47	-2.08
242	CLIFTON ISD	-2.05	60.97	-3.05
208	CLINT ISD	-0.86	58.17	-4.67
241	COLLEGE STATION ISD	-2.00	74.55	-2.42
29	COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD	7.85	73.93	8.86
367	COLUMBUS ISD	-16.62	50.78	-14.41
239	COMAL ISD	-1.95	66.88	-2.27
184	COMANCHE ISD	-0.29	61.20	2.40
243	COMFORT ISD	-2.05	60.30	-9.45
266	COMMUNITY ISD	-3.07	54.58	4.03
149	CONNALLY ISD	0.97	62.90	4.81
185	CONROE ISD	-0.31	66.78	0.83
50	COPPERAS COVE ISD	5.98	72.65	7.07
233	CORPUS CHRISTI ISD	-1.76	61.70	-1.70
154	CORRIGAN-CAMDEN ISD	0.76	57.65	-3.95
225	CORSICANA ISD	-1.34	59.42	1.60
351	COTULLA ISD	-8.97	45.05	-7.88
309	CROCKETT ISD	-5.27	52.00	-4.68
147	CROSBY ISD	1.02	64.82	-6.46
120	CROWLEY ISD	2.13	72.53	-0.20
339	CRYSTAL CITY ISD	-7.62	49.15	-8.69
37	CUERO ISD	6.85	68.60	2.51
202	CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS ISD	-0.67	68.57	-1.12
222	DALHART ISD	-1.27	57.03	-7.06
316	DALLAS ISD	-5.48	56.60	-4.11
283	DAYTON ISD	-3.87	53.97	-7.56
275	DECATUR ISD	-3.57	61.47	-6.05
101	DEER PARK ISD	3.29	74.35	2.68
22	DEL VALLE ISD	9.22	64.05	5.42
346	DENTON ISD	-8.66	57.25	-11.74
9	DENVER CITY ISD	11.18	75.93	10.95
274	DESOTO ISD	-3.57	61.50	-5.76
342	DEVINE ISD	-7.83	55.60	-6.13
49	DIBOLL ISD	6.03	63.68	9.85
115	DICKINSON ISD	2.29	61.58	5.04

170	DIMMITT ISD	0.30	54.72	3.32
318	DONNA ISD	-5.54	48.92	-4.34
92	DRIPPING SPRINGS ISD	3.86	74.30	6.00
332	DUBLIN ISD	-6.61	52.88	-5.74
39	DUMAS ISD	6.75	67.90	9.79
136	DUNCANVILLE ISD	1.48	66.53	2.62
343	EAGLE MT-SAGINAW ISD	-8.24	60.22	-6.62
41	EAGLE PASS ISD	6.69	65.55	8.06
67	EARLY ISD	4.80	74.03	5.04
257	EAST CENTRAL ISD	-2.76	63.47	-3.17
256	EAST CHAMBERS ISD	-2.72	59.72	1.46
125	EASTLAND ISD	1.98	66.03	6.90
180	ECTOR COUNTY ISD	-0.12	58.17	-1.69
293	EDCOUCH-ELSA ISD	-4.55	55.92	-5.26
150	EDGEWOOD ISD	0.89	56.00	-2.62
89	EDINBURG CISD	4.00	63.45	3.93
289	EDNA ISD	-4.26	56.75	-4.82
175	EL CAMPO ISD	0.07	63.42	-4.38
299	EL PASO ISD	-4.87	57.08	-5.01
358	ELGIN ISD	-10.54	49.55	-13.02
178	ENNIS ISD	-0.09	63.83	0.46
158	EVERMAN ISD	0.64	64.65	0.69
255	FABENS ISD	-2.70	54.03	-3.34
356	FAIRFIELD ISD	-9.51	55.83	0.07
126	FARMERSVILLE ISD	1.94	68.82	5.32
47	FERRIS ISD	6.09	65.90	5.02
69	FLORESVILLE ISD	4.74	64.75	2.91
72	FLOUR BLUFF ISD	4.64	70.18	4.76
268	FLOYDADA ISD	-3.18	53.33	-4.18
335	FORT BEND ISD	-6.98	65.38	-7.01
133	FORT WORTH ISD	1.60	59.25	-0.89
363	FREDERICKSBURG ISD	-11.14	54.38	-10.06
38	FRENSHIP ISD	6.81	72.28	8.65
31	FRISCO ISD	7.62	76.22	12.31
352	FT STOCKTON ISD	-9.14	52.08	-8.72
362	GAINESVILLE ISD	-11.02	51.83	-8.20
4	GALENA PARK ISD	11.79	70.25	9.74
93	GALVESTON ISD	3.78	62.83	0.57
277	GARLAND ISD	-3.70	63.05	-3.60
32	GATESVILLE ISD	7.50	70.35	9.33
111	GEORGE WEST ISD	2.38	68.03	-1.82
160	GEORGETOWN ISD	0.56	67.13	5.04
40	GIDDINGS ISD	6.72	70.20	12.34
254	GLEN ROSE ISD	-2.63	63.57	-4.61
253	GODLEY ISD	-2.60	57.47	-2.03
83	GOLIAD ISD	4.26	69.95	-0.13
196	GONZALES ISD	-0.56	57.03	1.99
97	GOOSE CREEK CISD	3.58	65.57	4.23

110	GRAHAM ISD	2.43	67.57	7.61
297	GRANBURY ISD	-4.80	58.00	-8.19
229	GRAND PRAIRIE ISD	-1.61	61.20	-5.39
11	GRAND SALINE ISD	10.70	69.78	7.68
13	GRANDVIEW ISD	9.99	73.72	11.70
169	GRAPE CREEK ISD	0.31	57.08	-7.13
164	GREENVILLE ISD	0.42	58.60	-0.74
130	GREENWOOD ISD	1.84	71.72	-1.02
244	GREGORY-PORTLAND ISD	-2.18	67.82	-3.30
99	GROESBECK ISD	3.55	63.80	-1.75
46	HARLANDALE ISD	6.27	62.53	1.05
65	HARLINGEN CISD	4.99	67.82	5.19
284	HAYS CISD	-3.92	60.10	-6.37
345	HEARNE ISD	-8.34	47.13	-7.76
353	HEMPSTEAD ISD	-9.22	51.58	-13.10
258	HENDERSON ISD	-2.82	60.32	2.19
203	HEREFORD ISD	-0.77	59.22	-7.08
8	HIDALGO ISD	11.34	70.97	8.29
21	HILLSBORO ISD	9.25	67.20	12.12
366	HITCHCOCK ISD	-14.61	44.95	-11.97
267	HONDO ISD	-3.18	57.03	-7.13
211	HOUSTON ISD	-0.90	58.65	-3.92
87	HUDSON ISD	4.05	65.47	10.63
338	HUMBLE ISD	-7.50	63.55	-7.86
326	HUNTSVILLE ISD	-5.84	57.92	-4.71
263	HURST-EULESS-BEDFORD ISD	-2.92	69.45	-3.69
140	HUTTO ISD	1.24	68.20	-3.28
193	INGLESIDE ISD	-0.50	63.17	1.59
287	INGRAM ISD	-4.23	55.53	-4.56
245	IRVING ISD	-2.24	60.30	-4.91
192	JACKSONVILLE ISD	-0.47	54.78	3.18
106	JIM HOGG COUNTY ISD	3.01	61.83	5.03
105	JOSHUA ISD	3.05	66.53	4.01
134	JOURDANTON ISD	1.55	63.50	2.08
226	JUDSON ISD	-1.47	63.45	0.15
218	KATY ISD	-1.18	72.30	-1.15
16	KAUFMAN ISD	9.55	72.13	14.62
188	KELLER ISD	-0.40	72.55	0.43
155	KENNEDALE ISD	0.75	67.28	-1.03
307	KERMIT ISD	-5.24	53.80	-8.44
25	KERRVILLE ISD	9.00	72.05	10.32
292	KILGORE ISD	-4.50	55.35	-4.60
168	KILLEEN ISD	0.35	66.03	3.74
189	KINGSVILLE ISD	-0.40	57.42	0.40
280	KLEIN ISD	-3.83	68.82	-4.22
340	KRUM ISD	-7.64	56.20	-4.71
141	LA FERIA ISD	1.22	63.70	-0.79
94	LA GRANGE ISD	3.73	67.88	-0.58

2	LA JOYA ISD	13.14	65.15	10.76
162	LA MARQUE ISD	0.53	60.45	-1.28
116	LA PORTE ISD	2.29	71.75	5.41
191	LA VEGA ISD	-0.46	53.97	1.74
247	LA VERNIA ISD	-2.28	69.45	-1.34
119	LAGO VISTA ISD	2.13	72.18	2.54
217	LAKE DALLAS ISD	-1.13	64.60	-4.57
163	LAKE TRAVIS ISD	0.50	73.25	-0.23
221	LAKE WORTH ISD	-1.26	49.13	3.44
214	LAMAR CISD	-1.00	63.95	-2.01
290	LAMESA ISD	-4.31	55.20	-4.42
271	LAMPASAS ISD	-3.42	59.70	-6.44
319	LANCASTER ISD	-5.59	54.60	-11.55
359	LAREDO ISD	-10.58	50.40	-15.80
117	LEANDER ISD	2.29	70.85	4.64
281	LEWISVILLE ISD	-3.86	68.97	-0.87
19	LIBERTY HILL ISD	9.32	75.97	6.83
294	LIBERTY ISD	-4.56	55.92	-2.60
298	LITTLE ELM ISD	-4.84	54.03	3.38
235	LITTLEFIELD ISD	-1.80	60.78	2.07
212	LIVINGSTON ISD	-0.94	58.95	2.46
27	LLANO ISD	8.43	72.72	9.02
223	LONGVIEW ISD	-1.28	59.53	-1.11
1	LOS FRESNOS CISD	13.16	71.82	14.37
228	LUBBOCK ISD	-1.58	61.45	-3.54
36	LUBBOCK-COOPER ISD	6.86	74.47	15.25
86	LUFKIN ISD	4.08	66.32	6.25
357	LULING ISD	-10.15	48.65	-18.18
260	LYFORD CISD	-2.86	54.13	-5.43
300	LYTLE ISD	-4.90	53.22	-7.61
60	MADISONVILLE CISD	5.37	67.07	6.85
317	MAGNOLIA ISD	-5.51	56.78	-0.95
365	MANOR ISD	-14.26	41.75	-13.00
194	MANSFIELD ISD	-0.52	69.57	-0.34
100	MARBLE FALLS ISD	3.39	66.10	3.94
103	MARION ISD	3.22	72.28	3.20
364	MARLIN ISD	-13.69	41.38	-16.20
88	MARSHALL ISD	4.04	65.90	7.99
330	MATHIS ISD	-6.35	50.85	-8.39
118	MCALLEN ISD	2.19	66.10	1.81
127	MCGREGOR ISD	1.87	66.40	-1.28
26	MCKINNEY ISD	8.93	72.30	12.59
325	MEDINA VALLEY ISD	-5.78	58.25	-2.61
224	MERCEDES ISD	-1.29	57.35	-0.84
198	MERKEL ISD	-0.60	64.05	-5.25
273	MESQUITE ISD	-3.55	64.65	-4.58
102	MEXIA ISD	3.28	60.80	4.17
129	MIDLAND ISD	1.86	63.63	3.18

264	MIDLOTHIAN ISD	-3.03	68.65	-1.15
35	MIDWAY ISD	6.86	75.85	10.83
75	MINEOLA ISD	4.52	68.72	10.18
74	MINERAL WELLS ISD	4.59	61.72	1.32
43	MISSION CISD	6.47	68.20	7.33
23	MONAHANS-WICKETT-PYOTE ISD	9.19	74.38	8.36
288	MOUNT PLEASANT ISD	-4.25	53.95	1.29
6	MOUNT VERNON ISD	11.60	77.50	12.24
78	MULESHOE ISD	4.38	62.03	5.32
313	NACOGDOCHES ISD	-5.44	56.10	-2.19
360	NATALIA ISD	-10.86	45.50	-13.19
48	NAVARRO ISD	6.06	72.75	6.74
246	NAVASOTA ISD	-2.25	57.33	-4.53
312	NEEDVILLE ISD	-5.41	62.65	-5.49
323	NEW BRAUNFELS ISD	-5.68	60.10	-8.04
59	NEW CANEY ISD	5.39	65.57	9.57
79	NORTH EAST ISD	4.37	73.18	4.02
286	NORTH FOREST ISD	-4.09	47.05	0.62
98	NORTHSIDE ISD	3.56	69.53	6.70
296	ODEM-EDROY ISD	-4.80	62.35	-7.42
14	ORANGE GROVE ISD	9.73	71.65	12.44
128	PALACIOS ISD	1.86	69.00	-0.08
207	PALESTINE ISD	-0.85	59.38	2.91
344	PALMER ISD	-8.26	55.88	-4.46
285	PAMPA ISD	-3.96	59.25	-6.00
77	PASADENA ISD	4.43	67.35	5.25
64	PEARLAND ISD	5.01	76.20	8.50
324	PEARSALL ISD	-5.77	54.65	-12.05
114	PECOS-BARSTOW-TOYAH ISD	2.34	60.15	-3.03
174	PERRYTON ISD	0.09	62.38	0.62
250	PFLUGERVILLE ISD	-2.45	67.68	-4.71
55	PHARR-SAN JUAN-ALAMO ISD	5.61	63.40	5.93
334	PILOT POINT ISD	-6.78	56.47	-5.61
159	PINE TREE ISD	0.61	66.03	2.01
197	PITTSBURG ISD	-0.56	58.60	0.27
76	PLAINVIEW ISD	4.52	63.28	1.98
282	PLANO ISD	-3.87	69.65	-1.89
28	PLEASANTON ISD	8.13	67.00	6.56
122	POINT ISABEL ISD	2.08	64.18	2.48
82	PORT ARTHUR ISD	4.26	60.67	2.32
331	POTEET ISD	-6.53	48.85	-10.16
81	PRESIDIO ISD	4.29	54.72	0.83
252	PRINCETON ISD	-2.54	60.35	-4.23
113	PROGRESO ISD	2.35	55.22	0.18
171	PROSPER ISD	0.24	67.60	-2.66
18	QUITMAN ISD	9.37	75.10	7.65
151	RAYMONDVILLE ISD	0.87	53.75	-5.27
234	RED OAK ISD	-1.79	67.68	-1.53

349	RICE CISD	-8.89	51.78	-14.54
213	RICHARDSON ISD	-0.94	66.15	4.62
143	RIO GRANDE CITY CISD	1.14	57.22	3.59
237	RIO HONDO ISD	-1.85	61.90	-5.83
206	ROBINSON ISD	-0.84	70.13	-1.86
146	ROBSTOWN ISD	1.05	54.15	-3.89
320	ROCKDALE ISD	-5.60	59.15	-9.83
215	ROCKWALL ISD	-1.02	68.63	4.77
176	ROMA ISD	-0.03	54.38	1.22
24	ROOSEVELT ISD	9.07	68.30	14.16
201	ROUND ROCK ISD	-0.64	69.22	1.55
132	ROYAL ISD	1.71	60.00	-0.80
62	ROYSE CITY ISD	5.13	66.00	3.41
295	SAN ANGELO ISD	-4.60	58.97	-0.60
261	SAN ANTONIO ISD	-2.87	57.45	-1.53
42	SAN BENITO CISD	6.66	65.97	3.10
341	SAN DIEGO ISD	-7.77	48.35	-8.13
321	SAN ELIZARIO ISD	-5.61	53.17	-10.05
305	SAN FELIPE-DEL RIO CISD	-5.20	58.55	-8.40
182	SAN MARCOS CISD	-0.18	62.63	-6.41
195	SANGER ISD	-0.55	63.00	-0.77
236	SANTA FE ISD	-1.83	62.85	-2.26
306	SANTA ROSA ISD	-5.20	53.45	-10.29
107	SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY ISD	2.64	70.22	4.20
291	SEALY ISD	-4.38	61.15	-3.74
108	SEGUIN ISD	2.61	62.83	3.94
137	SHALLOWATER ISD	1.36	64.53	2.69
30	SHARYLAND ISD	7.71	73.68	9.49
279	SHELDON ISD	-3.79	56.47	-2.34
269	SHEPHERD ISD	-3.30	52.78	4.78
153	SHERMAN ISD	0.81	63.17	5.77
104	SINTON ISD	3.12	63.42	1.27
251	SLATON ISD	-2.46	59.20	-2.27
210	SMITHVILLE ISD	-0.88	59.28	-2.61
249	SNYDER ISD	-2.38	60.57	-5.20
157	SOCORRO ISD	0.66	61.38	-2.92
139	SOMERSET ISD	1.25	56.03	-2.05
200	SOUTH SAN ANTONIO ISD	-0.63	58.17	-4.04
20	SOUTH TEXAS ISD	9.25	82.90	9.33
272	SOUTHSIDE ISD	-3.43	51.70	-6.26
45	SOUTHWEST ISD	6.32	61.60	4.14
314	SPLENDORA ISD	-5.44	52.42	-5.31
90	SPRING BRANCH ISD	3.88	67.43	5.88
121	SPRING ISD	2.09	66.90	2.76
361	STAFFORD MSD	-10.98	56.75	-20.02
311	STEPHENVILLE	-5.37	62.90	-3.72
172	SULPHUR SPRINGS ISD	0.16	65.03	-1.17
63	SWEENY ISD	5.05	73.82	0.77

112	SWEETWATER ISD	2.38	64.43	7.88
238	TAFT ISD	-1.95	54.75	-10.09
165	TATUM ISD	0.41	61.63	7.00
301	TAYLOR ISD	-5.00	56.15	-0.05
148	TEAGUE ISD	0.97	64.15	5.84
166	TEMPLE ISD	0.40	59.45	4.40
95	TERRELL ISD	3.71	63.30	2.42
173	TEXAS CITY ISD	0.15	65.22	-0.28
187	TOMBALL ISD	-0.36	67.88	-0.59
336	TORNILLO ISD	-7.34	48.72	-3.51
204	TROY ISD	-0.80	64.57	7.77
248	TULIA ISD	-2.30	57.08	-3.93
80	TULOSO-MIDWAY ISD	4.35	69.47	4.49
183	TYLER ISD	-0.28	61.72	-1.48
177	UNITED ISD	-0.04	61.03	-0.14
138	UVALDE CISD	1.32	56.47	0.48
3	VALLEY VIEW ISD	12.92	70.68	12.65
304	VAN ISD	-5.20	55.90	-4.68
179	VENUS ISD	-0.10	54.00	-4.04
276	VERNON ISD	-3.61	59.78	-5.06
209	VICTORIA ISD	-0.87	59.10	-0.20
85	WACO ISD	4.09	60.07	1.30
265	WALLER ISD	-3.04	58.53	3.72
190	WAXAHACHIE ISD	-0.44	68.15	-2.60
205	WEATHERFORD ISD	-0.83	63.50	-0.60
44	WESLACO ISD	6.41	68.88	7.92
315	WEST OSO ISD	-5.48	50.22	-4.11
262	WHARTON ISD	-2.90	60.95	-9.97
91	WHITE SETTLEMENT ISD	3.88	66.18	6.43
227	WICHITA FALLS ISD	-1.48	62.30	-0.28
34	WILLIS ISD	7.34	67.60	7.40
328	WILMER-HUTCHINS ISD	-5.94	48.83	-24.14
135	WYLIE ISD	1.53	71.35	7.20
52	YSLETA ISD	5.76	66.53	4.57
230	ZAPATA COUNTY ISD	-1.63	52.10	5.28