LATINO STUDENT IMPROVEMENTS ON THE TAAS EXAM

A Report of the Texas Educational Excellence Project

Texas A&M University

University of Texas-Pan American

John Bohte
J. L. Polinard
Kenneth J. Meier
Robert D. Wrinkle

For further information contact:

John Bohte, Department of Political Science, Texas A&M University,
409-845- 2327 johnny@polisci.tamu.edu

J. L. Polinard, Department of Political Science, University of Texas-Pan American
965-381-3341 Polinard@panam.edu

or visit us on the world wide web at
http://people.tamu.edu/~kmeier/

LATINO STUDENT IMPROVEMENTS ON THE TAAS EXAM

The pass rates for Latino students in Texas on the TAAS exam have lagged behind those for Anglo students. Recent trends in Latino test scores are encouraging, however. From 1991 to 1997, the statewide pass rate for Latino students on the TAAS has improved from 41.5% to 61.9%, compared to a rate of change for non-minority students of 68.9% to 84.9%. This improvement in Latino pass rates is notable, but much more progress is needed. One of the major goals of the Texas Educational Excellence Project is identifying those school districts that have made significant strides in improving the performance of Latino students on the TAAS exam. By identifying exemplary districts, we hope to provide the public and policy makers with information that will inform future policy making efforts aimed at improving Latino education in Texas.

The approach of the Texas Educational Excellence Project is to use a statistical technique, multiple regression analysis, as a tool for identifying the top school districts in Texas for Latino students. Multiple regression analysis makes it possible to develop generalizations about the overall performance of Texas school districts in educating Latino students, while also providing information that can be used to make comparisons across individual school districts. Our model is based on an education "production function" where student performance (defined as Latino pass rates on the TAAS) is a function of inputs into the educational process, such as operating expenditures, student-teacher ratios, and various educational policies. Estimation of this production function results in predictions about how well districts are expected to do, given the level of inputs available to them. Based on the results of the production function model, we compare how well districts *actually* perform to how well the statistical model *predicts* they should perform based on their inputs. The difference, if any, between the actual results and the predictions indicates how well districts are doing in educating Latino students.

Our units of analysis are 350 Texas school districts with at least 1000 students. To make sure that the districts are performing relatively similar functions, we further limit the analysis to districts with some but no more than 90 percent Anglo students and at least 10 percent Latino students, that is, multiethnic districts. This reduces our total number of districts to 262. Our data come from two basic sources: The Texas Educational Agency and the U. S. Bureau of the Census, School District Data File.

Dependent Variable: Student Performance

The state of Texas requires students in certain grades to take standardized TAAS tests every year. The percentage of Latino students in each district who pass these tests is the dependent variable in our analysis. We do not claim that results on TAAS exams account for the overall learning experience of Latino students. Student performance is a multi-dimensional

concept that can be measured in variety of different ways. However, pass rates on TAAS exams **do** measure whether students are picking up basic academic skills from grade to grade. Our dependent variable, therefore, focuses primarily on how well districts perform in teaching Latino students basic skills, and should not be construed as an overall measure of Latino student learning.

Independent Variables

A variety of factors known to influence education performance are included in our production function. All the independent variables are culled from the education literature and are frequently used in education production functions. Essentially, we use two sets of independent variables in our analysis. The first set of variables includes resource input and educational policy variables. The second set of variables includes measures that control for differences in environmental characteristics across school districts.

Resource and Policy Variables

1. Expenditures. The relationship between expenditures and educational outcomes is one of the most contested relationships in educational policy. Examining a wealth of studies, Hanushek (1986; 1989; 1996) contends that there is no consistent relationship between money and student outcomes. Although this finding has been challenged by others (Hedges and Greenwald 1996), it remains the conventional wisdom. In recent longitudinal studies, however, Murray (1995), Evans, Murray and Schwab (1997), and Murray, Evans and Schwab (1995) found that districts that increased expenditures had improved performance afterward.

Our expenditure variables include per pupil operating expenditures, teacher salaries, and the percentage of district money from state funds. Per pupil operating expenditures are used in preference to total per pupil spending because many Texas districts spend lavishly on non-operating activities. Education is personnel intensive, and most spending pays salaries of teachers and other staff. Higher salaries are perceived in economic theory as a way to attract better qualified persons to a profession (Hanushek and Pace 1995). Finally, state aid can be used to compensate for inequities in local tax bases. Although Texas is not known for redistributive educational policies and has a long history in court on this issue (*San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriquez*, 1973; *Edgewood Independent School District v. Kirby*, 1987; See also Texas Research League 1986; Accountable Cost Advisory Committee 1986; Weiher 1988), greater funds from state governments can compensate for a meager local tax base. The relationships between these expenditure variables and district Latino pass rates should be positive - i.e., more financial resources should lead to better performance on TAAS exams.

2. Teacher Attributes. Teachers are a crucial force in shaping student performance. As a profession based on life-long learning, there should be some advantage in having teachers with

adequate experience, especially in multiracial districts. The presence of more experienced teachers should have a positive effect on student performance. In this sense, teacher experience can be viewed as an important resource variable. Our first variable is a measure of average teacher experience (in years) for each district. To further tap into the concept of experience, we also include the percentage of non-certified teachers in each district. Our expectation is that this relationship should be negative.

3. Policy Variables. Education policies are adopted to influence student performance. Two such policies deal with student learning environment--class size and gifted classes. Although many studies indicate that only major changes in class size are effective, schools with smaller class sizes should have an advantage at the margins (see Pate-Bain et al. 1992; Nye et al. 1992; Hedges and Greenwald 1996; Hanushek 1996, 54). Our first policy variable is the student-teacher ratio in each district. Gifted classes are generally viewed as venues for providing the best education that a school system can offer (See DeHaan 1963). The number of students enrolled in gifted classes varies greatly across school districts in Texas (0 to 31%). Greater access to gifted classes should result in better student performance. To summarize, class size should have a negative relationship to exam performance, while the availability of gifted classes should be positively related to exam performance.

Control Variables

School districts vary widely in terms of environmental or background characteristics. To ensure that we are comparing apples to applies, controls must be included for various district background characteristics. Controlling for district background characteristics is also a crucial step that facilitates comparisons of findings across different school districts.

Our first control variable measures district poverty. In the context of educational policy, poverty is a serious constraint on student performance. Poverty not only means students lack access to learning tools in the home (computers, educational toys, etc.) but is also correlated with a less stable and less supportive home environment (e.g., single parent households, high rates of teen pregnancy, and low educational expectations; Necochea and Cune 1996; Fuller et. al. 1996). Our first measure of poverty is the percent of students in each district that qualify for free or reduced-price meals in school lunch programs. As the percentage of students in poverty rises, district pass rates on TAAS exams should decline. Our second poverty measure was the percentage of Hispanic families in the school district with incomes below the poverty level.

The home educational background of Latino students is the third control variable used in the analysis. We use the percentage of Latino adults, age 25 and older with at least a high school education. Generally, minority students who come from districts in which there are large numbers of adult Latinos with strong educational backgrounds tend to perform at higher levels than students who come from districts where there are lesser numbers of educated Latinos (Meier and

Stewart 1991). The relationship between percentage of high school educated Latinos and Latino pass rates should be positive.

The fourth control variable is the percentage foreign-born residents per district. Our concern here is the performance of Latino students, and one means of controlling for recent immigration is to use the percentage foreign born citizens in each district. Our expectation is that there should be a negative relationship between percent foreign-born citizens and Latino pass rates.

Our final control variable is student attendance, measured as percentage average daily attendance. Crucial to learning is the idea that students attend class. Our expectation is that the relationship between attendance and student performance should be positive.

Findings

Our production function is based on a pooled-time series analysis of educational inputs and average Latino pass rates using data from the years 1991 through 1997. As any time series tends toward serial correlation, we include a series of dummy variables to control for any serial correlation.

The basic production function is found in Table 1. The results show that all variables, with the exception of class size, are significant predictors of average district Latino pass rates. However, the percentage of foreign born residents variable is not in the expected direction. Our expectation was that this variable would be negatively related to Latino student performance. However, the variable is strongly and **positively** related to Latino student performance. That is, when one controls for poverty, the family educational background of Latinos and various other controls, percentage foreign born has a positive influence on Latino student performance. This finding comports with other research which suggests that first generation immigrant students tend to be [relatively] high achieving (Oropesa and Landale 1997).

Our other variables perform about as expected. Student attendance is strongly related to high performance as are teacher experience, teacher salaries and state aid. Pass rates tend to be depressed in districts with high numbers of uncertified teachers, high district poverty levels, and high percentages of students from low income families. Essentially, these results are very similar to previous research on minority student achievement (see Meier and Stewart, 1991; Polinard, Wrinkle, and Meier, 1995).

As noted above both Anglo and Latino pass rates have improved statewide. For all of the school districts in the model, there was an average improvement of 21.3% in the pass rate for Latino students over the seven year period. This rate of improvement resulted in an average 1997

Latino pass rate of 63.0% for the districts in the model. Over this time period, the Anglo pass rate improved 17.0% for an average pass rate of 83.0%. The average gap between Anglo and Latino pass rates for the multiethnic districts in the study is now 20%.

Results from this education production function make it possible to identify Texas school districts that excel in teaching basic reading and mathematics skills to Latino students. For example, our model predicts that the Mission Consolidated School District should have an average Latino student pass rate of 45.3% from 1991 to 1997. Mission's actual pass rate of 56.8% represents an 11.5% improvement over this standard. The same logic is used in evaluating the entire sample of Texas school districts. The top school district for Latino students in Texas is the South Texas district, with a rating of +22.6%, followed by Mission with a rating of +11.6% and Merkel with a rating of +11.3%.

The South Texas school district is somewhat unique and may not be comparable to other districts. The South Texas district is a district that overlays several other school districts and operates magnet schools. As a result, its student body is different from that of most other districts. This qualification should not be taken to imply that South Texas is not an exceptional school district. South Texas produces excellent results for both Anglos and Latinos and has done so for an extended period of time.

The top 25 districts for Latino students are shown in table 2. The first column of that table is the numerical score on which the districts are ranked. The second column is the average pass rate for Latino students from 1991 to 1997 in the district, and the third column is the Latino student pass rate for 1997.

Our numerical score ranking is based on the average scores for 1991 through 1997. Consequently, it may not recognize districts where dramatic improvements have been made recently. For example, the Point Isabel district did not make the list of the top twenty-five Latino districts. However, Point Isabel has improved its Latino pass rate by 26 points from 1995 to 1997 and gained close to 20 points on our rating measurement. Schools that have made large improvements during this time period are quite likely to appear in our ratings in future years.

Table 3 is the alphabetical listing of all of the districts in the study. For each district we report these same scores as noted above as well as its rank among the 262 districts in the study.

Given the rate of improvement in Latino TAAS scores over the past seven years and the leadership provided by the high performing Latino districts, we expect that, over the course of the next seven years, these multiethnic districts will have an additional average improvement of more than twenty percent in the Latino TAAS pass rate.

Conclusion

TAAS scores for Latino students in Texas lag behind those for Anglo students. Although Latino students have closed this gap somewhat over the past seven years, the difference remains substantial. This study identified school districts in Texas who have done a good job of educating Latino students after adjusting for resources, backgrounds and the type of students. The districts that we identify are those that are performing well above expectations. These are the districts that educators should look to for successful programs.

Our interaction with various school districts convinces us that there are no miracles in education, for Latino students or any other types of students. Only well designed programs that are consistently applied over long periods of time produce payoffs. If the top 25 districts have anything in common, it is that, hard work over a long period of time.

The Texas Educational Excellence Project

The Texas Educational Excellence Project (TEEP) is a joint program of the political science departments at Texas A&M University and the University of Texas-Pan American. TEEP seeks to apply scholarly research to educational policy issues in order to make recommendations for greater quality and equity in Texas school systems.

References

Accountable Cost Advisory Committee. 1986. "Accountable Cost Study and Recommendations of the Accountable Cost Advisory Committee to the State Board of Education." Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Chubb, John and Terry Moe. 1990. *Politics, Markets and America's Schools*. Washington: Brookings.

DeHaan, Robert F. 1963. *Accelerated Learning Programs*. Washington: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.

Edgewood Independent School District v. Kirby. Texas SupCt, No. C-8353, (1989).

Evans, William N., Sheila E. Murray, and Robert M. Schwab. 1997. "Schoolhouses, Courthouses, and Statehouses After *Serrano*." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 16 (Winter), 10-31.

Fuller, Bruce, Costanza Eggers-Pierola, Susan D. Holloway, Xiaoyam Liang and Marylee F. Rambaud. 1996. "Rich Culture, Poor Markets: Why do Latino Parents Forego Preschooling?" *Teachers College Record* 97 (Spring):400-418.

Hanushek, Eric A. and Richard R. Pace. 1995. "Who Chooses to Teach (and Why)?" *Economics of Education Review* 14 (June):107-117.

Hanushek, Eric A. 1986. "The Economics of Schooling: Production and Efficiency in Public Schools." *Journal of Economic Literature* 24 (September):1141-1177.

Hanushek, Eric A. 1996. "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.

Hanushek, Eric A. 1989. "Expenditures, Efficiency, and Equity in Education: The Federal Government's Role." *American Economic Review* 79 (May):46-51.

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.

Lasswell, Harold. 1936. *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How?* New York: McGraw Hill.

Lipsky, Michael. 1980. *Street Level Bureaucracy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Long, Norton. 1952. "Bureaucracy and Constitutionalism." *American Political Science Review* 46 (September), 808-818.

Meier, Kenneth J. and Joseph Stewart, Jr. 1991. *The Politics of Hispanic Education*. Albany: SUNY Press.

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.

Necochea, Juan and Zullmara Cune. 1996. "A Case Study of Within District School Funding Inequities." *Equity & Excellence in Education* 29 (September): 69-77.

Nye, Barbara A., Jayne Boyd-Zacharias, B. Dewayne Fulton, and Mark P. Wallenhorst. 1992. "Smaller Classes Really are Better." *American School Board Journal* 179 (May): 31-33.

Oropesa, R. S. and Nancy S. Landale. 1997. "Immigrant Legacies." *Social Science Quarterly* 78:399-416.

Pate-Bain, Helen, C.M. Achilles, Jayne Boyd-Zacharias, and Bernard McKenna. 1992. "Class Size Does Make a Difference." *Phi Delta Kappan* 74 (November): 253-56.

Polinard, J. L., Robert D. Wrinkle and Kenneth J. Meier. 1995. "The Influence of Educational and Political Resources on Minority Students' Success," *Journal of Negro Education* 64: 463-474.

San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriquez. 411 U.S. 1 (1973).

Smith, Kevin B. and Kenneth J. Meier. 1995. *The Case Against School Choice*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Texas Research League. 1986. "Bench Marks for 1986-87 School District Budgets in Texas." Austin, TX: Texas Research League.

Weiher, Gregory R. 1988. "Why Redistribution Doesn't Work: State Educational Reform Policy and Governmental Decentralization in Texas." *American Politics Quarterly* 16 (April): 193-210.

TABLE 1: LATINO EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTION FUNCTION

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error
Low Income	-.131	.014
Gifted	.156	.052
Attendance	1.95	.211
Teacher Salary	.0004	.0001
Class size	-.126	.182*
Teacher Certification	-.237	.056
Teacher Experience	.344	.144
State Aid	.063	.010
High School Education	12.26	2.42
%Poverty Background	-10.346	2.10
%Foreign Born	20.430	3.27
Per Pupil Operating	.002	.0004
Intercept	-165.933	21.497

R^2 (adj)= .71

F= 272.89

significance of F < .000

*Not significant

Table 2. The Top 25 Texas School Districts for Latino Students

Rank	District	Score	Average TAAS	1997 TAAS
1	South Texas	22.6	85.3	92.4
2	Mission Consolidated	11.5	56.8	76.0
3	Merkel	11.3	55.5	73.3
4	Los Fresnos Consolid	10.2	54.5	82.2
5	Coleman	10.0	55.6	76.4
6	Ballinger	9.8	55.9	64.6
7	Ferris	9.8	51.2	75.9
8	Aldine	9.7	53.8	76.0
9	Childress	9.3	50.3	72.1
10	Mount Pleasant	9.1	49.8	59.7
11	San Benito Consolida	8.2	49.8	73.0
12	Freer	8.1	54.0	67.1
13	Brazosport	7.7	56.2	81.8
14	Troy	7.6	56.5	74.7
15	Columbia-Brazoria	7.3	55.1	78.4
16	Texas City	7.3	53.4	75.4
17	La Feria	7.2	51.6	76.5
18	Jim Hogg County	7.1	53.8	72.3
19	Garland	6.9	55.5	66.6
20	Calallen	6.8	56.5	76.4
21	Kaufman	6.7	47.7	67.5
22	McAllen	6.7	54.6	69.6
23	Tuloso-Midway	6.6	50.6	73.9
24	Vernon	6.4	49.0	63.1
25	La Grange	6.4	50.5	64.7
Average for 262 Districts in Study		0.0	44.7	62.8

Table 3. Scores for all Texas School Districts

Rank	District	Score	Average TAAS	1997 TAAS
107	Abilene	1.0	47.5	62.6
243	Alamo Heights	-7.1	50.1	62.1
8	Aldine	9.7	53.8	76.0
42	Alice	4.5	46.7	62.4
229	Alief	-6.0	46.8	62.6
96	Alpine	1.6	49.2	65.9
86	Alvin	2.3	48.1	66.4
71	Amarillo	2.9	46.1	64.5
41	Anahuac	4.7	48.0	71.1
72	Andrews	2.9	51.0	69.4
46	Angleton	4.3	53.3	78.9
70	Aransas County	2.9	44.8	71.3
141	Aransas Pass	-0.8	40.0	55.9
234	Austin	-6.2	38.5	51.1
6	Ballinger	9.8	55.9	64.6
245	Bandera	-7.1	37.9	68.0
200	Bastrop	-3.4	39.9	56.2
43	Bay City	4.5	44.7	65.3
37	Beeville	5.1	45.6	61.4
131	Belton	-0.2	44.9	64.9
27	Big Spring	6.1	47.5	64.6
53	Bishop Consolidated	4.0	49.7	68.6
211	Boerne	-4.0	43.7	66.0
30	Borger	5.7	51.6	71.0
103	Brady	1.3	46.6	67.3
13	Brazosport	7.7	56.2	81.8
93	Breckenridge	1.8	43.6	64.9
105	Bridgeport	1.1	46.5	66.2
151	Brooks	-1.1	39.7	52.0
208	Brownfield	-3.9	36.8	56.9
188	Brownsville	-2.8	41.4	59.5
119	Brownwood	0.3	44.3	62.3
242	Bryan	-6.9	37.6	59.1
193	Burnet Consolidated	-3.0	41.2	58.0
20	Calallen	6.8	56.5	76.4
95	Caldwell	1.6	46.9	68.5
203	Calhoun County	-3.5	39.8	62.4
102	Cameron	1.4	44.1	64.5
260	Canutillo	-11.6	36.3	50.6
91	Carrizo Springs Cons	1.9	41.1	55.7
121	Carrollton Farmers Br	0.2	51.1	65.7
98	Castleberry	1.5	46.3	61.1

129	Channelview	-0.2	48.2	66.8
9	Childress	9.3	50.3	72.1
189	Cleburne	-2.9	39.6	56.8
253	Cleveland	-8.7	31.5	43.1
146	Clint	-0.9	42.7	63.1
5	Coleman	10.0	55.6	76.4
164	Colorado	-1.7	43.3	55.7
15	Columbia-Brazoria	7.3	55.1	78.4
130	Columbus	-0.2	44.5	57.5
187	Comal	-2.8	44.7	60.1
183	Comanche	-2.6	44.1	56.4
45	Connally	4.3	51.0	74.0
74	Corpus Christi	2.8	49.4	64.3
61	Corrigan-Camden	3.6	46.1	53.3
258	Cotulla	-11.1	28.6	46.0
196	Crane	-3.2	46.2	68.9
171	Cuero	-2.0	40.8	58.6
87	Cypress-Fairbanks	2.3	55.4	67.2
117	Dalhart	0.3	44.1	67.8
109	Dallas	0.9	41.1	53.5
175	Decatur	-2.2	42.3	52.4
190	Deer Park	-2.9	48.4	64.0
79	Del Valle	2.6	43.5	68.2
238	Denton	-6.8	41.2	59.4
108	Denver City	0.9	52.4	70.5
221	Devine	-5.1	41.2	64.9
52	Diboll	4.1	45.3	62.3
248	Dickinson	-7.7	33.8	44.9
77	Dilley	2.7	40.5	63.7
201	Dimmitt	-3.4	40.0	52.6
147	Donna	-0.9	37.1	57.3
232	Dublin	-6.0	32.4	44.8
118	Dumas	0.3	42.7	61.0
134	Eagle Pass	-0.3	42.3	63.9
214	East Central	-4.2	44.4	65.3
90	Ector County	1.9	42.1	60.1
33	Edcouch-Elsa	5.6	47.0	67.8
165	Edgewood	-1.8	35.8	54.6
58	Edinburg	3.8	47.6	65.7
38	Edna	5.1	49.8	75.7
136	El Campo	-0.5	44.2	72.7
173	El Paso	-2.1	44.0	60.1
218	Elgin	-4.9	39.7	57.8
132	Ennis	-0.3	44.2	64.3
28	Everman	6.1	52.5	67.9

217	Fabens	-4.8	37.5	53.6
7	Ferris	9.8	51.2	75.9
111	Floresville	0.8	42.5	59.4
63	Flower Bluff	3.5	52.9	71.1
224	Floydada	-5.4	34.9	45.1
247	Fort Bend	-7.5	46.2	63.8
228	Fort Worth	-5.9	36.2	48.9
251	Fredericksburg	-8.6	37.9	56.2
12	Freer	8.1	54.0	67.1
49	Frenship	4.3	50.0	70.0
82	Friona	2.5	47.2	61.1
54	Frisco	4.0	49.3	60.2
186	Ft Sam Houston	-2.7	61.7	68.6
100	Ft Stockton	1.4	45.2	63.9
197	Galena Park	-3.3	42.6	62.1
106	Galveston	1.1	44.7	60.8
19	Garland	6.9	55.5	66.6
158	George West	-1.4	43.8	65.4
154	Georgetown	-1.3	50.0	60.6
219	Giddings	-4.9	41.1	64.1
237	Glen Rose	-6.7	44.6	66.0
32	Goliad	5.6	51.0	77.2
137	Gonzales	-0.6	42.0	53.3
84	Goose Creek	2.4	47.6	67.7
148	Grand Prairie	-1.0	47.7	63.6
120	Greenwood	0.3	48.1	56.3
59	Gregory-Portland	3.8	53.9	76.8
254	Harlandale	-8.7	35.9	56.9
40	Harlingen Cons.	4.9	50.8	72.3
205	Hayes Consolidated	-3.6	45.9	55.8
152	Hearne	-1.2	43.4	60.0
262	Hempstead	-13.6	27.0	55.1
122	Hereford	0.1	41.2	61.1
140	Hidalgo	-0.7	40.7	67.9
48	Hillsboro	4.3	41.7	70.3
250	Hitchcock	-8.3	36.2	44.9
143	Hondo	-0.9	41.1	57.4
177	Houston	-2.4	40.3	58.1
249	Huntsville	-8.1	39.9	57.3
76	Ingleside	2.7	47.3	60.9
174	Ingram	-2.2	45.0	57.0
44	Irving	4.4	50.7	64.7
18	Jim Hogg County	7.1	53.8	72.3
65	Jourdanton	3.4	47.8	61.2
104	Judson	1.2	53.6	69.7

21	Kaufman	6.7	47.7	67.5
135	Kenedy	-0.5	40.3	49.5
244	Kermit	-7.1	37.6	55.0
113	Kerrville	0.6	46.2	72.6
110	Killeen	0.8	51.4	70.1
116	Kingsville	0.3	45.4	60.6
17	La Feria	7.2	51.6	76.5
25	La Grange	6.4	50.5	64.7
142	La Joya	-0.9	37.2	54.6
252	La Vernia	-8.7	40.6	57.4
144	La Porte	-0.9	51.5	70.2
128	La Vega	-0.1	41.5	56.8
163	Lake Worth	-1.6	36.1	51.5
184	Lamar Consolidated	-2.7	43.5	64.2
192	Lamesa	-3.0	36.2	55.2
126	Lampasas	-0.1	43.8	68.8
170	Laredo	-1.9	45.0	61.1
145	Levelland	-0.9	43.7	59.0
39	Littlefield	5.1	45.4	65.1
66	Lockhart	3.2	44.4	63.5
4	Los Fresnos Consolid	10.2	54.5	82.2
169	Lubbock	-1.9	43.1	60.4
127	Lubbock-Cooper	-0.1	45.9	65.3
204	Lufkin	-3.6	38.6	54.9
81	Luling	2.6	43.4	58.3
80	Lyford	2.6	45.5	59.3
227	Lytle	-5.5	36.9	65.2
50	Manor	4.3	44.2	59.0
178	Marble Falls	-2.4	40.2	62.2
149	Marlin	-1.0	40.9	58.3
194	Mathis	-3.1	32.9	47.2
22	McAllen	6.7	54.6	69.6
123	McGregor	0.0	49.3	76.7
255	McKinney	-9.7	34.4	56.9
172	Medina Valley	-2.1	42.6	64.6
47	Mercedes	4.3	48.6	64.1
3	Merkel	11.3	55.5	73.3
199	Midland	-3.3	38.7	51.8
160	Mineral Wells	-1.5	41.1	54.0
2	Mission Consolidated	11.5	56.8	76.0
60	Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	3.6	49.7	74.2
10	Mount Pleasant	9.1	49.8	59.7
222	Muleshoe	-5.3	38.5	56.4
206	Navasota	-3.7	37.4	56.7
67	Needville	3.1	51.0	66.8

150	New Braunfels	-1.0	44.9	64.5
64	Newton	3.5	45.2	68.0
124	North East	-0.0	52.8	70.1
125	Northside [Bexar]	-0.1	50.0	66.0
51	Odem-Edroy	4.2	50.9	70.1
88	Orange Grove	2.0	46.4	60.7
138	Palacios	-0.6	49.2	68.3
235	Palestine	-6.6	37.1	53.7
35	Pampa	5.4	50.3	74.0
223	Pasadena	-5.3	41.6	61.5
56	Pearland	4.0	56.2	80.0
139	Pecos-Barstow-Toyah	-0.7	43.6	68.9
55	Perryton	4.0	49.6	66.5
85	Pflugerville	2.3	57.1	72.0
78	Pharr-San Juan-Alamo	2.6	46.8	63.8
34	Plainview	5.5	49.2	69.6
176	Pleasanton	-2.3	39.5	58.1
94	Point Isabel	1.7	44.7	71.9
133	Post	-0.3	43.3	70.4
233	Poteet	-6.1	34.7	52.0
231	Presidio	-6.0	34.9	45.3
153	Raymondville	-1.3	41.4	58.2
191	Reagan County	-2.9	48.6	69.6
185	Rice Consolidated	-2.7	39.5	61.8
114	Rio Hondo	0.5	44.2	65.3
92	Robstown	1.8	39.8	62.3
168	Rockdale	-1.9	41.6	58.5
209	Roosevelt	-3.9	41.7	68.1
97	Round Rock	1.6	55.1	69.0
210	Royal	-3.9	34.5	50.0
73	Royse City	2.9	50.5	74.7
180	San Marcos	-2.5	41.4	62.0
11	San Benito Consolida	8.2	49.8	73.0
155	San Diego	-1.4	38.1	46.8
256	San Antonio	-9.7	35.1	48.5
57	San Felipe-Del Rio C	3.9	47.2	64.2
261	San Elizario	-12.7	23.8	36.2
202	San Angelo	-3.5	42.9	62.0
226	Santa Rosa	-5.5	38.0	52.8
225	Schertz-Cibolo-U. Ci	-5.4	42.0	59.1
212	Sealy	-4.1	43.0	67.1
162	Seguin	-1.6	42.6	55.9
156	Seminole	-1.4	46.7	67.5
166	Shallowater	-1.8	43.3	57.9
68	Sharyland	3.0	50.1	70.2

115	Sheldon	0.3	47.9	62.7
159	Sinton	-1.5	42.1	61.0
181	Slaton	-2.5	40.1	57.3
259	Smithville	-11.5	33.8	50.8
36	Snyder	5.4	49.2	63.9
75	Socorro	2.7	49.1	65.7
230	Somerset	-6.0	32.4	54.6
198	Sonora	-3.3	47.6	53.1
195	South San Antonio	-3.1	42.3	62.1
1	South Texas	22.6	85.3	92.4
257	Southside	-10.4	29.1	42.3
246	Southwest	-7.5	33.3	53.8
241	Spring	-6.9	47.8	67.0
220	Spring Branch	-4.9	44.1	59.9
207	Stafford MSD	-3.8	45.7	62.9
83	Sweeny	2.4	52.7	71.6
215	Taft	-4.5	35.8	56.1
182	Taylor	-2.6	42.3	62.0
216	Temple	-4.6	42.4	55.2
16	Texas City	7.3	53.4	75.4
14	Troy	7.6	56.5	74.7
29	Tulia	6.0	49.7	65.5
23	Tuloso-Midway	6.6	50.6	73.9
161	Tyler	-1.6	41.9	56.1
62	United	3.5	46.0	62.7
239	Uvalde Consolidated	-6.8	34.1	54.2
112	Van Vleck	0.6	48.9	70.0
24	Vernon	6.4	49.0	63.1
89	Victoria	1.9	43.7	63.7
167	Waco	-1.9	36.8	51.2
236	Waller	-6.7	34.2	51.4
99	Waxahachie	1.4	46.8	67.8
31	Weslaco	5.7	48.5	74.2
213	West Oso	-4.1	37.0	58.5
179	Wharton	-2.4	40.3	64.2
101	Wichita Falls	1.4	47.2	68.4
26	Wilmer-Hutchins	6.2	45.5	63.2
240	Yoakum	-6.9	39.4	53.2
69	Ysleta	2.9	49.4	71.9
157	Zapata	-1.4	39.3	66.0