THE BEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

FOR LATINO STUDENTS 1996-1999

Robert D. Wrinkle

and

Nick A. Theobald

A REPORT OF THE

TEXAS EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE PROJECT

NUMBER 10 JULY 2000

For further information, contact:
http:www-bushschool.tamu.edu/kmeier/teep

Or, in South Texas
Robert D. Wrinkle, Department of Political Science, University of Texas Pan American, 956-381-3341; **rdwe116@panam1.panam.edu**

The Texas Educational Excellence Project (TEEP) is a joint program of the George Bush School of Public Service and the Department of Political Science at Texas A&M University. The project also has research associates at the University of Texas Pan American and Oakland University. 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 1996-1999

The education of minority students is of primary concern for education leaders and policy-makers in Texas. Latino students continue to lag behind Anglo students in the state's fundamental measurement of basic skills—the TAAS. In 1999, 70.1 percent of Latino students passed the TAAS, compared with 89.7% for Anglo students. This compares to scores of 54.2% for Latinos and 79.8% for Anglos in 1996. Obviously, Latino students are narrowing the gap. However, these overall gains at the state level, while impressive, are not equally distributed across all districts. Some Latino school districts have made even more impressive gains while others have fallen behind. It is the aim of the Texas Educational Excellence Project to identify school districts that do a better job of educating Latino students. The programs and policies used by the exemplary districts then may be used as a standard by which other districts can measure and improve their own performance.

The Los Fresnos Consolidated school district is an example of one such exemplary district. In 1999, 84.15% of Latino students in Los Fresnos passed the TAAS, an improvement of almost ten percent over the 1996 pass rate of 74.9%. The Los Fresnos district attributes much of their success to the way the teachers, staff and parents work together. A special focus has been on the continual development of an aligned curricula for the entire district.

Los Fresnos is a relatively small school district. As such, many of their programs and approaches might not immediately transfer to other, larger districts. However, Brazosport, a much larger district, also has an impressive record of educating Latino students. Many of their programs are not targeted specifically at Latino students, but rather at all students. By focusing on improvements for all students, the Brazosport ISD contributes to the education of minority students as well.

The analytical technique used by the Texas Educational Excellence Project to identify exemplary performing districts is multiple regression analysis. Simply comparing pass rates ignores other factors which influence performance, and many of these factors are variables in which schools have little or no control over. Multiple regression analysis allows us to assess the impact of certain policy and resource related variables while controlling for other variables. By the use of this analytical technique, TEEP can develop ratings of overall performance in educating Latino students by Texas school districts given certain levels of resources, which then allows us to make more valid comparisons across individual school districts.

The model used in this analysis is based on what the literature identifies as an "educational production function." A very large literature has been developed which 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) is a function of various inputs into the process of educating students. 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 1996-1999 Education Production Function

The dependent variable in our production function is the school district pass rate for Latino students. Each year, all Texas school districts administer the TAAS exam to students in a variety of grades. The district average for all grades is our dependent variable. Obviously, it would be egregious to claim that this variable adequately captures the entire range of learning for Latino students. 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. We make no claims that this is an overall measure of Latino student learning.

Our independent variables are of four distinct types: school district policies, measures of teacher quality, financial resources available to the district, and environmental constraints. The school district policies include class size, attendance rates, and percentage of students enrolled in gifted classes. We expect performance to be negatively related to class size. Larger classes should reduce student performance on the TAAS. The other two measures should be positively related to student performance.

Measures of teacher quality include teacher certification (measured as the percent of district teachers who only have a temporary certificate to teach in their area) and the average years of teacher experience. We expect that more experienced teachers will have a positive effect on student performance, while the percentage of noncertified teachers should be negatively related to performance.

We consider financial resources to be among the most important ingredients that school districts have to influence student performance. However, the relationship between financial resources and student performance is a controversial one among educational researchers. 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.

We use three measures of financial resources: instructional funds per pupil; the average teacher salary for the district and percent of school district funds received from the state. These

measures capture a variety of monetary influences, specific resources devoted to teaching, the ability to compete for teachers in the market as well as state efforts to overcome local inadequacies in financial resources. It is our expectation that all relationships will be positive.

Environmental constraints are factors in the district that impede student performance. Even though schools cannot alter these factors, it is important to control for these factors when assessing the performance of schools. Among constraints included in our model are the percentage of Latino families living in poverty in the district, the percentage of poor students in the district (measured by the percentage eligible for free school lunches) and the percentage of Latinos age 25 and above in the district with at least a high school education. This education variable should be positively related to performance and the other two should be negatively related. Poverty is an especially constraining factor which schools have no control over. Yet, certain districts are better at addressing the needs of students living in poverty and decreasing the negative effects that it has on student performance.

The Data

Our analysis is limited to school districts above a certain size (1000 students) and Latino student population (10%). We do this because Texas has a very large number of school districts that are either very small or deal with a homogeneous population. The analysis is a pooled time series of data from 1996-1999. Analytically, all time series need to control for serial correlation that results from trends in the data. We introduce a series of dummy variable to control for serial correlation.

The production function equation is shown in Table 1. As can be seen in the table, many of the independent variables are powerful predictors of Latino student performance. Eight of the 11 variables are statistically significant. These include all three environmental constraints, school district policies, teacher qualifications and financial resources. These coefficients 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 is strongly and positively related to student performance, as are teacher salaries, percent of gifted students, amount of state aid and percentage of Latinos with at least a high school education. Percentage of poor students, noncertified teachers and the percentage of Latino poverty in the school district are negatively related to performance. No other independent variable achieved statistical significance.

It is important to note that since schools have little, or in the case of the environmental constraints, no control over the levels of these variables, it would be difficult to greatly improve scores by simply increasing or decreasing the levels of these variables. For example, districts would need to increase teacher salaries by about $2,000 a year to increase pass rates by one percent. Most districts could not afford such a large increase in salaries. Yet, certain districts seem better at utilizing the resources they have available. By comparing the *expected* pass rate with the *actual* pass rate, we can identify those schools that make the most of their resources. To illustrate this analysis, consider the case of Anahuac. In 1999, they were predicted to have a Latino pass rate of 62.61, while their *actual* pass rate of 77.93 was a 15.32% improvement. These results allow us to compare school districts as to how well they perform relative to

expectations. Based on this method, the top rated school district for Latino students in Texas was the Los Fresnos Consolidated School District with a score of 17.41, followed by Pittsburg with a 15.88 score.

The top 35 districts are shown in Table 2. The first column is the numerical score over the 1996-1999 period by which the districts are ranked. The second column is the 1999 score and the third column is the average pass rate for Latino students for the 1996-1999 period. The top-ranked districts represent a wide spectrum of Texas school districts. Some are quite large, others very small. Some are from border areas, while others are from large metropolitan areas. In short, these districts are widely representative of all Texas school districts.

Since our ranking is based on the average scores for 1996 through 1999 there may be districts that have improved greatly over the last year that are not ranked well. The twenty five best districts for 1999 are listed in Table 3. There are a few districts that seem to have made great strides in the last year, such as Burnet Consolidated which ranks 3rd for 1999, but only 52nd over the four year period. The Willis school district ranked 23rd in 1999 compared to ranking 152nd for the four year period. This is a result of the district showing a 10.90% improvement over the 1999 expected pass rate compared to performing 0.48% below the expected pass rate for the four year period. This one-year performance, if continued, will greatly improve these districts overall rating in coming years.

Many relatively small school districts can more rapidly move up (or down) our rankings. It is more difficult for larger school districts to make rapid relative changes, as the number of students involved is so large. In order to more clearly identify well performing large districts, we have displayed the larger school districts (those above 10,000 student population) in Table 4. The format of Table 4 is the same as that of Table 2. The top-rated large school district is Brazosport, with a 1996-1999 score of 13.70, followed by Aldine (11.41) and Mission Consolidated (10.25). These districts consistently rank among the higher-performing large districts in the state.

We provide an appendix in which all of the school districts covered in this study are listed alphabetically, along with their scores. Any person interested in a specific school district's rating and ranking may find that information in the appendix.

Conclusion

This report is one of the continuing studies of Texas school districts by the Texas Educational Excellence Project (TEEP). This paper focuses on those school districts that have done an exemplary job of educating Latino students. By recognizing districts which have a better than expected level of performance on the TAAS, a set of role models for other districts has been identified. While these districts do not all share a common set of programs and/or curricula, many of their programs and activities may be identified and transferred to other districts.

The identification of these high-performing districts should not be construed to indicate that all is well in the education of Latino students in Texas. Latinos continue to lag behind

Anglos in terms of TAAS pass rates, and lead them in dropouts. While progress is being made, much more needs to be done. Educators and policy-makers cannot afford to rest on their laurels. The education of minority students is an evolving and necessary policy focus for the state.

TABLE 1: LATINO EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTION FUNCTION

Variable	Coefficient	Standard Error
Low Income	-.0511	.0171
Gifted	.2124	.0626
Attendance	3.6555	.2930
Teacher Salary K	.4360	.1705
Class size	-.0200	.2352
Temporary Teacher Certification	-.2162	.0713
Teacher Experience	.2242	.1687
State Aid	.0281	.0125
High School Education	.0988	.0297
%Poverty Background	-.0731	.0248
Per Pupil Instructional	.0013	.0010

R2 (adj)= .55

F= 102.80

significance of F < .000

Table 2. 35 Best Districts for Latino Students

		SCORE	99 SCORE	AVERAGE
1	Los Fresnos Consolidated	17.41	15.00	84.15
2	Pittsburg	15.88	15.69	75.50
3	Anahuac	15.32	16.85	77.93
4	Mount Vernon	14.26	13.09	80.50
5	South Texas	14.09	8.26	90.93
6	Ferris	13.79	14.55	76.43
7	Brazosport	13.70	10.58	83.10
8	San Benito Consolidated	13.24	9.02	74.20
9	Tuloso-Midway	12.43	12.34	73.20
10	White Settlement	12.25	6.06	78.20
11	Terrell	11.93	14.54	76.73
12	Del Valle	11.72	11.56	69.85
13	Aldine	11.41	8.25	74.93
14	Texas City	11.32	9.04	75.82
15	Point Isabel	11.24	10.11	73.95
16	McGregor	10.93	9.75	80.18
17	Coleman	10.55	17.93	74.90
18	Mission Consolidated	10.25	7.03	77.00
19	Columbia-Brazoria	10.04	9.11	77.02
20	Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	9.95	11.71	75.43
21	Angleton	9.53	12.74	79.78
22	Ysleta	9.51	9.55	73.77
23	Alvarado	9.20	7.69	71.05
24	Pearland	9.01	7.95	79.65
25	La Feria	8.84	10.89	75.85
26	Crowley	8.78	6.43	81.50
27	Kaufman	8.36	9.83	69.28
28	Plainview	8.35	9.06	70.60
29	Royse City	8.34	12.16	75.30
30	Mexia	8.30	11.05	71.00
31	Bishop Consolidated	8.25	15.94	72.78
32	Edna	8.17	1.58	72.93
33	Hidalgo	8.16	8.34	70.78
34	Breckenridge	8.07	9.42	71.45
35	Weslaco	8.00	5.86	73.68

Table 3. The Best Districts in 1999

1	Coleman	17.93
2	Anahuac	16.85
3	Burnet Consolidated	16.03
4	Bishop Consolidated	15.94
5	Pittsburg	15.69
6	Los Fresnos Consolidated	15.00
7	Merkel	14.60
8	Ferris	14.55
9	Terrell	14.54
10	Mount Vernon	13.09
11	Crane	12.92
12	Angleton	12.74
13	Tuloso-Midway	12.34
14	Royse City	12.16
15	Calhoun County	11.97
16	La Marque	11.75
17	Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	11.71
18	Hillsboro	11.63
19	Del Valle	11.56
20	Mexia	11.05
21	La Feria	10.89
22	Brazosport	10.58
23	Willis	10.30
24	El Campo	10.26
25	Point Isabel	10.11

Table 4. The Best Large School Districts

Rank	Name	Score	99 Score	Average
1	Brazosport	13.70	10.58	83.10
2	Aldine	11.41	8.25	74.93
3	Mission Consolidated	10.25	7.03	77.00
4	Ysleta	9.51	9.55	73.77
5	Weslaco	8.00	5.86	73.68
6	Goose Creek	5.83	6.23	68.22
7	Harlingen	5.70	4.36	72.60
8	McAllen	5.61	2.67	71.88
9	Eagle Pass	5.59	7.08	66.20
10	Alvin	5.11	7.13	68.77

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.

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.

Appendix. Scores for All Districts

Rank	Name	Score	99 Score	Average
185	Abilene	-1.57	0.05	64.22
293	Alamo Heights	-8.94	-7.51	66.82
13	Aldine	11.41	8.25	74.93
81	Alice	3.75	5.91	63.60
242	Alief	-4.50	-7.87	63.13
154	Alpine	0.30	0.80	67.88
23	Alvarado	9.20	7.69	71.05
66	Alvin	5.11	7.13	68.77
96	Amarillo	3.05	2.29	65.55
3	Anahuac	15.32	16.85	77.93
74	Andrews	4.29	-2.57	70.47
21	Angleton	9.53	12.74	79.78
73	Aransas County	4.49	1.73	67.88
241	Aransas Pass	-4.39	-1.16	56.05
285	Arlington	-8.00	-7.55	61.92
299	Austin	-9.96	-13.56	51.83
141	Ballinger	1.04	6.28	68.50
198	Bandera	-2.13	-3.76	65.10
199	Bastrop	-2.15	-0.50	59.53
58	Bay City	5.63	2.25	65.90
128	Beeville	1.46	0.39	64.40
203	Bellville	-2.37	2.98	61.35
142	Belton	1.00	4.44	67.25
124	Big Spring	1.65	-2.39	64.05
143	Birdville	0.99	-1.89	72.88
31	Bishop Consolidated	8.25	15.94	72.78
170	Boerne	-0.56	0.21	67.53
103	Borger	2.68	-1.35	67.40
62	Brady	5.33	5.86	69.05
7	Brazosport	13.70	10.58	83.10
34	Breckenridge	8.07	9.42	71.45
144	Bridgeport	0.93	-1.75	67.25
259	Brooks	-6.02	-0.30	54.55
206	Brownfield	-2.60	3.18	58.08
189	Brownsville	-1.84	-1.53	61.70
127	Brownwood	1.48	-3.39	64.50
255	Bryan	-5.71	-2.98	59.20
52	Burnet Consolidated	6.10	16.03	69.20
46	Calallen	6.69	4.84	76.63
92	Caldwell	3.14	0.60	68.55
100	Calhoun County	2.69	11.97	65.70
110	Cameron	2.30	5.30	64.90
263	Canutillo	-6.34	-7.89	54.83
179	Carrizo Springs Cons	-1.22	-1.09	58.17
194	CarrolltonFarmers Br	-2.00	-1.70	68.30
197	Castleberry	-2.11	-4.24	61.78
161	Cedar Hill	-0.18	-10.64	72.20
122	Center	1.75	-8.27	63.13
157	Channelview	0.06	-4.54	66.68
42	Childress	7.12	3.47	70.53
93	Clear Creek	3.11	3.86	75.38

256	Cleburne	-5.83	-6.60	60.20
309	Cleveland	-14.96	-15.24	43.50
107	Clint	2.46	-2.47	64.78
17	Coleman	10.55	17.93	74.90
237	Colorado	-4.15	-5.01	61.33
19	Columbia-Brazoria	10.04	9.11	77.02
227	Columbus	-3.47	-6.70	62.70
211	Comal	-2.78	-3.55	63.63
191	Comanche	-1.92	7.85	67.25
71	Connally	4.62	0.31	70.30
269	Conroe	-6.80	-6.42	59.67
65	Copperas Cove	5.16	3.55	74.15
131	Corpus Christi	1.29	0.10	66.47
137	Corrigan-Camden	1.12	-3.32	63.83
207	Corsicana	-2.64	-0.98	59.83
304	Cotulla	-11.49	-11.94	47.45
54	Crane	6.04	12.92	74.95
26	Crowley	8.78	6.43	81.50
252	Cureo	-5.21	-5.17	59.70
149	Cypress-Fairbanks	0.53	1.30	71.43
41	Dalhart	7.22	6.49	71.55
265	Dallas	-6.49	-11.85	56.55
214	Decatur	-3.00	1.33	62.15
209	Deer Park	-2.73	-0.66	66.78
12	Del Valle	11.72	11.56	69.85
261	Denton	-6.19	-4.35	59.33
106	Denver City	2.56	3.93	71.72
246	Devine	-4.82	-3.52	63.38
201	Diboll	-2.34	4.53	59.75
289	Dickinson	-8.71	-7.99	50.35
125	Dilley	1.56	-1.00	63.85
250	Dimmitt	-5.15	-8.06	58.05
192	Donna	-1.92	-6.07	57.15
305	Dublin	-11.59	-8.02	50.50
72	Dumas	4.56	5.96	64.80
136	Duncanville	1.16	1.19	70.45
60	Eagle Pass	5.59	7.08	66.20
123	Eagle Mt-Saginaw	1.71	-5.90	70.85
216	East Central	-3.03	-4.22	66.38
48	Eastland	6.52	7.77	72.47
109	Ector County	2.38	-3.13	60.95
83	Edcouch-Elsa	3.48	1.25	70.32
146	Edgewood	0.67	4.43	58.15
77	Edinburg	3.99	1.59	67.28
32	Edna	8.17	1.58	72.93
223	El Paso	-3.40	-8.22	61.40
40	El Campo	7.24	10.26	72.13
213	Elgin	-2.96	-0.80	60.92
165	Ennis	-0.32	0.43	64.70
63	Everman	5.24	4.14	73.35
276	Fabens	-7.45	-6.24	55.80
6	Ferris	13.79	14.55	76.43
134	Floresville	1.23	3.38	62.95

86	Flower Bluff	3.31	2.86	72.00
306	Floydada	-11.92	-5.78	49.60
268	Fort Bend	-6.67	-5.91	64.40
275	Fort Worth	-7.44	-4.14	52.63
298	Fredericksburg	-9.94	-13.33	56.10
64	Freer	5.19	8.09	71.88
37	Frenship	7.67	9.85	73.93
159	Friona	-0.05	4.91	65.20
102	Frisco	2.68	3.05	68.90
282	Ft Sam Houston	-7.70	-7.48	73.27
78	Ft. Stockton	3.98	-0.17	63.80
182	Gainesville	-1.47	-4.41	63.13
98	Galena Park	2.89	9.32	65.47
61	Galveston	5.33	9.71	63.53
114	Garland	2.09	-0.32	69.45
79	Gatesville	3.91	6.13	72.70
240	George West	-4.32	-0.05	63.38
297	Georgetown	-9.72	-17.63	60.90
174	Giddings	-0.81	2.17	66.63
243	Glen Rose	-4.53	-11.60	66.38
43	Goliad	7.07	2.11	72.82
272	Gonzales	-7.15	-6.52	54.70
56	Goose Creek	5.83	6.23	68.22
200	Graham	-2.25	5.57	64.03
147	Grand Prairie	0.64	-2.86	67.47
236	Greenville	-4.11	-3.52	58.72
278	Greenwood	-7.54	-5.75	62.55
91	Gregory-Portland	3.15	1.60	75.28
105	Groesbeck	2.61	-0.83	66.97
258	Harlandale	-5.85	-5.02	58.78
57	Harlingen	5.70	4.36	72.60
284	Hayes Consolidated	-7.89	-8.58	59.60
167	Hearne	-0.39	-1.88	61.40
300	Hempstead	-10.42	-6.24	50.88
121	Hereford	1.78	5.49	64.90
33	Hidalgo	8.16	8.34	70.78
36	Hillsboro	7.99	11.63	66.90
291	Hitchcock	-8.85	-12.09	54.53
226	Hondo	-3.47	0.02	58.70
193	Houston	-1.98	-5.44	58.28
68	Hudson	4.95	7.74	70.25
247	Huntsville	-4.93	-1.14	61.55
235	Ingleside	-4.02	-3.54	62.42
270	Ingram	-6.85	-5.13	61.65
132	Irving	1.28	2.78	68.43
307	Jacksonville	-12.52	-12.77	46.33
45	Jim Hogg County	6.86	4.28	74.38
224	Jourdanton	-3.42	-6.78	64.10
210	Judson	-2.76	-5.45	69.02
116	Katy	2.01	-1.72	76.45
27	Kaufman	8.36	9.83	69.28
273	Kenedy	-7.21	-4.15	52.47
290	Kermit	-8.76	-12.99	53.45

75	Kerrville	4.16	6.10	69.82
172	Killeen	-0.70	-2.04	70.00
155	Kingsville	0.13	4.78	64.48
233	Klein	-3.87	-9.05	70.32
90	La Marque	3.23	11.75	66.93
281	La Vernia	-7.61	-13.89	61.55
158	La Joya	0.01	-0.16	57.97
115	La Porte	2.07	-1.44	71.43
178	La Grange	-1.20	0.98	62.63
171	La Vega	-0.69	4.72	61.35
25	La Feria	8.84	10.89	75.85
173	Lake Worth	-0.76	-2.29	55.63
112	Lamar Consolidated	2.19	3.98	66.20
217	Lamesa	-3.05	-0.37	55.63
120	Lampasas	1.79	-1.26	66.70
248	Lancaster	-5.04	-7.20	59.58
262	Laredo	-6.20	-8.77	59.55
218	Leander	-3.19	-4.79	66.38
222	Levelland	-3.38	-0.65	62.67
204	Liberty	-2.44	-1.67	61.63
44	Littlefield	7.02	7.21	66.70
111	Lockhart	2.26	-1.78	64.80
1	Los Fresnos Consolid	17.41	15.00	84.15
196	Lubbock	-2.07	-1.10	63.15
95	Lubbock-Cooper	3.10	7.37	71.22
260	Lufkin	-6.14	-6.70	57.22
249	Luling	-5.11	-8.82	56.03
187	Lyford	-1.83	-3.17	60.83
104	Lytle	2.66	3.98	66.63
183	Madisonville	-1.48	-0.43	62.65
245	Manor	-4.71	-13.55	56.92
89	Mansfield	3.24	4.58	72.65
230	Marble Falls	-3.78	-4.81	58.65
190	Marlin	-1.86	-8.68	58.72
283	Mathis	-7.88	-5.77	49.83
59	McAllen	5.61	2.67	71.88
16	McGregor	10.93	9.75	80.18
280	McKinney	-7.55	-4.66	54.85
221	Medina Valley	-3.35	-9.49	62.53
184	Mercedes	-1.52	-0.68	65.00
51	Merkel	6.11	14.60	74.32
145	Mesquite	0.84	2.18	68.20
30	Mexia	8.30	11.05	71.00
267	Midland	-6.51	-6.04	55.50
308	Midlothian	-13.88	-6.85	57.70
50	Mineola	6.14	7.96	71.75
160	Mineral Wells	-0.17	0.88	61.10
18	Mission Consolidated	10.25	7.03	77.00
20	Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	9.95	11.71	75.43
4	Mount Vernon	14.26	13.09	80.50
205	Mount Pleasant	-2.54	-11.76	58.83
168	Muleshoe	-0.47	5.71	62.10
295	Nacognoches	-9.08	-4.57	54.72

234	Navasota	-3.97	2.70	56.90
140	Needville	1.05	3.62	70.72
220	New Braunfels	-3.29	-7.71	64.30
129	Newton	1.46	-3.73	65.98
164	North East	-0.29	-1.73	71.03
87	North Forest	3.29	-8.16	63.95
219	Northside	-3.29	-4.93	67.00
138	Odem-Edroy	1.10	0.91	68.85
232	Orange Grove	-3.87	0.15	63.78
176	Palacios	-1.16	-0.79	68.32
238	Palestine	-4.23	-1.71	58.05
49	Pampa	6.23	1.90	72.18
148	Pasadena	0.59	1.71	64.97
24	Pearland	9.01	7.95	79.65
38	Pecos-Barstow-Toyah	7.66	3.12	67.72
135	Perryton	1.20	3.75	68.25
162	Pflugerville	-0.19	-2.13	73.28
84	Pharr-San Juan-Alamo	3.37	2.93	67.78
133	Pine Tree	1.27	-2.11	65.60
2	Pittsburg	15.88	15.69	75.50
28	Plainview	8.35	9.06	70.60
212	Pleasanton	-2.83	-2.40	60.20
15	Point Isabel	11.24	10.11	73.95
126	Port Arthur	1.52	2.13	57.15
76	Post	4.01	5.61	70.02
296	Poteet	-9.23	-7.43	54.42
188	Presidio	-1.84	-3.13	54.63
108	Randolph Field	2.43	-3.96	83.43
151	Raymondville	0.43	6.42	60.95
166	Reagan County	-0.32	-2.19	68.00
288	Red Oak	-8.71	-18.48	62.35
53	Rice Consolidated	6.05	8.80	65.72
279	Richardson	-7.55	-6.35	62.65
139	Rio Hondo	1.08	4.03	66.30
55	Robinson	5.83	7.37	76.77
80	Robstown	3.85	5.04	64.77
215	Rockdale	-3.00	1.70	62.25
177	Roosevelt	-1.17	-4.76	64.00
202	Round Rock	-2.35	-4.42	70.25
195	Royal	-2.04	-0.32	55.10
29	Royse City	8.34	12.16	75.30
303	San Antonio	-11.27	-10.43	52.03
8	San Benito Consolida	13.24	9.02	74.20
225	San Angelo	-3.43	-6.57	62.13
292	San Diego	-8.87	-7.31	50.47
99	San Marcos	2.78	6.47	64.73
310	San Elizario	-16.78	-20.82	43.80
82	San Felipe-Del Rio C	3.66	2.18	65.60
254	Santa Rosa	-5.38	-3.58	55.42
274	Schertz-Cibolo-U. Ci	-7.25	-7.46	61.10
150	Sealy	0.52	3.15	66.20
264	Seguin	-6.39	-8.54	57.55
186	Seminole	-1.75	1.70	65.93

208	Shallowater	-2.67	1.72	64.38
67	Sharyland	5.07	3.89	73.40
277	Sheldon	-7.46	-14.18	60.35
156	Sinton	0.08	1.92	63.78
244	Slaton	-4.59	-1.59	59.15
294	Smithville	-9.04	-3.19	54.38
101	Snyder	2.69	5.06	68.18
88	Socorro	3.25	0.93	68.10
266	Somerset	-6.50	-0.75	57.63
286	Sonora	-8.03	0.18	60.83
231	South San Antonio	-3.80	-2.54	63.38
5	South Texas	14.09	8.26	90.93
302	Southside	-11.01	-8.57	46.90
228	Southwest	-3.57	-1.40	57.58
239	Spring	-4.26	-3.69	69.22
229	Spring Branch	-3.76	-6.22	60.10
251	Stafford MSD	-5.16	-0.04	64.13
119	Stephenville	1.93	-3.20	70.65
39	Sweeny	7.25	8.51	75.75
175	Taft	-1.16	2.65	57.45
47	Tatum	6.58	1.62	72.18
163	Taylor	-0.21	6.40	64.13
311	Teague	-21.98	-8.81	45.85
287	Temple	-8.40	-9.00	58.13
11	Terrell	11.93	14.54	76.73
14	Texas City	11.32	9.04	75.82
152	Troy	0.39	-3.52	69.35
69	Tulia	4.83	1.85	67.90
9	Tuloso-Midway	12.43	12.34	73.20
271	Tyler	-6.93	-10.32	57.42
85	United	3.35	4.23	64.28
257	Uvalde Consolidated	-5.83	-5.55	55.47
181	Van Vleck	-1.43	-4.63	68.90
97	Vernon	2.93	2.81	67.45
94	Victoria	3.10	2.74	65.28
180	Waco	-1.29	2.93	57.13
301	Waller	-10.72	-12.72	51.05
118	Waxahachie	1.98	2.49	68.70
35	Weslaco	8.00	5.86	73.68
113	West Oso	2.10	0.32	61.70
10	White Settlement	12.25	6.06	78.20
117	Whorton	2.00	-0.07	64.13
70	Wichita Falls	4.80	3.40	70.50
169	Willis	-0.48	10.30	61.40
153	Wilmer-Hutchins	0.39	-7.82	57.45
253	Yoakum	-5.29	1.33	61.90
22	Ysleta	9.51	9.55	73.77
130	Zapata	1.41	0.44	62.17