

**THE BEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS
FOR LATINO STUDENTS 1997-2000**

Kenneth J. Meier

Robert D. Wrinkle

and

Nick A. Theobald

A REPORT OF THE
TEXAS EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE PROJECT

NUMBER 16 OCTOBER 2001

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 1997-2000

The education of minority students is of primary concern for education leaders and policy-makers in Texas. While Latino students have made impressive gains in the last decade, they continue to lag behind Anglo students in the state's fundamental measurement of basic skills—the TAAS. In 1991 41.5 percent of Latino students passed the TAAS, compared with 68.9% for Anglo students, a gap of 27.4 percentage points. By the end of the decade, Latino students had reduced to deficit to 17.4 percentage points, scoring an average pass rate of 71.9% in 2000 compared to the average Anglo pass rate that year of 89.3%. 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 2000, 87.35% of Latino students in Los Fresnos passed the TAAS, an improvement of almost 45 percentage points over the 1991 rate of 42.4% and an improvement over the 1997 pass rate of 82.2%. Much of the success of the Los Fresnos school district may be attributed to the development of a team approach to instruction in the district. Teachers, staff and parents work together to implement early intervention programs. In recent years, a special focus has been on the continual development of an aligned curricula for the entire district. This approach has allowed students and teachers to continue to develop and focus on successful programs and strategies. Obviously, the Los Fresnos approach works.

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 continues to have an impressive record of educating Latino students. In 2000, for example, the Brazosport district has a Latino student pass rate of 87.6%. 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 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 1997-2000 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 1997-2000. 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, with one exception, all of the independent variables are powerful predictors of Latino student performance. Ten 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, instructional funds per student, higher average years of teacher experience and percentage of Latinos with at least a high school education. Percentage of poor students, higher rates of non-certified teachers and the percentage of Latino poverty in the school district are negatively related to performance.

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 average teacher salaries by about \$3,000 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 East Chambers. For the period of 1997-2000, they were predicted to have a Latino pass rate of 69.72, while their *actual* average pass rate was 84.43; meaning that 14.71% more Hispanic students passed the TAAS than predicted. 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 over the 1997-2000 period was the Los Fresnos Consolidated School District with a score of 16.35, followed by Bangs with a 16.19 score.

The top 25 districts are shown in Table 2. The first column is the average pass rate for Latino students for the 1997-2000 period. The second column is the numerical score (the percent above or below the predicted pass rate) over the 1997-2000 period by which the districts are ranked. The third column is the score for the 2000 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 1997 through 2000 there may be districts that have improved greatly over the last year that are not ranked well. The twenty five best districts for 2000 are listed in Table 3. There are a few districts that seem to have made great strides in the last year, such as Jacksboro which ranks first for 2000, but only 49th. over the four year period. The Ballinger school district ranked twelfth in 2000 compared to ranking 114th. for the four year period. This is a result of the district showing a 11.86% improvement over the 2000 expected pass rate compared to performing just 2.99% above 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 Aldine, with a 1997-2000 score of 10.80, followed by Ysleta (10.29) and Goose Creek (6.55). 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). A major focus of the project is to identify those school districts that have done an exemplary job of educating Latino students. The analysis of those districts that have a better than expected level of performance on the TAAS, identifies a set of

role models for other districts. 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. All persons interested in the education of minority students in the state should have an interest in the identification and support of exemplary programs.

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. The Education Production Function

<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Slope</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>
Low Income Students	-.0599	.0148
Gifted Students	.1943	.0578
Attendance	2.9177	.2742
Teacher Salaries (k)	.3334	.1542
Class Size	.1539	.2214
Noncertified Teachers	-.2313	.0621
Teacher Experience	.2912	.1428
State Aid	.0395	.0114
Instructional Funding (k)	2.3597	.9370
Latino Education Levels	1.2879	.2644
Latino Poverty	-.4542	.2163

R-Square	.40
Adjusted R-Square	.40
F	69.74
N of cases	1459

**Table 2. Twenty-Five Best Districts for Latino
Students 1997-2000**

<u>Rank</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>TAAS</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>2000 Score</u>
1	Los Fresnos	87.35	16.35	12.35
2	Bangs	86.15	16.19	14.43
3	East Chambers	84.43	14.71	8.77
4	Brazosport	87.63	13.83	13.79
5	Pittsburg	79.30	13.59	9.02
6	Valley View	81.43	13.46	8.58
7	Ferris	81.60	13.02	12.52
8	Grand Saline	82.25	12.93	9.09
9	Coleman	83.03	12.72	13.21
10	Angleton	86.93	12.71	14.26
11	Del Valle	74.18	12.21	9.23
12	San Benito	78.15	12.19	8.87
13	Rosebud-Lott	83.15	12.15	9.95
14	Point Isabel	78.60	11.93	10.20
15	Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	82.18	11.19	13.91
16	South Texas	93.75	10.97	6.77
17	Mt. Vernon	82.90	10.80	14.67
18	Aldine	79.07	10.80	8.88
19	Tuloso-Midway	78.97	10.50	10.51
20	La Feria	81.75	10.36	8.03
21	McGregor	84.50	10.35	6.05
22	El Campo	80.50	10.33	11.28
23	Ysleta	78.65	10.29	11.21
24	Anahuac	77.40	10.26	-0.79
25	Columbia-Brazoria	81.55	10.03	7.53

Table 3. Best Districts for 2000

1	Jacksboro	15.16
2	Mt. Vernon	14.67
3	Bangs	14.43
4	Burnet-Consolidated	14.40
5	Angleton	14.26
6	Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	13.91
7	Brazosport	13.79
8	La Marque	13.76
9	Coleman	13.21
10	Ferris	12.52
11	Los Fresnos	12.35
12	Ballinger	11.86
13	Eastland	11.64
14	Alvin	11.54
15	Early	11.50
16	Marion	11.39
17	El Campo	11.28
18	Ysleta	11.21
19	Rio Hondo	11.07
20	Eagle Pass	11.06
21	Bishop Cons	11.01
22	Wharton	10.95
23	Kaufman	10.79
24	Frenship	10.65
25	Tuloso-Midway	10.51

Table 4. The Best Large School Districts

Enrollment 15,000+

<u>Rank</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>TAAS</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>2000 Score</u>
1	Aldine	79.07	10.80	8.88
2	Ysleta	78.65	10.29	11.21
3	Goose Creek	73.47	6.55	6.10
4	Harlingen	77.40	6.06	6.11
5	Galena Park	72.00	5.89	8.17
6	McAllen	75.75	5.45	5.63
7	United	68.65	4.38	1.59
8	Edinburg	70.88	4.04	3.61
9	Pharr-San-Juan-Alamo	72.20	3.71	3.92
10	Wichita Falls	74.78	3.64	2.67

Appendix A.

Scores for All Districts

<u>Rank</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>TAAS</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>2000 Score</u>
188	Abilene	70.10	-0.31	2.19
345	Alamo Heights	71.90	-9.43	-6.17
18	Aldine	79.07	10.80	8.88
74	Alice	68.20	5.26	6.12
297	Alief	66.20	-5.81	-8.78
29	Alvarado	74.15	8.98	6.04
47	Alvin	74.75	7.48	11.54
147	Amarillo	69.13	1.37	-0.84
24	Anahuac	77.40	10.26	-0.79
84	Andrews	75.20	4.61	7.20
10	Angleton	86.93	12.71	14.26
322	Aransas Pass	61.30	-7.25	-13.01
57	Aransas County	74.53	6.17	7.30
339	Arlington	65.15	-8.70	-10.91
333	Athens	59.03	-7.90	-7.32
347	Austin	56.20	-9.73	-9.22
114	Ballinger	75.32	2.99	11.86
169	Bandera	72.82	0.67	0.69
2	Bangs	86.15	16.19	14.43
26	Barbers Hill	83.10	9.93	5.99
181	Bastrop	67.07	0.06	4.04
64	Bay City	71.30	5.94	7.55
131	Beeville	70.20	1.93	3.31
184	Bellville	69.57	-0.08	6.67
112	Belton	74.32	3.07	5.67
150	Big Spring	67.95	1.23	0.79
198	Birdville	75.82	-0.72	.
35	Bishop Cons	79.85	8.25	11.01
128	Bloomington	66.65	2.03	2.92
143	Boerne	73.75	1.56	4.86
140	Borger	71.45	1.64	-0.03
118	Brady	74.10	2.95	-0.06
4	Brazosport	87.63	13.83	13.79
63	Breckenridge	74.88	5.95	4.81
343	Brennam	60.92	-9.25	-8.05
191	Bridgeport	69.98	-0.44	-5.80
241	Brooks	61.17	-2.63	-0.18
260	Brownfield	63.50	-3.64	-2.84
218	Brownsville	66.75	-1.51	-2.94
197	Brownwood	68.40	-0.65	-2.68
271	Bryan	65.40	-4.19	-4.27
31	Burnet Consolidated	76.75	8.58	14.40
50	Calallen	81.30	6.93	5.84
100	Caldwell	74.80	3.93	8.25
67	Calhoun County	74.27	5.84	10.35
110	Cameron	72.18	3.14	2.58
323	Canutillo	59.67	-7.40	-6.04
93	Canyon	78.78	4.20	6.08
293	Carrizo Springs	62.20	-5.43	-7.18

244	Carrollton-Farmers-B	70.98	-2.74	-4.70
299	Castleberry	62.60	-5.92	-10.83
250	Cedar Hill	73.50	-2.98	-5.73
358	Celina	62.30	-12.45	-11.49
273	Center	63.33	-4.33	-18.77
209	Channelview	69.15	-1.13	-4.24
354	Chapel Hill	53.63	-11.91	-14.95
151	Childress	72.57	1.23	-0.38
137	Clear Creek	78.05	1.72	-0.89
325	Cleburne	63.53	-7.44	-7.61
363	Cleveland	49.03	-15.01	-14.70
243	Clifton	72.40	-2.70	-1.27
148	Clint	68.30	1.32	-1.12
9	Coleman	83.03	12.72	13.21
124	College Station	80.45	2.35	-2.27
248	Colorado	68.82	-2.92	6.00
25	Columbia-Brazoria	81.55	10.03	7.53
283	Columbus	67.72	-4.72	1.13
205	Comal	70.00	-0.99	4.31
193	Comanche	72.10	-0.53	3.03
223	Comfort	67.88	-1.93	6.14
97	Connally	75.25	4.01	1.88
311	Conroe	65.13	-6.46	-4.61
91	Copperas Cove	78.50	4.36	3.82
167	Corpus Christi	70.57	0.75	-0.01
259	Corrigan-Camden	64.45	-3.63	-1.58
245	Corsicana	64.45	-2.77	-3.69
362	Cotulla	52.28	-13.95	-9.15
58	Crane	78.88	6.13	3.97
274	Crockett	60.08	-4.36	-18.57
203	Crosby	72.68	-0.90	-3.38
33	Crowley	85.30	8.30	6.28
284	Crystal City	55.95	-4.82	-5.63
265	Cuero	67.30	-3.94	2.56
196	Cypress-Fairbanks	74.32	-0.63	-1.34
69	Dalhart	74.93	5.70	4.65
351	Dallas	57.17	-10.71	-17.72
163	Dayton	66.72	0.93	-2.81
292	Decatur	65.45	-5.36	-3.03
225	Deer Park	72.65	-2.00	0.37
11	Del-Valle	74.18	12.21	9.23
306	Denton	63.35	-6.28	-8.50
83	Denver City	77.93	4.72	9.33
107	Desoto	77.55	3.30	4.41
266	Devine	68.20	-3.99	-5.31
213	Diboll	66.63	-1.25	3.59
321	Dickenson	56.38	-7.19	-2.59
295	Dimmitt	62.42	-5.62	-1.27
270	Donna	58.75	-4.18	-11.49
342	Dublin	57.58	-9.02	-5.58
62	Dumas	71.00	5.97	7.84
146	Duncanville	73.30	1.39	-0.32
164	Eagle-Mt. Saginaw	72.95	0.84	-2.16
39	Eagle Pass	71.97	7.84	11.06

45	Early	87.40	7.52	11.50
268	East Central	69.82	-4.07	-5.84
3	East Chambers	84.43	14.71	8.77
43	Eastland	78.93	7.68	11.64
187	Ector County	63.80	-0.26	-5.34
127	Edcouch-Elsa	73.40	2.04	-0.46
130	Edgewood	65.18	2.01	8.18
95	Edinburg	70.88	4.04	3.61
79	Edna	75.78	5.03	-0.72
22	El-Campo	80.50	10.33	11.28
287	El Paso	64.55	-5.02	-6.53
263	Elgin	65.10	-3.82	-7.18
216	Ennis	69.65	-1.43	-3.31
82	Everman	77.25	4.79	3.48
320	Fabens	59.97	-7.09	-5.01
314	Farmersville	67.90	-6.79	-11.05
7	Ferris	81.60	13.02	12.52
156	Floresville	68.22	1.15	2.75
102	Flour Bluff	77.00	3.78	2.45
357	Floyddayda	56.00	-12.37	-6.48
166	Fort Stockton	68.27	0.79	-3.05
316	Fredericksburg	63.03	-6.90	-2.41
53	Freer	76.90	6.66	7.66
30	Frenship	80.03	8.75	10.65
149	Friona	72.45	1.28	4.22
155	Frisco	71.47	1.15	1.68
318	Ft. Sam-Houston	79.07	-7.03	-8.52
286	Ft. Worth	58.78	-4.95	-0.00
305	Ft. Bend	69.18	-6.17	-8.51
313	Gainesville	63.50	-6.69	-11.61
65	Galena-Park	72.00	5.89	8.17
52	Galveston	69.13	6.67	4.66
190	Garland	71.07	-0.43	-3.05
85	Gatesville	76.35	4.51	4.62
204	George West	71.57	-0.99	2.63
355	Georgetown	63.22	-12.10	-12.86
189	Giddings	72.35	-0.36	1.42
267	Glen-Rose	71.82	-4.00	-3.95
66	Goliad	77.48	5.85	6.51
348	Gonzales	57.22	-10.34	-14.70
54	Goose Creek	73.47	6.55	6.10
173	Graham	73.10	0.50	3.87
141	Granbury	71.00	1.64	4.65
224	Grand Prairie	69.05	-1.98	-4.56
8	Grand Saline	82.25	12.93	9.09
280	Grand View	71.88	-4.58	6.17
51	Grape Creek	76.20	6.92	9.42
324	Greenville	59.83	-7.40	-11.51
307	Greenwood	68.45	-6.34	-0.55
94	Gregory-Portland	80.43	4.10	5.07
87	Groesbeck	73.30	4.44	8.85
230	Harlandale	65.90	-2.15	4.23
59	Harlingen	77.40	6.06	6.11
304	Hays	65.03	-6.14	-2.99

337	Hempstead	60.03	-8.56	-10.57
332	Henderson	63.10	-7.89	-11.60
106	Hereford	71.95	3.33	8.83
298	Herne	61.67	-5.88	-15.17
44	Hildago	75.93	7.64	6.89
34	Hillsboro	72.90	8.30	6.98
359	Hitchcock	55.72	-12.85	-15.79
242	Hondo	63.55	-2.69	-1.38
220	Houston	62.42	-1.80	-1.31
116	Hudson	74.15	2.98	5.44
261	Humble	73.30	-3.68	-3.89
269	Huntsville	67.52	-4.07	-0.59
229	Hurst-Eules-Bedford	76.00	-2.05	-4.74
222	Hutto	72.43	-1.90	-6.80
249	Ingleside	66.95	-2.95	-1.44
330	Ingram	64.88	-7.78	-12.23
171	Irving	72.03	0.53	-1.89
49	Jacksboro	80.73	7.04	15.16
361	Jacksonville	49.63	-13.81	-12.56
48	Jim Hogg County	79.13	7.39	9.10
276	Jourdanton	66.95	-4.37	-2.00
253	Judson	71.82	-3.30	-6.19
208	Karns-City	69.57	-1.07	5.09
176	Katy	79.43	0.31	-2.14
32	Kaufman	74.45	8.38	10.79
108	Kennedale	75.43	3.29	4.86
353	Kermit	55.60	-10.92	-15.48
75	Kerrville	75.47	5.21	3.96
264	Kilgore	63.75	-3.91	-8.41
200	Killeen	74.82	-0.79	-1.76
152	Kingsville	70.72	1.19	2.31
302	Klein	73.00	-6.12	-7.36
40	La Marque	75.45	7.81	13.76
115	La Vega	68.60	2.98	8.54
154	La Grange	69.88	1.16	5.04
20	La Feria	81.75	10.36	8.03
132	La Joya	63.22	1.86	5.55
183	La Porte	74.13	0.04	-1.81
296	La Vernia	70.57	-5.76	1.66
211	Lake Worth	60.55	-1.20	-1.45
178	Lake Travis	76.97	0.17	-4.04
129	Lamar Cons	71.18	2.01	1.68
162	Lampasas	71.73	0.93	-3.50
277	Lancaster	62.38	-4.38	-6.47
334	Laredo	63.03	-8.01	-6.91
235	Leander	71.18	-2.43	-4.37
319	Lemesa	58.40	-7.06	-9.70
240	Levelland	67.93	-2.59	-0.58
206	Lewisville	76.13	-1.01	-5.18
238	Liberty	66.25	-2.46	-7.42
38	Liberty Hill	82.30	8.00	5.30
175	Little-Elm	66.13	0.40	-6.01
99	Littlefield	70.50	3.96	5.18
356	Livingston	57.58	-12.13	-18.22

194 Llano	74.78	-0.56	3.80
168 Lockhart	68.95	0.71	3.80
86 Longview	70.60	4.45	-2.97
1 Los Fresnos	87.35	16.35	12.35
215 Lubbock	68.65	-1.39	1.04
101 Lubbock-Cooper	77.18	3.86	4.18
288 Lufkin	63.33	-5.04	-1.94
326 Luling	60.13	-7.45	-2.80
254 Lyford	63.58	-3.37	-7.10
76 Lytle	72.38	5.20	2.90
251 Madisonville	67.07	-3.01	-5.37
262 Magnolia	66.23	-3.71	-9.94
303 Manor	59.13	-6.14	-7.54
89 Mansfield	79.00	4.42	3.06
290 Marble Falls	63.58	-5.19	-5.77
119 Marion	77.75	2.90	11.39
281 Marlin	61.85	-4.61	-11.30
122 Marshall	70.50	2.53	-2.90
317 Mathis	56.33	-6.94	-0.48
71 Mcallen	75.75	5.45	5.63
21 McGregor	84.50	10.35	6.05
309 McKinney	61.40	-6.41	-3.85
272 Medina Valley	65.48	-4.22	-9.04
227 Mercedes	68.85	-2.03	-4.03
81 Merkel	77.78	4.82	0.36
159 Mesquite	72.82	1.02	1.48
77 Mexia	74.15	5.16	5.32
315 Midland	60.53	-6.87	-7.66
352 Midlothian	64.72	-10.85	-2.44
111 Mineola	73.88	3.09	0.88
192 Mineral Wells	66.13	-0.52	8.44
37 Mission	79.40	8.04	4.28
15 Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	82.18	11.19	13.91
300 Mount Pleasant	59.22	-5.98	-7.97
17 Mt. Vernon	82.90	10.80	14.67
195 Muleshoe	68.22	-0.58	2.59
350 Nacogdoches	58.70	-10.60	-12.10
68 Natalia	74.88	5.72	4.89
226 Navasota	63.30	-2.01	-0.48
219 Needville	74.25	-1.54	-5.07
239 New Braunfels	69.27	-2.59	-1.89
247 New Caney	66.18	-2.86	3.72
207 North East	74.82	-1.02	-0.76
170 North Forest	65.20	0.58	-3.81
233 Northside	71.47	-2.30	-1.01
113 Odem-Edroy	74.65	3.06	3.23
177 Orange Grove	71.93	0.29	8.36
202 Palacios	74.75	-0.83	2.76
291 Palestine	62.85	-5.34	-5.67
88 Pampa	75.43	4.42	3.47
135 Pasadena	70.93	1.75	2.20
28 Pearland	84.90	9.08	7.23
138 Pearsall	67.95	1.70	2.93
73 Pecos-Barstow-Toyah	69.90	5.29	0.02

125	Perryton	72.75	2.28	-1.29
214	Pflugerville	76.82	-1.33	-0.70
103	Pharr-San-Juan-Alamo	72.20	3.71	3.92
335	Pilot Point	63.75	-8.04	-4.40
180	Pine Tree	69.00	0.09	-0.33
5	Pittsburg	79.30	13.59	9.02
41	Plainview	74.85	7.75	10.40
201	Pleasanton	66.22	-0.80	0.24
14	Point Isabel	78.60	11.93	10.20
134	Port Arthur	61.42	1.82	2.51
340	Poteet	59.60	-8.72	-12.75
252	Presidio	55.63	-3.04	-4.14
285	Princeton	62.10	-4.92	3.77
255	Progresso	61.70	-3.39	-1.87
142	Randolph Fields	88.60	1.60	7.76
133	Raymondville	67.93	1.83	7.33
341	Red Oak	66.43	-8.75	-5.55
72	Rice-Cons	70.28	5.34	4.54
336	Richardson	65.97	-8.48	-12.66
78	Rio Hondo	74.20	5.05	11.07
232	Rio Grande City	60.60	-2.29	-3.08
61	Robinson	83.38	5.98	5.29
55	Robstown	71.38	6.44	6.15
275	Rockdale	67.30	-4.36	-5.99
161	Rockwall	74.18	0.94	-2.06
236	Roma	60.08	-2.44	-5.99
185	Roosevelt	71.20	-0.19	5.55
13	Rosebud-Lott	83.15	12.15	9.95
237	Round-Rock	74.27	-2.45	-1.42
231	Royal	62.03	-2.26	-3.89
60	Royse City	76.07	5.98	-6.10
12	San Benito	78.15	12.19	8.87
365	San Elizario	47.28	-18.85	-14.39
96	San Marcos	71.28	4.04	5.67
349	San Antonio	58.33	-10.52	-7.37
310	San Diego	56.00	-6.43	-4.97
153	San Felipe-Del Rio	69.45	1.18	-1.55
257	San Angelo	66.98	-3.62	-2.85
212	Sanger	70.55	-1.24	0.40
289	Santa Fe	66.35	-5.12	-0.78
329	Santa Rosa	61.90	-7.73	-5.88
301	Schertz-Cibolo	67.43	-6.07	-1.75
144	Sealy	72.02	1.52	0.46
312	Seguin	61.50	-6.65	-5.29
139	Seminole	73.18	1.64	3.25
234	Shallowater	69.53	-2.32	0.70
80	Sharyland	77.57	4.94	5.44
331	Sheldon	63.65	-7.79	-9.12
360	Sherman	56.60	-13.07	-14.13
165	Sinton	68.70	0.80	1.47
294	Slaton	65.18	-5.61	-5.98
327	Smithville	59.05	-7.51	-9.95
120	Snyder	73.50	2.74	1.65
121	Socorro	71.55	2.61	0.88

16	South Texas	93.75	10.97	6.77
246	South San Antonio	69.65	-2.82	-1.00
344	Southside	53.35	-9.41	-4.09
210	Southwest	64.97	-1.17	2.08
258	Spring	73.80	-3.62	-6.51
279	Spring Branch	63.97	-4.48	-6.32
256	Stafford	69.22	-3.59	-5.41
105	Stephenville	77.75	3.64	6.88
70	Sulphur Springs	76.90	5.50	0.77
228	Summerset	66.63	-2.05	5.19
46	Sweeny	81.18	7.50	7.24
136	Sweetwater	70.85	1.73	3.95
186	Taft	66.52	-0.19	1.08
160	Tatum	71.45	0.96	-5.04
174	Taylor	70.68	0.40	0.69
364	Teague	58.63	-15.27	-5.90
338	Temple	62.97	-8.65	-5.60
27	Terrell	78.63	9.51	2.46
217	Terrell County	72.35	-1.50	-3.14
36	Texas City	77.93	8.05	3.01
157	Tomball	72.10	1.12	3.61
182	Troy	74.20	0.06	0.38
126	Tulia	72.15	2.04	3.31
19	Tuloso-Midway	78.97	10.50	10.51
328	Tyler	61.58	-7.72	-6.91
90	United	68.65	4.38	1.59
278	Uvalde Cons	61.45	-4.40	-3.09
6	Valley View	81.43	13.46	8.58
221	Venus	66.13	-1.82	-7.62
158	Vernon	71.18	1.06	3.18
117	Victoria	70.75	2.97	2.67
172	Waco	64.50	0.53	4.08
346	Waller	56.40	-9.55	-7.65
179	Waxahachie	73.07	0.17	-1.76
308	Weatherford	65.30	-6.37	-4.69
42	Weslaco	79.00	7.69	5.09
98	West Oso	68.63	3.99	4.48
92	Wharton	70.88	4.30	10.95
56	White Settlement	76.78	6.29	-3.66
104	Wichita Falls	74.78	3.64	2.67
109	Willis	69.93	3.20	5.79
199	Wilmer-Hutchins	58.10	-0.78	-10.46
145	Wylie(Colin)	73.60	1.48	-1.27
282	Yoakum	69.90	-4.66	1.24
23	Ysleta	78.65	10.29	11.21
123	Zapata-County	66.50	2.39	-2.59

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

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>99 Score</u>	<u>Average</u>
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 Nacogoches	-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