THE BEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

FOR LATINO STUDENTS 1998-2001

Kenneth J. Meier

Robert D. Wrinkle

and

Nick A. Theobald

A REPORT OF THE

TEXAS EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE PROJECT

NUMBER 18 SEPTEMBER 18

For further information, contact:
http://teep.tamu.edu

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 1998-2001

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. Ten years later, Latino students had reduced to deficit to 14.8 percentage points, scoring an average pass rate of 75.6% in 2001 compared to the average Anglo pass rate that year of 90.4%. 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.

Bangs ISD is an example of one such exemplary district. In 2001, 89.1% of Latino students in Bangs passed the TAAS. This high pass rate for Latino students helps the district achieve the highest score in our ranking system. Billy Rankin, Bang's superintendent, credits three factors that contribute to their success; "one is a strong ESL program at each campus, second is a dedicated faculty at each campus that expects every student to be successful regardless of ethnicity, third is a close-knit student body that values education and is proud to be part of an exemplary campus."

Los Fresnos Consolidated is another example of an exemplary district, ranking in the top five for the past five years. 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.

Bangs and Los Fresnos are relatively small school districts. As such, many of their programs and approaches might not immediately transfer to other, larger districts. However, Ysleta, a much larger district, also continues to have an impressive record of educating Latino students. In 2001, for example, the Ysleta district has a Latino student pass rate of 83.9%. What makes this more impressive is that more than half of Ysleta's students live below the poverty line. Ysleta's Teacher Laptop Initiative helps to give teachers the necessary tools they need to educate the district's students. Ysleta also recently began a program to assure that all students have access to computers, both in school and at home. This strong commitment towards their teachers and students helps Yselta rank high academically among urban districts.

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 1998-2001 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 1998-2001. 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. Nine of the 11 variables are statistically significant. These include all three environmental constraints, two of the school district policies, both teacher qualifications and two of the 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 the 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 instructional spending by $250 per student a year to increase pass rates by one percent. Most districts could not afford such a large increase instructional expenditures, especially large districts. 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 Del Valle ISD. For the period of 1998-2001, they were predicted to have a Latino pass rate of 63.14, while their *actual* average pass rate was 77; meaning that 13.86% 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 1998-2001 period was the Bangs ISD with a score of 15.06, followed by Los Fresnos with a 14.49 score.

The top 25 districts are shown in Table 2. The first column is the average pass rate for Latino students for the 1998-2001 period. The second column is the numerical score (the percent above or below the predicted pass rate) over the 1998-2001 period by which the districts are ranked. The third column is the score for the 2001 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 1998 through 2001 there may be districts that have improved greatly over the last year that are not ranked well. The twenty five best districts for 2001 are listed in Table 3. There are a few districts that seem to have made great strides in the last year, such as Hildago which ranks first for 2001, but only 18th. over the four year period. The Orange Grove school district ranked twelfth in 2001compared to ranking 87th. for the four year period. This is a result of the district showing a 11.79% improvement over the 2001 expected pass rate compared to performing just 4.32% 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 1998-2001 score of 9.28, followed by Ysleta (9.20) and Galena Park (8.23). 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.

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	-.0723	.0125
Gifted	.0901	.0544
Attendance	3.1345	.2666
Teacher Salary K	.0631	.1415
Class size	.5091	.2137
Teacher Non certification	-.1812	.0573
Teacher Experience	.6684	.1223
State Aid	.0532	.0106
High School Education	.1238	.0171
%Poverty Background	-.0629	.0149
Per Pupil Instructional K	4.2960	.8575

R^2 = .32

F= 64.82

Table 2. The Forty Best Districts for Latinos 1998-2001

Rank	District	Score	TAAS	2001 Score
1	Bangs	15.06	90.30	8.70
2	Los Fresnos Consolid	14.49	89.32	11.81
3	Brazosport	14.10	90.27	13.66
4	Del Valle	13.86	77.00	13.75
5	Grand-Saline	13.36	85.65	14.15
6	Point Isabel	13.21	82.18	14.20
7	Valley-View	12.96	84.57	11.69
8	Angleton	12.92	90.63	12.11
9	Pittsburgh	12.19	81.75	10.43
10	Mount Vernon	11.79	86.90	12.23
11	Burnet Consolidated	11.36	83.65	8.21
12	Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	11.25	86.63	11.39
13	San Benito Consolida	11.07	81.10	10.81
14	McGregor	10.98	87.60	6.93
15	Ferris	10.56	82.88	5.80
16	Coleman	10.38	83.85	1.92
17	Rosebud-Lott	10.35	85.88	5.02
18	Hidalgo	9.89	81.43	17.11
19	La Marque	9.71	80.45	9.56
20	South Texas	9.43	93.98	5.67
21	Tuloso-Midway	9.43	81.57	7.93
22	Aldine	9.28	81.38	7.23
23	Ysleta	9.20	81.65	7.12
24	Columbia-Brazoria	9.06	84.40	11.86
25	La Feria	8.98	83.43	4.89
26	El Campo	8.77	83.57	5.38
27	Alvin	8.70	79.73	9.83
28	Barbers-Hill	8.64	85.78	4.95
29	Eagle Pass	8.53	75.70	6.08
30	Bishop Consolidated	8.49	84.40	7.19
31	Alvarado	8.37	77.18	6.83
32	Galena Park	8.23	77.30	9.19
33	Frenship	8.11	84.18	6.34
34	Eastland	8.09	82.82	6.81
35	Dumas	7.98	76.18	7.98
36	Hillsboro	7.88	74.45	6.01
37	Sweeny	7.68	86.35	9.07
38	Galveston	7.65	73.05	6.14
39	Anahuac	7.51	79.63	2.38
40	Calhoun County	7.46	80.68	9.49

Table 3. The Best Districts in 2001

1	Hidalgo	17.11
2	Hereford	14.83
3	Point Isabel	14.20
4	Grand-Saline	14.15
5	Del Valle	13.75
6	Brazosport	13.66
7	Mount Vernon	12.23
8	Angleton	12.11
9	Columbia-Brazoria	11.86
10	Los Fresnos Consolid	11.81
11	Mexia	11.80
12	Orange Grove	11.79
13	Merkel	11.74
14	Valley-View	11.69
15	Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	11.39
16	Denver City	11.24
17	San Benito Consolida	10.81
18	Ballinger	10.45
19	Pittsburgh	10.43
20	Alvin	9.83
21	La Joya	9.77
22	Groesbeck	9.67
23	La Marque	9.56
24	Calhoun County	9.49
25	Galena Park	9.19

Table 4. The Best Large Districts for Latinos
Enrollment 15,000+

1	Aldine	9.28	81.38	7.23
2	Ysleta	9.20	81.65	7.12
3	Galena Park	8.23	77.30	9.19
4	Goose Creek	6.67	77.20	7.65
5	McAllen	6.11	78.80	6.05
6	Harlingen	5.53	80.03	3.90
7	La Joya	5.39	68.72	9.77
8	Edinburg	3.95	73.70	2.94
9	Pharr-San Juan-Alamo	3.93	76.18	3.46
10	United	3.52	71.63	2.65

Appendix A. All Districts in the

164	Abilene	0.75	75.35	3.86
310	Alamo Heights	-6.39	77.25	-4.53
22	Aldine	9.28	81.38	7.23
54	Alice	6.62	71.32	8.18
323	Alief	-7.60	67.75	-10.24
204	Alpine	-1.50	76.05	-0.41
31	Alvarado	8.37	77.18	6.83
27	Alvin	8.70	79.73	9.83
170	Amarillo	0.65	71.75	0.63
39	Anahuac	7.51	79.63	2.38
82	Andrews	4.64	78.72	3.88
8	Angleton	12.92	90.63	12.11
315	Aransas Pass	-6.56	65.47	-2.67
76	Aransas County	5.12	76.82	3.66
332	Arlington	-7.96	67.68	-7.86
325	Athens	-7.69	62.67	-5.41
337	Austin	-8.41	59.72	-5.34
81	Ballinger	4.79	81.97	10.45
219	Bandera	-1.85	73.18	-9.68
1	Bangs	15.06	90.30	8.70
28	Barbers-Hill	8.64	85.78	4.95
154	Bastrop	1.03	71.15	-1.06
60	Bay City	6.17	74.80	7.01
127	Beeville	2.12	74.52	1.30
143	Bellville	1.59	74.82	3.23
100	Belton	3.49	78.78	3.58
176	Big Spring	0.36	69.88	-0.05
30	Bishop Consolidated	8.49	84.40	7.19
134	Bloomington	1.92	71.22	1.32
132	Boerne	1.98	78.00	2.43
157	Borger	0.98	74.22	5.81
362	Boyd	-11.76	59.10	-2.46
137	Brady	1.82	77.23	0.20
3	Brazosport	14.10	90.27	13.66
61	Breckenridge	6.12	77.85	2.35
346	Brenham	-9.33	64.02	-7.62
189	Bridgeport	-0.52	73.57	3.78
181	Brooks	0.16	67.43	5.13
276	Brownfield	-4.40	66.07	-7.96
221	Brownsville	-1.92	70.45	-3.19
199	Brownwood	-1.07	72.05	1.10
233	Bryan	-2.46	68.88	-0.40
11	Burnet Consolidated	11.36	83.65	8.21
79	Calallen	4.95	83.72	2.94
109	Caldwell	3.00	77.65	1.76

40	Calhoun County	7.46	80.68	9.49
125	Cameron	2.38	75.22	-2.17
288	Canutillo	-5.09	65.85	-0.79
78	Canyon	5.06	83.13	7.31
300	Carrizo Springs Cons	-5.57	65.88	-4.00
224	CarrolltonFarmers Br	-2.10	73.95	-1.66
347	Castleberry	-9.34	62.85	-13.17
326	Cedar Hill	-7.70	73.43	-7.05
355	Celina	-10.33	67.03	-5.97
358	Center	-10.95	61.17	-18.21
237	Channelview	-2.51	71.07	-1.17
364	Chapel Hill	-12.36	57.22	-11.67
162	Childress	0.84	75.93	8.99
178	Clear Creek	0.28	80.50	-1.94
309	Cleburne	-6.26	66.65	-6.40
370	Cleveland	-17.01	51.15	-20.92
229	Clifton	-2.35	.	-0.91
149	Clint	1.28	71.48	0.86
16	Coleman	10.38	83.85	1.92
172	College Station	0.44	81.65	-2.70
211	Colorado	-1.62	74.20	-3.74
24	Columbia-Brazoria	9.06	84.40	11.86
304	Columbus	-5.81	71.50	-7.84
163	Comal	0.77	75.60	2.97
107	Comanche	3.26	78.75	4.34
155	Comfort	1.02	73.88	6.83
297	Community	-5.48	63.40	-0.36
188	Connally	-0.44	75.82	-4.65
291	Conroe	-5.15	69.77	-1.94
111	Copperas Cove	2.85	81.68	2.06
182	Corpus Christi	-0.01	73.72	-1.11
239	Corrigan-Camden	-2.57	69.78	-0.55
264	Corsicana	-3.84	66.97	-5.76
365	Cotulla	-12.46	57.35	-7.96
75	Crane	5.12	82.68	2.35
320	Crockett	-7.14	61.83	-14.58
202	Crosby	-1.35	75.05	-0.50
51	Crowley	6.69	87.90	4.75
307	Crystal-City	-6.21	59.20	-5.11
250	Cureo	-3.04	72.95	0.81
201	Cypress-Fairbanks	-1.34	77.60	-2.95
120	Dalhart	2.51	76.28	-4.54
357	Dallas	-10.76	59.58	-10.78
198	Dayton	-1.06	69.15	0.58
257	Decatur	-3.46	71.38	-2.27
194	Deer Park	-0.80	77.30	0.83
4	Del Valle	13.86	77.00	13.75
301	Denton	-5.61	65.88	-6.12

50	Denver City	6.86	83.22	11.24
112	DeSoto	2.79	79.82	0.49
294	Devine	-5.25	70.13	-5.96
191	Diboll	-0.62	69.63	0.90
283	Dickinson	-4.79	62.55	-2.33
167	Dilley	0.70	70.80	-1.13
216	Dimmitt	-1.77	69.03	5.54
316	Donna	-6.89	59.67	-9.02
305	Dublin	-5.96	64.60	0.32
35	Dumas	7.98	76.18	7.98
159	Duncanville	0.88	75.63	-2.33
29	Eagle Pass	8.53	75.70	6.08
208	Eagle Mt-Saginaw	-1.56	73.28	-6.57
45	Early	7.15	92.32	7.76
71	East-Chambers	5.36	79.07	-16.01
286	East Central	-4.87	72.20	-7.09
34	Eastland	8.09	82.82	6.81
215	Ector County	-1.72	66.38	-2.63
131	Edcouch-Elsa	2.01	75.88	2.01
92	Edgewood	3.95	70.60	3.63
93	Edinburg	3.95	73.70	2.94
139	Edna	1.72	76.45	-0.20
308	El Paso	-6.26	66.75	-6.64
26	El Campo	8.77	83.57	5.38
282	Elgin	-4.76	67.30	-4.76
225	Ennis	-2.13	72.93	-1.25
66	Everman	5.87	81.38	5.26
290	Fabens	-5.10	64.35	-0.08
366	Fairfield	-12.59	61.20	-13.35
293	Farmersville	-5.19	74.50	0.09
15	Ferris	10.56	82.88	5.80
146	Floresville	1.48	72.53	0.78
105	Flower Bluff	3.34	80.40	3.26
354	Floydada	-10.12	61.35	-7.62
220	Fort Worth	-1.88	64.63	2.36
311	Fort Bend	-6.45	72.43	-7.25
312	Fredericksburg	-6.48	68.22	-2.71
59	Freer	6.31	80.13	2.17
33	Frenship	8.11	84.18	6.34
110	Friona	2.92	77.70	3.22
89	Frisco	4.26	77.63	7.78
313	Ft Sam Houston	-6.53	85.25	-4.93
218	Ft. Stockton	-1.82	69.88	-5.90
328	Gainesville	-7.78	65.25	-9.30
32	Galena Park	8.23	77.30	9.19
38	Galveston	7.65	73.05	6.14
203	Garland	-1.46	73.22	-2.37
91	Gatesville	3.99	80.80	7.04

193	George West	-0.77	76.15	2.78
361	Georgetown	-11.38	65.88	-9.46
179	Giddings	0.18	76.68	1.82
268	Glen Rose	-3.96	75.95	-0.55
363	Godley	-12.19	59.95	-9.74
85	Goliad	4.54	80.05	6.41
360	Gonzales	-11.17	60.13	-10.13
53	Goose Creek	6.67	77.20	7.65
113	Graham	2.70	78.78	3.78
77	Granbury	5.10	78.10	5.61
5	Grand-Saline	13.36	85.65	14.15
247	Grand Prairie	-2.92	71.55	-3.58
284	Grand-View	-4.82	75.93	0.01
73	Grape-Creek	5.24	76.82	2.68
295	Greenville	-5.31	65.00	1.47
251	Greenwood	-3.18	76.40	3.79
116	Gregory-Portland	2.62	82.82	2.50
101	Groesbeck	3.45	76.25	9.67
168	Harlandale	0.67	71.65	4.25
69	Harlingen	5.53	80.03	3.90
273	Hayes Consolidated	-4.22	70.00	-2.00
343	Hearne	-9.04	63.00	-13.45
352	Hempstead	-10.07	64.00	-8.27
353	Henderson	-10.11	64.65	-13.45
46	Hereford	7.02	78.63	14.83
18	Hidalgo	9.89	81.43	17.11
36	Hillsboro	7.88	74.45	6.01
359	Hitchcock	-11.04	61.40	-8.53
222	Hondo	-1.93	68.07	-0.23
217	Houston	-1.79	65.98	-0.70
147	Hudson	1.45	77.28	-3.14
287	Humble	-4.94	75.68	-6.04
246	Huntsville	-2.91	72.30	-1.76
245	Hurst-Euless-Bedford	-2.89	77.88	-5.57
230	Hutto	-2.35	75.68	1.92
214	Ingleside	-1.72	71.50	3.15
331	Ingram	-7.91	67.72	-11.03
169	Irving	0.66	75.05	-1.46
41	Jacksboro	7.46	84.35	8.30
368	Jacksonville	-13.87	53.15	-16.89
43	Jim Hogg County	7.36	82.20	7.29
260	Jourdanton	-3.65	70.93	-0.24
275	Judson	-4.36	73.30	-4.98
136	Karnes-City	1.83	74.65	6.72
196	Katy	-0.94	81.70	-2.03
49	Kaufman	6.92	78.05	5.66
119	Kennedale	2.52	78.52	2.83
348	Kermit	-9.70	60.03	-1.58

84	Kerrville	4.54	78.05	5.86
314	Kilgore	-6.56	64.60	-11.45
232	Killeen	-2.44	76.75	-5.07
102	Kingsville	3.45	75.63	5.43
329	Klein	-7.79	75.20	-7.65
74	La Vega	5.17	74.07	4.69
70	La Joya	5.39	68.72	9.77
192	La Grange	-0.65	72.13	-2.45
19	La Marque	9.71	80.45	9.56
25	La Feria	8.98	83.43	4.89
185	La Porte	-0.09	78.07	4.86
274	La Vernia	-4.22	76.38	-3.84
240	Lake Worth	-2.57	61.88	-11.21
223	Lake-Travis	-1.99	78.60	-4.52
135	Lake-Dallas	1.87	79.55	-2.34
138	Lamar Consolidated	1.73	74.85	0.42
319	Lamesa	-7.11	61.03	-6.02
262	Lampasas	-3.77	71.63	-11.34
272	Lancaster	-4.18	65.10	-0.47
345	Laredo	-9.33	65.53	-8.07
205	Leander	-1.51	75.38	1.30
200	Levelland	-1.17	72.63	-0.10
253	Lewisville	-3.23	77.78	-5.45
306	Liberty	-6.01	67.50	-11.50
56	Liberty-Hill	6.48	83.97	3.29
161	Little-Elm	0.85	68.63	-2.71
104	Littlefield	3.40	73.75	2.04
367	Livingston	-13.77	60.58	-8.12
158	Llano	0.91	79.40	2.97
166	Lockhart	0.71	71.88	1.90
115	Longview	2.65	71.60	-1.44
2	Los Fresnos Consolid	14.49	89.32	11.81
108	Lubbock-Cooper	3.23	81.97	0.86
180	Lubbock	0.17	72.90	0.82
255	Lufkin	-3.28	68.63	0.42
334	Luling	-7.97	63.70	-4.35
266	Lyford	-3.89	67.05	-3.04
80	Lytle	4.95	74.13	1.17
254	Madisonville	-3.26	71.05	1.44
330	Magnolia	-7.79	66.02	-11.02
356	Manor	-10.44	58.60	-16.75
106	Mansfield	3.29	82.05	-1.94
259	Marble Falls	-3.56	68.70	7.48
96	Marion	3.78	82.63	5.16
339	Marlin	-8.60	61.38	-17.75
171	Marshall	0.65	72.57	-2.91
271	Mathis	-4.15	61.70	-1.28
62	McAllen	6.11	78.80	6.05

14	McGregor	10.98	87.60	6.93
270	McKinney	-3.98	66.70	6.02
322	Medina Valley	-7.53	65.63	-12.29
261	Mercedes	-3.71	70.90	-6.15
65	Merkel	5.88	82.65	11.74
174	Mesquite	0.42	76.03	-2.59
68	Mexia	5.60	79.52	11.80
296	Midland	-5.47	65.30	-4.64
318	Midlothian	-6.97	72.60	-1.57
129	Mineola	2.05	76.28	1.56
126	Mineral Wells	2.14	72.47	5.71
64	Mission Consolidated	6.01	80.95	2.54
12	Monahans-Wickett-Pyo	11.25	86.63	11.39
10	Mount Vernon	11.79	86.90	12.23
341	Mount Pleasant	-8.84	59.83	-9.41
121	Muleshoe	2.44	75.75	8.12
338	Nacognoches	-8.44	63.60	-6.34
122	Natalia	2.44	74.68	-5.16
213	Navasota	-1.64	67.05	-1.08
256	Needville	-3.35	77.00	-5.44
244	New Braunfels	-2.89	72.32	-1.99
226	New-Caney	-2.19	70.65	2.07
148	Newton	1.43	73.50	1.94
263	North Forest	-3.78	64.47	-6.72
195	North East	-0.86	77.82	-0.06
236	Northside	-2.51	74.60	-3.06
184	Odem-Edroy	-0.06	76.38	-5.51
87	Orange Grove	4.32	79.10	11.79
173	Palacios	0.43	79.10	4.59
298	Palestine	-5.48	66.15	-8.29
117	Pampa	2.58	75.80	-0.59
142	Pasadena	1.60	75.63	1.47
52	Pearland	6.69	87.07	5.60
133	Pecos-Barstow-Toyah	1.97	71.02	0.04
141	Perryton	1.70	75.60	2.06
210	Pflugerville	-1.60	79.80	-0.82
94	Pharr-San Juan-Alamo	3.93	76.18	3.46
333	Pilot-Point	-7.96	66.98	-6.28
187	Pine Tree	-0.36	71.73	3.13
9	Pittsburgh	12.19	81.75	10.43
44	Plainview	7.35	77.43	6.29
340	Plano	-8.79	74.10	-8.66
160	Pleasanton	0.86	71.77	4.72
6	Point Isabel	13.21	82.18	14.20
150	Port Arthur	1.28	64.85	4.89
350	Poteet	-9.96	63.17	-11.35
177	Presidio	0.33	61.80	5.17
241	Princeton	-2.74	66.88	2.42

234	Progreso	-2.46	65.52	2.62
212	Randolph Field	-1.64	91.07	-6.38
86	Raymondville	4.41	73.50	8.33
349	Red Oak	-9.93	69.15	-9.08
88	Rice Consolidated	4.26	73.65	-0.74
335	Richardson	-8.00	69.48	-7.57
249	Rio-Grande-City	-3.01	63.60	-2.41
67	Rio Hondo	5.73	79.05	5.99
97	Robinson	3.70	85.50	2.74
47	Robstown	6.92	75.15	5.19
269	Rockdale	-3.97	72.03	-2.63
209	Rockwall	-1.58	74.70	-5.81
227	Roma	-2.21	62.38	-5.88
183	Roosevelt	-0.05	74.82	3.61
17	Rosebud-Lott	10.35	85.88	5.02
242	Round Rock	-2.83	77.20	-2.39
235	Royal	-2.49	67.55	-1.39
83	Royse City	4.56	77.30	4.76
190	San Felipe-Del Rio C	-0.53	72.32	-2.26
369	San Elizario	-14.59	55.33	-6.01
278	San Angelo	-4.47	69.65	-4.74
327	San Diego	-7.76	58.10	-15.55
13	San Benito Consolida	11.07	81.10	10.81
58	San Marcos	6.40	76.43	7.42
344	San Antonio	-9.05	63.45	-7.93
289	Sanger	-5.09	70.75	-10.05
267	Santa Rosa	-3.93	68.32	1.62
281	Santa-Fe	-4.74	71.80	-2.41
285	Schertz-Cibolo-U. Ci	-4.85	72.30	-2.47
165	Sealy	0.72	75.10	-1.04
302	Seguin	-5.72	65.30	-3.30
123	Seminole	2.43	77.28	5.49
197	Shallowater	-0.94	76.00	2.96
57	Sharyland	6.46	81.65	7.86
342	Sheldon	-8.86	66.40	-4.87
336	Sherman	-8.23	63.58	-1.10
128	Sinton	2.07	72.55	2.76
277	Slaton	-4.44	70.05	-0.89
299	Smithville	-5.56	64.10	-3.70
118	Snyder	2.56	77.88	1.93
175	Somerset	0.37	72.20	1.23
20	South Texas	9.43	93.98	5.67
231	South San Antonio	-2.40	73.40	-2.22
303	Southside	-5.78	59.80	-0.19
144	Southwest	1.51	70.57	3.36
258	Spring Branch	-3.51	67.70	-0.67
243	Spring	-2.87	76.57	-5.43
292	Stafford MSD	-5.19	71.80	-8.70

156	Stephenville	1.01	79.65	-3.08
95	Sulpher Springs	3.82	78.32	2.37
37	Sweeny	7.68	86.35	9.07
153	Taft	1.16	71.63	2.49
228	Tatum	-2.31	71.55	-2.62
206	Taylor	-1.53	72.63	-5.86
324	Teague	-7.64	70.45	6.82
321	Temple	-7.33	67.45	-5.55
42	Terrell	7.46	78.43	1.76
55	Texas City	6.54	79.63	4.49
140	Tomball	1.71	76.35	2.82
238	Troy	-2.54	75.60	-1.04
151	Tulia	1.25	75.20	0.63
21	Tuloso-Midway	9.43	81.57	7.93
317	Tyler	-6.94	65.45	-3.03
99	United	3.52	71.63	2.65
248	Uvalde Consolidated	-3.00	66.13	0.74
7	Valley-View	12.96	84.57	11.69
265	Venus	-3.86	66.43	-6.09
145	Vernon	1.49	75.35	2.30
130	Victoria	2.02	74.55	2.01
114	Waco	2.69	71.07	5.08
351	Waller	-10.04	59.47	-10.48
207	Waxahachie	-1.55	75.80	-3.51
279	Weatherford	-4.52	70.60	2.55
48	Weslaco	6.92	81.40	5.71
90	West Oso	4.10	72.80	2.26
98	West-McLennan	3.66	77.98	8.30
124	White Settlement	2.39	76.80	-0.78
72	Whorton	5.28	75.30	4.42
103	Wichita Falls	3.41	77.72	2.14
63	Willis	6.08	75.45	7.38
252	Wilmer-Hutchins	-3.21	57.63	-3.36
152	Wylie-Collin	1.22	77.68	1.80
280	Yoakum	-4.70	75.80	-8.46
23	Ysleta	9.20	81.65	7.12
186	Zapata	-0.24	65.57	-6.94