THE BEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

FOR LATINO STUDENTS 1999-2002

Kenneth J. Meier

Robert D. Wrinkle

Daniel Hawes

and

Nick Theobald

A REPORT OF THE

TEXAS EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE PROJECT

NUMBER 22 OCTOBER 10, 2003

For further information, contact: Nick Theobald at theobald@polisci.tamu.edu
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 1999-2002

The education of minority students is of primary concern for education leaders and policy-makers in Texas. In recent years, minority students have made impressive gains on the statewide TAAS exam. However, Latino students continue to lag behind Anglo students in TAAS scores, Texas's primary measurement of basic skills. Latino students, however, have made great strides in closing this gap. In 1996, 54.2% of Latino test-takers passed the TAAS, compared to 79.8% for Anglo students, a gap of 25.6 percentage points. By 2002, Latino students cut this gap in half to 12.8 percentage points, scoring an average of 79.7% compared to an average of 92.5% for Anglos in that year. Indeed, this is evidence of significant progress. However, these statewide gains are not evenly distributed across all districts. Some school districts have made even more impressive gains while others have fallen behind. The Texas Educational Excellence Project believes that by identifying those districts that do a better job in educating Latino students, Latino TAAS performance can be further improved. The programs and policies used by the exemplary districts may then be used as a standard by which other districts can measure and improve their own performance.

The Bangs Independent School District provides one such example. Taking resources and environmental factors into account, the predicted three-year average pass rate for Latino students at Bangs was 77.48%. The 1999-2002 Bangs Latino average pass rate was, in fact, 91.5%, over 14 percent better than expected. In 2002, 92.9% of Latino students in Bangs passed the TAAS. This impressive pass rate for Latino test-takers helps the district achieve the highest score in our ranking system. This is the second consecutive year in which Bangs ISD has achieved the top rank. Bangs superintendent James Hartman attributes the district's success to an emphasis on involving all students regardless of ethnicity. Bangs ISD makes special efforts to provide opportunities for student involvement in scholastic and extracurricular activities. Hartman believes that this involvement leads to a sense of belonging among the students, which in turn contributes to greater success.

Another exemplary school district is Grand Saline. This school district ranked second overall, and first place for the 2002 TAAS test under the TEEP ranking system. Gerald Gilbert, Grand Saline's superintendent, attributes their success to their emphasis on early intervention programs. Non-English speaking children are engaged in academic programs at an early age where phonics is emphasized. However, Gilbert considers the greatest factor to their success be parental involvement in the students' schooling as well as energetic teachers with a desire to teach.

Both Bangs and Grand Saline are relatively small school districts, and their approaches might not readily transfer to larger districts. However, some large districts, such as Galena Park, also have done an exemplary job at educating Latino students. In 2002, Galena Park ISD had a Latino student pass rate of 88%. This is particularly impressive since over 65% of the students in this district live in poverty.

The Texas Educational Excellence Project uses an analytical technique called multiple regression to identify which school district do a better job at educating Latino students. This technique allows important variables be considered, rather than simply comparing TAAS rates, which would ignore factors that influence performance. School districts often have little or no control over such external factors. By utilizing multiple regression, we can assess the impact of particular policy and resource related variables while holding other variables constant. Using this method, TEEP is able to rate a school district's overall performance in educating Latino students while controlling for the level of institutional resources. This provides a more valid basis of comparison of performance between individual school districts.

The model used in this analysis is based on what the literature defines as an "educational production function." A large literature has been developed 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 educational process. These inputs include the district's level of operating expenditures, percent of low-income students, the poverty level of the district, level of education of Latinos in the district, and various educational policies of the district. The prediction of how well the district should perform in educating Latino students is a result of the estimation of the established production function. Thus, with the results of the estimation, we can compare how well districts *actually* perform to how well the model *predicts* they will perform given a certain level of resources. This difference of *actual* to *predicted* is the measure of how well the districts are doing in educating Latino students. In other words, those districts that actually perform better than *predicted*, are those districts that are doing a superior job of educating Latino students.

The 1999-2002 Education Production Function

The dependent variable in our production function is the school district's TAAS pass rate for Latino students. All school districts in Texas are required to annually 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 incorrect to claim that this variable adequately captures the entire range of learning for Latino students. Indeed, we make no claims that this is an overall measure of Latino student learning. However, it is a measure of how well students do in acquiring basic skills. Thus, by rating school districts on this measure, we have a measure of how well the district does in teaching basic skills to Latino students.

The independent variables in our analysis fall into four types: school district policies, environmental constraints, teacher quality, and financial resources. School district policies include class size, student attendance (percent attending on an average day), and the percent of students enrolled in gifted classes. Performance should be negatively related to class size and positively related to the two other policy measures.

Environmental constraints are factors that hinder student performance. While school districts cannot adjust these factors, it is important to statistically control for them when assessing student performance. The measures of environmental constraint are the percentage of Latino families that live in poverty in that district and the percent of poor students (those who are eligible for free school lunches). Additionally, the educational level of Latinos within the district is measured using the percentage of Latinos in the district over age 25 with at least a high school education. This variable should be positively related to student performance while the poverty variables should be negatively related to student pass rates.

Teacher qualification is measured in two ways: the percent of teachers within a district with only a temporary teachers certificate in a subject specialty (as opposed to a permanent certificate), and the average number of years of teaching experience. We expect that teacher experience should contribute to student performance, while the percent of non-certified teachers should negatively affect Latino pass rates.

Among the most important factors are financial resources of the school district. However, the relationship between educational expenditures and student performance is controversial. Hanushek, in a variety of works (1986; 1989; 1996) finds no consistent relationship between money and student performance. For some time this finding has been the conventional wisdom for educational policy researchers. Lately, however, a number of researchers have qualified Hanushek's position. For example, in recent longitudinal studies, Murray (1995), Evans, Murray and Schwab (1997) and Murray, Evans and Schwab (1995) reported that districts that increased expenditures had improved student performance. A 1999 study by Bohte found that expenditures were correlated with higher test scores in Texas, even when controlling for the previous year's test scores.

In our analysis, we consider institutional resources and expenditures an important variable in our model. Financial resources are measured in three ways: instructional funds per student, average teacher salary, and the percent of funds received from the state. These measures characterize the total financial resources allocated to education, the district's ability to attract qualified teachers in a competitive marketplace, and the state's efforts to compensate for the unequal distribution of local financial resources. All of these measures should be positively related to student performance.

Texas school districts are diverse in both size and homogeneity. In order to use a set of organizations relatively similar in the tasks they perform, our analysis is limited to school districts with at least 1000 and at least 10 percent Latino students. The data analysis is a pooled time series with data from 1999 to 2002. Serial correlation, resulting from any trends in the variables over time, needs to be controlled for in any pooled time series analysis. A series of dummy variables are used to control of serial correlation.

Table 1 shows the basic production function equation. Nine of the 11 variables are statistically significant. These include two of the environmental constraints, both teacher qualifications, two of the school district policies, and all three of the financial resources.

Several variables are powerful predictors of Latino pass rates. Student attendance positively and significantly influences Latino student pass rates. The percentage of Latinos over age 25 with at least a high-school diploma is also a positive and significant predictor of Latino performance. Both teacher quality variables are statistically significant variable and in the anticipated direction. The coefficients for these variables indicate the amount of change in the dependent variable, Latino pass rates, that is related to a one-unit change in the independent variable. Thus, a one percent increase in enrollment in gifted classes produces a .19 percent increase in Latino TAAS pass rates.

It should be noted, however, that schools have little or no control over these variables, particularly the environmental constraints. As such, it is difficult for schools to substantially improve Latino pass rates by simply adjusting the levels of these variables. However, some districts seem to better utilize the resources available to them. Furthermore, we can identify those districts by comparing the *expected* pass rates given the resources with the *actual* pass rates. This then allows us to compare school districts as to how well they perform relative to expectations. La Marque ISD, for example, was predicted by the model to have an average Latino pass rate of 71.3 for the period of 1999-2002. Their actual average pass rate was 83.5%; meaning 12.2% more Latino students passed the TAAS than expected. This significant achievement advances La Marque ISD from 19th place last year to fourth place for the 1999-2002 average. This improvement is, indeed, worth noting.

Using this method, the top forty districts are listed in Table 2. The first column provides the numerical score on which the districts are ranked. The second column is the average pass rate for Latino students from 1999 to 2002. The last column is the residual score for the 2002 TAAS exam only. Bangs ISD performed 14.02 points better than expected, placing it in the top rank, followed closely by Grand Saline (+13.43) and Angleton (+13.41).

The best 25 school districts for Latino students in 2002 only are listed in Table 3. Grand Saline ISD is ranked number one followed by La Joya and Mount Vernon. La Joya's 2002 score is particularly impressive, moving from a 1999-2002 average of 6.71 to 12.07 for 2002. La Joya ISD has made significant gains in the past year, moving from 21st place to 2nd place in one year. The gains in 2002 are likely the result of policies adopted earlier; thus, these are the districts that are likely to be rated highly in future studies.

Large districts are distinct from smaller districts in that they face different challenges and often cannot change as rapidly as smaller district because more students are involved. Table 4 lists the ten best large districts (15,000 students or more) for Latino students. Galena Park holds is ranked the number one for the second consecutive year with a score of 9.61, followed by Ysleta (+8.69) and Aldine (+8.07).

The Appendix alphabetically lists all the districts examined in this study, along with their score. Any person interested in a specific school district can examine the Appendix to locate that district and identify their score and rank.

Conclusion

This study has identified those school districts in Texas that performed better than expected on the TAAS pass rate for Latino students. These districts can serve as role models for other districts in Texas. The districts have a wide variety of programs for early diagnosis, student motivation, and parental involvement. Not all of the districts use the same approach, indicating that success can be attained in a variety of ways. If effective programs and performances from these districts are identified, then other districts can adopt them, which will result in an overall benefit to Latino students.

Although this study only examines exemplary districts, that should not detract from the relatively low over-all TAAS pass rate for Latino students in Texas. In order to close the test gap between Latino and Anglo students, additional improvement is needed in these districts as well as other districts. Significant progress has been made in the last few years; yet, there is a great need for further improvement. Improving educational opportunities for all Texas children requires a long-term commitment to education. Improvement will require openness to innovation, as well as an emphasis on meaningful evaluation.

References

Bothe, John, 1999. "Class Size, Teacher Salaries and Student Performance." College Station, TX: Texas Educational Excellence Project.

Burtless, Gary. 1996. *Does Money Matter? The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement and Adult Success*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Culp, Cindy V. 2003. "Waco Trustees Grade Promotion Policy Will Increase Number of Students Retained?" *Waco Tribune.* http://www.wacotrib.com/news/newsfd/auto/feed/news/2003/04/10/1049951906.00353.1168.7802.html

Hanushek, Eric A. 1986. "The Economics of Schooling: Production and Efficiency in Public Schools." *Journal of Economic Literature* 24:1141-77.

Hanushek, Eric A. 1989. "The Impact of Differential Expenditures on School Performance." *Educational Researcher* 23 (4): 45-65.

Hanushek, Eric A. 1996. "School Resources and Student Performance." In *Does Money Matter? The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement and Adult Success*, Gary Burtless, ed. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Hedges, Larry V. and Rob Greenwald. 1996. "Have Times Changed? The Relation between School Resources and Student Performance." In *Does Money Matter? The Effect of School Resources on Student Achievement and Adult Success,* ed. Gary Burtless. Washington: Brookings.

Murray, Sheila E. 1995. "Two Essays on the Distribution of Education Resources and Outcomes." PhD. diss. Department of Economics, University of Maryland.

Murray, Sheila E., William N. Evans and Robert M. Schwab. 1995. "Money Matters After All: Evidence From Panel Data on the Effects of School Resources." University of Kentucky and University of Maryland working paper: The Martin School.

Smith, Kevin B. 1995. "Policy, Markets, and Bureaucracy: Reexamining School Choice." *Journal of Politics* 56 (May), 475-491.

Table 1. Regression Results

	Latino TAAS Pass Rate
Percent Low Income	-0.058
	(4.11)**
Percent Gifted	0.194
	(3.34)**
Attendance	2.963
	(10.34)**
Average Teacher Salary K	0.283
	(2.13)*
Class Size	0.293
	(1.32)
Non-Certified Teachers	-0.295
	(5.31)**
Teacher Experience	0.384
	(3.07)**
State Aid	0.033
	(2.90)**
Instructional Expenditures	0.003
	(3.00)**
High School Education	7.892
	(2.97)**
% Poverty Background	-3.863
	(1.80)
y00	-0.674
	(1.05)
y01	1.888
	(2.79)**
y02	5.131
	(7.11)**
Constant	-265.193
	(9.59)**
Observations	1338
R-squared	0.36

Absolute value of t statistics in parentheses
significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Table 2. Top 40 Districts in Texas

Rank	District	Score	Average TAAS Rate	2002 Score
1	Bangs	14.02	91.50	10.20
2	Grand Saline	13.43	88.07	14.09
3	Angleton	13.41	93.45	11.84
4	La Marque	12.20	83.50	9.00
5	Mount Vernon	12.19	90.18	11.87
6	Brazosport	11.78	91.40	10.08
7	Del Valle	11.77	78.57	11.87
8	Los Fresnos Cons	11.74	89.57	7.78
9	Monahans-Wickett-Pyote	11.52	90.32	10.96
10	Valley View	11.39	86.80	10.83
11	Burnet Cons	10.86	85.32	6.32
12	Alvin	10.73	83.70	11.53
13	Hidalgo	10.31	85.05	10.48
14	Columbia-Brazoria	10.16	88.10	11.74
15	Ferris	9.99	84.40	9.07
16	Coleman	9.62	86.02	6.49
17	Galena Park	9.61	81.97	9.99
18	Bishop Cons	9.57	87.20	5.70
19	Calhoun County	9.41	85.78	7.35
20	San Benito Cons	9.35	82.58	8.65
21	Point Isabel	9.12	83.50	5.18
22	Ballinger	8.75	88.03	6.26
23	Ysleta	8.69	83.43	5.22
24	Merkel	8.51	88.25	8.11
25	Hereford	8.42	82.78	8.32
26	Willis	8.20	80.43	10.61
27	Aldine	8.07	83.43	6.63
28	Pittsburg	8.02	81.62	0.56
29	Alice	7.95	74.82	10.14
30	Sweeny	7.89	88.98	6.19
31	Plainview	7.87	80.65	6.64
32	Orange Grove	7.84	85.00	10.12
33	Frenship	7.74	86.18	3.92
34	Denver City	7.56	87.25	6.19
35	Tuloso-Midway	7.53	83.20	3.77
36	Eagle Pass	7.53	78.50	5.12
37	El Campo	7.53	85.47	5.62
38	Galveston	7.35	76.20	7.71
39	Kaufman	7.08	81.07	2.64
40	Dumas	6.94	80.55	8.33

Table 3. Top 25 for 2002

Rank	District	Score	Average TAAS Rate	2002 Score
1	Grand Saline	13.43	88.07	14.09
2	La Joya	6.71	73.95	12.07
3	Mount Vernon	12.19	90.18	11.87
4	Del Valle	11.77	78.57	11.87
5	Angleton	13.41	93.45	11.84
6	Columbia-Brazoria	10.16	88.10	11.74
7	Alvin	10.73	83.70	11.53
8	Groesbeck	6.77	81.05	11.05
9	Monahans-Wickett-Pyote	11.52	90.32	10.96
10	Valley View	11.39	86.80	10.83
11	Willis	8.20	80.43	10.61
12	Hidalgo	10.31	85.05	10.48
13	Bangs	14.02	91.50	10.20
14	Alice	7.95	74.82	10.14
15	Orange Grove	7.84	85.00	10.12
16	Brazosport	11.78	91.40	10.08
17	Galena Park	9.61	81.97	9.99
18	Presidio	2.92	65.75	9.98
19	McKinney	0.75	74.35	9.47
20	Bay City	6.17	77.98	9.33
21	Cuero	1.33	79.68	9.32
22	Ferris	9.99	84.40	9.07
23	La Marque	12.20	83.50	9.00
24	Childress	3.61	81.22	8.95
25	San Benito Cons	9.35	82.58	8.65

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

Rank	District	Score	Average TAAS Rate	2002 Score
1	Galena Park	9.61	81.97	9.99
2	Ysleta	8.69	83.43	5.22
3	Aldine	8.07	83.43	6.63
4	La Joya	6.71	73.95	12.07
5	Goose Creek Cons	5.67	80.40	5.13
6	United	4.62	73.95	4.79
7	McAllen	4.55	80.55	3.03
8	Waco	4.51	76.07	7.67
9	Harlingen Cons	4.38	82.57	4.12
10	Pharr-San Juan-Alamo	3.39	78.47	2.82

Appendix. Scores for All Scools

Rank	District	Score	Average TAAS Rate	2002 Score
113	Abilene	2.46	79.82	3.63
284	Alamo Heights	-6.21	81.38	-6.61
27	Aldine	8.07	83.43	6.63
29	Alice	7.95	74.82	10.14
304	Alief	-7.74	69.25	-7.71
219	Alpine	-2.14	77.30	-5.72
51	Alvarado	6.19	77.90	5.23
12	Alvin	10.73	83.70	11.53
159	Amarillo	0.21	74.70	0.47
89	Anahuac	3.77	78.38	-4.12
3	Angleton	13.41	93.45	11.84
82	Aransas County	4.44	79.40	6.72
295	Aransas Pass	-7.03	68.07	-7.16
306	Arlington	-8.00	70.57	-6.75
289	Athens	-6.61	66.47	-2.76
22	Ballinger	8.75	88.03	6.26
209	Bandera	-1.72	74.57	2.27
1	Bangs	14.02	91.50	10.20
53	Barbers Hill	6.16	87.20	7.20
175	Bastrop	-0.16	72.70	-3.58
52	Bay City	6.17	77.98	9.33
136	Bellville	1.36	78.05	-3.81
87	Belton	4.14	81.93	4.39
201	Birdville	-1.40	81.32	-1.40
18	Bishop Cons	9.57	87.20	5.70
102	Bloomington	3.13	76.10	1.56
93	Boerne	3.62	82.12	6.44
120	Borger	2.16	78.00	5.63
137	Brady	1.35	79.47	3.29
6	Brazosport	11.78	91.40	10.08
109	Breckenridge	2.68	78.57	-1.30
299	Brenham	-7.23	67.97	-2.69
180	Bridgeport	-0.49	77.20	2.79
125	Brooks County	2.03	72.43	3.33
258	Brownfield	-4.43	68.57	-7.81
228	Brownsville	-2.64	73.20	-2.21
210	Brownwood	-1.78	73.95	0.43
225	Bryan	-2.46	71.85	-1.28
11	Burnet Cons	10.86	85.32	6.32
55	Calallen	6.04	86.77	8.01
121	Caldwell	2.15	78.55	-1.22
19	Calhoun County	9.41	85.78	7.35
186	Cameron	-0.75	77.25	-4.13

252	Canutillo	-4.04	71.07	-0.03
56	Canyon	6.00	85.90	4.74
254	Carrizo Springs Cons	-4.09	69.20	-1.35
220	Carrollton-Farmers Branch	-2.16	76.18	-2.45
307	Castleberry	-8.28	64.28	-7.09
280	Cedar Hill	-5.89	75.12	-5.68
334	Center	-14.93	60.53	-11.53
200	Channelview	-1.35	73.90	3.74
333	Chapel Hill	-13.42	60.45	-12.20
94	Childress	3.61	81.22	8.95
155	Clear Creek	0.43	81.85	-3.19
302	Cleburne	-7.48	69.80	-6.65
335	Cleveland	-17.15	53.10	-17.50
151	Clifton	0.71	79.55	2.81
184	Clint	-0.67	73.62	-0.43
16	Coleman	9.62	86.02	6.49
187	College Station	-0.79	82.95	-2.54
213	Colorado	-1.98	76.45	-4.51
14	Columbia-Brazoria	10.16	88.10	11.74
282	Columbus	-5.98	73.18	-9.16
146	Comal	0.95	78.82	0.14
107	Comanche	2.79	81.18	-2.62
100	Comfort	3.31	78.75	3.89
185	Connally	-0.68	77.60	-1.74
250	Conroe	-3.88	74.10	-1.52
83	Copperas Cove	4.43	83.60	3.49
179	Corpus Christi	-0.42	75.65	-1.28
178	Corrigan-Camden	-0.30	72.97	4.85
239	Corsicana	-3.35	70.03	-1.81
324	Cotulla	-10.17	61.10	-8.78
157	Crosby	0.24	78.72	4.26
62	Crowley	5.43	88.32	-0.82
279	Crystal City	-5.67	62.15	-7.40
139	Cuero	1.33	79.68	9.32
193	Cypress-Fairbanks	-1.04	79.97	-2.99
99	Dalhart	3.31	77.90	5.24
332	Dallas	-13.29	62.45	-8.77
222	Decatur	-2.22	75.30	-2.53
133	Deer Park	1.57	81.62	4.29
7	Del Valle	11.77	78.57	11.87
262	Denton	-4.80	69.57	-2.17
34	Denver City	7.56	87.25	6.19
269	Devine	-5.26	72.20	-7.75
127	Diboll	1.92	74.88	0.13
242	Dickinson	-3.46	66.78	-2.33
198	Dimmitt	-1.30	72.10	0.83
312	Donna	-8.66	60.72	-8.36

288	Dublin	-6.58	67.72	-10.74
40	Dumas	6.94	80.55	8.33
143	Duncanville	0.98	78.05	0.78
253	Eagle Mt-Saginaw	-4.04	73.78	-2.43
36	Eagle Pass	7.53	78.50	5.12
263	East Central	-4.85	74.90	-4.50
194	East Chambers	-1.09	75.93	-9.58
46	Eastland	6.66	84.82	3.11
236	Ector County	-3.13	68.97	0.21
182	Edcouch-Elsa	-0.60	75.70	-3.88
68	Edgewood	4.92	75.15	4.06
103	Edinburg Cons	3.04	76.10	3.44
173	Edna	-0.14	77.32	2.00
37	El Campo	7.53	85.47	5.62
300	El Paso	-7.34	68.68	-7.61
293	Elgin	-6.66	67.53	-12.06
207	Ennis	-1.68	76.78	-0.59
91	Everman	3.64	82.45	1.49
256	Fabens	-4.25	67.65	-5.68
249	Farmersville	-3.82	77.12	-0.48
15	Ferris	9.99	84.40	9.07
106	Floresville	2.87	76.97	4.42
95	Flour Bluff	3.60	82.85	4.44
294	Floydada	-6.82	66.43	-5.74
290	Fort Bend	-6.64	75.82	-7.04
153	Fort Worth	0.46	69.90	3.89
292	Fredericksburg	-6.66	71.72	-7.75
33	Frenship	7.74	86.18	3.92
90	Frisco	3.73	81.38	2.62
278	Ft Stockton	-5.63	69.60	-8.95
311	Gainesville	-8.61	67.55	-6.64
17	Galena Park	9.61	81.97	9.99
38	Galveston	7.35	76.20	7.71
205	Garland	-1.53	75.00	-1.71
41	Gatesville	6.92	85.15	7.74
117	George West	2.26	80.80	2.60
326	Georgetown	-12.10	69.65	-6.51
122	Giddings	2.11	80.12	2.93
297	Glen Rose	-7.21	75.80	-9.60
69	Goliad	4.88	83.65	5.40
321	Gonzales	-9.40	63.95	-3.02
61	Goose Creek Cons	5.67	80.40	5.13
115	Graham	2.43	81.82	0.13
237	Grand Prairie	-3.13	73.35	-3.87
2	Grand Saline	13.43	88.07	14.09
72	Grape Creek	4.69	79.12	-1.62
232	Greenville	-2.72	68.65	1.31
149	Greenwood	0.82	82.60	3.61

111	Gregory-Portland	2.50	84.88	-0.22
44	Groesbeck	6.77	81.05	11.05
108	Harlandale	2.73	76.65	6.56
84	Harlingen Cons	4.38	82.57	4.12
238	Hays Cons	-3.24	72.68	-0.80
328	Hearne	-12.28	63.65	-19.78
296	Hempstead	-7.20	68.88	-4.55
318	Henderson	-9.11	67.50	-8.52
25	Hereford	8.42	82.78	8.32
13	Hidalgo	10.31	85.05	10.48
50	Hillsboro	6.32	77.88	2.09
330	Hitchcock	-12.79	62.20	-16.63
183	Hondo	-0.61	72.35	-1.05
202	Houston	-1.41	69.88	2.01
114	Hudson	2.44	79.53	0.21
259	Humble	-4.64	77.45	-5.23
195	Huntsville	-1.13	75.28	-3.56
223	Hurst-Euless-Bedford	-2.34	80.18	-0.37
192	Ingleside	-0.98	75.55	0.34
308	Ingram	-8.45	69.47	-6.65
174	Irving	-0.15	76.80	-1.50
325	Jacksonville	-11.27	59.62	-1.33
57	Jim Hogg County	5.99	83.90	2.31
191	Jourdanton	-0.96	75.07	4.17
261	Judson	-4.67	74.78	-5.50
197	Katy	-1.25	83.45	-1.57
39	Kaufman	7.08	81.07	2.64
77	Kennedale	4.55	82.55	3.14
317	Kermit	-9.04	64.57	-4.55
58	Kerrville	5.93	82.05	8.47
229	Killeen	-2.66	77.78	-5.74
92	Kingsville	3.63	78.47	2.97
286	Klein	-6.30	78.30	-2.92
42	La Feria	6.88	85.80	4.74
131	La Grange	1.67	77.12	6.40
45	La Joya	6.71	73.95	12.07
4	La Marque	12.20	83.50	9.00
152	La Porte	0.64	80.68	0.37
66	La Vega	5.13	76.50	1.98
275	La Vernia	-5.42	76.80	-4.92
199	Lake Travis	-1.33	80.57	2.84
265	Lake Worth	-4.98	61.88	-6.17
135	Lamar Cons	1.44	77.97	0.83
274	Lamesa	-5.37	66.30	-0.83
268	Lampasas	-5.23	71.75	-4.08
230	Lancaster	-2.66	69.82	1.26
301	Laredo	-7.43	69.20	-5.83
211	Leander	-1.83	77.30	-2.36

266	Lewisville	-5.12	77.93	-8.10
287	Liberty	-6.55	70.15	-3.81
64	Liberty Hill	5.21	84.40	4.64
233	Little Elm	-3.06	67.12	-13.25
101	Littlefield	3.29	76.85	1.86
316	Livingston	-8.98	65.28	-0.58
96	Llano	3.56	83.57	4.81
188	Longview	-0.84	72.18	-3.39
8	Los Fresnos Cons	11.74	89.57	7.78
163	Lubbock	0.16	76.50	0.85
67	Lubbock-Cooper	5.06	86.75	7.22
226	Lufkin	-2.48	73.05	0.67
285	Luling	-6.24	67.97	-6.14
267	Lyford Cons	-5.19	69.30	-7.29
140	Lytle	1.19	71.35	-6.35
167	Madisonville Cons	0.07	74.78	2.60
313	Magnolia	-8.67	65.35	-8.75
329	Manor	-12.51	58.35	-14.00
130	Mansfield	1.72	83.12	-0.39
181	Marble Falls	-0.51	74.50	3.36
85	Marion	4.35	85.30	3.39
331	Marlin	-12.96	59.45	-13.73
255	Mathis	-4.20	65.65	-6.50
76	McAllen	4.55	80.55	3.03
54	McGregor	6.08	87.32	2.01
150	McKinney	0.75	74.35	9.47
320	Medina Valley	-9.31	66.30	-8.60
241	Mercedes	-3.44	73.35	-2.29
24	Merkel	8.51	88.25	8.11
169	Mesquite	-0.01	78.53	-3.26
48	Mexia	6.58	82.18	-0.85
273	Midland	-5.37	70.05	-0.71
246	Midlothian	-3.71	79.07	-4.73
132	Mineola	1.59	78.82	0.02
78	Mineral Wells	4.52	77.45	3.37
86	Mission Cons	4.33	82.65	4.34
9	Monahans-Wickett-Pyote	11.52	90.32	10.96
323	Mount Pleasant	-10.08	61.50	-9.22
5	Mount Vernon	12.19	90.18	11.87
73	Muleshoe	4.66	79.82	3.32
319	Nacogdoches	-9.29	65.43	-12.19
165	Natalia	0.12	73.43	-11.99
160	Navasota	0.16	71.88	-0.23
204	Needville	-1.50	80.53	1.91
244	New Braunfels	-3.64	74.18	-3.40
124	New Caney	2.05	75.53	4.09
154	North East	0.44	80.95	1.15
298	North Forest	-7.21	62.55	-8.98

218	Northside	-2.13	77.35	-2.05
214	Odem-Edroy	-1.99	77.40	-8.04
32	Orange Grove	7.84	85.00	10.12
118	Palacios	2.20	82.72	5.01
281	Palestine	-5.94	68.28	-7.09
172	Pampa	-0.07	76.68	-2.10
126	Pasadena	1.98	78.95	1.69
43	Pearland	6.77	88.45	4.74
164	Pearsall	0.14	73.25	-1.21
110	Pecos-Barstow-Toyah	2.59	74.05	6.81
144	Perryton	0.97	77.30	-0.01
171	Pflugerville	-0.06	82.62	0.09
97	Pharr-San Juan-Alamo	3.39	78.47	2.82
272	Pilot Point	-5.34	70.57	-0.21
176	Pine Tree	-0.20	75.62	1.27
28	Pittsburg	8.02	81.62	0.56
31	Plainview	7.87	80.65	6.64
123	Pleasanton	2.08	75.47	3.93
21	Point Isabel	9.12	83.50	5.18
98	Port Arthur	3.32	68.47	1.84
310	Poteet	-8.55	65.72	-5.21
105	Presidio	2.92	65.75	9.98
177	Princeton	-0.29	71.97	3.39
142	Progreso	1.11	70.40	5.41
47	Raymondville	6.61	78.68	6.01
303	Red Oak	-7.73	72.32	-2.07
148	Rice Cons	0.93	73.97	-7.18
305	Richardson	-7.86	72.03	-6.12
247	Rio Grande City Cons	-3.79	66.80	-3.65
60	Rio Hondo	5.75	82.65	1.25
88	Robinson	3.95	87.25	0.76
71	Robstown	4.73	76.55	2.69
248	Rockdale	-3.80	74.62	-6.20
277	Roma	-5.59	64.05	-4.42
141	Roosevelt	1.16	77.60	0.22
221	Round Rock	-2.19	79.07	-3.01
196	Royal	-1.13	71.88	2.99
75	Royse City	4.56	78.60	4.32
276	San Angelo	-5.46	71.25	-6.41
309	San Antonio	-8.50	67.70	-6.69
20	San Benito Cons	9.35	82.58	8.65
322	San Diego	-9.41	61.60	-11.09
327	San Elizario	-12.10	62.00	-6.90
216	San Felipe-Del Rio Cons	-2.02	74.72	-3.91
59	San Marcos Cons	5.89	80.25	5.22
212	Santa Fe	-1.97	75.95	1.63
224	Santa Rosa	-2.43	73.62	2.02
208	Schertz-Cibolo-U City	-1.70	77.15	2.46

170	Sealy	-0.06	78.25	-0.46
257	Seguin	-4.31	69.40	0.78
158	Shallowater	0.22	78.98	-4.29
49	Sharyland	6.51	84.72	8.48
314	Sheldon	-8.69	68.10	-8.20
283	Sherman	-6.17	69.18	-4.63
104	Sinton	3.03	76.28	5.05
231	Slaton	-2.71	75.00	0.32
240	Smithville	-3.41	69.55	3.21
119	Snyder	2.19	80.05	1.66
147	Socorro	0.95	76.50	-0.16
138	Somerset	1.34	76.32	-0.70
206	South San Antonio	-1.56	76.77	-0.44
63	South Texas	5.36	93.48	-0.32
234	Southside	-3.07	65.62	0.71
112	Southwest	2.47	74.00	4.17
251	Spring	-4.03	78.70	-1.18
235	Spring Branch	-3.12	71.28	1.34
260	Stafford MSD	-4.66	73.85	-7.51
168	Stephenville	0.05	80.93	-1.20
30	Sweeny	7.89	88.98	6.19
161	Sweetwater	0.16	76.18	-0.67
145	Taft	0.96	74.65	0.46
243	Tatum	-3.57	72.47	-6.84
217	Taylor	-2.03	72.50	-8.62
245	Teague	-3.65	78.65	-2.48
291	Temple	-6.65	69.88	-6.43
65	Terrell	5.15	78.20	2.00
70	Texas City	4.78	81.95	2.91
128	Tomball	1.78	80.05	1.50
190	Troy	-0.92	78.78	0.70
156	Tulia	0.28	76.70	-0.99
35	Tuloso-Midway	7.53	83.20	3.77
270	Tyler	-5.29	70.10	1.78
74	United	4.62	73.95	4.79
203	Uvalde Cons	-1.44	70.10	2.53
10	Valley View	11.39	86.80	10.83
227	Venus	-2.56	67.95	0.29
162	Vernon	0.16	77.07	-4.35
116	Victoria	2.27	77.35	1.89
80	Waco	4.51	76.07	7.67
315	Waller	-8.93	63.75	-4.48
189	Waxahachie	-0.92	79.15	0.08
215	Weatherford	-1.99	75.82	-0.30
79	Weslaco	4.51	82.97	3.38
166	West Oso	0.11	72.78	-7.07
81	Wharton	4.51	79.15	3.19
134	White Settlement	1.47	77.52	0.89

129	Wichita Falls	1.78	79.05	-0.65
26	Willis	8.20	80.43	10.61
271	Wilmer-Hutchins	-5.29	57.95	-0.96
23	Ysleta	8.69	83.43	5.22
264	Zapata County	-4.89	65.00	-10.84