

**TEA ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS
2003–04 SCHOOL YEAR
Revised December 2004**

Introduction

The Texas Education Agency (TEA) Accountability System is a method of evaluating school districts and schools with regard to their performance on certain student indicators, and of assigning an accountability rating based on that evaluation. The newly revised TEA Accountability System is based on an improvement model in which districts and campuses must meet either an absolute standard or an improvement standard for each accountability measure. The four possible classifications for districts and individual schools are Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable, or Academically Unacceptable.

The student performance indicators used to determine if absolute standards are met consist of current year Spring TAKS and SDAA passing rates and dropout or completion rates from the previous year. These indicators provide 36 possible performance variables that are employed to assess each campus and the district as a whole. The performance of all students and of the student groups of African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged are employed in the process of assigning accountability ratings. These ratings are based on the lowest performance of any of the 36 possible measures. For schools and districts that exhibit Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable performance on any of the yearly standards, it is possible to achieve the next higher level of accountability by meeting the required improvement component of the system. The TEA Accountability System Research Brief, available from the Houston Independent School District Department of Research and Accountability, describes the accountability model for the 2003–04 school year.

The 2004 TEA Accountability System represents a significant revision of the system that has been employed by the state of Texas since 1993. While the two systems each use the same student groups (All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged), there are significant differences in the systems that require comment. A comparison of the new system and the old system, last used in 2002, is presented in order to highlight the changes and differences between the two systems (**Table 1**).

Table 1: Comparison of Key Facets of the TEA Accountability: 2002 and 2004

Component	2002	2004
Standard Rating Labels	Exemplary (district/campus) Recognized (district/campus) Academically Acceptable (district) Academically Unacceptable (district) Acceptable (campus) Low Performing (campus)	Exemplary Recognized Academically Acceptable Academically Unacceptable
Evaluation of Assessment Subjects	TAAS reading, math, and writing for all students and student group. TAAS Social Studies for all students	All TAKS subjects tested (Reading/English Language Arts, Mathematics, Writing, Social Studies, and Science) for all students and each student group

Table 1: Comparison of Key Facets of the TEA Accountability: 2002 and 2004 (cont)

Component	2002	2004
Base Indicators for Determining Rating	TAAS percent Passing Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7-12)	TAKS percent Met Standard SDAA percent Met ARD Expectations Completion Rate (for grades 9-12 Completers based on graduates, continuing students, and GED recipients as a percent of the total class starting with the ninth-grade cohort four years earlier) Annual Dropout Rate (grades 7-8 only)
Accountability Subgroup of Students	All students tested on the campus who were enrolled in the <u>district</u> as of the PEIMS fall enrollment date	All students tested on the campus who were enrolled in the <u>campus</u> as of the PEIMS fall enrollment date
Student Groups	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged	All Students, African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged
Standards for Base Indicators (Assessment Standards for TAAS and TAKS and SDAA)	Exemplary (All Subjects $\geq 90\%$) Recognized (All Subjects $< 90\%$ and $\geq 80\%$) Academically Acceptable ($< 80\%$ and $\geq 55\%$ R, M, W and $\geq 50\%$ SS) Low-Performing ($< 55\%$ R, M, W and $< 50\%$ SS)	Exemplary (All Subjects $\geq 90\%$) Recognized (All Subjects $< 90\%$ and $\geq 70\%$) Academically Acceptable ($< 70\%$ and $\geq 50\%$ R/ELA, W, SS, SDAA and $\geq 35\%$ M and $\geq 25\%$ Science) Academically Unacceptable ($< 50\%$ R/ELA, W, SS, SDAA and $< 35\%$ M and $< 25\%$ Science)
Standards for Base Indicators (Dropout/Completion Rate)	Exemplary (Dropout ≤ 1.0) Recognized (Dropout > 1.0 and ≤ 2.5) Academically Acceptable (Dropout > 2.5 and ≤ 5.0) Low-Performing (Dropout > 5.0)	Exemplary (Dropout Rate ≤ 0.2 or Completion Rate $\geq 95\%$) Recognized (Dropout Rate > 0.2 and ≤ 0.7 or Completion Rate $< 95\%$ and $\geq 85\%$) Academically Acceptable (Dropout Rate > 0.7 and ≤ 2.0 or Completion Rate $< 85\%$ and $\geq 75\%$) Academically Unacceptable (Dropout rate > 2.0 or Completion Rate $< 75\%$)
Number of Performance Measures Used	The larger and more diverse the campus or district, the more measures apply - up to 21	The larger and more diverse the campus or district, the more measures apply - up to 36
Improvement Feature	No improvement feature	Higher rating possible for Academically Acceptable and Academically Unacceptable schools by meeting Required Improvement standards
Exceptions	No exceptions	Academically Acceptable rating possible by using exceptions. The number of possible exceptions is based on the number of assessment measures.

Findings

The results from the TEA 2004 Accountability Rating System analysis of the Houston Independent School District's (HISD) indicators are presented. Comparison tables provide a summary of the TEA ratings for HISD schools for 11 years, 1993 through 2002 and 2004; the 2004 TEA ratings of HISD schools by academic level; and

a summary of the 2004 TEA ratings by administrative districts. Also provided is a table of schools that were rated Academically Unacceptable and the reasons for that rating.

This report supersedes the TEA Accountability Ratings 2003–04 Report produced in October 2004. This revision reflects the results of appeals submitted to the state regarding the ratings of several schools. Specifically, the Academically Acceptable ratings of T. H. Rogers Elementary School, Carnegie Vanguard High School, and Challenge Early College High School were appealed. The state accepted all three appeals, raising each schools' rating to Recognized.

Tables detailing school-level results are provided. These tables are organized by administrative district and provide the 2004 TEA rating together with the indicators and the relevant student groups, which determined each school's 2004 TEA rating. A listing of schools not rated for the 2003–04 school year is also included in this report.

District-Level Rating

TEA rated HISD as Academically Acceptable for 2004. The district is assigned this rating because it has campuses that are rated Academically Unacceptable. Additionally, HISD is rated Academically Acceptable because of the performance of all students and African American, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantage students on the TAKS math and science tests, the 9th–12th grade completion rate of Hispanic students, and the dropout rates of all HISD students, Hispanic students, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Table 2: 1993 to 2002 TEA Ratings of HISD Schools

Rating	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Exemplary	0	4	7	15	25	36	12	11	35	63
Recognized	4	8	26	60	50	62	23	76	89	106
Acceptable	186	220	174	162	169	158	218	166	136	81
Low-performing	55	6	35	9	10	8	18	17	2	21
Total	195	238	242	246	254	264	271	270	262	271

Table 3: 2004 TEA Ratings of HISD Schools

Rating	2004
Exemplary	9
Recognized	69
Academically Acceptable	185
Academically Unacceptable	14
Total	277

- Over the six years from 1993 to 1998, the number of Exemplary schools increased (0 to 36), however, in 1999, changes in the accountability formula resulted in only 12 schools being rated Exemplary. The number of Exemplary schools decreased by one school from 1999 to 2000. In 2001, resurgence in Exemplary Schools occurred as the number of schools in this category increased by 24 schools from 11 in 2000 to 35 schools. This reassertion of excellence continued in 2002, when 66 schools reached Exemplary status.
- When the original TEA Accountability System was first implemented in 1993, HISD had no schools receiving Exemplary status, only four schools rated as Recognized, and fifty-five rated as Low-Performing. For the first year of the new TEA Accountability System, HISD had nine Exemplary schools, sixty-nine Recognized schools, and fourteen Academically Unacceptable schools. These results indicate that HISD had a much more academically sound baseline under this new system than it did under the original TEA Accountability System.
- In 2004, the majority of HISD campuses, 185, were rated as Academically Acceptable schools under the new TEA Accountability System.

Table 4: 2004 TEA Accountability Ratings of HISD Schools by Level

Rating	Elementary	Middle	High	Total
Exemplary	7	1	1	9
Recognized	56	8	5	69
Academically Acceptable	127	36	22	185
Academically Unacceptable	9	1	4	14
Total	199	46	32	277

- Approximately 95% of the elementary schools were rated Academically Acceptable or better. The percentage of elementary schools that were rated Exemplary or Recognized under the 2004 TEA Accountability System was 32%.
- For HISD middle schools, 98% received an Academically Acceptable rating or better. Only one HISD middle school was rated as Academically Unacceptable in 2004.
- For HISD high schools, 88% received an Academically Acceptable rating or better. In 2004, the highest percentage of HISD schools that were rated Academically Unacceptable, 13% was found at the high school level.

Administrative Districts

- The number of schools rated in each administrative district varied greatly. The range was from four schools from the Acres Homes Coalition to thirty-three from the Northwest District (see **Table 5**).

- Of the 13 administrative districts, five had at least one school attain an Exemplary rating. The Central District had the highest number with 3 of 14 schools receiving an Exemplary rating.
- Six administrative districts had no schools rated as Academically Unacceptable. The North and Northeast districts had three schools performing at the Academically Unacceptable level of accountability.

Table 5: 2004 TEA Accountability Ratings by Administrative District (2003–04 Configuration)

District	Number Rated	Exemplary	Recognized	Academically Acceptable	Academically Unacceptable
Central District	14	3	3	6	2
East District	25	2	5	18	0
North District	25	0	4	18	3
Northeast District	29	0	10	16	3
Northwest District	33	0	9	22	2
South Central District	25	0	5	18	2
South District	26	0	6	19	1
Southeast District	16	0	4	12	0
Southwest District	19	1	1	17	0
West Central District	18	0	6	12	0
West District	24	0	6	18	0
Acres Homes	4	2	1	1	0
Alternative District	19	1	9	8	1
HISD	277	9	69	185	14

Academically Unacceptable Schools

- As a result of the application of the new TEA Accountability System, fourteen schools were rated as Academically Unacceptable for the 2003–04 school year (see **Table 6**).
- Of these schools, eight, were rated Academically Unaccepted because of student group performance on the science TAKS. Five were rated Academically Unaccepted because of student group performance on the math TAKS.
- Two schools, DRAW and Gregory-Lincoln Elementary School were rated Academically Unaccepted because of student group performance on the reading TAKS.
- In 2004, one school, McReynolds Middle School, was rated Academically Unaccepted because the dropout rate of two student groups was greater than the Academically Acceptable standard of 2.0%.

- Four Schools, Houston, Kashmere, and Yates high schools and Ninth Grade Academy also received ratings of Low-Performing or Needs Peer Review under the 2002 TEA Accountability System.

Table 6: HISD Schools Rated as Academically Unacceptable by the 2004 TEA Accountability System by Reason

School	Rating	Reasons							
		Reading	Math	Writing	Soc St	Science	SDAA	Comp Rate	Dropout
Alcott ES	U					T, A, E			
De Chaumes ES	U					T, H, E			
DRAW	U	T, E	T, E	T		T			
Eighth Avenue ES	U					T, E			
Gregory-Lincoln ES	U	A							
Houston, Sam HS	U		A						
Houston Gardens ES	U					T, A, E			
Janowski ES	U					T, H, E			
Jones, J. Will ES	U					H			
Kashmere HS	U		E						
McReynolds MS	U								T, H
Milam ES	U					T			
Ninth Grade Academy	U		T, A, H, E						
Yates HS	U		H						

Legend for Accountability Student Groups

T = All Students (Total)

H = Hispanic

E = Economically Disadvantaged

A = African American

W = White

U= Academically Unacceptable

2004 TEA Accountability Ratings by Administrative Districts

Central District		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Gregory-Lincoln ES	U	T, A, H, E	T, A, H, E			T			
Jones, J. Will ES	U					H			
MacGregor ES	A					T, E			
Poe ES	A			H		E			
River Oaks ES	R		E						
Roberts ES	E								
Rogers, Will ES	A					T, H, E			
Twain ES	E								
West University ES	E								
Wharton ES	R	T, E		T		T			
Wilson ES	A					H			
Gregory-Lincoln MS	A		T, A, H, E				T		
Lanier MS	R		T, A, H, E		H		T		
Lamar HS	A		A, E			A			

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups

T = All Students (Total)

H = Hispanic

E = Economically Disadvantaged

A = African American

W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings

E= Exemplary

R= Recognized

A= Academically Acceptable

U= Academically Unacceptable

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

East District	Reasons*									
	School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
			Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Briscoe ES	A		T, H, E				T, H, E			
Burnet ES	A						T, H, E			
Cage ES	E									
Carrillo ES	R	T, H, E	T, H, E	T, H, E			T, H, E			
Clinton Park ES	A		T, A, E	T			T			
De Zavala ES	A						T, H, E			
Franklin ES	A	T, H, E					T, H, E			
Gallegos ES	A						T, H, E			
Harris, R. P. ES	R	T, A, H, E	T, A, H, E				T, H, E			
Henderson, J. P. ES	A						T, H, E			
Lantrip ES	A						T, H, E			
Oates ES	R		T, H, E				T, H, E	T		
Pleasantville ES	A						T, A, E			
Port Houston ES	R	T, H, E	T, H, E				T, H, E			
Robinson ES	A						T, H, E			
Rusk ES	A	E		T, H, E			T, H, E			
Tijerina ES	A		T, H, E				T, H, E			
Whittier ES	A						T, H, E			
Edison MS	A		T, H, E							
Holland MS	A		T, A, H, E							
Jackson MS	A		T, H, E							
Project Chrysalis MS	E									
Austin HS	A		T, H, E							
Eastwood HS	R	H	T, H, E				T, H, E			
Furr HS	A		T, H, E				T, A, H, E			

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

North District		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Barrick ES	A								
Berry ES	A	T, H, E							
Burbank ES	A								
Coop ES	A								
De Chaumes ES	U								
Durkee ES	A		A						
Garcia ES	A								
Herrera ES	R	T, H, E					T		
Janowski ES	U								
Jefferson ES	A								
Ketelsen ES	A								
Looscan ES	A		T, H, E						
Lyons ES	R								
Martinez, C ES	R	T, H, E	T, H, E	T, H, E			T		
Northline ES	A								
Roosevelt ES	A								
Ryan ES	A								
Scarborough ES	A		T, H, E						
Sherman ES	R	T, H, E							
Burbank MS MS	A		A						
Fonville MS	A	T, A, H, E	T, H, E						
Henry MS	A		T, A, H, E						T, H
Marshall MS	A	T, A, H, E	T, A, H, E			T, A, H, E			T, H, E
Davis HS	A		T, A, H, E						
Houston HS	U		A						

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

Northeast District		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Atherton ES	R	H	H				T, A, E		
Bowie ES	R	H		H					
Bruce ES	A			T, E			T, E		
Chatham ES	A		T, A, E				T		
Concord ES	R	T, A, E	T, A, E	T			T	T	
Crawford ES	A								
Dogan ES	A	T, A, H, E	T, A, H, E	T, E			T		
Easter ES	R	A, E	A	T, E			T, H, E		
Eliot ES	A						T, H, E		
Henderson, Nat Q. ES	R			T, A, E					
Houston Gardens ES	U						T, A, E		
Isaacs ES	R	T, A, E	T, A, E	T, E			T, E		
Jones, Anson ES	A						T, E		
Kashmere Gardens ES	A						T, A, E		
Martinez, R ES	A						T, H, E		
McDade ES	R	T, A, E	T, A, E				T, A, E		
Pugh ES	R			T, H, E			T, H, E		
Ross ES	A						T, A, E		
Sanderson ES	R		T, A, H, E						
Scott ES	R			H			T, E	T	
Scroggins ES	A						T, H, E		
Smith, E. O. ES	A	H		T, E					
Three D Academy ES	A						A, H, E		
Fleming MS	A	A	T, A, H, E						
Key MS	A		T, A, H, E						T, E
McReynolds MS	U								T, H
Smith, E. O. MS	A	T, H, E	T, A, H, E						
Kashmere HS	U		E						
Wheatley HS	A	T, A, H, E	A, H, E				T, A, H, E		

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

Northwest District		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Allen ES	A								
Benbrook ES	A		T, H, E						
Brock ES	R								
Browning ES	R			T, H, E					
Burrus ES	R						T		
Crockett ES	A			H, E					
Durham ES	A					A, E			
Eighth Avenue ES	U					T, E			
Field ES	A		T, H, E			T, H			
Garden Oaks ES	A					T, H, E			
Harvard ES	R					T, H, E			
Helms ES	A					T, H			
Hohl ES	A		A	T, H, E		T, H, E			
Holden ES	A					T			
Kennedy ES	R		T, A, H, E	T, H, E					
Love ES	A					T, H, E			
Memorial ES	R	T, A, E	T, A, E			T			
Milam ES	U					T			
Oak Forest ES	A					T, H, E			
Sinclair ES	R	T, H, E	T, H, E	T, H, E		T			
Smith, Katherine ES	A					T, E			
Stevens ES	A					T, H, E			
Stevenson ES	A					T, H, E			
Travis ES	R	H, E		H, E		T, H, E	T		
Wainwright ES	A		T, A, H, E			T, H, E			
Black MS	A		T, H, W, E						
Clifton MS	R	H, E	T, A, H, E				T		
Hamilton MS	A		T, A, H, E						
Hogg MS	A		T, H, E						
Reagan HS	A		T, H, E			T, H, E			
Scarborough HS	A		T, A, H, E, W			T, A, H, E		H, E	
Waltrip HS	A		T, A, H, E			T, A, H, E			
Washington HS	A		T, A, H, E			T, A, E			

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

South Central District		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Alcott ES	U					T, A, E			
Blackshear ES	A			T, A, E		T, A, E			
Brookline ES	R	T, H, E	T, H, E	T, H, E		T, H, E			
Cornelius ES	R					T, A, H, E			
Dodson ES	A	H				T, H, E			
Douglass ES	A					T, E			
Foster ES	A					T, A, E			
Garden Villas ES	A		T, A, E			T, A, H, E			
Golfcrest ES	A					T, H, E			
Gregg ES	A					H			
Hartsfield ES	A					T, A, E			
Kelso ES	R	A	T, A, E	T, A, H, E		T, A, E			
Lockhart ES	R					T, A, E			
MacArthur ES	A					T, E			
Peck ES	A					T, E			
Seguin ES	A	H				T, H, E			
Thompson ES	A	E	T, A, E			T, A, E			
TSU/HISD ES	R	T	T				T		
Turner ES	A					T, A, E			
Whidby ES	A	T	T, A, E			T, A, E			
Cullen MS	A		T, A, H, E						
Hartman MS	A		T, A, E				T		T, H
Ryan MS MS	A		T, A, H, E						
Jones HS	A	T, H, E	T, A, H, E			T, A, H, E		T, A, H, E	
Yates HS	U		H						

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

South District		Reasons*							SDAA	Completion	Dropout
School	Rating	TAKS									
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science					
Almeda ES	A							T, A, E			
Bastian ES	A					T, A, E		T, A, E			
Codwell ES	R							T, A, E			
Fairchild ES	R	T, A, E	T, A, E		T, A, E			T, A, E			
Frost ES	A								T		
Grimes ES	A		T, A, E					A			
Grissom ES	A							T, A, H, E			
Hobby ES	A	H	T, A, E					T, A, H, E			
Law ES	A		T, A, E					T, A, E			
Mading ES	R		E					T, A, H, E			
Mitchell ES	A							T, H, E			
Montgomery ES	R	T, A, H, E	T, A, E		T, A, H, E			T			
Petersen ES	R	T, A, E	T, A, H, E		T, H, E			T, A, E	T		
Reynolds ES	A		E					T, A, E			
Rhoads ES	A	T, A, E	T, A, E		E			T, A, E			
Windsor Village ES	R	T, H, E	T, H, E		H, E			T, A, H, E			
Woodson ES	A							T, A, E			
Young ES	A							T, A, E			
Attucks MS	A		T, A, H, E								
Dowling MS	A		T, A, H, E				A				
Thomas MS	A	T, A, H, E	T, A, H, E			T, A, H, E			T		
Woodson MS	A		T, A, E								
Madison HS	A		T, A, H, E					H			
Ninth Grade Academy	U		T, A, H, E								
Sterling HS	A		T, A, H, E					T, A, H, E			
Worthing HS	A		T, A, E					T, A, E			

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

2004 TEA Accountability Ratings by Administrative Districts

Southeast District		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Belfort Acad ES	A		A				T, H, E		
Bonner ES	A						T, H, E		
Crespo ES	A						T, H, E		
Davila ES	R	T, H, E		T, H, E			T, H, E		
Harris, J. R. ES	R	T, H, E	T, H, E				T, H, E		
Lewis ES	R			T, A, H, E					
Park Place ES	A						T, H, E		
Patterson ES	A						T, H, E		
Rucker ES	A						T, H, E		
Sanchez ES	R						T, H, E		
Southmayd ES	A						T, H, E		
Deady MS	A		T, H, E						
Ortiz MS	A		T, A, H, E						
Stevenson MS	A		T, H, E						
Chavez HS	A		T, A, H, E, W				T, A, H, E		
Milby HS	A		A				T, H, E		

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

Southwest District		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Anderson ES	A					T, A, E			
Argyle ES	A			A		T, H, E			
Bell ES	A			H					
Elrod ES	A	T, H, E	T, A, H, E			T, A, H, E			
Foerster ES	A		A			T, A, E			
Fondren ES	A					T, H, E			
Gross EL ES	A					T, A, E			
Halpin** ES	A					T, H, E			
Kolter ES	E								
Milne ES	A		T, A, H, E			T, A, E			
Parker ES	A					H, E			
Red ES	A					A, E			
Sugar Grove ES	A					T, H, E			
Tinsley ES	A					T, A, H, E			
Valley West ES	R	H	A			T			
Fondren MS	A	H	T, A, H, E		T, A, H, E				
Johnston MS	A		H						
Welch MS	A		T, A, H, E						
Westbury HS	A	H, E	T, A, H, E			T, A, H, E		H	

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

** Paired with Anderson ES for school rating

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

West Central District		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Benavidez ES	A					T, H, E			
Braeburn ES	A	T, H, E	T, H, E	T, H, E					
Condit ES	R		H, E			T			
Cunningham ES	A		T, H, E			T, H, E			
Gordon ES	A					T, H, E			
Herod ES	R		A, H, E			T, W, E			
Horn ES	R	A, E	A, E	T, W					
Longfellow ES	A		A, E			A, E			
Lovett ES	R					T, A			
Rodriguez ES	A		T, H, E			T, H, E			
Shearn ES	A					T, H, E			
Sutton ES	A					H			
Kaleidoscope MS	A		T, H, E						
Long MS	A	H	T, A, H, E						T, H, E
Pershing MS	A		H, E				T		
Pin Oak MS	R	H, E	T, A, H, W, E	H	T, H, E		T		
Bellaire HS	A		A						
Challenge HS	R		A, H, E		T			T, A, H, W, E	

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups

T = All Students (Total)

H = Hispanic

E = Economically Disadvantaged

A = African American

W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings

E= Exemplary

R= Recognized

A= Academically Acceptable

U= Academically Unacceptable

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

West District School	Rating	Reasons*					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		TAKS							
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Ashford ES**	A					A, H, E			
Askew ES	R		A, E	A, H, E			T		
Bonham ES	A					T, A, H, E			
Briargrove ES	R	H, E	H, E			T			
Briarmeadow ES	A			T					
Bush ES	R					T			
Emerson ES	A		A			T, A, H, E			
McNamara ES	A					T, H, E			
Neff ES	R	H, E		T, H, E		T, H, E			
Pilgrim ES	R					T, H, E			
Piney Point ES	A					H			
Sands Point ES	A	T, H, E	H			T, E			
School at Post Oak ES	A					T			
Shadowbriar ES	A					A, H, E			
Walnut Bend ES	A		A			H, E			
White ES	A						T		
Briarmeadow MS	R		T						
Grady MS	A						T		
Revere MS	A							T	
Sharpstown MS	A		T, A, H, E						
West Briar MS	A		A						
Lee HS	A	A, H, E	T, A, H, E, W			T, A, H, E			
Sharpstown HS	A		T, A, H, E, W			T, A, H, E			
Westside HS	A		A, H, E					H	

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

** Paired with Shadowbriar ES for school rating

2004 TEA Accountability Ratings by Administrative Districts

Acres Homes		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Highland Heights ES	E								
Osborne ES	E								
Wesley ES	R			T, A, E					
Williams MS	A		T, A, E						

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

**2004 TEA Accountability Ratings
by Administrative Districts**

Alternative District		Reasons*							
School	Rating	TAKS					SDAA	Completion	Dropout
		Reading	Math	Writing	Social Studies	Science			
Banneker-McNair **	A					T, E			
DRAW	U	T, E	T, E	T		T			
Energized ES	A					T, E			
Kandy Stripe ES	A		T, A			H			
Rice School ES	R	H, E	A, E	A, H, E		T, A, H, E	T		
Rogers, T. H. ES	R						T		
YMCA ES**	A	T	T, A, E			T, A, E			
Young Scholars ES	A	T	T	T					
Dominion Academy MS	A		T, A, E						
Energized MS	R	T, H, E	T, H, E		T, E				
Rice School MS	R		T, A, H, E				T		
Rogers, T. H. MS	R						T		
WALIPP MS	R	T, A, E	T, A, E						
Carnegie Vanguard	R					A		T, A, H, W, E	
DeBakey HS	E								
HSLECJ	R		T, A, H, E			T, A, H, E			
HSPVA	R					A, E			
Jordan, Barbara HS	A		T, A, H, E			A			
Middle College	A					H			

* Legend for Accountability Student Groups
 T = All Students (Total) H = Hispanic E = Economically Disadvantaged
 A = African American W = White

Legend for TEA Accountability Ratings
 E= Exemplary
 R= Recognized
 A= Academically Acceptable
 U= Academically Unacceptable

** Alternative District school pairings: Banneker-McNair paired with Peck ES and YMCA ES paired with Whidby ES for school rating.