

RESEARCH

DROPOUT ANALYSIS 2003–04



INTRODUCTION	1
RESULTS	4
DISCUSSION	8
Appendix A: Dropout Categories as Defined by the Texas Education Agency	10
APPENDIX B: REASONS FOR EXCLUDED RECORDS AS DEFINED BY THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY	11
APPENDIX C: HISD 2003–04 DROPOUT PERCENTAGES BY SCHOOL, ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT, AND REGION	12



HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

Board of Education

Dianne Johnson, PRESIDENT

Karla Cisneros

Diana Dávila, FIRST VICE PRESIDENT

Kevin H. Hoffman

Manuel Rodríguez, Jr., SECOND VICE PRESIDENT

Lawrence Marshall

Arthur M. Gaines, Jr., SECRETARY

Greg Meyers

Harvin C. Moore, ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Abelardo Saavedra
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Kathryn Sánchez
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Venita R. Holmes
RESEARCH SPECIALIST

Michael A. Schroder
RESEARCH SPECIALIST

Harry M. Selig
RESEARCH MANAGER

HISD 2003–04 DROPOUT ANALYSIS

Introduction

Background

Throughout the state of Texas, school districts report dropout information to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) at the end of the academic year. However, the procedures for identifying dropouts has changed over the years. Specifically, in 1987, a dropout was defined as a student in grades 7–12 who did not hold a high school diploma or the equivalent, and who was absent from school for 30 or more consecutive days with no evidence of being enrolled in another public or private school. As implemented by the State Board of Education, students with an approved excuse were excluded from the dropout definition, as were students who returned to school the following semester or school year. Subsequently, the first Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) dropout records were submitted for students dropping out during the 1987–88 school year.

In the original dropout definition, as outlined in the *TEA 1988-89 PEIMS Data Standards*, students did not count as dropouts who received General Educational Development (GED) certificates. In addition, students who transferred to other educational settings leading to high school diplomas, GED certificates, or college degrees were also excluded. Students who withdrew to enter health care facilities and those incarcerated in correctional facilities were also not included in the dropout definition. Beginning with the 1992–93 dropout rate, TEA searched dropout data for prior years to identify previously reported dropouts. Repeat dropouts were removed from the dropout count. Also beginning in 1992–93, a student expelled for committing certain types of criminal acts on school property or at a school-related event was removed from the dropout count if the term of expulsion had not expired. By 1999, Senate Bill (SB) 103 amended the accountability statute to exclude all expelled students from the dropout count during the terms of expulsion.

Legislative direction given at the time the revised Texas Education Code was adopted in 1995 indicated that, in deleting the dropout definition from code, it was intended that students who meet all graduation requirements but do not pass the exit-level Texas Assessment of Academic Skills not be counted as dropouts. Also beginning that year, students who withdrew from school to return to their home countries were not counted as dropouts, even if the districts did not have evidence that the students had re-enrolled in school. Further, when the age of compulsory attendance was raised from 16 to 17 in 1989, an exemption was added for students who are at least 17 years old and enrolled in GED preparation programs. In 1999, SB 1472 added an exemption for students who are at least 16 years of age and enrolled in Job Corps programs.

In 2001, the legislature revisited the exemption of students attending school while in correctional facilities or residential treatment centers. Under House Bill 457, a student who fails to enroll in school after release from one of these facilities is no longer counted as a dropout for the district in which the facility is located if that district is not the student's home district.

By 2003, the 78th Legislature passed legislation affecting the dropout rate calculated by TEA. As a result, SB 186 requires dropout rates to be computed according to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and graduation rates to be computed according to No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 standards. The first school year for which dropout data will be collected based on the NCES definition and procedures is 2005–06. In addition, HB 2683 requires that the performance of students served in Texas Youth Commission facilities not be attributed to the districts serving these facilities for the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) measures and accountability ratings.

TEA Dropout Definition

A dropout is defined as a student who is enrolled in school at some time during the school year but leaves school during the school year without an approved excuse. A dropout is also defined as a student who

completes the school year and does not return the following year. In 2003–04, a student reported to have left school for any of the following reasons was considered a dropout for accountability purposes:

- to enroll in an alternative program and was not in compliance with compulsory attendance;
- to enroll in an alternative program and was not working toward a GED certificate or a high school diploma;
- to enroll in college but was not pursuing a degree;
- enrollment was revoked due to absences;
- expelled for criminal behavior and could return to school but had not;
- expelled for reasons other than criminal behavior;
- left because of low or failing grades, poor attendance, language problems, exit-level Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) or Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) failure, or age;
- left to pursue a job or join the military;
- left due to pregnancy or marriage;
- left due to homelessness or non-permanent residency;
- as a result of alcohol or other drug abuse problems;
- did not return to school after completing a term in a Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program; or
- left for another or an unknown reason.

TEA Dropout Exclusions

Since the current TEA definition of a dropout grew out of the accountability system used to rate the performance of districts and campuses, the definition excludes some students who might be considered dropouts under other dropout definitions. Some groups of school “leavers” are excluded from the dropout count to avoid unfairly penalizing districts for dropout circumstances outside their control. For example, because of the difficulty in tracking students who have left the country, students who withdraw from school to return to their home countries are not counted as dropouts, even if they do not indicate intent to re-enroll in school. To count these students as dropouts would inflate the dropout rates of districts that have disproportionate numbers of foreign students.

Others are excluded to avoid unintended negative consequences for students. For example, repeat dropouts (students who were counted as dropouts in previous years, returned to school, then dropped out again) are removed from the official dropout count. Because students who drop out but return to school are more likely to drop out again, including repeat dropouts in the count could discourage districts from aggressively trying to recover these students.

TEA and the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) both define a dropout as a student who is enrolled in school at some time during the school year but either: leaves school during the school year without an approved excuse; or completes the school year and does not return the following year. Leavers are not considered dropouts. A student who leaves school for one of the following reasons is not considered a dropout by TEA or NCES: (1) graduates; (2) transfers to, or withdraws with intent to transfer to, a public or private school; (3) is being home schooled; (4) enrolls in college; or (4) dies.

Further, a student who leaves school for one of the following reasons is not considered a dropout by TEA standards:

- receives a General Educational Development (GED) certificate by March 1 the following year;
- enrolls in an approved adult education GED preparation program; or
- meets all graduation requirements but does not pass the exit-level TAAS or TAKS.

According to NCES, the only type of student who is not considered a dropout is one who leaves school and receives a GED by the last Friday in October of the following year.

The Dropout Calculation

An annual dropout rate is calculated by dividing the number of students who drop out during a single school year by the total number of students enrolled the same year. Annual dropout rates reported by different organizations may differ because: (a) different grade levels are included in the calculation; (b) dropouts are defined and counted differently; (c) total student counts are taken at different times of the school year; or (d) the data systems employed provide different levels of precision.

In 1992–93, districts began submitting individual student attendance records as part of the PEIMS data collection. For the first time, TEA was able to compute cumulative enrollment—the number of students in attendance in grades 7–12 at any time during the previous school year. Cumulative enrollment more closely parallels the required reporting of dropouts, which covers students who drop out at any time during the school year and includes students who enroll after the fall enrollment count. Cumulative enrollment also provides the most consistent data for comparisons of dropout rates between districts and campuses with different mobility rates. For these reasons, cumulative enrollment replaced fall enrollment in the dropout rate calculation. This is the only change that has been made to the calculation during the 14 years the annual dropout rate has been reported by TEA.

Completion Rate

A completion rate is the percentage of students from a class of first-time ninth graders or seventh graders who complete their high school education by their anticipated graduation date. Completion may be defined as those who graduate, continue in high school, and/or receive a GED.

Longitudinal Completion Rate

Due to interest on the part of educators and policy makers, TEA calculated a longitudinal completion rate, which is comprised of completion rates for eight classes of ninth-grade students, in the graduating classes of 1996 through 2004. The method used to calculate the rates was developed so that the completion/student status rates and longitudinal dropout rate equal 100 percent. The completion/student status rates include three components: graduates, continuing students, and GED recipients. The longitudinal dropout rate makes up a fourth component. The longitudinal rate is based on the same definition of dropouts used in the TEA annual dropout rate.

The longitudinal rates for the class of 2004 are based on the tracking of students who began grade 9 for the first time in the 2000–01 school year. Completion/student status and longitudinal dropout rates are reported in AEIS district reports and on campus reports for high schools with continuous enrollment in grades 9–12 for the preceding four years.

Longitudinal Rate

TEA also calculates longitudinal rates for Grades 7–12 to determine the number of students continuing through grade levels. A longitudinal dropout rate is the percentage of students from the same class who drop out before completing their high school education. A Grade 7–12 longitudinal dropout rate was first calculated in 1997–98. The longitudinal rates for the class of 2004 are based on the tracking of students who began Grade 7 in 1998–99.

Use of Dropout Rate in TEA Accountability System

When HISD and TEA determine schools' accountability ratings, dropout rates are a major factor. For this reason, it is very important to have an agreed-upon definition of a dropout and compile accurate records on dropouts. A new accountability system was developed for the 2004 ratings cycle. Ratings will be based on TAKS performance, State-Developed Alternative Assessment (SDAA) performance, Grade 9–12 completion rates, and Grade 7–8 annual dropout rates. A Grade 9–12 completion rate reflects the percentage of students in the ninth grade class who complete high school by the cohort's expected graduation date four years later.

Three of the four indicators will be evaluated for individual student groups (African American, Hispanic, White, and economically disadvantaged), as well as for all students. SDAA results will be evaluated for all students only. There are four standard ratings for districts and campuses: *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, *Academically Acceptable*, and *Academically Unacceptable*. Other labels can be applied in special circumstances outside the standard rating procedures. Standards for performance on the base indicators are phased in over time. For the 2005 accountability ratings:

- At least 75 percent of a Grade 9 class must graduate, receive a GED certificate, or be enrolled in high school for a rating of *Academically Acceptable*. In addition, a Grade 7–8 annual dropout rate of 1.0 percent or less is required for the *Academically Acceptable* rating;
- At least 85 percent of a Grade 9 class must graduate, receive a GED certificate, or be enrolled in high school for a rating of *Recognized*. In addition, a Grade 7–8 annual dropout rate of 0.7 percent or less is required for the *Recognized* rating; or
- At least 95 percent of a Grade 9 class must graduate, receive a GED certificate, or be enrolled in high school for a rating of *Exemplary*. A Grade 7–8 annual dropout rate of 0.2 percent or less is required for the *Exemplary* rating.

Alternative education accountability procedures, developed for alternative education campuses (AECs) and charters registered as AECs, use TAKS, SDAA, Grade 9–12 completion rates, and Grade 7–12 annual dropout rates to determine whether these campuses are *Academically Acceptable*. At least 75 percent of a Grade 9 class must graduate, receive a GED certificate, or be enrolled in high school and the Grade 7–12 annual dropout rate must be 10.0 percent or less.

Results

Districtwide

Table 1 presents the districtwide and state dropout rates for the five accountability student groups used for the school years 1999–2000 to 2003–04. **Appendix C** presents the 2003–04 dropout rates for the district, by campus, administrative districts, and regions for the five student accountability groups and Asian students.

Table 1: Districtwide and State Annual Dropout Rates by Student Groups, 1999–2000 to 2003–04

Category	1999–00 Gr. 7–12		2000–01 Gr. 7–12		2001–02 Gr. 7–12		2002–03 Gr. 7–8		2003–04 Gr. 7–8		2003–04 Gr. 7–12	
	HISD	State	HISD	State	HISD	State	HISD	State	HISD	State	HISD	State
Total	3.2	1.3	1.5	1.0	1.4	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.6	0.2	2.2	0.9
Afr. Amer.	3.5	1.8	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.2	1.8	1.0
Hispanic	3.4	1.9	2.0	1.4	1.8	1.3	1.2	0.4	0.7	0.3	2.8	1.3
White	1.5	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.9	0.4
Econ. Disadv.	2.1	1.3	1.4	1.0	1.3	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.2	2.1	0.9

- In 2003–04, the Grade 7–8 overall dropout rate for HISD was 0.6% and the dropout rate for the state was 0.2%. In comparison, the Grade 7–12 dropout rate for HISD was 2.2%, while the state dropout rate was 0.9% in 2003–04.
- For both HISD and the state, the Grade 7–12 dropout rates for economically disadvantaged students were higher than the Grade 7–8 dropout rates in 2003–04. The differences in the rates were moderately larger for the district than for the state (1.5 and .7 percentage points, respectively).
- Relative to ethnicity, in 2003–04, the HISD Grade 7–8 and the Grade 7–12 dropout rates were highest among Hispanic students and lowest among White students. The Grade 7–8 comparison was 0.7% for Hispanic students and 0.2% for White students, while the Grade 7–12 comparison was 2.8% for Hispanic students and 0.9% for White students.

- When contrasting 1999–00 to 2003–04, HISD and the state Grade 7–12 dropout rates for each of the student groups decreased. The largest decrease in the HISD as well as the state dropout rates were among African American students by 1.7 and 0.8 percentage points, respectively.
- The HISD Grade 7–12 dropout rate for economically disadvantaged students from 1999–2000 to 2003–04 remained unchanged compared to the decrease in the state dropout rate of 0.4 percentage points.

Table 2 provides the official dropout rate in 2003–04 for Grades 7–12 for all students, by ethnicity and economic status. Further, the actual number of dropouts reported in 2003–04 in HISD, the number of records excluded from the actual number, resulting in the official number of dropouts are presented in Table 2. Cumulative attendance and group percent attendance provide additional data relative to dropouts. It should

Table 2: Annual Grades 7–12 Dropouts by Student Groups, 2003–04

<u>Student Groups</u>	<u>Dropouts Reported</u>	<u>Records Excluded</u>	<u>Official Dropouts</u>	<u>Cumulative Attendance</u>	<u>Group Percent</u>	<u>Official Dropout Rate Grades 7–12</u>
All Students	2,181	326	1,855	84,491	100	2.2
African American	646	163	483	26,729	32	1.8
Hispanic	1,396	142	1,254	45,311	54	2.8
White	109	19	90	9,574	11	0.9
Native American	2	0	2	59	0	3.4
Asian/Pac. Islander	28	2	26	2,818	3	0.9
Economic Disadv.	1,435	208	1,227	59,242	70	2.1

Economically Disadvantaged percentage is based upon the All Students group.

be noted that cumulative attendance represents the total number of students in corresponding grades reported in attendance during any six-week period of the school year, as submitted on the PEIMS end-of-year attendance records.

- The official number of dropouts in HISD for Grades 7–12 during the 2003–04 academic year totaled 1,855 students. Official dropouts were primarily comprised of 1,254 Hispanic students, followed by 483 African American students. There were only 90 White students reported as official dropouts in the Grades 7–12 subgroup.
- The overall number of students counted in the cumulative attendance record in 2003–04 for Grades 7–12 was 84,491 students. Hispanic students represented 54% and African American students represented 32% of the cumulative attendance figure. In addition, 70% of the students who were reported in attendance were economically disadvantaged.
- The official dropout rate for Hispanic students in Grades 7–12 was 2.8, which was the highest among student groups who are most represented in the district.

Table 3 shows the official dropout rate for Grades 7–8 in 2003–04 of HISD students by ethnicity and economic status. Records excluded, official dropouts, cumulative attendance, and group percent of Grades 7–8 students are also depicted in Table 3. As in Table 2, cumulative attendance represents the total number of students in corresponding grades reported in attendance during any six-week period of the school year, as submitted on the PEIMS end-of-year attendance records.

- The official number of dropouts in HISD for Grades 7–8 during the 2003–04 academic year consisted of 184 students. Hispanic and African Americans dominated the official dropout figures as indicated by 127 students were Hispanic and 49 were African American.
- The total number of students counted in the cumulative attendance record in 2003–04 for Grades 7–8 was 30,938 students. Hispanic students were found to reflect 56% of the reported cumulative attendance and

Table 4: HISD Dropouts Excluded From Official Count by TEA, 2002–03 and 2003–04

	Number of Students	
	2002–03	2003–04
Potential Dropouts Reported by HISD	2,476	2,181
Recovery Category		
Enrollment	240	196
Previous Dropout	79	48
GED	49	39
Duplicate	5	28
Graduate	11	7
Attendance	71	4
Not ADA Eligible	11	4
Total Recovered Dropouts	466	326

in a total of 2,010 dropouts for which HISD was accountable. By the 2003–04 school year, HISD experienced a decline in the potential number of dropouts to 2,181 students. As a result of the dropout recovery process, HISD was able to eliminate 326 students as dropouts.

- In 2002–03, the largest number of recovered dropouts, 240, were students who were identified as being enrolled in a public school elsewhere in Texas. This represents 51.5% of the total number excluded. Similar findings were apparent in 2003–04, with 196 or 60.1% of students being recovered as dropouts due to enrollment in public school somewhere else in the state.
- The percentages of recovered dropouts who were previous dropouts declined from 17.0% of the recovered dropouts in 2002–03 to 14.7% in 2003–04. In contrast, the percentages of a recovered dropouts based on GED status increased from 10.5% of recovered dropouts in 2002–03 to 12.0% in 2003–04.

High Schools

There were 32 high schools in HISD with Grade 7–12 dropout rates and Grade 9–12 completion rates in 2003–04 for the student accountability groups and Asian students (Appendix C). One school, Lee High School was projected to be Low Performing in 2005 based on the 2003–04 dropout data.

- The Grade 7–12 overall dropout rates of the 32 high schools ranged from 0% to 7.1% in 2003–04. DeBakey High School for Health Professions and the High School for the Performing and Visual Arts reported no dropouts, while Lee High School had the highest overall dropout rate of 7.1%.
- Among these 32 high schools, the Grade 9–12 completion status dropout rates ranged from 23.2% to 0.0%. Lee had the highest completion status dropout rate with 23.2%, while DeBakey High School for Health Professions and the High School for the Performing and Visual Arts had the lowest rate of 0.0%.

Middle/Combined Schools

There were 46 middle/combined schools in HISD with Grade 7–8 and Grade 7–12 dropout rates (Appendix C). The Grade 7–8 dropout rates were used as part of the calculations to determine these schools' accountability ratings.

- The Grade 7–8 overall dropout rates of the 46 middle and combined schools ranged from 0% to 1.7%. Briar Meadow, Clifton, Kaleidoscope, Lanier, Las Americas, Pershing, Project Chrysalis, The Rice School, T. H. Rogers, and WALIPP middle schools reported no Grades 7–8 dropouts for 2003–04.
- The highest Grade 7–8 dropout rate reported among all students and student groups was 2.0% for Hispanic students at Johnston Middle School in 2003–04.
- There were seven schools projected to be Low Performing based on the Grades 7–8 dropout rates: Attucks, Fondren, Johnston, Long, Thomas, Welch, and Williams.

Alternative Accountability and Other Schools

There were 11 alternative accountability schools, three disciplinary alternative educational programs (DAEPs), and 12 other schools within HISD with dropout rates for the five student accountability groups and Asian students (Appendix C). Although DAEP schools did not receive accountability ratings, their dropout data are included in the districtwide dropout rates and, thus, impacted the district as a whole.

- Among the 11 alternative schools, 10 schools reported Grade 7–8 dropout rates in 2002–03. Three schools were projected to be low performing due to annual or completion status dropout rates: ALTA, Drop Back In, Houston Night High School.
- The annual and completion status dropout rates at the DAEPs were 0% at JJAEP (since the dropout data were attributed to the student’s home campus) and CEP Southeast and Southwest.
- Annual Grade 7–8 and Grade 7–12 dropout rates among schools in the Other group were 0%, with the exception of HCC Life Skills, in Grades 7–12. The highest completion status dropout rates, among the schools meeting accountability size requirements, were at HCC Life Skills.

Administrative Districts and Regions

Appendix C presents the dropout rates for each of the five regions and 14 HISD administrative districts. Among the Regions, all total Grade 7–8 dropout rates were less than 1.0%. All regions’ total Grade 7–12 dropout rates exceeded 1.0%, ranging from 1.6% in the Central region to 5.3% in the Alternative/Charter region. The completion status dropout rates were less than 25.0% in all of the regions. The rates among the administrative districts followed the same trends as the regions, with the exception of North/Acres Homes. The total Grade 7–8 annual rates were less than 1.0%. The total Grade 7–12 annual dropout rates were greater than 1.0% in all the districts with the exception of West Central. All districts had completion status rates less than 25.0%.

Discussion

For 2003–04, HISD reported 2,181 students as potential dropouts; TEA recovery procedures determined that 326 of these students were not dropouts. Therefore, the number of dropouts for which HISD was accountable during the 2003–04 school year was 1,855, with a decrease of 155 students from 2,010 students identified in 2002–03. Furthermore, the 2003–04 districtwide Grade 7–8 dropout rates were substantially lower than the Grade 7–12 dropout rate (0.6% vs. 2.2%). In addition, the dropout rates for all ethnic groups in grades 7–8 were between 0.0% and 0.7%, while the dropout rates in Grades 7–12 were between 0.9% and 2.8%. Asian and White students, with equal dropout rates, were lower than African American and Hispanic rates.

HISD considers dropout prevention and recovery as a major priority in an attempt to meet districtwide goals of improving student achievement. To that end, the district implemented a wide range of programs to meet the varied needs of its diverse student population. Secondary schools have initiated strategies and interventions which they believe will better serve their unique populations. In previous years, the district has created a Dropout Roundtable comprised of central office administrators, district office administrators, principals, and school staff that meets regularly to initiate policy and programs for addressing the dropout situation. Outreach has brought other partners such as the business community, neighborhood organizations, and public health agencies into the district’s efforts to address the dropout issue. Preventive in nature, all of these programs seek to identify and serve at-risk students as early as possible so that they complete their education.

At the beginning of the 2004–05 school year, HISD initiated “Reach Out for Dropouts” to personally contact students who did not return to school and were potential dropouts. As a result of this effort, 291 students re-enrolled and 48 students were able to graduate in May. Continued efforts such as “Reach Out for Dropouts” can reclaim students who would otherwise remain as dropouts. Other initiatives at the high school level can help students remain in school, complete their education, and graduate. As a result of these initiatives, HISD can expect to lower annual and completion status dropout rates in the future.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Dropout Categories as Defined by Texas Education Agency

Student withdrew from/left school:

- to pursue a job
- to join the military
- because of pregnancy
- to marry
- due to alcohol or other drug abuse problems
- because of low or failing grades
- because of poor attendance, enrollment not revoked by district
- because of language problems, enrollment not revoked by district
- because of age
- due to homelessness or non-permanent residency

Student was expelled under the provisions of TEC §37.007 but can now return to school and has not done so.

Student withdrew from/left school for reasons related to academic performance such as low or failing grades, poor attendance, language problems, or TAAS or TAKS failure.

Other

Source: "PEIMS Leaver-Reason-Code, TEA, July 18, 2003.

Appendix B

Reasons for Excluded Records as Defined by Texas Education Agency

Student graduated

Student died while enrolled in school or during the summer break after completing the prior school year

Student withdrew from/left school:

- to enroll in another Texas public school district

- to enroll in a private school in Texas

- to enroll in a public or private school outside Texas

- to return to family's home country

- to attend an alternative program (GED, JTPA, trade school, drug rehabilitation, etc.), is in compliance with compulsory attendance laws (TEC Sections 25.085-25.086), and district has acceptable documentation that the student is working toward the completion of high school (diploma or GED certificate)

- to enter college with documentation that he or she is working towards an Associate's or Bachelor's degree
- to enter a health care facility

Student was expelled under the provisions of TEC §37.007 and cannot return to school

Student failed exit-level TAAS or TAKS but met all other graduation requirements

Student who still resides in the district officially transferred to another Texas public school district through the Student Transfer System (STS).

Student completed the GED and has not returned to school

Student withdrew from/left school for home schooling

Student was incarcerated in a facility outside the boundaries of the district

Student was withdrawn from school by the district when the district discovered that the student was not a resident at the time of enrollment or had falsified enrollment information, proof of identification was not provided, or immunization records were not provided

Student graduated in a previous school year, returned to school, and left again

Student received a GED in a previous school year, returned to school to work toward the completion of a high school diploma, and then left

Student was removed from the district by Child Protective Services (CPS), and the district has not been informed of the student's current status or enrollment

Student was court ordered to attend an alternative education program.

Source: "PEIMS Leaver-Reason-Code, TEA, July 18, 2003.

Appendix C

HISD 2003-04 Dropout Percentages by School

School	Annual Dropout Rates												Completion Status Dropout Rates						2005 Low-performing Group(s) †
	Grades 7-8						Grades 7-12						Grades 9-12						
	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	
Standard Account. Regular/Magnet																			
Austin HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	4.1	0.0	12.5	4.1	3.2	3.7	10.9	0.0	*	11.3	0.0	10.2	
Bellaire HS	*	*	–	–	–	–	0.9	0.9	0.3	2.4	0.1	1.6	3.3	7.1	1.4	9.1	0.3	6.0	
Carnegie Vanguard H	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.3	8.7	5.1	13.5	4.2	11.5	
Challenge HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	1.1	0.0	*	2.7	0.0	0.0	10.3	8.7	5.1	13.5	4.2	11.5	
Chavez HS	0.0	–	*	*	*	*	3.3	3.0	2.3	3.6	0.7	3	13.4	8.7	16.7	13.1	25.0	13.3	
Davis HS	*	–	–	*	–	*	3.9	5.2	*	3.7	3.6	3.5	11.2	19.6	*	10.3	0.0	11.2	
DeBakey H S H P	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Eastwood Academy	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.4	*	*	0.5	0.0	0.5	2.3	–	–	2.3	–	0.0	
Furr HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1.8	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.9	4.8	7.0	*	4.6	0.0	5.0	
H S for Law Enforce.	–	–	–	–	–	–	1.2	1.1	0.0	1.4	0.0	1.4	6.6	5.3	*	7.5	0.0	8.5	
H S P V A	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Houston, Sam HS	*	–	–	*	–	*	2.4	1.3	0.0	2.5	2.5	2.1	12.1	2.4	*	13.0	9.5	11.1	
Jones HS	*	*	–	–	–	*	3.2	1.9	0.0	4.8	0.0	2.7	15.6	9.8	*	22.7	*	16.2	
Jordan, Barbara HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.8	0.9	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.7	3.4	2.5	–	5.5	*	3.4	
Kashmere HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	4.5	4.2	–	6.1	7.7	4.5	10.6	11.5	–	5.3	*	8.5	
Lamar HS	*	*	–	*	*	*	1.4	0.8	2.2	2.7	0.8	1.2	5.1	2.3	7.3	9.2	3.8	7.4	

Data in bold indicate accountability groups meeting size requirements. If a rate is not bold, the group failed to meet TEA's size requirements.

* Fewer than 5 students enrolled.

– No students reported in that category.

Data Source: TEA 2003–2004 Campus Dropout and Completion Status Summaries, June 2005.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged

If a bold rate does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement for rates greater than:

- 1.0% Gr.7-8, Annual Dropout (Standard)
- 10.0% Gr. 7-12, Annual Dropout (Alternative)
- 25.0% Gr. 9-12, Completion Status Dropout (Standard and Alternative)

Appendix C

HISD 2003-04 Dropout Percentages by School

School	Annual Dropout Rates												Completion Status Dropout Rates						2005 Low-performing Group(s) †	
	Grades 7-8						Grades 7-12						Grades 9-12							
	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.		
Lee HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	7.1	5.0	3.3	7.9	5.4	5.5	23.2	27.8	8.8	24.3	19.2	22.3	A	
Madison HS	*	–	–	–	*	*	1.8	1.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	2.1	5.3	4.2	0.0	7.1	14.3	4.5		
Middle College HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.3	0.4	*	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.4	3.3	*	0.0	*	3.4		
Milby HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.8	3.2	0.0	2.8	7.4	2.2	14.2	13.6	*	14.1	*	10.6		
Ninth Gr. Academy	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.8	2.4	–	3.1	–	2.7	10.3	8.7	5.1	13.5	4.2	11.5		
Reagan HS	*	*	–	–	–	*	3.4	2.0	0.0	3.4	5.6	3	9.7	11.8	–	10.2	0.0	10.2		
Scarborough HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.9	2.2	0.0	3.7	1.4	2.4	12.2	9.5	*	17.4	5.5	14.3		
Sharpstown HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	4.8	3.8	3.8	5.2	6.5	4.4	12.8	7.4	13.0	15.5	16.2	13.8		
Sterling HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.4	1.8	9.1	4.0	0.0	1.8	7.3	6.2	*	7.7	40.0	6.6		
Waltrip HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	1.8	1.4	0.0	2.3	1.0	1.9	7.2	2.7	0.0	10.6	3.3	9.4		
Washington HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.7	2.0	0.0	5.2	8.1	2.2	3.8	2.3	*	13.9	0.0	4.9		
Westbury HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.8	1.3	2.2	4.7	3.6	2.1	13.2	9.2	12.5	22.9	4.4	14.9		
Westside HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	2.7	2.5	0.7	4.8	1.6	4	7.5	6.1	1.7	12.9	5.6	9.6		
Wheatley HS	*	*	–	–	–	*	5.9	5.6	0.0	6.3	*	4.2	18.9	16.0	*	22.0	–	17.8		
Worthing HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	1.9	0.0	6.2	0.0	2	9.9	9.4	–	20.0	*	11.8		
Yates HS	*	–	–	*	*	*	3.4	3.2	0.0	6.0	0.0	2.8	12.1	11.5	0.0	24.0	0.0	11.1		
Attucks MS	1.0	0.7	*	2.5	*	1.2	1	0.7	*	2.5	*	1.2								E

Data in bold indicate accountability groups meeting size requirements. If a rate is not bold, the group failed to meet TEA's size requirements.

* Fewer than 5 students enrolled.

– No students reported in that category.

Data Source: TEA 2003–2004 Campus Dropout and Completion Status Summaries, June 2005.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged

If a bold rate does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement for rates greater than:

- 1.0% Gr. 7-8, Annual Dropout (Standard)
- 10.0% Gr. 7-12, Annual Dropout (Alternative)
- 25.0% Gr. 9-12, Completion Status Dropout (Standard and Alternative)

Appendix C

HISD 2003-04 Dropout Percentages by School

School	Annual Dropout Rates												Completion Status Dropout Rates						2005 Low-performing Group(s) †
	Grades 7-8						Grades 7-12						Grades 9-12						
	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	
Black MS	0.6	0.6	*	0.8	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.6	*	0.8	0.0	0.6							
Briar meadow MS	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	0.0	0.0							
Burbank MS	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.7							
Clifton MS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0							
Cullen MS	0.5	0.7	*	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.5	0.7	*	0.0	0.0	0.6							
Deady MS	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.6							
Dowling MS	0.5	0.3	*	0.7	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	*	0.7	0.0	0.5							
Edison MS	0.4	*	–	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.4	*	–	0.4	0.0	0.3							
Energ. For Exc. MS	1.1	0.0	–	1.4	–	1.2	1.1	0.0	–	1.4	–	1.2							
Fleming MS	0.2	0.0	*	0.7	*	0.2	0.2	0.0	*	0.7	*	0.2							
Fondren MS	1.4	1.5	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.4	1.4	1.5	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.4							T A E
Fonville MS	0.8	1.5	*	0.6	2.0	0.6	0.8	1.5	*	0.6	2.0	0.6							
Grady MS	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.4							
Gregory-Lincoln MS.	0.2	0.0	*	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	*	0.6	0.0	0.3							
Hamilton MS	0.2	0.7	*	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.7	*	0.2	0.0	0.3							
Hartman MS	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2							
Henry MS	0.4	0.0	*	0.5	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.0	*	0.5	0.0	0.4							

Data in bold indicate accountability groups meeting size requirements. If a rate is not bold, the group failed to meet TEA's size requirements.

* Fewer than 5 students enrolled.

– No students reported in that category.

Data Source: TEA 2003–2004 Campus Dropout and Completion Status Summaries, June 2005.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged

If a bold rate does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement for rates greater than:

- 1.0% Gr.7-8, Annual Dropout (Standard)
- 10.0% Gr. 7-12, Annual Dropout (Alternative)
- 25.0% Gr. 9-12, Completion Status Dropout (Standard and Alternative)

Appendix C
HISD 2003-04 Dropout Percentages by School

School	Annual Dropout Rates												Completion Status Dropout Rates						2005 Low-performing Group(s) †			
	Grades 7-8						Grades 7-12						Grades 9-12									
	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.				
Hogg MS	0.6	0.0	*	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.0	*	0.6	0.0	0.3										
Holland MS	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.5	0.2	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.5	4.5	0.2										
Jackson MS	0.8	0.0	*	0.9	0.0	0.5	0.8	0.0	*	0.9	0.0	0.5										
Johnston MS	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.8										H
Kaleidoscope MS	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	*	0.0										
Key MS	0.8	0.7	*	1.4	0.0	0.7	0.8	0.7	*	1.3	0.0	0.7										
Lanier MS	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3										
Las Americas MS	0.0	*	–	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	*	–	0.0	*	0.0										
Long MS	1.7	0.0	2.9	1.9	0.0	1.3	1.7	0.0	2.9	1.9	0.0	1.3										T H E
Marshall MS	0.5	0.0	*	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.5	0.0	*	0.5	0.0	0.5										
McReynolds MS	0.3	0.0	–	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0	–	0.4	0.0	0.2										
Ortiz MS	0.8	0.5	0.0	0.8	5.9	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.0	1.0	5.9	1										
Pershing MS	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2										
Pin Oak MS	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.8	0.9										
Proj. Chrysalis MS	0.0	*	–	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	*	–	0.0	*	0.0										
Revere MS	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.3										
The Rice School	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0										

Data in bold indicate accountability groups meeting size requirements. If a rate is not bold, the group failed to meet TEA's size requirements.

* Fewer than 5 students enrolled.

– No students reported in that category.

Data Source: TEA 2003–2004 Campus Dropout and Completion Status Summaries, June 2005.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged

If a bold rate does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement for rates greater than:

- 1.0% Gr.7-8, Annual Dropout (Standard)
- 10.0% Gr. 7-12, Annual Dropout (Alternative)
- 25.0% Gr. 9-12, Completion Status Dropout (Standard and Alternative)

Appendix C

HISD 2003-04 Dropout Percentages by School

School	Annual Dropout Rates												Completion Status Dropout Rates						2005 Low-performing Group(s) †
	Grades 7-8						Grades 7-12						Grades 9-12						
	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	
Rogers, T. H. MS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	–	*	*	0.0	
Ryan MS	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4							
Sharpstown MS	0.7	0.5	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.6	0.7	0.4	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.6							
Smith Ed. Center	0.6	0.4	*	1.2	–	0.3	0.6	0.4	*	1.2	–	0.3	10.3	8.7	5.1	13.5	4.2	11.5	
Stevenson MS	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.1							
Thomas MS	1.3	1.4	*	0.7	0.0	1.3	1.3	1.4	*	0.7	0.0	1.3							T A E
WALLIPP MS	0.0	0.0	–	–	–	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–	–	0.0							
Welch MS	0.8	0.6	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.7							H
West Briar MS	0.5	1.3	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.7	0.5	1.3	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.7							
Williams MS	1.2	0.6	–	2.5	*	1.1	1.4	0.6	–	3.2	*	1.1							T E
Woodson K-8	0.3	0.4	*	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.7	0.6	*	1.9	0.0	0.2							
Alternative Accountability																			
ALTA	0.0	*	–	0.0	*	0.0	11.5	16.9	0.0	11.2	7.7	12.1							T A H E
H.P. Carter	20.0	*	–	*	*	*	2.9	5.9	–	1.7	*	2.7	21.2	18.2	–	23.8	*	24.1	
CLC HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	6.4	7.1	*	5.5	0.0	6.3	18.5	18.7	–	15.9	33.3	17.0	
Community Services	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.9	0.0	0.5	1.0	0.6	6.7	*	–	*	0.0	12.5	
Drop Back In	–	–	–	–	–	–	12.2	12.5	–	12.7	*	13.2	27.4	22.9	–	37.5	*	26.7	T E

Data in bold indicate accountability groups meeting size requirements. If a rate is not bold, the group failed to meet TEA's size requirements.

* Fewer than 5 students enrolled.

– No students reported in that category.

Data Source: TEA 2003–2004 Campus Dropout and Completion Status Summaries, June 2005.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged

If a bold rate does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement for rates greater than:

- 1.0% Gr.7-8, Annual Dropout (Standard)
- 10.0% Gr. 7-12, Annual Dropout (Alternative)
- 25.0% Gr. 9-12, Completion Status Dropout (Standard and Alternative)

Appendix C

HISD 2003-04 Dropout Percentages by School

School	Annual Dropout Rates												Completion Status Dropout Rates						2005 Low-performing Group(s) †
	Grades 7-8						Grades 7-12						Grades 9-12						
	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	
Energ. For Exc. Alt.	–	–	–	–	–	–	8	10.0	*	3.6	*	7.1							T
Houston Night HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	6.8	6.2	*	8.3	–	7.5	63.6	66.7	–	*	–	66.7	
Kay On-Going HS	–	–	–	–	–	–	6.9	7.1	–	7.1	0.0	6.1	45.5	43.7	–	47.1	–	44.8	
CLC MS	0.8	1.4	*	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.8	1.4	*	0.0	0.0	0.5							
Kay On-Going MS	1.6	0.0	–	2.3	*	0.0	1.6	0.0	–	2.3	*	0.0							
Provision, Inc.	0.0	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	0.0	*	0.0							
D.A.E.P.																			
CEP Southeast HS	0.0	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	–	0.0	–	0.0	
CEP Southwest HS	0.0	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	–	0.0	*	0.0	
JJAEP	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	0.0	0.0							
Other Accountability																			
Harper Alter.	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	*	0.0	5.3	3.3	–	7.8	11.1	5.1	50.0	50.0	–	*	*	57.1	
H C C Life Skills	–	–	–	–	–	–	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	*	0.0	10.3	8.7	5.1	13.5	4.2	11.5	
North District Alt.	0.0	*	–	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	*	–	0.0	*	0.0							
Gregory-Lincoln ES	*	*	–	–	–	*	*	*	–	–	–	*							
Kandy Stripe	0.0	0.0	–	–	–	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	–	–	0.0							
Petersen ES	*	–	–	*	–	*	*	–	–	*	–	*							

Data in bold indicate accountability groups meeting size requirements. If a rate is not bold, the group failed to meet TEA's size requirements.

* Fewer than 5 students enrolled.

– No students reported in that category.

Data Source: TEA 2003–2004 Campus Dropout and Completion Status Summaries, June 2005.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged

If a bold rate does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement for rates greater than:

- 1.0% Gr.7-8, Annual Dropout (Standard)
- 10.0% Gr. 7-12, Annual Dropout (Alternative)
- 25.0% Gr. 9-12, Completion Status Dropout (Standard and Alternative)

Appendix C

HISD 2003-04 Dropout Percentages by School

School	Annual Dropout Rates												Completion Status Dropout Rates						2005 Low-performing Group(s) †
	Grades 7-8						Grades 7-12						Grades 9-12						
	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	
SOAR Center	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	*	*	*	0.0	
Stevenson ES	*	–	–	*	–	*	*	–	–	*	–	*	*	–	–	–	–	–	
Turner ES	*	–	–	*	–	–	*	–	–	*	–	–	*	–	–	–	–	–	
Valley West ES	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	–	–	–	–	–	
Wesley ES	*	*	–	–	–	–	*	*	–	–	–	–	*	–	–	–	–	–	
Dominion Academy	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	0.0	–	0.0	*	0.0	0.0	–	–	–	–	–	

Data in bold indicate accountability groups meeting size requirements. If a rate is not bold, the group failed to meet TEA's size requirements.

* Fewer than 5 students enrolled.

– No students reported in that category.

Data Source: TEA 2003–2004 Campus Dropout and Completion Status Summaries, June 2005.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged

If a bold rate does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement for rates greater than:

- 1.0% Gr.7-8, Annual Dropout (Standard)
- 10.0% Gr. 7-12, Annual Dropout (Alternative)
- 25.0% Gr. 9-12, Completion Status Dropout (Standard and Alternative)

Appendix C

HISD 2003-04 Dropout Percentages by District

School	Annual Dropout Rates												Completion Status Dropout Rates						2005 Low-performing Group(s) †
	Grades 7-8						Grades 7-12						Grades 9-12						
	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	
Central District	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.3	1.1	0.5	1.4	2.0	0.6	0.8	5.1	2.3	7.3	9.2	3.8	7.4	
East District	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.3	0.3	1.9	1.0	4.3	2.0	1.6	1.6	8.3	5.6	20.0	8.7	0.0	7.7	
North District	0.6	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.8	0.5	1.9	2.1	0.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	11.8	12.2	*	11.9	6.5	11.2	
Northeast District	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.4	2.8	2.7	0.0	3.0	3.3	2.2	10.4	9.0	5.1	13.6	4.1	11.6	
Northwest District	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.3	1.8	1.2	0.0	2.0	1.2	1.6	9.2	6.1	12.5	11.3	3.7	10.6	
South District	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.7	1.6	1.2	2.2	2.7	0.0	1.5	10.0	8.3	5.0	13.2	4.4	11.1	
South Central District	0.3	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	2	1.9	0.0	2.4	0.0	1.6	13.6	10.9	0.0	23.0	12.5	13.4	
Southeast District	0.7	0.4	0.0	0.7	1.6	0.5	2.3	2.0	1.2	2.4	1.8	1.9	13.8	10.3	18.2	13.6	25.0	12.0	
Southwest District	0.9	0.7	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.9	1.8	1.0	0.9	3.1	1.5	1.4	13.2	9.2	12.5	22.9	4.4	14.9	H
West District	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.8	0.1	0.5	3.4	2.4	1.5	4.8	1.7	3.4	13.4	10.2	6.0	18.9	8.0	17.2	
West Central District	0.8	0.0	0.8	1.3	0.3	0.9	0.8	0.4	0.5	1.7	0.2	1.1	9.8	8.7	4.1	13.3	3.4	11.4	H
Alternative District	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	2.7	0.3	2.4	10.2	8.8	4.8	13.4	4.0	11.6	
Acres Homes	1.2	0.6	–	2.5	*	1.1	2.3	1.7	0.0	4.3	7.5	1.9	3.8	2.3	*	13.9	0.0	4.9	T E

Data are rolled up to 2003-04 configuration.

Data in bold indicate accountability groups meeting size requirements. If a rate is not bold, the group failed to meet TEA's size requirements.

* Fewer than 5 students enrolled.

– No students reported in that category.

Data Source: TEA 2003–2004 Campus Dropout and Completion Status Summaries, June 2005.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged

If a bold rate does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement for rates greater than:

- 1.0% Gr. 7-8, Annual Dropout (Standard)
- 10.0% Gr. 7-12, Annual Dropout (Alternative)
- 25.0% Gr. 9-12, Completion Status Dropout (Standard and Alternative)

Appendix C

HISD 2003-04 Dropout Percentages by Region

School	Annual Dropout Rates												Completion Status Dropout Rates						2005 Low-performing Group(s) †
	Grades 7-8						Grades 7-12						Grades 9-12						
	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	Total	Afr. Amer.	Asian	Hisp.	White	Econ. Dis.	
District																			
Districtwide	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.6	2.2	1.8	0.9	2.8	0.9	2.1	10.3	8.7	5.1	13.5	4.2	11.5	
Central	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	1.6	1.3	0.7	1.9	0.7	1.4	7.1	6.6	4.2	10.2	3.1	9.3	
East	0.6	0.2	0.0	0.7	1.9	0.4	2.3	1.5	1.6	2.2	1.7	1.8	11.6	8.2	18.5	11.7	15.9	10.2	
North	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.7	0.5	2.2	2.1	0.0	2.2	2.5	1.8	10.2	8.4	5.0	13.2	4.2	11.3	
South	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	2.3	1.2	1.3	2.4	0.0	1.4	10.1	8.4	5.0	13.4	4.4	11.2	
West	0.7	0.5	0.3	1.1	0.2	0.8	2.5	1.5	0.9	3.7	0.9	2.4	10.2	8.8	4.7	14.1	4.0	12.0	H
Alternative/Charter	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	5.3	3.3	0.0	3.6	1.1	3.2	10.5	9.2	5.1	13.6	4.2	11.8	

Data are rolled up to 2005-06 configuration.

Data in bold indicate accountability groups meeting size requirements. If a rate is not bold, the group failed to meet TEA's size requirements.

* Fewer than 5 students enrolled.

– No students reported in that category.

Data Source: TEA 2003–2004 Campus Dropout and Completion Status Summaries, June 2005.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged

If a bold rate does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement for rates greater than:

- 1.0% Gr. 7-8, Annual Dropout (Standard)
- 10.0% Gr. 7-12, Annual Dropout (Alternative)
- 25.0% Gr. 9-12, Completion Status Dropout (Standard and Alternative)