

RESEARCH

DROPOUT ANALYSIS 2002–03



INTRODUCTION 1

RESULTS 4

DISCUSSION 7

APPENDIX A: 8

HISD 2002–03 DROPOUT PERCENTAGES BY
ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICTS AND SCHOOL



HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT Board of Education

Dianne Johnson, PRESIDENT

Diana Dávila, FIRST VICE PRESIDENT

Manuel Rodriguez, Jr., SECOND VICE PRESIDENT

Arthur M. Gaines, Jr., SECRETARY

Harvin C. Moore, ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Karla Cisneros

Kevin H. Hoffman

Lawrence Marshall

Greg Meyers

Abelardo Saavedra
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

James LaVois
INTERIM CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER

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 2002–03 DROPOUT ANALYSIS

Introduction

Background

Schools districts throughout the state report dropout information to the Texas Education Agency (TEA) at the conclusion of the academic year. Over the years, how school districts identify dropouts has changed. 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 2002–03, 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 TAAS or TAKS failure, or age;
- to pursue a job or join the military;
- due to pregnancy or marriage;
- 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 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 Texas Assessment of Academic Skill (TAAS).

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 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 policymakers, TEA calculates a longitudinal completion rate, which is comprised of completion rates for eight classes of ninth-grade students, the graduating classes of 1996 through 2003. 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 2003 are based on the tracking of students who began grade 9 for the first time in the 1999–2000 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 grades 7–12 longitudinal dropout rate was first calculated in 1997–98. The longitudinal rates for the class of 2003 are based on the tracking of students who began grade 7 in 1997–98.

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 completion rates, and grades 7–8 annual dropout rates. A grade 9 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 2004 accountability ratings:

- At least 75 percent of a grade 9 class must graduate, receive a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or be enrolled in high school for a rating of *Academically Acceptable*. In addition, a grade 7–8 annual dropout rate of 2 percent or less is required for the *Academically Acceptable* rating;
- At least 85 percent of a grade 9 class must graduate, receive a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or be enrolled in high school for a rating of *Recognized*. In addition, a Grade 7–8 annual dropout rate of .7 percent or less is required for the *Recognized* rating; or
- At least 95 percent of a grade 9 class must graduate, receive a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or be enrolled in high school for a rating of *Exemplary*. A grade 7–8 annual dropout rate of .2 percent or less is required for the *Exemplary* rating.

Results

Districtwide

Table 1 presents the districtwide and state dropout rates for the five accountability student groups used for the school years 1998–99 to 2002–03. (Appendix A presents the 2002–03 dropout rates for the district and by campus for the five student accountability groups and Asian students.)

Table 1: Districtwide and State Annual Dropout Rates by Student Groups, 1998–99 to 2002–03

| Category | 1998–99 | | 1999–00 | | 2000–01 | | 2001–02 | | 2002–03 | | | |
|---------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------|----------|-------|
| | Gr. 7–12 | | Gr. 7–12 | | Gr. 7–12 | | Gr. 7–12 | | Gr. 7–8 | | Gr. 7–12 | |
| | HISD | State | HISD | State | HISD | State | HISD | State | HISD | State | HISD | State |
| Total | 3.9 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 0.9 |
| Afr. Amer. | 4.5 | 2.3 | 3.5 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| Hispanic | 4.1 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 3.0 | 1.4 |
| White | 1.7 | 0.8 | 1.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 0.4 |
| Econ. Disadv. | 2.3 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 1.0 |

- In 2002–03, the Grade 7–8 overall dropout rate for HISD was 0.9% and the dropout rate for this group at the state was 0.2%. In comparison, the Grade 7–12 dropout rate for HISD was 2.4%, while the state dropout rate was 0.9% in 2002–03.
- For both HISD and the state, the grade 7–12 dropout rates for economically disadvantaged students was higher than the Grade 7–8 dropout rates in 2002–03. The differences in the rates were somewhat larger for the district than for the state (1.3 and .7 percentage points, respectively).
- Relative to ethnicity, in 2002–03, the HISD Grade 7–8 dropout rate was highest among Hispanic students and lowest among African American students (1.2% vs. 0.5%). Similar findings were noted relative to the Hispanic Grade 7–12 dropout rate (3.0%). However, the 7–12 dropout rate was lowest among White students at 1.1%.
- When comparing 1998–99 to 2002–03, HISD and state dropout rates for each of the student groups decreased. The largest decrease in the HISD dropout rate was among African American students by 3.2 percentage points, while the largest decrease in the state dropout rate was among African American students by 1.1 percentage point.

- The decrease in the HISD Grade 9-12 dropout rate for economically disadvantaged students from 1998–99 to 2001–02 was slightly higher than the decrease in the state dropout rate by 0.4 percentage points.

Table 2 lists official dropout and cumulative attendance data for Grades 7–12 and Grades 7–8 including both number and percent in 2002–03. 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 overall number of students counted in the cumulative attendance record in 2002–03 for Grades 7–12 was 55,676 and 22,938 students in Grades 7–8.
- Hispanic students reflected the greatest percentage of students in the cumulative attendance record at 52.6% and 54.7% in Grades 7–12 and 7–8, respectively, reflecting a slight increase of 0.7 percentage points over the previous year.
- Among the Grades 7–12 and 7–8 subgroups, Hispanic students represented the largest percentage of official dropouts in 2002–03 at 65.4% and 73.2%, respectively.
- When considering ethnic groups, the official dropout percentage of African American students was lower for Grades 7–12 than for Grades 7–8 (27.5% vs. 32.3%, respectively). In comparison, the official dropout percentage for Hispanic students was higher for Grades 7–12 than Grades 7–8 (65.4% vs. 73.2%).
- Economically disadvantaged dropouts were represented at 59.6% in grades 7–12, which was moderately lower than the official dropout percentage at grades 7–8 (66.0%).

Table 2: Dropout and Attendance Data by Student Groups, 2002–03

| Group | 2002–03 | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| | Grades 7–12 | | | | Grades 7–8 | | | |
| | Official Dropouts | | Cumul. Attendance | | Official Dropouts | | Cumul. Attendance | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| All Students | 2,010 | 100.0 | 82,886 | 100.0 | 265 | 100.0 | 30,062 | 100.0 |
| Af. Am. | 552 | 27.5 | 26,739 | 32.3 | 46 | 17.4 | 9,699 | 32.3 |
| Hispanic | 1,315 | 65.4 | 43,630 | 52.6 | 194 | 73.2 | 16,461 | 54.8 |
| White | 109 | 5.4 | 9,648 | 11.6 | 18 | 6.8 | 2,957 | 9.8 |
| Nat. Am. | 1 | 0.0 | 51 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 18 | 0.1 |
| Asian/Pacific | 33 | 1.6 | 2,818 | 3.4 | 7 | 2.6 | 927 | 3.1 |
| Eco Dis.* | 1,197 | 59.6 | 55,676 | 67.2 | 175 | 66.0 | 22,938 | 76.3 |

*Economically Disadvantaged percentage is based upon the All Student group.

Table 3 provides a breakdown of the number of students excluded from the official TEA dropout count by reason. As evident in Table 3, during the 2001–02 school year, HISD submitted a count of 1,583 potential dropouts and recovered 422 students. The resulting final total of dropouts was 1,161 for which the district was accountable. Table 3 also shows that in 2002–03, HISD submitted a count of 2,476 potential dropouts. After implementing its recovery procedures, TEA excluded 466 names from the district’s dropout count resulting in a final total of 2,010 dropouts for which HISD was accountable.

- In 2002–03, the largest number of recovered dropouts, 240, were students who were identified as being enrolled in a public school elsewhere in the state. This represents 51.5% of the total number excluded.
- The percentages of recovered dropouts who were previous dropouts declined from 19.7% of the recovered dropouts in 2001–02 to 17.0% in 2002–03. In contrast, the percentages of a recovered dropouts based on GED status increased from 4.3% of recovered dropouts in 2001–02 to 10.5% in 2002–03.

Table 3: 2001–02 and 2002–03 HISD Dropouts Excluded From Official Count by TEA

| | Number of Students | |
|--|--------------------|------------|
| | 2001–02 | 2002–03 |
| Potential Dropouts Reported by HISD | 1,583 | 2,476 |
| Recovery Category | | |
| Enrollment | 244 | 240 |
| Previous Dropout | 83 | 79 |
| GED | 18 | 49 |
| Duplicate | 6 | 5 |
| Graduate | 5 | 11 |
| Attendance | 58 | 71 |
| Not ADA Eligible | 8 | 11 |
| Total Recovered Dropouts | 422 | 466 |

High Schools

There were 31 high schools in HISD with Grades 7–12 dropout rates and Grades 9–12 completion rates in 2002–03 for the student accountability groups and Asian students (Appendix A). There are no schools projected to be Low-performing in 2004 based on the 2002–03 dropout data.

- The Grades 7–12 overall dropout rate of 29 high schools ranged from 0% to 6.8% in 2002–03. Carnegie Vanguard, DeBaKey, Eastwood Academy and Middle College High School reported no dropouts, while Lee High School had the highest overall dropout rate of 6.8%.
- Among these 31 high schools, the Grades 9–12 completion status dropout rates ranged from 29.7% to 0.0%. Jones had the highest completion status dropout rate, while Eastwood Academy and High School for Law Enforcement had the lowest rate of 0.0%.
- None of the high schools were projected to be Low-performing in 2004.

Middle/Combined Schools

There were 46 middle/combined schools in HISD with Grades 7–8 and Grades 7–12 dropout rates (Appendix A). For schools projected to be Low-performing in 2004 based on the 2002–03 dropout rates, the specific group(s) causing this rating are indicated.

- The Grades 7–8 overall dropout rate of the 44 middle and combined schools ranged from 0% to 2.2%. Briar Meadow, Kaleidoscope, Lanier, Pershing, Project Chrysalis, The Rice School, T. H. Rogers, WALIPP, and Thomas middle schools reported no Grades 7–8 dropouts for 2002–03.
- The highest Grades 7–8 dropout rate reported was 3.2% at Las Americas Middle School in 2002–03. Las Americas also had the highest dropout rate at Grades 7–8 for economically disadvantaged students.
- Relative to the total Grades 7–12 dropout rates, Briar Meadow, Kaleidoscope, Lanier, Pershing, Project Chrysalis, The Rice School, T. H. Rogers, Thomas, and WALIPP reported no dropouts.
- The highest total Grades 7–12 dropout rate as well as the highest Grades 7–12 dropout rate for economically disadvantaged students was reflected at Las Americas Middle School (3.2% and 2.0%, respectively).
- McReynolds is projected to be Low-performing in 2004 based on the total Grades 7–8 dropout rate and the Grades 7–8 dropout rate for Hispanic students.

Alternative Accountability Programs

There were 14 alternative schools and three disciplinary alternative educational programs (DAEPs) within HISD for the five student accountability groups and Asian students (Appendix A). 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 17 alternative schools, 10 schools reported Grades 7–8 dropout rates in 2002–03. H.P. Carter, Harper, Energized for Excellence Middle School, Provision, Inc., Kandy Stripe and SOAR reported no dropouts. The highest dropout rate was shown at Kay-On-Going Middle School (12.7%).
- In 2002–03, the Grades 7–8 dropout rates at the D.A.E.P.s ranged from 0% at JJAEP (since the dropout data were attributed to the student’s home campus) to 1.0% at CEP Southeast High School.
- Alternative schools reported Grades 7–12 dropout rates ranging from 0% at H.C.C. Life Skills, Energized for Excellence Middle School, Provision, Inc., Kandy Stripe and SOAR to 19.3% at Drop Back In Academy.
- HCC Life Skills and Ninth Grade Academy had the highest overall Grades 9–12 completion rates as well as the Grades 9–12 completion rate for economically disadvantaged at 85.4% and 88.3%, respectively.

Administrative Districts

Appendix A presents the dropout rates for each of the 14 HISD administrative districts. The overall dropout rate for Grades 7–8 was lowest within the South and Southwest districts and highest within the Northeast District in 2002–03 (0.5% and 1.4% in the respective groups). For grades 7–12, the dropout rate was lowest at 0.7% within the West Central District and highest at 3.3% in the West District. In 2001–02, four of the thirteen districts had overall dropout rates lower than one percent. Further, the completion rates at grades 9–12 ranged from 84.5% to 96.9% within the 14 districts. West Central had the highest completion rate of 96.9% and South Central had the lowest completion rate of 84.5%.

Discussion

For 2002–03, HISD reported 2,476 students as potential dropouts; TEA recovery procedures determined that 466 of these students were not dropouts. Therefore, the number of dropouts for which HISD was accountable during the 2002–03 school year was 2,010. The overall 2001–02 dropout rate for HISD included 1,161 students, a decrease 849 students (73.1%). This was due in part to the more accurate identification of dropouts through the use of the PEIMS Leaver Record and the district’s goal of reducing the number of dropouts.

Furthermore, the districtwide Grades 7–8 dropout rates were substantially lower than the Grades 7–12 dropout rate (0.9% vs 2.4%). In addition, the dropout rates for all ethnic groups in grades 7–8 fell between 0.5% and 1.2%, while the dropout rates in grades 7–12 fell between 1.1% and 3.0%. African American students had the lowest dropout rate among Hispanic, Asian, and White students in grades 7–8, while White students had the lowest dropout rate in grades 7–12.

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 has 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. 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.

Appendix A
HISD 2002-03 Dropout Percentages by District

| School | Annual Dropout Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | Completion Status Dropout Rates | | | | | | 2004 Low-performing Group(s) † |
|------------------------|----------------------|------------|-------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------|-------|-------|-------|------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Grades 7-8 | | | | | | Grades 7-12 | | | | | | Grades 9-12 | | | | | | |
| | Total | Afr. | Asian | Hisp. | White | Econ. Dis. | Total | Afr. | Asian | Hisp. | White | Econ. Dis. | Total | Afr. | Asian | Hisp. | White | Econ. Dis. | |
| District | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Districtwide | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 14.6 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 18.2 | 5.7 | 11.7 | |
| Central District | 0.6 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 5.2 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 8.0 | 4.4 | 9.7 | |
| East District | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 15.4 | 7.8 | |
| North Central District | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.6 | 2.0 | 13.4 | 14.9 | * | 13.7 | 7.0 | 12.8 | |
| Northeast District | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 14.3 | 1.0 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 5.6 | 2.2 | 14.0 | 14.2 | – | 13.7 | * | 12.3 | H |
| Northwest District | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 9.8 | 6.6 | 0.0 | 12.1 | 5.1 | 11.5 | |
| South District | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 4.0 | 2.5 | 4.9 | 1.5 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 16.7 | 5.8 | |
| South Central District | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 15.5 | 13.0 | * | 22.9 | 33.3 | 16.1 | |
| Southeast District | 0.8 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 3.7 | 2.7 | 4.0 | 2.2 | 14.0 | 21.4 | 9.1 | 13.7 | 11.1 | 13.2 | |
| Southwest District | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 13.9 | 10.9 | 8.3 | 20.7 | 8.9 | 14.7 | |
| West District | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 10.4 | 8.8 | 6.9 | 11.0 | 12.7 | 8.9 | |
| West Central District | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 1.2 | 7.7 | |
| Alternative District | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 3.3 | 0.3 | 2.3 | 8.2 | 9.5 | 1.8 | 9.5 | 3.3 | 10.2 | |
| North/Acres Homes | 0.9 | 0.5 | * | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 7.2 | 6.7 | * | 15.2 | 0.0 | 7.8 | |

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 reported.

– No students reported in that category.

Completion Rates; Completion/Student Status Groups: Graduates + Continuers + GED

Data Source: TEA 2002–2003 Campus Dropout Summary, November 2004.

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

If a bold rate over 5.0% does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement.

Appendix A

HISD 2002-03 Dropout Percentages by School

| School | Annual Dropout Rates | | | | | | Completion Status Dropout Rates | | | | | | 2004 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 | | | | | | | 3.8 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 9.4 | 0.0 | * | 9.5 | * | 8.2 | |
| Bellaire HS | | | | | | | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 10.3 | 1.2 | 7.7 | |
| Carnegie Vanguard H | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 14.6 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 18.2 | 5.7 | 11.7 | |
| Challenge HS | | | | | | | | | | | | | 14.6 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 18.2 | 5.7 | 11.7 | |
| Chavez HS | | | | | | | 4.0 | 2.1 | 4.8 | 4.1 | 6.3 | 2.9 | 14.6 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 18.2 | 5.7 | 11.7 | |
| Davis HS | | | | | | | 3.4 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 10.2 | 13.6 | * | 10.2 | 0.0 | 10.7 | |
| DeBakey H S H P | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 15.4 | 1.8 | |
| Eastwood Academy | | | | | | | 0.0 | * | * | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | |
| Furr HS | | | | | | | 3.1 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 7.9 | 0.0 | * | 10.6 | 10.0 | 8.7 | |
| H S for Law Enforce. | | | | | | | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| H S P V A | | | | | | | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | |
| Houston, Sam HS | | | | | | | 3.1 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 2.4 | 15.8 | 17.4 | * | 16.0 | 10.3 | 14.5 | |
| Jones HS | | | | | | | 4.3 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 19.7 | 15.5 | * | 24.5 | * | 20.9 | |
| Jordan, Barbara HS | | | | | | | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 4.1 | 2.7 | * | 6.5 | * | 4.1 | |
| Kashmere HS | | | | | | | 4.8 | 5.0 | - | 3.7 | * | 3.7 | 14.3 | 13.9 | - | 22.2 | * | 10.6 | |
| Lamar HS | | | | | | | 1.9 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 2.4 | 5.2 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 8.0 | 4.4 | 9.7 | |

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 reported.

- No students reported in that category.

Completion Rates; Completion/Student Status Groups: Graduates + Continuers + GED

Data Source: TEA 2002-2003 Campus Dropout Summary, November 2004.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged
If a bold rate over 5.0% does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement.

Appendix A

HISD 2002-03 Dropout Percentages by School

| School | Annual Dropout Rates | | | | | | Completion Status Dropout Rates | | | | | | 2004 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 | | | | | | | 6.8 | 6.4 | 4.1 | 7.4 | 3.0 | 5.6 | 13.1 | 17.3 | 6.9 | 12.7 | 15.2 | 10.3 | |
| Madison HS | | | | | | | 1.8 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.0 | * | 4.0 | 33.3 | 3.3 | |
| Middle College HS | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | – | 0.0 | |
| Milby HS | | | | | | | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 14.0 | 21.4 | 9.1 | 13.7 | 11.1 | 13.2 | |
| Ninth Gr. Academy | | | | | | | | | | | | | 14.6 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 18.2 | 5.7 | 11.7 | |
| Reagan HS | | | | | | | 4.2 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 3.5 | 11.0 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 11.6 | 4.8 | 11.6 | |
| Scarborough HS | | | | | | | 3.1 | 2.9 | 6.7 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 2.8 | 10.2 | 7.0 | * | 16.9 | 2.2 | 15.5 | |
| Sharpstown HS | | | | | | | 4.5 | 3.4 | 2.2 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 3.3 | 7.0 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 10.5 | 6.5 | |
| Sterling HS | | | | | | | 3.7 | 2.8 | 14.3 | 5.4 | 8.3 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 4.9 | * | 2.4 | 0.0 | 4.5 | |
| Waltrip HS | | | | | | | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 8.4 | 4.4 | * | 10.8 | 6.6 | 9.2 | |
| Washington HS | | | | | | | 2.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 7.2 | 6.7 | * | 15.2 | 0.0 | 7.8 | |
| Westbury HS | | | | | | | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 3.7 | 2.1 | 2.4 | 13.9 | 10.9 | 8.3 | 20.7 | 8.9 | 14.7 | |
| Westside HS | | | | | | | 2.1 | 2.4 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 14.6 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 18.2 | 5.7 | 11.7 | |
| Wheatley HS | | | | | | | 5.2 | 5.3 | * | 5.3 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 13.6 | 14.7 | – | 12.7 | – | 14.0 | |
| Worthing HS | | | | | | | 2.6 | 2.3 | * | 8.8 | 7.7 | 2.9 | 7.5 | 6.9 | – | 18.7 | – | 11.8 | |
| Yates HS | | | | | | | 2.9 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 12.2 | 11.8 | – | 16.7 | * | 12.8 | |
| Attucks MS | 0.3 | 0.4 | * | 0.0 | * | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | * | 0.0 | * | 0.2 | | | | | | | |

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 reported.

– No students reported in that category.

Completion Rates; Completion/Student Status Groups: Graduates + Continuers + GED

Data Source: TEA 2002–2003 Campus Dropout Summary, November 2004.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged
If a bold rate over 5.0% does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement.

Appendix A
HISD 2002-03 Dropout Percentages by School

| School | Annual Dropout Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | 2004 Low-performing Group(s) † | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------------|------|-------|-------|-------|------------|--------------------------------------|--|------|-------|-------|-------|------------|--|--|--|
| | Grades 7-8 | | | | | | Grades 7-12 | | | | | | | Completion Status Dropout Rates Grades 9-12 | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | Afr. | Asian | Hisp. | White | Econ. Dis. | Total | Afr. | Asian | Hisp. | White | Econ. Dis. | | Total | Afr. | Asian | Hisp. | White | Econ. Dis. | | | |
| Black MS | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Clifton MS | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cullen MS | 0.7 | 0.5 | * | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.9 | * | 3.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deady MS | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 14.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 14.3 | 0.7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dowling MS | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 5.0 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 5.0 | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Edison MS | 1.4 | * | * | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.4 | * | * | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Energ. For Exc. MS | 0.0 | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fleming MS | 0.7 | 0.7 | * | 0.6 | * | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | * | 0.6 | * | 0.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fondren MS | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 0.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fonville MS | 0.7 | 3.7 | - | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 3.7 | - | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grady MS | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gregory-Lincoln Ed. | 2.2 | 2.9 | * | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 2.9 | * | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hamilton MS | 0.3 | 0.0 | * | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.0 | * | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hartman MS | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Henry MS | 1.3 | 0.0 | * | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | * | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.1 | | | | | | | | | | |

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 reported.

- No students reported in that category.

Completion Rates; Completion/Student Status Groups: Graduates + Continuers + GED

Data Source: TEA 2002-2003 Campus Dropout Summary, November 2004.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged
If a bold rate over 5.0% does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement.

Appendix A
HISD 2002-03 Dropout Percentages by School

| School | Annual Dropout Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | Completion Status Dropout Rates | | | | | | 2004 Low-performing Group(s) † | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------------|------|-------|-------|-------|------------|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Grades 7-8 | | | | | | Grades 7-12 | | | | | | Grades 9-12 | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total | Afr. | Asian | Hisp. | White | Econ. Dis. | Total | Afr. | Asian | Hisp. | White | Econ. Dis. | Total | Afr. | Asian | Hisp. | White | Econ. Dis. | | | | |
| Hogg MS | 0.6 | 0.0 | * | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 2.9 | * | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.7 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Holland MS | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 5.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 5.9 | 0.9 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jackson MS | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Johnston MS | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kaleidoscope MS | 0.0 | 0.0 | – | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | – | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Key MS | 1.6 | 0.5 | * | 4.8 | * | 1.5 | 1.6 | 0.5 | * | 4.8 | * | 1.5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lanier 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Las Americas MS | 3.2 | * | * | 3.3 | – | 2.0 | 3.2 | * | * | 3.3 | – | 2.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Long MS | 1.2 | 1.0 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Marshall MS | 1.4 | 0.0 | – | 1.5 | 7.1 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 0.0 | – | 1.7 | 7.1 | 1.8 | | | | | | | | | | |
| McReynolds MS | 2.1 | 1.6 | * | 2.2 | * | 0.6 | 2.1 | 1.6 | * | 2.2 | * | 0.6 | | | | | | | | | T | H |
| Ortiz MS | 0.8 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pershing 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 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pin Oak MS | 1.7 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 1.6 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proj. Chrysalis MS | 0.0 | * | * | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 0.0 | * | * | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Revere MS | 1.3 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 reported.

– No students reported in that category.

Completion Rates; Completion/Student Status Groups: Graduates + Continuers + GED

Data Source: TEA 2002–2003 Campus Dropout Summary, November 2004.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged
If a bold rate over 5.0% does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement.

Appendix A

HISD 2002-03 Dropout Percentages by School

| School | Annual Dropout Rates | | | | | | | | | | | | Completion Status Dropout Rates | | | | | | 2004 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. | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.1 | * | - | 0.0 | - | 12.5 | |
| Ryan MS | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.3 | | | | | | | |
| Sharpstown MS | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.5 | | | | | | | |
| Smith Ed. Center | 1.0 | 0.0 | * | 3.4 | - | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.0 | * | 3.4 | - | 1.1 | | | | | | | |
| Stevenson MS | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.7 | | | | | | | |
| Thomas MS | 0.0 | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| WALLIPP MS | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | * | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | * | - | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| Welch MS | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 14.6 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 18.2 | 5.7 | 11.7 | |
| West Briar MS | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | | | | | | | |
| Williams MS | 0.9 | 0.5 | * | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.5 | * | 2.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | | | | | | | |
| Woodson K-8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | * | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.4 | * | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | | | | | | | |
| Kandy Stripe | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | - | - | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| Alternative/Other Accountability | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ALTA | 8.3 | * | - | 9.1 | - | 11.8 | 8.8 | 6.6 | 16.7 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 7.4 | | | | | | | |
| H.P. Carter | 0.0 | * | - | * | * | 0.0 | 5.5 | 3.0 | - | 7.2 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 24.2 | 26.7 | - | 23.5 | * | 18.5 | |
| CLC HS | | | | | | | 6.5 | 6.1 | * | 7.7 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 17.5 | 16.5 | - | 23.1 | 0.0 | 17.6 | |
| Community Services | 1.0 | 1.0 | * | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 20.0 | 28.6 | - | * | 14.3 | 30.8 | |

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 reported.

- No students reported in that category.

Completion Rates; Completion/Student Status Groups: Graduates + Continuers + GED

Data Source: TEA 2002-2003 Campus Dropout Summary, November 2004.

† T-Total; A-African American; H-Hispanic; W-White; E-Economically Disadvantaged
If a bold rate over 5.0% does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement.

Appendix A
HISD 2002-03 Dropout Percentages by School

| School | Annual Dropout Rates | | | | | | Completion Status Dropout Rates | | | | | | 2004 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. |
| Drop Back In | | | | | | | 19.3 | 21.5 | * | 17.1 | * | 14.8 | | | | | | | |
| Energ. For Exc. Alt. | | | | | | | 1.1 | 1.2 | – | 0.0 | – | 1.4 | | | | | | | |
| Harper Alter. | 0.0 | 0.0 | – | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 5.5 | 4.7 | – | 7.8 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 25.0 | * | – | * | * | 28.6 | |
| H C C Life Skills | | | | | | | 0.0 | 0.0 | – | * | * | * | 14.6 | 14.1 | 4.6 | 18.2 | 5.7 | 11.7 | |
| Houston Night HS | | | | | | | 9.9 | 9.9 | – | 8.1 | * | 12.0 | 58.8 | 60.0 | – | * | – | 45.5 | |
| Kay On-Going HS | | | | | | | 6.5 | 5.4 | * | 7.9 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 42.9 | 42.9 | – | 47.4 | * | 42.1 | |
| CLC MS | 0.5 | 0.0 | * | 1.0 | * | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.0 | * | 1.0 | * | 0.5 | | | | | | | |
| Kay On-Going MS | 12.7 | 6.3 | – | 14.9 | – | 12.7 | 12.7 | 6.3 | – | 14.9 | – | 12.7 | | | | | | | |
| Provision, Inc. | 0.0 | 0.0 | – | 0.0 | – | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | – | 0.0 | – | 0.0 | | | | | | | |
| SOAR Center | 0.0 | 0.0 | – | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | * | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.1 | * | – | * | 0.0 | * | |
| D.A.E.P. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CEP Southeast HS | 1.0 | 0.8 | – | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 1.5 | * | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | * | – | * | – | 0.0 | |
| CEP Southwest HS | 0.5 | 0.0 | * | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 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 | * | * | – | * | – | * | |

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 reported.

– No students reported in that category.

Completion Rates; Completion/Student Status Groups: Graduates + Continuers + GED

Data Source: TEA 2002–2003 Campus Dropout Summary, November 2004.

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

If a bold rate over 5.0% does not have a Low-Performing code, the group met required improvement.