

**THE BEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS
FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS 2007**

Erin K. Melton

Texas A&M University

A REPORT OF THE
TEXAS EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE PROJECT

For further information, contact: Meredith B. L. Walker, mwalker@politics.tamu.edu

The Texas Educational Excellence Project (TEEP) is a program housed within the Department of Political Science at Texas A&M University. The project also has research associates at the University of Kansas, the University of Texas - Pan American, the University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, the University of Oklahoma, Kent State University, and the University of Iowa. TEEP seeks to apply scholarly research to educational policy issues in order to make recommendations for greater quality and equity in Texas school systems.

The Best School Districts for African American Students 2007

Minority students in Texas have consistently improved their scores on the statewide TAKS exam. The 2007 TAKS exam provides evidence that the gaps in performance among African American students and their Anglo counterparts is continually closing, and at a considerable faster pace than earlier years of data have shown. State-mandated test scores are improving, yet performance remains an area of major concern for the community at-large. As put forth in earlier reports, the Texas Educational Excellence Project believes in order to improve black test scores, school districts that do a better job of educating black students should be identified. It is our belief that school districts can improve performance by applying the programs employed in successful districts.

Troup Independent School District is an excellent example of the success that can be achieved when consistent, personal measures are taken to improve the education of students. Troup, which ranked first among Texas school districts in this report, is a small district with an average enrollment of approximately 1000 students of which 17% are African American. Because a considerable percentage of the African American population that Troup serves is of low socioeconomic status, Troup faculty spend a great deal of time tutoring the students “one-on-one” in order to ensure they learn and retain the necessary information to progress from one grade to the next. Prior to the personalized attention students now receive from teachers, a program titled “Study Island” was implemented by the district. After careful evaluation, the district decided that its students were best served by personalized attention. Troup administers benchmark testing three times annually in order to evaluate student performance; a special emphasis is placed on the areas of math and science. Finally, Troup accredits its success of students to their belief in practice of high expectations for all students. In reference to African American students in particular, administration notes, “we simply just do not expect less out of them”.

Tatum Independent School District ranks second among schools that successfully educate black students. Of its total enrollment, Tatum educates 27% black students annually. Tatum credits its overall success to a leadership style that “talks it and walks it as well”. Teachers are encouraged to believe in their own self-efficacy as Tatum is convinced that this attitude will translate to students in both the short and long run. In terms of specific programs, Tatum uses a structure of benchmark timelines, administered every six weeks, wherein student performance is evaluated on a class-by-class basis. When problems are detected, intervention specialists are used to regroup students providing them with additional time, resources, and support no matter the problem area. Their motto, “every student is special and no child is left behind” coupled with their vision, “excellence for all” are concise, yet profound testaments to the breadth and depth of educational philosophy exemplified by the teachers, administrators, and staff of the district.

The Texas Educational Excellence Project uses an analytic technique, termed multiple regression, to point out school districts that successfully educate black students. This analytical tool provides the leverage to discuss Texas school districts in comparison to one another as well as more generally, in terms of how school districts in Texas perform on the whole.

Our model is based on what is generally known as an “education production function” in which student performance (measured here as black pass rates on state standardized tests) is a function of varying factors in the educational arena such as teacher-student ratios, per pupil expenditures, and district demographics. From this, we can determine how well districts perform given the resources available to them. Further, our model uncovers how well districts are performing compared to how well the statistical model predicts they should perform based on the aforementioned factors.

An Education Production Function

School districts are organizations; they receive inputs (resources and students) from their environment and produce outputs (educating students among others). A vast literature has designated a variety of education production functions whereby the outputs of school systems can be evaluated relative to their inputs (Burtless 1996; Smith 1995; Hanushek 1986; 1989; 1996).

Our dependent variable is the school district's pass rate for black students on the TAKS exam. Texas requires all school districts to administer exams to students in several grades on an annual basis. We make no claim that results on TAKS exams account for the overall learning experience of black students. Student performance is a multi-dimensional concept that can be measured in a variety of ways. However, pass rates on these exams do measure whether students are picking up basic academic skills as they advance from grade to grade. Our dependent variable, therefore, focuses primarily on how well districts perform in teaching black students basic skills, and should neither be constructed nor considered an overall measure of black student learning.

The independent variables fall into four general types--environmental constraints, financial resources, teacher qualifications, and district policies. Environmental constraints are factors that restrict agency performance; in the case of education the key constraint is how difficult/easy it is to educate students. In the context of education policy, poverty is a serious constraint on student performance.

The measures of constraint are the percent of poor students (defined as those eligible for free school lunches) and the percentage of black families that live in poverty. We also measure the educational level of blacks in the school district using the percentage of blacks in the school district over age 25 with at least a high-school diploma. The education variable should be positively related to student performance and the other two measures should be negatively related to black pass rates.

Financial resources are the raw materials of any organization's attempt to meet its goals. Three measures of financial resources are included--per student instructional funds, average teacher's salary, and percent of funds received via state aid. These represent total resources devoted to education, the attractiveness of teaching positions in a competitive marketplace, and state efforts to overcome the unequal distribution of local financial resources. The relationship between expenditures and educational outcomes is one of the most contested questions in all of educational policy. Hanushek (1986; 1989; 1996) contends that there is no consistent relationship between money and student outcomes. Although others have challenged this finding (Hedges and Greenwald 1996), it remains conventional wisdom. In recent longitudinal studies, however, Murray (1995), Evans, Murray and Schwab (1997), and Murray, Evans and Schwab (1995) found that districts that increased expenditures were correlated with higher test scores even when controlling for the previous year's test scores. We consider expenditures a critical variable for inclusion in the model. All relationships should be positive.

The two teacher qualification measures are the percent of teachers who hold no college degree and the average number of years of teacher experience. The relationship for non-degree holders should be negative, while the expectation is that more experienced teachers will lead to higher student performance.

Finally, the education production function contains three policy measures—the percentage of students taking gifted classes, class size, and student attendance (percent attending on an average day). Performance should be positively related to gifted classes and attendance and negatively related to class size.

Texas has a large number of school districts; many are very small or deal with a homogeneous student body. In an effort to use a set of organizations relatively similar in the tasks they perform, we have restricted our analysis to school districts with at least 1000 students and at least 10 percent black students. These restrictions resulted in a total of 164 districts in the study. The data analysis is a pooled time series with data from the years 2005 through 2007. In any pooled time series one needs to control for serial correlation resulting from any trend in the variable over time. A series of dummy variables are introduced to achieve this control.

The basic production function is shown in Table 1. Several variables are powerful predictors of black student pass rate. The black student pass rate is strongly influenced by the average teacher salary as well as attendance rate. Alternatively, increases in the amount of low income students in a district negatively impact the black student pass rate. The remaining variables included in the model failed to reach statistical significance.

The results of this model allow comparisons among school districts as to how well they performed (or did not) given expectations. As an illustration, the model predicted that the Troup Independent School District would have an average black pass rate of 63.16% from 2004-2006; Troup's actual pass rate was 84.33%. From this method,

the top ranked school district for black students in Texas was Troup with a +21.17 score followed by Tatum with a +16.72 and Fairfield with a score of +13.40.

The top forty districts are shown in Table 2. The first column is the numerical score on which the districts are ranked. The second column is the average pass rate for black students from 2005-2007 and the third column is the ranking score for 2007 only. Table 3 reports the 25 best districts for black students for 2007 only. La Grange ISD and Troup ISD led the districts with high pass rates for 2007. Recent gains are likely the result of the benefits of policies adopted earlier so these are the districts that are likely to continue to be rated highly in future studies.

Although our top 25 includes districts of all sizes, large districts often cannot change as quickly as small districts simply because so many students are involved. Table 4 presents the top ten large districts (those with 15,000 or more students). Galena Park, Pearland, and Carrollton-Farmers Branch top this list of large districts. The final table, or Appendix, provides an alphabetical listing of all of the school districts examined in this study, along with their scores. Persons interested in a specific school district can examine the Appendix to locate that district and identify the score and rank.

Conclusion

This study has identified those school districts in Texas where students performed better than expected on the statewide TAKS exam. These districts can serve as exemplars for other districts as they continue to strive for increased student performance. It is clear that not all the districts utilize the same approach, yet each of their employed methods and programs seem to be working and have the potentiality to be useful in other districts.

Accordingly, this project examines exemplary districts; however, the overall low-pass rate for black students in Texas should not be overlooked. Additional improvement is needed in low-performing districts as well as other districts to eradicate the test gap between black and Anglo students. Progress is being made, yet a great deal of improvement is necessary to ensure the benefits of educational opportunities for all Texas children.

TABLE 1. Regression Results for African American Student Performance

	African American Pass Rate
Percent Low Income	-0.180 (3.67)**
Percent Gifted	-0.257 (1.02)
Attendance	1.960 (2.06)*
Average Teacher Salary (1000s)	0.619 (2.35)**
Class Size	0.024 (0.84)
Teacher Experience	0.252 (0.77)
% Teachers with No Degree	0.017 (0.13)
State Aid	0.010 (0.23)
Instructional Expenditures	-0.002 (1.16)
High School Education	-0.890 (0.11)
% Poverty Background	-2.078 (0.32)
2005	-23.542 (11.92)**
2006	-8.94 (6.00)**
Constant	-125.756 (2.39)**
Observations	492
R-squared	0.62

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

TABLE 2 - TOP 40 SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR BLACKS (2005 - 2007)

Rank	District	Score	Pass Rate	2007 Score
1	TROUP ISD	21.17	84.33	28.77
2	TATUM ISD	16.72	79.33	16.95
3	FAIRFIELD ISD	13.40	77.67	26.64
4	CALDWELL ISD	11.02	76.67	16.10
5	WOODVILLE ISD	10.91	73.33	23.02
6	EAST CHAMBERS ISD	10.69	76.00	27.78
7	EAST CENTRAL ISD	10.63	77.67	8.91
8	PARIS ISD	10.30	70.33	21.77
9	KOUNTZE ISD	10.19	73.33	20.07
10	WEST ORANGE-COVE CISD	10.09	64.33	23.57
11	LUFKIN ISD	9.86	73.33	10.13
12	GALENA PARK ISD	9.50	72.00	9.67
13	KENNEDALE ISD	9.40	79.33	11.29
14	COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD	9.29	78.67	18.13
15	PEARLAND ISD	9.00	83.00	6.34
16	KILGORE ISD	8.98	72.33	13.07
17	SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY ISD	8.83	81.67	13.50
18	NEWTON ISD	8.54	67.33	10.64
19	ANGLETON ISD	8.36	78.33	9.48
20	ROCKDALE ISD	8.02	72.67	15.91
21	DIBOLL ISD	7.65	69.00	7.73
22	LIBERTY ISD	7.60	71.67	14.46
23	LITTLE ELM ISD	7.15	73.67	3.29
24	WYLIE ISD	7.09	78.67	0.02
25	SILSBEE ISD	6.80	72.33	18.47
26	CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH ISD	6.78	74.33	3.83
27	PITTSBURGH ISD	6.78	67.33	17.77
28	LA GRANGE ISD	6.42	71.67	28.96
29	HENDERSON ISD	6.15	70.00	11.53
30	CUERO ISD	5.96	68.67	9.76
31	SHELDON ISD	5.94	67.00	4.15
32	HARDIN-JEFFERSON ISD	5.66	74.67	5.80
33	ALDINE ISD	5.59	71.00	4.01
34	EL CAMPO ISD	5.59	70.00	0.43
35	SHERMAN ISD	5.52	67.33	4.61
36	GIDDINGS ISD	5.44	69.67	9.75
37	ATLANTA ISD	5.38	66.67	-1.45
38	LIBERTY-EYLAU ISD	5.16	65.33	-5.41
39	TERRELL ISD	5.13	67.33	3.81
40	CHAPEL HILL ISD	4.68	68.67	17.48

TABLE 3 - TOP 25 SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR BLACKS (2007 ONLY)

Rank	District	Score	Pass Rate	2007 Score
1	LA GRANGE ISD	6.42	71.67	28.96
2	TROUP ISD	21.17	84.33	28.77
3	EAST CHAMBERS ISD	10.69	76.00	27.78
4	FAIRFIELD ISD	13.40	77.67	26.64
5	WEST ORANGE-COVE ISD	10.09	64.33	23.57
6	WOODVILLE ISD	10.91	73.33	23.02
7	PARIS ISD	10.30	70.33	21.77
8	KOUNTZE ISD	10.19	73.33	20.07
9	PALESTINE ISD	4.37	64.67	18.71
10	SILSBEE ISD	6.80	72.33	18.47
11	COLOUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD	9.29	78.67	18.13
12	PITTSBURG ISD	6.78	67.33	17.77
13	TEMPLE ISD	2.93	64.33	17.60
14	CHAPEL HILL ISD	4.68	68.67	17.48
15	TATUM ISD	16.72	79.33	16.95
16	NEW BOSTON ISD	4.37	69.67	16.89
17	CALDWELL ISD	11.02	76.67	16.10
18	ROCKDALE ISD	8.02	72.67	15.91
19	WHARTON ISD	2.96	65.33	15.18
20	LIVINGSTON ISD	2.00	64.33	14.68
21	LIBERTY ISD	7.60	71.67	14.46
22	SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U ISD	8.83	81.67	13.50
23	HUTTO ISD	2.49	71.33	13.20
24	KILGORE ISD	8.98	72.33	13.07
25	MALAKOFF ISD	-18.51	41.00	12.89

TABLE 4 - TOP 10 SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR BLACKS (15,000 + Students)

Rank	District	Score	Pass Rate	2007 Score
1	GALENA PARK ISD	9.50	72.00	9.67
2	PEARLAND ISD	9.00	83.00	6.34
3	CARROLLTON-FARMERS BRANCH ISD	6.78	74.33	3.83
4	ALDINE ISD	5.59	71.00	4.01
5	IRVING ISD	3.25	66.67	5.14
6	LAMAR CISD	2.86	72.00	1.00
7	ABILENE ISD	2.74	67.33	1.74
8	KILLEEN ISD	2.27	68.67	1.90
9	CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS ISD	1.61	74.67	-3.08
10	RICHARDSON ISD	1.05	67.67	-4.19

APPENDIX - Full Rank List for All Districts

Rank	District Name	Score	Pass Rate	2007 Score
61	ABILENE ISD	2.74	67.33	1.74
33	ALDINE ISD	5.59	71.00	4.01
88	ALIEF ISD	0.10	65.00	1.31
101	AMARILLO ISD	-1.28	61.67	-2.99
145	ANAHUAC ISD	-7.71	56.67	-28.68
19	ANGLETON ISD	8.36	78.33	9.48
93	ARLINGTON ISD	-0.19	67.67	-3.08
79	ATHENS ISD	0.84	65.00	1.60
37	ATLANTA ISD	5.38	66.67	-1.45
115	BAY CITY ISD	-2.85	60.00	-3.80
98	BEAUMONT ISD	-0.92	61.33	-0.17
150	BELLVILLE ISD	-10.28	57.67	5.06
56	BRAZOSPORT ISD	2.96	70.67	5.65
103	BRENHAM ISD	-1.46	63.67	3.39
131	BRYAN ISD	-4.11	55.67	-2.97
4	CALDWELL ISD	11.02	76.67	16.10
64	CAMERON ISD	2.34	66.00	12.52
26	CARROLLTON-FARMERS ISD	6.78	74.33	3.83
154	CARTHAGE ISD	-12.05	54.33	-22.73
129	CEDAR HILL ISD	-4.04	66.00	-1.18
114	CENTER ISD	-2.79	59.67	8.07
89	CHANNELVIEW ISD	0.05	64.00	-1.45
40	CHAPEL HILL ISD	4.68	68.67	17.48
162	CITY VIEW ISD	-20.68	41.00	-70.26
104	CLEVELAND ISD	-1.48	60.00	-2.38
81	COLDSPRING-OAKHURST ISD	0.67	60.00	-6.29
65	COLLEGE STATION ISD	2.32	73.00	7.30
14	COLUMBIA-BRAZORIA ISD	9.29	78.67	18.13
164	COLUMBUS ISD	-30.62	36.67	-74.15
112	COMMERCE ISD	-2.68	60.00	5.87
49	CONNALLY ISD	3.37	65.00	2.89
59	COPPERAS COVE ISD	2.91	71.00	-2.26
158	CORRIGAN-CAMDEN ISD	-13.53	46.67	-7.74
148	CORSICANA ISD	-9.13	54.33	-20.00
144	CROCKETT ISD	-7.16	49.33	2.77
47	CROSBY ISD	3.62	71.00	8.19
143	CROWLEY ISD	-6.85	66.00	-6.82
30	CUERO ISD	5.96	68.67	9.76
71	CYPRESS-FAIRBANKS	1.61	74.67	-3.08

48	DAINGERFIELD-LONE STAR ISD	3.54	66.33	10.07
76	DALLAS ISD	1.04	66.00	3.61
160	DAYTON ISD	-18.32	47.33	-25.09
51	DEL VALLE ISD	3.25	63.33	-0.56
126	DENISON ISD	-3.68	61.33	-14.37
128	DENTON ISD	-4.04	63.33	-11.19
124	DESOTO ISD	-3.34	65.67	0.07
21	DIBOLL ISD	7.65	69.00	7.73
119	DICKINSON ISD	-3.26	61.00	-14.34
94	DUNCANVILLE ISD	-0.32	65.67	-6.27
7	EAST CENTRAL ISD	10.63	77.67	8.91
6	EAST CHAMBERS ISD	10.69	76.00	27.78
132	EDNA ISD	-4.28	58.33	-32.07
34	EL CAMPO ISD	5.59	70.00	0.43
156	ELGIN ISD	-12.95	51.67	-16.24
95	ENNIS ISD	-0.33	65.67	1.25
105	EVERMAN ISD	-1.50	63.00	-3.89
3	FAIRFIELD ISD	13.40	77.67	26.64
84	FORT BEND ISD	0.42	74.67	2.90
96	FORT WORTH ISD	-0.37	63.67	1.08
12	GALENA PARK ISD	9.50	72.00	9.67
55	GALVESTON ISD	2.97	64.00	0.92
77	GARLAND ISD	1.03	72.33	1.35
36	GIDDINGS ISD	5.44	69.67	9.75
116	GILMER ISD	-2.96	60.67	3.32
151	GLADEWATER ISD	-10.46	50.67	-10.40
155	GONZALES ISD	-12.39	45.33	-29.51
107	GOOSE GREEK ISD	-1.72	64.33	0.06
92	GRAND PRAIRIE ISD	-0.14	66.00	0.40
149	GREENVILLE ISD	-9.43	52.67	-11.73
106	GROESBECK ISD	-1.68	61.67	-2.04
32	HARDIN-JEFFERSON ISD	5.66	74.67	5.80
117	HEARNE ISD	-3.03	51.00	3.27
137	HEMPSTEAD ISD	-6.05	54.33	-2.21
29	HENDERSON ISD	6.15	70.00	11.53
99	HILLSBORO ISD	-0.95	58.33	5.05
153	HITCHCOCK ISD	-11.43	48.33	-12.75
67	HOOKS ISD	2.19	66.33	-25.39
110	HOUSTON ISD	-2.20	62.67	-1.33
157	HUMBLE ISD	-13.48	59.00	-15.21
97	HUNTSVILLE ISD	-0.77	63.00	-3.88
125	HURST-EULESS-BEDFORD ISD	-3.52	69.00	-7.53
62	HUTTO ISD	2.49	71.33	13.20

50	IRVING ISD	3.25	66.67	5.14
54	JACKSONVILLE ISD	2.98	61.00	5.61
130	JASPER ISD	-4.06	56.67	-2.80
141	JEFFERSON ISD	-6.45	54.33	-11.41
78	JUDSON ISD	0.84	67.67	0.95
13	KENNEDALE ISD	9.40	79.33	11.29
16	KILGORE ISD	8.98	72.33	13.07
66	KILLEEN ISD	2.27	68.67	1.90
127	KLEIN ISD	-3.95	70.33	-3.84
9	KOUNTZE ISD	10.19	73.33	20.07
28	LA GRANGE ISD	6.42	71.67	28.96
87	LA MARQUE ISD	0.18	61.00	11.80
45	LA VEGA ISD	4.36	63.33	9.56
60	LAMAR ISD	2.86	72.00	1.00
133	LANCASTER ISD	-4.98	59.00	2.32
22	LIBERTY ISD	7.60	71.67	14.46
38	LIBERTY-EYLAU ISD	5.16	65.33	14.68
23	LITTLE ELM ISD	7.15	73.67	3.29
69	LIVINGSTON ISD	2.00	64.33	14.68
73	LONGVIEW ISD	1.14	63.67	-0.40
136	LUBBOCK ISD	-5.75	59.33	-5.94
11	LUFKIN ISD	9.86	73.33	10.13
142	MADISONVILLE CISD	-6.74	59.33	-16.46
161	MALAKOFF ISD	-18.51	41.00	12.89
63	MANOR ISD	2.48	63.33	11.39
90	MANSFIELD ISD	0.00	73.67	0.05
159	MARLIN ISD	-13.93	44.33	-13.68
42	MARSHALL ISD	4.55	66.67	4.78
91	MESQUITE ISD	-0.11	70.67	3.56
86	MEXIA ISD	0.35	60.00	-7.73
100	MOUNT PLEASANT ISD	-1.19	59.33	-5.25
83	NACOGDOCHES ISD	0.46	61.67	-3.46
74	NAVASOTA ISD	1.12	65.00	-3.75
44	NEW BOSTON ISD	4.37	69.67	16.89
18	NEWTON ISD	8.54	67.33	10.64
70	NORTH FOREST ISD	1.67	56.67	2.97
43	PALESTINE ISD	4.37	65.67	18.71
8	PARIS ISD	10.30	70.33	21.77
15	PEARLAND ISD	9.00	83.00	6.34
138	PFLUGERVILLE ISD	-6.32	62.67	-4.01
72	PINE TREE ISD	1.55	67.33	-10.42
27	PITTSBURG ISD	6.78	67.33	17.77
123	PLEASANT GROVE ISD	-3.32	65.67	-25.09

120	PORT ARTHUR ISD	-3.37	56.00	-3.20
46	QUEEN CITY ISD	3.67	67.00	11.39
152	RICE CISD	-10.65	51.67	1.55
75	RICHARDSON ISD	1.05	67.67	-4.19
20	ROCKDALE ISD	8.02	72.67	15.91
109	ROYAL ISD	-2.09	57.67	-4.19
134	RUSK ISD	-5.39	57.67	-5.51
17	SCHERTZ-CIBOLO-U CITY ISD	3.67	67.00	11.39
146	SEALY ISD	-7.77	59.00	-13.49
31	SHELDON ISD	5.94	67.00	4.15
35	SHERMAN ISD	5.52	67.33	4.61
25	SILSBEE ISD	6.80	72.33	18.47
163	SMITHVILLE ISD	-22.13	42.47	-72.39
122	SPRING ISD	-3.32	63.33	-7.92
140	STAFFORD MSD	-6.42	63.00	-20.68
53	SULPHUR SPRINGS ISD	3.03	68.67	7.52
118	SWEENY ISD	-3.25	66.67	-7.69
2	TATUM ISD	16.72	79.33	16.95
108	TAYLOR ISD	-2.07	60.00	-20.23
121	TEAGUE ISD	-3.30	61.00	-26.14
58	TEMPLE ISD	2.93	64.33	17.60
39	TERRELL ISD	5.13	67.33	3.81
68	TEXARKANA ISD	2.10	63.67	4.21
102	TEXAS CITY ISD	-1.44	63.33	2.40
111	TRINITY ISD	-2.23	55.33	7.70
1	TROUP ISD	21.17	84.33	28.77
113	TYLER ISD	-2.75	61.33	-7.43
85	VERNON ISD	0.38	63.00	0.43
80	WACO ISD	0.68	58.00	2.97
41	WALLER ISD	4.65	71.00	-1.33
147	WAXAHACHIE ISD	-7.79	62.00	1.76
10	WEST ORANGE-COVE CISD	10.09	64.33	23.57
82	WEST OSO ISD	0.49	57.67	7.11
139	WESTWOOD ISD	-6.42	60.00	-4.62
57	WHARTON ISD	2.96	65.33	15.18
52	WHITEHOUSE ISD	3.15	74.67	9.46
135	WICHITA FALLS ISD	10.91	73.33	23.02
5	WOODVILLE ISD	10.91	73.33	23.02
24	WYLIE ISD	7.09	78.67	0.02