



TEXAS

LOW PROFICIENCY AND LOW ACCESS

COMBINED NATIONAL OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN/PROFICIENCY STATE RANK: 43rd

Opportunity to Learn Index Score: 39% (36th)

Percentage of Students at National Proficient Level or Above: 28% (Tied-30th)

Disadvantaged Student Group¹	Opportunity to Learn (compared to White, non-Latino students)
Native American	83%
Black	43%
Latino	37%
Poverty (FARL) ²	40%

Texas ranks 43rd among the states when the Opportunity to Learn of the state’s disadvantaged students is combined with a measure of educational quality.³ Texas’s Native American, Black and Latino and students, taken together, have considerably less than half the opportunity to attend the state’s best-supported, best-performing schools as the state’s White, non-Latino students. A low-income student also has less than half of the opportunity to learn of the average White, non-Latino student.


Opportunity to Learn Core Resource	Resource Access Rank
Access to High Quality Early Childhood Education ⁴	14th
Access to Highly Qualified Teachers ⁵	11th
Access to Instructional Materials ⁶	43rd
Access to College Preparatory Curriculum ⁷	24th

The key Opportunity to Learn resources used in this report are high quality early childhood education, highly effective teachers, well-funded instructional materials and a college preparatory curriculum. All students must have equitable access to key educational resources if they are to have equitable opportunities for success.

Key Research Findings: Texas is one of a group of states with comparatively low graduation rates, a comparatively high percentage of students from disadvantaged groups and comparatively low funding for instruction. High performing schools in states of this type tend to have greater percentages of highly qualified teachers, while low performing schools have lesser percentages of highly qualified teachers.


OPPORTUNITY FOR SUCCESS

Texas Student Access to Well-Resourced, High-Performing Schools



Native American, Asian American, Black and Latino students and students of any race or ethnicity eligible for free or reduced price lunch are more likely than White, non-Latino students in Texas to be disadvantaged by attending schools where they have little chance of becoming proficient in basic skills and graduating on time. Black and Latino students are three times as likely to find themselves in such schools than are White, non-Latino students as are low-income students.

Texas Students in Poorly-Resourced, Low-Performing Schools









* Performance for sub-groups of the Asian American populations (Hmong, Cambodian, etc.) varies drastically. Further federal and state disaggregation of data is needed to more accurately speak to performance results of Asian Americans.

Dividing the percentages of Native American, Black, Latino and low-income students in these “drop-out factories” by the percentage of White, non-Latino students in these schools gives us the comparative disadvantage of each group: (Higher numbers are worse: more of a disadvantage)

Group	Comparative Disadvantage
Native American students	130%
Asian American students*	160%
Black, non-Latino students	310%
Latino students	290%
Low income students	290%
Comparison is to all White, non-Latino students	100%

Taking steps to improve access to key resources, improving the teacher-to-student ratio and increasing the percentage of highly effective teachers in the state’s less effective schools will improve the Opportunity to Learn of the state’s minority and low-income students.







Economic Consequences⁸ Total Annual Economic Burden to Taxpayers Because of Inequity: \$6.8 billion⁹

	Potential Return on School Improvement Investment	250%
	State Annual Total Lifetime Health Loss	\$1.3 billion
	State Annual Crime-Related Loss	\$883 million
	State Tax Losses (Lifetime)	\$4.6 billion
<hr/>		
	Annual Lost Lifetime Earnings (Difference attributable to high school graduation per annual cohort)	\$9.5 billion
	Net Annual Potential Revenue Increase from Equity (After deducting estimated cost of improving schools)	\$4.2 billion

* Performance for sub-groups of the Asian American populations (Hmong, Cambodian, etc.) varies drastically. Further federal and state disaggregation of data is needed to more accurately speak to performance results of Asian Americans.

SOCIAL AND CIVIC CONSEQUENCES

Changes attributable to educational equalization with White, non-Latino students

	College Graduation (25 years of age +)¹⁰ Increase Expected Attributable to Equitable Access Black, Latino, Native American (total)	118%
	Employment¹¹ Increase Expected Attributable to Equitable Access With High School Diploma Further Increase with Bachelor's Degree	 2% 4%
	Income¹² Increase Expected Attributable to Equitable Access With High School Diploma Further Increase with Bachelor's Degree	 42% 89%
	Health¹³ Increase Expected Attributable to Equitable Access Black, non-Latino Latino	 28% 40%
	Civic Engagement¹⁴ (National Election Participation) Increase Expected Attributable to Equitable Access	9%
	Incarceration¹⁵ Decrease Expected Attributable to Equitable Access to Education Black, non-Latino Latino	 -87% -33%

¹ Enrollments (2005/6): Native American (15,045), Asian American (141,893), Black, non-Latino (667,216), Latino (2,048,989), White, non-Latino (1,652,251), FARL (2,181,697).

² Students eligible for Free and Reduced Price Lunch. This measure is similar to the state's percentage of children living in poverty: Native American (24%), Asian American (12%), Black, non-Latino (35%), Latino (34%), White, non-Latino (20%).

³ The NAEP percentage of all public school students scoring at or above proficiency for Grade 8 Reading is used as a proxy for system quality.

⁴ Access for 4-year-olds: NIEER Yearbook.

⁵ Ratio of disadvantaged to advantaged student access: State Consolidated Performance Reports for School Year 2004/5 in Peske, Heather G. and Kati Haycock: Teaching Inequality: How Poor and Minority Students are Shortchanged on Teacher Quality. The Education Trust, June 2006.

⁶ NCES.

⁷ Access to AP Math; USED/OCR.

⁸ Earnings and Revenue: Levin, Henry. The Costs and Benefits of an Excellent Education for All of America's Students. Columbia University, January 2007.

⁹ Numbers are rounded.

¹⁰ U.S. Census, American Community Survey (ACS), 2006.

¹¹ ACS.

¹² ACS.

¹³ National Survey of Children's Health, Indicator 6.1. This report follows the practice of using the condition of health of White, non-Latinos as the baseline from which to measure the health of all groups. This is the meaning of the "100%," indicator. It does not mean that 100% of all White, non-Latinos are in good health. If the health of White, non-Latinos in a state were, in general, to improve (or deteriorate), the percentage indicators for historically disadvantaged groups would change proportionately.

¹⁴ Potential Civic Engagement is represented by national voting rates by educational attainment applied to adult educational attainment of the state. U.S. Census Bureau. Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2004; American Community Survey, Educational Attainment Adult Population. 2004 Voting Turnout Rate from United States Election Project: http://elections.gmu.edu/Turnout_2004G.html

¹⁵ Bureau of Justice Statistics, Special Report: Education and Correctional Populations, January 2003.